

The Global City as a Space for Transnational Identity Politics

Working Paper*

Fiona B. Adamson
SOAS, University of London

and

Maria Koinova
University of Warwick

Abstract: Global Cities are key nodes in circuits of transnational political activity. As dense spaces of political interaction, cities provide bundles of material, political and ideational resources that allow for the generation of new identities and frames of meaning, shifts in tactical and strategic alliances, and network brokerage activities. The key function of cities in facilitating transnationalism has not been adequately explored in the existing International Relations literature on transnationalism. In this paper, we use the case of London as a Global City to examine how its features as a dense institutional context; a node in multiple global networks; and as a resource-rich environment creates a creative space for innovations in transnational politics. We focus on the strategies employed by identity-based transnational political entrepreneurs and discuss four mechanisms of mobilization: brokerage (the linking of disparate networks), strategic framing (the use of symbolic politics), coalition-building (the forging of alliances between organizations) and social learning or mediated diffusion (the adoption of new ideas and practices). Our analysis challenges both standard state-centric and single-case study accounts of transnational activity, suggesting a novel site of investigation for IR scholars.

*First uploaded to freely accessible SOAS e-repository on 4 November 2013

Introduction

Studies of transnationalism in International Relations (IR) have largely ignored the importance of Global Cities as key nodes in circuits of transnational political activity. Non-state transnational networks have been analyzed as operating across more than one territorially-defined nation-state, and as either challenging or reinforcing state sovereignty. They have been viewed as constituting part of a broader “global civil society” (e.g. Guidry, Kennedy and Zald 2010; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Risse-Kappen 1995; Stroup 2012; Wapner 1995). To date, however, IR scholarship on transnationalism has devoted little attention to understanding the spatiality of transnational politics, or how the geography of the international states system co-exists with an alternative global landscape – a landscape, we argue, of networked urban spaces and cities that structures circuits of exchange and interaction in contemporary world politics. This alternative global urban geography, and the opportunity structures embedded in it, has received significant attention from sociologists and geographers, but is under-theorized by International Relations scholars (Brenner 1998, 2004; Curtis 2011).

In this paper, we attempt to remedy this omission in the IR literature by focusing on the constitutive and generative roles that urban spaces play in international politics. We do so by examining the “Global City” as an important site in transnational identity politics, and by suggesting how it structures and facilitates shifts in political mobilization strategies across a range of transnationally-oriented non-state movements. The term “Global City” is a means of designating those major urban and metropolitan areas in the world that perform key functions in the global political economy (Sassen 1991). We propose a framework for understanding the role of global metropolises in transnational politics, by focusing on how the incentives and

constraints embedded in cities – what we refer to as *urban opportunity structures* – shape the local strategies pursued by non-state political entrepreneurs engaged in transnational politics. We argue that a focus on the “local” strategies and forms of transnational politics that occur in major urban centres can shed light on broader patterns of transnationalism in world politics. Our aim in this article is to set out a new research agenda, rather than to engage in hypothesis-testing or to present detailed case studies. As a way of focusing our analysis, however, we draw examples throughout the paper from the case of London, which is consistently ranked in surveys -- along with New York -- as one of the top two “Global Cities” in the world.

Our argument is set out in the rest of the paper as follows. First, we discuss the existing literature on transnationalism in world politics, define what we mean by “the Global City,” and outline why it is an important and understudied site of transnational political activity. We discuss three features of the Global City and why they matter for the study of transnationalism: the Global City is a densely structured institutional context; a node in multiple global networks; and a resource-rich environment. These features form sets of urban opportunity structures that shape the local strategies employed by transnational political entrepreneurs. By *transnational political entrepreneurs*, we simply mean political actors who are mobilizing on behalf of political projects that transcend national boundaries.

Transnational political entrepreneurs devise mobilization strategies that emerge partly in response to local incentives and constraints. In our discussion, we focus on how the urban context provides incentives for transnational political entrepreneurs to use either *horizontal* or *vertical* mobilization strategies. These strategies are forged in the highly stratified environment of Global Cities, which replicates global power relations in a concentrated and microcosmic form. We

identify four mobilization mechanisms through which these strategies could be deployed: *brokerage*; *strategic framing*; *coalition-building*, and *social learning* or *mediated diffusion*. These mechanisms respectively relate to the mobilization or manipulation of networks, identities, alliances, and ideas and practices. While these mechanisms are not unique to cities, the forms in which they are deployed are shaped by and respond to particular contexts or sets of opportunity structures found in individual Global Cities. As a means of illustrating the logic of our framework, we provide suggestions of how the mechanisms have functioned in identity-based and diasporic transnational movements in London. Finally, we conclude by discussing the implications of our framework and analysis for the broader literature on transnationalism, suggesting how a focus on cities as spaces of transnationalism can help IR scholars understand and map strategic innovations and circuits of activity in transnational identity-based movements. More generally, we argue for the utility of a “spatial turn” in IR that takes into account alternative geographies of the global which exist alongside the nation-state system.

The Global City and Transnational Politics

IR scholars of transnationalism are fundamentally concerned with understanding patterns of transnational action and activism, and how these patterns impact on world politics. From early studies that established the centrality of transnationalism in world politics (e.g. Nye and Keohane 1971), IR has grown increasingly sophisticated in its analysis of the dynamics and sources of transnational politics. Constructivists have pointed to the important role that transnational activism plays in promoting and diffusing international norms in areas such as human rights protection, security policy and the environment (e.g. Brysk 2000; Evangelista 1999; Finnemore and Sikkink 1998; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Price 1998; Risse, Ropp and

Sikkink 1999; Wapner 1995), while realists and rationalists point to the strategic aspects of norm promotion by transnational actors, and the important role that power plays in normative contestations and transnational politics (Barnett and Snyder 2008; Bob 2002; 2005; Cooley and Ron 2002). Social movement theorists have dissected and elucidated some of the operational dynamics of transnational politics and protest, including the ways in which the “local” and the “global” come together in particular mechanisms or processes, such as “scale shifts” or “leverage politics” (Bob 2005; della Porta and Tarrow 2005; Finnemore and Sikkink 1998; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Khagram, Riker and Sikkink 2002; Tarrow 1994, 2005).

Scholars have examined the role that transnational politics plays in shaping the international security environment (Adamson 2005b; Checkel 2013; Evangelista 1999; Fair 2005; Laffey and Nadarajah 2012; Lyons 2006; Malet 2013; Salehyan 2006, 2007, 2009; Shain 2002), domestic processes of democratization (Mendelson and Glenn 2002; Koinova 2009, 2013) and regime change (Owen 2010; Walt 1997; Shain 2005). In addition, the study of transnationalism has expanded from focusing primarily on institutionalized international or non-governmental organizations (INGOs and NGOs) to a broader range of transnational actors such as religious organizations and movements (Adamson 2005; Barnett and Stein 2012; Nexon 2009) and transnational ethnic groups or diaspora organisations (Adamson 2002, 2007; Jenne 2007; King and Melville 2000; Koinova 2011a, 2011b, 2013; Laffey and Nadarajah 2012; Lyons and Mandaville 2010; Saideman 2001; Shain and Barth 2003; Shain 2007; Sheffer 1986, 2003; Ragazzi 2009; Varadarajan 2012; Wayland 2004).

These latter forms of transnationalism can be analyzed as “transnational identity politics” in that they are forms of transnational action that are structured around a particular identity category, as opposed to being structured around the

pursuit of economic interests or broader normative change. Diaspora politics, transnational ethnic mobilization, religious identity movements, networks of indigenous peoples, or transnational populations such as the Roma, and networks structured around sexual or other identities, such as transnational LGBT or Queer politics, constitute examples of “transnational identity politics” that can be analytically distinguished from forms of transnationalism structured around either the pursuit of economic goals or “norms promotion” (Adamson 2012; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Vertovec 2010).

The variety of transnational politics and movements found in contemporary world politics are often conceptualized as constituting a broader “global civil society” or “global public sphere” that either subsumes or co-exists with the politics of the international states system (Wapner 1995; Keane 2003; Kaldor 2003). Yet, transnational movements are also embedded in multiple national contexts, and some of the most interesting work in the field examines the embeddedness of transnational politics, focusing on how national contexts produce variations in transnational organizational cultures, impacts and/or strategies (Krasner 1995; Risse-Kappen 1994; Stroup 2012). Scholars of migration and diaspora politics, for example, have analyzed the ways in which different national contexts may simultaneously shape a transnational “political field” by examining the “triadic” relationship that exists among sending or “home” states, receiving or “host” states, and “diasporas” (Adamson 2002; Brubaker 1996; Ostergaard-Nielsen 2001, 2003a, 2003b; Peter and Peretz 2005; Sheffer 1986, 2003). Actors who engage in transnational politics are not simply free-floating individuals existing in a non-specified space of “global civil society” but are “rooted cosmopolitans” who are also deeply embedded in particular local contexts (Tarrow 2005: 35-56).

One of the challenges facing scholars of transnationalism therefore is to better understand the relationship between the “local” and the “global” in transnational politics (Hertel 2006; Lyons and Mandaville 2010; Mittelman 2000; Robertson 1992, 1995; Rosenau 2003; Sheppard 2002; Stroup 2012). We argue that a particularly rich strand of interdisciplinary literature that has much to contribute to our understanding of the geographical embeddedness of “transnationalism” has been the literature on Global Cities. By focusing on the Global City as a “space” of transnational politics, we can better understand and elucidate the ways in which strategies and processes that occur in “local” contexts also produce transnational effects.

Global Cities

Global Cities have received a tremendous amount of scholarly attention in the past two decades across a wide range of literatures in geography, sociology, and urban studies (Brenner 1998, 2004; Brenner and Keil 2006; Chen and Kanna 2012; Holston 1998; Le Gales 2002; Scott 2002). An increasing level of academic and policy interest has been devoted to categorizing, mapping and ranking the world’s leading “Global Cities.”¹ Referring to major urban metropolises in the world that exert a global influence as centers of global economic, political or cultural activity, the term “Global City” was popularized in Saskia Sassen’s (1991) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Building on an emerging literature in the 1980s and 1990s that examined the growth of “world cities,” “mega cities,” “informational cities” or “supervilles” in the context of globalization (Braudel 1984; Castells 1989; Chase-Dunn 1984, 1985;

¹ See, for example, the Globalisation and World Cities Research Network at Loughborough University; the Global Cities index produced by Foreign Policy magazine; as well as private reports and rankings by such organizations as the Wealth Report’s Global City Survey, the Tokyo-based Institute for Urban Strategies’ Global Power City Index and the Global Economic Power Index. New York and London are ranked as the top two Global Cities in every one of these surveys, with Paris, Tokyo and Hong Kong ranking close behind in most of the surveys.

Friedmann 1986; Friedmann and Wolff 1982), Sassen's work was an attempt to rethink the geography of contemporary globalization by examining the consequences of the simultaneous *dispersion* and *concentration* of global economic activities in urban metropolises (Sassen 1991: xix, 20ff).

As the world population becomes increasingly urbanized, the combination of dispersion and concentration means that Global Cities increasingly become microcosms of broader global power relations. Many of the world's mega-cities boast populations that are greater than those of national states. Attracting flows of global capital and labor in the form of both international finance and international migration leads to "the implosion of a range of systemic contradictions into the physical sites of global cities" (Curtis 2011: 1924) in which the urban geography of the city reflects and replicates the broader structural inequalities of the international system (Harvey 1973, 1989, 2000, 2011; Knox and Taylor 1995; Lefebvre 1995; Sassen 1991; Massey 2007).

The Global City can be understood as a particular space that is defined by high levels of proximity, dynamic density and concentration. Proximity refers to physical geography; dynamic density is about connectivity; and concentration is about the numerical preponderance of entities. Focusing on the unique configuration of institutions, networks and resources that are found in Global Cities provides an alternative means of investigating how spatiality and geography structure international politics (Lefebvre 1991[1974]). International Relations scholars of course are intensely interested in the functions of institutions in world politics (states, international organizations (IOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), multinational corporations, etc.) but have undertheorized the importance of their geographical embeddedness, i.e. the importance of *where* particular institutions are

located. They have analyzed the role of networks as key features of world politics, but have often ignored their spatial specificity.

Similarly, IR scholars pay a great deal of attention to the measurement of resources as a proxy for power, but in doing so employ a geographically thin notion of resources as only being embedded in states as unitary actors. As we show in this paper, however, resources cannot be assumed to be evenly distributed within territorial states, but rather their particular concentrations in urban contexts is an understudied feature that is key to understanding patterns in world politics. Financial, symbolic and human resources are embedded in concentrated spaces that cannot simply be reduced to state territories. In short, IR scholars, including those who study transnational politics, have paid almost no attention to the *spatial* organization of institutions, networks, and resources in the world system.

A focus on how urban contexts contain particular configurations of institutions, networks and resources can help shed light, we argue, on the spatial embeddedness of many forms of transnational action. The Global City can be understood as an institutional context; as a node in multiple networks, and as a resource-rich environment. We briefly describe each of these features, draw examples from London, and discuss their “top-down” and “bottom-up” manifestations. In so doing, we show how the make-up of Global Cities mirrors broader geopolitical power configurations, but in a compressed and proximate form. This helps us to dissect how these features create unique sets of urban opportunity structures, that in turn structure patterns of political mobilization that are simultaneously “local” and “global.”

The Global City as Institutional Context

The Global City can be understood as a particular *institutional context*, in that it is characterized by a high *density, concentration* and *proximity* of a wide range of key political, economic, cultural and media institutions. Studies of transnationalism have focused on international organizations as sites of activity for norm entrepreneurs (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998) and have examined how local and international NGOs interact or are joined together in transnational advocacy networks (Keck and Sikkink 1998, Bob 2002, 2005). Scholars have shed light on how particular national institutions structure transnational action (Risse-Kappen 1994; Stroup 2012) and have studied the institutional cultures of international and non-governmental organizations (Barnett 2003; Hopgood 2006; Stroup 2012).

Major global institutions however are not free-floating, but are rather embedded in particular geographic spaces. These are largely urban and metropolitan, meaning that the institutional geography of world politics exists as a topography of urban spaces. It matters that the United Nations headquarters are in New York and Geneva, and that the World Bank and International Monetary Fund are in Washington DC. Institutions congregate and develop reciprocal and interactive relationships with one another. The congregation of corporate headquarters and financial institutions, for example, plays a role in creating dense business districts in Global Cities (Sassen 1991:5). Just as the physical concentration of corporate headquarters creates the incentives for the emergence of an accompanying service sector, conglomerations of major political and media institutions also spawn a rich topography of accompanying institutions, such as lobby groups, advocacy groups, consultants, “experts,” commentators, think tanks and others. This all contributes to the further creation of a

densely stratified institutional context that is tied together by reciprocal and symbiotic power relations.

Global Cities, by bringing together in a focused geographic area institutions of finance, politics, knowledge, commerce, media, advocacy and culture, are places characterized by dynamic density and concentrated political opportunity structures. Such contexts are focal points for the exercise of power and influence in Global Politics: national governmental structures, international organizations (IOs) and international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) provide platforms and venues for lobbying or agenda-setting by non-state actors engaged in transnational political activities.

London as a Global City, for example, brings together a wide mix of governmental, non-governmental and media organizations. The British Government exerts a disproportionate global influence (in relation to the size and population of the United Kingdom) due to its strong connections and influence with North America, the European Union, and the broader Commonwealth (the headquarters of which are also in London) and attracts lobbying from a wide range of transnationally-oriented organised groups in the UK. The BBC and its World Service; the Economist Group; press agencies such as Reuters; the broader British press, a range of major publishing houses, as well as numerous media outlets and publications, including satellite television networks such as al-Jazeera, are based in London or have major London offices. London is also the base for numerous foreign media outlets. Arabic language newspapers based in London, for example, include *Al-Arab*, *al Hayat*, *Azzaman*, and *Al Haqaeq*. London is also home to the International Press Telecommunications Council, which is a consortium of the world's leading news agencies and vendors. The concentration of media in the city provides a range of opportunities for political

actors to communicate and disseminate information, engage in agenda-setting, and influence public opinion.

In addition, international NGOs and think tanks provide sites of influence for transnational movements as important sources of agenda-setting and political and financial support for international campaigns, and can be lobbied or drawn upon in processes of leverage politics (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Bob 2005). Major NGOs such as Amnesty International, Save the Children, PEN, Survival International and the Minority Rights Group have their headquarters in London, in addition to globally influential think tanks such as Chatham House or International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS). Likewise, scores of smaller NGOs are based in London – a great number of which are “transnational” or “diasporic” in orientation. The Kurdish Human Rights Project (KHRP), for example, plays a significant role in transnational Kurdish politics from its base in London.

The rich institutional context of the Global City contains a mix of formal and informal, elite and grassroots, powerful and weaker institutions -- all of which have different constituencies, audiences and forms of influence. This creates an institutional environment rich with possibilities for political action -- including lobbying, agenda-setting, coalition-building, alliance-formation and so forth. Indeed, many of the activities of influence and power that have been outlined in the existing literature on transnationalism, such as engaging in “leverage politics” (building a coalition with a more powerful organization) or “information politics” (generating and disseminating information) are activities that require institutional symbiosis and are facilitated by institutional proximity, density and concentration. Transnationally-oriented NGOs, for example, rely on media outlets for engaging in “information” or “symbolic” politics, and on lobbying and accessing governmental institutions and

international organizations as a means of putting political pressure on target states or other actors. Keck and Sikkink's (1998) "boomerang pattern", which refers to local NGOs operating transnationally in order to exert influence on their own country's politics via the mediation or intervention of a more powerful third party actor (such as a powerful third party government) are often in practice facilitated by contacts that occur within the compressed space of a city.

Bob (2002: 38) observes that small local grassroots movements around the world operate in a global marketplace in which success is determined by their ability to "pitch their causes internationally" and "universalize their narrow demands and particularistic identities." This is enhanced by their access and proximity to "large and powerful... 'gatekeeper' NGOs." Bob notes that smaller or weaker groups will seek access to and influence with more powerful organizations by setting up overseas offices, or engaging in overseas lobbying. These global "transnational" dynamics however often have a very "local" manifestation. Diasporic, exile or emigre groups already located in the Global City can serve as a local base for such overseas organizations or may even constitute a transnational or mobile leadership or cohort that is engaged in political activities which connect organizations in the Global City to overseas networks. This brings us to a second feature of the Global City that is relevant for our understanding of transnational politics, namely its high degree of connectivity, due to its function as a node in multiple transnational and global networks.

The Global City as Node in Multiple Networks

As information, transportation and communication hubs, Global Cities are defined by their international connectivity (Castells 1992). The quantity of

information, people and processes that pass through Global Cities leads to alternative geographies of integrated city-regions (Deutsch 1966; Deutsch et al. 1957; Sassen 1991; Scott 2002). Major political, financial and knowledge production institutions in Global Cities exert a global influence and are connected to their counterparts through dense circuits of communication and transport and elite transnational networks.

There is an increased interest in IR in the role that networks play in structuring global politics, not just as modes of organization but also as sets of relations that form structures (Goddard 2009; Hafner-Burton and Montgomery 2006; Kahler 2009). Key here is to understand networks as relational structures and to see where power lies in such networks. Power is concentrated in the Global City, since it is a node with high "degree centrality" in terms of network analysis.² It is durably linked to multiple local, national, regional, supra-national and global actors, and plays an important role as a site of exchange among them (Sheppard 2002).

As spaces of globalized capital (Lefebvre 1991 [1974], 2000, 2009; Harvey 1973, 1989, 2000, 2012; Massey 2007; Sassen 1991) cities are repositories for "top down" forms of power that exerts influence beyond the confines of the urban context. The institutions described in the section above, for example, are all London-based, yet also function as nodes in broader transnational political, media or NGO networks that span the globe and connect or influence other actors in multiple venues and locales. London is a major communication and transportation hub, with the largest international airport in the world, and one of the largest Internet Exchange Points. Its legacy as a maritime empire means that it is still a key node in global maritime and shipping networks, acting as the headquarters of the International Maritime Organization (IMO), as well as the International Federation of Shipmasters'

² Degree centrality is a term in network analysis designating the strength and number of direct ties between one actor and others (Kahler 2009: 8).

Associations. In 2008, 50% of all the world's shipping contracts were signed in London.³ It receives 15.3 international visitors a year, 75% of the world's Fortune 500 companies have offices in London, and its residents speak 279 languages.⁴ "London," Massey (2007: xiii) notes, "is a world city in that it has effects on the wider planet beyond it."

At the same time as Global Cities are spaces in which elite global networks converge, they are also spaces in which alternative and "bottom-up" networks of power operate. Global Cities simultaneously produce concentrations of wealth and power but also become centers for service industries that attract low-cost labor (Sassen 1991). Circuits of global capital shape urban spaces, but also lead to bottom-up resistance to these reconfigurations and restructurings. Global Cities bring together, in close proximity, elite networks of global power as well as bottom-up networks of global resistance. They are stratified spaces that reproduce in microcosmic form larger global political and economic inequalities where "working class cosmopolitans" (Werbner 1999) share space with jet-setting global elites.

The Global City attracts mobile professionals, highly-skilled workers and international students, as well as low-skilled labor and/or migrants escaping from economic disadvantage or political persecution (Cadge et al. 2009; Smith and Guarnizo 2009). It is particularly important as a node in numerous forms of diasporic networks and transnational movements connecting various newcomers to the city to their countries of origin via "homeland politics." This point is often missing in studies of diasporic and transnational politics – many of which focus on a single case study, without explicitly examining how various and multiple transnationally-oriented

³ Oxford Economics, Ltd. London's Competitive Place in the UK and Global Economies, City of London Corporation Economic Development Office, London 2011, p. 30.

⁴ Taken from www.telecitygroup.com/telecities/telecities-London.pdf accessed October 11, 2013.

diasporic movements share the same space of the Global City, how they may interact with each other, and to what effect.

Global Cities, as nodes in multiple and stratified networks, thus provide many opportunities for both vertical and horizontal connectivity. Through vertical connectivity weaker networks can connect to networks of power in the form of leverage politics or lobbying (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Bob 2002, 2005). Through horizontal connectivity similarly placed networks can form coalitions and alliances among themselves, thus multiplying their power and influence.

The Global City as Resource Rich Environment

In addition to its characteristics as a densely institutionalized environment, and its status as a node in multiple transnational networks, Global Cities are centers of finance, banking and commerce. They provide a resource-rich environment containing dense concentrations of financial, human and social capital. One of the key observations of the Global Cities literature is that there is an increasing disembedding of Global Cities from national economies and territories, as part of a broader pattern of capitalist restructuring connected with globalization. As Curtis (2011: 1927) notes, “the state-centrism of much of IR theory has blinded IR scholars to the historic importance of such developments.” Circuits of global capital and finance may flow more freely between geographically dispersed world cities than between a Global City and its national periphery. This calls into question the traditional IR mapping of power, which has relied largely on national statistics and indices measuring GDP, population, military strength, etc. to count “poles” and determine the relative power of different nation-states (Waltz 1979). Thus, while IR scholars debate the implications of an emerging multi-polar international system, urban geographers are mapping out

the contours of a new global geography defined by networked mega-cities such as New York, London, Tokyo, Hong Kong and Shanghai.

In London, the City plays a major role in global financial transactions, has one of the world's largest stock exchanges, and is a space of concentrated wealth and resources. Its international financial service sector includes wholesale insurance, asset management, exchange, investment banking, hedge funds, private banking and private equity, which are accompanied by supporting industries such as financial media, accounting, consulting and legal services. London facilitates the largest flow of international capital in the world, exceeding flows to and from the United States -- \$2,159 billion flowed into the UK, and \$2,000 billion flowed out from the UK in 2007. London is also the leader in cross-border bank lending, with 20% of the world's total, and in foreign exchange turnover, with 34% of the world's total. London's role as a hub of international finance means that the United Kingdom is one of the most globally financially integrated countries in the world, holding foreign assets and liabilities in the sum of 960% of its Gross Domestic Product (GDP).⁵ London is consistently ranked as the most desirable city in the world by the super-rich and, according to the Bank of England, in each year since 2010 £23 billion of foreign money flows into the London property market.⁶

In addition to the concentration of global wealth that is found in financial services sectors, there are also the human, financial and capital resources that are found embedded across the city as a whole. Working class migrant populations, for example, despite their low incomes and resources as compared to the top strata of the Global City, nevertheless may be relatively well-positioned vis-a-vis populations in their country of origin and may be the source of substantial remittances and financial

⁵ London: Winning in a Changing World, London Mayor's Office, 2008, pp. 11-12.

⁶ <http://www.thewealthreport.net/The-Wealth-Report-2012.pdf> accessed October 11, 2013.

outflows. For example, according to a survey conducted by Lindley (2009), members of the approximately 60,000 strong Somali population of London regularly remit several thousand dollars a year each to family members or other contacts abroad. The UK as a whole is a host to at least 3,750 money service businesses (MSBs), many of which are London-based and which facilitate remittances by various diaspora populations (Vargos-Silva 2011).

The Global City thus provides multiple opportunities for resource mobilization by tapping into the financial assets that are embedded across its institutions and populations. Even relatively small organized groups can be successful in generating significant funding and resources if they devise strategies that allow them to tap into available resources. Strategies for doing so can include public fundraising, charitable contributions, informal taxes of local businesses, funds channeled via government, charity or private actors, securing funds via social pressure, enlisting the support of wealthy patrons, or even coercion. For diasporic actors engaged in so-called “homeland politics,” cities may contain potential constituencies, generated through migration processes, which are open to political mobilization for “homeland-oriented” causes or political projects. Transnationally-oriented groups can devise strategies that will allow them to fundraise or otherwise tap into existing capital supplies in Global Cities, as well as taking advantage of the concentrated human and social capital available to them as a means of building up organizations and interest groups.

Global Cities and Urban Opportunity Structures

Institutions, networks and resources -- the basic building blocks of political action -- come to be uniquely structured in urban metropolises. These unique configurations found in the Global City can be captured by the notion of *urban*

opportunity structures. Urban opportunity structures are composed of a “complex set of markets, institutions, systems, and social networks” (Galster 1995, 1998), which in turn shape the political strategies, actions and behaviors of actors. While the concept has been used in other literatures, we find it useful as a way of designating the incentives, opportunities and constraints that transnational actors encounter in cities like London. In a Global City, the multiple institutions, networks, and resources constitute an amalgam of factors that simultaneously shape local political action and structure its transnational effects. These opportunity structures are defined by their proximity, density and concentration and structured in ways that are both vertical and horizontal, reflecting the polarization and inequalities that mark the international system as a whole, and that come together geographically in dense urban contexts.

The specifics of the urban opportunity structures in London are of course shaped by a myriad of unique and complex factors such as its particular geographical location, history as a colonial metropole, national political culture and governance structure of the United Kingdom, as well as its pivotal role as a gateway between markets in North America and Asia. The particular configuration of urban opportunity structures in other Global Cities such as New York, Tokyo, Paris or Hong Kong will differ in shape and scope. In addition, there is an increasing literature that argues for re-thinking the basic definitions and rankings of Global Cities in a manner that places less emphasis on their role as nodes in the circulation of global capital. This literature urges scholars to expand their definition to include mega-cities of the global South. Scholarship on Sao Paulo, Cairo and Calcutta shows that such cities may have very different features, structural configurations and political opportunity structures (Caldeira 2000; Ismail 2006; Roy 2002). It is important to address how global inequalities are reflected across a range of urban contexts that may differ in their

structure and offer very different sets of incentives and constraints for political mobilization (Chen and Kanna 2012; Davis 2007; Huyssen 2009; Kanna 2011; Shatkin 2013).⁷ Nevertheless, as a starting point for incorporating an alternative urban geography into our understanding of transnational action, we find it useful to undertake a scoping exercise of the ways in which urban opportunity structures may shape forms of transnational political mobilization that are simultaneously “local” and “global” in London as one particular example of a Global City.

Transnational Political Mobilization in the Global City

In the section above, we discussed what we mean by the “Global City” and delineated three of its key features, namely its characteristics as an a) institutional context, b) node in multiple networks, and c) resource-rich environment. We discussed how these features can be conceptualised as *urban opportunity structures*. The exact configurations of such opportunity structures will vary across Global Cities, yet they may share common features, such as the ways in which they simultaneously structure “local” and “global” politics.

In this section we discuss the strategies and mechanisms employed by transnational political entrepreneurs operating in an urban context. After briefly discussing the phenomenon of political entrepreneurs, we elaborate on how the unique configuration of urban opportunity structures embedded in the Global City provides incentives for entrepreneurs to use strategies that are either *horizontal* or *vertical*. We then go on to discuss four mechanisms that can be engaged by political entrepreneurs in processes of political mobilization. These mechanisms are *brokerage* (the linking of disparate networks), *strategic framing* (the use of symbolic politics),

⁷ We thank Salwa Ismail for this point.

coalition-building (the forging of alliances between organizations), and *social learning* or *mediated diffusion* (the adoption of new ideas and practices). We discuss each mechanism and how it may be deployed by political entrepreneurs, drawing on some illustrative examples drawn from London.

Identity-Based Transnational Political Entrepreneurs in the Global City

Political entrepreneurs are a familiar concept to students of International Relations. Goddard (2009: 249) notes that “[p]olitical entrepreneurs reside at the core of IR theory” and that they are key to understanding and explaining political change across a wide variety of theoretical approaches. Political entrepreneurs play a key role in fostering interstate cooperation, creating new foreign policy ideas, and in transforming state systems (Goddard 2009: 250-251). Studies of transnationalism and social movements have examined how political entrepreneurs spread normative change in areas such as human rights protection and adaptation, transitional justice or the emergence of prohibition regimes (Acharya 2004; Adamson 2005a; Finnemore and Sikkink 1998; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Nadelmann 1990; Snyder and Vinjamuri 2003). Scholars working on diaspora politics have engaged the term to understand the role that agents play in coordinating the political activity of transnationally-dispersed populations (Adamson 2002, 2005b, 2013; Brinkerhoff 2009; Koinova 2011a; Weyland 2004).

Political entrepreneurs can be defined as either individuals or organizations who deploy ideational, social, material and/or institutional resources to strategically engage in goal-oriented political activities. Entrepreneurs are a key feature of rational choice approaches to politics, but they also feature prominently in what has been labeled by Sikkink (2011) as “agentic constructivism.” The concept of political

entrepreneurs has also emerged in network-based approaches to understanding political change. Goddard (2009), for example, building on the work of Burt (1992, 2004, 2005), Gargiulo and Benassi (2000) and Padgett and Ansell (1993), analyzes entrepreneurs as emerging out of the structural contradictions that exist when there are gaps, or “structural holes” in existing social networks.

Political entrepreneurs figure as important actors in the literature on transnational politics. Whether conceptualized as “norm entrepreneurs” (Finnemore and Sikkink 1998), “diaspora entrepreneurs” (Brinkerhoff 2009) or “transnational political entrepreneurs” (Adamson 2002, 2005b, 2013; Koinova 2011; Weyland 2004), these terms are all used to denote actors who engage in sustained goal-oriented activity for the purposes of effecting political change. We build on this literature, by using the term “identity-based transnational political entrepreneurs” to refer to political entrepreneurs who are engaged in identity-based transnational political projects. In other words, the term refers to political entrepreneurs who are engaged in transnational projects or forms of transnational action that are structured around a particular *identity category*. These could include projects structured around a particular national, religious, ethnic or other form of identity, and can thus be distinguished logically (if not always practically) from other forms of transnational mobilization in the pursuit of economic interests or normative change (Adamson 2012; Keck and Sikkink 1998).

Examples of identity-based transnational political entrepreneurs could include those claiming to mobilize transnationally (across national borders, globally) on behalf of a particular diaspora, ethnic group, or national or religious community. We do not here attempt to define what constitutes a diaspora, ethnic group or religious community, as this is outside the scope of our argument. Our concern is limited to

understanding the strategies of non-state actors who, by their own accounts, are engaging in transnational political projects in the name of or on behalf of identity-based collectivities. There are many examples of such actors who -- whether they view themselves as a member of a diaspora, an exile, emigre, refugee, “travelling” religious or political figure, or simply a political activist - are “rooted cosmopolitans” in that they are simultaneously engaged in transnational political projects but also deeply embedded in a particular geographic context or place (Tarrow 2005: 35-36).

We argue that identity-based transnational political entrepreneurs who operate within Global Cities are uniquely positioned, due to the particular features and characteristics of the Global City that we have outlined above, i.e. its particularly dense institutional context; its positionality as a central node in multiple global networks; and its high concentration of material and human resources. Such actors may be simultaneously engaged in *both* transnational *and* local politics. In other words, when they engage in actions oriented to furthering transnational projects, they are doing so within the particular context and environment defined by the urban opportunity structures that characterize the Global City. In some cases, this may be a conscious choice. For example, some transnational political actors may choose to physically locate themselves in a Global City for the purpose of accessing the institutions, networks and resources that are embedded in it (Bob 2002). In other cases, this may be coincidental, as in the case of actors who simply find themselves in the Global City by default and engaged in transnational political projects or mobilizations. While the latter have not consciously chosen to engage in transnationalism from within the Global City, their activities are nevertheless affected by its unique structure and context.

This structure and context has effects on transnational politics via two possible pathways. First, it can influence the *strategies and mechanisms* that transnational political entrepreneurs choose to deploy, because of the particular configuration of urban political opportunity structures that are prevalent in the Global City. Second, it can influence *transnational outcomes* that result from these strategies and mechanisms due to the unique positionality of the Global City as a space that is simultaneously “local” and “global.” This latter point is made by Doreen Massey (2007: 7,15) when she argues that in “powerful places” politics is never just “local,” but rather has effects in “even the remotest corner of the globe.” Global Cities, she writes, “have lines that run out from them: trade routes, investments, political and cultural influences; the outward connections of the internal multiplicity itself; power relations of all sorts that run around the globe and that link the fate of other places to what is done in [cities like] London.”

In the following pages, we wish to look at the first of these two pathways that we have identified, namely the effect on the choice of *strategies and mechanisms* that transnational political entrepreneurs employ by virtue of their particular location in the Global City. We discuss four mechanisms: *brokerage* (the linking of disparate networks), *strategic framing* (the use of symbolic politics), *coalition-building* (the forging of alliances between organizations), and *social learning or mediated diffusion* (the adoption of new ideas and practices). For each mechanism, we provide examples of their use as part of a *vertical* or *horizontal* strategy. By *vertical* strategies, we simply mean instances in which political entrepreneurs choose to reach out to *more powerful actors*. By *horizontal* strategies, we refer to instances in which political entrepreneurs reach out to *similarly situated or weaker actors*.

Brokerage

Social network theorists have identified “brokers” as particularly powerful actors in their ability to link together disparate networks. When two networks are separated by a “structural hole” a broker can gain power by filling the gap and bringing together two unlinked networks (Burt 2005; Goddard 2009; Padgett and Ansell 1993). Entrepreneurial political activists, for example, can engage in “brokerage” by linking together social movements or activist networks from different national contexts to form a transnational social movement (McAdam et al 2001). Brokerage can also bring about a “scale shift” in incidents of transnational contention, when a political issue that emerges in one local context becomes “scaled up” and made relevant to another transnational context (McAdam and Tarrow 2005; Tarrow 1998; 2005). Adamson (2005b, 2013) has shown how diaspora populations may unwittingly become actors in civil wars when political entrepreneurs in the diaspora engage in “brokerage” by linking “political networks” in one country with “conflict networks” in another. Similarly, in her research on the Kosovo, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Chechen secessionist conflicts, Koinova (2011a) demonstrated that “brokerage” was an important mechanism connecting “diaspora” and “homeland” secessionist elites.

How does the mechanism of brokerage apply to instances of identity-based transnational mobilization in the context of the Global City? We argue that the Global City encourages political entrepreneurs to engage in brokerage by providing numerous opportunities for both horizontal and vertical connectivity across networks within a close proximity of one another. As one Armenian diaspora activist in London commented: “everybody travels through London - influential scholars, politicians,

visitors, who attend various seminars and conventions.”⁸ Political entrepreneurs who are skilled at engaging in “brokerage,” or in connecting disparate networks, can enhance their power and influence by becoming key players in more than one political network, or by acting as a gatekeeper to numerous networks.

Strategic networking opportunities can occur through either vertical or horizontal forms of brokerage. Horizontal brokerage occurs when an actor or organization is able to connect actors in similarly situated networks who may not have otherwise connected. For example, a small-scale event in 2009 organized by the charity organization Islamic Help gathered together British Muslims, a Palestinian activist, an Algerian-origin poet-singer, and an American activist from Hawaii. Each of these actors was in turn positioned within broader transnational networks, meaning that Islamic Help, by organizing a local event in London, was able to potentially create links across broadly dispersed transnational networks.

Vertical forms of brokerage can occur when weaker networks become connected to more powerful global networks. Actors based in powerful networks or institutions can link actors embedded in weaker networks and institutions, thus providing enhanced opportunities for engaging in transnational action. Actors in well-connected NGOs, think tanks or national governments may be positioned to bridge numerous weaker networks, thus enhancing both their “vertical” and “horizontal” connectivity. In London, for example, local politicians and members of Parliament have performed “brokerage” roles for a range of smaller transnationally-oriented networks. The Respect Party politician George Galloway, for example, performed this role by linking up a range of smaller organizations and networks mobilizing on behalf of Palestine via his “Viva Palestina Campaign.” Acting as a broker between UK-

⁸ May 6, 2011 interview with Koinova.

based Palestinian organizations, politically-engaged Islamic NGOs, and local Palestinian solidarity groups and charities, Galloway was able to connect organizations mobilizing on behalf of Palestine in ways that created broader networks both within the UK and beyond, leading to projects such as the organization of a convoy with relief supplies through Europe and North Africa to Gaza in 2009. The UK organization made transnational connections, and there is currently an active branch of Viva Palestine in Malaysia. Galloway later performed a similar brokerage role with organizations mobilizing on behalf of Kashmir, announcing plans to organize a convoy to Kashmir in 2013.⁹

Enhanced “connectivity” via brokerage can be seen in the example of Armenian diaspora organizations and Baroness Caroline Cox. Cox, a member of the House of Lords, actively linked members of the Armenian “diaspora” with each other, as well as internationally with elite networks in Armenia Nagorno-Karabakh in the 1990s. Cox was an important source of information from Karabakh, giving public talks in various settings in London which ‘woke up the consciousness of parliamentarians,’ and had a mobilizing effect on many members of the Armenian diaspora, who had little access to information or contacts from Karabakh at the time. Performing overseas visits on behalf of Christian charities, she also managed to actively broker links between Christian charities and Armenian nationalist organizations, thus greatly enhancing the power of Armenian diaspora activists (Koinova 2011).

⁹ See vpm.org.my accessed 13 October 2013 and [@ConvoytoKashmir](https://twitter.com/ConvoytoKashmir).

Strategic Framing

The concept of “strategic framing” has been largely developed in and drawn from the literature on social movements (Benford and Snow 2000), although it is also found separately in the public policy literature on policy frames (Rein and Schoen 1996), as well as increasingly employed as a useful analytical tool by scholars of international relations (Bob 2005; Busby 2007; Khagram, Riker and Sikkink 2002; Payne 2001). Frames have been defined as “schemata of interpretation” that are “intended to mobilize potential adherents and constituents, to garner bystander support, and to demobilize antagonists” (Benford and Snow 2000: 614; Goffman 1974: 21, as cited in Benford and Snow 2000) or as persuasive devices used to “fix meanings, organize experience, alert others that their interests and possibly their identities are at stake, and propose solutions to ongoing problems” (Barnett 1999: 25 as cited in Payne 2001: 39). Social movement approaches conceptualize framing as “the conscious strategic efforts by groups of people to fashion shared understandings of the world and of themselves that legitimate and motivate collective action” and have identified the linking of different frames, or “frame alignment” as an important way to explain the emergence and growth of social movements (McAdam, McCarthy and Zald 1996: 6 as cited in Busby 2007: 251).

“Strategic framing” can be deployed in the context of both vertical and horizontal strategies. Bob (2002, 2005) has examined the use of vertical strategies in his study of activists who have connected their particular political project to a broader strategic frame in order to gain the support of more powerful actors. Bob compared how the Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni people in the Niger Delta, Nigeria and the *Ejercito Zapatista de Liberacion Nacional* in Chiapas, Mexico, were both

able to gain international attention and success by attracting powerful northern and western INGOs to their causes via the use of strategic framing. Political entrepreneurs in the Ogoni movement deployed frames that linked their local interests to broader frames of environmental and corporate responsibility, while the Zapatistas were able to deploy frames that linked indigenous rights to concerns about the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). This compared with other similarly situated groups (the Ijaw in Nigeria and the *Ejercito Poplar Revolucionario in Mexico*) who did not use such frames, and failed to garner international attention. A similar dynamic has been captured by scholars of transnational or diaspora politics, who note how groups may strategically use liberal or human rights-based frames to gain support from new audiences (Adamson 2002, 2013; Ostergaard-Nielsen 2003; Koslowski 2005; Koinova 2009; Lyons and Mandaville 2010).

London as a Global City provides multiple incentives for political entrepreneurs to engage in vertical forms of “strategic framing” as a way of expanding their influence and audience. London-based Kosovo Albanians, who towards the end of the 1990s lobbied the Blair government for Kosovo’s independence, did not attribute any causal power to their direct lobbying, but rather claimed to have shaped British public opinion to accept an unpopular policy, i.e. to back NATO’s 1999 military intervention. Kosovar activists used a myriad of media interventions to repeat a frame that “one needs to learn from mistakes of the past,” eluding to the failure of the previous government of Prime Minister John Major to intervene early on in the war in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Koinova 2012).

Kurdish political entrepreneurs have successfully drawn attention to the Kurdish national cause via the use of human rights frames (Adamson 2007, 2013). One of the most successful projects in that regard is the London-based Kurdish

Human Rights Project (KHRP). Its founder, Kerim Yildiz, when accepting an international human rights prize on behalf of the organization, noted, “we established an NGO named the Kurdish Human Rights Project in England with British lawyers and other human rights advocates in partnership with regionally based non-profit organizations and bar associations to give international recognition to not only the Kurds but also to shine a spotlight on the region in order to develop a more nuanced understanding of the injustice that anyone who lived in those regions faced.” The organization has been successful in using human rights frames to engage in “information” and “symbolic” politics around the Kurdish issue, and more recently has deployed human rights frames to draw attention to environmental issues in Turkey, such as the Ilusu dam project and the Baku-Ceyhan pipeline.¹⁰

London also provides opportunities and incentives for identity-based political entrepreneurs to engage in strategic framing as part of horizontal strategies, or strategies directed toward similarly placed organizations. The use of an overarching frame can connect seemingly disparate national or local issues into a common narrative, which can then subsequently be deployed to increase a group’s mobilization capacity. The global caliphate-oriented organization *Hizb ut-Tahrir* (Party of Liberation), for example, has its informal headquarters in London and attempts to mobilize support locally amongst populations in London. It frequently uses an overarching “Islamicization” frame to draw connections across a range of conflicts and political issues (2011, 2012). At its annual meeting in 2009, for example, it linked the situation of the Palestinian people with the pressure exerted on Muslim groups in the UK. Although the vast majority of British members of *Hizb ut-Tahrir* (HT) are not of Palestinian origin, the strategic framing serves to forge new connections and to

¹⁰ Excerpt from speech taken from www.khrp.org. Accessed on 10 October 2013.

make the organization and its supporters relevant to a conflict that dominated the UK media at the time. HT employed similar framing strategies in the UK in the 1990s with respect to the conflict in Bosnia, and in 2012-13 with Syria. The “Islamicization” of the Palestinian and other conflicts through strategic framing has helped some pan-Islamic groups mobilize constituencies in London, while simultaneously creating concerns amongst secular Palestinians and others in the UK.

Coalition-Building

Coalitions are “collaborative, means-oriented arrangements that permit distinct organizational entities to pool resources in order to affect change” (Levi and Murphy 2006). They are composed of distinct groups of actors or organizations that combine to face threats or take advantage of opportunities in order to exert a joint political influence. Unlike networks, which involve multiple nodes of individuals who participate in them consciously or not, coalitions typically have a purposeful quality, and are constituted from more formally organized institutions or organizations. Coalitions can be variously categorized as *instrumental* (short-term cooperation with low level of involvement); *event* (short-term cooperation with higher level of involvement); *federated* (low degree of involvement of organizations, but long-term cooperation between them) and *campaign* (high level of involvement and long-term cooperation) (Tarrow 2005: 163-168).

Coalitions can take place within communities of social movements (Della Porta and Rucht 1995; Snow et al. 2004), but also across movements. Multi-issue coalitions are more likely to arise when cross-movement coalitions are formed, especially when there is proximity of ideology between their organizations (Van Dyke 2003). Beamish and Luebbbers (2009) argue that status distinctions on the basis of race, gender, and place impede the development of multi-issue coalitions. Coalitions

have received a great deal of attention in the IR literature on transnationalism in the form of the large body of work that has emerged around the concept of transnational advocacy networks (TANs) (Keck and Sikkink 1998; Bob 2005; Hertel 2006), which are essentially transnational coalitions that form around particular issues.

The Global City provides powerful opportunities for both “vertical” and “horizontal” coalition-building, due to the density and proximity of political organizations and movements that are operating in the same space. Coalitions can enhance the power and reach of both powerful and weaker organizations, bringing distinct benefits to each. One of the most prominent coalitions which has arisen in London over the past decade or so is the “Stop the War Coalition (StWC),” which emerged in the wake of September 11, 2001 and in response to concern about western military campaigns in the context of the “war on terror.” Bringing together a wide range of organizations with prominent roles played by the Alliance for Workers’ Liberty, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND), Communist Party for Great Britain, Muslim Association of Britain (MAB), Quakers, and Socialist Workers’ Party (SWP), the coalition was successful in mobilizing or channeling anti-war public opinion and was responsible for coordinating what is said to be the largest public demonstration in the United Kingdom in February 2003 to protest against war in Iraq. Estimated numbers on the streets of London were up to 1 million, with the event attracting prominent speakers and receiving global media attention.¹¹

This “event-based” coalition was not without its internal and external critics, with some questioning what political values the various member organizations, such as Muslim Association of Britain (MAB) and the Socialist Workers Party (SWP)

¹¹ “Million March Against Iraq War,” BBC News 16 February 2003, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/2765041.stm> accessed 15 October 2013.

shared beyond a common opposition to the war.¹² Nevertheless, the coalition proved durable and institutionalized, later organizing events after the 2005 bombings in London, and again at the 2009 G-20 summit, in conjunction with other groups such as the British Muslim Initiative, Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, and Palestine Solidarity Campaign. Many of the actors involved in the Stop the War Coalition activities have been involved in other ad-hoc coalitions around particular issues, such as the Israeli raid on a Turkish flotilla to Gaza in May 2010. Thousands demonstrated in the streets of London on May 31 and in early June 2010 to protest the killings, with speakers and attendees at the protest coming from a wide range of organizations self-identifying as either nationalist, leftist, religious/Islamic and/or liberal/human rights-oriented.

Social Learning and Diffusion

The concepts of “social learning” and “diffusion” both describe processes by which norms, ideas or practices are transferred from one actor to another (Checkel 1998). Although derived from different literatures, they identify similarities in how norms and behaviors spread, including agreeing on the micro-mechanisms of such transfer. Bandura (1976) notes that social learning can occur via observation, direct communication, or via more indirect means, such as the media. McAdam and Rucht (1993:5) also find that processes of diffusion are either “mediated,” where an active role is ascribed to personalized contacts between emitter and adopter, or “non-mediated” where non-relational channels are used such as the media. They argue that “diffusion involves the following elements: 1) a person group or organization that serves as the emitter or transmitter, 2) a person, group or organization that is the

¹² Nick Cohen, “The Left’s Unholy Alliance with Religious Bigotry,” *The Guardian* 23 February 2003.

adopter; 3) the item that is diffused, such as material goods, information, skills, and the like, and 4) a channel of diffusion that may consist of persons or media that link the transmitter and the adopter.”

Work on diffusion has grown exponentially over the past several years, and it is beyond the scope of this article to do a full review of the literature (e.g. Ambrosio 2010; Gleditsch and Ward 2006; Brinks and Coppedge 2006; Bunce and Wolchik, 2007, 2010; Saideman 2012; Salehyan and Gleditsch 2006; Schutte and Weidmann 2011; Zhukov and Stewart 2012). Scholars have argued that the likelihood of norm diffusion is often dependent on who carries it, and that actors adapt the norms or behavior of what they consider to be a “reference” or “support group,” either because they share a common identity or “because they find themselves in similar circumstances” (Ambrosio, 2010: 387). For diffusion to take place, the adopter needs to “attribute similarity” between him/herself and the emulated model (McAdam and Rucht 1993: 66). Diaspora organizations often emulate the strategies of each other to develop successful strategies and campaigns. In the United States, for example, the Indian lobby group US Indian Political Action Committee (USINPAC) explicitly emulates the powerful American Israel Public Affairs Committee (AIPAC) in an attempt to replicate their influence in Washington DC.¹³

Geographic proximity and spatial clustering have been identified as features conducive to diffusion and social learning (Brinks and Coppedge 2006; 464; Gleditsch and Ward 2006: 912), and these are both key features of the Global City that structure action by political entrepreneurs. Multiple examples exist of both “horizontal” and “vertical” social learning or diffusion processes taking place in the context of London. Kosovo’s achievement of independence, for example, was viewed

¹³ Mira Kandar, “The New AIPAC? Forget the Israel Lobby. The Hill’s Next Big Player is Made in India,” *Washington Post*, September 30, 2007.

by other nationalist or diaspora groups as a model to be emulated. Kosovar activists in London claimed to have been approached by a member of a Kurdish political organization to give advice to them on how they could achieve a similar success of independent statehood.¹⁴ London-based Palestinian entrepreneurs repeatedly presented Kosovo as a model for Palestine, regardless of whether the entrepreneurs themselves advocated a one-state or two-state solution.¹⁵ Kurdish activists have also modeled some of their campaigns on those of the Armenian diaspora, and have made links with Armenian activists to campaign for the recognition of a Kurdish genocide.¹⁶

Another example of diffusion and social learning exists in the Islamic charity sector. The United Kingdom is home to over 1,000 Muslim charities, a great many of which are London-based. Around 50 of these registered charities are NGOs devoted primarily to international humanitarian aid and development. Many of these NGOs are quite small: the modal registered Muslim aid NGO has an annual budget of around £300,000 (de Cordier 2009). Over the past decade, large and powerful established Islamic charities, such as Islamic Relief, have created training networks and umbrella organizations such as the now well-established Muslim Charities Forum (MCF). The MCF provides skills training and diffuses knowledge of UK charity legislation and requirements, such as accounting, record keeping, public outreach and campaigning. Islamic Relief was able to diffuse the knowledge it had acquired as a long-established player in the international humanitarian aid sector, a member of the UK Disasters Emergency Response Committee (DEC) and its consultative status at

¹⁴ 14 July 2009 Interview with Koinova.

¹⁵ 7 May 2010 Interview with Koinova; 9 May 2010 Interview with Koinova.

¹⁶ See *Azad Hye* (2008). "Establishment of a Permanent Kurdish-Armenian Dialogue," July 8, 2008, at <http://www.azad-hye.net/news/viewnews.asp?newsId=592kza10>

the UN Economic and Social Council. Such diffusion processes have led to a rapid “professionalization” of many UK Islamic charities. This in turn has increased the effectiveness of many charities and enhanced their ability to play leading roles in the global faith-based humanitarian NGO sector (Adamson and de Hanas 2010).

Diffusion of ideas can also take place via media coverage, which is a key component of many political entrepreneurs’ strategies. London-based Palestinian political entrepreneurs, for example, consistently mentioned the importance of London’s concentrated media for their strategies in interviews conducted with one of the authors. They claimed to prefer the use of public demonstrations and protests as compared with lobbying because of the greater impact that demonstrations could have via global media coverage. Coverage provided opportunities to shape British and world public opinion due to access to the relatively free British press, as well as the high concentration of Arabic language media outlets that could diffuse coverage across the Arabic speaking world.¹⁷

Conclusions

Global Cities have been identified by sociologists and geographers as being important features of the contemporary global economy. We have argued in this paper that they are also important spaces for understanding transnational politics, and have suggested a framework for including them in IR studies of transnationalism. Global Cities function as densely structured institutional contexts, as nodes in multiple global networks, and as concentrated spaces of human and material resources. These features of the Global City produce configurations of urban opportunity structures that in turn structure the preferences and behavior of political entrepreneurs.

¹⁷ 7 May 2010 Interview with Koinova; 9 May 2010 Interview with Koinova.

Identity-based transnational political entrepreneurs operating in urban metropolises can adopt either horizontal or vertical strategies of mobilization, engaging a range of mechanisms, such as brokerage, strategic framing, coalition-building, and social learning or diffusion. We have outlined the logic of these mechanisms and provided some illustrations of these mechanisms at work in London. While these mechanisms are not unique to Global Cities, they are particularly prevalent due to the myriad of opportunities that political entrepreneurs have to make connections with or learn from other political actors operating in the same urban context.

The aim of this paper has been to lay out a framework and research agenda, and as such it has not included detailed process-tracing of when and how particular political entrepreneurs deploy particular mechanisms; how different mechanisms relate to each other; or under what conditions particular mechanisms or strategies will lead to more or less successful outcomes. Future research on how Global Cities structure transnational action would benefit from detailed comparative case studies that would examine more closely, for example, diverse transnational movements within a single city or, alternatively, a single transnational movement operating in more than one Global City. In addition, there are increasing opportunities to engage in large-N quantitative studies of the relationship between Global Cities and transnational action through the analysis of various forms of “big data.”

A research agenda that incorporates cities and urban spaces into the study of transnationalism in IR also opens up interesting possibilities for studying past instances of global transnational action. The roles played by cities such as New York and London in the transnational anarchist movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, or the importance of European metropolises for understanding the emergence of transnational decolonization movements in the interwar period, could

lead to enhanced understanding of historical variants of transnational action that are understudied in IR but may nevertheless hold important lessons (Boitton 2010; Goyens 2007; Rosenberg 2006).

As the world becomes increasingly urbanized, there is a need to have a better understanding of the ways in which urban spaces shape transnational politics. In this paper, we suggest one possible framework for developing a research agenda that would allow IR scholars of transnationalism to take a more explicitly “spatial turn.” A focus on the geography and spatiality of transnational action should incorporate alternative conceptualizations of the topography of world politics beyond the system of territorial nation-states. Such alternative topographies should include those of networked urban metropolises and Global Cities or other similarly important spaces, such as the “virtual” spaces of on-line transnational activism. By having a more sophisticated appreciation for the spatiality and geography of world politics, IR scholars will be better equipped to understand the various ways in which the “local” and “global” come together in forms of transnational action.

Bibliography

- Acharya, Amitav (2004) "How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism," *International Organization* 58 (2): 239-275.
- Adamson, Fiona B. (2002) "Mobilizing for the Transformation of Home: Politicized Identities and Transnational Practices," in Nadjé al-Ali and Khalid Koser, eds., *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home* (London: Routledge): 155-168.
- Adamson, Fiona B. (2005a). "Global Liberalism Versus Political Islam: Competing Ideological Frameworks in International Politics," *International Studies Review* (7): 547-569.
- Adamson, Fiona B. (2005b) "Globalisation, Transnational Political Mobilisation, and Networks of Violence," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 18 (1): 31-49.
- Adamson, Fiona B. (2011) "Engaging or Contesting the Liberal State? 'Muslim' as a Politicized Identity Category in Europe," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 37 (6): 899-916.
- Adamson, Fiona B. (2012) "Constructing the Diaspora: Diaspora Identity Politics and Transnational Social Movements," in Peter Mandaville and Terence Lyons, ed. *Politics from Afar: Transnational Diasporas and Networks* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Adamson, Fiona B. (2013) "Mechanisms of Diaspora Mobilization and the Transnationalization of Civil War," in Jeffrey Checkel, ed., *Transnational Dynamics of Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 63-89.
- Adamson, Fiona B. and Madeleine Demetriou (2007) "Remapping the Boundaries of 'State' and 'National Identity': Incorporating Diasporas into IR Theorizing," *European Journal of International Relations* 13 (4): 489-526.
- Adamson, Fiona B. and Daniel de Hanas (2010) "For the Ummah or Humanity? Islamic Humanitarianism Between Community and Cosmopolitanism" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Aldrich, Howard and Roger Waldinger (1990). "Ethnicity and Entrepreneurship," *Annual Review of Sociology* 16: 111-135.
- Ambrosio, Thomas (2010) "Constructing a Framework for Authoritarian Diffusion: Concepts, Dynamics and Future Research," *International Studies Quarterly* 11 (4) : 375-392.
- Bandura, Albert (1976) *Social Learning Theory* (London: Pearson)
- Barnett, Michael and Jack Snyder (2008) "The Grand Strategies of Humanitarianism," in Michael Barnett and Thomas G. Weiss, eds., *Humanitarianism in Question* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Barnett, Michael and Janet Gross Stein, eds. (2012) *Sacred Aid: Faith and Humanitarianism* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Beamish, Thomas and Amy Luebbers (2009). "Alliance Building Across Social Movements: Bridging Difference in a Peace and Justice Coalition" *Social Problems* 56 (4): 647-676.
- Benford, Robert D. and David A. Snow. 2000. Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 611-639.

- Bob, Clifford (2002) "Merchants of Morality" *Foreign Policy* 129: 36-45.
- Bob, Clifford (2005) *Insurgents, Media and Transnational Activism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Boitton, Jennifer Anne (2010) *Colonial Metropolis: The Urban Grounds of Anti-Imperialism and Feminism in Interwar Paris* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press).
- Boulding, Kenneth. (1978) "The City as an Element in the International System," in L. S. Bourne and J. W. Simmons, eds., *Systems of Cities*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Braudel, Fernand. 1984. *The Perspective of the World: Civilization and Capitalism 15th-18th Centuries* Vol III. London: Collins.
- Brenner, Neil (1998) "Global Cities, Global States: Global City Formation and State Territorial Restructuring in Contemporary Europe," *Review of International Political Economy* 5 (2): 1-37.
- Brenner, Neil (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Brenner, Neil and Roger Keil (2006) *The Global Cities Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Brinkerhoff, Jennifer (2009). "The Diasporas as a Political Entrepreneur: The Diaspora Advantage and Theoretical Implications" Paper presented at the workshop *Explaining Diaspora Politics* SOAS, London, October 30-31, 2009.
- Brinks and Coppedge (2006). "Diffusion is no Illusion," *Comparative Political Studies* 39: 463.
- Brubaker, Rogers (2006) *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the Nationalism Question in the New Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Brysk, Allison, (2000) *From Tribal Village to Global Village: Indian Rights and International Relations in Latin America* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Bunce, Valerie and Sharon Wolchik (2006). "Transnational Networks, Diffusion Dynamics, and Electoral Revolutions in the Postcommunist World," *Physica* 78: 92-99.
- Burt, Ronald S. (1992) *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.)
- Burt, Ronald S. (2004) "Structural Holes and Good Ideas," *The American Journal of Sociology* 1190 (2): 349-399.
- Burt, Ronald S. (2005) *Brokerage and Closure: An Introduction to Social Capital*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Busby, Joshua (2007) "Bono Made Jesse Helms Cry: Jubilee 2000, Debt Relief, and Moral Action in International Politics," *International Studies Quarterly* 51: 247-275.
- Cadge, Wendy, Sara Curran, Jessica Hejtmanek, B. Nadya Jaworsky and Peggy Levitt (2009) "The City as Context: Culture and Scale in New Immigrant Destinations." Willy Brandt Working Papers in International Relations and Ethnic Studies, Malmo University.
- Caldeira, Teresa (2000), *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation and Citizenship in Sao Paulo* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Castells, Manuel (1989) *The Informational City: Information Technology, Economic Restructuring and the Urban-Regional Process* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Castells, Manuel (1992) *The Informational City: Economic Restructuring and Urban Development* (Oxford: Blackwell).

- Chase-Dunn, Christopher (1984) "Urbanization in the World System: New Directions for Research," in M.P. Smith, ed. *Cities in Transformation* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage)
- Chase-Dunn, Christopher (1985) "The System of World Cities, AD 800-1975," in M. Timberlake, ed. *Urbanization in the World Economy* (New York: Academic Press).
- Checkel, Jeffrey (1997). "International Norms and Domestic Politics," *European Journal of International Relations* 3 (4): 473-496.
- Checkel, Jeffrey (1998) "The Constructivism Turn in International Relations Theory," *World Politics* 50 (2): 342-348.
- Checkel, Jeffrey (2001). "Why Comply? Social Learning and European Identity Change" *International Organization* 55 (3): 553-588.
- Checkel, Jeffrey, ed. (2013) *Transnational Dynamics of Civil War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Chen, Xiangming and Ahmed Kanna, eds. (2012) *Rethinking Global Urbanism: Comparative Insights from Secondary Cities* (London: Routledge).
- Cooley, Alexander and James Ron (2002) "The NGO Scramble: Organizational Insecurity and the Political Economy of Transnational Action," *International Security* 27 (1): 5-39.
- Curtis, Simon (2011) "Global Cities and the Transformation of the International System" *Review of International Studies* 37 (4): 1923-47.
- De Cordier, Bruno (2009) "Faith-Based Aid, Globalisation and the Humanitarian Frontline: An Analysis of Western-Based Muslim Aid Organisations." *Disasters* 33 (4): 608-228.
- Della Porta, Donatella and Dieter Rucht (1995). "Left-Libertarian Movements in Context," in J.C. Jenkins and B. Klandermans (eds.) *The Politics of Social Protest* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), pp. 299-272.
- Della Porta, Donatella and Sidney Tarrow, eds. (2005) *Transnational Protest and Global Activism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield).
- Deutsch, Karl (1966) *Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).
- Deutsch, Karl et al. (1957) *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Evangelista, Matthew (1999). *Unarmed Forces* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Fair, Christine (2005). "Diaspora Involvement in Insurgencies: Insights from the Khalistan and Tamil Eelan Movements" *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics* 11 (1): 127-147.
- Faist, Thomas (2000). "Transnationalization in International Migration." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23 (2): 189-222.
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink (1998) "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," *International Organization* 52 (4) Autumn: 887-918.
- Friedmann, John (1986) "The World City Hypothesis," *Development and Change* 17: 69-84.
- Friedmann, John and Goetz Wolff (1982) "World City Formation: An Agenda for Research and Action," *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 6 (3): 309-44.
- Galster, George C. and Sean P. Killen (1995) "The Geography of Metropolitan Opportunity: A Reconnaissance and Conceptual Framework," *Housing Policy Debate* 6 (1): 7-43

- Galster, George C. (1998) *An Econometric Model of the Urban Opportunity Structure: Cumulative Causation Among City Markets, Social Problems, and Undeserved Areas*. Research Report, Fannie Mae Foundation.
- Georgiulo and Benassi 2000 "Trapped in your own net? Network Cohesion, Structural Holes, and the Adaptation of Social Capital," *Organization Science* 11 (2): 183-196.
- Gleditsch, Kristian Skrede and Michael Ward (2006). "Diffusion and the International Context of Democratization," *International Organization* 60 (Fall), pp. 911-933.
- Goddard, Stacie E. (2009) "Brokering Change: Networks and Entrepreneurs in International Politics," *International Theory* 1 (2): 249-281.
- Goffman, Erving (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience* (London: Harper and Row).
- Goyens, Tom (2007). *Beer and Revolution: The German Anarchist Movement in New York City, 1880-1914*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Guidry, Kennedy and Zald, eds. (2010) *Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power and the Transnational Public Sphere* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press).
- Haas, Peter (1992). "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination" *International Organization* 46 (1): 1-35.
- Haegel, Peter and Pauline Peretz (2005). 'States and Transnational Actors: Who's Influencing Whom? A Case Study in Jewish Diaspora Politics during the Cold War', *European Journal of International Relations* 11 (4): 467-493.
- Hafner-Burton, Emily and Alexander Montgomery (2006) "Power Positions: International Organizations, Social Networks, and Conflict," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50 (1): 3-27.
- Harvey, David (1973) *Social Justice and the City* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins).
- Harvey, David (1989) *The Urban Experience* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins).
- Harvey, David (2000) *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography* (New York: Routledge).
- Harvey, David (2012) *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution* (London: Verso).
- Hertel, Shareen (2006) *Unexpected Power: Conflict and Change Among Transnational Activists* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Holston, James (1998) *Insurgent Citizenship* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Hopgood, Stephen (2006) *Keepers of the Flame: Understanding Amnesty International* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Huyssen, Andreas, ed. (2009) *Other Cities, Other Worlds* Durham: Duke University Press
- Ireland, Patrick (1994). *The Policy Challenge of Ethnic Diversity: Immigrant Politics in France and Switzerland*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Ismail, Salwa (2006) *Political Life in Cairo's New Quarters: Encountering the Everyday State* (St Paul: University Minnesota Press).
- Jenne, Erin K. (2007) *Ethnic Bargaining: The Paradox of Minority Empowerment* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Kahler, Miles, ed. (2009) *Networked Politics: Agency, Power and Governance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Kaldor, Mary (2001). *New and Old Wars* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press).
- Kaldor, Mary (2003) *Global Civil Society: An Answer to War* (Oxford: Polity Press)

- Kanna, Ahmed (2011) *Dubai: The City as Corporation* (St Paul: University of Minnesota).
- Keane, John (2003) *Global Civil Society?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink (1998) *Activists Beyond Borders*. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Khagram, Sanjeev, James V. Riker and Kathryn Sikkink (2002), *Restructuring World Politics: Transnational Social Movements, Networks and Norms* (St Paul, MN: University of Minnesota Press).
- King, Charles and Neil J. Melvin (2000) "Diaspora Politics: Ethnic Linkages, Foreign Policy, and Security in Eurasia" *International Security* 24 (3): 108-138.
- Koinova, Maria (2009). "Diasporas and Democratization in the Post-communist World" *Communist and Post-communist Studies* 42 (1): 41-64.
- Koinova, Maria (2011a). "Diasporas and Secessionist Conflicts," *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 34 (2): 333-356.
- Koinova, Maria (2011b) "Can Conflict-Generated Diasporas be Moderate Actors During Episodes of Contested Sovereignty? Lebanese and Albanian Diasporas Compared," *Review of International Studies* 37 (1): 437-62.
- Koinova, Maria (2011c). "Why Do Conflict-generated Diasporas Pursue Sovereignty-based Claims through State-based or Transnational Channels" Revised draft of the Paper presented at the *Explaining Diaspora Politics* workshop, SOAS, London, October 30-31, 2009.
- Koinova, Maria (2013) "Four Types of Diaspora Mobilization: Albanian Diaspora Activism for Kosovo Independence in the US and UK," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 9 (4): 433-453.
- Koopmans, Ruud and Paul Statham (2001). 'How National Citizenship Shapes Transnationalism,' *Revue Europeene des Migrations Internationales* (17) 2: 63-100.
- Koopmans, Ruud, Paul Statham, Marco Guigni, and Florence Passy. (2005). *Contested Citizenship*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Koslowski, Rey, Ed. (2005) *International Migration and the Globalization of Domestic Politics* (London: Routledge).
- Krasner, Stephen (1995) "Power Politics, Institutions and Transnational Relations," in Thomas Risse-Kappen, ed. *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Laffey, Mark and Suthaharan Nadarajah (2012) "The Hybridity of the Liberal Peace: States, Diasporas and Insecurity," *Security Dialogue* 43 (5): 403-20.
- Lefebvre, Henri (1991[1974]) *The Production of Space* Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith (Oxford, Blackwell).
- Lefebvre, Henri (2000), *Writings on Cities* Translated and edited by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Lefebvre, Henri (2009) *State, Space, World: Selected Essays* Edited by Stuart Elden and Neill Brenner (St Paul: University of Minnesota Press).
- Le Gales, Patrick (2002) *European Cities: Social Conflicts and Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Levi, Margaret and Gillian H. Murphy (2006) "Coalitions of Contention: The Case of the WTO Protests in Seattle," *Political Studies* 54 (4): 651-670.
- Lindley, Anna (2009) "The Early Morning Phonecall: Remittance from a Refugee Diaspora Perspective," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (8): 1315-1334.

- Lyons, Terrence and Peter Mandaville (2010). "Think Locally, Act Globally," *International Political Sociology* 4, 124-141.
- Lyons, Terrence (2006). "Diasporas and Homeland Conflict," in Miles Kahler and Barbara Walter (eds) *Territoriality and Conflict in an Era of Globalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malet, David (2013) *Foreign Fighters: Transnational Identity in Civil Conflicts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Mandaville, Peter (200). *Transnational Muslim Politics: Reimagining the Umma* (London: Routledge).
- Massey, Doreen (2007) *The World City* (Cambridge: Polity).
- McAdam, Doug and Sidney Tarrow (2005) Scale Shift and Transnational Contention. In Della Porta and Tarrow 2005: 121-150.
- McAdam, Doug and Dieter Rucht (1993). "The Cross-national Diffusion of Movement Ideas," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 528: 56-74.
- McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow and Charles Tilly (2001). *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McAdam, Doug, John D. McCarthy and Mayer N. Zald (1996) *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald (1977) "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory" *American Journal of Sociology* 82 (6): 1212-1241.
- Mendelson, Sarah E. and John K. Glenn (2002) *The Power and Limits of NGOs: A Critical Look at Democracy Building in Eastern Europe and Eurasia* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Mittelman, James H. (2000) *The Globalization Syndrome: Transformation and Resistance* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Nadelmann, Ethan (1990) "Global Prohibition Regimes: The Evolution of Norms in International Society" *International Organization* 44 (4): 479-526.
- Nexon, Daniel H. (2009) *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe: Religious Conflict, Dynastic Empires and International Change* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Nye, Joseph S. and Robert O. Keohane (1971), "Transnational Relations and World Politics: An Introduction," *International Organization* 25 (3): 329-349
- Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva. (2001). Transnational political practices and the receiving state: Turks and Kurds in Germany and the Netherlands. *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs*, 1 (3): 261- 282.
- Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva. (2003a) *Transnational Politics: Turks and Kurds in Germany*. (London: Routledge).
- Østergaard-Nielsen, Eva (2003b). "The Politics of Migrants' Transnational Political Practices," *International Migration Review* 37 (3): 760-786.
- Owen, John M. (2010) *The Clash of Ideas in World Politics: Transnational Networks, States and Regime Change, 1510-2010* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Padgett, John F. and Christopher K. Ansell (1993) Robust Action and the Rise of the Medici, 1400-1434. *American Journal of Sociology* 98 (6): 1259-1319.
- Payne, Rodger A. (2001) Persuasion, Frames and Norm Construction. *European Journal of International Relations* 7 (1): 37-61.
- Pichardo, Nelson A. 1988. Resource Mobilization: An Analysis of Conflicting Theoretical Variations. *Sociological Quarterly* 29 (1): 97-110.

- Price, Richard (1998) "Reversing the Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Landmines," *International Organization* 52 (3) Summer 1998: 613-644.
- Raggazi, Francesco (2009). "Governing Diasporas," *International Political Sociology* 3 (4): 378-397.
- Schoen, Donald and Martin Rein (1995) *Frame Reflection: Towards the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies* (New York: Basic Books).
- Risse, Thomas, Stephen Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, Eds. (1999). *The Power of Human Rights* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas (1994) "Ideas Do Not Float Freely: Transnational Coalitions, Domestic Structures, and the End of the Cold War," *International Organization* 48, 2: 185-214.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas, ed. (1995) *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Robertson, Roland (1992) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications)
- Robertson, Roland (1995) "Glocalization: Time-space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity," In *Global Modernities* edited by Mike Featherstone, Scott Lash and Roland Robertson. London: Sage.
- Rosenau, James (2003) *Distant Proximities: Dynamics Beyond Globalization* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Rosenberg, Clifford (2006), *Policing Paris: The Origins of Modern Immigration Control Between the Wars* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press)
- Roy, Ananya (2002) *City Requiem, Calcutta: Gender and Politics of Poverty* (St Paul, MN: University of Minnesota Press).
- Saideman, Stephen M. (2001) *The Ties That Divide: Ethnic Politics, Foreign Policy and International Conflict* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Saideman, Stephen M. (2012) "When Conflict Spreads: The Arab Spring and the Limits of Diffusion," *International Interactions* 38 (5): 713-22.
- Salehyan, Idean and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch (2006), "Refugees and the Spread of Civil War," *International Organization* 60 (2): 335-336.
- Salehyan, Idean (2007) "Transnational Rebels," *World Politics* 59 (2): 217-242.
- Salehyan, Idean (2009) *Rebels Without Borders: Transnational Insurgents in World Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Sassen, Saskia (1991) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schutte, Sebastian and Nils B. Weidmann (2011) "Diffusion Patterns of Violence in Civil Wars," *Political Geography* 30 (3): 143-152.
- Scott, Alan John (2002) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press).
- Shain, Yossi (2002). 'The Role of Diasporas in Conflict Perpetuation and Resolution', *SAIS Review*, 22 (2): 115-144.
- Shain, Yossi and Aharon Barth (2003) "Diasporas and International Relations Theory," *International Organization* 57 (3): 449-479.
- Shain, Yossi (2007) *Kinship and Diasporas in International Affairs* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan).
- Shatkin, Gavin, ed. (2013) *Contesting the Indian City: Global Visions and the Politics of the Local* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell)
- Sheffer, Gabriel (1986) *Modern Diasporas in International Politics* (London: Croom Helm)

- Sheffer, Gabriel (2003). *Diaspora Politics*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Sheppard, Eric (2002) "The Spaces and Times of Globalization: Place, Scale, Networks and Positionality," *Economic Geography* 78 (3): 307-330.
- Sikkink, Kathryn (2011) "Beyond the Justice Cascade: How Agentic Constructivism Could Help Explain Change in International Politics." Paper presented at the Princeton IR Colloquium, November 21, 2011.
- Snow, David, et al. (1986) "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization and Movement Participation" *American Sociological Review*. 51: 464-481.
- Snow, David, Sarah Soule and Hanspeter Kriesi (2004). *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements* (Malden, MA: Blackwell).
- Snyder, Jack L. and Leslie Vinjamuri (2003) "Trials and Errors: Principles and Pragmatism in Strategies of International Justice," *International Security* 28 (3) 5-44.
- Stroup, Sarah (2012), *Borders Among Activists: International NGOs in the United States, Britain and France* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press)
- Tarrow, Sidney (1994) *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Tarrow, Sidney (2005). *The New Transnational Activism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Tölölyan, Khachig (2000). "Elites and Institutions in the Armenian Transnation" *Diaspora* 9 (1): 107-136.
- Van Dyke, Nella (2003). "Crossing Movement Boundaries: Factors that Facilitate Coalition Protest among American College Students 1930-1990," *Social Problems* 50 (2): 226-250.
- Varadarjan, Latha (2010). *The Domestic Abroad. Diasporas and International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Vargos-Silva, Carlos (2011) *Migrant Remittances to and From the UK*. Oxford: The Migration Observatory, University of Oxford.
- Vertovec, Steve (2010) "Transnationalism and Identity," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 27 (4): 573-582.
- Wapner, Paul. 1995. "Politics Beyond the State: Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics," *World Politics* 47 April: 311-340.
- Walt, Stephen M. (1997) *Revolution and War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Waltz, Kenneth (1979) *Theory of International Politics* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley)
- Waterbury, Myra (2010). *Between State and Nation. Diaspora Politics and Kin-state Nationalism in Hungary* (London: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Wayland, Sarah (2004) Ethnonationalist Networks and Transnational Opportunities: the Sri Lankan Tamil Diaspora," *Review of International Studies* 30 (3): 405-426.
- Werbner, Pnina (1999) "Global Pathways: Working Class Cosmopolitans and the Creation of Transnational Ethnic Worlds," *Social Anthropology* 7 (1): 17-35.
- Zhukov, Yuri M. and Brandon M. Stewart (2011) "Choosing Your Neighbours: Networks of Diffusion in International Relations," *International Studies Quarterly* 57 (2): 271-287.