

ON THE ROLE OF GLOBAL NETWORKS OF CITIES IN WORLD POLITICS

E. G. Dovbysh¹

This article analyzes the role of global networks of cities in world politics. The research is based on the concept of global (world) cities acting as one of globalization factors. The question of correlation of a city with its environment stands upfront. Based on the analysis of secondary data published in the literature the author identifies two types of networks of cities: infrastructure networks and active networks. They differ from each other in the principles of their formation, in their organizational integrity and in their roles in international relations. The first-type networks are derived and secondary compared with global processes building under the influence of world economic and political needs, the very cities not playing here active roles in the building. Second-type networks form for achieving specific goals and objectives and can be named then goal city networks. Such unions must not only simplify the problem solution but strengthen the positions of ally cities compared with the other IR participants. The author proves that the infrastructure networks of cities are entities that have only indirect impact on world politics, while active network possess some important features of actors of international relations. The rules discussed and established by the network participants allow in their turn for establishing goals for the participants. They interact with the other participant of global management structures in developing and implementing the policy on some global problems.

Key words: networks of cities, cities in world politics, new actors of IR, globalization.

Despite the facts that both international relations and world politics are dominated by states, in the early 21 century we can see that other actors are involving in global deals more actively. It was globalization that made possible new participants of world politics to emerge. As the boundaries between internal and external policies blur and political and economic processes in different countries become interdependent, the role of new actors (such as cities and networks of cities) gets increasingly important.

¹Yevgeny G. Dovbysh, Rus. Acad. Sci., Institute of World Economy and International Relations, Junior researcher. E-mail: edovbysh@gmail.com.

Today we can see the last stage of global urbanization which takes place in Asian and African countries. In China for instance about half of the population already lives in cities, whereas in Indian cities live 364 million, and by 2030, there will be 700 million [Katz B., Bradley J. 2014, p. viii]. The intense migration from rural to urban areas in developing countries led to majority of humanity lives in cities nowadays. It suggests that the cities today, as never before, are of great importance for the fate of the whole world.

However, for a long time the due attention to the role of cities in international relations (IR) and world politics has not been given. Such little interest in the cities can be attributed to the dominance of the traditionalist view on the nature of IR. Proponent of this approach is Rosenau, who believes that there are two worlds of world politics [see: Rosenau J, 1990]. The first one is place, where the state is the major actor and where all the principal events in world politics (such as negotiations, peace treaties and nuclear proliferation talks) take place. In the second world, where the non-state actors participate as well as states, cooperation in the fields of culture and education is being discussed. Since these problems are less important, they are not in the focus of political science. Today, however, this division of the international issues looks quite artificial: traditional and non-traditional participants are not separated by impermeable wall. Modern IR is a complex interaction of different institutions, structures, individuals.

The changes in understanding of the nature of the city have contributed to inclusion urban-related questions in the discourse of international relations theory. In the middle of the 20 century, there has been a methodological shift in understanding the city. Previous researchers such as Weber and Wirth questioned internal nature of the city. They tried to identify the patterns of its functioning as a complex social organism, whereas today, in urban studies scholars is questioning the relationship of the city with its surroundings. Today not only the nearby rural area, region and country are thought to be significant for a city, but also the global political and economic processes.

The founders of this approach are Hall, Cohen and Chase-Dan [see: Hall P. G., 1966; Cohen R. B., 1981; Chase-Dunn C. K., 1985]. They dealt with the city in the context of global politics and economics. Based on their work Friedman and Sassen developed the theory of the world/global city [see: Friedmann J., 1986; Sassen S., 1991]. Global city is thought to be key cities in the world, used by global capital as

"command centers" for the management of markets [Sassen S., 1991, p. 320].

At the same time with the idea of the special role of the largest cities in the world economy and politics, the idea that the cities are related and connected with each other emerged. Since "globality" of a city can be revealed only in the course of city's relations towards other cities, it is important to study the structure of global urbosphere. Both Friedman and Sassen, agreed that the main cause of global cities to exist is the inequality in the distribution of resources between the Global Centre and the Periphery, which generates inequality between states and between cities.

Global cities (such as New York, London, and Tokyo) clearly stand out against the other cities. They are at the top of the pyramid, where the various aspects of the management of the global economy and politics are concentrated and collected. All other cities compared to them play a less prominent role in the world economy; however, the processes of globalization are affecting them as well. If the leading cities are the subjects of globalization, the rest of the cities are its objects. They have to be embedded into a hierarchical system, and to seek their own niche in the global economy and politics. Thus, the majority of European capitals (including Moscow) are serving as a gateway to the global economy for their countries and regions [see: Sergeev V.M., Kazanev, A.A., 2007; Allen J., 2010]. This division in city roles is influenced by many factors, and mostly by fundamental reasons rooted in very logic of global economy and politics. The city has become a global one, if there are global processes inside it.

Since the late 1980 's. the theory of "global cities", has gotten a large number of followers. Sociologists, urbanists, planning professionals from different countries and with different methodological units have taken numerous empirical studies by classifying the world cities. In the beginning the global urbosphere had been described as a hierarchical structure, but today in studies performed at the junction of urban and international studies, the most common view is that cities are organized into a global network, inside which there are dominant spot, distinguished by its size and resources, i.e. global cities. These ideas were written by Timberlake, Taylor, Beaverstock and Smith, in their influential works [see for example: Taylor P. J., Beaverstock J. V. and Smith R. G. A, 1999].

Networks of cities are complex entities. Their complexity caused by dual nature of a city. The city has both spatial and social characteristics. On the one hand, any city is a physical space, the area and locality. On the other hand, urban space is filled with interactions between social networks and individuals. In this sense, the city acts as organizer of the social space of the whole society; this not only sets the characteristics of social institutions, but also affects the behavior of individuals [see: Levada Y. A.,1993a; Levada Y. A.,1993b]. It is the dual nature of the city which is the reason for the existence of two types of global networks of cities. The city is important to global processes, as the object to influence on and to use in accordance with their needs. However, the city being a social entity has the opportunity to influence these global processes. Therefore, some global networks of cities are the objects of globalization, whereas others have few features of its actors. In addition, these two types of networks are different in their principle of formation and organization, objectives and goals, and in their roles in IR.

So, the first type is the global infrastructure networks of cities. They exist as long as the global economy and global politics still retain the need for a place, despite advances in technology. These networks are derived from global processes; they are formed under their influence. However, they have an impact on global processes too. These networks at the same time are factors and actors of IR, what makes them an intermediate type of active-passive participants i.e. agents of IR.

The second type of networks is being organized directly by cities in order to achieve specific goals and targets, so they could be named the target networks of cities. These networks are also result of globalization, but, unlike the first type, they are more compact and their composition is defined formally; they appear and disappear in the ad hoc process; they are organized on the problematic principle and have clearly prescribed purposes for which achieving the specific tools are applied. Such networks are not just part of the global infrastructure, one of the many factors, but also an actor seeking to modify the surrounding social and political landscape, which has its own objectives and interests.

Global infrastructure networks of cities

The fact of the matter is that infrastructure networks are more static, so they are a convenient subject for research [see: Taylor P. J., Beaverstock J. V. and Smith R. G., 1999; Taylor P. J., 2001]. In addition, the data for their analysis are already contained in materials on the global economy. Researchers should just summarize available datum and employ the techniques of economic geography for analysis, and easily get the answer to the question: which cities are the most significant for the world economy?

Global economic network of cities are formed through intensive information, human, financial flows between the offices of the world's largest multinational firms. The creators of such networks are not the cities themselves, but the companies located in cities. In this case, cities serve as places where firms interact with their counterparts, thereby uniting the cities in the network. Based on the study of the movement of capital, the traffic flow in the network one could see that the main places in such networks are occupied by New York, London and Tokyo [see: Sassen S., 2009; Tomer A., Puentes R., Neal Z., 2013].

Research model, focused on the study of the economic dimension of the interaction of cities, can be transferred to other spheres. So it is possible to identify other types of infrastructure networks of cities. For example, Taylor suggested that firms could be replaced by diplomatic embassies, offices of global NGOs and UN organizations in order to outline the global political networks of cities [Cm.: Taylor P. J., 2005]. These institutions are also senders and recipients of flows. Because those flows are political, the town merged into the *global policy network*. Among such networks can be distinguished: 1) global diplomatic network of cities based on the interaction between diplomatic embassies; 2) global network of cities, which is formed through the interaction of UN structures; and 3) global network of cities, built around the interaction of transnational NGOs. Let's look at each type of global policy networks.

Back in the 1990 's. Nierop investigated the location of embassies and diplomatic missions in cities and on the basis of that data he concluded on the role of cities in world politics [see: Nierop T., 1994]. His findings confirmed initial hypothesis that the majority of embassies, diplomatic missions, consulates, trade offices are located in the capitals of states. In the global diplomatic networks of cities, capital cities are both senders and recipients of political information, they are the main distributors of political movements and the conductors of states' will in

international relations. In terms of the concept of global cities, the capital-cities are “command posts and control centers” for the global policy.

Global diplomatic network is heterogeneous. It consists of several smaller networks, within which located points of attraction. Such points are the capital of the world or regional Powers. For example, the European and South American network gravitate to Washington; Tehran and Beirut dominated in the Islamic world; and the capital of the former socialist countries constitute a separate group. But at the same time although capitals are important players in the global diplomatic network, they are not the only type of cities in the network. There are also cities such as Frankfurt, Hong Kong, Los Angeles, Istanbul, Lagos, Mumbai, Sao Paulo, Sydney and Toronto. Despite the fact that they are not capitals, these cities have important economic and/or political roles in their countries.

The next type of infrastructure networks that have an important influence on the global political flows is involved in the functioning of global governance [see: Rosenau J., 1990]. The main characteristic of this complex system is the presence of numerous control mechanisms, based on its background, objectives, structure and processes. Not only States but also intergovernmental and non-governmental structures are parts of this complex system. Since the activities of such organizations are interstate in their nature, they contribute to the formation of the infrastructure networks of cities. This process can be seen at the example of the organizations working under the auspices of the United Nations. In the process of implementation UN program on public health, protection of human rights, assistance to developing countries, UN agencies share information, resources and knowledge. This is linking cities in which they work into networks.

According to Taylor, to identify the structure of the network of cities, it is necessary to consider, in which cities offices, branches of UN organizations are located [Cm.: Taylor P. J., 2005]. It is obvious that in this network Geneva, Washington and New York are dominant. While communication inside the network is spreading mainly in one direction from the global Centre to the Periphery.

But the UN is just one of the many structures, within the global governance. For global governance is also important global civil society, understood as an interrelated and multi-level social space consisting of many independent non-governmental institutions and ways of life [see:

Kean J., 2001]. Due to the fact that in the global civil society linkages between its entities are implemented on transterritorial boundaries, global civil society connects local, regional and global. Networks of cities play a significant role in processes of such connecting.

In this case, global networks of cities are constructed by circulating flows between offices of international NGOs. To examine the global network of NGOs Taylor has selected organizations dealing with environment, protection of human rights, and international aid for developing countries [Cm.: Taylor P. J., 2005]. And only those organizations that have branches in at least three continents were selected.

Distribution of global civil society institutions around the world suggests that the network of cities caused by their activities is heterogeneous and consists of smaller networks. Main role in such networks play not only cities from developed countries but also ones from developing countries. Along with the networks, which are dominated by London, Washington or Geneva, there are networks where the leaders are Brussels, Ottawa, Nairobi and Manila. In these networks the main flows of finance, information, knowledge and human capital are moving from developed to developing countries.

In general it can be said that global infrastructure networks of cities formed by world political processes. Political infrastructure networks of cities are not created intentionally by anyone; they are more likely to occur as the other actors of IR (states, NGOs, international organizations, etc.) begin to need them. It is obvious that in this case, cities themselves do not play an active role in forming and shaping of networks. It is the offices of international organizations and embassies, which are the start and end points of the political flows. Therefore, infrastructure networks are influenced by external factors and often change their configuration. Thus, significant changes in the diplomatic network cities may occur following the changing their state's role on the international stage.

In this way, on the one hand, global infrastructure networks of cities are a factor of IR, because along with the technologies, socio-cultural context, international norms, they have an indirect influence on states and intergovernmental organizations which are traditional actors. But, on the other hand, they are notably more important than other factors, since they act as intermediaries in the global political processes. Therefore, such networks should be attributed to agents of IR.

Global target network of cities

A city, being a complex social entity with its own interests and goals, resources and strategies, can manifest itself as an active participant in world politics. Its activity could be of two types: the city can build relationships with other actors of IR by means of "diplomacy of cities" [see: Pluijm, R., 2007], or perform in the collective network actor.

The reason why a city starts bilateral interaction with states and intergovernmental organizations, transnational corporations, can be rooted in the city's interest in attracting the investment required for the development of urban infrastructure. The city authorities are negotiating with TNCs about hosting the head office in the downtown, or they are lobbying for the city's special status in Parliament, they are vying for the Olympic Games and so on. The city's competitors in the fight for such scarce benefits as capital and political power are cities as well. To succeed in a global race cities implement a program to establish a unique brand of the city and try to design the urban identity [see: OECD Territorial Reviews..., 2006].

But sometimes even such giants as New York, London and Tokyo, with economic resources comparable to those of middle-income countries like the Czech Republic, prefer cooperation and coordination of efforts. Most often this coordination occurs in addressing global issues, as issues such as climate change, inequality between the South and the North are global in terms of their causes and local in terms of their manifestation. For example, climate change is caused by a complex set of reasons and it could not be affected by territorial actors (states, regions, and cities). But natural disasters brought about by climate change, has local consequences: typhoons and droughts always harms the specific territories. Cities, which are local territorial units, are in a deadlock. To overcome it, they have to interact with other actors of IR and, first of all, with other cities.

Such global networks of cities are the second type. They are also the result of globalization and advance in technology. However, in contrast to the infrastructure networks of cities, they are not only important factors of IR, but they also possess some characteristics of actors of IR. These networks are purposefully constructed by city-

attractors, which are global cities. Such alliances not only to simplify the solution of the problem, but also to strengthen the position of cities-allies against other actors of IR. In this case, the city and their network are no longer just places where social, economic and political interactions occur, but also an important participants of world politics

The brightest example of such self-organized network of cities is a recently created group "C40" (Climate Leadership Group), which is in the focus of Acuto's research [see: Acuto M., 2013a]. The Group, composed of 58 largest cities, has set a goal to fight climate change by means of influencing on government, intergovernmental structures, and global public opinion.

The process of formation of this network can be subdivided into several phases [see: Acuto M., 2013b]. In 2005 the network was created. It was the initiative of the London authorities that promoted Summit of leaders of the world's largest cities. During the Summit the agreement of cooperation between cities was adopted and coordinating body was established. At this stage, the Group was able to prove that it has the right and the necessary resources for the participation in global environmental policy on an equal footing with other participants.

On the next stage there was increasing in number of participants and partners. In 2007, at a meeting in New York, core group of 20 cities was joined by another 20 cities, including cities of developing countries. Despite the fact that initially the C40 announced the exclusive role of cities in tackling global environmental problems, it had to greatly extend the range of its members and allies to include not only cities. Thus, since 2006, the group has been a strategic partner of the Clinton Foundation, and since 2011, it has been collaborating with the World Bank.

After parties and mediators had established the network, the network was mobilized. The initial set of cities, which are complex social entities themselves, could turn into even more complex structure, which was a collective entity. But such collective entity, which is the C40, is differing from infrastructure networks in its ability to be active.

Today C40 simultaneously operates on two fronts. First and foremost activity is hold in applied projects in the field of urban environment. For that purpose, there is a constant exchange of experience among experts in the field of urban planning, land use, waste, energy efficiency, etc. Also C40 has political activities at the level of states and global governance. On the political front, the main mechanisms are diplomacy and lobbying. The Group is lobbying for

environmental program in the UN; the group takes part in influential environmental summits.

The main incentive for cities to participate in networks such as C40 is the fact that the network serves as a multiplier, which allows cities to be visible in world politics. For the cities participating in the network is the ability to increase their role in IR and become more independent in decision making. In addition, network-participants acquire important economic and political links, which could be converted to any type of capital.

Global target networks of cities, as one can see in case of C40, depend on their structure and principles of organization. In C40, as in other networks of this type (for example, "Mayors for Peace"), an important role is played by the so-called "culture of network" [see: Marsh D., Smith M., 2000] and "rules of the game ". Rules for the functioning of the network of cities are discussed in the very beginning; they set the limits of permissible actions and define the role of the participants. All of that have an impact on the final result of the network's activities. After the institutionalization of the network is finished, network is able to set goals for their members: now not only the city is affecting the network, but the network has an impact on its city-members. All of this suggests that networks become a collective subject. Since this subject has its own resources, accepted by others actors of IR and sought to change the global political environment, this type of network of cities could be named the collective actor of IR.

Network of cities as the new actors of IR

Thus, networks of cities due to the dual nature of the cities are involved in IR in two ways. First, as seen in the case of the infrastructure networks, they have an indirect influence on global processes, working upon other actors of world politics. In this case, the basic tools and mechanisms of these effects are related to the physical characteristics of the network: the distance between cities, the existence of the necessary buildings and lines of communication etc. Secondly, as seen in the case of the "C40" and "Mayors for Peace", networks of cities are active participants, influencing global context. The activity of the latter is based on the social nature of the city and shown in city lobbying and diplomacy.

It should be mentioned that cities can be often attributed to both types of networks. Big and rich cities serve for the global economy and politics' purposes, and at the same time they are actively influencing global processes. Cities such as London, New York, Tokyo, and Paris are agents of global political flows sent by states, international organizations, etc. But at the same time they both seek to generate and direct these streams. The city, and especially global or world city, is able to be both agent, and actor in world politics. However, most cities are just infrastructure for globalization.

This clear difference between global and other cities raises a question what factors are stimulating city to "aware" themselves as independent and coherent entities. It seems to be likely that inclusion of cities in the system of global governance is a natural process that occurs as the world order is under restructuring.

Both increasing of social and political life's complexity and the emergence of new challenges and threats, lead to including a wide range of actors and stakeholders in the decision-making process. System of IR becomes more complicated because it involves more actors. But the changes are not only quantitative; there are also changes in principles of global interactions: the hierarchical and vertical ways of communication are challenged by networks. At the global and macro-regional levels (the European Union, post-Soviet states) the spatial restructuring of the governance is under way [see: Prohorenko I.L, 2012]. At the same time, the IR system breaks down into many sub-systems, built around specific issues and challenges in global politics: there are separate areas related to climate change, nuclear non-proliferation, and global social problems. This, in turn, contributes to the emergence of phenomena of "subpolitisation" of world politics [see: Beck U., 2005], i.e purchasing features of actors of IR by subjects that did not have them earlier and "privatization" of world politics [see: "Privatization" of world politics..., 2008].

The city is one of those actors who are privatizing the world politics. They do not represent the interests of such a wide range of people, as states do. But compared with TNCs, they look more legitimate and democratic, because the contents of the «international agenda» of the city are determined by the arrangement of forces in the city coalition which include city authorities, business and civil society.

Today, the active networks of cities become a part of a wider group of actors of various natures dealing with important global problems.

They interact with other participants within the framework of global governance. This is exemplified by the global policy in the area of environmental protection, which development involves not only traditional actors of world politics, but also the institutions of global civil society, commercial structures and networks of cities. The city, therefore, participate in the transformation of the modern system of IR in order to make it open for different actors and stakeholders.

References:

1. Levada Yu. A. 1993. *K probleme izmeneniya sotsial'nogo prostranstva-vremeni v protsesse urbanizatsii (The problem of social space-time changes in urbanization)*, In: Levada Yu. Statyi po sotsiologii (Levada Yu. Articles on sociology). Moscow.
2. Levada Yu. A. 1993. *Urbanization as a sociocultural process (Urbanizatsiya kak sotsiokulturnyy protsess)*, In: Levada Yu., Statyi po sotsiologii (Articles on sociology). Moscow
3. *"Privatizatsiya" mirovoy politiki: lokalnye deystviya - globalnye rezultaty ("Privatization" of world politics: local action - global results)*. 2008 ed. Lebedeva, M.M. Moscow
4. Prohorenko I.L. 2012. *O metodologicheskikh problemakh analiza sovremennykh politicheskikh prostranstv (On the methodological problems analysis of contemporary political spaces)*. Polis (Political Studies), № 6.
5. Sergeev V.M., Kazanov A.A. 2007. . *Setevaya dinamika globalizatsii i tipologiya global'nykh vorot (Network Dynamics of globalization and the global target)*. Polis (Political Studies), № 2.
6. Acuto M. 2013a. *Global Cities, Governance and Diplomacy: The Urban Link*. London: Routledge.
7. Acuto M. 2013b. *The new climate leaders? // Review of International Studies*. Vol. 39.
8. Allen J. 2010. *Powerful City Network: More than Connections, Less than Domination and Control // Urban Studies*. Vol. 47.
9. Beck U. 2005. *Power in a Global Age*. Cambridge: Polity.
10. Chase-Dunn C.K. 1985. *The System of World Cities, A.D. 800–1975 // Urbanization in the World-Economy*. New York: Academic

Press.

11. Cohen R.B. 1981. *The new international division of labor: multinational corporations and urban hierarchy* // Urbanization and Planning in Capitalist Society. New York: Taylor & Francis.
12. Hall P.G. 1966. *The World Cities*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
13. Friedmann J. 1986. *The World City Hypothesis* // Development and Change. Vol. 17.
14. Katz B., Bradley J. 2014. *The Metropolitan Revolution*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
15. Kean J. 2001. «*Global civil society?*» *Introducing global civil society* // Global civil society. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Marsh D., Smith M. 2000. *Understanding Policy Networks: Towards a Dialectical Approach* // Political Studies. Vol. 48.
17. Nierop T. 1994. *Systems and Regions in Global Politics*. Chichester and New York: John Wiley.
18. OECD Territorial Reviews. 2006. *Competitive Cities: A New Entrepreneurial Paradigm in Spatial Development*. URL: www.sourceoecd.org/governance/9789264022409
19. Pluijm R. van der. 2007. *City Diplomacy: The Expanding Role of Cities in International Relations* // Clingendael Diplomacy Papers. Vol. 10.
20. Rosenau J. 1990. *Turbulence in World Politics: A Theory of Change and Continuity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
21. Sassen S. 2009. *Cities in Today's Global Age* // SAIS Review. Vol. 20
22. Sassen S. 1991. *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
23. Taylor P.J. 2001. *A New Mapping of the World for the New Millennium* // The Geographical Journal. Vol. 167.
24. Taylor P.J. 2005. *New Political Geographies: Global Civil Society and Global Governance through World City Networks* // Political Geography. Vol. 24.
25. Taylor P.J., Beaverstock J.V., Smith R.G. 1999. *A Roster of World Cities* // Cities. Vol. 16.
26. Tomer A., Puentes R., Neal Z. 2013. *Global Gateways: International Aviation in Metropolitan America. Report of Brookings Metropolitan Policy Program*. URL: <http://www.brookings.edu/~media/research/files/reports/2012/10/25->

global-aviation/25-global-aviation.pdf