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Locating the global governance of HIV and AIDS: exploring the geographies of transnational advocacy networks

Abstract

Over the last two decades, HIV and AIDS have been framed as a ‘global problem’. In the process, transnational advocacy networks have emerged as important actors, and particular places are recognised as key nodes in global HIV and AIDS governance. Using the example of London, UK, this paper examines how these networks are involved in local articulations of global governance and reveals that ‘global’ processes are inflected by the locations through which networks are routed. The example suggests the need for further analysis of the geographies through which HIV and AIDS is reconfiguring power relations at a variety of spatial scales.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Partnerships between nation states, supranational institutions of global governance, business and civil society have long been a feature of global health policies (Buse and Walt, 2000; Zacher, 2007). One of the most prominent issues in recent decades to be framed in global terms has been HIV and AIDS. An impressive infrastructure for the global governance of HIV and AIDS initiatives has emerged including, UNAIDS (1996), the International Aids Vaccines Initiative (1996), the UN’s Millennium Development Goals (2001), the Global Fund for HIV and AIDS, TB and Malaria (2002), and the US President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) (2003) (Chataway and Smith, 2007; Ingram, 2009, 2010). HIV and AIDS is now an extensive and intensive object of global policy initiatives.

A distinctive feature of the different HIV and AIDS pandemics is the ways in which they are transforming understandings of death, life, sex, blood, family structures, reproduction, hierarchies of scientific knowledge and gender relations. In the process, the causes and effects of HIV and AIDS are creating new social divisions and solidifying old ones (Preston-Whyte, 2006), while simultaneously throwing up new political spaces characterised by notions of ‘new life’ (Robins, 2005) and ‘therapeutic citizenship’ (Nguyen, 2005). The complexities of these transformations in different places are related to the intensity and extent of the HIV and AIDS global governance infrastructure. Articulations of local and global aspects of HIV and AIDS are raising concerns about the effectiveness of ‘global’ responses and the implications for people living with HIV and AIDS.

One way of attending to the geographies of HIV and AIDS governance is to focus on a key set of actors that work across a simple local/global dualism. While the transnational
HIV and AIDS focus has often fallen on the effects of migration (c.f. Takahashi and Magalong, 2008) or health networks (Thomas, 2010), central to the articulation of local/global HIV and AIDS governance is a wide variety of transnational advocacy networks (TANs) of experts, policy-makers, scientists and activists. The emergence of these TANs was facilitated by the growth of NGOs in the 1990s (deMars, 2005; Reimann, 2006), the United Nation’s ‘Conference Decade’ (Batliwala, 2002) and new initiatives amongst activists in NGO strategizing such as partnerships and coalitions (Yanacopulos, 2005). TANs exist in many different sectors and are part of important networks in relation to HIV and AIDS including health, religion, and international development – often in overlapping configurations.

Since Keck and Sikkink’s (1998) seminal work on the strategies of TANs, scholarship has tended to focus on their political roles (Hudson, 2001; van Tuijl and Jordan, 1999). Key issues have included TANs’ accountability, representation, and their legitimacy in international decision-making fora (Steffek and Hahn, 2010). Here, we want to develop another issue, namely that of how the embedded geographies of HIV and AIDS TANs helps to understand the issue-focus of particular networks (see Lindquist (2004)). We present a case study which takes as its starting point advocacy networks in the UK, and centred in London. London is conceptualised as a particular node in the transnational networks involved in the global response to HIV and AIDS.

We are interested in the specificity of London as a particular socio-political space and how this shapes the form and content of advocacy mobilised from here based on an analysis of international association data (UIA, 2007). In 2005, the UK concurrently held the presidencies of the G8 and EU which offered unique opportunities to press for key global commitments around HIV and AIDS. We identify and explore issues related to the ‘reach’, ‘scale’ and embeddedness of London-based advocacy and how it is shaped by local, national and international contexts by reviewing the websites of member organisations of the UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development (UK-CAID). We focus in particular on the case of the UK’s Department for International Development (DfID) role in the construction of the UK’s HIV and AIDS Strategy (2004b) in the mid-2000s, and the capacity of the UK-CAID to influence the formulation of this Strategy. Through this example we argue that the ‘developmentalisation’ of AIDS strategy is a feature of the UK-based global response to HIV and AIDS.

Section Two examines different theoretical approaches to the relationship between global and local activism and advocacy. We move away from approaches that conceptualise transnational activism by counterposing local and global scales, preferring instead an approach that seeks to understand how global relationships are built-up and routed through places. Section Three examines the case of TANs in London. It explores how the global governance of HIV and AIDS in, and through, London can be understood as a specific articulation of HIV and AIDS as a global issue, shaped by the interplay of local organisational landscapes with opportunities to connect with distanced networks of transnational activists.
2. THEORISING TRANSNATIONAL ADVOCACY NETWORKS

Efforts to theorise social movement activity at the transnational level are generating new ways to conceptualise socio-political space and the agency of actors engaged in contentious politics. Writers using a range of social science approaches are challenging the dualism of local versus global politics by broadening our understandings of the practices, processes and structures implicated in political action. In this section we examine recent developments in social movement theory which contribute to an analysis of the spatial politics of TANs. We build toward an analytical approach that recognises the significance of place and location in shaping HIV and AIDS activism.

Tarrow’s (2005) work on the ‘new transnational activism’ offers social movement scholars a framework for rethinking transnational contention. He focuses on *internationalism* as the key to understanding the formation of transnational movements and the opportunities and constraints for collective action. Internationalism involves a triangular system of states, non-state actors, and international institutions such as the United Nations, the IMF and World Bank, and NATO, and Tarrow is interested in specifying processes and mechanisms which create linkages between domestic activists with the international system. Expanding on earlier work that identified political opportunity structures largely within domestic spheres, Tarrow investigates the political and institutional contexts which facilitate transnational mobilisation and which enable non-state actors including NGOs, advocacy groups and transnationally networked groups of experts to make their claims at the international level. Tarrow’s work strongly argues for the continuing centrality of nation-states, both in terms of their domestic politics and the international institutions that they have put into place to manage global governance. Simultaneously, he reminds us that many transnational activists are best viewed as ‘rooted cosmopolitans’ who are primarily embedded in domestic politics but may find themselves mobilising resources and networks across borders in pursuit of specific goals which lend themselves to claims-making within international institutions. Tarrow’s work, therefore, is useful in drawing attention to the interactions between embeddedness and the reach of activists.

Another strand of social movement research, emerging from human geography, envisions movement activity as an assemblage of diverse spatial strategies of claims-making. Leitner et al (2008) take issue with Tarrow and other social movement researchers who give too much primacy to the role of the nation-state and international institutions. Instead they view contentious politics in terms of its counter-hegemonic underpinnings involving differently positioned participants who join together to promote ‘alternative imaginaries.’ They favour an approach which recognises multiple spatialities connecting places, scales, networks, and mobilities, and which examines the ways in which these spatialities are co-implicated in contentious politics. Leitner et al (2008) draw attention to the ways in which power differentials shape the contours of transnational advocacy. As they argue (ibid, 159): ‘To the extent that contentious politics interacts with the state, the strategies available will be shaped by state-constructed scalar configurations and the different conditions of possibility within local places.’ On this understanding, we can recognise that the global governance structures which have emerged in response to HIV
and AIDS are situated within the state-constructed scalar hierarchies, thus reflecting and reinforcing existing inequalities in the global system. In turn, international donors and international organisations (such as The Global Fund) have tremendous power in determining the priorities and activities of the global response to AIDS, with the USA playing a decisive role in policy formation through its influence over supra-national institutions of global governance (for example, UNAids and the UN Millennium Development Goals).

These approaches to the geography of movement activity draw attention to the embeddedness of ‘global’ activism and advocacy in national and sub-national institutional contexts, and the ways in which movement activists are constantly involved in ‘scaling-up’ their activities or ‘reaching out’ to build networks. It is in this sense that we suggest that transnational politics is fundamentally embedded in and routed through particular places (Barnett, In press). Appadurai (2001), for example, using the example of urban social movements in Mumbai, argues that the lateral reach of such movements – their efforts to build international networks or coalitions of durability with their counterparts across national boundaries – is in large part shaped by the ‘depth’ of their engagement in local contexts. Likewise, Stark et al (2006) ask whether civic organisations can be both locally rooted and globally connected. They find there is not a forced choice between foreign linkages and domestic integration. Their work moves beyond a dichotomy between footloose experts versus rooted cosmopolitans, to suggest an analysis of the ways in which different sorts of local relationships encourage or hinder spatially extensive styles of engagement (Cox, 1998).

A more complex understanding of the dependence of transnational advocacy on locally embedded relationships leads to a more sober evaluation of the potential of such activity. For example, Seckinelgin (2005) offers a cautious tale in regards to the capacity of NGOs to exercise agency within the HIV and AIDS governance system, particularly in terms of effecting long-term sustainable changes embedded in community-based approaches as opposed to short-term relief based interventions. NGOs are in a sense contracted to implement the policies proscribed by international donors and policymakers. Seckinelgin argues that within the HIV and AIDS governance system, NGOs are habitually cast as being ‘closer’ to the people on the ground, and therefore capable of identifying the needs and representing the interests of the target populations (c.f. Ferguson and Gupta, 2002). However, in a highly competitive funding market, NGOs are compelled to adhere to certain norms and adopt particular practices which are amenable to the priorities of powerful funding bodies. As NGOs navigate through these uneven power relations with donors, they may find their relationships with the communities they serve are altered and even weakened. As a result, the place-sensitive agency often attributed to NGOs is limited by the unequal power relations characterising the HIV and AIDS governance system.

Ingram’s (2010) research on the development of the US President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) resonates with these theoretical and empirical arguments concerning the opportunities and constraints that exist for activism and advocacy at different scales of governance. Ingram views the international response to HIV and AIDS
as evidence of the governmentalization of security. In his view, the pandemic was framed as an issue of international security to be managed through the application of governmental rationalities to secure the welfare of populations, as opposed to a more narrow view of security as linked to the sovereignty of states. Rather than viewing this as a break with the history of geopolitics, Ingram argues that it is best interpreted as an accommodation between geopolitics and governmentality. And in this accommodation, Ingram extends understandings of governmentality by making room for the role of social movement dynamics. This creates space to examine the role of TANs as insiders and outsiders in HIV and AIDS governance, the contested understandings of appropriate responses to the pandemic, and the opportunities and constraints presented by the complex configuration of the global governance regime.

A range of work in political sociology, human geography, urban studies and development studies therefore indicates that global politics goes on in particular places, at particular times (see Sassen, 2008). The embeddedness of transnational advocacy networks in places underscores the importance of particular locations in mediating the emergence of ‘global civil society’ and ‘transnational publics’, not least as locations for key events through which global policy making is performed in real-time and coordinated through time (Hajer, 2005). The uneven geography of place-embedded transnational civil society has implications for the strategic coordination of advocacy networks. Events such as legal cases, international conferences and policy meetings on international governance and corporate AGMs, all provide event-spaces that shape the temporal rhythms of activism and advocacy. In turn, examining the activities of TANs provides an opportunity to develop an understanding of the strategies adopted to coordinate diverse interests and varied actions over space and time. The ways in which HIV and AIDS has transformed the connections between different aspects of everyday social and political life whilst simultaneously being framed at different scales of governance and policy initiatives, has meant activists have to co-ordinate, and work within, multi-faceted and multi-sited advocacy responses (de Sousa Santos and Rodríguez-Garavito, 2005).

In principle, the network form of organisation offers extensive possibilities for activists and institutions – whether in coalitions or campaigns – to operate simultaneously at the many different sites at which opportunities to effect social change are understood to be located (Farmer, 2005; Marais, 2005). Therefore, transnational networked organisational forms provide the means of including a diverse range of interests and organisations that are focused on aspects of the HIV and AIDS pandemic (Piper and Uhlin, 2004). At the same time, these networks are embedded in particular places which serve as ‘nodes’, locations which correspond to concentrations of key governance and corporate control functions. In the case of HIV and AIDS governance, London, New York, Washington DC, and Geneva host a high proportion of international meetings addressing different aspects of global HIV and AIDS policy (UIA, 2007) (see Marx et al., 2006). Furthermore, the UK, USA and Switzerland comprise three of the top four countries hosting international organisation headquarters (UIA, 2007). Clustered around these concentrations of international organisations are similarly high concentrations of civil society actors involved in coordinating TANs. As a result, actors and activities clustered in these locations play a key role in the strategizing of advocacy networks. In the next
section, we elaborate further on the ways in which this clustering is instrumental in shaping ‘global’ responses to HIV and AIDS.

3. THE LOCAL POLITICS OF GLOBAL HIV AND AIDS GOVERNANCE

London has a long history of being a node in transnational advocacy networks, largely as a result of being at the centre of Empire and Commonwealth (Israel, 1999). From the early 20th Century, it has been at the hub of a vast network of colonial and then international development networks (Kothari, 2006). These networks themselves constitute development through transnational relations (Bebbington and Kothari, 2006) that are informed by a recognition of London’s links to places marginalised by other London-based processes such as a coordination centre for global financial flows (Massey, 2006). In relation to HIV and AIDS, the UK government was one of the first to respond more liberally to HIV and AIDS (by, for example not tying aid to conservative contraception policies), and by the early 1990s many HIV and AIDS activists from other countries had been attracted to London (pers comm. VK Nguyen 2010).

The analysis in this section focuses on the organisational landscape of London between 2003 and 2007 following the temporalities of key advocacy moments around global governance initiatives in which TANs sought to advance their agendas. It looks in particular at a process of policy consultation and formulation around the UK government’s HIV and AIDS strategy between 2003 and 2005. A key London-based organisation is the UK Consortium on AIDS and International Development (UK-CAID) which actively developed links with South Africa’s Treatment Action Campaign (TAC) in transnational advocacy campaigns. The UK-CAID is important for the analysis elaborated on in this paper because it brings together many UK organisations focused on HIV and AIDS and co-ordinates responses to the UK government in the process of formulating the UK government’s HIV and AIDS strategy (see for example, Athersuch, 2008).

In this section, we develop an understanding of the geographies of global governance of HIV and AIDS by attending to the place-specific characteristics of the HIV and AIDS TANs that are embedded and routed through London. In the first part of the section, we examine the concentration of UK-based HIV and AIDS organisations in London that are members of UK-CAID. More than half of London-based organisations which primarily focus on HIV and AIDS aim to serve local beneficiaries. We argue that activists in these locally-focused organisations participate in the ‘global’ governance of HIV and AIDS primarily through their associations with long-standing, well-known development charities. Our analysis suggests that the international or global outlook of HIV and AIDS governance from London emerges because these charities with their international geographies have incorporated HIV and AIDS into their work with marginalised populations in other countries. But these networks have a historical-geographic specificity, so that the networks that constitute London as a node enable TANs to mobilise power more effectively in relation, for example, to South Africa than neighbouring Mozambique. Part of the answer also lies in the process we examine in the
second part of this section, which explores how activists in London-based organisations participated in developing the UK government’s international strategy on HIV and AIDS. The consultation process around the formulation of the UK government’s HIV and AIDS strategy suggests that local politics in London as well as the tensions inherent in the production of such policy documents also matter to the global governance of HIV and AIDS.

3.i). Mapping local landscapes of global HIV and AIDS advocacy

Our case study is based on the analysis of the HIV and AIDS organisations that the UK-CAID claimed and identified as members in 2007. The web pages of the UK-CAID member organisations were evaluated to determine the geographic location of each organisation (by city) and to obtain each organisation’s mission statement, beneficiaries and geographic scope of activities (Hogan, 2008; Madge, 2010). In so doing, we took each organisation’s mission statement as a description of its aims and objectives. The mission statements were evaluated as summaries of the organisations’ activities and operations and as constituting their ‘virtual presence’ (Shumate and Dewitt, 2008)

The results of this analysis showed that of the 90 organisations that presented complete data\(^1\), 70% (62 organisations) were based in London. The only other city to host more than one or two percent was Oxford at 4%. Thus, London is the most important location for the largest United Kingdom-wide Consortium of organisations working on HIV and AIDS. An analysis of the mission statements of the London-based organisations was based on their primary and secondary focus. This revealed that approximately 29% of the organisations were primarily focused on HIV and AIDS. However, the largest category (71% of organisations) had incorporated HIV and AIDS concerns into their primary focus of, for example, development, health, education, faith. This suggests that the activists in TANs that constitute London as a global governance node bring the networks of their substantive interests to bear on HIV and AIDS rather than being primarily and fundamentally constituted by the various HIV and AIDS epidemics.

When viewed in terms of the second stated purpose contained in the mission statements, approximately 30% are providing services to other organisations. ‘Services’ were broadly interpreted as providing support to other organisations, whereas other organisations were more specific in identifying, for example, advocacy, research or representation as a second stated purpose. The second largest category (20%) of specified second stated purposes was those organisations involved in advocacy. Assuming affinities between activities related to ‘research’, ‘advocacy’, ‘service’ and ‘fundraising’ the data aggregating the stated secondary purposes suggests that 60% of organisations are part of professional or technical networks that support other organisations. Notably, in 2007 no organisations had a primary purpose of representing people living with HIV and AIDS in London or the UK and only 4% of organisations have a secondary purpose of representing PLWA.

\(^1\) Two organisations listed in the membership database presented incomplete data and were excluded from the analysis.
The view that emerges from this survey of the organisational landscape of HIV and AIDS organisations in the UK is that they are primarily London-based, they relate to HIV and AIDS from established sectoral perspectives, and the majority provide professional, advocacy or technical services to support other organisations around the world. When the data was then further filtered to evaluate the work of London-based HIV and AIDS organisations, 50% of the organisations are engaged in ‘research’, ‘service’ or ‘advocacy’ confirming the broader trend amongst all the organisations.

The geographic focus of operations of London-based organisations that have HIV and AIDS as their primary purpose indicates that 53% are focused on the UK and that 47% have an international focus. In terms of organisations that have HIV and AIDS as a second stated purpose, the geographic focus is exclusively international. In other words, the majority of organisations focused explicitly on HIV and AIDS in London work on local rather than global issues. The ‘international-ness’ of the London-based organisations is derived from existing organisations with existing international remits and which have incorporated HIV and AIDS into their work.

In sum, in the UK there is a marked concentration of HIV and AIDS organisations that were members of UK-CAID in London. However, London-based organisations do not necessarily have an international orientation as their primary focus; they are as likely to primarily serve local London beneficiaries. This key finding raises important empirical and conceptual questions which we aim to address further below. Most significant, we argue that it suggests that the international or global outlook of HIV and AIDS governance from London emerges because international development charities with a history and infrastructure with particular geographies have incorporated HIV and AIDS into their work with marginalised populations. This means that these TANs constitute London as a particular node of ‘development and HIV’ in the global governance of HIV and AIDS, and these place-based networks both enable and constrain activists to mobilise power to achieve their agendas. We now want to consider how local organisational HIV and AIDS politics around funding, activities, and strategising might seep into and shape ‘international’ responses. In 3.ii), we examine how the concerns of London-based organisations are raised in relation to the formulation of the UK’s HIV and AIDS Strategy.

3.ii). The local politics of global HIV and AIDS strategies

In 2003, DfID was tasked with preparing the first comprehensive UK government strategy on HIV and AIDS in the developing world. DfID distinguishes itself as the “UK government department responsible for promoting sustainable development and reducing poverty” within a framework of the Millennium Development Goals (DfID, 2004b). UK-based organisations were recognised as key stakeholders and their activities and concerns were taken into account in the consultation processes through which this strategy was developed, without necessarily influencing the final outcome of this process. Here, we want to consider the role of the UK-CAID in the preparation of the UK government’s HIV and AIDS strategy document. Documents can be considered as important artefacts
of policy making and therefore can provide rich sources of data for researchers (Freeman and Maybin, 2011). The sequential analysis begins with DfID’s initial Consultation document on the ‘UK government’s strategy on HIV and AIDS in the developing world’ (DfID, 2004a) before considering the UK-CAID’s response and the final policy document ‘Taking Action’. All three documents were analysed from an ‘organisational field’ perspective (Davis and Zald, 2005). This involves identifying explicit reference to the existence of networks, relationships and activities that suggest the implicit need or existence of a network, as well as silences in the text about organisational relationships and networks.

The first stage of DfID’s consultation involved the circulation of a consultation document to “civil society [organizations], NGOs, international, multilateral and donor bodies, the private sector and developing country Governments” (DfID, 2004a). Here, a key questions is identified: ‘what role should the UK government play in the global response to HIV and AIDS?’ (DfID, 2004a). The document is structured around five key areas that have been identified by DfID as “essential to a global response” (DfID, 2004a). These five areas are “Focusing on the poor”, “Scaling up evidence-based interventions”, “Building effective national responses”, “Improving efficiency and effectiveness of the international response”, and “Investing in long-term solutions”. The consultation document invokes a sense of a relatively inclusive network approach spanning many different parts of the world, working across different scales of government and being quite detailed and explicit about interventions at a very local level. DfID is presented as able and willing to (continue) playing a global, co-ordinating role in responses to the epidemic. The consultation document presents a view in which ‘global’ co-ordination involves ‘vertical’ state-constructed hierarchical styles of targeted intervention rather than simply ‘horizontal’ networked co-ordination of global responses. This spatial imaginary of global co-ordination is premised on the existence of an extensive ‘network’ of organisations, agreements, governments and other agents. Nevertheless, people living with HIV and AIDS are not directly present in this stage of the consultation process, reflecting in part the relative weakness of London based activists in directly advancing the interests of PLWA and/or the relative absence of such organisations in London.

The UK-CAID’s (2004) concerted response to DfID’s consultation paper was presented as the contribution of a network of NGOs working on international development, even though its members include companies and member-based representative organisations. The UK-CAID members and drafters of the DfID document evidently shared the assumption of the existence of a broad range of organisations that needed to be networked more effectively. There is a high degree of consensus between the DfID document and UK-CAID response. However, while the UK-CAID response seeks to refine the initial DfID consultation, this serves only to underscore the degree to which the finally published strategy departs significantly from the direction that the consultation process itself followed.

The main emphasis of the UK-CAID response was upon issues of accountability and legitimacy. In short, it was not the role of networks per se in generating effective strategy, but rather the precise function of these networks that is problematised by activist and
advocacy organisations. Questions from UK-CAID members focus on who should call whom to account in these networks? And who should be recognised as a legitimate actor within the network? For example, UK-CAID members point out that although the strategy is aligned with a pro-poor agenda, poor people have not been part of the consultation process. People living with HIV and AIDS are left out, again reflecting the limited power and presence of such activists in London.

Context-specific issues permeate the consultation debate. For example, UK-CAID members question whether the UK’s domestic ambiguity about breastfeeding undermines their potential to play a global leadership role. One of the ways that it appears that organisations will be recognised and allocated a role in the ‘global’ network is on the basis of whether they ‘add value’ – the definition of which itself was part of new public management reforms within the UK (Berg, 2001). UK-CAID members contrast DFID’s view of themselves as a ‘global’ co-ordinators with the local politics of the UK still not contributing the promised 0.7 per cent of GDP to development aid. UK-CAID members also draw attention to migrants and migration – two issues that are critical to the spread of HIV and AIDS and important for a cosmopolitan London and yet are not mentioned at all in the DFID document. Finally, UK-CAID members question DFID’s sole gaze outwards to the ‘developing world’ without clarifying how HIV and AIDS issues will be integrated into UK domestic government practices. Despite the recognised global outlook, there are numerous comments about the partiality of DFID’s support for existing international agreements (for example, the omitting references to the internationally agreed principle of Greater Involvement of People living with AIDS (GIPA)). UK-CAID members’ queries thus highlight a number of existing international agreements that DFID does not mention but should, given the ‘global co-ordination’ role it has adopted.

The final strategy document (DFID, 2004b) which emerged from this consultation process indicates both the potential and limits of advocacy organisations in shaping global governance regimes. The DFID consultation document and the final strategy are very different, and in significant respects the politics of departmental positioning and budgeting appears to have trumped the activities of the TANs and activists within DFID (DFID, 2004b). The final strategy did include various substantive emphases that reflected expressed concerns of UK-CAID members. These included the recognition of the value of a human rights approach to HIV and AIDS (page 13) and a very strong emphasis on women, girls and vulnerable groups such as children (page 1). The existence of other co-ordinating organisations (such as the African Union) is also far more prominent than before (page 3 and 28). There is also far more attention paid to the existing international agreements and how DFID will support these (page 2). However, the final strategy puts primary emphasis on the role of nation-state institutions (pages 64-66), so that the development TANs that help constitute London as a node are relatively marginal to the final strategy. The original emphasis on the need to adopt a flexible approach to intervening at different scales is replaced by a clear preference for working through the sovereignty of individual states (page 64). The ‘global co-ordination’ originally envisaged by DFID is replaced by an international diplomacy perspective (page 28) (DFID, 2004b). There is much more emphasis on ‘supporting’ existing agreements than ‘leading’ global co-ordination (page 4). The final strategy neither picks up on issues of
migration to London nor makes any reference to UK domestic HIV policies. In short, then, while some of the content of the final strategy reflects the input of advocacy networks, the procedural dimensions of this example of global strategy towards HIV and AIDS give a more diminished role to transnational networks than was envisaged during the dialogic consultation process.

4. CONCLUSION

While transnational networks are acknowledged as an important feature of contemporary HIV and AIDS politics, our case study of TANs that work through London draws attention to the significance of place and location in shaping the role of transnational advocacy. We have focussed on the distinctive geographies of HIV and AIDS TANs, in which particular places come to play pivotal roles in articulating spatially extensive networks (Lindquist, 2004; Miller, 2000). The embeddedness of networks in particular places provides the potential for access to national and international policy forums. Yet the potential influence thereby revealed is limited by the extent to which transnational advocacy remains dependent on the opportunities provided by the geopolitics of such fields of governance.

We have argued that the operations of HIV and AIDS TANs cannot be understood through a simple conceptual binary of the local and the global. We have proposed instead an analytical approach that explores how global relationships are built-up and routed through particular places. The example of policy-making centred around policy and organisational networks located in London suggests the need to think through the complex articulations of place-based mobilisations, embedded opportunity structures, and variable capacities for projecting influence over spaces. The specificity of London as a nexus of international flows and circulations as well as a scene of national and international governance means that TANs embedded there are able to exert some influence in shaping global governance regimes, but this influence is inflected by the organisational specificities of networks in this place. What we have suggested through this example is that the global governance of HIV and AIDS is not simply a response to a generically ‘global’ problem, but emerges from locally embedded articulations of HIV and AIDS as an issue with spatially extensive consequences.
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