



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/241701/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

Rokem, Jonathan Rock, YARDIMCI, OZNUR, Weinstein, Liza et al. (2026) Bringing Nationalism into Global Urban Studies. Urban Studies. ISSN: 0042-0980

<https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980261456008>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) licence. This licence allows you to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, and any new works must also acknowledge the authors and be non-commercial. You don't have to license any derivative works on the same terms. More information and the full terms of the licence here:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Bringing nationalism into global urban studies

Jonathan Rokem¹ , Öznur Yardımcı² ,
Michael Gentile³  and Liza Weinstein⁴ 

Urban Studies

1–14

© Urban Studies Journal Limited 2026



Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/00420980261456008

journals.sagepub.com/home/usj

Abstract

This critical commentary investigates the resurgence of nationalist politics through a global urban studies lens, arguing that cities are critical arenas in which contemporary nationalist projects are enacted, negotiated and contested. While scholarship on nationalism, geopolitics and international relations remains largely state-centric, global urban studies has tended to treat cities as denationalised nodes embedded in transnational networks of global capital. Our intervention is situated within a broader global context of democratic backsliding and autocratisation that have accelerated over the past two decades and are increasingly visible across both authoritarian regimes and constitutional democracies. These developments are closely tied to the rise of populism and ethno-religious nationalism, which have mobilised anxieties surrounding inequality, migration and ethnic and racial identity to advance exclusionary political agendas. We argue that cities function simultaneously as infrastructures of nationalist governance and as spaces of political resistance. Urban actors from municipal authorities to grassroots movements reproduce, adapt and contest nationalist projects through everyday political practices. Attending to the situated and uneven ways that these dynamics unfold reveals cities not merely as passive sites of national politics but as key arenas where the boundaries of citizenship, migration, belonging and state power are actively reconfigured.

Keywords

cities, geopolitics, global urban studies, international relations, nationalism

¹Northeastern University London, UK

²University of York, UK

³University of Oslo, Norway

⁴Northeastern University Boston, USA

Corresponding author:

Jonathan Rokem, Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Politics, International Relations, Sociology, and Anthropology, Northeastern University London, Devon House, 58 Saint Katharine's Way, London E1W 1LP, UK.

Email: jonathan.rokem@nulondon.ac.uk

摘要

本篇批判性评述以全球城市研究为视角,探讨了民族主义政治再度兴起的态势,并提出核心观点:城市是当代各类民族主义议程实施、协商与抗争的关键场域。尽管有关民族主义、地缘政治与国际关系的研究仍主要以国家为中心,但全球城市研究却往往将城市视为嵌入全球资本跨国网络中的去民族化节点。本文的研究切入点立足于宏观全球大背景,即近二十年来,民主倒退与威权化两大趋势持续加剧,在威权政体与宪政民主国家中都表现得愈发明显。上述发展态势与民粹主义和族裔宗教民族主义的兴起密切相关,二者利用民众对不平等、移民问题以及族群、种族身份的普遍焦虑,推行排外性政治议程。我们认为,城市既是民族主义开展治理的载体,也是政治抵抗发生的场域。市政当局与基层草根运动等各类城市行动主体,通过日常政治实践再生产、调适并挑战各类民族主义议程。本文考察这些动态因地而异、发展失衡的现实表现,揭示了城市不仅仅是国家政治的被动载体,更是各方力量主动重塑公民身份、移民、身份归属与国家权力边界的关键场域。

关键词

城市、地缘政治、全球城市研究、国际关系、民族主义

Received: 2 December 2025; accepted: 8 May 2026

Introduction

This critical commentary interrogates the surge of nationalist political contestations worldwide through the lens of the urban. The urbanisation of nationalist conflict is not a new development and stretches back to ancient Rome, as both a city and an empire, and Venice, as a 14th-century city-state. Yet in this brief intervention we emphasise that the last few decades have intensified the speed, scale and visibility of these trends alongside a broader global rise in authoritarian politics. We reflect on the emergence, enactment and endorsement of nationalist ideologies and their multiple interactions with the city scale, and consider how nationalist politics are being reshaped, adopted, negotiated and challenged by a diverse set of local actors and institutions.

Drawing together insights from studies of nationalism, international relations, geopolitics and global urban studies, we reflect on these contestations and the broader entanglements between urban and national governing logics, situating them within the longer history of state–city relations and

their inherently ambivalent forms (Rossi, 2018). We propose that these shifting tensions constitute a productive site of inquiry for scholars in global urban studies. While state-centric approaches still dominate the scholarship on nationalism, international relations and geopolitics, global urban studies has generally continued to bypass the nation state, treating the city as a denationalised node in a global network of capital flows. It is into this persistent schism that our commentary seeks to intervene, making the case that a more deliberate integration of insights from nationalism studies will help illuminate the complex intersections of local and national political projects underpinning increasingly shifting and contentious urban politics.

Democratic backsliding and autocratisation are rising global trends, reshaping the basis and character of legitimate state authority, not only in traditionally hierarchical regimes but also in constitutional democracies (V-Dem, 2025: 12). For the past few decades, different forms of populism and ethno-religious nationalisms have reemerged in a wide range of cities worldwide, recently

captured in the term ‘urban populism’ (Cohen, 2025). However, the implications of these developments for cities and their increasing geopolitical tensions with national politics remain underexplored (Yiftachel and Rokem, 2021).

The contemporary illiberal moment is shaped by multiple interacting forces and structural shifts rather than a single defining development. These include economic polarisation, climate uncertainty, forced migration and widespread precarity, which intensify contestation between the urban and national scales. Illiberalism is further normalised through digitally mediated disinformation, resurgent gendered power relations, exclusionary and violent forms of masculinity and hybrid religious expressions beyond traditional institutions. Although these shifts are widespread, and taking place in diverse national and urban contexts, they share common features across different authoritarian geographical settings (Jones, 2026). This requires attending to the role of the situated context and the embedded flows of power attached to place, rather than approaching it as a planetary process (Luger, 2020: 1).

Cities have a long history of being sites of both contention and control. Urban political actors have exploited these tendencies in diverse ways, from reinforcing and deepening ethnic or racial exclusions (Agnew and Shin, 2020), to pursuing and promoting solidarity movements in search of a cosmopolitan urban citizenship (Brubaker, 2017; Weinstein, 2019, 2022). As cities remain sites of exclusion, where urban rights and resources are unevenly distributed by race, ethnicity, religion, gender, class, caste or political connections, they also serve as sites of alternative political projects where marginalised groups, including migrants and displaced populations, redefine civic belonging and citizenship within and beyond their localities (Blokland et al., 2015). Manifesting

through everyday urban practices and collective mobilisations, urban politics on both the right and the left are reinforcing and contesting nationalist state projects, juxtaposing national and urban power with implications that extend far beyond the scale of the city.

In this moment of global geopolitical rupture and displacements arising from climate crises, economic dislocation, political violence and multiple armed conflicts, the project of drawing together insights from the scholarship on nationalism, international relations and geopolitics with global urban studies becomes increasingly urgent. In a growing number of countries, governments are waging war against their own cities and urban populations, utilising military technologies, strategies and personnel, allegedly to help stifle crime, ‘restore civic order’ or curb gang violence. Confronting the urgency and complexity of these challenges requires a fuller set of analytical tools and a more integrated dialogue across traditionally siloed fields (Fawaz et al., 2025).

Contestations between local and national actors have spanned a continuum from powerful, autonomous metropolitan centres within democratic neoliberal states, such as London, Paris, Berlin and New York, to major cities subordinated within hierarchical and authoritarian regimes, predominantly in the Middle East and parts of Asia and Africa (Koch, 2018). Across these varied configurations, urban space is operating simultaneously as both a site of state-imposed pressures and a locus of resistance contesting aggressive identity politics and infusing urban geopolitical violence (Rokem and Boano, 2023).

We begin by introducing nationalism into the field of global urban studies, providing a brief overview of the conceptual and empirical contributions of each field and diagnosing the unproductive schism that exists between them. Next, we demonstrate why

urban studies needs to engage in more depth with processes on the national scale and reinsert understandings of national authority, institutions and democratic legitimacy into analyses of cities in a global context (Gordon and Ljungkvist, 2022). We further develop this argument through a brief review of various urban mobilisations that have opposed or responded to nationalist movements. Brief examples of city–state tensions from India, Turkey and Ukraine serve as illustrative cases and possible launching pads for further inquiries. While the disciplinary and scalar schisms discussed in this brief commentary undermine productive inquiries in a range of fields, our focus in this commentary is on the global urban studies readership of this journal, proposing a deeper integration of analyses of nationalism, international relations and geopolitics into our study of cities.

Nationalism, international relations, geopolitics and global urban studies

Both global urban studies and the scholarship on nationalism, international relations and geopolitics have tended to overlook how national and urban dynamics are co-constitutive. Nationalism can be understood as a political project aimed at exercising sovereign control over a defined territory and its population (Hobsbawm, 1992), which has taken several forms, including liberal, (multi)cultural, ethnic and civic. Foundational scholarship that predominantly emerged from political, historical, sociological and cultural perspectives conceptualises the nation as a historically imagined, territorially bounded and culturally uniform entity (Anderson, 1983). Treating the nation state as its primary unit of analysis (Hobsbawm, 1992; Ó Tuathail, 1996; Waltz, 1979) has meant that this extensive body of work has paid limited attention to the urban scale,

often neglecting the ways in which cities mediate, reinforce or challenge nationalist ideologies (Koch and Paasi, 2016).

Conversely, in pushing back against a longstanding methodological nationalism, global urban studies, since the 1990s, has focussed attention on the deterritorialisation of national power and its reterritorialisation on both supranational and subnational scales, including cities and regions (Brenner, 2004; Castells, 2002; Friedmann, 1986; Sassen, 1991). Since the early 2000s, it has systematically disengaged from nation-state analysis, relegating international relations scholarship to sparse theoretical interventions offering limited accounts of the existence of cities in a national, as well as global, political system (Acuto, 2013: 6).

This gap is striking, as state nationalism, which emerged in 18th- and 19th-century Europe, was itself a political strategy to strengthen territorial control, cultivate loyal citizenries, stimulate economic development, enhance military capacity and, more recently, promote political stability through the global diffusion of the nation-state model (Taylor, 1994). Since the rise of modern nationalism, cities have played a central role in nation-building projects, particularly through urban design, planning and architectural practices (Therborn, 2015). Such interventions were integral to modern nationalism's key objective of producing cultural homogeneity through the alignment of state and society (Gellner, 1983).

Cities have historically been central in shaping national and global politics and sites where national power and nationalist ideologies are negotiated, contested, transformed and adopted. Particularly in its ethnic, racial and religious/sectarian variants, they are similarly marked by authoritarian identity politics, populist economic discourses and a pronounced antagonism towards pluralism, diversity and supranational cooperation. Simultaneously, cities can act as key arenas

within which inhabitants nurture a particular collective character that is simultaneously cosmopolitan and place based (Shaham-Maymon et al., 2025) and that diverges from national identities (Brenner and Miodownik, 2025). Global cities in particular offer key sites for meaningful climate action (Castán Broto et al., 2025), immigration governance (Thouez, 2020) and peacebuilding (Elfversson et al., 2023).

One prominent example is Brexit and mobilisation of a wider anti-EU sentiment as a hallmark of European nationalist extreme-right movements, drawing on nostalgic imaginaries of a culturally homogenous past and opposition to immigration and diversity. These reemergent forms of nationalism project right-wing populist, racialised and often religiously inflected visions of both the city and the nation (Agnew and Shin, 2020). Such dynamics produce mounting tensions with major urban centres that embody multiculturalism and liberalism (Avni, 2025).

Recent scholarship has identified these mutual blind spots between nationalism and urban studies, highlighting how cities both shape and are shaped by nationalist ideologies (Antonsich, 2018; Brenner and Miodownik, 2025). These contributions map the shifting linkages and entanglements between nationalism, international relations and geopolitics with the shifting political geographies of cities. Others have underscored the role of cities as counter-narrative spaces and sites of resistance that challenge the state's monopoly over identity and belonging (Nyers, 2011).

An important illustration of these dynamics emerged in the early 2010s during the so-called 'Arab Spring'. Igniting in Tunisia, it rapidly evolved into a wave of anti-government, pro-democracy uprisings and armed rebellions that spread across major Middle Eastern and North African cities, including Tripoli, Cairo, Damascus, Manama and Baghdad. Mobilisations, led

primarily by disenfranchised urban youth, redefined the political potential of social media as a tool for contesting entrenched authoritarian regimes (Allegra et al., 2013). In Tunisia and Egypt, and later Syria, mass mobilisation toppled governments and prompted regime change. The Arab Spring demonstrates how urban arenas can become focal points for contesting the nationalist project, transforming cities from instruments subjected to state power into crucibles of resistance and democratic ambition (Ross and Koch, 2022). While cities are often understood as sites of individual freedom, citizenship and diversity, recent scholarship highlights how the contemporary nationalist turn has intensified ethno-religious and racial divisions and violence across different geopolitical scales (Rokem and Boano, 2023). This dynamic is evident in the escalation of violence against immigrants and racially minoritised groups in major U.S. cities and the Trump administration's deployment of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) agents to detain and deport migrants in urban areas, provoking clashes over legitimate authority. Such interventions produced deadly confrontations and mass protests in cities such as Los Angeles and Minneapolis, turning immigration enforcement into a testing ground for competing claims to political authority (Nicholls, 2026).

Across different political regimes, urban space has likewise re-emerged as a central terrain of struggle, as seen in Iran, where mass protests in Tehran and other major cities mobilised younger, more secular and urban residents to challenge the Islamic Republic's social and political order. The regime's violent repression of these mobilisations illustrates how urban political contexts can rapidly shift and simultaneously incubate dissent while serving as key sites in which states deploy coercive power to reassert control (Bayat, 2013), often with wider

geopolitical consequences extending far beyond the local and national context.

These insights underscore the need for scholarship on cities at a global scale to engage with questions of national authority, institutions, democratic legitimacy, citizenship and nationalist ideologies. Bridging the divide between nationalism and urban studies has never been more urgent in a rapidly changing global urban present, as it promises richer analyses of political power and contestations over state authority. More interdisciplinary, decolonial and inter-scalar analyses in global urban studies can help deepen understandings of ascendant forms of nationalist authoritarianism and incursions of national-level power into cities and against minoritised urban populations.

Global networks of nationalism and urbanism

Seminal North-Western scholarship on global cities (Friedmann, 1986; Sassen, 1991) conceptualised urban centres as partially deterritorialised nodes of capital accumulation, migration flows and cultural exchange operating within global capitalist networks (Castells, 2002), with minimal attention devoted to the national scale. It rejected the methodological nationalism that had long dominated understandings of state power, international migration and industrial regulation. In the early 1990s, critical geographers and urban sociologists began to reconceptualise the spatial organisation of political and economic authority. They emphasised the growing economic influence of major metropolitan regions and the ways in which these regions were becoming politically 'disembedded' from their national contexts and the exclusive authority of the state (Agnew, 2017). Sassen's conceptualisation of the global city centred its 'de-territorialisation' from traditional state and regional hierarchies (Sassen, 1991). These developments have

generated productive analyses of complex configurations between city and state, contributing to what Brenner and Schmid (2014), drawing from Lefebvre (1991), describe as processes of 'planetary urbanisation'. Yet such planetary perspectives can overlook the relevance of national and regional sites of power, and the political influence of deindustrialised or rural places increasingly destabilised by resurgent geopolitical competition and populist nationalism.

Meanwhile, reactionary or authoritarian politics, increasingly characterised as illiberal, are infiltrating municipal governance (Laruelle, 2022). Yet the analysis of nationalism still focuses excessively on national manifestations, such as the rise of right-wing populism and the rejection of liberal norms such as diversity and inclusion. Predominantly neglecting the urban scale, this misses the structural and often local mechanisms through which authoritarianism is operationalised and enacted, including global real estate markets and seemingly inclusive urban policies entangled in shifting illiberal and populist urban agendas (Cohen, 2025).

Luger and Dürr (2025: 3–4) see illiberalism as constituting a planetary urban condition, restructuring urban life across diverse regional and national contexts. Yet they warn that these framings risk reproducing analytical blind spots if they fail to engage with nationalism and the nation-state as enduring political forces shaping illiberal geopolitics across global, national and urban scales. This is manifested, on the one hand, in resurgent nationalism that advances the supremacy of particular racial, religious and territorial identities, and, on the other, in a vigorous countermovement from working-class, migrant and ethnic, religious, racially or politically minoritised groups living in cities, challenging the exclusive sovereignty of the nation state (Davis and De Duren, 2011).

Despite this analytical distance, studies organised around a few key themes have helped to transcend this unproductive schism and disciplinary siloing. First, the divided/contested cities literature has centred nationalist, ethnic, religious and regional conflicts at the urban scale (Anderson, 2019). Second, more recent urban geopolitics literature has integrated understandings of nationalism in a range of urban conflicts, from 'ordinary urban geopolitics' (Rokem et al., 2017) to extreme manifestations of urbicide (Mezentsev and Mezentsev, 2022). Yet both approaches have tended to position cities either as geopolitical victims of broader regional and national conflicts or as instruments through which nationalist agendas are implemented (e.g. Yardımcı, 2020, 2022).

Some cities are adopting more pluralistic approaches that directly challenge nationalist homogeneity (Magnusson, 2011). Such cities are analysed as sites of resistance, where marginalised communities access relative sanctuary through more inclusive urban governance structures (Uitermark et al., 2012). Significantly, sanctuary cities, where officials engage in service delivery and enact protective policies without regard to residents' immigration status, have transitioned from exceptional cases to normative practice (Nicholls and de Wilde, 2023). In polarised contexts where the interests of national or regional governments oppose these policies, conflicting legal and policy trajectories have arisen, constituting fledgeling or contested urban sovereignty (Barber, 2017; Davis and De Duren, 2011) or the enactment of urban foreign policy (Hobbs, 1994: 18; see also Curtis and Acuto, 2018).

At the same time, increasing challenges to the monopoly of nation states over foreign affairs and international relations have come from the rise of global city networks as emergent infrastructures of global governance (Acuto and Leffel, 2021). These

networks embody forms of urban diplomacy that operate across borders and institutional hierarchies (Curtis and Acuto, 2018). Yet, when situated within contemporary debates on populism and nationalism, they also reveal deeper political tensions. As nationalist movements seek to reassert the primacy of the nation state in defining sovereignty and belonging (Agnew, 2017; Yuval-Davis et al., 2019), city networks represent post-national collaborations that challenge these bounded territorial imaginaries.

Additionally, cross-city networks of civil society organisations are fostering cooperation and policy exchange and are increasingly clashing with national agendas rooted in ethno-racial exclusion and anti-globalism. While these movements are facilitating pragmatic governance and may fail in establishing actionable inclusivity (Kuge, 2020), they nonetheless show that cities provide potential counterforce with competing and contrasting visions to nationalist retrenchment. In this sense, urban internationalism positions cities as active agents in the reconfiguration of global politics. However, as Brenner (2004) and Jessop (2016) have argued, these processes also risk exposing and exacerbating tensions between urban autonomy and centralised state authority. These frictions have become increasingly pronounced amid the tightening of border controls and the proliferation of advanced surveillance technologies that are intensifying the competing logics underlying local and national power and democracy.

Cities and multiple nationalisms

Next, we elaborate how these processes manifest in three selected cases that reflect some of the authors' own research expertise. They are not used because they are the only suitable examples, but for being part of a larger global nationalist turn and its relationship with the urban. In selecting the cases, we

follow Robinson's (2016: 643) assertion that 'we can theorize from anywhere'. We discuss how localised mobilisations, spanning diverse regional contexts from Turkey, where there is an intensifying sense of urban rage (Dikeç, 2018), to India, where devolved governance structures and new political movements are grounded in urban protest, are posing a direct challenge to oppressive national governments, deepening economic inequalities and anti-democratic agendas. We also focus on the case of Ukraine, where municipal governments act as mediators between nationwide nationalist discourses and local anti-nationalisms (often expressed as stark regionalisms), channelling the energy of local pride into the 'good' nationalism needed to fight an external aggressor. Either way, the intervention of cities moderates the adverse impacts of nationalist policies stemming from central governments.

Mobilised groups, often backed by informal governing regimes, are providing a powerful counterforce to repressive nationalist movements, with implications for power on the national scale. As they challenge the exclusive authority of nationalist governments and extreme-right- and left-wing political parties, the responses they are eliciting increasingly entail spectacles of military force and technologies and weaponry designed for use against external enemies.

Turkey provides a stark example of deepening tensions between urban and national visions of the political community. Since the mid-2000s, the AKP's governance has become increasingly authoritarian, marked by right-wing populism (Yenigun and Eraydin, 2019: 273) that polarises society along moral, cultural, and political lines. These dynamics peaked in 2019, when the opposition captured key metropolitan municipalities, most notably Istanbul. The victory was framed as a democratic rupture: the newly elected mayor, Ekrem İmamoğlu, declared that 'the decline of democracy ends

now', presenting Istanbul as a beacon of hope and a testament to democratic resilience in the face of rising authoritarianism (McLean et al., 2024).

Claiming to serve as 'Mayor for everyone', İmamoğlu adopted an inclusive discourse grounded in 'radical love' (Wuthrich and Ingleby, 2020). To counter centralised control and funding blockages, he expanded locally financed social assistance programmes and prioritised public support by using digital platforms, for example for livestreamed council meetings. While doing so, he promoted a broad conception of 'the people' that embraces Istanbul's ethno-sectarian diversity without explicitly foregrounding difference (Deets, 2024: 897–898). This stood in contrast to the national government's neo-Ottomanist vision of the 'nation' that privileges Sunni Muslim groups (Serdar, 2023). He constructed an alternative 'community of value' (Anderson, 2012), through diverting the nationalist sentiments towards the 'non-citizens' and claiming a metropolitan unity grounded in transparency.

His cosmopolitan counter-imaginary of the political community gained national traction, as evident in protests across 55 of Turkey's 81 provinces after İmamoğlu's arrest on alleged corruption charges. The scale of public response underscores not only the widespread discontent with autocratization but also the capacity of urban governments to articulate alternative 'imagined communities' grounded in metropolitan unity, enacted through attempts to enhance urban citizenship.

More recently, the politics of so-called bulldozer justice, underway in Delhi and other parts of North India since 2020, have laid bare the intersection of urban governance and exclusionary nationalism. State governments, particularly those led by the Hindu Nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), have employed extrajudicial demolitions to target informal settlements,

disproportionately impacting Muslim residents accused of criminal activity or political dissent. These demolitions, framed as efforts to remove ‘illegal encroachments’, have functioned as collective punishment and public displays of state power, accelerating the marginalisation of minoritised groups. In response, activists have challenged these actions in the courts, with the Indian Supreme Court issuing a judgment in November 2024 condemning bulldozer justice as unconstitutional, rebuking state authorities for bypassing judicial process and establishing guidelines designed to halt arbitrary state-led evictions. This ongoing contestation demonstrates the potency of cities as arenas of both state coercion and legal resistance, foregrounding the critical role of urban space in contemporary nationalist politics.

Against this backdrop, Delhi’s political landscape has been transformed by the rise of the Aam Aadmi Party (AAP), emerging from street-level activism and mobilised by widespread frustration with government corruption. The creation of Delhi’s Legislative Assembly in 1991 opened new arenas for urban contestation for national projects, as residents rallied around demands for cleaner and more accountable governance. While AAP’s service- and welfare-orientated agenda has avoided confronting Hindu nationalism head-on, its experiments with service delivery, education and neighbourhood-based public health initiatives nonetheless demonstrate how urban struggles over everyday state provision can recalibrate expectations of what the state owes its citizens, even within a national landscape dominated by the BJP’s exclusionary nationalism (Hall, 2021).

Ukraine is a unique example, fighting for its future national survival against the Russian full-scale invasion since 2022. Both nationalisms and anti-nationalism have an urban base, but their relative presence and importance vary across the country, going

against some of the urban geopolitical trends depicted in other cities, such as Istanbul and Mumbai, embedded in national contexts not marked by armed conflict. In Ukraine, as one moves from west to east, ethnic nationalism gradually gives way to civic nationalism, but also to weaker identification with the nation state, and even to anti-nationalism. Eastern Ukrainian cities, such as Mariupol and Donetsk, for their part, have a long history of acting as bastions of anti-nationalist (and, to a lesser extent, anti-nation-state) politics – mostly when the nationalism is specifically Ukrainian (Gentile, 2020). Thus, unlike elsewhere in Western, Central and Eastern Europe, where liberal-minded large cities challenge nationwide politics driven by the non-metropolitan electorate, the political fault lines in Ukraine run between the elites of major cities, epitomised by the Lviv–Donetsk dichotomy, an artificially constructed mutual demonisation fanned by political technologists and Russian propaganda (Homanyuk and Ashutosh, 2024).

Cities are where most Ukrainians encounter the language of wartime nation building, albeit spoken in different dialects. The municipal authorities across the country have mobilised local and regional symbolic resources towards the shared goal of victory, producing ubiquitous patriotic posters with messages tailored according to the socio-political traits of local communities and to the way the city has suffered during the war.

In Kyiv, the nation’s capital, as well as in Lviv and Dnipro, the scale of the messages is undoubtedly national: ‘Glory to Ukraine’, ‘We will be victorious’ and so on. In Kharkiv, on the other hand, the emphasis is local: ‘We are united – we are Kharkivites’, ‘I am proud to be a Kharkivite’, ‘Kharkiv lives and works’, ‘Kharkiv is a hero city’. Zaporizhzhia, while sharing many cultural similarities with Kharkiv, emphasises its unique position as an important historical

Cossack capital: on the city's main square, the public is reminded that Zaporizhzhia is the cradle of Ukrainian statehood. In the eastern regions of the country, it would seem, the city has become an important mediator and mitigator, rather than critic, of nationalist discourses originating further west. In this role, it uses local ideological ammunition to help reorientate the hearts and minds of citizens towards a future with, rather than in opposition to, Kyiv, and against Russia, an enemy belatedly discovered.

To fully comprehend these diverse manifestations of 'ordinary urban geopolitics' (Rokem, 2018), it is essential to understand how cities are being reshaped by, and are subsequently transforming, the trajectories of broader nationalist projects. As examples from Turkey, India and Ukraine demonstrate, both contestation and collaboration between national and local sites of power are altering the character of local and national citizenship and belonging, while also showcasing the role that cities play in resisting, negotiating and sometimes supporting projects of exclusionary nationalism.

Final word: the nation in the city and the city in the nation

Increasingly fierce contestations between national authorities and local actors, exacerbated by economic polarisation, climate uncertainties, widespread precarity, digital mediation of far-right ideas, media disinformation and armed conflict, require that we as urban scholars sharpen our analytical lenses and draw upon a wider set of theoretical and conceptual tools, including those associated with international relations, geopolitics and nationalism studies. Enhanced analyses of these shifting phenomena require drawing on insights that have so far remained tangential to global urban studies,

including those associated with ethnic and civic nationalisms, state sovereignty and illiberalism.

Further empirical research conducted in contested urban spaces and drawn from unlikely comparative cases will deepen understandings of these politics, provided that it is underpinned by a mobilisation of cities against the nationalist drift. This means more than organising workshops and conferences devoted to the theme. Instead, it is essential that we (urban scholars) enter the public debate to a far greater extent and place more emphasis on establishing a global network of academics facilitating urban peacebuilding in times of divisive national politics. This is a call to establish collaborative networks across sectors to generate political change beyond academia.

Bridging this divide will require that we move beyond typically siloed frameworks to develop interdisciplinary and inter-scalar approaches to examine how struggles over identity, authority and belonging are unfolding within and between cities and nation states. By incorporating insights developed by scholars concerned more with national-level dynamics and international relations, global urban studies can help illuminate how cities, as sites of political change, moving between illiberal trends and democratic possibility, are operating as arenas for negotiating non-local or not-only-local nationalist political projects. These perspectives invite us to revisit the categorisations with which we decipher cities and nationalism and to examine how they relate to the challenges of the global present. Hence, scholars and students of the reemerging geographies of nationalism and urbanism may be wise to ask not only 'what is a nation?' (Renan, 1996 [1882]) or 'what is a city?' (Simmel, 1950 [1903]) but also 'what is the nation in the city?' and 'what is the city in the nation?'.

Acknowledgements

The ideas underpinning this critical commentary originated in discussions held during an Urban Salon meeting at Northeastern University London in April 2025. These discussions subsequently informed a seminar proposal entitled 'Bringing Nationalism into Global Urban Studies', submitted to the 2025 Urban Studies Foundation and Urban Studies Journal Seminar Series Competition. The present critical commentary was further developed by Jonathan Rokem, Öznur Yardımcı, Michael Gentile and Liza Weinstein, who are the authors of the published text and take full responsibility for its content. We gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Mustafa Kemal Bayırbağ in the drafting of the original seminar proposal. We also recognise the valuable input of Oren Yiftachel, Nufar Avni, Mori Ram, Camillo Boano and several other colleagues who contributed to earlier conceptualisations and interventions, and who collectively continue to advance debates at the intersection of urban studies and nationalism. Finally, we would like to thank the editors of *Urban Studies* and the two anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback and support.

ORCID iDs

Jonathan Rokem  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1595-5040>

Öznur Yardımcı  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2398-9857>

Michael Gentile  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5224-788X>

Liza Weinstein  <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-8948-0712>

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

- Acuto M (2013) *Global Cities, Governance and Diplomacy: The Urban Link*. Routledge.
- Acuto M and Leffel B (2021) Understanding the global ecosystem of city networks. *Urban Studies* 58(9): 1758–1774.
- Agnew J (2017) *Globalisation and Sovereignty: Beyond the Territorial Trap*. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Agnew J and Shin M (2020) *Mapping Populism: Taking Politics to the People*. Rowman and Littlefield.
- Allegra M, Bono I, Rokem J, et al. (2013) Rethinking cities in contentious times: The mobilisation of urban dissent in the 'Arab Spring'. *Urban Studies* 50(9): 1675–1688.
- Anderson B (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, rev edn. Verso.
- Anderson B (2012) *What does 'the migrant' tell us about the (good) citizen?* COMPAS Working Paper No. 94. University of Oxford. Available at: https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/WP-2012-094-Anderson_Migrant_Good_Citizen.pdf (accessed 1 May 2026).
- Anderson J (2019) How do cities shape conflicts? In: Dumper M (ed.) *Contested Holy Cities: The Urban Dimension of Religious Conflicts*. Routledge, pp.19–35.
- Antonsich M (2018) Living in diversity: Going beyond the local/national divide. *Political Geography* 63: 1–9.
- Avni N (2025) Liberal cities in autocratizing states: Scholarly pathways and a research agenda. *Urban Studies* 63(8): 1623–1642. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00420980251385996>.
- Barber B (2017) *Cool Cities: Urban Sovereignty and the Fix for Global Warming*. Yale University Press.
- Bayat A (2013) *Life as Politics: How Ordinary People Change the Middle East*. Stanford University Press.
- Blokland T, Hentschel C, Holm A, et al. (2015) Urban citizenship and right to the city: The fragmentation of claims. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39(4): 655–665.
- Brenner N (2004) *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*. Oxford University Press.

- Brenner N and Miodownik D (2025) Identities, participation, and the immigration crisis in the city: A comparative analysis. *Cities* 166: 106269.
- Brenner N and Schmid C (eds) (2014) *Implosions/Explosions: Towards a Study of Planetary Urbanization*. Jovis.
- Brubaker R (2017) Why populism? *Theory and Society* 46(5): 357–385.
- Castán Broto V, Marvin S, Davies A, et al. (2025) When cities broke into the global stage: 20 years since the publication of ‘Cities and Climate Change’. *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space* 43(6): 1031–1052.
- Castells M (2002) Local and global: Cities in a network society. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie* 93: 548–558.
- Cohen O (2025) What is urban populism? *Contemporary Politics*. Epub ahead of print 1 September 2025. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569775.2025.2551912>.
- Curtis S and Acuto M (2018) The foreign policy of cities. *RUSI Journal* 163(6): 8–17.
- Davis D and De Duren N (2011) *Cities and Sovereignty: Identity Politics in Urban Spaces*. Indiana University Press.
- Deets S (2024) Liberal democratic mayors in illiberal populist regimes: Istanbul’s challenges. *Nationalities Papers* 52(4): 889–906.
- Dikeç M (2018) *Urban Rage: The Revolt of the Excluded*. Yale University Press.
- Elfvérsson E, Gusic I and Rokem J (2023) Peace in cities, peace through cities? Theorising and exploring geographies of peace in violently contested cities. *Peacebuilding* 11(4): 321–337.
- Fawaz M, Marques E, Theodore N, et al. (2025) Reflections on critical urban studies in perilous times. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 49(3): 473–478.
- Friedmann J (1986) The world city hypothesis. *Development and Change* 17: 69–83.
- Gellner E (1983) *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press.
- Gentile M (2020) Diabolical suggestions: Disinformation and the curious scale of nationalism in Ukrainian geopolitical fault-line cities. *Geopolitics* 28(5): 681–709.
- Gordon DJ and Ljungkvist K (2022) Theorizing the globally engaged city in world politics. *European Journal of International Relations* 28(1): 58–82.
- Hall D (2021) *Delhi, Public Services, the AAP, Social Movements and the Public [Working Paper]*. Available at: <https://gala.gre.ac.uk/id/eprint/34034/> (accessed 7 March 2026).
- Hobbs H (1994) *City Hall Goes Abroad: The Foreign Policy of Local Politics*. Sage.
- Hobsbawm EJ (ed.) (1992) *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*, 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press.
- Homanyuk M and Ashutosh I (2024) Inscribing Ukraine: The symbolic dimension of Russian reterritorialization through war. *Political Geography* 109(1): 103052.
- Jessop B (2016) *The State: Past, Present, Future*. Polity Press.
- Jones R (2026) Political geography III: Authoritarian geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*. Epub ahead of print 28 April 2026. <https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325261446609>.
- Koch M and Paasi A (2016) Banal nationalism 20 years on: Re-thinking, re-formulating and re-contextualizing the concept. *Political Geography* 54: 1–6.
- Koch N (2018) *The Geopolitics of Spectacle: The New Capital Cities of Central Asia*. Cornell University Press.
- Kuge J (2020) Countering illiberal geographies through local policy? The political effects of sanctuary cities. *Territory Politics Governance* 8(1): 43–59.
- Laruelle M (2022) Illiberalism: A conceptual introduction. *East European Politics* 38(2): 303–327.
- Lefebvre H (1991) *The Production of Space*. Translated by Nicholson-Smith D. Blackwell.
- Luger J (2020) Questioning planetary illiberal geographies: Territory, space and power. *Territory Politics Governance* 8(1): 1–6.
- Luger JD and Dürr MJ (2025) The urban question under illiberalism? Three thematic approaches. *Urban Studies* 62(15): 3031–3052.
- McLean S, Gezer Y and Ebrahim N (2024) Turkey’s Erdogan dealt major election blow as opposition party wins big cities. CNN, 1 April. Available at: <https://edition.cnn.com/2024/04/01/middleeast/turkey-local-election-blow-erdogan-opposition-mime-intl> (accessed 20 February 2026).

- Magnusson W (2011) *Politics of Urbanism: Seeing Like a City*. Routledge.
- Mezentsev K and Mezentsev O (2022) War and the city: Lessons from urbicide in Ukraine. *Czasopismo Geograficzne [Geographical Journal]* 93(3): 495–521.
- Nicholls WJ (2026) Los Angeles contre l'ICE: La bataille pour la souveraineté urbaine à Los Angeles [Los Angeles versus ICE: The battle for urban sovereignty in Los Angeles]. *La Vie des Idées [Books & Ideas]*, 27 January. Available at: <https://laviedesidees.fr/Los-Angeles-contre-l-ICE> (accessed 7 March 2026).
- Nicholls WJ and de Wilde M (2023) Contentious immigration politics in a multijurisdictional field: A case study of Orange County, California. *Political Geography* 100: 102776.
- Nyers P (2011) No one is illegal between city and nation. *Studies in Social Justice* 4(2): 127–143.
- Renan E (1996 [1882]) What is a nation? In: Eley G and Suny RG (eds) *Becoming National: A Reader*. Oxford University Press, pp.42–55.
- Robinson J (2016) Starting from anywhere, making connections: Globalizing urban theory. *Eurasian Geography and Economics* 57(4–5): 643–657.
- Rokem J (2018) Ordinary urban geopolitics: Contrasting Jerusalem and Stockholm. In: Rokem J and Boano C (eds) *Urban Geopolitics: Rethinking Planning in Contested Cities*. Routledge, pp.50–68.
- Rokem J and Boano C (2023) Towards a global urban geopolitics: Inhabiting violence. *Geopolitics* 28(5): 1667–1680.
- Rokem J, Fregonese S, Ramadan A, et al. (2017) Interventions in urban geopolitics. *Political Geography* 61: 253–262.
- Ross B and Koch P (2022) *How Cities Can Transform Democracy*. Polity Press.
- Rossi U (2018) The populist eruption and the urban question. *Urban Geography* 39(9): 1425–1430.
- Sassen S (1991) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. Princeton University Press.
- Serdar A (2023) An illiberal inclusion: Neo Ottomanism, Sunni privilege and the reconfiguration of national belonging in Turkey. *Nations and Nationalism* 29(4): 1043–1061.
- Shaham-Maymon G, Brenner N, Yaacov P, et al. (2025) Urban identity versus national identity in the global city: Evidence from six European cities. *European Journal of Political Research* 64: 580–598.
- Simmel G (1950 [1903]) The metropolis and mental life. In: Wolff K (ed.) *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*. Free Press, pp.409–424.
- Taylor PJ (1994) The state as container: Territoriality in the modern world-system. *Progress in Human Geography* 18(2): 151–162.
- Therborn G (2015) Cities and power. *International Journal of Urban Sciences* 19(1): 1–6.
- Thouez C (2020) Cities as emergent international actors in the field of migration: Evidence from the lead-up and adoption of the UN global compacts on migration and refugees. *Global Governance* 26(4): 650–672.
- Ó Thathail G (1996) *Critical Geopolitics*. Routledge.
- Uitermark J, Nicholls W and Loopmans M (2012) Cities and social movements: Theorizing beyond the right to the city. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* 44(11): 2546–2554.
- V-Dem (2025) *Democracy report 2025: 25 years of autocratization – Democracy trumped?* Available at: https://www.v-dem.net/documents/54/v-dem_dr_2025_lowres_v1.pdf (accessed 20 October 2025).
- Waltz K (1979) *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley.
- Weinstein L (2019) Spotlight on political geographies of right-wing populism: Introduction. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*. Available at: <https://www.ijurr.org/spotlighton/> (accessed 14 February 2025).
- Weinstein L (2022) Editorial introduction: Populism and right-wing imaginaries special issue. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 46(1). Available at: <https://www.ijurr.org/issue/vol-46-number-1-january-2022/> (accessed 14 February 2025).
- Wuthrich FM and Ingleby M (2020) The push-back against populism: Running on ‘radical love’ in Turkey. *Journal of Democracy* 31(2): 24–40.
- Yardımcı Ö (2020) State stigmatisation in urban Turkey: Managing the ‘insurgent’ squatter dwellers in Dikmen valley. *Antipode* 52: 1519–1538.

- Yardımcı Ö (2022) Drawing the boundaries of 'good citizenship' through state-led urban redevelopment in Dikmen valley. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 30(3): 235–247.
- Yenigun O and Eraydin A (2019) Governing urban diversity in Istanbul: Pragmatic and non-discriminatory solutions of governance initiatives in response to politicisation of diversity. *European Urban and Regional Studies* 26(3): 268–282.
- Yiftachel O and Rokem J (2021) Polarizations, exclusionary neonationalisms and the city. *Political Geography* 86: 102329.
- Yuval-Davis N, Wemyss G and Cassidy K (2019) *Bordering*. Polity Press.