

# Global Citizenship in Theory and Practice

Hans Schattle

Yonsei University

Perhaps more than any other concept, the idea of global citizenship has emerged since the late 1990s as a key strategic principle in higher education. At scores of colleges and universities in the United States and abroad, the current era of globalization has been accompanied by renewed scholarly interest in an international dimension of citizenship as well as numerous initiatives with the specific aim of inspiring young people to think and live as global citizens. What insights do the historical evolution of cosmopolitan ideals and the recent expansion of the term *global citizenship* in public discourse offer to scholars, teachers, and administrators?

This chapter begins by tracing the origins and development of the cosmopolitan tradition, illustrating how today's multifaceted idea of global citizenship echoes numerous strains within cosmopolitan political thinking that have endured through the ages. Then, the chapter chronicles the recent ascendance of the term *global citizenship*, reviews some of the ongoing scholarly debates surrounding this idea, and explores how contemporary understandings of global citizenship encompass multiple concepts, such as awareness, responsibility, participation, cross-cultural empathy, international mobility, and personal achievement.

## THE COSMOPOLITAN TRADITION THROUGHOUT HISTORY

The term *cosmopolitan* is a composite of the Greek words for *order*, *universe*, and *citizen*. At its heart, the cosmopolitan ideal holds that the inherent dignity and well-being of each human person warrants equal respect and concern,<sup>1</sup> and advocates of the cosmopolitan ideal tend to emphasize universal standards of responsibility that require citizens to “transcend the morally parochial world of the sovereign state” (Linklater, 1999, p. 39). Joshua Cohen (1996) has summarized the essence of cosmopolitanism: “Our highest allegiance must be to the community of humankind, and the first principles of our practical thought must respect the equal worth of all members of that community” (p. vii.).

The earliest political strains of cosmopolitan thinking date back to ancient Greece, where Socrates and Diogenes both identified themselves as citizens of the world.<sup>2</sup> They did so to challenge the bounded civic ideal of the *polis*, which championed locally exclusive ties to one's immediate political community. As Michel de Montaigne wrote of Socrates:

When someone asked of Socrates of what country he was, he did not reply, "Of Athens," but "of the world." His was a fuller and wider imagination; he embraced the whole world as his city, and extended his acquaintance, his society, and his affections to all mankind. (Montaigne, 1575/1958, p. 63)

As noted by Derek Heater (1996), who has led the way in contemporary historical scholarship of world citizenship, Socrates held a nonpolitical view of world citizenship that envisioned a sense of affinity with all humanity and the universe, as well. Socrates did not renounce his citizenship of Athens; on the contrary, he willingly submitted to a dubious death sentence. In contrast, the Cynics conceived of world citizenship as a direct rebellion against citizenship of the *polis*. Diogenes of Sinope famously made clear his disdain for what he considered the hypocrisy and dishonesty of his fellow citizens and set himself apart by proclaiming himself a citizen of the world.

The notion of world citizenship took a decidedly legalistic turn in ancient Rome, with the ideals of universal law and civic virtue closely intertwined in the writings of Roman Stoic thinkers, such as Cicero, Marcus Aurelius, and Seneca. In the context of an empire of overlapping jurisdictions, Roman political philosophers introduced the idea of multiple citizenships and allegiances radiating from state-based political ties into the international arena. As Seneca emphasized:

Let us grasp the idea that there are two commonwealths—the one, a vast and truly common state, which embraces alike gods and men, in which we look neither to this corner of earth nor to that, but measure the bounds of our citizenship by the path of the sun; the other to which we have been assigned by the accident of our birth.<sup>3</sup>

By acknowledging citizenship ties based on "the accident of our birth," but awarding higher standing to an envisioned universal political community, the Stoics championed the human capacity to lead a dual civic life—fulfilling obligations to the state while also serving the *cosmopolis* as a virtuous human person. Such ethical perspectives on world citizenship carried into medieval Christian thinking, with Stoic principles related to moral universalism essentially carried forth into the formation of particular Christian teachings and literature, such as *City of God* by St. Augustine.

The single most powerful cosmopolitan thinker from the Age of Enlightenment and early modern period was Immanuel Kant, who advanced the ideal of "cosmopolitan right" secured through an international "pacific federation" among free and independent states. As Kant speculated in his essay, "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch," written in 1795: "The peoples of the earth have thus entered in varying degrees into a universal community, and it has developed to the point where a violation of rights in one part of the world is felt everywhere" (Kant, 1991, p. 108). Of course, Kant's linkage of world citizenship to universal human rights echoed the revolutionary declarations of rights written during this period in the emerging American and French *national* republics. Strikingly, at the same time as the U.S. constitutional framers were convening in Philadelphia in 1787, Benjamin Franklin foresaw the eventual prospect of European federation.

During the 20th century, the atrocities and casualties of the two world wars, culminating in the nuclear attacks upon Hiroshima and Nagasaki, reinvigorated campaigns for a cosmopolitan model linked to more cohesive global governing institutions. Immediately following the Second World War, public discourse regarding "world citizenship" revolved heavily around the found-

ing of the United Nations and nuclear disarmament, with the latter often cited in the interview in the still more the case.

The founding of the United Nations and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights for all, reinforced the connection between the World Council of Churches and the United Nations—underscoring the importance of national sovereignty. The United Nations often invoked "world citizenship" as a guiding principle. Some political movements even began to echo Leninist aspirations for a new strain of cosmopolitanism.

During the 1950s and 1960s, the idea of world citizenship and international relations period brought back ancient cosmopolitan allegiances to contemporary educational and allied organizing programs such as the United Nations.

As early as 1945, the United States National Council on Human Relations, a professional organization of the sorts of philosophy that had greater force during the war.

Just as the meaning of interdependent decisions and common citizenship. (Hahn)

The promise of the political and democratic tradition in Korea, and studies seem more interested in the

ing of the United Nations and the hope that this new global institution would foster world peace and nuclear disarmament. Albert Einstein served as one of the most visible advocates of world government, which he believed was necessary to ward off nuclear holocaust. Einstein stated in an interview in the 1940s: "Do I fear the tyranny of a world government? Of course I do. But I fear still more the coming of another war" (quoted in Nathan & Norden, 1968, p. 376).

The founding documents of the United Nations, filled with sweeping affirmations of human rights for all, represented a giant step forward regarding aspirations for a rights-based model of world citizenship. At the same time, the stalemate of the Cold War and the chronic deadlocks between the West and the Soviet bloc—particularly within the United Nations Security Council—underscored the inherent limitations of the United Nations so far as its ability to transcend national sovereignty and power politics. In addition, groups in opposition to the United Nations often invoked "world citizenship" with scorn during the Cold War years. The idea of world citizenship became vulnerable to attack as signaling a remote and tyrannical world government. Some political organizations on the far right, such as the John Birch Society in the United States, even began to equate "world citizenship" with communism, overlooking the fact that Marxist and Leninist aspirations of an international workers utopia amounted to just one of many competing strains of cosmopolitanism as the concept evolved through the ages.

During the 1980s, in what turned out to be the waning years of Soviet communism, the idea of world citizenship had receded to the margins of political discourse. Even within the field of international relations, the term *globalization* was barely on the radar screen. However, this same period brought the early ascendancy of a new model of "global citizenship" that hearkened back to ancient cosmopolitan ideals of a universal human community and the goal of mediating ties and allegiances to overlapping, interdependent political and moral communities. Especially within the educational arenas in the United States and the United Kingdom, professional associations, allied organizations, and educational studies specialists began to show greater interest in designing programs seeking to inspire young people to become global citizens.

As early as 1979, the curriculum guidelines of the National Council for the Social Studies (in the United States) stated that the purpose of social studies education is "to prepare students to be rational, humane, participating citizens in a world that is increasingly interdependent." In 1984, the council's president, Carole Hahn, placed "global citizenship" directly on the agenda of the professional organization with an impassioned argument that can be viewed as a forerunner to the sorts of philosophical arguments in favor of global citizenship that would emerge with much greater force during the 1990s. As Hahn stated in her 1984 presidential address:

Just as the spread of nationalism since the eighteenth century caused people to rethink the meaning of "citizen," so now it is once again time to rethink that concept in light of our global interdependence. Like it or not, each of us riding on this planet is affected by one another's decisions and actions. We share a common destiny and, to an increasing extent, we share a common culture. Although most of us do not realize it, we are participants in a global society. (Hahn, 1984, p. 297)

The promises of an emerging global society became far more evident in the early 1990s with the political and economic opening of the former Soviet Union and its satellites, the ongoing democratic transformations in formerly authoritarian states such as South Africa and South Korea, and stunning advances in digital technology and telecommunications that made the world seem more interconnected and, indeed, smaller than before.

## CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDINGS OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP

As *globalization* became one of the buzzwords of the approaching new century, the idea of global citizenship became more conspicuous not only within scholarly debates but also as a salient and relevant idea for the general public. International relations theorist Richard Falk (1994) and sociologist John Urry (2000) both captured the new incarnation of global citizenship in separate articles that identified key segments of the population that seemed to fit into categories of prospective global citizens. Their images of global citizens can be consolidated into the following five categories, which overlap with each other:

- 1 "Global cosmopolitans," as in individuals who develop, often through extensive international travel, "an ideology of openness towards certain 'other' cultures, peoples and environments" (Urry, 2000, p. 73).
- 2 "Global activists," as in campaigners who take up causes such as human rights, poverty eradication, environmental protection, or who seek to hold accountable international economic institutions. True to the adage "think globally, act locally," these individuals also are often active in their local communities and national political arenas.
- 3 "Global reformers," who out of concern for all humanity advocate more cohesive and democratically accountable global governing institutions, if not a centralized system of world government, "as indispensable to overcome the chaotic dangers of the degree of political fragmentation and economic disparity that currently exists in the world today" (Falk, 1994, p. 132).
- 4 "Global managers," as in individuals who work, often in collaboration with the United Nations and other international governing institutions, to resolve borderless problems ranging from climate change to the threat of nuclear weapons.
- 5 "Global capitalists," as in multinational corporate executives who travel the world and form a "denationalized global elite that at the same time lacks any global civic sense of responsibility" (Falk, 1994, p. 135). Some global capitalists also are seen as willing to assume heavy financial risks in their respective quests to "unify the world around global corporate interests" (Urry, 2000, p. 172).

One category of global citizen that Falk and Urry did not single out—but could have done—is global educators. Classroom teachers and school principals; scholars with international credentials, contacts, and research agendas; leaders of international exchange programs; and educational outreach coordinators for advocacy groups (such as Oxfam International) together comprise a visible and dynamic group of global citizens today. Global educators strive to render their students competitive in the international economy, while also instilling awareness and empathy of other countries, cultures, and issues of common concern across the planet. Although many internationally engaged educators would not necessarily regard themselves as global citizens, they often aspire for the young people whose lives they touch to fit this description.

Recent academic debates surrounding prospects for some sort of international dimension of citizenship can be divided into two major categories. A normative debate on the desirability and feasibility of global citizenship has carried forth among political philosophers and social theorists. Sociologists and international relations scholars focused on developments especially related to international migration and transnational activism have contributed to empirical debates as to whether we are now undergoing a transition away from citizenship as exclusive and bounded

with  
ing g  
T.  
matri  
espec  
and f  
globa  
on th  
ernin  
M  
ship i  
of dis  
neigh  
ship,  
citize  
eratic  
privil  
desig  
tice, l  
of wo  
being;  
think  
this re  
cal lib  
In l  
institu  
global  
tional  
repres  
tanisr  
model  
intern  
referer  
Hel  
border  
soverei  
Held's  
avoids  
Rather  
to man  
also th  
  
In  
shi  
the  
reg

within nation-states and domestic politics and toward an expansion of citizenship into an emerging global sphere.

These two categories of academic debates contain many internal divisions. Within recent normative debates on global citizenship, different approaches to global citizenship can be identified, especially when comparing how various scholars on both sides of the Atlantic have approached and framed the concept. In many cases, scholars based in North America have typically framed global citizenship primarily in moral and ethical terms—as a phenomenon dependent primarily on the habits and choices of individuals, irrespective of the state of affairs within any set of governing institutions.

Moral philosopher Martha Nussbaum, for example, is well known for framing global citizenship in a manner that echoes the ancient rationale of Stoic cosmopolitanism: that the well-being of distant strangers should concern everyday people as much as the well-being of their closest neighbors. Nussbaum (1996) advocates world citizenship rather than state or national citizenship, as the appropriate central focus in civic education, on the grounds that education for world citizenship helps promote individual and collective self-awareness, helps promote a spirit of cooperation in solving global problems, and helps acknowledge moral obligations from wealthier and privileged nations to the rest of the world. While Nussbaum focuses not so much on institutional design but on fostering moral sentiments, especially with regard to international distributive justice, her argument takes on political relevance just the same. Nussbaum has argued for an ethic of world citizenship, especially within the United States: “If we really do believe that all human beings are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights, we are morally required to think about what that conception requires us to do with and for the rest of the world” (p. 14). In this respect, cosmopolitanism in the present day often emerges as a global extrapolation of classical liberal principles such as liberty, equality, and justice.

In Europe, where a legally binding model of European Union citizenship now complements the institution of national citizenship, scholars often more readily incorporate specific proposals for global governing institutions into arguments advocating global citizenship. The work of international relations theorists David Held (1995, 1999) and Andrew Linklater (1999) provides a good representation of models of global citizenship aligned more closely with institutional cosmopolitanism. David Held, for instance, has linked his understanding of global citizenship to a proposed model of cosmopolitan democracy (1995) that would include an elected worldwide assembly, an international judiciary, military force, and economic policy institutions, as well as transnational referenda and public scrutiny of international nongovernmental organizations (pp. 270–283).

Held argues that states should no longer be regarded as the exclusive power centers within their borders but should be “relocated” within an umbrella of cosmopolitan democratic law, with the sovereign authority of states situated within an overarching global legal framework. In this regard, Held’s vision of cosmopolitan citizenship contains world federalist affinities, though Held carefully avoids arguing for any kind of jurisdiction over citizenship to be transferred to a global authority. Rather, he advocates a conceptual enlargement of citizenship in order to account for multiple ties to many different spheres, sustained not only through access to global governing institutions but also through informal networks within transnational civil society. As noted by Held (1999):

In this system of cosmopolitan governance, people would come to enjoy multiple citizenships—political membership in the diverse political communities which significantly affect them. They would be citizens of their immediate political communities, and of the wider regional and global networks which impacted upon their lives. (p. 107)

Likewise, Linklater (1999) has proposed a "dialogic conception" of global citizenship that would emphasize processes of public deliberation in seeking appropriate solutions to common global problems. In Linklater's view:

World citizens would remain members of bounded communities, each in possession of its rightful sovereign status and free from external intervention. But the act of imagining themselves as participants in a universal society of co-legislators in which all human beings are respected as ends-in-themselves would place moral and psychological constraints on the wrongful exercise of state power. (p. 41)

Such advocates of global citizenship from the academy often share the perspective of placing civic attachments in a series of concentric circles—radiating from one's immediate political communities and then outward to the nation-state and beyond.

Meanwhile, the academic literature on international migration and transnational advocacy networks serves to illustrate how much scholarly disagreement persists as to the extent that various developments and trends associated with globalization actually carry implications for the meaning of citizenship. With regard to international migration, scholars have debated as to whether a possible model of "postnational membership" is displacing national citizenship or whether national citizenship remains resilient, with nation-states still firmly in control of citizenship laws and policies. The central point of contention: Whether international migrants in any given country receive partial membership rights (based on residency) mainly because of the moral force of international human rights or because of national governments acting on their own initiative and following their core principles. Essentially this debate hinges upon whether legal protection granted to migrants traces back to international norms or internal characteristics of domestic political systems.

If an increase in membership rights for noncitizens traces back to international norms, as scholars such as David Jacobson (1996), Yasemin Soysal (1994), and Saskia Sassen (1999) have argued, then national citizenship is regarded as undergoing "devaluation" (Jacobson, 1996, p. 9) or as headed toward obsolescence. Soysal has maintained, based upon the experiences of guestworkers in European countries that: "The recent guestworker experience reflects a time when national citizenship is losing ground to a more universal model of membership, anchored in deterritorialized notions of persons' rights" (p. 3). Likewise, Jacobson has argued that "the polity is in the process of being transposed to a transnational level as an entity based on human rights codes (namely the Euro-Atlantic community) and the state as the institutional forum—the territorial locus—of that legal-political order" (p. 133).

On the other hand, if state recognition of membership rights for migrants stems primarily from attributes and policies within individual host countries—particularly countries subscribing to liberal constitutions—then national citizenship remains resilient. As Randall Hansen (1999) has noted, also arguing that the causal flow is primarily domestic: "The liberal and expansive nature of permanent residents' rights is rooted foremost in the liberal and democratic political process and liberal democratic institutions, above all the judiciary" (p. 436). Similarly, as Christian Joppke (1998) has argued: "If the pressure of human rights meets nation-states from the outside, postnational membership analysts face the problem that this pressure is more urgently felt in the West than elsewhere" (p. 27). At this juncture, the evidence is far from conclusive that membership rights within individual countries, for citizens as well as migrants, have shifted decisively from sources within nation-states to sources beyond them. In keeping

humanity sub-  
Brubaker's desc  
sons to states" (t  
matter of choic

For transnat  
Once again, the  
to a model of gl  
classification of  
scholars claim t  
evidence of an  
of transnationa  
ang effect" in v  
tions in order  
especially repr  
ever, although  
implications fo  
to any sort of  
recent scholars  
*Action*, edited  
work on an int

Global cit  
economic  
This is tr  
governanc  
instrumen

Interesting  
their political  
tional politica  
national polit  
noted: "The r  
composed of:  
have to distin  
Thomas (199  
the mandate  
citizenship in  
1997, p. 182)

## CONCEPT

Alongside the  
yet another li  
interpreted a  
Rather th

humanity subdivided rather than united, the institution of national citizenship still fits Rogers Brubaker's description (1992) as an "international filing system, a mechanism for allocating persons to states" (p. 31). For the vast majority of the world's population, citizenship status is not a matter of choice but an accident of birth.

For transnational activists, in contrast, global civic engagement is indeed a matter of choice. Once again, though, scholars disagree as to whether campaigning on global issues actually amounts to a model of global citizenship. Although "global activists" taken together provide us with a major classification of prospective global citizens, as outlined above, rarely do international relations scholars claim that the proliferation of international nongovernmental organizations lends decisive evidence of an emerging global citizenry. In one of the most widely read studies tracing the evolution of transnational civil society, Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink (1998) documented a "boomerang effect" in which domestic grassroots organizations form alliances with international organizations in order to mount both internal and external pressure on state and national governments, especially repressive political authorities in violation of international human rights standards. However, although Keck and Sikkink believe that such nonstate actors in the international arena carry implications for state sovereignty, they do not claim that these transnational networks amount to any sort of cosmopolitan citizenship or global citizenry. This point of view is commonplace in recent scholarship on transnational activism. One prominent exception is the volume *Global Citizen Action*, edited by Michael Edwards and John Gaventa (2001), which specifically links advocacy work on an international scale with the idea of global citizenship. As Gaventa has written:

Global citizenship is the exercise of the right to participate in decision making in social, economic, cultural and political life, within and across the local, national and global arenas. This is true especially at the global level: Where the institutions and authority of global governance are not so clear, the rights of citizenship are made real not only through legal instruments but through the process of citizen action. (p. 278)<sup>5</sup>

Interestingly, sociologists studying the same phenomenon generally seem less reticent than their political science colleagues when it comes to discussing possible implications of transnational political and social activism for citizenship. In advocating for the development of transnational political parties as a check upon multinational corporations, Ulrich Beck (1999) has noted: "The rank and file of global parties, the 'global citizenry' in its various national colors, composed of multiple branches, should not be confused with a global managerial class. We will have to distinguish between global capitalists and global citizens." Likewise, sociologists Boli and Thomas (1997, 1999) have argued that international nongovernmental organizations carry out the mandate of world citizenship and "translate the diffuse global identity and authority of world citizenship into specific rights, claims, and prescriptions for state behavior" (Boli & Thomas, 1997, p. 182).

## CONCEPTS OF GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IN PUBLIC DISCOURSE

Alongside these empirical debates regarding the feasibility of global citizenship, I have introduced yet another line of inquiry and analysis: how the specific idea of global citizenship is actually being interpreted and communicated in the present day.

Rather than imposing the label of global citizen on particular segments of the population, or

arguing whether or not certain trends and patterns of transnational activism or international migration provide us with examples of global citizenship, I have examined how individuals who consider themselves as global citizens have reflected upon global citizenship and applied the idea in their lives. Likewise, I have also examined how numerous organizations and institutions that have adopted the term *global citizenship* into mission statements, programs, and strategies have framed this concept in relation to their endeavors.

By exploring the many pathways followed by self-described global citizens, as well as specific global citizenship agendas taken on by organizations, the key concepts underlying global citizenship in contemporary public discourse come into clearer focus. Awareness, responsibility, and participation are what I consider to be the primary concepts of global citizenship, while cross-cultural empathy, personal achievement, and international mobility are important secondary concepts. In this section of the chapter, I want to cast light upon each of these concepts by conveying insights shared with me during interviews with more than 150 self-identifying global citizens and advocates of global citizenship. These research findings are provided in further detail in my book, *The Practices of Global Citizenship* (2008).

First and foremost, for many individuals global citizenship entails self-awareness as well as outward awareness of one's surroundings and the world. Rather than viewing the idea of global citizenship as implying an absence of place, many self-described global citizens believe the personal relevance of the idea depends on strong and well-defined roots, not only within a particular community but also with respect to one's own individuality. For example, a novelist who lives in New Mexico, along the border separating the United States and Mexico, eloquently defined her idea of a global citizen to me as "somebody that can move between different worlds, what one perceives as these invisible membranes that separate culture and landscape and environment and people from different backgrounds." This person also noted that the individuals she has known with this sense of fluidity share an essential personal quality: "No matter where they were, they were at home; they were comfortable in the universe of their own skin, and consequently that made them available and fresh whenever they met other people in any sort of situation."

Self-awareness, then, can be considered an initial step of global citizenship, providing a lens through which further experiences and insights are perceived. As noted to me by a French-language teacher who has led her students on immersion experiences in Africa: "The thing that I say to my students is becoming a global citizen is not something that happens overnight; it's a process of self-awareness and as you become self-aware, you become more aware of others." Self-awareness also extends into questions of national identity, as some interview respondents who thought of themselves as global citizens flatly rejected the notion that one's sources of national identity should be seen as restricted. As one woman emphasized to me:

I was born in Korea, and I'm a U.S. citizen. That's a pretty finite state, right? But there's so many more interesting ways of life—and living and being—that's outside of just that finite state of being an immigrant Korean who's now a U.S. citizen. So why not be open to it?

Self-awareness as related to global citizenship, then, means that one avoids clipping one's wings as well as remaining at ease in one's own skin.

Global citizenship as outward awareness entails such personal qualities as understanding complex issues from multiple vantage points, recognizing sources of global interdependence and a "shared fate" that implicates humanity and all life on the planet, and looking beyond distinctions,

at least in one's more universal thoughts about one's national identity. A woman from Oklahoma Field Service (A she began to challenge the thoughts of Littleton, Colorado) of global citizenship action of consumerism is what is required raised in Nigeria ing to do with access of you as part of challenges in research.

Many self-described barriers that reflecting upon cultural differences herself as a global "young people are of have similar identity from Oklahoma and overseas in her home and Croatia:

I have learned global citizenship better health about my life

In short, aware citizens to embark on a global journey

The terms *global* describe themselves as the aspiration of core principle of "The one thought each human being of citizenship is of universal human rights an official associate corporations and c



at least in one's mind, between insiders and outsiders in order to view the human experience in more universal terms. For some individuals, global citizenship involves awakening to new insights about one's native country or continent while gaining perspectives from other lands. One young woman from Ohio, who spent a year in the Netherlands on an exchange through the American Field Service (AFS)—an organization that itself includes "global citizenship" in its mission—said she began to change her position on the gun control debate in the United States after listening to the thoughts of her Dutch classmates following the 1999 massacre at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado. An administrator for UNICEF Canada told me that in her view, the essence of global citizenship is found in awareness, not actions such as making ethical purchases: "The action of consuming doesn't make the difference. The shift in attitude or the shift in awareness is what is required. That's the fundamental change." Likewise, a university professor born and raised in Nigeria and now living in Missouri noted that global citizenship, in her mind, has nothing to do with acquiring or giving up national citizenship but is "a mind-set that makes you aware of you as part of the human family, and going beyond your interests to recognize the needs and challenges in resolving some of the problems that the world is faced with."

Many self-described global citizens think about the concept in terms of looking beyond potential barriers that can separate human persons—such as nation, religion, and ethnicity—and then reflecting upon universal commonalities of the human experience, regardless of whatever cultural differences seem to persist. A young medical student from Oregon—who came to regard herself as a global citizen after exploring Europe for six months—said the trip taught her that "young people are really a lot the same, no matter what country they come from. We all kind of have similar ideas and similar kinds of passions about life." Similarly, a community volunteer from Oklahoma expressed how she had grown as a person, first by hosting dozens of visitors from overseas in her home and later through political activism and volunteer work in Mexico, Russia, and Croatia:

I have learned that people, for the most part, are really wonderful, and that most people, global citizens, want peace in the world; they want better things for their children; they want better health care, better living conditions, and it's shaped me...it has shaped everything about my life.

In short, awareness of the wider world provides the motivation for many self-described global citizens to embark on sustained involvement in society or politics and to begin to take responsibility for a global common good.

The terms *global citizenship* and *global responsibility* often seem interchangeable for people who describe themselves as global citizens or advocate global citizenship. This comes as no surprise, as the aspiration of shared moral obligations across humanity has endured through the ages as a core principle of cosmopolitanism. In the eloquent words of Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006): "The one thought that cosmopolitans share is that no local loyalty can ever justify forgetting that each human being has responsibilities to each other" (p. xvi). Similar to the way that the notion of citizenship is often conceived, global citizenship is interpreted by some as a two-sided coin of universal human rights and corresponding global responsibilities. Consider this perspective from an official associated with the United Nations Global Compact, a collaborative of multinational corporations and civil society organizations:

The beauty of the term [global citizenship] is it brings in the notion of rights that should be balanced with responsibilities...and maybe it is counterproductive, in political terms, to overuse the term because it would provoke all sorts of resistance arguing that there is no such territory beyond the nation-state. But then it offers all the strength of trying to come to grips with a broad definition of our rights and responsibilities in a space that is not yet defined.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, signed in 1948 at the founding of the United Nations, is not binding in the same manner as national or state constitutions, but it nevertheless issues key imperatives for national governments, such as the duty to protect refugees and internally displaced persons, as well as any individuals abused or mistreated within their countries of residence. In an interview for my research, a senior United Nations human rights official framed the idea of global citizenship in terms of safeguarding the human rights of those no longer protected by their governments:

In terms of crimes against humanity, and the personal criminal liability of leaders, I think the challenge that we're looking at is how to protect fundamental human rights of those [persons] whose kind of protector, the state, has completely failed.... To the extent that there's been a complete inability or unwillingness of their government to protect their most basic fundamental universal human rights, I think they have a legitimate claim, for that purpose, to turn to the international community. So in that sense, they are the original global citizens. They have no other citizenship, in a sense, than their humanity.

On the other hand, for all the power of rights-based interpretations of global citizenship, self-described global citizens seem to link the idea of global citizenship more commonly with awareness. What responsible global citizenship requires, in the minds of people thinking and talking about the concept, seems to boil down to two key themes: principled decision making and solidarity across humanity. Global citizenship as principled decision making applies every bit as much within local communities as in the international arena. Environmental issues were cited especially often as an area in which responsible and aware global citizens are concerned about the effects of government policies as well as their personal daily choices. For example, an information technology consultant from San Francisco, who defined a global citizen as "someone who makes decisions based on an awareness of the impact of those decisions on the planet," added in the next sentence that she never would buy a sport-utility vehicle. An environmental campaigner based in Washington, DC, framed global citizenship as responsibility to the planet and to future generations:

We have to recognize that given the advances in technology, given the growth in the global economy and the capacity we now have in this country [the United States]—for example, we can unilaterally change the world's climate—in fact, we're almost doing that—and so I think we have to recognize that we have a responsibility now that goes far beyond our boundaries.... Recognizing that the earth is an ecosystem almost automatically defines us as global citizens.

Global citizenship, for many individuals, entails being aware of responsibilities beyond one's immediate communities and making decisions to change habits and behavior patterns accordingly.

The original French self-described global solidarity and global citizenship are preoccupied with redress with a Catholic internationalism. It's not a question of redress.

The most basic political or social liability. Several self-described local community One individual who global citizen even interview, if the lack in which he lived, I

While I was doing information about university and debate—people feel a great sense of conversation with

For this individual, being deprived of a political

Politically active governing institutions subjecting international paigner interviewees should we have, over tutions that really of counterpower."

the September 2000 amounted to global able. Similarly, with group promoting a power "means the capacity based on national and

Although political governing institutions responsibilities of global Churches put it, America's withdrawal from it as global citizen:

The original French usage of *solidarité* signifies collective responsibility (Hayward, 1959), and the self-described global citizens interviewed for my study frequently joined together ideas of global solidarity and global responsibility. This was especially true among individuals who were preoccupied with resolving global problems such as endemic poverty. One respondent, associated with a Catholic international-development organization based in Canada, justified the usage of *global citizenship* rather than alternative terms because, in his words, global citizenship is synonymous with "global equality" and "the notion of solidarity with the poor, the preferential option of the poor.... It's not a question of just promoting love and friendship throughout the world; it's a question of redressing the enormous imbalances that exist."

The most basic examples of global citizenship as participation involve contributing to the political or social life of a community, even if one is not legally a citizen of the country in question. Several self-described global citizens who had lived abroad emphasized that participating in a local community away from home translated, at least in their minds, into global citizenship. One individual who spent several years living overseas made it clear that he regarded himself a global citizen even while lacking the right to vote in his country of residence. When asked, in an interview, if the lack of voting rights impaired his sense of belonging to the various communities in which he lived, he responded that he felt very much a part of political life nevertheless:

While I was disenfranchised, I still was able to get actively involved in debate, in getting information about the political situation in each country. The very fact that I was involved in university and educational projects meant that invariably I came across quite a bit of political debate—people interested in politics, people moving in and out of politics. I certainly didn't feel a great sense of loss not being able to vote, because I was still able to engage in debate and conversation with people who were voting and was able to get my ideas across anyway.

For this individual, being deprived of voting rights in his adopted country did not leave him feeling deprived of a public voice in his community.

Politically active global citizens focus on directly influencing the practices and decisions of governing institutions—demanding responsible policies from domestic political institutions and subjecting international institutions to public scrutiny. One transnational human rights campaigner interviewed for this book said that global citizenship has to do with "the idea of where should we have, over what institution should we have democratic control, and what are the institutions that really decide over people's lives and against whom we should organize some form of counterpower." For this individual, legally a citizen of France, organizing a teach-in outside the September 2000 meeting in Prague of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank amounted to global citizenship by virtue of trying to hold these powerful institutions accountable. Similarly, with regard to challenging power, the former leader of a transnational advocacy group promoting a human right to food emphasized that the internationalization of corporate power "means the counterbalancing power on the citizen side has to be transnational movements, based on national and regional movements that link globally."

Although political participation in this regard is aimed at promoting responsible decisions by governing institutions, many activists also believe that participation in itself fulfills the moral responsibilities of global citizenship. As an environmental campaigner for the World Council of Churches put it, American church leaders who in early 2001 opposed the United States government's withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol on climate change were "exercising their responsibility as global citizens within their country to try and change those decisions."

Global citizen activists seeking reforms within governing institutions are motivated by the goal of democratic empowerment as well as idealistic aspirations for human flourishing. Many transnational activists do seem to burn with desire to change the world for the benefit of the least advantaged. For example, a leader of the advocacy group Global Exchange recalled how his experiences traveling in impoverished countries and encountering children facing death left him determined to “get at the causal roots, the institutional causality” of poverty by challenging government and corporate power. Reformers, then, do not merely seek to secure greater democratic control over the institutions they hold under scrutiny; they raise the stakes and strive for change.

Likewise, a prominent Canadian activist who has participated in numerous demonstrations outside meetings of international economic institutions said that in her view, the goal of the “global citizens movement,” as she called it, is twofold: first, to amplify the role of politics in the global economy and reclaim political space that has been lost to remote and unaccountable processes of decision making; second, to change the rules in the global economy, particularly with regard to international trade regulations that critics believe are stacked in favor of corporate interests: “I don’t believe in a global economy with footloose transnational corporations and transnational capital that is not governed in any way by laws at any level. I [also] don’t believe it’s enough anymore to do it at the nation-state level. We have to bring the rule of law to global institutions.”

By no means must reform-seeking global citizens be transnational activists. In many instances, self-described global citizens carry out quests for reform in their neighborhoods and homes. The organizer of an environmentally innovative cohousing initiative in Cambridge, Massachusetts, noted that many of the participating residents—global citizens, in her mind—could have afforded larger, more expensive houses, but that the community is:

...the embodiment of a philosophy that there’s a higher standard of living, both socially and spiritually, that can be achieved if we are willing to pull together and invest some time and effort into what the community needs and how we live. And I think that has global ramifications, because if we demonstrate that, then it’s there for other people to notice. That’s a statement of faith.

Making such a statement of faith, while planted literally in one’s own backyard, serves as an interesting counterweight to more overtly political and transnational versions of global citizenship as participation. Global citizenship often signifies forms of civic engagement that are mainly domestic and cross-cultural rather than international and political. Not only does global citizenship involve reclaiming transnational space for the public, but global citizenship also thrives within local public space.

Cross-cultural aspects of global citizenship spring to life in human relationships across many sources of difference, such as ethnicity, language, religion, and social class. For individuals who consider themselves global citizens by virtue of cross-cultural empathy, global citizenship has little, if anything, to do with where a person votes, or from which country one holds a passport, and everything to do with how an individual interacts with others and fits in wherever one should happen to be planted at any moment in time, even if only temporarily. Global citizenship, in this context, implies a readiness to cross intangible borders that others might consider all too formidable. Whether one is an outsider in unfamiliar surroundings or fully entrenched in one’s place of birth, global citizenship as cross-cultural empathy depends heavily on a willingness to build personal relationships with those from other backgrounds.

Although an ea-  
seem largely beyo-  
takes on political s  
and responsibility  
both in terms of tr  
this person was int  
tion in Melbourne  
lia’s aboriginal pop

We are a mig  
and different  
concept if you  
cultures and  
that that cultu

In keeping with  
of global citizensh  
classes in Spanish  
Latino background  
language learning:

She can share  
share with he  
Argentina or  
munity.... Tc

Global citizens  
cultural traditions  
culture entails cr-  
nurture a sense o  
requires levels of  
communal life an

Media referenc  
Journalists aroun  
phrase to describ  
residences in mor  
Scores of famous  
ers have been ext  
Jane Goodall, Em  
Yoko Ono, Mary  
Ustinov.

Not everyone l  
ever. Several dist  
committees were  
to classify thems  
personal achieve

Although an easy acceptance of people from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds might seem largely beyond the sphere of politics, cross-cultural empathy in many circumstances also takes on political significance. An Australian journalist who defined citizenship in terms of rights and responsibilities said that global citizenship, in his view, means not fearing other cultures—both in terms of traveling overseas and welcoming immigrants into Australia. Just one day before this person was interviewed, he participated (as a citizen, not as a reporter) in a mass demonstration in Melbourne in which an estimated 300,000 people called for reconciliation with Australia's aboriginal population:

We are a migrant culture, and there are enormous numbers of people with different faces and different colored skins and different accents. I don't feel that they're a threat. That's my concept if you talk about a global citizen: it's someone who doesn't feel threatened by other cultures and who sort of feels his own culture is robust enough to stand up amongst them, that that culture itself is a product of diversity.

In keeping with this view of diversity as enriching, a parent from California put her moral vision of global citizenship into practice by enrolling her daughter in a bilingual school that conducts classes in Spanish as well as in English and enrolls a cross-section of youngsters from Anglo and Latino backgrounds. This dual-language experience, in the parent's eyes, lends itself to more than language learning:

She can share with them (the classmates) what she's learning about being Jewish. They can share with her what they know about their parents and grandparents perhaps being raised in Argentina or Mexico. That's where global citizenship starts. It's how you think of your community.... To be a global citizen, all you have to do is think about somebody else.

Global citizenship, then, not only involves thinking about someone else and absorbing the cultural traditions of others but also involves sharing one's heritage. Being the outsider in another culture entails crossing cultural boundaries with grace and verve; it requires the willingness to nurture a sense of belonging in an unfamiliar setting. Engagement across cultures, meanwhile, requires levels of interest and sensitivity, as well as the willingness to absorb and contribute to communal life and include people who might otherwise feel left at the margins.

Media references to global citizenship occasionally read like a who's who list of celebrities. Journalists around the world have discovered that global citizen works as a convenient catchphrase to describe illustrious individuals—especially those who are world renowned, maintain residences in more than one country, and are also active in various global humanitarian causes. Scores of famous actors, athletes, entrepreneurs, musicians, scientists, spiritual leaders, and writers have been extolled as global citizens in glowing press accounts: Muhammad Ali, Bill Gates, Jane Goodall, Emmylou Harris, Angelina Jolie, the Dalai Lama, Rupert Murdoch, V. S. Naipaul, Yoko Ono, Mary Robinson, Ted Turner, Dionne Warwick, and the late Isaac Stern and Sir Peter Ustinov.

Not everyone labeled a global citizen by virtue of their achievement agrees with the label, however. Several distinguished people declared global citizens by dignitaries, journalists, or awards committees were quite modest during interviews for this study, and, at times, were reluctant to classify themselves as global citizens. On the other hand, global citizenship as a measure of personal achievement is taken more seriously within many schools, colleges, and universities,

as many educators aspire to develop a new generation of competent and competitive global citizens. The articulation of global citizenship as achievement was particularly apparent in secondary education, as secondary-school principals espousing global citizenship seemed acutely concerned that their students would advance to universities and reach sufficient academic and technological proficiency to compete in the global marketplace.

For example, a retired secondary school principal from New Zealand said that the term *global citizenship* entered her vocabulary around 1997, as her school began successfully recruiting Asian students from overseas, leading to a much more internationally mobile and culturally diverse student body. Alongside the cultural transformation of her school, which is located in a fairly remote area, the principal associated global citizenship mainly with notions of competence and competitiveness. Upon returning from an international conference for secondary-school principals held in 1998 in Helsinki, Finland, the principal told a local news reporter: "The message that is coming through very clearly is that technology, literacy and numeracy are the keys to global citizenship. We might be relatively isolated in New Zealand, but, through communication, through learning languages and through having an international outlook, we can keep pace with developments in places like Europe" (quoted in Baird, 1999)

To help translate this international outlook into daily life, the school invested NZ\$300,000 in a computer network and placed computer terminals in open public spaces rather than in enclosed classrooms. The school provided each student with unlimited Internet access and an e-mail account—an amenity more common at universities than secondary schools and a move that at the time placed the school technologically ahead of every other secondary school in the surrounding region. The principal also placed an emphasis on four extracurricular "quadrants"—sports, cultural activities, leadership, and service. The strategy focused on civic competence and professional competitiveness is working: More than 90% of the school's graduates go on to university education, and half of them become the first university graduates in their families.

Global citizenship as international mobility often tends to be more about professional opportunities and lifestyle options than about political or social responsibility and engagement. Typically, self-described global citizens who approach the concept mainly through their travels have not relocated abroad as immigrants but have moved to pursue career or educational opportunities. For the most part, these mobile individuals seemed to take their national citizenship as given, even as they immersed themselves, albeit partially and temporarily, in unfamiliar territory. In this regard, internationally mobile global citizens engaged in communal life abroad often spoke of being good neighbors while away from home. This did *not* entail, for these individuals, regarding everyone in the world as a "global neighbor." Rather, it meant settling into a new community and becoming part of that community, at least in some modest way.

The sorts of mobile individuals willing to nurture civic ties away from home usually also were the types of people who would simultaneously maintain strong senses of attachment within their countries of origin—and resettle at home eventually. For these sorts of individuals, the sense of belonging that accompanies domestic forms of citizenship is not necessarily diminished by international experiences. Instead, the sense of belonging is transplanted into communities that the expatriates call home for a temporary period of time. For example, a New Zealand television executive said that his family went about "nesting" in various local communities overseas while he held management positions for several years in the United Kingdom and in Australia:

When we live and work in the UK, particularly in London, which I prefer, we feel like we're part of the UK. We pay our taxes; our kids go to school; we make friends; we have family

there that we can guess once again you were originally a citizen.

For other self-described sense of distance from migration or whether relationship between migration case, several respondents perceive themselves overseas.

A London advertisement, first after spending even more so after London and, eventually, Asia he explained how he traveled on business five minutes to work added, talking about as flying into London

In other cases, self-expression that could they live anywhere individuals did not need of kinship with human contrary, most of the passports from the world citizenship has little, nothing to do with lifestyle the will to live on just where residency need

## CONCLUSION

The strains of thinking readily are the ideas of today's self-described global to their lives and ended political and social ideas citizenship discourse self-citizenship in the present have become too wide robust model of citizen

there that we can visit on a weekend. When I'm there, I feel like I'm part of the place, so I guess once again, it's an attitude of mind: that when you are in a location other than where you were originally born and brought up, if you feel like a citizen, then consider yourself a citizen.

For other self-described global citizens, international mobility was strongly associated with a sense of distance from one's country of origin. It is difficult to make any cause-and-effect claim in this regard: it is not entirely clear whether a lack of belonging usually prompts international migration or whether international migration erodes one's sense of belonging. Perhaps the relationship between migration and detachment, for some individuals, is mutually reinforcing. In any case, several respondents who think of themselves as global citizens articulated how they came to perceive themselves as being removed from their respective home countries during experiences overseas.

A London advertising executive, for instance, began to feel disengaged from the United Kingdom, first after spending a year in the United States on a management education program, and even more so after his corporate role expanded to include jurisdiction for continental Europe and, eventually, Asia. Although this person had always been based, at least officially, in London, he explained how he quite literally did not have a strong sense of place. He noted that when he traveled on business (60–70% of the time), “frequently I’ll wake up somewhere, and it takes me five minutes to work out...remember where I am, and I don’t find that at all odd.” This person added, talking about flying into Heathrow Airport: “I don’t regard it as flying home. I regard it as flying into London.”

In other cases, self-described global citizens seem to think about global citizenship simply as an expression that conveys enthusiasm for international travel and a feeling, in some cases, that they could live anywhere, provided that they are able to maintain high living standards. These individuals did not necessarily show an interest in transnational political activism or feel a sense of kinship with humankind; nor were they looking to change their country of citizenship. On the contrary, most of these individuals seemed to recognize the privileges associated with holding passports from the world's wealthier constitutional democracies. This particular strain of global citizenship has little, if anything, to do with political or social engagement and just about everything to do with lifestyle: the term describes an affluent subset of individuals with the means and the will to live on just about any continent, especially if they have reached a point in their lives where residency need not be dictated by employment or other professional considerations.

## CONCLUSION

The strains of thinking within contemporary global citizenship discourse that fit together most readily are the ideas of awareness, responsibility, and participation. The ways in which many of today's self-described global citizens often interpret the meaning of “global citizenship” in relation to their lives and endeavors hearken to moral visions of citizenship and cosmopolitanism as these political and social ideals have evolved through the ages. At the same time, other aspects of global citizenship discourse simultaneously challenge conventional assumptions about what counts as citizenship in the present day and prompt questions as to whether notions of global citizenship have become too wide-ranging to provide an coherent picture of a genuinely reconfigured and robust model of citizenship for the 21st century.

As the viability of the current era of globalization itself is increasingly called into question—with growing concern among many international relations scholars that aspirations toward further developments in global governance and collaboration in solving shared global problems are giving way instead to renewed rivalries among multiple national and regional powers—it is not certain that the idea of global citizenship will continue to gain traction in the next decade as much as the past two decades. In a world in which nationalism remains the single most powerful source of political belonging, it is even less certain as to whether global citizenship will begin to move toward the center of the political mainstream across the English-speaking world, let alone take root in public debate elsewhere, particularly in non-Western settings.

Public opinion surveys, though, have shown consistently in recent years that younger generations, at least in the world's more open and affluent constitutional democracies, are more receptive than their elders to the general idea of being an actively engaged participant and a morally responsible member—if not an outright citizen—of communities that reach beyond the boundaries of any given country. Of course, this attitudinal shift owes itself considerably to developments such as the rise of the Internet and other global media platforms, the increased accessibility of international travel, and ongoing social changes that point toward multicultural societies. As illustrated in other chapters in this volume, such developments are inextricably linked with many educational programs that now engage with the specific idea of global citizenship. If global citizenship is to continue gaining traction in the coming years, it will be in no small measure due to the efforts of countless educators, from elementary school teachers to university administrators, who have sought to highlight and advance understandings of global citizenship in curriculum content and extracurricular programs.

As colleges and universities continue building upon strategies with the aims of advancing public understanding of global citizenship and inspiring young people to think and live as global citizens, the insights from past and present renderings of global citizenship leave us with some challenging questions for consideration, which include: Are today's educational initiatives invoking the specific term *global citizenship* really new and distinctive in comparison with other past and present initiatives related to global education or international education? Especially if the specific term *global citizenship* is only hazily defined on campus (or not unpacked at all), to what extent does *global citizenship* bring intellectual substance to the table? How can educators balance the imperatives of fostering a climate on campus in which a plurality of global citizenship understandings coexist while also preventing the idea from lapsing into incoherence and irrelevance? How literally should we take the idea of global citizenship in higher education? Do some self-professed global citizens, especially those who begin to think about global citizenship as a result of short and limited experiences abroad, gravitate to a relatively shallow view of the concept that fails to reckon with persistent cultural differences? And how can we reliably measure and determine, over time, the extent that educational programs for global citizenship actually are making a difference in levels of awareness, responsibility and participation in coming generations of citizens? These sorts of questions will become critically important as university communities work to advance the idea of global citizenship, build upon mission statements and strategic agendas, and design and implement specific programs and activities that will demonstrate how global citizenship imperatives can spring to life.

## NOTES

1. As Charles Jones by an institutive moral concern, standpoint for
2. Historical acco citizen of the u
3. Cited in Heater
4. Joppke's case a baffling" that citizenship, is l actual immigra Denizenship is r (1998) has not the ostensible g a rich civil soci
5. See also Muet: linked with the

## REFERENCES

- Appiah, K. A. (2006)  
 Baird, N. (1999, July  
 Beck, U. (1999). *Wh*  
 Boli, J., & Thomas, G  
 organization. *Am*  
 Boli, J., & Thomas, G  
*tions since 1875*.  
 Brubaker, R. (1992).  
 Press.  
 Cohen, J. (Ed.). (199  
 Edwards, M., & Gave  
 Falk, R. (1994). The  
 127-139). Londo  
 Gaventa, J. (2001).  
*citizen action* (pp  
 Hahn, C. L. (1984).  
 297-299.  
 Hansen, R. (1999). I  
*Journal of Politic*  
 Hayward, J. E. S. (1  
*of Social History*,  
 Heater, D. (1996).  
*thought*. New Yor  
 Heater, D. (2002). V  
 Held, D. (1995). *Der*  
 Held, D. (1999). The  
 tion. In I. Shapir  
 University Press.  
 Hutchings, K., & Dai  
 Jacobson, D. (1996).  
 University Press.  
 Jones, C. (1999). *Gl*



## NOTES

1. As Charles Jones (1999) has defined cosmopolitanism: "The fundamental idea is that each person affected by an institutional arrangement should be given equal consideration. Individuals are the basic units of moral concern, and the interests of individuals should be taken into account by the adoption of an impartial standpoint for evaluation" (p. 15).
2. Historical accounts differ as to whether Socrates and Diogenes each used the term citizen of the world or citizen of the universe. For the sake of consistency, I will use the term citizen of the world.
3. Cited in Heater (1996, p. 221)
4. Joppke's case against "postnational membership" also takes on a normative aspect; he finds it "concretely baffling" that the status of guestworkers in Europe as second-class members, not on track toward full citizenship, is held up as a model by postnationalists: "Independent of the academic stance taken, the actual immigrant-receiving societies have treated post-national membership as an intolerable anomaly.... Denizenship is not celebrated; it is detested" (p. 28). Beyond questions of guestworker status, Peter Schuck (1998) has noted that recent genocides in Bosnia, Somalia, Rwanda, and Cambodia "should remind us that the ostensible goals of post-national citizenship—human rights, cultural autonomy, and full participation in a rich civil society—are tragically elusive" (p. 203).
5. See also Muetzfeldt and Smith (2002) for an argument that a conception of global citizenship can be linked with the emergence of global civil society and global governing institutions.

## REFERENCES

- Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: Norton.
- Baird, N. (1999, July 28). Principal urges international outlook. *The Southland Times*.
- Beck, U. (1999). *What is globalization?* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Boli, J., & Thomas, G. M. (1997). World culture in the world polity: A century of international non-governmental organization. *American Sociological Review*, 62, 171–190.
- Boli, J., & Thomas, G. M. (Eds.). (1999). *Constructing world culture: International non-governmental organizations since 1875*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Cohen, J. (Ed.). (1996). *For love of country? Debating the limits of patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Edwards, M., & Gaventa, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Global citizen action*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Falk, R. (1994). The making of global citizenship. In B. van Steenberg (Ed.), *The condition of citizenship* (pp. 127–139). London: Sage.
- Gaventa, J. (2001). Global citizen action: Lessons and challenges. In M. Edwards & J. Gaventa (Eds.), *Global citizen action* (pp. 275–287). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Hahn, C. L. (1984). Promise and paradox: Challenges to global citizenship. *Social Education*, 48, 240–243, 297–299.
- Hansen, R. (1999). Migration, citizenship and race in Europe: Between incorporation and exclusion. *European Journal of Political Research*, 35, 415–444.
- Hayward, J. E. S. (1959). Solidarity: The social history of an idea in 19th century France. *International Review of Social History*, 4, 270–271.
- Heater, D. (1996). *World citizenship and government: Cosmopolitan ideas in the history of western political thought*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Heater, D. (2002). *World citizenship: Cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents*. London: Continuum.
- Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the global order*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Held, D. (1999). The transformation of political community: Rethinking democracy in the context of globalization. In I. Shapiro & C. Hacker-Cordón (Eds.), *Democracy's edges* (pp. 84–111). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchings, K., & Dannreuther, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Cosmopolitan citizenship*. London: Macmillan.
- Jacobson, D. (1996). *Rights across borders: Immigration and the decline of citizenship*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jones, C. (1999). *Global justice: Defending cosmopolitanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Joppke, C. (1998). Immigration challenges the nation-state. In C. Joppke (Ed.), *Challenge to the nation-state: Immigration in Western Europe and the United States* (pp. 5–48). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kant, I. (1991). Perpetual peace: A philosophical sketch (H. B. Nisbet, Trans.). In H. Reiss (Ed.), *Kant: Political writings* (pp. 93–130). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1795)
- Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Linklater, A. (1999). Cosmopolitan citizenship. In K. Hutchings & R. Dannreuther (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan citizenship* (pp. 35–59). London: Macmillan.
- Montaigne, M. E. (1958). *Essays* (J. M. Cohen, Trans.). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin. (Original work 1575)
- Muetzelfeldt, M., & Smith, G. (2002). Civil society and global governance: The possibilities for global citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 6, 55–75.
- Nathan, O., & Norden, H. (Eds.). (1968). *Einstein on peace*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1996). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country? Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 3–17). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Sassen, S. (1999). *Guests and aliens*. New York: New Press.
- Schattle, H. (2008). *The practices of global citizenship*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Schuck, P. H. (1998). *Citizens, strangers and in-betweeners: Essays on immigration and citizenship*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *The limits of citizenship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Urry, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond societies*. London: Routledge.

Ch  
Fos  
The F  
in the  
James  
Univers

The future, culturally p such serious 2008, pp. 4 between 4, 30,000 sep other word this is to sa the unsusta lated the G there will h head, 2008 In his b even more the curren The questi challenges wonders, c our intuiti profound c The mi United Sta that they v they are hu however, 1 education they are g increasing months of