

[DOI: 10.20472/IAC.2018.040.070](https://doi.org/10.20472/IAC.2018.040.070)

THOMAS J. WARD
University of Bridgeport, United States

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP: REALITY VERSUS ASPIRATION

Abstract:

Those who teach “global citizenship” appear to operate on the assumption that a world republic already exists with its own guiding principles and norms. While beneficiaries of national citizenship inherit both rights and duties, no enforceable “social contract” delineates “global citizens’” rights and duties. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the document repeatedly referenced by “global citizenship” aspirants, has only limited enforceability, given its status as a declaration rather than a treaty. The United Kingdom’s referendum against continued European Union membership as well as the United States’ willingness to abandon extant trade norms and protocols challenge the assumption that the world is ripe for global consensus, consolidation and citizenship. Indeed, we seem to remain distant not only from “global citizenship”’s assumed “world republic” but from what Jurgen Habermas envisioned and described as shared “world domestic policy.” “Global citizenship” education per se does not conform with today’s sociopolitical realities. The authority and expertise attributed to its purveyors warrant critical assessment.

Keywords:

Global Citizenship, Rights and Duties, National Citizenship, Perpetual Peace, Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Social Contract, Failed State

JEL Classification: F55

Introduction

In the eighteenth century, Jean-Jacques Rousseau¹, Jeremy Bentham² and Immanuel Kant explored approaches to and interpretations of global governance. Immanuel Kant in *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* (1795) introduced and then quickly retracted the proposition for a “world-republic:”

For states...can form a State of nations (*civitas gentium*), one, too, which will be ever increasing and would finally embrace all the peoples of the earth. States, however, in accordance with their understanding of the law of nations, by no means desire this, and therefore reject *in hypothesi* what is correct *in thesi*. Hence, instead of the positive idea of a world-republic, if all is not to be lost, only the negative substitute for it, a federation averting war, maintaining its ground and ever extending over the world may stop the current of this tendency to war and shrinking from the control of law.³

Kantian scholar Claude Perrottet cites Kant’s fierce resistance to autocracy as a key rationale for him opting instead for a less integrated future “federation of free states,” i.e., a “federation avoiding war” that would respect every citizen’s right to a carefully delimited “universal hospitality” for citizens of the federation’s member states.⁴ Perrottet points out that Jurgen Habermas anticipated a future where one might find shared “world domestic policy” even in the absence of a world government.

The quest for a greater standardization of policies and protocols and a strengthening of international ties has been upstaged in certain venues by what is commonly referred to today in the English-speaking world as “global citizenship.” While beneficiaries of national citizenship inherit both rights and duties, no enforceable “social contract” delineates self-declared “global citizens” rights and duties. “Global citizens” remain reliant on nation-states for their security. The realpolitik of threats of trade wars among World Trade Organization member states punctuates the extent to which genuine political and economic integration remains aspirational rather than realized.

“Global Citizenship”—A Term in Search of a Definition

When in June 2018, one does a *Google* search for the term “global citizenship,” *Wikipedia* appears third in said search just below two links to the website of *Global Citizen*^{5,6}, the sponsor of the annual Global Citizen Festival and one of the most prominent promoters

¹ *Discours sur l’Inégalité* (1754), *Le Contrat Social* (1762) and *Émile* (1763).

² *Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1780-1823).

³ Immanuel Kant, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* (1795), p. accessed on June 19, 2018, pp. 136-137. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/50922/50922-h/50922-h.htm>

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Global Citizen*, accessed on July 6, 2018. <https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/>.

⁶ Joe McCarthy, “What is a Global Citizen?” *Global Citizen*, March 7, 2018, accessed on July 6, 2018. <https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/content/what-is-a-global-citizen/>

of “Global Citizenship”. *Global Citizen* contributor Joe McCarthy informs readers that while some “global citizens” are “super activists,” “most are regular folks who want to help solve major problems, while also hanging out with Rihanna in their free time.”⁷

Unlike the *Global Citizen* site, the *Wikipedia* explanation of “global citizenship” constitutes a definition rather than advocacy or *apologia*. In the period between March 2015 and June 2018, the *Wikipedia* definition for “global citizenship” has remained unchanged:

Global citizenship is the idea of all persons having rights and responsibilities that come with being a member of the world, with whole world philosophy and sensibilities, rather than as a citizen of a particular nation or place. The idea is that one’s identity transcends geography or political borders and that responsibilities or rights are derived from membership in a broader class: “humanity.” This does not mean that such a person denounces or waives their nationality or other, more local identities, but such identities are given “second place” to their membership in a global community.”⁸

An online *Google* search of “Ways to become a Global Citizen” reveals simple “3-Step,” “6-Step,” “7-Step” and “10-Step” recipes to get there.⁹ Each of the proposed approaches overlooks the heavy toll that can be exacted in moving from one national identity to another (a global identity in the case of “Global Citizenship”). Countless followers of Mohandas Gandhi and ultimately Gandhi himself lost their lives in the effort to gain independence from the British Empire and forge a new and separate Indian identity. Nelson Mandela and his followers faced imprisonment and death in pioneering a new South Africa. The signers of the United States’ Declaration of Independence put their lives and fortunes at risk in declaring their loyalty to a new country. They braced for death for treasonous acts and for war when they articulated their resolve to separate from the British Crown.

What fate would North Koreans face in pledging their allegiance to the liberal democratic principles that “live loudly within” “global citizenship”’s value system? What fate would a declared devotee to “global citizenship” face if she or he were an Iraqi or Syrian citizen living within an ISIS controlled area of either of those countries? The dire risks that can result from moving from one’s current national identity to another contrasts sharply with the “cheap grace”¹⁰ “6-Step” or “7-Step” approach to becoming “global citizens.” Take, for example, Step Three of Jenny Clark’s “7 Steps to become a Global Citizen:”

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ “Global Citizenship,” *Wikipedia*, last accessed on July 5, 2018.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_citizenship

⁹ “Ways to become a Global Citizen,” *Google.com*, last accessed on June 23, 2018, Google.com Search Term using Google.com “Ways to become a Global Citizen.”

¹⁰ This is a reference to German Theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer’s *Cost of Discipleship* (1948), which opens with Bonhoeffer’s statement that “Cheap grace is the mortal enemy of our church. Our struggle today is for costly grace.”

Eat at different restaurants and make strides to learn a language. Get to know the owners of the restaurants—where are they from? What are their stories? Buy an ethnic cookbook and make your own meals. You can even make it fun and have themed parties where everyone brings a specific dish and try to speak only that language throughout the dinner party.¹¹

How does one say “lightly sautéed” or “shaken not stirred” in Persian or in Swahili? One wonders how many times Ms. Jenny Clark has organized such a party and whether they were “successful” or just awkward and dull. It should be noted that the restaurant step is avoided in the “6 Ways to be a Better Global Citizen in 2014,” which consists of:

1. Learn about the stuff you buy.
2. Travel sustainably.
3. Volunteer locally.
4. Donate, but donate smart.
5. Read everything you possibly can.
6. Get involved in politics¹².

Yet while the “6-steps” may help to deepen our understanding of social responsibility and strengthen our awareness of world developments through reading everything we “possibly can,” in what sense does this make one a “global citizen?” To which world institution does one swear loyalty? The United Nations? If so, what are the compelling reasons for doing so? What can the United Nations, the **member state** organization that it is today, provide in return to such “citizens?”

Britannia 2.0?

The “global citizens” movement has mainly gained traction in the developed countries of the English-speaking world: the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia, and Canada. Two of the important advocacy centers for “global citizenship” are located in posh neighborhoods of New England. The *Global Citizens Initiative* is headquartered in Greenwich, CT,¹³ one of the wealthiest suburbs of metropolitan New York. Its apostrophized peer *The Global Citizens' Initiative* is located in Milton, Massachusetts¹⁴, one of the wealthiest Boston suburbs. *Global Citizen*, the sponsor of the Global Citizen Festival and of numerous humanitarian campaigns around the world has offices on Broadway in New York City, as well as in London.¹⁵ Oxfam has its Global Citizenship Education Project headquartered in Oxford, UK.

¹¹ Jenny Clark, “7 Steps to become a Global Citizen,” *GVI UK*, accessed on June 27, 2018.

<https://www.gvi.co.uk/blog/7-steps-to-become-a-global-citizen/>

¹² Matt Hershberger, “6 Ways to be a Better Global Citizen in 2014,” *Matador Network*, January 1, 2014, last accessed June 1, 2018. <https://matadornetwork.com/change/6-ways-to-be-a-better-global-citizen-in-2014/>

¹³ Global Citizens Initiative, 2 Sound View Drive, Greenwich, CT 06830.

¹⁴ The Global Citizens' Initiative, 82 Buckingham Road, Milton, MA 02186.

¹⁵ Global Citizen; New York: Suite 207, 594 Broadway, New York, NY, 10012 and London: 19 Fitzroy Street, London W1T 4BP, UK.

One American academic institution of higher education has gone so far as to initiate an actual undergraduate degree in “Global Citizenship,” described as “the first of its kind in the country.” The curriculum of said program has no foreign language requirement nor is there a single course in political science, international relations, or international organization.¹⁶ By default, the “global citizenship” “experts” of this program have locked their students into a future world where English is the *lingua franca*. Graduates will have been prepared for a “d  j   vu all over again” future. The implicit guarantee of their curriculum, as it is currently configured, is that the “sun will never set” on this “global citizenship” world.

Francis Fukuyama, political scientist, former State Department official and author of *The End of History and the Last Man* (1992, 2006) has pointed to the lack of diversity of perspective in the “global citizens” movement’s leadership:

There is currently a minuscule elite that considers themselves as global citizens, where geography and culture don’t seem to matter. If this elite thinks that the rest of the world thinks like them, they’re wrong. The benefits of globalization were not shared equally, which is why there is a pushback. The majority of people still, as we said earlier, are on a national, if not regional level. Changing that will be extremely difficult and lengthy.¹⁷

Measuring “Global Citizenship” and some “more Academic” Views on the Topic

In 2010 University of British Columbia President Martha Piper made a commitment that her university would “prepare students to become **exceptional** (emphasis added by Ward) global citizens, promote the values of a civil and sustainable society, and conduct outstanding research to serve the people of British Columbia, Canada and the world.”¹⁸ Harvard School of Education’s “global citizenship” expert Fernando Reimers deems it *urgent* to teach youth to be “**strong** (emphasis added) global citizens.”¹⁹ The fact that these two educators suggest that there are degrees of “global citizenship” consciousness, that is, “exceptional” versus “normal,” and “strong” versus “weak” would lead one to assume that there is not just a popular *Wikipedia* understanding of “global citizenship” but an academic or more scientific one, as well.

¹⁶ Becker College “Bachelor of Arts in Global Citizenship,” last accessed May 23, 2018.

<https://www.becker.edu/academics/undergrad/division-of-humanities/global-citizenship>

¹⁷ Francis Fukuyama with Alexander Gorchakov, “Democracy needs Elites,” *Huffington Post*, March 2, 2017, last accessed on February 3, 2017.

https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/francis-fukuyama-democracy-elites_us_58b5a2cfe4b0780bac2d8ea3

¹⁸ Gina Eom, “Global Citizenship – where does the AMS fit in?” *ubc insiders*, January 29, 2007.

<http://ubcinsiders.ca/2007/01/global-citizenship-where-does-the-ams-fit-in-2/>

¹⁹ Kate Stringer, “74 Interview: Harvard’s Fernando Reimers on the Crucial Need to Teach Kids to Be Strong Global Citizens,” *74 Interview*, May 21, 2017, last accessed on April 28, 2018.

<https://www.the74million.org/article/74-interview-harvards-fernando-reimers-on-the-crucial-need-to-teach-kids-to-be-strong-global-citizens/>

When asked in an interview by Ms. Kate Stringer to define “global citizen,” Harvard’s Fernando Reimers responded, “A global citizen is someone who understands how their lives are influenced by globalization: how we associate, how we organize, how we work.” He then added:

It has also made us aware of challenges that we share that cannot be resolved within the boundaries of a nation-state. The best example is global warming, but it’s not the only example.”²⁰

In 2016 Reimers served as the lead author of *Empowering Global Citizenship: A World Course* (2016).

Hans De Wit critiques the concept of “good global citizens” because it “suffers from a great diversity of conceptualizations and a lack of clear understanding of how it can be measured or whether it is even useful as a concept.”²¹ Keeping this in mind, let us take a moment to reflect on Professor Reimer’s definition of “global citizenship.” In accord with his definition, a “global citizen” is “someone who understands how their lives are influenced by globalization: how we associate, how we organize, how we work.” In what sense does “understanding” constitute the basis of citizenship? In *Empowering Global Citizens*, (2016) Dr. Reimers identifies the desired outcomes of “Global Citizenship” education as reflecting “the result of competencies in understanding, caring about, and having the capacity to influence global affairs and advance human rights.”²² However, these largely affective and attitudinal outcomes suffer from inadequacies and are subject to competing interpretations of human rights, for example, differing views on women’s rights and religious freedom. Significant differences exist on these matters in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) vis-à-vis the Cairo Declaration of Human Rights in Islam (1990).²³

To his credit Dr. Reimers does recognize that the “legal foundation for “global citizenship” does not currently exist.²⁴ However, he proceeds to identify creative methodologies and

²⁰ Kate Stringer, “74 Interview: Harvard’s Fernando Reimers on the Crucial Need to Teach Kids to Be Strong Global Citizens,” *74 Interview*, May 21, 2017, last accessed on April 28, 2018, <https://www.the74million.org/article/74-interview-harvards-fernando-reimers-on-the-crucial-need-to-teach-kids-to-be-strong-global-citizens/>

²¹ Elspeth Jones, Robert Coelen, Jos Beelen, and Hans de Wit (eds.), *Global and Local Internationalization, Global Perspectives on Higher Education* Vol. 34, 2016, last accessed on May 19, 2018. <https://www.sensepublishers.com/media/2594-global-and-local-internationalization.pdf>

²² Fernando M. Reimers, Vidur Chopra, Connie K. Chung, Julia Higdon, E.B. O’Donnell, *Empowering Global Citizens—A World Course*, (Charleston: Create Space Independent Publishing Platform, 2016), p. iv.

²³ Quilliam Admin, “Perspective—Human Rights: The Universal Declaration versus the Cairo Declaration,” *Quilliam*, December 2012. <https://www.quilliaminternational.com/human-rights-the-universal-declaration-vs-the-cairo-declaration/>

²⁴ Fernando M. Reimers, *Empowering Global Citizens—A World Course*, p. Ixiii.

curricular outcomes for GC education in spite of this “minor technicality” of its lack of a legal foundation.

Oxfam, one of the organizations that offers a “global citizenship” curriculum that Dr. Reimers highlights in *Empowering Global Citizens*, provides its own delimited definition of “global citizenship.” For Oxfam (1997), a “global citizen” is someone who:

- is aware of the wider world and has a sense of her or his own role as a world citizen;
- respects and values diversity;
- has an understanding of how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically, and environmentally;
- is outraged by social injustice;
- participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from local to global;
- is willing to act to make the world a more sustainable place;
- takes responsibility for his or her actions.²⁵

When one examines the definition provided by Oxfam, it is a definition that includes no measurable outcomes. How “willing” must one be to “act to make the world a more sustainable place” in order to qualify as a “global citizen?” Would recycling once a month be sufficient? To what extent must one respect and value “diversity” to be a “global citizen?” To what degree must one be “outraged by social injustice” to be a “global citizen?”

Enormous will is required to create a federal union such as the United States or the European Union. In the case of the United States, once states such as New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts had ratified the federal constitution, the possibility of any of them ever withdrawing from it was virtually nil, as illustrated by the American Civil War, which responded to the South’s secession from the Union, the unconstitutionality of which was reaffirmed by the United States Supreme Court in *Texas vs. White* (1869).²⁶ The formation of a world republic would almost certainly require countries interested in joining to surrender their national sovereignty.

²⁵ OXFAM, *Education for Global Citizenship – A guide for schools*, (Oxford, UK: OXFAM, 2015), p. 5, last accessed on December 11, 2017.

<https://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/resources/education-for-global-citizenship-a-guide-for-schools>

²⁶ Philip Bump, “So you want to secede from the U.S.: A Four Step Guide,” *Washington Post*, June 27, 2016, last accessed June 25, 2018. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/the-fix/wp/2016/06/27/so-you-want-to-secede-from-the-u-s-a-four-step-guide/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.4e652c42a081

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), another prominent advocate of GC education,²⁷ describes citizenship as “the binding element of a national community” and as “an instrument and object of social closure.” UNESCO also points to the implicit constraints of national citizenship:

National citizenship draws boundaries between states. It is today one of the most powerful instruments of exclusion; every modern state identifies a particular set of persons as its citizens and defines all others as non-citizens, as aliens. At the same time, citizenship is an instrument of closure within states. A conceptual, legal, and ideological boundary between citizens and foreigners or migrants is established by every state. Every state discriminates between citizens and resident foreigners, reserving certain rights and benefits, as well as certain obligations, for citizens.²⁸

While the UNESCO staff who help to draft such documents point to the limitations of national citizenship, they fail to recognize that, more threatening than the nation state, is the repression of some UNESCO member states that are under dictatorial rule. In those countries, “exclusions” exist not based on citizenship but based on religious beliefs or conscience. In the UNESCO critique of national citizenship, perpetrators of state-sponsored violence and repression remain faceless while prominent liberal democracies, designed in their foundations to protect the rights of citizens through rule of law, are implicated as villains by this UNESCO document that decries the state as “one of the most powerful instruments of exclusion.”²⁹

**

Key “Global Citizenship” Advocacy Groups

The financial, ideological and political thrust of the “global citizenship” movement resides largely in three constituencies: the paid civil servants of international organizations such as the United Nations and UNESCO; the affluent funders and salaried administrators of foundations and international non-governmental organizations such as the Ford Foundation, Open Society, OXFAM, and various other “global citizen”-related NGOs; and thirdly the proponents of “Global Citizenship” who play senior leadership roles in a number of English-speaking universities including, as we have noted, the faculty and administration of some prominent schools of education, e.g., Harvard Graduate School of Education.

²⁷Why do education policymakers need to mainstream Global Citizenship Education: An Appeal of the 2030 Agenda,” *UNESCO Liaison Office in New York*, May 1, 2018, last accessed on May 15, 2018. http://www.unesco.org/new/en/unesco-liaison-office-in-new-york/about-this-office/single-view/news/why_do_policy_makers_need_to_mainstream_global_citizenship_e/

²⁸ UNESCO, “Citizenship,” *Learning to live together*, last accessed on April 28, 2018. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/citizenship/>

²⁹ *Ibid.*

There is reason to question the apparent assumption that promoters and educators of “global citizenship” are in an authoritative position to teach and enable others to become “global citizens,” as they imply. To teach engineering, one must normally be an engineer. To teach government, one must normally be a political scientist. To teach law enforcement, one must be trained in law enforcement. To teach the martial arts, one must normally be recognized by having an advanced credential in that field. In the case of Taekwondo, that would normally be at least a fourth degree black belt.

To teach “global citizenship,” one would normally be expected to be not only a “global citizen” but the holder of a black belt in “global citizenship.” Yet, in the absence of a World Republic to which we all swear loyalty, GC “experts” are self-declared. Intentionally or not, are those who allow themselves to be held up as “experts” doing a disservice to the consumers whom they educate?

Duties of National Citizenship versus “Global Citizenship”

National citizenship provides holders of citizenship with certain rights and also requires them to fulfill certain duties. The rights of citizens are outlined in constitutions and other foundational documents. They are guaranteed in any nation that respects the rule of law. Duties of national citizens, unlike those of “global citizens” are not self-assessed and are more than aspirational. US citizens, for example, are expected to subscribe to the law, to pay taxes, to receive basic education, and to serve on juries when summoned to do so. In many nations, able-bodied males are also required to defend the nation. Failure to comply in any of these areas can result in severe sanctions and penalties, including imprisonment.

In the case of the Peoples’ Republic of China, there are also specific rights afforded to citizens as well as duties:

1. Follow the Constitution: Article 53 enjoins on all citizens “to abide by the Constitution and the law, keep state secrets, protect public property and observe labor discipline and public order and respect social ethics.”
2. Safeguard the Unity of the Nation.
3. Safeguard the Honor of China.
4. Perform Military Service and Defend the Motherland.
5. Pay Taxes.
6. Receive Education.
7. Other Duties: Married Chinese couples have the duty to practice family planning and help the state in controlling the growth of population. Further, parents have the duty to rear and educate their minor children. It is the duty of the adult children to look after and help their parents. Workers have the duty to do their work efficiently and follow the labor discipline.³⁰

³⁰Tanvi Priya, “Fundamental Rights and Duties of the Chinese Citizens,” *Political Science*, last accessed on April 1, 2018. <http://www.politicalsciencenotes.com/china/fundamental-rights-and-duties-of-the-chinese-citizens/1400>

This is not to suggest that such rights and duties could not be established for a global nation. However, those rights and duties do not exist at the present time.

“Global Citizenship” and the Social Contract

Thomas Hobbes is probably the most prominent figure who explained the emergence of the state in response to the inherent threat and dangers to the “state of nature.” Hobbes emphasized that evil predilections within human beings are inherent and a consequence of what he viewed as humanity’s “fallen state.” For his part, Rousseau, also a proponent of the social contract, held a more benign view of human nature, arguing that human nature is inherently inclined to innocence and non-violence. Leo Strauss argues that, in Rousseau’s view, “the modern state based on self-preservation constitutes a way of life precisely contrary to that which would make men happy.”³¹ Rousseau felt that societal corruption leads to problems forcing people into social contracts. Rousseau emphasizes that the realization of the general will rather than anyone’s “particular will” should serve as the focus of the state and sovereign power.

In the case of the United States, the Federalist Papers and the Anti-Federalist papers reflected the debate amongst the leadership of the states that participated in the American Revolution. These conflicting viewpoints brought the differing and sometimes contradictory views to the forefront that the future U.S. Constitution had to address, including slavery and the representation of the member states such as Pennsylvania, Virginia, Rhode Island, and New York in federal governance, i.e., based on population versus representation by state. Through the revolutionary war (1775-1783), the framers of the constitution discovered the inadequacies of their initial “social contract,” that is, the Articles of Confederation (1781). This led them to enter into debate on the positives and negatives of ceding more of their sovereignty to the federal government through a stronger constitution leading to the formation of “a more perfect union.”³² In the case of the European Union, there have been longstanding and still inchoate efforts in moving from the initial European Coal and Steel Community (1952) to the Treaty of Lisbon (2009). The 2016 withdrawal of Great Britain from the European Union (Brexit) reminded us that the EU identity, though impressive and hopeful, has not been fully realized. The path to world integration, based on the example of the European Union, as well as other less advanced integration processes such as customs unions in other parts of the world, is suggested in **Figure One** below:

World Federation

↑

World Economic Union

↑

World Common Market

↑

³¹ Leo Strauss and Joseph Cropsey (eds.), *History of Political Philosophy*, Third Edition, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987), p. 560.

³² “The Constitution of the United States,” last accessed on May 1, 2018.

<http://constitutionus.com/>

World Customs Union
 ↑
Free World Trade Agreement
 ↑
Preferred World Trade Agreement³³

[Figure One: Steps in the process of political and economic integration]

The summer 2018 current round of debate on the re-implementation of tariffs on aluminum, steel and agricultural products³⁴ confirms that our world remains distant even from a World Free Trade Agreement, let alone a World Federation where states would surrender a significant portion of their sovereignty to a global government. In Kant's *Perpetual Peace*, he sensed that the world around him was unlikely to do more than allow for free trade and agree to Universal Hospitality for citizens from neighboring republics. He explains the limitations and implications of such hospitality as follows:

Hospitality means the right of a stranger not to be treated as an enemy when he arrives in the land of another. One may refuse to receive him when this can be done without causing his destruction; but, so long as he peacefully occupies his place, one may not treat him with hostility. It is not the right to be a permanent visitor that one may demand. A special beneficent agreement would be needed in order to give an outsider a right to become a fellow inhabitant for a certain length of time. It is only a right of temporary sojourn, a right to associate, which all men have. They have it by virtue of their common possession of the surface of the earth, where, as a globe, they cannot infinitely disperse and hence must finally tolerate the presence of each other. Originally, no one had more right than another to a particular part of the earth.³⁵

Given the enormous challenges to constitutional democracy and rule of law in wide portions of today's world, one can relate to Kant's assumption that the world was not

³³ I have adapted this diagram for use in my political and economic integration graduate course. The steps toward integration (with the exception of the discussion of preferred trade agreements) are covered in this World Trade Organization piece: Daniel Brou and Michele Ruta, "Economic integration, political integration or both?" World Trade Organization, August 2007, last accessed on May 17, 2018.

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1022.1945&rep=rep1&type=pdf> For the convenience of readers, one can also consult this non-academic *Investopedia* link, which succinctly refers to steps towards complete economic integration without addressing political integration: <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/e/economic-integration.asp>

³⁴ Lorne Cooke, "EU braces for US to go ahead with steel and aluminum tariffs." AP, May 22, 2018, last accessed July 13, 2018.

<https://www.apnews.com/f861cbfe69f84917ad1b020d3094d190>

³⁵ Immanuel Kant, "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch," 1795.

http://fs2.american.edu/dfagel/www/Class%20Readings/Kant/Immanuel%20Kant,%20Perpetual%20Peace_.pdf, last accessed on May 19, 2018.

ready for a world republic in his time. The European Union clearly outlined requirements related to democracy, rule of law, and market accessibility as criteria for entry into its economic union. “Global citizenship” educators emphasize listening to others with different views. *They do not grapple with the hard steps that follow the listening.*

Is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights the Social Contract for “Global Citizens?”

Proponents of “global citizenship” point to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the international human rights documents that ensue from it as their reference point, as their “Social Contract.” Indeed, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is a magnificent foundational document and guidepost for the insurance of the protection of human rights; however, it is not a social contract. As we have already noted, it is a *declaration* rather than a treaty. One can ride on the wings of advocacy and assert that the UDHR constitutes customary international law or even argue that it supersedes the laws of nation-states. Yet must one not recognize that there are a variety of substantive challenges to this position? The University of Missouri School Of Law provides useful sources on the interface between US Law and International Human Rights Law and provides guidelines and case studies that American lawyers in the field need to be apprised of:

...new practitioners should seek to understand the extent to which international human rights law actually operates in U.S. law. Thus far, the U.S. has ratified only three of the core U.N. human rights treaties: the CCPR (Covenant on Civil and Political Rights); the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination; and, the Convention against Torture (CAT). However, these treaties are non-self-executing meaning in essence that “these treaties do not give rise directly to individually enforceable rights in U.S. courts.”³⁶

The United States is not alone in having established delimitations on the applications of the UDHR and related international human rights law in its jurisprudence. The Cairo Declaration that we have already referred to and which has been ratified by forty-five Islamic countries clearly delineates between certain aspects of the UDHR and Shariah law, which is viewed as superseding the UDHR in those domains. Furthermore, important constituencies both within the Russian government and the Russian Orthodox Church express deep reservations regarding the UDHR because of its decidedly Western focus and its emphasis on the rights of the individual over the rights of the broader community.³⁷ China, for its part, is frequently cited for its failure to respect UDHR.³⁸ It emphasizes in its

³⁶“International Human Rights Law in US Courts, Introduction, *School of Law, University of Missouri*, accessed on May 15, 2018. <https://libraryguides.missouri.edu/intlhumrhtsinuscourts>

³⁷ Robert Coalson, “Russian Conservatives Challenge Notion Of 'Universal' Values,” *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, December 10, 2008, last accessed on May 3, 2018. https://www.rferl.org/a/Russian_Conservatives_Challenge_Notion_Of_Universal_Values/1358106.html

³⁸ See, for example, Mark C. Eades, “China’s Excuses for Its Human Rights Record Don’t Hold

foreign policy the centrality of non-interference as the basis upon which it conducts interstate relations. “Global citizen” advocacy groups such as Harvard’s School of Education, Oxfam, or the *Global Citizen*³⁹ seem to downplay the limited enforceability of UDHR. If it is not doing so⁴⁰, it might be valuable for the faculty of Harvard’s School of Education to enter into serious dialogue about the viability of its views on “global citizenship” and UDHR with faculty from Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School of Government and Harvard Law School.

They could also pay more heed to reactions by representatives of countries in the Global South to the replacing of national identities with “global citizenship.” Nico Jooste and Savo Heleta of South Africa’s Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University describe “global citizenship” as an “oxymoron.” They argue that it is not “worthwhile to spend time and resources on its vague rhetoric and its attempts to popularize buzzwords while the majority of students in the global South live in an unjust world.” Jooste and Heleta argue in favor of having the students of the developing world be prepared not as “global citizens” but as “globally competent graduates who are fully aware of their roles in the quest for a better tomorrow for their communities, countries, regions, and the world as a whole.”⁴¹

“Global citizenship,” they argue, is presented as a “state of mind” but they point to Bowden’s warning that “this creates a tension for those who do not regard it as the role of higher education institutions to realize states of mind, but to provide knowledge and skills.”⁴² Jooste and Heleta warn that the Western view of the world is based on individualism and they argue that “if individualism is a key tenet of global citizenship, this will be in direct conflict with customs, norms and values in many societies around the world, which prefer communal living.” They make the following observation regarding “global citizenship” proponents:

They are only attempting to repackage basic common sense and human decency, social responsibility, and good critical thinking skills, coupled with the knowledge awareness and care for global issues into a new movement, a creation of a new “learned” elite known as global citizens who are open-minded and enlightened, unlike their close-minded, “nationalistic,” and “tribalistic” peers who apparently do not care about the people or world

Water,” US News, January 17, 2014. <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2014/01/17/china-has-no-excuse-for-its-poor-human-rights-record> or Matthew Gilber and Ian Turner, “Universal Declaration of Human rights: China’s Violations in Tibet,” *UDHR Tibet Weekly*, last accessed on May 4, 2018. <https://udhrtibet.weebly.com/udhr-violations.html>

³⁹ *Global Citizen*, last accessed on May 24, 2018, <https://www.globalcitizen.org/en/>

⁴⁰ Reimers has been a faculty associate in the Kennedy School’s Center for International Development since 2002.

⁴¹ Nico Jooste and Savo Heleta, “Global Citizenship versus Globally Competent Graduates: A Critical View from the South,” *Journal of Studies in International Education* Vol. 21, Issue 1, 2017, last accessed on April 28, 2018.

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1028315316637341>

⁴² *Ibid.*

beyond their ethnic or religious groups or outside the borders of their countries.”⁴³

Conclusion

While the advocates of “global citizenship” appear to exude hope, emphasizing the unifying potential of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), there are other issues that they tend to de-emphasize and even ignore. Freedom House, which surveys the extent to which countries embrace or distance themselves from the ideals of liberal democracy and constitutional government, indicates that, over the past decade, the level of democratic rule in the world has declined rather than progressed. In 2006 47% of the world was deemed free, 30% was viewed as partially free and 23% was viewed as not free. In 2016, 45% of the countries were deemed free, 30% still partially free and 25% classified as not free.⁴⁴

The actual realization of a world republic such as Kant had considered in writing *Perpetual Peace* would require sufficient ripeness in world consciousness to prompt discussion of a world-level social contract that could bring nations together with a willingness to surrender a portion of their sovereignty to a higher world-level political institution. If a consensus existed on this matter, it would lead to a Constitution of the United Nations of the World that could be ratified by UN member states similar to the way in which member states have ratified the treaties leading up to the European Union or the decision of the freed British colonies in North America to ratify the United States Constitution between 1787 and 1790. In the latter case, the signatory states agreed to relinquish their control over interstate commerce; they surrendered their right to conduct their own defense and foreign policy and they accepted that the disputes between states would be adjudicated through the federal court system.

None of the steps towards integration mentioned above is currently in place to realize a “more perfect”⁴⁵ world union for “global citizens.” Without establishing a United Nations-sanctioned and, dare I say, a Security Council resolution-based definition of “global citizenship,”⁴⁶ which we are far from doing, today’s “global citizenship” world represents a de facto “failed state.” “Failed State” research scholar Robert Rotberg emphasizes that, more than anything else, a state must be able to provide its people with “security,

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ *Populists and Autocrats: The Dual Threat to Global Democracy—Freedom in the World 2017*, (New York: Freedom House, 2017), p. 4.

⁴⁵ “Preamble,” *The Constitution of the United States*, accessed on June 14, 2081.

<http://constitutionus.com>

⁴⁶ The United Nations Security Council has as three of its principle mandates “to maintain international peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations; to investigate any dispute or situation which might lead to international friction; to recommend methods of adjusting such disputes or the terms of settlement.” It is also the Security Council’s responsibility to “recommend the admission of new members.” *United Nations Security Council “Functions and Powers,”* last accessed on June 17, 2018.

<http://www.un.org/en/sc/about/functions.shtml>

especially human security.”⁴⁷ If a state cannot provide this, it is by definition a “failed state.”⁴⁸

Proponents of “global citizenship” have no way to provide security for the inhabitants of the globe. Under the United Nations, economic sanctions and military actions are approved not by the Secretary General but by the Security Council. Within that Council, the P-5 or Permanent Members each may exercise the power of the veto to impede military actions or other sanctions from being approved by the UN. Any one of the five permanent members thus may block what other members deem as critical to the protection and maintenance of human security.

The Security Council’s role as enforcer confirms that extant international organizations and thus “global citizenship” remain hostage to collective security measures that require the buy-in of major world powers who, through the UN Security Council, determine whether or not to take the collective security measures needed to address regional problems. Depending on the conflict, other regional powers, beyond the P-5, also must be consulted on collective security measures. These regional powers include Germany, Japan, Turkey, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and India. Here we might also add North Korea, Pakistan, and Israel because they possess nuclear weapons.

No consensus exists among the P-5 or the aforementioned regional or nuclear powers regarding “global citizenship.” Depending on a regional power’s hierarchy of national values (with the English-speaking developed world probably being the audience most receptive), “global citizenship”’s proponents will find themselves lauded or demeaned depending on the P-5 nation that they visit. The P-5 and the other regional powers serve as the de facto “war lords” of our very inchoate “world republic.”

Today’s world functions not based on “global citizens” but on cooperation amongst nations, international organizations, International non-governmental organizations and other global actors and advocates to uncover and address the challenges that we face. At this point in history we cannot be prescriptive regarding “strong” or “exceptional” “global citizenship;” we can at best speculate on what *real* “global citizenship” might eventually mean.

References

Aksu, Esref (ed.), *Early Notions of Global Governance—Selected Eighteenth Century Proposals for ‘Perpetual Peace.’* Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 2008.

Bohman, James and Lutz-Bachmann, Matthias (eds.). *Perpetual Peace—Essays on Kant’s Cosmopolitan Ideal.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1997.

⁴⁷ Robert I. Rotberg, (ed.), *State Failure and State Weakness in a Time of Terror*, (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2003). p. 3.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

Brou, Daniel and Ruta, Michele. "Economic integration, political integration or both?" World Trade Organization, August 2007, last accessed on July 12, 2018.

<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.1022.1945&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

The Cairo Declaration on Human Rights in Islam, August 5, 1990, last accessed on March 12, 2018.

<http://hrlibrary.umn.edu/instree/cairodeclaration.html>.

Cameron, John David. "Communicating Cosmopolitanism and Motivating Global Citizenship." In: *Political Studies*, November 3, 2017. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0032321717726919>

Carpenter, Sara; Chum, Anthony & Weber, Nadya. "Conflict and convergence: theories and practices for global citizenship and adult education." Paper presented at the 37th Annual SCUTREA Conference, 3-5 July 2007, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, last accessed on May 14, 2016.

<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/163956.htm>

"Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice." San Francisco: The United Nations Organizing Committee, 1945, last accessed on May 2, 2018.

<https://treaties.un.org/doc/publication/ctc/uncharter.pdf>

Coalson, Robert. "Russian Conservatives Challenge Notion of 'Universal' Values." *Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty*, December 10, 2008, last accessed on May 3, 2018.

https://www.rferl.org/a/Russian_Conservatives_Challenge_Notion_Of_Universal_Values/1358106.html

Cooke, Lorne. "EU braces for US to go ahead with steel and aluminum tariffs."

AP, May 22, 2018, last accessed July 13, 2018.

<https://www.apnews.com/f861cbfe69f84917ad1b020d3094d190>

von Drehle, David. "A Lesson in Hate: How an Egyptian student came to study 1950s America and left determined to wage holy war." In: *Smithsonian Magazine*, February 2016, last accessed May 16, 2008.

<https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/a-lesson-in-hate-109822568/#Qrezxi1B2SKXA3he.99>

Eades, Mark C. "China's Excuses for Its Human Rights Record Don't Hold Water." *US News*, January 17, 2014. <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2014/01/17/china-has-no-excuse-for-its-poor-human-rights-record>

Fukuyama, Francis with Gorlach, Alexander. "Democracy needs Elites." *Huffington Post*, March 2, 2017.

https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/francis-fukuyama-democracy-elites_us_58b5a2cfe4b0780bac2d8ea3

Fukuyama, Francis. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: The Free Press, Simon & Schuster, 2006.

Fukuyama, Francis. "The Global Rise of Populist Nationalism." *Youtube.com*, July 14, 2017.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ILGdOPaybl4>

Gilber, Matthew and Turner, Ian. "Universal Declaration of Human rights: China's Violations in Tibet." *UDHR Tibet Weekly*, last accessed on May 4, 2018. <https://udhrtibet.weebly.com/udhr-violations.html>

Goren, Helen and Yemini, Miri. "Global Citizenship Education redefined—A Systematic Review of Empirical Studies on Global Citizenship Education." In: *International Journal of Educational Research*, vol. 82, 2017, p. 170-183, last accessed on March 18, 2018.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0883035516308163>

- Goren, Helen and Yemeni, Miri. "The Global Citizenship Gap: Teacher Perceptions of the Relationship between Global Citizenship Education and Students Socio-Economic Status." In: *International Journal of Educational Research*, Volume 67, October 2017, p. 9-22. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0742051X1730834X>
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*, 1651, Project Gutenberg. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/3207/3207-h/3207-h.htm>
- Habermas, Jurgen (trans. Max Pensky). *The Postnational Constellation—Political Essays*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2007.
- Human Rights Watch. "China: Ratify Key International Human Rights Treaty—Credibility of Rights Council Campaign at Issue," October 8, 2013. <https://www.hrw.org/news/2013/10/08/china-ratify-key-international-human-rights-treaty>
- Huntington, Samuel. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of the World, Order*. New York: Touchstone, Simon & Schuster, 1997.
- Jones, Elspeth; Coelen, Robert; Beelen, Jos & de Wit, Hans (eds.). In: *Global and Local Internationalization, Global Perspectives on Higher Education*, vol. 34, 2016, last accessed on May 19, 2018. <https://www.sensepublishers.com/media/2594-global-and-local-internationalization.pdf>
- Jooste, Nico and Heleta, Savo. "Global Citizenship versus Globally Competent Graduates: A Critical View from the South." In: *Journal of Studies in International Education*, vol. 21, issue 1, 2017, accessed on April 28, 2018. <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1028315316637341>
- Kant, Immanuel. *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, 1795, https://slought.org/media/files/perpetual_peace.pdf
- Lagos, Taso G. "Global Citizenship—Towards a Definition." Unpublished, last accessed May 16, 2018. <https://depts.washington.edu/gcp/pdf/globalcitizenship.pdf>
- Levitt, Peggy and Nyiri, Pal. "Books, Bodies, and Bronzes: Comparing Sites of Global Citizenship Creation," vol. 37, 2014 - issue 12, Pages 2149-2157 | Received 06 Jan 2014, Accepted 26 Feb 2014, Published online: 14 Aug 2014. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01419870.2014.934263>
- Lyons, Kevin; Hanley, Joanne; Wearing, Stephen & Neil, John. "Gap Year Volunteer Tourism: Myths of Global Citizenship?" In: *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), p. 361-378, January 2012. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S016073831100079X>
- Olayemi, Abdul Azeez Maruf; Alabi, Abdul Majeed Hamza & Buang, Ahmad Hidayah. "Islamic Human Rights Law: A Critical Evaluation of UIDHR & CDHRI in Context of UDHR," In: *Journal of Islam, Law and Judiciary*, Vol. I, Issue 3, 2015, pp. 27-36. <http://joils.discinternational.org/index.php/joils/article/view/13>
- OXFAM, Education for Global Citizenship – A guide for schools. Oxford, UK: OXFAM, 2015, last accessed on December 11, 2017. <https://www.oxfam.org.uk/education/resources/education-for-global-citizenship-a-guide-for-schools>
- Perrottet, Claude. "Kant's Perpetual Peace: The New World Order of Critical Philosophy." In: *The Journal of Global Development and Peace*, Vol. I, 2009, pp. 4-33, last accessed on July 1, 2009. <https://www.bridgeport.edu/docs/Research/Journal-of-Global-Development-and-Peace/Journal-for-GLDP-2009.pdf>

- Pinghua, Sun. "On Significance of the Birth of Universal Declaration of Human Right. China Human Rights, last accessed on May 17, 2018. http://www.chinahumanrights.org/CSHRS/Magazine/Text/t20091223_524609.htm
- Priya, Tanvi. "Fundamental Rights and Duties of the Chinese Citizens." In: *Political Science*, last accessed on April 1, 2018. <http://www.politicalsciencenotes.com/china/fundamental-rights-and-duties-of-the-chinese-citizens/1400>
- Quilliam Admin. "Perspective—Human Rights: The Universal Declaration versus the Cairo Declaration," *Quilliam*, December 2012. <https://www.quilliaminternational.com/human-rights-the-universal-declaration-vs-the-cairo-declaration/>
- Reimers, Fernando M.; Chopra, Vidur; Chung, Connie K.; Higdon, Julia & O'Donnell, E.B. *Empowering Global Citizens—A World Course*. Charleston: Create Space Independent Publishing Platform, 2016.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. Edited and introduced by G.D.H. Cole. *The Social Contract and Discourses*, 1761, <http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/rousseau-the-social-contract-and-discourses>.
- Strauss, Leo and Cropsey, Joseph (eds.). *History of Political Philosophy*. Third Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.
- Stringer, Kate "74 Interview: Harvard's Fernando Reimers on the Crucial Need to Teach Kids to Be Strong Global Citizens." *The 74 Interview*, May 21, 2017, last accessed on April 28, 2018. <https://www.the74million.org/article/74-interview-harvards-fernando-reimers-on-the-crucial-need-to-teach-kids-to-be-strong-global-citizens/>
- Tuck, Richard. *The Rights of War and Peace—Political Thought and the International Order from Grotius to Kant*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- UNESCO. "Citizenship." Learning to live Together, last accessed on April 28, 2018. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/international-migration/glossary/citizenship/>
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The United Nations, 1948, last accessed on May 16, 2018. http://www.un.org/en/udhrbook/pdf/udhr_booklet_en_web.pdf
- University of Missouri School of Law. "International Human Rights Law in US Courts, Introduction," last accessed on May 15, 2018. <https://libraryguides.missouri.edu/intlhumrghtsinuscourts>
- 2015 Wisconsin Global Youth Summit. "What makes someone a 'global Citizen'?" University of Wisconsin, Madison, last accessed on May 17, 2018. http://international.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/WGYS2015_Global-Citizenship.pdf