

This edition of Issues in Global Education deals with dual or multiple citizenship, world or global citizenship, and what each of those ideas means to our future. These notions are fundamentally involved with matters of identity, immigration policies, and global problems or issues that transcend national boundaries. We can only begin to address these factors, introducing students to this significant area of potential controversy. The topic is both provocative and challenging, but is one that can fruitfully lead to a reflective examination of the globalization process and the meaning of citizenship.

We begin with an attempt by one organization to define world citizenship, and to examine why the historical record suggests it has not been achieved thus far. It presents a case for world citizenship. As you read and discuss this material, think about both historical and present-day political organizations, from the United States to the United Nations to the European Union to OPEC; and about individual nations that deal with each other through war, terrorism, treaties, or various types of oral or written agreements on an ongoing basis.

CITIZENSHIP: NATIONAL OR WORLD? OR BOTH?

Can there ever be a “citizen of the world?” That is, a citizen who does not owe allegiance to one single community, state, or nation, but rather owes allegiance to the entire human race—without boundaries, without regard to race, ethnicity, social/economic condition, or place of birth? People have sometimes referred to “the universal man/woman” but that has generally alluded to a person who is a citizen of a particular nation, but who has thoughts and practices activities that are international, transnational, or global in nature. Is it possible to be born in the United States, but actually be a citizen of the world? Children who are born in the United States to parents who are citizens of another country, have what is known as “dual citizenship.” If you grew up with this status, here are some of the issues that would arise. Where would your loyalty reside? How would your birth certificate read? Would you need one? Would you vote, and in which country? Would there be, as in the film *Titanic*, a “King of the World?” Could you travel anywhere? Would you need a passport? If you wouldn’t need one, what would you need? In many cases today, all that is needed to cross borders is a certified birth certificate. Is, the world’s surface, as some would suggest, basically open to all? Are problems such as global warming, genocide, resource exploitation, and the like, universally a problem for all? Or does a nation such as the United States, for example, have an overriding “national interest” in the supply of oil from the Middle East, and thus protect those interests with force?

World Citizenship Defined

From the World Citizen Foundation

The World: universally outgoing, conceptually unbounded. The planet dynamically, synergistically and organically one with itself and the cosmos.

Citizenship: the restrictive rights and duties within a given social structure.

The two words together seem paradoxical. “You can educate either the citizen or the man,” wrote Thoreau. Yet in their union lies the potential success of the human species; in their non-union lies the demise of a fatally-flawed creature that could not overcome its self-imposed global anarchy.

This is the perennial mystery of the conceptual “joining” the perceptual. How and where does the spirit dwell in the body?

World citizenship today implies the joining of the perennial wisdom of humankind with

up-to-the-minute geo-political and geo-technical reality.

“The term ‘world citizen’ can be better understood with a negative definition than with a positive one. If a citizen of a state with political frontiers is expected to pay allegiance to the government of the state to which he or she belongs and is expected to take arms against aliens who might invade the territory of the state, a world citizen recognizes the entire world as one’s state and in principle does not recognize any

member of one's own species as an alien to the world community to which oneself belongs. Such a person recognizes the earth as one's sustaining mother, the innate inviolable laws of nature as one's protecting father, all sentient beings as one's homes. The world citizen's allegiance is to the foundation of truth, the universality of knowledge and the fundamental ground of all values."

Guru Nitya Chattanya Yati, founder/head, East-West University

Before the industrial age and the electronic revolution, the identity and functioning boundary of social units was largely determined by the nation-state and the barriers of geography. The workings of government and the writings of history were from non-global perspectives. Loyalty to the feudal prince, and later to the sovereign king, was direct, one-dimensional and absolute. Society was . . . determined by the human voice. The development of the printing press and, in 1844, electronic information transfer, established lines of communication from one relatively isolated social unit to another. A person's thoughts now could be known instantly from a distance. One did not have to know him or her personally. Indirect political representation was born. Inevitably the notion that the governed should have a voice in government became increasingly popular. Democracy, kindled in the context of rising expectations, inflamed revolution after revolution from east to west, north to south.

Yet here was born a tragic paradox, for the essence of democracy is universal participatory decision-making, whereas national sovereignty, a hangover from feudalism and the absolute sovereignty of kings, is based upon exclusivity and the non-participation of citizens outside the national boundary. Citizens "belonged" to the nation only while all humans outside that nation were "foreigners," or worse, "aliens."

This tragic contradiction begins to be

socially instilled almost at birth. One is not born a human or, politically, a world citizen, but rather "French," "English," "American," "Russian," "Chinese," or "Iranian." One could add that all labels at birth—"black," "white," "Arab," "Jew," "Catholic," etc.—are essentially false when contrasted with the reality of the human emerging from a human womb into the world of humans.

Personal qualities are simplistically attached to national (and other) labels, rendering violence and aggression easy to justify by their leaders. We are "good," "noble," "best," etc., because we are "British," or "American," or "Russian." Others, are *ipso facto* "bad," "ignoble," "inferior." Unlike us, they are threats to be feared, even killed.

Those who identified directly with the world of humans were considered starry-eyed idealists, utopians, sentimental humanitarians, impractical moralists, or simply crackpots. The only empirical world "citizens" were the pirates sailing freely on the open seas. They were the forerunners of the multinational corporations, the world "citizens" of the industrial world. The practical world, the world of the 17th, 18th and 19th century political power, was channeled into a framework based on unreality, the fiction of nationalism.

Then came the 20th century. Speed of transportation increased 100-fold in a few decades. Electricity and electronics linked the global surface, eliminating time and distance implosively as barriers between humans and leaving only divisive ideas, language and politics, the surrogate of religion. A new dimension was added, which, if translated, was the element of reciprocal support, or universality and wholeness.

Almost overnight, the world became historically speaking, one community, yet without overall management. The 17th, 18th, and 19th century sovereign state system, imposed by largely reactionary leaders, with notable exceptions,

on the 20th-century world four major revolutions: technological, electronic, nuclear and space, proved and is proving daily to be totally inadequate to solve global human problems.

Indeed, the nation-centered way of "solving" problems is the major problem! The nation-state, by insisting on its absolute sovereignty, has become suicidal for the entire human species.

Today, with virtually no distance and no time between humans, each person is the focus of a global input. Everything happening in the world affects, sooner or later, each individual. With computers and satellites, the input to the individual has become fully supranational. Yet this irrefutable fact and its radical implications are popularly ignored.

A Middle East war raises the price of oil for everyone; an atomic bomb exploding in the South Pacific can mean leukemia for a baby born in Dayton, Ohio; dumping radioactive waste off the coast of Florida can mean radioactive fish caught by fishermen off the coast of Iceland, Great Britain, France or Spain; a shortwave radio placed anywhere on the surface of the globe receives a babble of voices—and ideas—from all corners of the world community.

Everything is happening at once and everything is happening to everybody. This is the most revolutionary fact of any century.

Yet what of the individual's output? Here, the reciprocal truth is, if possible, even less realized. If everything is happening directly to everyone, then every individual should be outputting directly to everything. This means simply that every individual should have the capability of direct democratic effect on the world at large. The world's individuals should constitute for themselves a global governing body to represent each individual as an outputting co-trustee of the earth as a whole.

An apt analogy is the human body itself. Each cell is linked to the whole by

a nervous system directly connected to the human “computer,” the brain. For this almost unbelievable coordinating mechanism to order the necessary action required by a specific threatening situation, there is instant feedback from hurt cells. The “government” operates on the basis of both individual and common good; thus it is “global,” not “national” or “local” in character.

Government itself can be likened to the brain or the management mechanism by which the entire organism and each individual cell or unit can be fulfilled in terms of the triad of self, local community and the entire human community. The evolution of the computer today promises instantaneous input and output potential to each human and to all humanity, thus for the first time in history permitting world government and global institutions to take their rightful place in human institutions.

World citizenship, then, is the only dynamic and imperative political identity capable of relinking the conceptual or moral value of the human being with the social and economic organization of his/her now planetary community. It expresses both the innate and inalienable sovereignty of each human as well as the overall sovereignty of the human species, also innately and inalienably. Thus it fulfills at once the criteria for ethics as well as ethical politics. Also, it connotes a plan of ongoing political action at all levels of social activity, local to global.

If indeed the nation-state has lost its legitimacy as a two-dimensional, horizontal, we-and-they, zero (or negative) sum political entity in a three-dimensional, positive-sum, “We-the-people-of-the-planet-earth” world, then so also has personal commitment to exclusive national citizenship. Just as no one sovereignty or group of sovereignties can directly prevent any other from unleashing a third international war, so also can no amount of commitment by merely national leaders bring the world situa-

tion under control.

But just as national citizenship had to be taught, learned and experienced in former centuries, not without great turmoil to the social norms of the period, so world citizenship must now be taught, learned and experienced.

To think, feel and act globally is almost without precedent in our recorded history. Only rare prophets have managed to do so, but without the aid of modern science and technology. And so they were vilified and put to death. But now, faced with Armageddon, we must all become as prophets, for, as Buckminster Fuller put it, “Either war is obsolete, or (humans) are.”

World citizenship is more than merely a political strategy. It “verticalizes” the individual, raising him or her above the “left” and “right” of nationalistic politics, to meet and make functional the

perennial value systems which heretofore have been only the subject of religious credence. Thus it complements and fulfills all religious prophecies and integrates at the same time the synergistic worlds of instantaneous communications, energy and ecology with political power systems and institutions.

The “Promised Land” of the Hebrews, the “Peace on earth,” and “Thy will be done on earth . . .” of the Christians, the benevolent social order of the Moslems, the world fraternal order of the Sikhs, the “Middle Way” of the Buddhists, the “universal world order” of the Baha’is, all are contained in and can grow out of the multidimensional, human, spiritual/political dispensation of universal world citizenship.

There is no other pathway to the future . . . and to the stars.

*Source: Adapted from the World Citizen Foundation
<<http://www.worldgovernment.org/wcd.html>> (Aug 1, 2001)*

What Is a World, or Global Citizen?

[According to Martha Nussbaum, a global citizen is a true humanist in the classical sense. *Ed.*]

Martha Nussbaum, whose major field of research and writing is reform in education, has a major focus on what constitutes a liberal education . . . a “wider ideal . . . a cosmopolitan education, an education for world citizenship” . . . making students into “citizens of the world,” people who can interact competently and respectfully with people and cultures from around the globe. According to Nussbaum, there are “three capacities . . . particularly important to a cultivated humanity. First, one should be able to reflect critically on oneself and one’s traditions, accepting no belief or tradition until it has survived ‘reasons’s demand for consistency and for justification’ . . . Socratic, critically reflective education teaches students ‘to think for themselves.’ Second, one should be able to see oneself not simply as a citizen of a particular locale or a member of a particular group, but also and ‘above all’ as a human being ‘bound to all other human beings by ties of recognition and concern.’ Third, one should possess narrative imagination; one should, that is, be able to understand the world ‘from the point of view of the other.’ These are not the only three capacities that ‘intelligent’ citizenship requires, but they are the guiding aims of world citizenship.”

In this view of global citizenship one does not have to give up a national identity, but could exist in multiple citizen contexts, as long as one is willing to accept the humanity of people wherever found and under any condition.

Source: This appreciation of Martha Nussbaum’s work is extricated from an article by Marilyn Friedman in the January, 2000 issue of Journal of Ethics, “Educating for World Citizenship,” a review of Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education by Martha Nussbaum, p. 586-87

The Matter of Dual or Multiple Citizenships

Dual Citizens in America: An Issue of Vast Proportions and Broad Significance

By Stanley A. Renshon

[Consider whether there is a strong case to be made for national identity and pride. *Ed.*]

Fueled in part by enormous and, in this century, unprecedented numbers of new immigrants, the United States is becoming dramatically more diverse—racially, ethnically, and culturally. The latest census figures show that the number of legal and illegal immigrants living in the United States has almost tripled since 1970, rising from 9.6 million to 26.3 million today and far outpacing the growth of the native-born population. Moreover, a substantial percentage of these immigrants arrive here from countries with very different cultural and political traditions at a time when American cultural values are increasingly questioned by some. A critically important question, therefore, is whether the unprecedented diversity brought about by recent immigration is being achieved at the expense of a common national culture.

. . . The psychological implications and political consequences of having large groups of Americans holding multiple citizenships are rarely, if ever, seriously considered. Yet, such questions go to the very heart of what it means to be an American and a citizen. They also hold enormous implications for the integrity of American civic and cultural traditions. Is it possible to be a fully engaged and knowledgeable citizen of several countries? Is it possible to follow two or more very different cultural traditions? Is it possible to have two, possibly conflicting, core identifications and

attachments? Assuming such things are possible, are they desirable?

WHAT IS DUAL CITIZENSHIP?

At its most basic level, dual or multiple citizenship involves the simultaneous holding of more than one



citizenship or nationality. That is, a person can have each, or many, of the rights and responsibilities that adhere to a citizen in all of the several countries in which he or she is a citizen, regardless of length of time or actual residence in a country, geographical proximity, or the nature of his or her economic, cultural, or political ties.

How could a person owe allegiance or fully adhere to the responsibilities of citizenship in several countries at the same time? In the United States, the legal answer is: easily.

The United States does not formally recognize dual citizenship, but neither does it take any stand—politically or legally—against it. No American citizen

can lose his or her citizenship by undertaking the responsibilities of citizenship in one or more other countries. This is true even if those responsibilities include obtaining a second or even a third citizenship, swearing allegiance to a foreign state, voting in another country's election, serving in the armed forces (even in combat positions, and even if the state is a "hostile" one), running for office and, if successful, serving. Informed constitutional judgment suggests Congress could legislatively address any of these or other issues arising out of these multiple, perhaps conflicting, responsibilities. Yet, to date, it has chosen not to do so.

A person in the United States may acquire multiple citizenships in any one of four ways. First, he or she may be born in the United States to immigrant parents: All children born in the United States are US citizens regardless of the status of their parents (*jus soli*). Second, a person may be born outside the United States to one parent who is a US citizen and another who is not. A child born to an American citizen and British citizen in the United Kingdom, for example, would be a citizen of both countries. Third, a person may become a naturalized citizen of the United States and have that act ignored by his or her country of origin. This is true even if the country of naturalization requires, as the United States does, those naturalizing to "renounce" former citizenship/nationality ties. In the case of the United States, failure to take action consistent with the renunciation carries no penalties, and others countries can, and usually do, ignore that oath of allegiance. Fourth, a person can become a naturalized citizen of the United States and in doing so lose citizenship in his or her

country of origin, but can regain it at any time and still retain US citizenship.

Dual or multiple citizenship is not the same as dual nationality. Citizenship is a political term. It draws its importance from political, economic, and social rights and obligations that adhere to a person by virtue of having been born into, or having become a recognized or certified member of a state.

Nationality, on the other hand, refers primarily to the attachments of members of a community to each other and to that community's ways of viewing the world, practices, institutions, and allegiances. Common community identifications develop through several or more of the following elements: language, "racial" identifications, ethnicity, religion, culture, geography, historical experience, and identification with common institutions and practices.

In many culturally homogenous countries nationality and citizenship coincide, yet they are not synonymous. As one scholar has argued, "an individual's national identity is not necessarily the same as the passport she holds."* This, of course, is precisely the problem . . .

. . . I have established that there are currently 89 countries worldwide that allow some form of multiple citizenship. It is important to underscore, however, that the specific rights and responsibilities that accrue to such citizens vary.

Some countries allow their citizens to become dual citizens but balk at allowing immigrants to their country to do so (Germany). New Zealand now permits dual nationality unless, in a specific instance, this "is not conducive to the public good." The French Civil Code formerly provided that any adult who voluntarily accepted another nationality would automatically forfeit French citizenship, but this provision was amended in 1973 so that now "any adult, habitually residing abroad, who voluntarily accepts another nationality will only lose the French nationality if he expressly so declares." Some countries, like Algeria and France, allow their nationals to chose which country's armed forces to

join. Others do not. Irish citizens in Britain may vote and sit in Parliament. The Irish constitution was changed in 1984 to permit Britons living in the republic to vote in elections to the lower house of the Irish national parliament. Spain does not permit those who hold Latin American citizenships to vote or stand for election. Peru, Argentina, and Colombia allow absentee voting by their dual citizens. El Salvador, Panama, Uruguay, and the Dominican Republic do not. The new Mexican law creates Mexican dual citizenship (but not dual nationality) and regulates it. Holders of Declaration of Mexican Nationality IDs will not be able to vote or hold political office in Mexico, to serve in the Mexican Armed Forces, or to work aboard Mexican-flagged ships or airlines. It is possible to both permit and regulate dual citizenship. Most countries that allow it also restrict it, but not the United States.

This brief survey is not meant to be exhaustive. However, it is meant to underscore one important point: Countries that allow multiple citizenships vary substantially in the specific ways and the extent to which they encourage or limit the responsibilities and advantages of their multi-citizenship nationals.

SO WHAT? MULTIPLE CITIZENSHIP AND AMERICAN IMMIGRATION

There are vast numbers of various immigrants coming into the United States . . . These numbers establish a basic and important fact: American immigration policy is resulting in the admission of large numbers of persons from countries that have taken legislative steps (for economic, political, and cultural reasons) to maintain and foster their ties with countries from which

they emigrated. One may disagree about the importance or implications of these facts, but not with their presence.

. . . Is there now, or was there ever, a national American identity? If so, of what elements does it consist? Whatever one's answers, and historically there have been many, these are matters of content—whether the focus be ideals, customs, emotional attachments, "creeds," values, or psychologies. Less appreciated is another question that has become increasingly prominent in the last four decades: Even if there is an American national identity, is it legitimate to ask immigrants to subscribe to it? Increasingly the answer from immigrant advocates and their political allies is, "No."

Assimilation—with its implications that there is a national American identity and immigrants choosing to come here should, in good faith, try to embrace it—is "contested," to borrow a somewhat dainty post-modern term that hardly does justice to the fierce assault on it as a normative and descriptive model. At one time, that had been both the expectation and the reality. It seems obvious that immigrants who enter a country where this view of assimilation is operative and legitimate enter a different country than one in which it is not. It also seems obvious that the potential meaning and implications of having enormous numbers of immigrants entering the United States with dual or multiple attachments to other countries also differs in the two cases.

Stanley A. Renshon is Professor of Political Science at the City University of New York, a certified psychoanalyst, and the author of six books and over sixty articles. (srenshon@gc.cuny.edu)

Source: Adapted from Stanley A. Renshon. July 2000. "Dual Citizens in America: An Issue of Vast Proportions and Broad Significance." Background. Washington DC: Center for Immigration Studies <<http://www.cis.org>> (Aug 1, 2001)

Articles appearing in *Issues in Global Education (Issues)* represent the opinion of the authors and are not necessarily those of the sponsoring organization. The intent is to encourage dialogue throughout the global education community. Although the editor believes that materials mentioned in *Issues* to be of interest to its readers, it does not reflect an endorsement. We have sought permission to reprint as required. If we have erred, please advise.

Comment on *Issues* articles, announcements, ideas and information about global education should be sent to the editor.

President: Andrew F. Smith
Editor: Don Bragaw <dhb@prodigy.net>
Managing Editor: Ria Boemi
Design: The Seymour Design Group
URL: <http://www.globaled.org>
Issues in Global Education
 The American Forum for Global Education
 120 Wall Street • Suite 2600 • New York, NY 10005
 212-624-1300 • FX: 212-624-1412
 email: globed120@aol.com

© 2001 The American Forum for Global Education ISSN: 1088-8365.

* Peter H. Schuck. 1997. "The Functionality of Citizenship." *Harvard Law Review*, Volume 110, p. 1817.

<http://www.uslawfirm.com>

IRISH CITIZENSHIP PROJECT

Global Thinking . . . International Opportunities

International Opportunities in:

- European Employment
- Real Estate Investing
- Exploring Cultural Heritage
- Safe International Travel
- Corporate Expansion
in the European Union Markets
- Trust/Retirement Planning
- European Investments
- Foreign Study

"There are more than 70 million people throughout the world that can claim Irish descent and 40 million of these are Americans."

Republic of Ireland, Department of Foreign Affairs

"It is perfectly legal for Americans to hold Irish citizenship without losing their American Citizenship."

US Dept of State, Bureau of Consular Affairs

"Irish law permits dual citizenship and does not require applicants to renounce any other citizenship."

Irish Nationality and Citizenship Acts 1956 and 1986 as amended

Irish Citizens are also citizens of the European Union

Irish citizenship/passport will allow you to live and work in Ireland for as long as you wish. Irish citizens are also citizens of the European Union and allowed to live and work in any of the following countries without any barriers.

Belgium	France	Austria
Denmark	Ireland	Portugal
Germany	Italy	Finland
Greece	Luxembourg	Sweden
Spain	The Netherlands	United Kingdom

If you are interested in acquiring Irish citizenship and a passport, please fill in the information on our Preliminary Research & Evaluation Form to see if you are eligible. If eligible, our company provides a broad range of services including acquiring the required birth, death and marriage records in the United States and Ireland, as well as genealogical research if necessary, to secure your Irish citizenship and passport. The fee for this preliminary research and evaluation is \$29.95 USD. You can also mail your request and check to the address below. Checks should be made payable to eMercury, Inc.

[Address and method of payment omitted. *Ed.*]

Member of Irish Chamber of Commerce in the United States, Inc.

Member of The Irish Ancestral Research Association

Source: eMercury, Inc., 45 North Union Ave., Box 969, Lansdowne, PA 19050-0969 <<http://www.uslawfirm.com>> (Aug 1, 2001)

Citizenship for Sale

By James A. Paul

In a world of burgeoning offshore funds and tax havens, the rich are constantly on the lookout for places to hide their money and park their assets. A current trend is to establish multiple citizenships—in countries where non-residents are not subject to taxation or government controls. As *Freebooter* magazine urges its well-heeled readership: “Have a domicile in a tax haven country which meets your personal requirements and where you can enjoy yourself and relax without fear of war or revolution.”

Freebooter recommends that the safest strategy is to have citizenship in several offshore countries so that tax authorities have a harder time tracing suspicious activities.

To accommodate this new demand, citizenships are now offered for sale in many countries. This may seem astonishing, but it is just one more sign of globalization, the weakening of states, and the spread of international tax fraud. Presumably, these purchased citizenships are not subject to service in the army or mandatory jury duty, nor are the “citizens” required to have feelings of patriotism and cultural identity in their adopted country(ies). Rules outlawing dual or multiple citizenship are being relaxed or abolished in many countries, making the process far easier than it was only a few years ago. As a sign of the times, United States citizens (and even public office-holders) have recently run for public office in second countries. In March of 1998, Jesus R. Galvis, a City Council member in Hackensack, New Jersey, ran for the Senate in Colombia, the Latin American nation where he held dual citizenship. Though he lost the senatorial election, the case shows how much immigration laws have changed, since even voting in a foreign election could have led to revocation of US citizenship

in decades past. In 1997, a US citizen was elected President of Lithuania.

Consider the following “Citizen Acquisition Programs” that are reported by *Freebooter*, with information current as of 1995. Note that citizenship often comes with a local driver’s license (no driving test required) as well as a passport. In some cases, investments in the country are a requisite, in addition to the basic fee.

The “Rolls Royce of all citizenship/passport programs” is said to be the Republic of Ireland’s, which carries not only substantial tax advantages but also “lifetime rights to live and work in any EU country” and “the finest visa-free travel document available.” But Ireland is “only for the truly

wealthy” because it requires a very large fee, purchase of a home and a minimum investment of a million pounds sterling.

According to an April 1998 article in the *New York Times*, the United States has been selling access to its citizenship, too, though slightly more indirectly. For an investment of \$500,000, foreigners have been recently able to acquire a “green card”—a document that is a prelude to gaining formal citizenship and allows regular residence in the US. Apparently, many persons used loopholes in this law to obtain green cards with much smaller investments, leveraged by loans.

Source: James A. Paul, October 1997 <<http://www.globalpolicy.org/nations/citizen/citbuy.htm>> (Aug 1, 2001)
Global Policy Forum, 777 UN Plaza, Suite 7G, New York, NY 10017; e-mail: globalpolicy@globalpolicy.org

Citizenship Acquisition Program

The appeal of some countries is their inexpensive citizenship, combined with negligible taxes. The list below shows some of these bargains, for those in the market for cut-rate citizenship and tax havens:

COUNTRY	CITIZENSHIP	NOTES
ARGENTINA	\$35,000	1,2
BAHAMAS	\$150,000	3,4
BELIZE	FROM \$75,000	NA
BOLIVIA	\$29,500	1,2
IRELAND	\$250,000	3,4,5
PANAMA	\$32,500	1
ST. KITTS/NEVIS	\$14,000	3
VENEZUELA	\$35,000	1
URUGUAY	\$38,000	3

Sources: *Freebooter* and *Offshore World*

NOTES: (1) Driver’s license included. (2) Price for adults (children under 18 somewhat lower). (3) Investment in country also required. (4) Sum covers entire family. (5) Applicants must also own a home in the country.

It is not clear whether the sums quoted are charged directly by the government or whether they include fees charged by intermediaries.

Globalization and Citizenship

An International Conference, Geneva, December 9-11, 1996

[The following statement emerged from this UN conference. Attendees considered the question of citizenship in an increasingly global world. *Ed.*]

INTERPRETATIONS OF CITIZENSHIP

It is not surprising that, in the midst of such fundamental and contradictory processes of change, questions of citizenship assume increasing importance. As Alastair Davidson¹ noted, with reference to the works of Norberto Bobbio, “the starting point of citizenship is the attempt by ordinary people to impose order on chaos.”

The end point is not in sight; and to the extent that the construction of citizenship is an ongoing process, it may be illusory to think that there will ever be one. In the view of a number of conference participants, citizenship will always be what we make of it. It is in constant evolution, and to “freeze” its attributes in time does not necessarily contribute to understanding contemporary reality.

Nevertheless, the concept has a past which shapes the way most people in the advanced industrial world understand it. The modern “citizen” is in fact the product of centuries of nation-building, involving protracted struggles over the nature of political allegiance and over the rules governing the exercise of political power within specific geographical territories.

For this reason, as Richard Falk² noted, citizenship is usually defined above all in relation to nationality. Citizens are recognized members of one (or more) national

“Citizenship is a contract about power.”

Mats Karlsson⁷

communities, to which they owe loyalty and from which they expect protection. This is the identity they assume in the international arena, where they interact with citizens of other countries on a basis only modestly regulated by international law and convention.

The sense of solidarity associated with citizenship has thus been won—in relatively new nations as well as older ones—by drawing clear lines between “us” and “them.” Such an undertaking has negative implications that participants felt should be highlighted. Anthony Giddens⁴ drew attention to the endless abuses of the patriotism of citizens that have been perpetrated by regimes pursuing nationalist agendas. Citizens have obligations to states that may go as far as the sacrifice of life itself; and one need only remember the carnage of recent wars to understand the pathological underside of strong commitment to a single national community.

Leaving aside extreme cases of loyalty unto death, one can clearly see other ways in which modern citizenship can promote exclusion in some spheres, while encouraging solidarity in others. E.V.K. Fitzgerald³ noted, for example, that within a context of growing disparity between most and least developed countries today, individuals who can obtain citizenship in relatively more powerful and prosperous national enti-

ties gain benefits that others—remaining outside such systems—are not likely to have. Membership in certain national societies, bringing entitlement to the protection of their governments and access to the social services provided by their states, has become a scarce commodity, for which foreigners are often ready to pay a high price.

The “insider/outsider” dimension of any form of citizenship below the global level became a recurring theme throughout the conference. Nevertheless it was the inclusionary, liberating and democratic potential of citizenship that received most pronounced attention from participants—first as it developed historically within Western society and then as the idea spread to other geographical areas and interacted with other cultures.

“Citizenship,” Elizabeth Jelin⁶ reminded the group, “is about rights.” Traditionally these have been the rights of individuals. Over a long period of struggle, absolutist regimes in Western Europe were forced to recognize such civil rights as freedom of religion, thought and speech, freedom from arbitrary search and seizure, and freedom to organize. They did so only haltingly, and favoured some parts of the population over others. But as a process of democratization (including expanded suffrage) advanced, so did the protection of a series of political rights. These allowed people the opportunity to have a say in determining the rules under which they would interact with public authorities and with other citizens, as well as in electing the officials who would form the government.

1. Mr. Alastair DAVIDSON— Inaugural Professor of Citizenship Studies • Centre for Urban and Social Research
Swinburne University of Technology • Hawthorn, Victoria, Australia

2. Mr. Richard FALK— Professor of International Relations • Center of International Studies • Princeton University • Princeton, NJ, USA

3. Mr. E.V.K. FITZGERALD— Director • Finance and Trade Policy Research Centre • University of Oxford • Oxford, United Kingdom

4. Mr. Anthony GIDDENS— Director • London School of Economics and Political Science • London, United Kingdom

5. Mr. Björn HETTNE— Professor of Peace and Conflict Research • University of Göteborg • Göteborg, Sweden

6. Ms Elizabeth JELIN— Principal Researcher • CONICET • Buenos Aires, Argentina

7. Mr. Mats KARLSSON— State Secretary • Ministry for Foreign Affairs • Stockholm, Sweden

The classical Western “citizen state” can thus be described as a political community, established within a well-defined territory, based upon a system of rights and obligations sanctioned by law, and subject to review by all members through established procedures and in relative equality of conditions. The strong strain of secularism inherent in Western nationalism has ensured that for political purposes “citizens” have been (in Richard Falk’s words) “ideally purged of any secondary identities (race, religion, gender) and pledged to reconcile private concerns with the promotion of the public good.” This has played a fundamental role in encouraging the institutionalization of tolerance.

In fact, it is precisely the equality of political condition inherent in the con-

cept of citizenship that permits “civil society” to flourish. Members of society can pursue their own interests, within different subcultures and organizations, up to the point at which their actions curtail the basic civil and political rights of others. As Björn Hettne⁵ noted, this balance between freedom and order is associated with a quality of “civility” that can expand or retreat, making the intervention of the state more or less necessary at various times and places.

Relative equality of economic opportunity is a fundamental element in the maintenance of a tolerant, participatory political community. And one of the basic points of contention in the long struggle over rights has been whether individual freedom can be guaranteed without previously, or simultaneously,

ensuring a certain level of economic security and social justice. European welfare states have gone furthest in developing the latter as an entitlement of the “social citizenship” that is a hallmark of European democracy.

In contrast, authoritarian political systems, ranging from Bismarkian Germany to twentieth-century communist states like the Soviet Union and China—as well as some others of a strongly statist developmental persuasion in Third World countries—have given priority to economic and social rights, without much attention to civil and political liberty.

Source: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development <<http://www.unrisd.org/eng/index/conf/glbctcon.htm>> (Aug 1, 2001) UNRISD, Palais des Nations, CH - 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland; e-mail: info@unrisd.org

A Curriculum for Global Citizenship

Developed by Oxfam GB and adapted here.

The young people of today will grow up to be the citizens of the future: but what that future holds for them is not yet clear.

The world they live in is one of tremendous change and opportunity—but also one of increasing inequality. While many people enjoy a higher standard of living than ever before, many others—both in the UK and overseas—face life without enough to eat, without a home, without freedom from violence, without a way of earning a living, without a say in their future. Oxfam believes that poverty is at the root of all these problems. Most people would agree that it is morally unacceptable that one in four people in the world live in extreme poverty. But it is also inefficient. It wastes human talent, leads to conflict and unrest, and encourages the destruction of scarce environmental resources. Oxfam believes that eradicating poverty is the only way to ensure a secure and sustainable future for everyone. If people in our country or in other countries

are poor, we are part of their problem. As Global Citizens of the future, we hope young people can become part of the solution.

THE PROBLEM OF POVERTY

- One in four of the world’s people today lives in a state of absolute poverty.
- 35,000 children die every day because they are poor.
- 130 million children do not attend primary school, 70 per cent of them girls.
- 1.3 billion people have no safe water or sanitation.
- One-third of pupils in the United Kingdom live in relative poverty.

WHAT IS THE CURRICULUM FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP?

The Curriculum for Global Citizenship is not a new curriculum. Many of the ideas and principles it promotes are reflected in what teachers may know as multi-cultural, anti-racist, development, or environmental education. But Global Citizenship builds on these other “educations” to offer a spe-

cific—and unique—response to the challenge of poverty.

YOUNG PEOPLE’S AWARENESS OF GLOBAL ISSUES

Young people today are not passive or complacent. They are concerned about the destruction of the rainforests, that many people in the world go hungry, that conflict affects the lives of people in both North and South.

By incorporating the principles of Global Citizenship into education, we can enable young people to develop these concerns, challenge poverty and injustice, and take real effective action for change. Already in the “developing countries” of Africa, Asia and Latin America progress has been made over the past few decades:

- death rates of children have been cut by half since 1960;
- life expectancy has gone up from 41 to 62 years;
- twice as many people now have safe water to drink.

The elimination of poverty is affordable and achievable—if individuals and communities want and demand it. Educating young people to become Global Citizens will ensure that they are able to work for a more secure and sustainable future.

THE GLOBAL CITIZEN IS ONE WHO:

- is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen;
- respects and values diversity;
- is willing to act to make the world a more equitable and sustainable place;

- takes responsibility for their actions.

The key elements for developing responsible Global Citizenship are identified as:

KNOWLEDGE AND UNDERSTANDING SKILLS

- Social justice and equity
- Critical thinking
- Diversity
- Ability to argue effectively
- Globalization and interdependence
- Ability to challenge injustice and inequality
- Sustainable development

- Respect for people and things
- Peace and conflict
- Co-operation and conflict resolution

VALUES AND ATTITUDES

- Sense of identity and self-esteem
- Empathy
- Commitment to social justice and equity
- Value and respect for diversity
- Concern for the environment and commitment to sustainable development
- Belief that people can make a difference

Oxfam's "Cool Planet" site provides background information, curriculum materials, student activities and other resources to promote an understanding of a global perspective. View it at <<http://www.oxfam.org.uk/coolplanet>>. There is also an Oxfam US site, as well as separate sites dealing with major global issues.

Classroom Activity

Borders: a Multi-Dimensional Approach

LEVEL– Middle School/High School

COURSE– Social Studies, Language Arts, Interdisciplinary

RATIONALE– As students enter middle school, they are constantly faced with borders in their own lives—whether these borders are gang turf lines, R-rated movies, the teachers' lounge or the recognition of city and town lines. Students and teachers often look at issues from one perspective, or perhaps two, instead of multi-dimensional points of view. In this unit students will look at borders from many different angles and become aware of their complexity. Further, students should also become aware of why borders exist, their historical, social or cultural origins, and whether these borders are justified or sustainable.

This unit will enable students to explore the many aspects of borders in their own lives. These borders include, but are not limited to:

- psychological borders • social borders

- political borders • linguistic borders
- economic borders • architectural borders
- cultural borders

This unit will also help students gain knowledge and understanding of causes and effects of the many types of borders they encounter in their daily lives.

LESSON OVERVIEW– The main objective of the unit is for each student to complete a culminating project (by student's design) to show a new perspective on borders. After determining what a border is and where borders are, each week the students will examine a new facet of borders. Students will examine: political borders (e.g., US/Mexico border), economic borders (trade laws, economic disparities), social borders (employer/employee, educated/non-educated), linguistic borders (French/German, Spanish/English), immigration (cause of and result of), architectural borders (building materials and psychological effect), art as a border (territorial warnings of graffiti and contemporary art vs. classical art) cultural

borders (all aspects of similarities and differences), psychological borders (personal space and imagined personal limitations).

TIME NEEDED– As determined by the teacher. The unit lends itself to an integrated approach, incorporating language arts, visual arts, science, etc., and all of those learning areas can be enhanced by relating them to the topic, which furthers the idea of borders and eliminating borders in learning.

PROCEDURES– Introductory Lesson (this basic pattern can be repeated throughout)

What are borders and why do people cross or not cross them? Rationale: When students think of the word "border," they frequently think of an international border, in particular, the border between the US and Mexico. Students also commonly think that "crossing the border" refers solely to illegal aliens from Mexico—or getting lunch at Taco Bell. It is important for students to be aware of the many types of borders that exist. Students will learn about different borders, e.g., psychological, cultural, social, economic, etc. They will also examine the cause and effect of choosing to cross or not cross these borders.

LESSON SUMMARY– Students explore the definition of “border” and brainstorm about the various types of borders within their lives and communities. Students also examine reasons people choose to cross or not cross these various borders. They will be brainstorming in cooperative groups and will keep a personal log of borders they come across during a 24-hour period in their daily lives. It is important that students be aware of the strong historical nature of, and the multiple forces that maintain “borders” or “boundaries” in the context of the development of nations in history.

SUGGESTED PROCEDURES–

- Students write in journals for 5 minutes in response to: “What is a border? List as many types of borders as you can think of.”
- Have students quietly share their responses with a partner.
- Ask students what they think a border is. Create an idea or word wall with students’ responses. Accept all possibilities. Some possible responses may be: a line between countries, a county line, something around a picture, gang turf, marked territory . . .
- Direct the class to discover that a border is something that sets something apart, a real or imagined division setting one part from another. Hint: get students to explain the purpose of a border around a picture. Write a working definition on the board and also have a student read aloud a definition from a collegiate dictionary.
- Once all students are comfortable with a working definition of borders in a broad sense, go through the same procedure to create a web of various types of borders. Some possible student responses may be, but certainly are not limited to: international, city, county, state, social, geographical, cultural, political, imaginary borders. Use the picture example again by asking what the border sets apart and then have the students apply that to their school, or their town. It is usually easier for stu-

dents if you start small, with known ideas, and then work out to a broader scope. Guide students to acknowledge the various types of borders (as explained in the overview).

- Now ask students to think why someone might want to cross a border (using the class’ broad definition of border). Place students in cooperative groups of four and tell them to brainstorm and record as many different possibilities as they can to explain why someone might cross or not cross a border. Allow students ten minutes for this activity. Upon completion, ask for a reason from each group and create a web on butcher paper. Note: If students begin to see and make connections of central themes, encourage this; if not, don’t worry—that is another lesson.
- Conclude the lesson by asking students to think of borders in their own lives. Give examples, such as: teachers’ lounge, sibling’s room, bars, and military bases. For homework, have students keep a 24-hour log of borders that they encounter, whether they did or did not cross these borders, and why they wanted (or did not want) to do so. Students should log a minimum of 10 entries.

FOLLOW-UP LESSONS– Relevant homework assignments over the next several days connect the themes (political, economic, cultural borders, etc.) for student synthesis and application. For a language arts exercise, students might read a novel, or short stories, and write a journal, or an essay, from the chief character’s point of view, identifying all the different borders the character comes across.

Additional lessons might be built around the following ideas: an examination of the local, state or national newspapers (or news periodicals) for identifiable “borders”; an art teacher’s visual presentation of the shift from one art or architectural genre to another over time; a language teacher examining the issue of multiple languages, dialects and native tongues existing in the same

country or region; viewing of film clips, slides, and Internet presentations reflecting the changes in social/cultural mores of people over time, etc. Several lessons should focus on the matter of how people in the past have perceived “borders” and how, as in the case of present-day Yugoslavia, Bosnia, Kosovo, and Herzegovina, people’s perceptions of borders may lead to difficulties, and how people perceive that those difficulties can be surmounted.

FINAL PROJECT– A culminating project will be designed and completed by the student. Possibilities are:

- an oral interview and resulting history of how the border has affected someone (famous, personal);
- a short story (fiction) reflecting the change in “borders” in a person’s life;
- a debate over the nature of the changes in major forces of life: e.g., social/medical problems, conflict;
- a video of school or local issues that reflect a change in the people’s lives or the nature of school, home, church;
- a research paper on any specific topic within those studied;
- a play dramatizing types of borders;
- an architectural model of a building undergoing one or more “border” changes;
- a portfolio of “border” changes identified in one of the areas of study;
- a survey of schoolmates, community leaders/citizens, relevant to the topic “How has ‘crossing borders’ affected your life?”;
- or the many, many other projects the students’ interests will suggest and create.

Source: Lesson plan by Kristi Whistler, Los Lunas Middle School, Los Lunas, NM. (c) Latin America Data Base, Latin American Institute <<http://www.ladb-unm.edu/retanet/plans/soc/borders.html>> (Aug 1, 2001)

The Latin American Institute encourages teachers to share their lessons concerning Latin America, or global citizenship. Information about such submissions can be obtained from <<http://www.ladb-unm.edu/retanet/plans.html>> (Aug 1, 2001)

(Continued on back page)

(Continued from page 11)

OTHER SUGGESTED PROCEDURES—

Assign the various readings in this publication to small groups. Using the central notion of “World Citizenship” have students contribute what they perceive the writers believe are the major characteristics of this term. When this has been accomplished, have students create a territorial entity that would conform to those characteristics. This may prove very difficult, and the task of

the teacher will be to constantly remind students of the very elusive nature of “no boundaries” and “no national entity” when dealing with the more radical notions of “global/world citizenship.”

The teacher might find it useful to research (or have students research) the example of Garry Davis, the man who renounced all national citizenship claims and proclaimed himself the “First Citizen of the World.” Using the article “The Matter of Dual or Multiple Citizenships”

by Renshon, “Citizenship for Sale” by Paul, and the advertisement for the “Irish Citizenship Project,” have students create lists of Advantages and Disadvantages of such citizenship. Widen the discussion to consider “multiple citizenship.” Using various techniques, have the students consider each of the following in relation to those two citizenship concepts: nationalism, ethnicity, culture, race, loyalty, immigration, ownership of property, birthright. Teacher may add others as deemed important.

A SHORT BIOGRAPHY OF GARRY DAVIS

WAR CAREER: 1941-45.

Was a B-17 Bomber Pilot in the 8th Air Force. Flew six missions.

August 24, 1944, was shot down over Peenemunde, near Werner von Braun's heavy water plant. Interned in Sweden. Escaped. Became pilot instructor, Luke Stewart Field.

POST-WAR: Studied causes of war and world law: Einstein, Gandhi, Willkie, Emery Reves.

1947: Worked for United World Federalists.

1948: Renounced US nationality in Paris, becoming “stateless.” Issued statement declaring himself “world citizen.” French government forced him to leave France.

May 12, 1948: Claimed “global political asylum” on UN “territory” of Palais de Chaillot, Paris. Claim was refused by French Government. Called for Charter review conference via Article 109. Received letters of support worldwide at UN “territory.” Was “deported” to France. Refused national ID card. Created first World Citizen Identity Card.

ISSUES IN GLOBAL EDUCATION

The important issues that an interconnected world raises for educators and education policy makers.

RECENT TITLES HAVE INCLUDED:

- Democracy: The Global Wave of the Future?
- The United Nations • Global Ethics
- Globalization and the Opportunity for Peace



Subscribe and receive six issues per year for \$30 (US); \$36 (Canada); \$48 (International).

Call The American Forum for Global Education at
1-800-813-5056

**THE
AMERICAN FORUM
FOR
GLOBAL EDUCATION**

A private, not-for-profit organization founded in 1970. Our mission is to educate United States citizens for responsible participation in our communities, our nation and our interdependent world. We offer consultation to global education programs and to those schools planning to “internationalize” or “globalize” their curriculum. We provide global and international education materials for classroom use and professional development programs for teachers and administrators. We are a forum for the exchange of ideas and practices on content and directions of global education.

<<http://www.globaled.org>>