

INTRODUCTION

Scepticism has had an important weight when it comes into the creation of an ethical pathway to conduct global politics. The United Nations Millennium Declaration in September 2000 figured as a historical breakpoint that brought into the international agenda the advent of a new era where ethical and political norms, irrespective of time and space, were relevant to all people in the dawn of the twenty-first century. Unlike the bequeathed UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, for the first time, the UN Millennium Declaration emphasised *collective responsibility* upholding the principles of human dignity, equality and equity at the global level; giving the additional feature of globalisation as to become “a positive force for all the world’s people.”¹ Uncertainty, however, prevails concerning the normative weight and practical force that applies to the advocacy of the values and principles of freedom, equality, solidarity, tolerance, respect for nature, and shared responsibility fostered by this Declaration. These principles were suggested to be attained within a context of a globalised world, but marked in a world of states in which they arose. How is it therefore imaginable to guarantee the enforcement of these values and principles involving all actors in a global scale? How are the burdens and *responsibilities* ‘distributed’ to accomplish the goals prescribed, for example, by the UN Millennium Declaration? The answers to these questions continue to be just as difficult to find today as they were at the beginning of this millennium.

In a world system, some may argue, where states are *the* agents of individual rights and duties,² global responsibilities and global rights seem to lack normative force³ and

¹ United Nations (UN), Millennium Declaration, General Assembly, A/RES/55/2, September 2000, 1. [Accessed on 18 September 2008]: available from: <http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm>

² See for example Andrew Linklater, *The Transformation of Political Community: Ethical Foundations of the Post-Westphalian Era* (Cambridge, Polity Press: 1998); M. Glen Johnson and Janusz Symonides, *The Universal Declaration of*

practical viability,⁴ when these are exercised across state borders. However, the literature on globalisation has positively exploded with arguments focusing on the development of *new* activities and relationships between individuals, communities and societies that have altered the very context of political action and the boundaries of the public sphere. One central controversy concerns the claim to universality embedded in human rights discourse: i.e. whether the ethical and political norms may be relevant for all people at all times and places. Another controversy concerns how, exactly, new actors (and factors) are affecting the central role the state has used to have in defining – more or less autonomously – those rights and the responsibilities that go with them.

Globalisation has had a significant effect in the transformation of the boundaries of political communities. The extent to which globalisation has influenced the re-configuration of political communities is nevertheless unclear. One may acknowledge that global trends have had some side-effects upon setting either new or loosened political boundaries from within and beyond the nation-state. The notion of citizenship as it is conceived by modern liberalism as delimited to bounded communities, entrenched in the unalterable idea of the modern nation-state system, is thus rendered cumbersome and anachronistic. Clearly, then, the state-centric system is undergoing changes which need re-assessment, especially on how the boundaries of political communities are to be set up today. This needs to be taken into account in the development of alternative views of citizenship for the 21st century.

Human Rights: A History of its Creation and Implementation (Paris: UNESCO, 1998); and Stephen Krasner, “Westphalia and All That,” in *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change*, eds. Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).

³ See Michael Walzer, *Thick and Thin: Moral Arguments at Home and Abroad* (London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994).

⁴ See Michael Walzer, David Miller, Hannah Arendt, Alastair Davidson, Kenneth Baynes, Michael Sandel; and republican foundations with Thomas Paine and Jean-Jacques Rousseau. They will be further discussed within the thesis.

I hope this thesis will contribute in part to this debate by supporting and furthering this project of embracing the ethical dimension that is now clearly such a crucial part of International Relations (IR) study. In so doing, I attempt to show that global ethics can be usefully approached in terms of something IR scholars should, perhaps, be rather more familiar with the concept, and practice, of citizenship. Then, the concept I give for *global citizenship* in this thesis will try to shed some little light on the ethical and practical relationship between the citizen and the state, on one hand, and how our view of political community could be enhanced, and perhaps challenged, within a context of an international system of nation-states.

1. International Relations and the Contextual Approach

The first approach is contextual in nature. It is relative to the development of ethics in contemporary international relations theory and the evolution and impact of globalisation in global politics and polities that I will further discuss. After the Second World War, the international community embarked on a new course to provide the requirements of justice of all mankind alongside normative guidelines as well as goals.⁵ The task was therefore to give in this effort, as Michael Doyle and Anne-Marie Gardner point out, “a more ethical understanding and arrangement of relations between individuals and institutions governing them.”⁶ Within this course, a generation of scholars of International Relations gave an important weight to ethics in the analysis of international relations.⁷ Nevertheless, scepticism arose to challenge the ethical position in international politics reaffirming the

⁵ Jean-Marc Coicaud, “Conclusion: Human Rights in Discourse and Practice: The Quandary of International Justice,” in *The Globalization of Human Rights*, eds. Jean-Marc Coicaud, Michael W. Doyle, and Anne-Marie Gardner (Tokyo, New York and Paris: United Nations University Press, 2003), 178.

⁶ Michael W. Doyle and Anne-Marie Gardner, “Introduction,” in *The Globalization of Human Rights*, 11.

⁷ See Arnold Wolfers, Michael Walzer, Stanley Hoffman, Hedley Bull, Richard Ulman, Charles R. Beitz, to mention few that have discussed thoroughly the ethical implication on international relations in the second half of the twentieth-century.

role of the state for the course of global politics from the realist platform in the post-war era and from the neorealist in the last quarter of the 20th century.⁸ As Charles Beitz identified, it is certain that revolutionary changes in economic and political structures are taking place in the new century and whose outcomes are not predicted. He continues saying that “it required most of a century for the political theory of the democratic state to catch up with political-economic change.”⁹ Or as Martin Albrow exposes, “the change on action and social organization for individual and groups that challenges the idea of the modern nation-state happens to be when national citizens and other agencies are encouraged to cross and transgress their physical and conceptual boundaries.”¹⁰ It is so when the current world is more complex than sixty years ago,¹¹ and two hundred years from the creation of the modern state. It is therefore necessary to enhance our approach on global ethics in terms of citizenship.

The second aspect within the contextual approach pinpoints the impact of globalisation in the construction and development of *new inter-actions*¹² between individuals and societies, and new forms of social, cultural and political organizations. First, new factors are emerging over the last decades that have changed the course of politics and delimitation of polities within states as well beyond the national boundaries.

⁸ Marshall Cohen, “Moral Skepticism and International Relations,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 13, no. 4 (1984): 299-346; George Kennan, *American Diplomacy 1900-1950* (New York: New American Library, 1951); Hans Morgenthau, *In Defense of the National Interest* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952); and Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Relations* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1979).

⁹ Charles R. Beitz, “Social and Cosmopolitan Liberalism,” *International Affairs* 75, no. 3 (1999): 515.

¹⁰ Martin Albrow, *The Global Age: State and Society Beyond Modernity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997), 4.

¹¹ In reference to the UN Universal Declaration of Human (1948), the beginning of the Post-War era with the creation of new international institutions existing today (i.e. The United Nations, The Bretton Woods institutions); and the setting of the concept and practice of “communities of states.” See April Carter, *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship* (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), 74.

¹² I will come back to this term at the end of this introduction in the explanation of chapters two and three of this thesis.

These factors—generally termed ‘globalisation’¹³—have given greater significance to the role of new actors and phenomena that are re-shaping how the world is conceived, and the approach of determining the means and ends to bring feasible solutions to problems that affect each and every actor in multi-spatial arenas. In the quest of finding plausible answers, we need to reformulate not only the role of the state in the world system, but the role and concept of the individual, group and community, and their interaction(s) with more complex societies.¹⁴

Second, citizenship was conceptualised in a formal agreement between the state and the citizen—which are the central concepts of this thesis—where the citizen acquired identity and loyalty within the state.¹⁵ The state therefore provided the demarcation of one sole political community where, with their citizens, a social contract was accorded in the establishment of concrete rights and duties.¹⁶ From this time onwards citizenship has become a state-centred institution shaped by the principle of nationality¹⁷ as “the rule of territorial organisation of states, and the idea of popular sovereignty as the legitimisation of political authority.”¹⁸ However, in the second half of the last century, more plural forms of life emerged in the light of social commitment in culturally and ethnically diverse societies (e.g. mass migrations transforming societies into diverse, multi-ethnic societies¹⁹). The state’s boundaries limiting a sole political community has become increasingly blurred as a

¹³ Generally when speaking of social, political and economic trends shaping politics and polities worldwide. For example: global justice, new technologies of communication, on the global nature of threats posed to the survival of human race such as nuclear weapons or the planet with environmental damaging, or the trends of the global economy. See John Tomlinson, *Globalization and Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge Polity Press, 1999).

¹⁴ See Barry K. Gills, “Democratizing Globalization and Globalizing Democracy,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 581, no. 1 (May 2002): 158-71.

¹⁵ See chapter 8 in John Locke, “Second Treatise,” in *Two Treatises of Government*, ed. Peter Laslett (New York: New American Library, Mentor Books, 1963 [1690]).

¹⁶ See chapter IV in Jean-Jacques Rousseau, *The Social Contract* (New York: Hafner Press, 1947 [1762]).

¹⁷ Although for the concept that recently we have for ‘nation’ is different as it was defined in the 18th and 19th centuries.

¹⁸ See volume III in Samuel E. Finer, *The History of Government from the Earliest Times* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

¹⁹ Martin O. Heisler, “Changing Citizenship Theory and Practice: Comparative Perspectives in a Democratic Framework,” *Political Science & Politics* 38, no. 4 (October 2005): 667.

result of broader national and transnational social and individual interactions, as Andrew Linklater points out,

[t]he nature of the bond uniting members of the same society and extent of separateness from the world is therefore being transformed across the world. The prospect of a post-Westphalian order is already immanent within a complex web of social, economic, cultural and political changes, and new visions of citizenship, community and sovereignty have started to appear.²⁰

The theoretical, ethical and practical debates in the IR mainstream and their relation to ‘global’ citizenship could be centred on the inescapable political content of rights and duties, within and beyond the boundaries of the nation-state, and the politicisation of our universal moral duty to human beings in a global world. These, in my view, are cornerstone for understanding modern politics and international relations in the 21st century.

2. Particular Problems: The Theoretical, Ethical and Practical Challenges of *Global Citizenship*

The task of reconfiguring the idea and practice of citizenship in a context of social movements, new social forms of organisation, national and global politics in the 21st century, is not straightforward. Problems for defining sources of identity—individual commitments, membership and loyalties to political communities, enforcement of rights and duties, empirical and ethical implications *inter alia*—rise as to bring a coherent basis for an understanding of an enhanced citizenship. However, through the idea and practice of citizenship within a global context of social and political transformations, *new* spaces are created for the development of what we could well call *global citizenship*.²¹ It is useful to think of the ‘global citizenship problem’ from three epistemic vertexes that are nevertheless

²⁰ Andrew Linklater, “Citizenship and Sovereignty in the Post-Westphalian State,” *European Journal of International Relations* 2, no.1 (1996): 84.

²¹ Onora O’Neill, “Foreword,” in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Reader*, eds. Nigel Dower and John Williams (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002), xi.

deeply intertwined: the *theoretical*, the *ethical* and the *practical* problem. These three themes continually surface throughout the discussions of this thesis.

The *theoretical problem* rests on how emphases and understandings are presented to bring reasonable pictures of the contemporary political reality. The theoretical grounds for enhancing the concept of citizenship have been more contested mainly as a result of the evolution of global trends. Migration, globalisation, identity politics, regionalism, humanitarian intervention, and human rights, to mention few of multiple phenomena, have had huge impact in the formulation of theory and parameters of citizenship. These changes respond to diverse societies where identities, loyalties, and memberships are not attached to the state as the sole political community that defines them, but influenced by both internal and external factors. Information, technology and communications, massive migration, education, and overall human interactions, have transformed the way how political theory—especially international political theory—is moving forward to explain new sources and means of identity, the demarcations of political and moral communities, and the gradual diffusion of sovereign power between international actors, national agents or individuals. Questions are placed, whether they address new forms of social organization, individuals' membership and allegiances will challenge the level of commitment to the nation-state. Or, in terms of identity and allegiance to a wider moral constituency, the concept of global citizenship may conflict with the notions we have acquired on how we think of national citizenship. The problem is even more contentious when arguing for or against a global moral community, which is explored in the *ethical problem*.

The *ethical problem* consists of normative principles and norms that bring into scope our moral obligations. In terms of an enhanced citizenship, this involves whether we accept obligations in principle towards people in any part of the world. In addition, global

citizenship, I will argue, faces four essential claims. First, regarding *membership*, determining whether we all belong morally to one world community of human beings, or some may argue non-human as well; whatever the division of states and bounded social communities that in practice divide us.²² Second, referring to *universalism*, the question is raised whether global citizenship assumes a traditional teleological ethic of a universal concept, timeless and of unchanging norms.²³ Third, related to *rights and duties*, whether the idea of global citizenship is more about duties or more about rights, and should or should not be equally balanced.²⁴ And fourth, which is attributed to the *foundational ethical claim* of the idea of global citizenship, whether a global moral position is indeed desirable and ought to be promoted.²⁵ The next paragraph will complement the interrogative: is global citizenship ethical or rather institutional?

The *empirical problem* refers specifically to global democratic and global justice practices that settle the formal implementation of global citizenship towards global governance. For the purpose of this thesis, I will analyse the initial stage of imagining global citizenship: the phase of deliberation, debate or consent prior to the establishment of rules and law enforcement, institutional-building; or even the formalization of global citizenship in global democracy, the creation of democratic global institutions, and yet world government.²⁶ In this sense, when developing complex and ambitious theories on global governance or global rule of law, I raise the question: is it taken for granted that individuals or groups, globally, are involved (or have the option to be involved) in

²² Nigel Dower, "Global Ethics and Global Citizenship," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Reader*, 146.

²³ Refer to 'cosmopolitanism' as its purest form from Kant to alternative and "new" forms of cosmopolitanism. For example, Thomas Pogge, Martha Nussbaum, James Bohman and Andrew Linklater.

²⁴ See Stephen Castles and Alastair Davidson, *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging* (New York: Routledge, 2000); and David Miller, *On Nationality* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

²⁵ Williams, "Section I Introduction," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Reader*, 12.

²⁶ I would like to emphasize that the terms I refer as "formal global citizenship" is not intended to have a bias on what it is desirable or what it is not. These are expressions brought by different theorists related to the development of an enhanced formal implementation, and implication, of global citizenship.

deliberative process and outcomes beyond their own states? Globalisation can provide the scenario for this purpose, but it is not itself an ethical justification.²⁷ It rather provides the *matrix* within which realistic ethical choices have to be made²⁸ which is crucial to the expression of ethical responsibilities. As a result, these interactions are in essence the real institutions that, if further taken away, consolidate a “political constitution for the pluralist world society.”²⁹

Answers to every problem and questions previously posed would not be accurate if they are approached under one single framework. Times are changing. International political theory needs also to move forward and accept the present reality. Hedley Bull expressed in relation to the monochromatic interpretation of the statist world system that “one reason for the validity of the states system is the tyranny of the concepts and normative principles associated with it.”³⁰ It is hence not only adequate but *necessary* to bring forward alternative images of political communities, their ethical and empirical implications. Linklater points out that “the absence of alternative images of political community which could not be dismissed as facile or utopian is a striking feature of modern political life.”³¹ This thesis will therefore try to answer the following two central questions: how far do we need a particular worldview in order to make the idea of global citizenship meaningful, and where are the ‘limits’ of changing polities that may transcend or exist within the borders of the nation-state?

²⁷ Nigel Dower and John Williams, “Introduction,” in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Reader*, 6.

²⁸ Richard Falk, “An Emergent Matrix of Citizenship: Complex, Uneven, and Fluid,” in *Global Citizenship: Critical Reader*, 15.

²⁹ Jürgen Habermas, “A Political Constitution for the Pluralist World Society?,” *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 34, no.3 (2007): 331-43.

³⁰ Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1977), 275.

³¹ Andrew Linklater, “Citizenship and Sovereignty,” 78.

3. Central Problematic and Purpose, and Main Hypothesis

The central problematic of this thesis, within the context of the evolution of global ethics with regard the role of the state in the theory of International Relations, becomes clear: the concept and practice of citizenship can no longer be envisaged as to be restricted into territorial—sometimes artificial—national boundaries. The impact of globalisation on different political arenas and on individual and social interaction(s) through diverse political communities has challenged the modern understanding of citizenship as a state-centric social integration. The modern-liberal view of citizenship—as a legal status of citizenship guaranteeing universal political equality within the boundaries of an alleged homogenous society—disregards political action in the construction of meaningful concepts of citizenship. How is citizenship then conceived if political participation transcends the borders of the nation-state? If global citizenship implies, as in the literature, the recognition and enforcement of individual rights at a global scale, protected by global institutions or even a global *demos*, is it therefore desirable and feasible to visualize citizenship transcending national boundaries as an extension of (thin) liberal citizenship to broader political spheres? If this is the case, what are the ethical and practical implications of such enlargement? While we are witnessing social transformations where a global civil society is emerging as the multiplicity of rights claims which gives rise to certain tensions between state and civil society at different spatial dimensions, how should citizenship be conceived in a way it can bring political meaning alongside a normative basis to practice politics in multi-level and various political spheres? This thesis argues that the idea, theory and practice of citizenship clearly need to be more coherent with the transformations, mobility and enhancement of political communities, in which group and individual interactions have hitherto been the case.

The main purpose of this thesis is to give *a* contribution with a paradigm shift on how citizenship is conceived as merely through statist political community politics. I also attempt to show that it is rather through interactions, communication and possible mutual commitments that a strong and coherent concept of global citizenship could be constructed in the realms of identity, political communities and commitments' re-configuration. Therefore, the purpose of this work will be the re-examination of citizenship and identity in light of changing conceptions of citizenship.

The main hypothesis of this thesis is that *the concept and practice of global citizenship brings the opportunity to envisage alternative understandings to the pure statist concepts of citizenship with which we are so familiar.* If the de facto influence of globalisation on politics and political within and beyond the nation-state boundaries is accepted, *the concept of a rather thin citizenship entrenched exclusively in the state's territorial boundaries can no longer face the realities that constant social and political changes have on sources and definitions of citizens' identities, and the definition – and construction – of sub- as well as transnational political boundaries where political activity can be developed.* If the theoretical, ethical and practical analysis of global citizenship is developed to identify the strengths and weaknesses of moving forward this concept and bring the grounds for its practice, my first sub-hypothesis emerges: *Global citizenship, if seen as an enlargement of liberal citizenship as a passive legal status – as exposed in the literature – hinders citizens' meaningful political participation that may transcend the boundaries of the nation-state. In contrast, it suggests the expansion of the political community to a global polis which may lead to contentious ethical and practical implications.*

The purpose of my main hypothesis derives in my second hypothesis: *global citizenship reflected in political activity is possible whereby individuals can develop multiple identities while enhancing political practice through the interaction in-between different political arenas considering at a time strong and weak polities where citizenship can be performed.* Even though I dwell on the contentious understandings of conceiving citizenship beyond the national borders without undermining basic elements that citizenship requires, my second sub-hypothesis stresses that *some aspects of political action, democratic deliberation, and normative principles are necessary to give an image of a plausible and meaningful concept of global citizenship in multi-spatial public spheres.*

4. Division of Chapters

Chapter one reviews how liberal thought has shaped the modern mainstream view of citizenship and how it is contested by thick and disaggregated notions of citizenship. I contest this view of the role of the state as singular supplier of rights and assess whether the territorial limitations of the state, as the ultimate notion of political community, and the concept of citizenship are conterminous. I also discuss the relationship between the concept of thin citizenship and the nation-state as the exclusive political community. Thin citizenship as the universalistic feature of natural rights, the recognition of citizens exclusively in the nation-state as a bounded political space, and the passive feature of liberal citizenship are presented alongside Locke's, Kant's, Mill's, Rawls's and T. H. Marshall's accounts. I show that the liberal account presents some gaps on space limitations and political practice which can be offset with thick understandings of nuanced forms of "inter-active" citizenship that lead to multilayered views of political participation. Both pure thin or thick views of citizenship have some time and space limitations in the process of imagining global citizenship. I reassess thin and thick concepts of citizenship in a

context where global forces re-configure the political demarcations of multi-spatial polities. I finally depict several post-national and contemporary cosmopolitan “disaggregated” forms of citizenships which are not attached to nation-state political boundaries to give a broader scope on how the concept of citizenship transcends the nation-state boundaries.

Chapter two shows the way global citizenship is directly entrenched in how political boundaries are defined, responding in the process to conflicting notions of the good and, therefore, the legitimacy of delimiting political boundaries. I place the problematic of the idea of a bounded nation-state community within the context of a heightened globalised world. I also stress that the concept of the nation-state community at the evidence of the increasing porosity of national borders brings problems when the realms of sovereign self-determination and the principles of human rights are translated, in practice, to extra-territorial notions of political membership.

The literature on global citizenship, predominantly via liberal-cosmopolitan thought, is only conceivable by enlarging liberal (individual) citizenship at the global scale. This theoretical framework preserves the thin conception of citizenship when translated into a wider concept of space that surpasses the boundaries of the nation-state. Hence I contest whether citizenship claims priority of universalistic identity implied by citizenship over other plural identities and I illustrate the flaws in democratic legitimacy and political meaning that global citizenship suggests in its cosmopolitan version. Instead, and following Benhabib’s concept of “democratic iterations,” I give a moral and democratic concept of global citizenship where the ‘global’ component of citizenship refers to the practice of politics in diverse and multi-spatial dimensions. This concept can overcome ethical and practical gaps to the cosmopolitan (global) citizenship.

Chapter three discusses how global citizenship is practiced in different public spaces regarding democratic activity as bringing legitimacy, and human rights as moral justification, to give a normative insight of global citizenship in practice. I emphasise the internationalist discourse on human rights at both liberal perspectives: the international society of states and the constitutionalization of cosmopolitan law. I claim that both theoretical standpoints do not capture the complexity of multilayered citizenship in different public spaces. Cosmopolitanism, in its suggestion of making a ‘global public’ under the auspices of a cosmopolitan law, could result in a thin line between the use of force and “good international citizenship.” I stress that the practice of global citizenship, in the form of global governance reforms and cosmopolitan (global) democracy—as Charter 99 and the report of the UN Commission on Global Governance suggest—enhances the liberal cosmopolitan view. This position has some ethical and practical problems, especially by underlying human rights as the basis for cosmopolitan institution-building and for creating a ‘global *demos*’ in reforming global institutions. Here I highlight the potentialities of transnational politics in civil society to make possible the debate of cosmopolitan norms, as human rights, in multilayered public spaces, and democracy through democratic iterations. Some examples are employed to show that global citizenship can be meaningful in multiple strong and weak polities.

The task for now will dwell in furthering our normative framework of our alleged paradigm on citizenship. The exposition of contesting meanings of citizenship will allow us to unwind our sight on how we think about citizenship and politics in a more complex and globalised reality.