CHAPTER 3

Global Citizenship: From the Global Public and Cosmopolitan Governance to 'Global' Democratic Iterations

> We are like travelers navigating an unknown terrain with the help of old maps, drawn at a different time and in response to different needs … While the terrain we are traveling on, the world society of states, has changed, our normative map has not.[1]

The concept and practice of politics in multi-layered spaces have opened the spectrum to *de facto* reference for conceiving citizenship within and outside the territorial delimitation of the nation-state, from the local to the global level. However, different conceptions of citizenship practiced in multiple spaces, in theory as well as in practice, may develop theoretical, practical and even ethical implications that could result in contentious understandings of the constituting form that relates the individual and the nation-state as the public space for political practice.

The argument of this chapter is two-fold. In the first section I contend that, as the theoretical and moral framework for citizenship to be practiced and envisioned outside the nation-state, cosmopolitan approaches are rendered rather less plausible and desirable than they might at first seem.[2] The mainstream of "international society of states" endorsed by the United Nations (UN) framework established in its foundational charter alongside the UN Declaration of Human Rights suggest a world system where cosmopolitan values might derive from. But also, these principles are evoked in the normative basis to promote democratic global reforms. Such is the case of Charter 99 that pinpoints those values

---

[1] Seyla Benhabib, *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Citizens and Residents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 2.

[2] For reference regarding the moral implications of a cosmopolitan world order see Monique Canto-Sperber, "The Normative Foundations of Cosmopolitanism," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 106, no. 2 (January 2006): 267-83.

invoking 'world citizenship' together with the advocacy of democratic reforms of global institutions in the economic, social, and humanitarian domains. I try to demonstrate here that this example of cosmopolitan normative and practical groundwork falls short of capturing the complexity of multilayered citizenship in different spaces and undermines the diversity of political communities whose ontological element of plurality is not recognised for proper political environments.

In the second section I argue that the normative closure of diverse public spaces reflected in civil society show that politics can permeate national borders in a way that brings into practice broader and manifold scopes for identity building, and affirmation, as well as new practices of global governance.[3] I claim that *spaces-in-between* can exist in multi-spatial arenas where the practice of citizenship can be attained in the creation of political communities within a more substantive and thicker dimension demonstrating political meaning and democratic practice. For this purpose, I suggest that the Arendtian concept of "in-between" politics translated into global (multi-spatial) spheres proves fruitful in the formation of a thicker concept of global citizenship as political practice. For politics may transcend the territory of the nation-state considering at the same time plurality for the formation and affirmation of identity.

I also argue that global citizenship may be developed not only through political practice within the frame of nation-state public sphere but also through democratic iterations that conceive citizenship on a more multi-spatial normative basis, albeit emphasising the need of constituting boundaries for identity, and political and democratic activity. I demonstrate

---

[3] See for example Allen Buchanan and Robert O. Keohane, "The Legitimacy of Global Governance Institutions," *Ethics and International Affairs* 20, no. 4 (2006): 405-37.

that the formation of these iterations are possible and even desirable to conceive global citizenship in terms of plurality in the formation of diverse politico-democratic spaces.

1. 'Making' a Global Public? Human Rights and Moral Cosmopolitanism as the Normative Ground of Global Citizenship

The concept of global citizenship has been approached in the literature mainly in line with moral cosmopolitanism in which human rights shore up the moral and normative sense of an enhanced citizenship paradoxically opposed to, as well as enforcing, the modern-liberal notion of citizenship.[4] Yet the alleged antagonism between the modern-liberal model and the cosmopolitan form of citizenship—as the former to centre on the national political community whereas the latter to a global one—is developed via a common moral basis underpinning liberal maxims of individual rights such as liberty, equality and autonomy.[5]

Contemporary cosmopolitanism suggests that international human rights become the moral grounds for cosmopolitan citizenship. This theoretical framework also encourages the extension of these core values into the global arena and promoted through "a cosmopolitan constitution with equal citizenship for all members of the human race."[6] To do so, contemporary citizenship, under cosmopolitanism, develops the model of membership which responds to, first and foremost, a de-territorialised notion of a person's

---

[4] The link between human rights and the world society of states entangles the range and character of societies to whose members the individuals have distributive obligations, the doctrine of human rights, and the ethical requirements that carry on "international institutions, regimes, and practices, as distinct from the individual states and societies that make them up". In this sense, states are seen as the "most effective political mechanisms for protecting human rights, which are themselves pre-eminently cosmopolitan values." See Charles R. Beitz, "Social and Cosmopolitan Liberalism," *International Affairs* 75, no. 3, (1999): 521.

[5] These values under moral cosmopolitanism constitute a broad moral stance that focuses upon the moral role of the individual humans. It brings "the basis on which [international] institutions should be justified or criticized." See Charles R. Beitz, "International Liberalism and Distributive Justice: A Survey of Recent Thought," *World Politics* 51, no. 2 (1999): 287.

[6] Thomas Mertens, "Cosmopolitanism and Citizenship: Kant Against Habermas," *European Journal of Philosophy* 4, no. 3 (1996): 329. For a broader discussion on contemporary global citizenship through cosmopolitanism see Derek Heater, *World Citizenship and Government: Cosmopolitan Ideas in the History of Western Political Thought* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), and April Carter, *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship* (New York: Routledge, 2001).

universal rights,[7] whereby the individual becomes a political member of a global political community. Two questions stem from this: is a cosmopolitan human rights' regime at odds with the structures of inter-state politics? And, is a global public really necessary to develop global citizenship in practice? The first question will be approached within the realm of international politics in the context of an inter-state system. The second will be addressed as whether a global public is indeed ethically desirable and politically plausible to conceive politics beyond and within the nation-state political boundaries.

The relationship between international politics centred in a system where the predominant actors are the nation-states should be challenged by *de facto* politics that are practiced within and beyond national borders. I focus on two contemporary political lines of thinking that have emerged with regard to the expansion of human rights: the "law of peoples" model defended, for example, by Rawls and the cosmopolitan citizenship centred on a new law of nations as suggested by Habermas. One can start by contesting the assumption in which international theory has focused on in the transposition of different domestic models of public space onto its various images of an inter-state public realm.[8] This is shown, for instance, by liberal international theory which has given an image of distinction between public and private affairs, from the norms of non-intervention as private and the spread of international law as public.[9] The assumption of inter-state international public spheres needs to be re-assessed when political debate regarding human rights is only conceived within an exclusive scenario of international 'Society of Peoples,'[10]

[7] See Yasmine Soysal, *Limits of Citizenship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994); and Rainer Bauböck, *Transnational Citizenship: Memberships and Rights in International Migration* (Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar, 1994).
[8] Patricia Owens, *Between War and Politics: International Relations and the Thought of Hannah Arendt* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), 128.
[9] See Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1977).
[10] See John Rawls, *The Law of Peoples* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).

or where the public is understood as a social interaction between states.[11] Nevertheless, the opposite view of nation-state centred world politics prevalent in the cosmopolitan view, which disaggregates human rights enforcement from national law and transposes it to supranational institutions, needs also to be contested primarily when it is used to transcend the nation-state framework by constitutionalising international law.[12]

The controversy on the concept and scenarios to conceive global citizenship lies on whether a global public sphere could be developed in which public morality and human rights are debated within a context of an international society of states, or if a cosmopolitan law should be enforced by global institutions. The answer could be approached by simply acknowledging that a global public sphere does not really exist, even though some attempts to 'make' a global public sphere are placed in question which I discuss later. However, it is noteworthy that liberal cosmopolitan thesis centres on individual political agency which should be secured by a cosmopolitan law, hence on the thin aspect of citizenship as the utmost moral basis in which global citizenship shall be formed. Yet the extension of liberal values which focus on the political role of individual politics developed by liberal cosmopolitanism undermines the essence of political practice that citizenship requires in order to 'construct' a thicker dimension of global citizenship. This could lead us to think that global citizenship under liberal cosmopolitanism is indeed an extension of the modern-liberal concept of citizenship which entails "the necessity for executive, legislative, and

---

[11] For constructivist theory on public spheres based on the social interaction between states see for example, Marc Lynch, *State Interests and Public Spheres: The International Politics of Jordan's Identity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999); and Jennifer Mitzen, "Reading Habermas in Anarchy: Multilateral Diplomacy and Public Spheres," *American Political Science Review* 99, no. 3 (2005): 401-17.

[12] There are some variants among cosmopolitan theorists on regard to cosmopolitan law-enforcement with humanitarian ends - from the ones that advocate radical cosmopolitan with military intervention to cosmopolitan idealists that encourage human rights through existent international institutions. On cosmopolitan militaries see Lorraine Elliot and Graeme Cheeseman, eds., *Forces of Good: Cosmopolitan Militaries in the Twenty-First Century* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2004); and for the concept of 'cosmopolitan law-enforcement' see Andrew Linklater, "The Good International Citizen and the Crisis in Kosovo," in *Kosovo and the Challenge of Humanitarian Intervention*, eds. A. Schabel and R. Thakur (Tokyo: UN Press, 2000).

judicial components to world organizations transcending the nation-states."[13] But how then is the public of global citizenship to be formed? I argue here that the public sphere that liberal cosmopolitanism presupposes is indeed in-between global institutions, presenting the very political gap that global citizenship requires.

The idea of a global public sphere associated with a law of world citizens in the form of human rights brings forward the dilemma of how this global public sphere is formed. The question of having in mind a law of world citizens where states allegedly act legitimately in the name of a non-existent global public should be revisited. For example, at some extrapolated position, Habermas argues to form this public of 'world citizens' through violent mobilization as if it is to be produced as a social entity. He continues that, in the effort to 'make' a global public, we are seeing an explicit justification of 'humanitarian' war in the work of some critical and normative international theory. He assumes that this could only be possible within a context of completely institutionalised cosmopolitan condition and the achievement of which is supposed to be promoted.[14] The Nuremberg trials in 1945 stipulated the extension of the categories of "crimes against humanity, genocide, and war crimes" within the framework of international law – which has also encouraged the emergence of the concept of "humanitarian interventions."[15]

In this position there is a thin line that separates the promotion of "good international citizenship"[16] and military intervention for the sake of humanitarian ends. NATO's military intervention in Kosovo provides a perfect illustration of the risks that a

---

[13] Edward Demenchonok, "From a State of War to Perpetual Peace," *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 66, no. 1 (January 2007): 38.

[14] Jürgen Habermas, "Bestiality and Humanity: A War on the Border between Law and Morality," in *Kosovo: Contending Voices and Balkan Interventions*, ed. William Joseph Buckley (Michigan, MI: Eerdmans Publishing, 2000), 306-16.

[15] The term "crimes against humanity" was used during the Nuremberg trials to refer to crimes committed during international armed conflicts. See United Nations, *Principles of the Nuremberg Tribunal,* Principle 6[c], International Law Commission of the United Nations (1950); Steven R. Ratner and Jason S. Abrams, *Accountability for Human Rights Atrocities in International Law: Beyond the Nuremberg Legacy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002 [1997]), 26-45.

[16] Andrew Linklater, "The Good International Citizen and the Crisis in Kosovo."

"cosmopolitan façade" could do which legitimise western military war in the name of "global governance," and which opens up space for power strategies disguised as humanitarian intervention.[17] Habermas exposes it as

> [t]he negative duties of a universalistic morality of justice – the duty to refrain from crimes against humanity and wars of aggression – are rooted in all cultures, and they happily correspond to the yardsticks which the institutions of the world organization themselves would use to justify their decisions.[18]

The Kosovo war is the most illustrative example of domestic military intervention as one form of post-national war.[19] However, the debate could be centred on whether military intervention is indeed desirable by enforcing universal values or human rights.

The implication thereby of 'making' a global public sphere lies in the means used to do so. To 'make' a global public sphere "in order to produce the people" of the global public requires of "various forms of violent mobilization," as Arjun Appadurai argues.[20] Besides, the creation of world government is not impossible if projecting the key functions of the state upwards, as Alexander Wendt has suggested.[21] Habermas, on the other hand, argues that the domestication of global politics is possible in a federal and multilayered world republic, not as to replicate "the character of a state as whole" but to "perform the vital but clearly circumscribed functions of securing peace and promoting human rights at the supranational level."[22] For Arendt, however, this likelihood of 'making' such world state or government may be disastrous. She wrote,

---

[17] See Ulrich Beck, "The Cosmopolitan Manifesto," *New Statesman* 127, no. 4377 (March 1998): 29.

[18] Jürgen Habermas, "A Political Constitution for the Pluralist World Society?," *Journal of Chinese Philosophy* 34, no. 3 (September 2007): 339.

[19] Beck conceives the Kosovo war as the first post-national war, see Ulrich Beck, "The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology in the Second Age of Modernity," in *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*, eds. Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 61.

[20] Arjun Appadurai, "Full Attachment," *Public Culture* 10, no. 2 (1998): 447.

[21] Alexander Wendt has argued that a 'world state' is inevitable, which he defines as possessing the global monopoly on the use of legitimate violence given the logic of international anarchy and the tendency for military technology to become ever more destructive. See Alexander Wendt, "Why a World Government is Inevitable," *European Journal of International Relations* 9, no. 4 (January 2003): 491-542.

[22] Jürgen Habermas, *The Divided West*, ed. and trans. Ciaran Cronin (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006): 136.

the very notion of one sovereign force ruling the whole earth, holding the monopoly of all means of violence, unchecked and uncontrolled by other sovereign powers, is not only a forbidding nightmare of tyranny, it would be the end of all political life as we know it ... Politics deals with men, nationals of many countries and heirs to many pasts; its laws are the positively established forces which hedge in, protect, and limit the space in which freedom is not a concept, but a living political reality.[23]

The likelihood of world government resembled, to her, the ultimate notion of expanding liberal ideals during the twilight of the First World War. The 'making' of world government presupposes, for Arendt, the submission of individuals to a central authority and by which authentic politics is overcome and eliminated; now within a context where nations take the place of individuals.[24]

Either the idea of a world state or a neo-Kantian cosmopolitan approach of creating a world order based on cosmopolitan law—in the form of constitutionalising international law[25]—attempts to surmount the meaning of politics needed in the process of imagining global citizenship. It happens so, on one hand, in the intent of configuring global democracy in using global monopoly of violence for implementing homogenous human rights and democratic standards within nation-states, as suggested in UN reform proposals or the so-called 'humanitarian interventions'.[26] Or on the other hand, through the path of "constitutionalising" human rights with new mechanisms of global scale democracy that may lead to contentious notions for legitimising 'global politics.' Such is the case of the imaginary of consolidating a global *demos* in the supposition of either putting forward the

---

[23] Hannah Arendt, *Men at Dark Times* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1968), 81-2.

[24] Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1966 [1951]), 142.

[25] Habermas entangles the idea of cosmopolitan constitution with constitutionalizing international law by conceiving a politically constituted world society which is composed of both citizens and states. This affirmation is particularly relevant mainly because he gives answer to the alleged paradox between the concept of world society of states and cosmopolitan law. See Jürgen Habermas, "The Constitutionalization of International Law and the Legitimation Problems of a Constitution for World Society," *Constellations* 15, no. 4 (2008): 444-55.

[26] Ingeborg Maus, "From Nation-State to Global State or the Decline of Democracy," *Constellations* 13, no. 4 (2006): 473.

concept of global community of cosmopolitan citizens and states, as Habermas suggests, [27] or the idea of creating a world parliament within the framework and provisions of the UN Charter, as Held advocates.[28] Even though the normative sense that human rights imply the moral basis for conceiving an idea and an ideal of performing global citizenship, this notion, however, should be carefully treated so as to not invoke violence for making a global public in which these rights are to be enforced. 'Making' a global public suggests to use violence (or at least force) to overcome the challenges for reorganising global institutions. No 'perpetual peace,' as in Kant's thesis, can be attained by merely evoking individual rights without deterrence or the threat of using force.[29] Or even in a world state in cosmopolitan terms, as Canto argues, will bring "[a] cosmopolitan state of the world [which] is not a guarantee for perpetual peace but is likely to harbour renewed causes of conflict."[30]

Moral cosmopolitanism in the form of human rights—if we take the postulation in which every human being is of equal moral worth—is hallmark for the idea of global citizenship. Nevertheless, today's cosmopolitanism is taken differently from this moral assumption and which rather calls for government by rules and by international laws;[31] as Habermas and Held promote as "political cosmopolitanism" where rational activity and a common will are operated for the whole world.

The existence of an international regime of human rights remains at the exclusive jurisprudence of states. The liberal and democratic states have installed progressively

---

[27] Habermas, "The Constitutionalization of International Law," 448.

[28] Habermas, "The Constitutionalization of International Law," 447. David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), 279-80; and more recently see also Andrew Strauss, "Taking Democracy Global: Assessing the Benefits and Challenges of a Global Parliament Assembly," *One World Trust,* (2005) [accessed 24 November 2008]: available from www.oneworldtrust.org

[29] Canto-Sperber, "The Normative Foundations of Cosmopolitanism," 279.

[30] Canto-Sperber, "The Normative Foundations of Cosmopolitanism," 281.

[31] See James Bohman and M. Lutz-Bachmann, eds., *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1997).

international constraints within which human rights are defended today under the provisions of international law.[32] If we take for granted that cosmopolitan democracy should be put forward to enforce justice at a global level where rights must be adopted *a priori* as the basis of international institutional reforms, it is rather doubtful whether human rights are to be enforced by global institutions if a global public is nonexistent. The transposition of modern liberalism on the grounds that it focuses exclusively on rights reflects that cosmopolitan right is not at odds with state liberal politics; it is still oriented on both persons and states where the *res publica* is still constitutionally governed by an interstate order.[33]

If the creation of a global public order based on either international law considering an inter-state public or by the constitutionalization of human rights where these are enforced by supranational institutions occurs, then a few key questions follow. Where, for example, is the public situated to practice politics among individuals and political communities to debate and contest human rights and to give political meaning to intra- and trans-national citizenship? How is politics within and beyond the nation-state conceived in a world state order endorsed by *inter*national law where states are to be the primary political entities to discuss and create norms on human rights? I approach these questions in the rest of this chapter.

What needs to be highlighted now is what cosmopolitan democratic theorists render as possible solutions for conceiving global democracy in the form of liberal cosmopolitan democracy. That is, by giving in their basic idea the process of deliberation among free and

---

[32] See for example Rawls's account on "the law of peoples" which outlines the moral basis of a just system of international law and human rights. John Rawls, *The Law of Peoples,* 37, 65.
[33] Anna Yeatman, "Globality, State and Society," *Citizenship Studies* 7, no. 3 (September 2003): 275.

equal citizens in which deliberative democracy should be reached.[34] Nevertheless, this assumption of deliberative democracy still lacks a political meaning referring to a political collectivity relevant to the practice of democratic global citizenship I stress in this chapter. Both the liberal concept of deliberative democracy and the cosmopolitan view of citizenship regard individuals as the units of moral and legal rights in a world society.[35] The problem stems from this individualistic assumption, which liberal contemporary discourse on global democracy, as well on international institutional reforms, centres on. The following task, therefore, would be to re-assess whether global citizenship takes its democratic form through global institutions, or perhaps other forms of democracy need to be taken into account.

2. The Practice of Global Citizenship: Contesting Cosmopolitan Global Democracy as Global Governance Reforms

The liberal cosmopolitan approach of making a global public through cosmopolitan law, as I have exposed, concentrates on trumping individual autonomy and rationality to accomplish the ideal of forming a concept of a rather 'individual' global citizen. I refer here to the metaphor that Richard Falk gives to "the citizen pilgrim" to describe:

> the spirit of a sojourner, committed to transformation that is spiritual as well as material, that is premised on the wholeness and equality of the human family, and that is disinterested in devising technical fixes that will enable global governance to succeed as a functional project.[36]

The liberal cosmopolitan view of citizen, as Falk envisions and Held advocates, is based on individuals as bearers of rights, say of human rights, which undermines political meaning and collective identity. It also emphasises the empowerment of individuals to deliberate in multiple public spheres under the principle of impartiality which is paramount for

---

[34] Chantal Mouffe, "Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism?," *Social Research* 66, no. 3 (1999): 748.
[35] See Thomas W. Pogge, "Cosmopolitanism and Sovereignty," *Ethics* 103, no.1 (October 1992): 60-1.
[36] Richard Falk, *On Humane Governance: Toward a New Global Politics* (Cambridge: Polity, 1995), 211-2.

cosmopolitan institution-building.[37] Despite the liberal cosmopolitan assumption of developing possible allegiances of an individual to different forms of communities, which is based on *a priori* affectedness on the grounds of a neo-Kantian defence of individual autonomy, it falls short in underpinning the political meaning that citizenship requires for identity formation, collective embeddedness and allegiance to different layers of political communities. The liberal cosmopolitan concept of citizenship underlines human rights as the basis for cosmopolitan instititutional-building and for creating a 'global *demos*' in reforming global institutions. So global-cosmopolitan democracy, in a world system in which international institutions are conceived as the arenas for plausible politics beyond national borders, is furthered in conjunction with human rights as to reform global institutions but which lacks real political and democratic practice.

Despite the alleged assumption that liberal cosmopolitan politics collides with a sheer liberal statist one, liberal democracy at both points remains in shared legal and political cores whereby democracy ought to be practiced as a democracy first and foremost of individuals, not communities, who interact with multiple institutional layers, from the local to the global level.[38] This could result in ethically contentious understandings, especially when moral cosmopolitanism is not developed cautiously and which may descend into moral individualist cosmopolitanism: to ultimately protect and promote the values of individual autonomy and human dignity[39] within the frames of liberal politics. The ethical position in which cosmopolitan democracy has been reflected in discourse "towards a vision of humanity that is based on our interconnection and an understanding of

[37] David Held, "Cosmopolitanism: Globalisation Tamed?," *Review of International Studies* 29, no. 4 (2003): 476.
[38] Alexander Wendt, "A Comment on Held's Cosmopolitanism," in *Democracy's Edges*, eds. Ian Shapiro and Casiana Hacker-Cordon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 127-33.
[39] Geoffrey Stokes, "Transnational Citizenship: Problems of Definition, Culture and Democracy," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 17, no. 1 (April 2004): 122.

the need of shared values"[40] implies creating a homogenous understanding of individual basic rights that need to be enforced at the global scale. For example, the overarching principles of egalitarian individualism, reciprocal recognition, consent, and inclusiveness and subsidiarity were inscribed in significant post-war legal and institutional initiatives. Such was the case of the UN Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 and subsequent Covenants on Civil and Political Rights of 1966 that raised the egalitarian principle of human rights. More recently, the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action – adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights in 1993 – affirms that

> all human rights derive from the dignity and worth inherent in the human person, and that the human person is the central subject of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and consequently should be the principal beneficiary and should participate actively in the realization of these rights and freedoms.[41]

Single persons are regarded as subjects of international law and, in principle, they are the ultimate source of political authority.[42] It is this individualistic bias in the notion of global citizenship viewed via cosmopolitan democracy that I contest. Many international non-governmental organizations promote the notion of global citizenship to endorse, for example, social and environmental responsibility "in a worldwide community of which we are all a part,"[43] in a way that reveals the faculty assumption that the individualistic bias in basic liberal rights must necessarily be transferred to global citizenship rights. Or in Falk's words referring to his 'individualistic' metaphor of "citizen pilgrim": "in such a global setting [the citizen pilgrim] is to be a lonely voice in the wilderness, yet representing an

[40] This slogan has been created for global citizenship by the INGO WYSE International. See WYSE, "Our Approach", (2004) [accessed 16 November 2008]: available from
http://www.wyse-ngo.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=14&Itemid=34
[41] United Nations (UN), "Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action," UN General Assembly, A/CONF.157/23, Geneva, July 12, 1993 [accessed 18 November 2008]: available from
http://www.unhchr.ch/huridocda/huridoca.nsf/(Symbol)/A.CONF.157.23.En?Opendocument
[42] See Marc Weller, "The Reality of the Emerging Universal Constitutional Order: Putting the Pieces of the Puzzle Together," *Cambridge Review of International Studies* 10, no. 2 (1997): 40-63; and James Crawford and Susan Marks, "The Global Democracy Deficit," in *Re-imaging Political Community,* eds. Daniele Archibugi, David Held and Martin Köhler (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), 72-90.
[43] Eric C. Dahlin and Ann Hironaka, "Citizenship Beyond Borders: A Cross-National Study of Dual Citizenship," *Social Inquiry* 78, no. 1 (February 2008): 61.

ethically driven commitment to truthfulness, human and natural wellbeing, and an overall quest for sustainability and equity."[44]

Such is the case of Charter 99 that advocates fair and equal participation in the process of global-policy making who affects the people that are not represented in international institutions, such as the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the UN—to mention two institutions which most of the debates on global governance reforms centre on.[45] Charter 99 may not embody the all-encompassing document that describes comprehensively the cosmopolitan view of citizenship. However, it shows core elements of the cosmopolitan worldview as an alternative to democratic practice and hence 'world citizenship.'[46] It highlights cosmopolitan values in the respect of human rights and cosmopolitan democracy in the form of democratic accountability and participation in the international institutions' decision-making.[47] Since its creation for readdressing the agenda of global governance months before the UN Millennium Assembly Summit in September 2000, it brought side-by-side an alternative agenda in the name of global governance reform. The conflict is present when determining the ethical or the institutional role about what nations ought to do, and about membership of institutions of a specifically global kind.[48] In addition, it is worth mentioning that the promotion of such global governance reforms may be devoid of potential political meaning to foster and even conceive global

---

[44] Richard Falk, "Towards a Necessary Utopianism Democratic Global Governance," *The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research*, August 2008 [accessed 3 March 2009]: available from http://www.transnational.org/Resources_Treasures/2008/Falk_NecessaryUtopianism.html
[45] See for example David Held, "Regulating Globalization? The Reinvention of Politics," *International Sociology* 15, no. 2 (June 2000): 398.
[46] Charter 99, *A Charter for Global Democracy* (2000) [accessed 21 September 2008]: available from http://www.oneworldtrust.org/pages/download.cfm?did=97
[47] Charter 99, *A Charter for Global Democracy,* 4.
[48] Nigel Dower, "Global Citizenship: Yes or No?," in *Global Citizenship: A Critical Reader*, eds. Nigel Dower and John Williams (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 30.

citizenship within the justification of making equitable global policies as seen in the holistic discourse to promote "a more peaceful, prosperous and just world."[49]

First, it is significant to identify the rationale that accompanies the efforts that have been demonstrated in the advocacy of greater equality and representation in the reform of global governance paralleled to human rights and these in the epithet of global citizenship. The transversal relationship between the political and policy-making, namely cosmopolitan democracy, may come to confusion when speaking of global citizenship as an *enhanced* concept of modern-liberal citizenship. This point is pertinent for understanding the means and the purpose of developing such a concept and perhaps it urges us to question whether global citizenship may be only developed through the scheme and arenas of 'governing' global institutions. Charter 99, for example, advocates accountability and participation of civil society in international decision-making. Although the Charter does make an emphasis on global democracy interrelated to global citizenship, it falls short in capturing the complexity of citizenship when it is translated into the global sphere. Both the UN Millennium Declaration[50] and Charter 99 invoke the UN Declaration of Human Rights as the basis for promoting 'world citizenship.' Yet the scheme of inter-state politics is still present in both documents and they do not highlight the participation not only of individuals in global institutions, but also the political participation of civil society in multi-tier polities. Clearly human rights must be promoted and form the justification of global citizenship. However, the assumption of universal rights interpreted at a global political

---

[49] United Nations (UN), Millennium Declaration, UN General Assembly, A/RES/55/2, New York, September 2000 [accessed 18 September 2008]: available from http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.htm
[50] United Nations (UN), "United Nations Millennium Declaration," Part V, UN General Assembly, A/RES/55/2, New York, 18 September 2000 [accessed 19 August 2008]: available from
http://www.un.org/millennium/declaration/ares552e.pdf

community—as seen in the 'publics' of global institutions—must be subject to re-assessment and, instead, negotiated in the plural spectrum of global multi-tier polities.

2.1 A Democratic Critique

The cosmopolitan view on global democracy and, more precisely, its relation to human rights, focuses on the creation of new global governance structures with responsibility for addressing poverty, welfare and related issues to offset the power and influence of market-oriented agencies such as the WTO and IMF.[51] Cosmopolitan democracy suggests, as Held argues, "new forms of international regulation, the development of regional and global governance structures."[52] By the same token, the report of the UN Commision on Global Governance, which bore the title of *Our Global Neighbourhood*, gives a comprehensive example for underpinning "global values ... as the cornerstone of global governance."[53] Yet this vision of creating a 'global ethic' would lead us to think that some kind of a normative standard of global justice needs to be established in order to create such 'governance structures.' I find in such allusion ethical and practical problems. Nevertheless, due to spatial restrictions, I will not give a full analysis of the ethical and practical implications of creating a (moral) global public to the extent that some theorists argue to pursue a global egalitarian approach via redistributive justice.[54] I highlight instead that such global ethic is far from being attainable by only considering that we live in a world of value conflicts. Even though we accept there is a 'global' consensus on certain elements of a 'global ethic,'

---

[51] See for example Pippa Norris, "Global Governance and Cosmopolitan Citizens," in *Governance in a Globalizing World*, eds. Joseph S. Nye Jr. and John D. Donahue (Washington, DC: Brookings, 2000).

[52] Held, "Cosmopolitanism: Globalisation Tamed?," 466.

[53] Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighbourhood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).

[54] On 'moral individuation' in a Rawlsian sense, and global governance regarding worldwide redistributive justice see, for example, Andrew Kuper, "Rawlsian Global Justice: Beyond the Law of Peoples to a Cosmopolitan Law of Persons," *Political Theory* 28, no. 5 (October 2000): 640-74; Charles R. Beitz, *Political Theory and International Relations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, [1979] 1999); Pogge, "Cosmopolitanism and Sovereignty," 48-75; Thomas W. Pogge, *Global Justice* (Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 2001); and Thomas W. Pogge, "Moral Universalism and Global Economic Justice," *Philosophy and Economics* 1, no. 1 (February 2002): 29-58.

such as 'human rights,' there are still conflicts over the specific policies to enforce such rights. Democratic politics, on their part, finds one expression in "the authoritative allocation of values for a political community as a whole."[55] Or further, as Axtamann argues: "[d]emocracy aims to prevent the authoritarian or dictatorial allocation of such values by institutionalising mechanisms of popular participation in, and control over, political decision-making."[56]

It should not be misunderstood, however, that a cosmopolitan idea of the individual (in terms of universal respect) is worthless for viewing democracy within and beyond national borders. Nor should human rights be considered as merely individualistic rights, as most cosmopolitans view them. What has to be re-assessed (or reformulated) is the conception of global citizenship that could regard both political participation in significant democratic publics; and a kind of moral justification that gives 'inclusive' membership to individuals to participate in multi-level public discourses. In such an attempt, the task would reside, from now on, in providing a deeper scope of global citizenship by identifying where the sites for potential democratic deliberation are, on one hand; and to give a more fully political and ontological scope for meaningful democratic deliberation on cosmopolitan norms, such as human rights on the other.

3. **Action in Multi-tier 'Global' Publics: Moral Cosmopolitanism and Democratic Iterations as the Normative Ground and Democratic Practice of Global Citizenship**

As analysed in the two previous chapters, the nation-state centrism for conceiving the demarcation of citizenship as the ultimate *political* space within the context of intense globalisation, say of a broader creation of trans-territorial social networks, is no longer

---

[55] Roland Axtamann, "What's Wrong with Cosmopolitan Democracy?," in *Global Citizenship: A Reader*, eds. Nigel Dower and John Williams (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002), 112.
[56] Axtamann, "What's Wrong," 112.

feasible for visualising citizenship only within this territorial space. The experience of multilayered spatial practice shows that political activity is possible whereby individuals can develop multiple political identities through the interaction in-between different political arenas. I hope to show here how democratic iterations are put in practice and how these can be *constituting* of the formation, and affirmation, of identity(ies) as well as the practice of a concept of global citizenship thicker than its cosmopolitan variants.[57]

As shown previously, the notion of global citizenship viewed in terms of cosmopolitan democracy in line with Charter 99 as a response to the UN Millennium Declaration on the advocacy for democratic accountability and participation in international decision-making, does not give relevance to political meaning and involvement to fill the gaps that a thick dimension of global citizenship require. I rather argue that citizenship 'in practice' can be developed in multiple spaces where the 'global' component of citizenship corresponds to the practice of citizenship in diverse and multiple public spaces.[58] As pointed out earlier, the sense of political community is still necessary for delimiting citizenship and the idea of democratic iterations gives the elements of *justification* in contesting and pursuing cosmopolitan norms, and *legitimacy* in the form of democratic practice, which I discuss separately.

The impact of globalisation in the re-definition of state boundaries is also significant to re-assess the normative closure within which citizenship is practiced. Cosmopolitan International Relations theorists have given an important contribution to develop "post-Westphalian" conceptions of sovereignty in which the state could be a mediating figure of

---

[57] Interestingly, a concept of "thick cosmopolitanism" is explored as an alternative view of thin cosmopolitanism. This view suggests the concept of "nearness" through which "relationships of causal responsibility" are identified. See Andrew Dobson, "Thick Cosmopolitanism," *Political Studies* 54, no. 1 (2006): 165-84.
[58] Saskia Sassen shares this vision of the 'global', in her words, as "multi-scalar" which not only takes place at the global scale but also at the national and sub-national scales. See Saskia Sassen, "The Participation of States and Citizens in Global Governance," *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies* 10, no. 5 (2003): 5.

different loyalties at the subnational, national and international level so as to overcome the challenges of sovereignty that global forces, say social and economic, have to national citizenship.[59] They have given formulations of global citizenship to reveal that there is a possibility of a dialectal movement beyond the closed world of the sovereign state which can be developed encompassing the individual, the subnational, the national and the international political structures. However, their theoretical approaches fall short in emphasising the thick dimension that global citizenship requires to create the bonds between different levels of political communities and political meaning to develop citizenship in practice. In other words, the liberal-democratic concept of citizenship, like cosmopolitanism, disregards the multiple ways in which global citizenship can be politically constructed. Democratic iterations are a distinct form of visualising that democracy as well as politics can be practiced in multilayered public arenas. The practice of democratic iterations, which I elaborate shortly, overcome the challenges that globalisation poses to the concept of modern-liberal citizenship as an 'institution' and thereby promotes a disaggregated form in a context where state sovereignty comes under increasing stress where supra- as well as subnational spaces for democratic attachments and agency are present in the contemporary world.[60]

As established in chapter two, human rights as cosmopolitan norms may bring the moral justification to the concept of global citizenship alongside democratic iterations

[59] See for example Charles R. Beitz, *Political Theory and International Relations*; Charles R. Beitz, "Rawls's Law of Peoples," *Ethics* 110, no. 4 (July 2000): 669-96; Allan Buchanan, "Rawls's Law of Peoples: Rules for a Vanished Westphalian World," *Ethics* 110, no. 4 (July 2000): 697-721; Andrew Linklater, "Citizenship and Sovereignty in the Post-Westphalian State," *European Journal of International Relations* 2, no. 1 (1996): 77-103; and Pogge, "Cosmopolitanism and Sovereignty," 48-75.
[60] See Saskia Sassen, "Towards Post-National and Denationalized Citizenship," in *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, eds. Engin F. Isin and Bryan S. Turner (New York: Sage, 2003).

which enhance popular sovereignty while other forms of global law undermine it.[61] One example would be the relationship between deterritorialised law and global capitalism or as Teubner argues as "global law without a state."[62] Unlike the liberal cosmopolitan view of citizenship, the concept of democratic iterations emphasises respecting the claims of diverse democratic communities, regarding their distinct cultural, legal, and constitutional self-understandings, albeit strengthening their commitments to emerging norms of cosmopolitan justice.[63] In this sense, human rights through democratic iterations transcend the historical or cultural context of any particular nation-state and give the legal and political framework in which a disaggregated form of citizenship could be practiced.

In so doing, I echo Soysal's assumption on post-national citizenship when she suggests that there is "an increasing contradiction between rights, which are universal, uniform and globally defined, and social identities, which are particularistic and territorially specified."[64] Contestation of human rights requires, in my view, key elements of democracy in forms that participatory politics de-centre, or transcend national political life. It implies that such networks are conducted to democratic citizenship if they are accompanied by active involvement with representative institutions "which exhibit accountability, transparency, and responsibility toward a given constituency."[65] Legitimacy and democratic attachments are necessary to conceive a democratic global citizenship. They are also relevant since transnational networks without democratic attachment can propagate

---

[61] Seyla Benhabib, "Twilight of Sovereignty or the Emergence of Cosmopolitan Norms? Rethinking Citizenship in Volatile Times," *Citizenship Studies* 11, no. 1 (February 2007): 22.

[62] Gunther Teubner, "Global Bukowina: Legal Pluralism in the World-Society," in *Global Law without a State*, ed. Gunther Teubner (Aldershot & Brookfield, VT: Darthmouth, 1997), 3.

[63] The concept of 'democratic iterations', as discussed in chapter two, is developed mainly by Seyla Benhabib. She gives several examples regarding the rights of people who are not protected in constituencies where they have no right to claim; the disaggregated form of European citizenship; as well as the contributions of Kant's principle of hospitality and Hannah Arendt's concept of "The Rights to have Rights". See Seyla Benhabib, *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents and Citizens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

[64] Soysal, *Limits of Citizenship*, 3.

[65] Seyla Benhabib, "Disaggregation of Citizenship Rights," *Parallax* 11, no. 1 (2005): 15.

fundamentalism as well as terrorism to create alternative polities, on one hand, or the exercise of free economic agencies in non-democratic borderless markets activities, on the other.[66]

It should be noted that the practice of thicker citizenship and yet the practice of transterritorial citizenship may also require institutional frameworks so as to guarantee equal access in order that equal participants are able to bring themselves to political encounter as equal political beings.[67] For example, there are several international conventions in which states have agreed upon human rights norms. Even though most of the conventions have been set under the provisions of the UN treaty bodies, the human rights regime could be understood as a set of interrelated and overlapping global and regional regimes that encompass human rights treaties as well as customary international law.[68] Clearly these treaties are only enforced either by international organizations[69] or legally by states to their own population. It should nevertheless be underlined, in fact, that international, regional, national and sub-national legal frameworks are indispensable to guarantee the legal status of every citizen to be participants in forming a moral conversation concerning cosmopolitan norms as human rights. Yet it should be noted that the traditional discourse of human rights seen as universal and of unrestricted validity, binding all

---

[66] Aihwa Ong, "Experiments with Freedom: Milieus of the Human," *American Literary History* 18, no. 2 (March 2006): 231.

[67] James Bonham, "The Moral Costs of Political Pluralism: the Dilemmas of Difference and Equality in Arendt's Reflections on Little Rock," in *Hannah Arendt: Twenty Years Later,* eds. Larry May and Jerome Kohn (Cambridge, MA.: MIT Press, 1997), 68.

[68] There are some examples that the UN treaty bodies include such as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, the Convention Against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child. See Benhabib, *The Rights of Others*, 7.

[69] Such as the NATO proceeded to military intervene in order to cease ethnic cleansing and crimes against the civilian population in Bosnia and Kosovo.

individuals and societies whatever their religion, tradition, or culture[70] may encounter some problems. There is an existing moral dilemma of what values and rights constitute the essential and universal features of human beings which are allegedly universally acknowledged to be intrinsically valuable and essential to everyone. There are also competing notions of human rights as moral rights (e.g. the conception of basic interests, the idea of human dignity, of autonomy, or of basic capacities[71]) that may concern the core moral aspects of global citizenship. However, both the modern-liberal and the liberal cosmopolitan view of human rights disregard the political component that may lead to human rights discourse become irrelevant, or even worse, to justify the instrumentalisation of power for purposes that "have little to do with ensuring the liberty, agency, integrity, capabilities, or dignity of persons."[72] I aimed to show throughout this chapter that the encompassing nature between human rights and the concept of global citizenship not only highlights citizens' equality and political agency and the right of membership alike the liberal concept of citizenship and of human rights. It also underlines the way which contested meanings of citizenship and human rights can be developed in broader ways of thinking about politics and society in multiple legal polities.

3.1 'Global' Civil Society and Legal Constituencies: 'Strong' and 'Weak' Milieus for Meaningful Global Citizenship

The emergent 'global' civil society gives a perfect example on how political practice can be developed crossing the boundaries of the nation-state territory.[73] The term of "global civil

---

[70] Allan Gewirth, *Human Rights* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1982); and Jack Donnelly, *Universal Human Rights* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003).

[71] For an agency view see Alan Gewirth, *Human Rights*. For a basic interest view see John Finnis, *Natural Law and Natural Rights* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1980); and Joseph Raz, *The Morality of Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988).

[72] Jean L. Cohen, "Rethinking Human Rights, Democracy, and Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization," *Political Theory* 36, no. 4 (August 2008): 582.

[73] Chris Brown, "Cosmopolitanism, World Citizenship and Global Civil Society," *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 3, no. 1 (2000): 7-26.

society," however, must be treated cautiously since its meaning "is neither self-evident nor unprejudiced."[74] I will not attempt to go into depth on how "global civil society" is conformed and how it is deemed in its various definitions. Nevertheless, I take Keane's definition of "global civil society" as "a vast, interconnected, and multi-layered social space that comprises many hundreds of thousands of self-directing or non-governmental institutions and ways of life."[75] Keane argues,

> the members of global civil society help to conserve or to alter the power relations embedded in the chains of interaction linking the local, regional, and planetary orders. Their cross-border networks help to define and redefine who gets what, when, and how in the world. Of great importance is the fact that these networks have the power to shape new identities, even to stimulate awareness among the world's inhabitants that mutual understanding of different ways of life is a practical necessity, that we are being drawn into the first genuinely transnational order, a global civil society."[76]

This concept, however, remains too broad so as to capture the potentialities of 'global' civil society for the practice of global citizenship that regard the aspects of politics for the discussion of human rights, and democracy for the delimitation of political spaces. The multiple forms of transnational politics in 'global' civil society, e.g. NGOs, may also not have the aim of debating and contesting cosmopolitan norms as their justification and may not be completely democratic in the process of achieving their specific goals. Or as Ong argues,

> [i]t would appear that spatial freedom and movements we associate with diasporas and market-driven mobilities are no guarantees of the spread of human rights; on the contrary, these border-crossing movements often attest to the rise of nondemocratic forms of negative freedom. Transnational NGOs can only intervene in specific milieus, tinkering at the edge of sheer life, falling far short of claims about "a single normative rights standard."[77]

---

[74] John Keane, "Global Civil Society?," in *Global Civil Society 2001*, eds. Helmut Anheier, Marlies Glasius and Mary Kaldor (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 23.
[75] John Keane, "Global Civil Society?," 23.
[76] John Keane, "Global Civil Society?," 24.
[77] Ong, "Experiments with Freedom," 242.

I rather underline the potentialities of transnational politics in civil society[78] (as I designate the term 'global' to citizenship[79]) to make possible the debate of cosmopolitan norms in multi-layered public spaces with the difference of doing so through democratic iterations. As pointed out earlier, human rights declarations and covenants have been important to domestic civil society and social movement activists so as to bring legitimate justice-based and democracy-oriented demands to claim rights against their own governments and to demand their legal and constitutional institutionalization.[80] This last argument is essential to focus on the political agency of local actors and movements that may be the main vehicle for denouncing domestic or transnational injustice, for example, and to give an "ethical-political" meaning to the universal principles they may invoke.[81]

The concept that Arendt gives to "space-in-between" is fruitful to conceive politics "in a nascent or emerging 'global' civil society that is typically characterised in liberal terms."[82] She gives rather a deeper concept of politics that relies less on law and institutions but underpins the scope for a "politics of freedom via active involvement," through dialogue among individuals which brings a "rich identity and rootedness" rather than a view of citizenship as a rights-holding thinner status.[83] In this sense, the concept of "space-in-between" can enlarge the scope of thicker citizenship which can be practiced in different spaces, from the local to the regional or global level. The transnational aspect of citizenship practice is doable through 'multi-spatial' civil society which has no fixed borders in terms

---

[78] For a well-developed analysis on the controversy between civil society and citizenship, see Agnes S. Ku, "Beyond Paradoxical Conception of 'Civil Society without Citizenship'," *International Sociology* 17, no. 4 (December 2003): 529-48.

[79] See the term I give to 'global' in chapter two, and page 93 of this chapter.

[80] Cohen, "Rethinking Human Rights," 581.

[81] Cohen, "Rethinking Human Rights," 581.

[82] The liberal terms refers to the cosmopolitan view of global democracy are exemplified in the work of Archibui and Held in Daniele Archibugi and David Held, *Cosmopolitan Democracy* (Cambridge: Polity, 1995).

[83] Anthony F. Lang, Jr. and John Williams, *Hannah Arendt and International Relations: Reading Across the Lines* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 199.

of sovereignty. It brings in addition the political form that responds to the diversity of individuals and communities in a world where the destabilising of national state-centered hierarchies of legitimate power and allegiance has enabled the multiplication of non- and partly formalised political dynamics and actors.[84] For example (and as in practice), the interlocking networks of local and global activists in the form of an emergent 'global' civil society give new possibilities of cross-boundary politics that may demand in their constituencies forms of post- and transnational citizenship projects. I would like to show one illustration of how democratic iterations (as complex processes of deliberation and exchange through which universal rights are contested, contextualised, and reformulated through legal and political constitutions) take the form in both 'weak' and 'strong' polities.

Migrants' organizations are one among many examples of how public debate can generate democratic iterations by complementing both social informal networks (weak polities) in their respective legal constituencies (strong polities). Such is the case for the *Frente Indígena Binacional* (FIOB) as one organization which represents native Oaxaquenian and Baja-Californian migrants in the United States.[85] This organization was founded to fight for the respect of indigenous migrants and non-migrants' human rights.[86] This is a communitarian transnational network that consists of a well-structured body that designs projects and programs alongside governmental institutions. As a transnational social network, it tries to find economic resources and develop political and social organizational processes both in Mexico and in the US. Nevertheless, besides having a

---

[84] Saskia Sassen, "The Repositioning of Citizenship," in *People out of Place: Globalization, Human Rights, and the Citizenship Gap,* ed. Alison Brysk and Gershon Shafir (New York: Routledge, 2004), 191.
[85] Frente Indígena de Organizaciones Binacionales (FIOB). Available from http://fiob.org/quienes-somos
[86] Rufino Domínguez Santos, *Proyectos del frente indígena oaxaqueño Binacional,* Estados Unidos, Fresno, California, 31 May, 2000, [conversation] Cited by María del Rosario Campos Beltrán, "Mujeres y redes de migrantes. Un análisis de caso del FIOB," in *La sociedad civil en la encrucijada. Los retos de la ciudadanía en un contexto global*, eds. Edgar Esquivel and Israel Covarrubias (México, D.F.: ITESM, 2005), 292.

transnational character, this organization upholds cultural as well as social links with their localities.[87] However, my attention has been drawn to the organization's fight for women human rights and their political participation within the organization and their localities in both countries. This is due to the organization's major objectives: to protect women who face the problematic of migration processes, especially of relocation and residency.[88] In the case of indigenous groups, whose communitarian structures are strong, the organizational structures as resources become at stake within migration processes. But in the case of women migrants, the challenge is even greater. One of the main processes is migrant political participation in the United States. The political system differs, and migrant may live a lack of correspondence between his or her political culture and other institutional rules. This may result, in time, in new adjustments within social structures that may obstruct or facilitate this transition.[89] From October 1991 to May 2000, FIOB implemented 13 projects to benefit indigenous migrant women.[90] From the creation of FIOB up to now, indigenous women participation has increased in their localities as well as in the organization. Their participation in multiple publics (from Oaxaca to California) has significantly boosted their political role in determining their individual rights in both political spheres.[91] This has been particularly significant for the progress of gender equality, but also to enhance indigenous women's perception about their role in political discourse that has an important effect in their right to public debate as well as their political participation to fight for their rights.

---

[87] Referring to "paisanaje" as the individual identity to his or her community. See Lane Hyrabayati Ryo, "Paisanazgo and Migrant Associations," in *Cultural Capital: Mountain Zapotec Migrant Associations in Mexico City* (Tucson and London: The University of Arizona Press, 1993), 1-24.

[88] Campos Beltrán, "Mujeres y redes de migrantes," 285.

[89] Víctor Manuel Durand Ponte, *Etnia y cultura política. Los mexicanos en los Estados Unidos* (México, D.F.: Miguel Ángel Porrúa and Centro Regional de Investigaciones Multidisciplinarias – UNAM: 2000), 14.

[90] Domínguez, *Proyectos del frente indígena.* Cited in "Mujeres y redes de migrantes."

[91] FIOB, *Declaración de Principios, Programa de Acción y Estatutos,* Documentos Básicos del Frente Indígena Oaxaqueño Binacional (1994), 7-8.

The existence of FIOB and other pro-activist immigrant groups that have engaged in militant action in most developed countries, demonstrate that democratic iterations can take place today *in-between* spaces of communication and action by transnational public spheres and by migrants who are themselves often bi-national or post-national, as well as being seasonal or temporary workers. Particularly, the public debate about the status of undocumented workers in the U.S., who are predominantly of Mexican origin, has set up negotiations and conversations among Mexican representatives and state and local leaders in regions of the US that have been affected by migration. For example, in November 2008, the *Mexican American Legal Defence Fund* and the National Council of *La Raza*—the oldest and largest Hispanic American civil rights organization—denounced the rise in hate crimes taking place in the US, especially against Hispanics, and called for passage of the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crime Prevention Act (LLEHCP) to ensure federal jurisdiction when local officials fail to act.[92]

These examples show how the concept of global citizenship, pursuing the debate on human rights and at the same time guaranteeing the principle of *egalitarian reciprocity* and *universal moral respect* as the moral justification, ensure the participation of citizens so as to establish discourses where citizens can debate and ask for *justification of the presuppositions of the conversations to build the appropriate publics for determining rights claims*.[93] Democratic iterations – as new forms of legitimisation to construct political boundaries either within 'thick' or 'thin' political systems – give legitimacy and justification to multilayered forms of political practice. This concept also considers a distinct way in which citizenship can be constructed in its variable senses consisting of

---

[92] Alison Raphael, "RIGHTS-US: Lawmakers Urged to Stem Wave of Hate Crimes," *Global Intelligence News*, 25 November, 2008 [accessed 18 January 2009]: available from
http://globalintel.net/wp/2008/11/25/rights-us-lawmakers-urged-to-stem-wave-of-hate-crimes/
[93] See chapter two for reference on the 'justification' of global citizenship based on cosmopolitan norms.

"historically and culturally specific forms of political agency, participatory activity, human capacities, and social attitudes and relations"[94] – as in the case of FIOB.

Democratic iterations give an alternative view of how global citizenship can be formed within democratic practices by underlying at the same time cultural, social, and political processes that may give differentiated forms of political membership at particular times. Unlike the view of a liberal international citizenship view based on international law, justice and human rights,[95] the concept of global citizenship as citizenship practiced in democratic iterations is not only conceived as a status of rights (as stipulated in most international treaties regarding human rights), and which I have discussed throughout this thesis. It rather emphasises political practices on and for rights.

4. **Conclusion: 'Global' Citizenship: Multi-spatial Milieus for Political and Democratic Action**

As analysed in the two previous chapters, the traditional nation-state centric approach for conceiving the demarcation of citizenship as the ultimate *political* space within the context of intense globalisation, say of a broader creation of trans-territorial networks, is no longer feasible for visualising citizenship only and exclusively within this territorial space. The experience of multi-layered political activity shows that individuals can have multiple identities through the interaction in-between different political arenas. I tried to show in this chapter how democratic iterations are put in practice and how these can be *constituting* on the formation, and affirmation, of identity(ies) as well as the practice of thicker citizenship. I contested the notion of global citizenship viewed in terms of cosmopolitan democracy in line with Charter 99 and the report of the UN Commission on Global Governance on the

---

[94] Kevin Olson, "Constructing Citizens," *The Journal of Politics* 70, no. 1 (January 2008): 41.
[95] International citizenship is understood as "the province of national governments working within the many international and regional institutions formed under the auspices of international organizations such as the UN … [and] is usually limited by the mutual respect for sovereignty of other states, which are the members of international society". See Geoffrey Stokes, "Transnational Citizenship," 123.

advocacy for democratic accountability and participation in international decision-making. Yet, the cosmopolitan form of democracy—which is brought directly to individuals and founded upon human rights and the ethical demands of world civil society[96]—shows theoretically that still there is a gap in the realm of political practice that has not been filled in the legitimization of human rights.

As I have argued, a sense of political community is still necessary for delimiting citizenship and the imaginary of a global community, as promoted by cosmopolitanism, may well lead to ethical and practical problems. I argued that citizenship 'in practice' can be developed in multiple spaces where the 'global' component of citizenship corresponds to the practice of citizenship in diverse and multiple spaces. The transnational aspect of global citizenship that I have formerly argued consists of the inter-action between multiple political communities from the local to the global space through democratic iterations. These iterations can be created in-between informal (weak) publics of civil society, such as informal, non-state and transnational pressure groups. 'Global' civil society can ameliorate radical opposition between global aspirations and local self-determination, which can pursue debate on human rights, on one hand, and cultural identity and recognition, on the other. However, I placed emphasis on the importance of minimal institutional frameworks as (strong) publics in order to guarantee free access of citizens in public debate. They also demonstrate that both kinds of publics can be mutually complemented, in the form of democratic iterations, which provide both action and political meaning, on one hand, and legal construction as result of public debate. In-between both strong and weak publics a concept of global citizenship, I claimed, can be situated.

---

[96] Monique Canto-Sperber, "The Normative Foundations of Cosmopolitanism," 272.