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The University of Glasgow was established in 1451, and is the fourth oldest University in the UK. It has long been prominent as a crucible of ideas with a global impact, boasting alumni of such calibre as Adam Smith and Lord Kelvin, six Nobel Laureates, as well as many prominent UK and Scottish politicians, both historic and contemporary. The modern University of Glasgow is increasingly international in both its outlook and its population, and students, staff, and alumni are making increasingly significant and positive contributions to the lives of people both at home and abroad.

It is in the context of these longstanding traditions of intellectual rigour, internationalisation, and service to others that I am delighted to commend this collection of contributions on the subject of Global Citizenship Education. The book has its origins in large part in the work of the Education for Global Citizenship Unit (EGCU), located within the Faculty of Education at the University of Glasgow. Academic staff from the Unit and wider Faculty are responsible for no less than 10 chapters of this edition. In addition, much of the editing work was conducted by the Director and Deputy Director of this innovative Unit, alongside a former Professor of Education in the Faculty. The University’s strong tradition of international collaboration is also in evidence across the collection given the array of contributors from beyond the UK.

One of the Unit’s core objectives over recent years, with the support of the UK Department for International Development (DFID), has been to enhance development awareness among teachers at all stages of their careers. A key means to promote this awareness is through research and the dissemination of fresh thinking relating to global issues and the corresponding role of education. The Unit has acted as a catalyst in this regard, bringing together a genuinely international spectrum of views on the interrelationships between globalisation, citizenship, identity, and education. These relationships are often contested and sometimes controversial, however the University recognises and supports the importance of such debate and deliberation, and of the need to open and maintain dialogue between the different perspectives.

This collection makes a valuable and original contribution to this debate by presenting a set of challenges to policymakers, researchers, curriculum planners and teachers across the world. The different chapters combine contemporary critique with a view of the future often imbued with a palpable sense of urgency; these key global issues require to be addressed in all of our schools and by all educators (including Universities such as Glasgow). The truly global reach of the different chapters and contributors lends weight to the breadth of analysis, and reflects the value of international collaboration around themes such as these.
FOREWORD

On behalf of the University of Glasgow I wish to congratulate the Editors and all contributors to this collection, and I hope that it achieves the international impact that it merits.

Sir Muir Russell
Principal and Vice-Chancellor
University of Glasgow
Bringing together a collection of this scale has been a long haul and its concept and shape has changed over time. Its genesis is certainly in the Education for Global Citizenship Unit (EGCU) at the University of Glasgow. I was invited by Harry Blee to contribute a seminar or two to the EGCU’s programme, supported by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) and aimed at teachers, teacher educators and teachers in training. At that point I thought that global citizenship was a contradiction in terms and that citizenship was a characteristic that could be ascribed only by the nation-state to its members bounded by a territory and a set of laws. In the same period in 2001 I was trying to write material on terrorism in relation to questions of education and globalisation that became the collection *Education, Globalization and the State in the Age of Terrorism* (2004). Indeed, the chapter I contributed to the collection ‘War as Globalization: The “Education” of the Iraqi People’ I first gave as a seminar in the EGCU series in 2003.

It is fair to say that the Unit and its activities had a profound influence on me; forcing me to rethink the notion of global citizenship and as a result leading to a sea-change in my ideas. I no longer thought about citizenship purely in terms of the nation-state, and I came to believe that the promise of global civil society depended upon an active global citizenship education programme. This would not be a ‘shallow’ syllabus that considered notions of ‘citizen’, ‘citizenship’, ‘nation’, ‘state’ etc. and their reconfiguration within the context of globalisation but instead, and more importantly, raised awareness and embarked on a political education of many issues facing the world community; adopting an action-orientation and intelligent advocacy toward issues of poverty, war, hunger, inequality, the spread of disease, ecological disasters, and, in particular, the exploitation and abuse of children. In short, I received a political reorientation in the company of colleagues in the Faculty of Education at the University of Glasgow and through dialogue and discussion with colleagues, teachers and students. I now no longer think of global citizenship as an oxymoronic term but rather think of it as a component of the imaginary of global civil society, and a natural complement to global studies in education that has the aim not just of human rights education but rather an active political agenda and the greater sensitisation toward global cultural exchange and questions of internationalisation.

Remarkably, today it is the case that people interconnected by any means but especially critical mass communication through the facility of the Internet and the World Wide Web now constitute a threshold for the emergence of a myriad of global civil spaces that already comprise a densely woven global civil society (albeit still in its infancy). The prospect of greater North/South dialogue and joint education projects based around the concept of global citizenship holds the best of the Enlightenment promises – education for all, greater scientific and pedagogical
conversation and communication, the spread of freedom through access to knowledge and information, and political action in the face of social injustice.

In respect of my five years in the then newly created Faculty of Education at the University of Glasgow and the Education for Global Citizenship Unit I wish to personally record my thanks to some colleagues in Scotland: Harry Blee, Bob Davis, Jim Conroy, Cathy Fagan, Robert Docherty, John Dakers, Christine Forde, Alan Britton, Frank O’Hagan, and many others.

My co-editors Harry Blee and Alan Britton also wish to acknowledge and thank some of the individuals and groups associated with the Education for Global Citizenship Unit at the University of Glasgow. First and foremost, they would like to thank Jacqueline Doogan and Jacqueline Jackson who have provided outstanding administrative and organisational support and expertise throughout the lifetime of the Unit and its associated projects and programmes. Both have also played pivotal roles in the organisation of this book, processing and formatting the various chapters and maintaining a close eye on deadlines. Faculty colleagues Stephen McKinney and Frank O’Hagan kindly assisted with document checking and proof-reading, and Jon Lewin from the SCRE Centre provided further immensely valuable support in this regard. However responsibility for any errors within the text lies with the Editors.

Harry and Alan would also like to acknowledge the role of the International Development Education Association in Scotland (IDEAS), an umbrella organisation of NGOs with an interest in global and development issues, which was a key partner in the first three years of the DFID-funded project, and provided an external perspective that enhanced greatly the philosophy, scope and impact of this work. Alan would also like to thank Karen and Catriona for inspiration.

While most of the chapters in this book are original, several are adapted from previously published material, and the editors are grateful for the permissions granted to facilitate this:


Michael A. Peters
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, September 4, 2007

Harry Blee & Alan Britton
University of Glasgow, September 5, 2007
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INTRODUCTION

Many Faces of Global Civil Society: Possible Futures for Global Citizenship

The underlying political concepts of the notion of citizenship struck during the Enlightenment are in disarray as though they have melted under the constant sun of the combined and sometimes contradictory processes of globalisation, localisation and regionalisation. This collection of over thirty chapters brings together an international field of contributors who examine these concepts and processes in a fresh light, and provide a variety of perspectives and prescriptions that deserve to have a significant impact on national and transnational educational policy critique and policy making.

From Canada to South Africa, from Scotland to the Middle East, from Sweden to New Zealand, from the Netherlands to the United States; the contributions are both geographically and ideologically diverse. This is a reflection of the genuinely global current interest in issues of citizenship and globalisation, and how these can be addressed through education. Certain contributors locate the roots of some of these issues in 19th Century industrial and scholastic processes, or in the experiences of migrant communities in the Old and the New World, or arising from the impact of such migration on indigenous peoples. Fresh inspiration and insight is thus gained from historic contextualisation, while other chapters are resolutely contemporary, drawing on recent and ongoing political events and processes. A number of contested issues are addressed, including racism, migration, colonialisation, terrorism, neoliberalism, and citizenship itself. The recent resurgence in interest in the interplay between religion, religiosity and citizenship is also reflected in several chapters. While some chapters focus exclusively on the analysis of particular national or regional contexts, others make the case for a citizenship education that is truly global in its scope and organisation.

This introductory chapter provides an overview of some of the core concepts that will emerge and recur elsewhere in this collection. The editors begin by describing the way in which citizenship was framed by some of the key Enlightenment figures, and highlight some of the reasons that this conceptualisation has appeared less stable and resilient in recent times. Contemporary notions of cosmopolitanism and citizenship are compared and contrasted with their antecedents. Issues of international cooperation and conflict are considered, as well as some of the institutional and constitutional responses. The European Union is highlighted in particular, as it represents a complex
multinational laboratory for core ideas relating to the current and future status of
the individual citizen, the nation state, civil society and the globalised knowledge
economy (issues that are explored in a vast array of different contexts elsewhere in
the collection). The editors conclude by pressing the case for effective and
meaningful global citizenship education as a contribution towards the search for an
evasive yet essential conception of global civic society.

THE ENLIGHTENMENT VIEW OF CITIZENSHIP

Traditionally, the concept of citizenship had a home in the bounded nation-state
and referred to rights, privileges and responsibilities ascribed to people born or
migrated to a territory with clear boundaries. In the history of political philosophy,
for Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau the social contract is the means by which order
and civil society is maintained: we agree to a social contract thereby gaining civil
rights in return for subjecting ourselves to the law. Hobbes was the first of the
moderns to articulate this conception in his *Leviathan* (1651) where he famously
founded his theory on a hypothetical State of Nature where each of us would have
natural and unlimited freedoms but there was an endless ‘war of all against all’.
Hobbes’ theory is the basis for an account of legitimate government or sovereignty.
Only by entering into a social contract does man, who for Hobbes has a basically
egoistic and self-interested nature, subscribe to a society where war can be avoided
and the peace maintained. John Locke’s *Two Treatises on Government*, especially
the second treatise, outlines his justification for civil government.

Rousseau developed a different theory that sought to provide an account of
popular sovereignty as both indivisible and unalienable. His *The Social Contract or
Principles of Political Right* (1762) famously begins ‘Man is born free; and
everywhere he is in chains. One thinks himself the master of others, and still
remains a greater slave than they. How did this change come about? I do not know.
What can make it legitimate? That question I think I can answer’. The
Enlightenment *philosophers* argued that people became citizens by giving their
consent to a legal and binding agreement concerning their rights and freedoms.
This social contract was made in the name of the common good and collective
security and people gave their consent it is argued because of enlightened self-
interest based on the supposition that they have something to gain through the
imposition of order and the rule of law. The actual political arrangements of course
varied considerably from state to state as did the legal and philosophical
justifications yet nothing can disguise the palpable state of affairs that the transition
to civil society through the exercise of choice constitutes a social agreement which
involves a moral commitment to a set of values and ethical norms that legislate and
work for all members of a single moral community.

To talk of a single moral community is also immediately to invoke Kant and his
account of cosmopolitanism, and to talk of cosmopolitanism is immediately to
invoke a globally-oriented institution that aims at the cultivation of global citizens.
Indeed, the root stock of the word first used in 1614 to mean ‘citizen of the world’
derives from the Greek *kosmopolites* (*kosmos* ‘world’, *polites*, meaning ‘citizen’,
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and *polis* meaning ‘city’) ‘Cosmopolitanism’ with a first recorded use in 1828 registers the idea that there is a *single moral community* based on the idea of freedom and thus in the early twenty-first century is also seen as a major theoretical buttress to the concept of universal human rights that transcend all national, cultural and State boundaries.

While the Greeks had a concept of ‘cosmopolitanism’ that issued from the Sophists against the form of political culture advocated by Plato and Aristotle which was wedded to the city and its citizens, and later took a Stoic form that was popular with early Christianity, its modern form emerged with the Enlightenment and was associated first with Erasmus’ humanism and with the development of natural law doctrine. Pauline Kleingeld (2006) argues:

> The historical context of the philosophical resurgence of cosmopolitanism during the Enlightenment is made up of many factors: The increasing rise of capitalism and world-wide trade and its theoretical reflections; the reality of ever expanding empires whose reach extended across the globe; the voyages around the world and the anthropological so-called ‘discoveries’ facilitated through these; the renewed interest in Hellenistic philosophy; and the emergence of a notion of human rights and a philosophical focus on human reason (http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/).

She goes on to document the way in which the impulse of cosmopolitanism was strongest in the late eighteenth century both feeding and growing out of the 1789 declaration of human rights. While Montesquieu, Voltaire, Diderot, Addison, Hume and Jefferson all saw themselves as cosmopolitans, it was Kant who defended and popularised the idea that human beings belong to a single moral community sharing the characteristics of freedom, equality and autonomy that grounded the concept and legitimacy of law. Philosophical cosmopolitanism therefore had a parallel in political cosmopolitanism based on a concept of law that applied to all States.

Thus, famously, Kant in *Perpetual Peace* (1795) argues for a concept of moral cosmopolitanism based on universal law to which States would consent even though he rejected a strong notion of world government in favour of a loose federation. In Section II of Perpetual Peace he adumbrates the principles – ‘three definitive articles’ – that are required to establish peace (against the natural state of war) beginning with the republican civic constitution, a federation of free States, and the law of world citizenship is said to be limited to conditions of ‘universal hospitality’ where ‘Hospitality means the right of a stranger not to be treated as an enemy when he arrives in the land of another.’

Besides moral and political (or legal) cosmopolitanism there is also a form of economic cosmopolitanism associated with the work of Adam Smith who sought to diminish the role of politics in the economic realm. Said to date from Quesnay the notion of economic cosmopolitanism was promoted strongly in the twentieth century by Friedrich Hayek and Milton Friedman, and taken up in a particular form of neo-liberalism that now characterises the World Trade Organization.
In contemporary discourse cosmopolitanism is often referred to under the term globalisation and includes economic (neoliberal) cosmopolitanism, political cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitan law, based on moral universalism. For all three accounts as Thomas Pogge notes, there is, first, an assumption of individualism — the unit of analysis is the individual rather than the State or some other entity; second, the assumption of universality. Thomas Pogge (2002: 169) writes,

Three elements are shared by all cosmopolitan positions. First, individualism: the ultimate units of concern are human beings, or persons. … Second, universality: the status of ultimate unit of concern attaches to every living being equally …. Third, generality: this special status has global force.

We can therefore distinguish three forms of contemporary cosmopolitanism: Kantian moral cosmopolitanism represented by the discourse of human rights and, perhaps, institutionally by the United Nations; Kantian political cosmopolitanism represented by the likes of Habermas, Rawls, Beitz, Pogge; cosmopolitan democracy, argued for by Held; and economic cosmopolitanism currently best exemplified by a form of neo-liberal ‘free-trade’. The first might also be further extended by certain cosmopolitan institutions such as the International Criminal Court that seeks to develop a concept of the individual in international law that is not absolutely subject to the State.

It is clear from the preamble provided thus far that considerations of cosmopolitanism and the notion of global citizenship are nothing new, having exercised a broad range of political, economic and social thinkers over a long period in time. However it is the Editors’ view that the particular perspectives gathered in this collection are most timely because these concerns have been thrown into sharper and more urgent relief by a number of recent events, movements and processes. In the next section, we highlight certain contemporary political and economic movements, notably the ongoing enlargement and ‘deepening’ of the European Union (EU), the EU’s relationship with the United States, and the interface between globalisation and terrorism, that we argue require a response from educators across the globe.

EUROPE’S MORAL AND POLITICAL VISION OF GLOBALISATION

The Laeken Declaration on the Future of the European Union pictured the Union standing at a crossroads – ‘a defining moment of its existence’ – on the one hand it was about to expand to bring in ten new Member States and, on the other, it faced two democratic challenges, one internal, the other external. The first concerns the challenge of developing a set of European institutions for the citizens of Europe, of creating a closer and more transparent relationship between the Union and its citizens – in short, better democratic governance and an assault on the ‘democratic deficit’. The second concerns Europe’s new role in a globalised world. As the Declaration expresses this new imperative:
Following the fall of the Berlin Wall, it looked briefly as though we would for a long while be living in a stable world order, free from conflict, founded upon human rights ... The eleventh of September has brought about a rude awakening. The opposing forces have not gone away: religious fanaticism, ethnic nationalism, racism and terrorism are on the increase, and regional conflicts, poverty and underdevelopment still provide a constant seedbed for them.

What is Europe’s new role in this changed world? Does Europe not, now that it is finally unified, have a leading role to play in a new world order, that of a power able both to play a stabilising role worldwide and to point the way ahead for many countries and peoples? ... Now that the Cold War is over and we are living in a globalised, yet also highly fragmented world, Europe needs to shoulder its responsibilities in the governance of globalisation.

By ‘the governance of globalisation’ the Declaration means ‘to set globalisation within a moral framework ... to anchor it in solidarity and sustainable development.’ The Laeken Declaration indicates that, in part, is was drafted in response to public calls for a greater EU role in justice and security – not only action against cross-border crime, control of immigration and reception of asylum seekers but also action in the field of employment, combating poverty and social exclusion, and promoting greater economic and social cohesion. Clearly, there is a strong role for the Union to promote and coordinate action in all transnational issues as well as tackling broader and more sensitive issues in a common approach to foreign affairs, security and defence.

At the same time the Declaration makes clear that the Future of Europe must respond to calls for better and more transparent, more efficient government to be enhanced through a better division and definition of competence between the Union and Member States. In particular, greater clarification is required of exclusive (Union) competence, competence by Member States and that which is shared. These questions and the reorganisation of competence are crucial for issues of foreign policy and defence. They also go to the heart of fears of a super state and the encroachment upon exclusive areas of competence by states. In addition, the declaration raised questions about the Union’s instruments and the democratic legitimacy and transparency of the Union’s institutions, particularly the Commission, the Parliament and the Council. The Declaration ends on a note concerning the proposed Constitution for European citizens and the reorganisation of the four Treaties on which the Union is based.

MULTIPLE CITIZENSHIP: EUROPE’S FAILED CONSTITUTION

Our Constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people. Thucydides II, 37 (Opening quotation of the draft constitution)
The draft constitution already amended and revised by 105-member forum even if it failed the ratification process nonetheless represents an astonishing achievement. In one sense it is the attempted realisation of a dream of a unified Europe first raised by Winston Churchill in 1946. European Union has come into existence through a deliberative process of progressive change toward the constitutional ideal enabled by a series of treaties beginning with the establishment of a coal and steel community in 1958.

The failed draft constitution comprising of four parts – its definition, objectives and institutions, its fundamental rights and citizenship, its competencies and actions, its policies and functioning of the Union – is the culmination of historical process that asserts a moral and political vision, now carried forward by means of a treaty. For that reason it is worthy of examination as a prototype of what is to come, what is inevitable in some form or other. The Preamble begins by stressing the significance of its humanist inheritance embodied in its early Greek and Roman origins, its (Christian) ’spiritual impulse,’ and the philosophy of the Enlightenment centered on the human person and his or her inviolable and inalienable rights:

Conscious that Europe is a continent that has brought forth civilisation; that its inhabitants, arriving in successive waves since the first ages of mankind, have gradually developed the values underlying humanism: equality of person, freedom respect for reason

It continues by emphasising that a reunited Europe intends to continue along ‘this path of civilisation, progress and prosperity’ – a path characterised by concern for all its inhabitants, for the value of openness to culture and learning, for the deepening of democratic public life, and for ‘peace, justice and solidarity.’

The governance of globalisation and the cultural mandate for Europe’s role is seen to derive from its humanistic legacy and the extent to which the constitution embodies Europe’s humanistic legacy can be judged by the centrality of the Charter of Fundamental Rights. It is noteworthy that education and citizens’ rights – and their interdependency – are prominent in the Charter of the EU, which contains in Article 14, ‘Rights to education’ specified in three related clauses:

- Everyone has the right to education and to have access to vocational and continuing training.
- This right includes the possibility to receive free compulsory education.
- The freedom to found educational establishments with due respect for democratic principles and the rights of parents to ensure the education and teaching of their children in conformity with their religious, philosophical and pedagogical convictions shall be respected, in accordance with the national laws governing the exercise of such freedom and right.

It could be argued that the notion of citizenship education might contain both the passive neoliberal State versions often defined in terms of consumer sovereignty (in line with neoliberal welfare consumer regimes) and the more progressive social democratic EU version. Certainly there is a pressing need in the UK for a notion of citizenship education that is more sensitive to EU institutions (the Parliament, Council, Commission, and Court of Justice) and fundamental rights.
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THE LEARNING CITIZEN IN EUROPEAN DEMOCRACY

It is now some years since the Lisbon European Council set the ‘bold and ambitious’ ten-year goal of making the EU the most dynamic, competitive, sustainable knowledge-based economy in the world. Crucial to this policy rhetoric is a series of recent related concepts that cluster around the old dualisms between economy and society, knowledge and information-knowledge economy/knowledge society; and the learning economy/learning society. Yet it is clear that policy areas overlap and that indeed there is a radical interpenetration of social and economic policy. Perhaps, the fundamental understanding for policy makers in the ‘post-modern condition’ is the way the old dualisms obfuscate a conceptual appreciation of the imperatives of structural reform. Attention in the European Council has recently focused on three areas: active labour market reforms; liberalisation of financial markets; and increased investment in knowledge to ensure future competitiveness and jobs. Of course, these three policy areas are related and overlap somewhat. The Council is looking to overcome existing barriers to flexible labour markets by encouraging multi-lingualism, the development of appropriate ICT skills, provision of better child care and rewards for those who work longer. Its approach to financial liberalisation is focused in part on providing the right regulatory environment, while there is also a strong impetus to roll out fast broadband telecom networks and to step up support for research, innovation, education and training.

A staff paper (European Report Jan 16, 2002) suggested that the EU lags behind on lifelong learning and that the transition to the knowledge-based economy must be speeded up. In other words, spending on education needs to be strengthened. The argument is made that the European ability to produce, diffuse and use knowledge effectively relies heavily on its capacity to produce highly educated people for its firms to be engaged in a continuing process of innovation. Yet the paper notes that lifelong learning is still not a reality for most citizens. Average public spending on education in the European Union as a percentage of GDP remained unchanged at 5% between 1999 and 2000 and overall level of public and private spending on research and development is still too low. The paper complains that the EU is suffering a competitive disadvantage because EU businesses, governments and citizens have not yet embraced new technologies, the Internet and electronic commerce as readily as in the United States. There is some empirical evidence to support this view for while up-take of ICTs is increasing it has not yet been reflected in productivity gains or the reshaping of business practices.

In the Lisbon Council the transition to the knowledge-based economy has been taken up in a range of related research project designed to investigate and enhance Europe’s case. A number of these projects are focused on the notion of ‘the learning citizen’, a concept that is a happy combination of words with considerable normative and illocutionary force directly at the building a European democracy where learning is advanced as a fundamental human right. Exactly how this right ought to be construed is not straightforward because both underlying concepts of ‘learning’ and ‘citizen’ are contestable and require active interpretation.
US VS EU CONSTITUTION

It is useful and important to compare the ethos of EU Constitution with that of the US Constitution (and their current interpretations) even although the Philadelphia Convention was produced two centuries ago. Both the EU Constitution and the Laeken Declaration offer a different perspective to the US Constitution and foreign policy outlook. Where the latter is based on negative rights the former is based on a conception of positive rights. The difference could not be more marked. American constitutional rights were originally designed to protect Americans from infringements upon their life, liberty and property. The language of the Constitution carefully limits the powers of the government and the division of powers between governments and the general rights of the governed. By contrast, the EU Constitution is based upon positive rights with reference to ‘social justice,’ ‘solidarity,’ ‘equal opportunity,’ ‘equality between the sexes’ and ‘cultural diversity.’ Further, it claims to desire ‘sustainable development,’ ‘mutual respect between peoples,’ and the eradication of poverty, with accordingly less emphasis on property rights and free enterprise. At the broader level, this difference signals not only different constitutional outlooks but also diverging political cultures: a neoliberal US favouring corporate America, a ‘defensive modernism,’ and the doctrine of ‘pre-emptive strike’ and ‘regime change’ versus a social democratic model focused on ‘social justice’ and ‘solidarity,’ and committed to governance of globalisation within a moral framework.

The Global Citizenship agenda might begin to tackle some questions of comparative analysis and also entertain the question in international law of the emergence since the second world war of the geopolitical concepts of ‘war crimes’, ‘crimes against humanity’ and ‘crimes against the peace’ (see e.g., Peters, 2004).

DECONSTRUCTING THE WEST?

The concept of ‘the West’ has served important political purposes both historically and in the present foreign policy context. On the one hand it has been a cultural and philosophical unity achieved through an active historical projection back to the origins of Western civilisation, at least to the classical Greeks, while on the other, it has been used as a modernist category, politically speaking, to harness the resources of Enlightenment Europe as a basis for giving assurances about the future of liberal democratic societies and the American way of life. The concept was an implicit but key one assumed in an influential analysis of new world order by Samuel Huntington (2002), who in his The Clash of Civilizations predicted a non-ideological world determined increasingly by the clash among the major civilisations. In Huntington’s analysis ‘the West’ functions as an unquestioned and foundational unity yet the concept and its sense of cultural and historical unity has recently been questioned not only in terms of its historical fabrication but also in terms of its future continuance. Martin Bernal (1991, 2001), for instance, controversially in Black Athena and in a set of responses to his critics, questions the historical foundations of ‘the West’ demonstrating how the concept is a recent
fiction constructed out of the Aryan myth propagated by nineteenth-century
historiography. Even more recently, accounts of the so-called ‘new world order’
have emphasized either the dominance of an American hegemonic Empire (Hardt
and Negri, 2000) or an emerging EU post-modern state system (Cooper, 2001).
These accounts offer competing and influential conceptions of the ‘new
imperialism’ based on different visions of world government and proto-world
institutions. They give very different accounts of questions of international
security, world order and the evolving world system of states.

Most recently, and under the impact of a set of events tied to the experience of
the war prosecuted against Iraq, Robert Kagan (2003) has questioned whether
Europeans and Americans still share a common view of the world and charts the
divergence of these two perspectives on the question of power – its efficacy,
morality and desirability. Robert Kagan is senior associate at the Carnegie
Endowment for International Peace, and a columnist for the Washington Post. He
served in the US State Department from 1984 to 1988. A neo-conservative himself,
Kagan has written on the US foreign policy in Nicaragua and edited a collection
with William Kristol on present dangers facing American foreign policy and
defence. Of Passion and Power is an expansion of an essay that original appeared
in Policy Review. Kagan’s thesis can be summed up briefly in his own words:

Europe is turning away from power, or to put it a little differently, it is
moving beyond power into a self-contained world of laws and rules and
transnational negotiation and cooperation. It is entering a post-historical
paradise of peace and relative prosperity, the realization of Immanuel Kant’s
‘perpetual peace’. Meanwhile, the United States remains mired in history,
exercising power in an anarchic Hobbesian world where international laws
and rules are unreliable, and where true security and the defence and
promotion of a liberal order still depend on the possession and use of military
might (p. 3).

He suggests that this state of affairs is not simply the product of the Bush
presidency or an administration dominated by neo-conservatives but rather that the
differences are long-lived and likely to endure. Europe and American no longer
share a common ‘strategic culture’. As he depicts the differences, ‘Americans
generally see the world divided between good and evil, between friends and
enemies …’ They favour coercion over persuasion, ‘seek finality in international
affairs’ (p. 4), tending towards unilateralism. They are less inclined to act through
the United Nations or other international institutions and more sceptical of
international law. By contrast, Europeans ‘see a more complex picture’. They are
both more tolerant of failure and more patient, preferring peaceful solutions,
‘negotiation, diplomacy, and persuasion to coercion’ (p. 5).

Global Citizenship needs to be critically self-aware that all the traditional
assumptions governing our situated world-views ought to be continually open to
change, sometimes quite radically and unexpectedly, as when the Berlin Wall came
down or the Soviet system collapsed. By contrast we seem to be confronted with
ample evidence of the predicted future dominance of the world system by China
and India, yet a coherent educational response to this future probability has barely begun to emerge.

EDUCATION FOR CITIZENSHIP IN THE AGE OF TERRORISM

In global citizenship education we might investigate the following assertions: that war and globalisation go hand in hand; that contemporary globalisation is a form of war (and war may be a form of globalisation); that militarisation and war are integral parts of the neo-liberal agenda; and that there are inextricable links between the US military-industrial complex, the free market, and world order. We might also encourage the investigation of these claims within the context of the war in Iraq and provide some background to questions concerning a civilizational analysis of globalisation that contextualises the US National Security Strategy and the neo-conservative influence in the White House. Is there a role for education in understanding the relationship between war and globalisation? Educationally speaking, we would argue that we need to understand this specific event – the war against Iraq – in terms of an emerging global politics.

The geopolitical consequences of empire, of past administrative division and colonial policies, are always hard to predict and even harder to deal with. ‘Blowback’ is also a reality that must be contemplated as an inevitable accompaniment to contemporary political decisions that involve regime change. Arguably, the extremist Islamic terrorist attacks on civil society in the West have their origin not only in the formation of extremist Islamic terrorist networks in the last twenty years, but also perhaps more profoundly in British and U.S. intervention and ongoing struggle for control of oil stakes in the Middle East, notably Iraq and Saudi Arabia, dating back at least to the 1920s. If Samuel Huntington is to be believed this is representative of an even greater historical legacy of Christian-Islamic relations now centuries old.

The growth of global civil society is linked to the history of colonialism and imperialism and yet there is something still of great importance about the cosmopolitan sentiments offered by the Enlightenment thinkers that led first to the League of Nations and, then, the United Nations, UNESCO and other institutional defenders of the concept of fundamental human rights. While this is a contested history and one imbricated in the recent history of colonialism and post-colonialism it is also a history of the growth and development of liberal democracy as the world's most rapidly growing and dominant form of government. The problem is that at the level beyond the individual state there is little in the way of structures and templates for world governance to which individual citizens have access or redress. There are only those organisations set up at Bretton Woods that provided the architecture for the West during the Cold War. Since the rapid decolonisation that took place before and after WWII we have seen the development of a number of newly independent states, many of which gained nominal political independence but continued the colonial economic legacy of exploitation and control.
INTRODUCTION

Today we have passed into an era that is best symbolised by the significance of regional trading blocs and attempts at regional governance with the huge growth also of NGOs and other global agencies that transcend national boundaries. On the one hand, there is the economic organisation of the truly stateless multi- and transnational corporation, now sometimes referred to as the ‘globally integrated enterprise’, and, on the other, the development of regional forms of governance like the EU that through twin processes of integration and enlargement, is creating a ‘new Europe’ based on an alternative vision of globalisation to the hegemonic power and world dominance of a sole superpower. There are signs that the prospects for EU regional governance, despite the recent setback to the ratification process of the constitution, will not only continue to mature but will also be emulated by other regions such as East Asia. This is not to argue that politics necessarily follows economics.

With the dominance of a sole world superpower there have been criticisms of both the UN and Bretton Woods institutions such as the WTO and the World Bank as being essentially Ameri-centric, reflecting American interests and open to American manipulation. The United Nations stands in need of reform, especially given the rise of Asian states like China and India but also the remarkable growth of Japanese economy and economic power. The question of reform is difficult as is the notion of one vote per country especially given the huge differences in population between, say, China or India or Indonesia and small island states like Samoa or Fiji. Some talk of a new era of ‘Continental politics’.

Further, since the end of the Cold War, oil politics and the rise of militant Islam or Islamism has seemingly taken over as the new territorial paradigm in international politics with forms of Muslim international solidarity across national borders and in terms of anti-American and anti-Israeli radical movements, as well as new regional groups both within and outside the Middle East. The identification of radical Islam as essentially terrorist and George Bush’s ‘war against terror’ has initiated a new era of international politics that has greatly damaged relations between the West and the Muslim world and apparently mitigated against the enhancement of prospects for both the growth of international security of movement and global civil society. The war in Iraq has also introduced splits in the Western alliance and encouraged a new level of American aggression with the neoconservative intention of acting alone, with or without its allies, and with or without UN approval.

Global citizenship education realistically must be set against these contemporary realities. As a form of education it must actively engage with these very issues. In one sense global citizenship education also offers the prospect of extending both the ideologies of human rights and multiculturalism, perhaps, post-colonialism, in a critical and informed way. One thing is sure, as the essays presented in this book demonstrate so clearly, there can be no one dominant notion of global citizenship education as notions of ‘global’, ‘citizenship’ and ‘education’ are all contested and open to further argument and revision. Global citizenship education does not name the moment of global citizenship or even its emergence so much as the hope of a form of order where the rights of the individual and of groups, irrespective of race,
gender, ethnicity or creed, are observed by all governments and become the basis of participation in new global spaces that we might be tempted to call global civil society. Indeed this very conception of cosmopolitanism or something close to it has recently been doing the rounds in legal philosophy by scholars such as David Held (2003) and Norberto Bobbio who argue that given globalization and its uncontrollable economic processes the world requires a new form of cosmopolitan democracy that justifies a set of centralized institutions representing world citizens in facing economic and political problems that escape the control of the nation state, together with new administrative structures and legal rights called ‘cosmopolitan rights’. Whether one agrees with this conception of cosmopolitan democracy or not it certainly provides a platform for education and for the discussion and debate surrounding a long standing idea in political theory that has quite staggering implications for the design and conduct of education in an age of globalization.

ORGANISATION OF THIS BOOK

The book is designed to contribute to an integrated understanding of the philosophy, theory and pedagogy of Global Citizenship Education. A number of chapters provide critical definitional and analytical foundations; these examine the different and contested interpretations of what is meant by such terms as ‘global citizenship’, ‘globalisation’, ‘cosmopolitanism’ and ‘citizenship education’. Other contributions seek to situate these concepts within educational processes and philosophical lineages, as well as examining the rationale for a global educational project based on these ideas. This collection also brings together a range of national and geographical case studies that demonstrate and critically interrogate some of the policy and curriculum structures that have been deployed to develop education for global citizenship in a large number of contexts. It is the Editors’ hope that wherever the reader is based, s/he will be able to draw on the breadth of ideas and perspectives here in ways that can inform, challenge and inspire.
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