Project manager extraordinaire Patti Marxsen not only did a magnificent job of bringing harmony out of chaos whenever it threatened, but also went the extra mile. Having become fully immersed and fascinated with the subject herself, Patti composed an invaluable resource for teachers who may be inspired to put the insights of this volume into action. In the *Resources* section of the BRC website, www.brc21.org, thanks to Patti's good efforts, we now offer a link to "Curriculum Resources for Global Citizenship Education." Helen Casey, our trusted companion on all of our publishing projects to date, has once again brought her way with words to the making of this book. We are grateful to the distinguished Teachers College Press for working with us to refine our initial plans and signing on as our publishing partner.

May this book support teachers in awakening young Americans to genuine global concerns.

Virginia Straus
Executive Director
Boston Research Center for the 21st Century

Global Citizenship: Promises and Problems

Nel Noddings

> My country is the world; to do good is my religion.
> —Thomas Paine

ON A RECENT DAY, I SENT e-mail messages to people in Japan, Argentina, the Netherlands, and England. Before I finished reading my own messages, I had an automatic response from the recipient in England, telling me that he was in Ethiopia and would respond to the substance of my message later. In a world of instant communication and swift travel, we have become keenly aware of our interdependence. Many of us are now concerned about the welfare of all human and nonhuman life, preservation of the Earth as home to that life, and the growing conflict between the appreciation of diversity and the longing for unity. We are concerned, too, that our technological capacity has run far beyond our moral competence to manage it. We dream of peace in a world perpetually on the edge of war. One response to these concerns is the promotion of global citizenship.

But what do we mean by *global citizenship?* This is not an easy question to answer, and the issues that arise as we try to answer it are difficult. However, even if we cannot answer the question entirely to our satisfaction, these issues belong in discussions of schooling practices and curriculum. In what follows, I first explore the basic question: What is *global citizenship?* Then I look more closely at four of the issues that arise from the initial exploration: Is global citizenship primarily a matter of economics? How can we protect the Earth as our home and that of future generations? What sort of diversity should we try to preserve, and can we encourage unity while we

maintain diversity? What role should peace education play in promoting global citizenship?

WHAT IS GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP?

The words *citizenship* and *citizen* usually refer to a national or regional identity. One who is recognized as a citizen of a particular nation has the special rights and duties prescribed by the government of that nation. Global citizenship cannot yet be described in this way. There is no global government to which we as individuals owe allegiance, and there are no international laws that bind us unless our national government accepts them. Thus, we can't look to the familiar, technical definition of citizenship to help us in describing global citizenship.

Sometimes *citizen* is used synonymously with *inhabitant*, as in "the deer is a citizen of the forest." Although this statement is charming, most of us think that citizenship involves more than a reference to where we live and even more than the technical description of our national (or regional) rights and responsibilities. Educators have been trying for years to describe citizenship more fully and to figure out ways to promote it. For example, some social studies educators believe that the study of American history promotes American citizenship (Thornton 2001b). Does it? To answer this question, we have to say much more about what is meant by citizenship. In her chapter in this volume, Gloria Ladson-Billings points out that even within a nation, some of those who qualify formally for citizenship do not feel as though they share fully in that citizenship.

Perhaps we can agree that a citizen of Place X has (or should have) an interest in, or concern about, the welfare of X and its people. Such a citizen cares about X and wants to protect its interests and way of life. This is a description with which Americans are familiar, and it is used often to arouse national pride and commitment. It would take us too far afield to explore all the ways in which people have described "American interests" and the "American way of life." But we know that attempts at such description exhibit complexity and conflict. It is not an easy job to say exactly what is meant by "the" American way of life. We fall easily into slogans and clichés.

Consider, then, how much harder it will be to define global citizenship. Is there, for example, a global way of life? Some think that there could be—even that there should be—a global way of life, and it usually looks suspiciously like their own way. Advocates of globalization—"the removal of barriers to free trade and the closer integration of national economies" (Stiglitz 2002, ix)—come close to defining global citizenship solely in terms of economics. A global citizen, from this perspective, is one who can live and

work effectively anywhere in the world, and a global way of life would both describe and support the functioning of global citizens.

Many careful thinkers are critical of this approach, and international meetings of world financial organizations have been marked by riotous protests. What sparks the protests? What are the objections to globalization? First, there is evidence that present efforts at globalization have aggravated existing economic injustice. Good global citizens should be concerned about this, just as good national citizens are concerned about injustice within their own boundaries. This observation prompts us to think more about the idea of *interest*. It may be better for present purposes to use *concern* instead of *interest*. *Interest* too often conveys the notion of self-interest or concentration on the benefits to one's own group. Indeed, when citizens of one nation speak of their *interests*, people of other nations are understandably wary. When our interests are truly global, this worry should be relieved. But for now, to avoid this problem, let's speak of *concern*. When we are concerned with the welfare of X—our nation, region, or globe—we are concerned with the well-being of all its inhabitants.

Second, globalization's emphasis on economic growth has led to practices that threaten the physical environment—the life of the Earth itself. The problems in this area are so complex that even scientists are unsure about the harms and benefits resulting from certain practices. It seems clear that global warming is a reality and that the reduction of carbon emissions is imperative. However, other practices—the genetic engineering of plants, for example—need much more study. Closely related to problems concerning the global environment are those that affect people in particular locations. What may be good for people in a large region (say, a huge dam designed to provide electricity) may be a disaster for those in the particular locality. Some global citizens may be willing to live anywhere, but others want to live in a particular place that they love. Is love of place compatible with global citizenship? At the very least, we've added another factor to the concerns of global citizens—the well-being of particular physical places.

Third, critics object to construing global interest entirely in economic terms. Even if it were possible and just to establish one world economic order, other aspects of life must be considered. If global citizens appreciate cultural diversity, they will speak of *ways* of life, not one way, and they will ask how a valued diversity can be maintained. But what sorts of diversity should we appreciate? If a culture wants to maintain the inequality of women or the slavery of children, should we accept these practices as tolerable facets of cultural diversity—as simply "their way"? When cultural diversity pushes us toward moral relativism, we must back away. And so we have to think carefully about the merits of diversity and those of unity or universality and how to achieve an optimal balance between the two. We should be interested in social as well as economic justice.

Fourth, because globalization points to a global economy, we have to ask whose economic vision will be adopted. As noted earlier, the powerful nations are likely to impose their own vision. At the present time, the most powerful view is that of the huge international corporations. Even if it could be argued that their vision is benign and requires only tinkering to be just, many of the world's people harbor doubts, and while the disparity between rich and poor grows, it is predictable that groups (even nations) will protest violently. Moreover, nations of the First World often associate corporate capitalism with their own overall way of life, and this association adds a strong ideological component to the problem. Citizens of wealthy nations may feel it a patriotic duty to defend economic practices that seem inseparable from their way of life. These citizens then try to persuade or even force others to accept that way of life "for their own good."

We must ask, also, whether global citizenship—defined in part as the activation of the concerns so far identified—is compatible with national citizenship. Should we put the concerns of globe or nation first, or is this a bad question? Should our choice depend on the particular concern under consideration? Is there an inherent conflict between patriotism and global citizenship? Can patriotism be redefined in a way that removes the conflict?

It would seem that peace is a precondition of global citizenship. I cannot be a global citizen if my country is at war with others, any more than a loyal citizen of Virginia could be a U.S. citizen during the Civil War. One could argue, of course, that a progressive orientation toward global citizenship will promote world peace. This is a chicken-and-egg argument. However we arrange the priorities, peace education must play a vital role in the promotion of global citizenship. A global citizen must see war as contrary to all of the concerns we have identified—to worldwide economic and social justice, to the health of our physical world, to the preservation of well-loved places, to the balance of diversity and unity, and to the well-being of all of earth's inhabitants. Yet if war comes, the vast majority of us will stand—sadly, perhaps even angrily—with our own nation. Even our enemies, educated as badly as we are, would think less of us if we did not. This underscores our earlier claim that war cannot be reconciled with global concerns, and so peace education must play a vital role in supporting global citizenship.

Before exploring some of these issues in greater depth, we should return briefly to the question of what can be learned from our experience in educating for national citizenship. I mentioned earlier that some educators believe that the teaching of American history promotes American citizenship. As Thornton (2001b) has shown, there is little evidence to support this belief. Perhaps we need a blend of history, geography, civics, and other studies to encourage good citizenship. Perhaps no amount of knowledge will accomplish that goal. We may need forms of practice and participation that we rarely offer in schools. Still, it seems clear that knowledge must inform practice. As we look at the issues involved in global citizenship, we must try to identify the knowledge and skills students will need to achieve this new form of citizenship.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

One deep concern of good citizens is economic justice. Global citizenship requires a commitment to the elimination of poverty. Joseph Stiglitz notes that the motto of the World Bank is "Our dream is a world without poverty" (Stiglitz 2002, 23). The World Bank and other global organizations (for example, the International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization) have accomplished some noteworthy goals, but they have not eliminated poverty, and some of their practices have actually increased it. Because the people who run these organizations are trained in and committed to the economic theories associated with capitalism, they think in terms of growth. But growth, measured by an increase in national wealth, does not always reduce poverty. To do so, policymakers must select strategies deliberately designed to manage growth in ways that reduce poverty. The perceived failure of world financial organizations to do this has motivated the fierce opposition to them that we saw in Seattle, Washington, Genoa, and Canada.

I have already outlined some important objections to globalization. Of crucial importance is the complaint that globalization as it has been defined by the World Bank, IMF, and WTO has increased the misery of many people (Bigelow and Peterson 2002). Critics condemn, among other things, the continued (and abusive) use of child labor and the existence of sweatshops in developing nations. Whether the overall picture is as bad as that depicted by protestors is not clear (Singer 2002), but it can be shown that some particular situations are very bad indeed.

This observation should alert us to a difficult issue for educators. We often seek numbers or statistics to back our positions, but numbers can be notoriously misleading. We may be able to show, for example, that a nation has experienced a substantial increase in growth; at the same time, other numbers tell us that the gap between rich and poor in that nation has also increased greatly. Which numbers are more important? If the condition of the poor has improved despite the gap, should the gap itself be a concern? There are both short- and long-term views to consider. Might current poverty be a temporary price to pay as growth is encouraged? Eventually, some insist, growth will better the condition of everyone. This is at least questionable.

Teachers who want to help their students to understand the deceptive possibilities of numbers might use a strategy that alternates between global figures and those closer to home. For example, students are often told that jobs in the future will require a great deal of education. This is a reason given

for students to stay in school and study hard. But is it true? Many of the fastest-growing jobs (measured by percentage of growth) do indeed require a college-level education. But the fastest growing jobs are not the ones that will employ the most workers. One has to look at the base as well as the percentage of growth. The occupations that will employ most workers in the next decade are almost all jobs that require little education (see Bracey 2003; Noddings 2003a).

Students should learn to look at numerical data carefully. They should, of course, ask about the source of figures. Who provides them, and might there be a hidden agenda in what is presented? Further, they should be encouraged to dig more deeply behind the figures. Suppose a nation reports fewer people living in poverty in 2002 than in 1998. That certainly looks good. But what if the condition of those who remain in poverty has worsened dramatically? And what if those who are living well clearly have the resources to help and yet do nothing?

Conditions in poorer nations, as described in *Rethinking Globalization* (Bigelow and Peterson 2002), are truly dreadful: high infant mortality, starvation, exploitation of workers in sweatshops, destruction of the natural environment, lack of medicines for preventable and curable diseases, child labor, deprivation of education. Any sensitive person—any global citizen—reading this list will be moved to say that something must be done.

But who should act and how? Peter Singer (2002) argues that the wealthy nations, especially the United States, should do much more to relieve starvation and suffering in poor countries. This seems unarguable. However, Singer goes on to argue that if governments do not provide adequate help, individuals should do so, and he insists that "hundreds of millions of people" can afford to give $200 a year to overseas aid and yet are not doing so (Singer 2002, 188). What Singer overlooks is that America ranks in the top three of advanced democracies in charitable giving and volunteerism (Halstead 2003, 124). According to the same source (which students should check), it also ranks in the bottom three (worst) in poverty, economic inequality, infant mortality, health care coverage, life expectancy, and personal savings. Much needs to be done right here in the United States. It may be that Americans have made choices different from the ones advocated by Singer for their charitable giving.

The debate over who should act and how might be a lively one. Some students may argue that "charity begins at home." To this Singer would no doubt point out that he is talking about *starvation and death*, not the satisfaction of selfish wants and minor needs. Should we let children in Africa starve so that students in our own town can have new band uniforms? Put so starkly, the choice seems obvious. But suppose kids in our town or the next one really need more food, heat in their houses and schoolrooms, dental care, protection from adult abuse, and winter clothing? (See Kozol 1991.) The needs all over the world, including the United States, are enormous.

There are better arguments against Singer's demands, however, than the one that says, "charity begins at home" (which he has wrongly attributed to me—see Singer 2002, 159). We really cannot *care for* people at a great distance without some means of direct contact. *Caring for*, as I have described it (Noddings 1984, 2002), requires us to respond to expressed needs and to monitor the effects of our actions and react anew to the responses of those we care for. This does not mean that we cannot *care about* many people for whom we cannot care directly. *Caring about* requires us to work toward the establishment of conditions under which *caring for* can flourish. This is exactly the professed attitude of the large world economic organizations, but—as we have seen—mistakes can be made, and greed can displace the professed attitude and its goals.

The demands of *caring for* involve not only immediate response (someone on the spot must provide food now) but also concern for the future. This kind of direct caring has for centuries been the primary responsibility of women but, as Peggy McIntosh reminds us in her chapter, it has not been highly valued in the arena of public affairs. *Caring for* stays with the cared-for. If I save a child from starvation today, what will prevent her starving tomorrow? What will prevent his becoming a victim or perpetrator of atrocious violence? How will he or she be educated? All of these questions point to the need for the establishment and maintenance of environments in which caring can be effective. What can we do in this direction? We might vote for candidates who endorse the world organizations that operate most effectively on the global plane. We might seek out charitable organizations that are working not only to meet emergencies but also to create long-term conditions for the well-being of those now suffering. Clearly, learning how to conduct ourselves as global citizen-carers is a major educational task.

In addition to finding the right candidates and organizations to support, we should examine our own ways of life. Almost certainly the present way of life in the United States is not sustainable. We consume far too great a proportion of the world's resources, and it seems unlikely that everyone, everywhere, could live as middle-class Americans now live. Should we change, or is this assessment simply wrong? Here we have to be practical while trying to create a sustainable way of life. If we were all to adopt a simple, frugal way of life tomorrow, the American financial world would collapse, and quite possibly the least well off among us would suffer the most. Life as we know it in the United States seems to depend on the willingness of consumers to continue spending. We should, however, be able at least to move toward a more sustainable way of life. Happiness does not depend on wealth. Indeed, economists and social scientists have shown that beyond the poverty level, more money does not correlate with a higher level of happiness (Lane 2000). This is an important message for students to hear.

Dare we ask our students to consider adopting economic moderation as a virtue? Some years ago, in a course I was teaching on moral education, I raised this question. Many students answered affirmatively, and they went on to declare that no individual needs a yearly income in the millions. While suggesting moderation, no one in the class made the kind of demands for individual sacrifice that Singer has made. Certainly no one suggested a legal limit on incomes such as one suggested years ago by George Orwell (1941)—that the highest income not be allowed to exceed the lowest by more than 10 times and that anything in excess of that amount should be taxed at 100%! We were expressing a positive view of voluntary moderation as a personal and national virtue. Yet two students expressed outrage. No way were they willing to put voluntary limits on what they could acquire through their own efforts. That conversation is one I'll never forget. Steeped in Horatio Alger tales of poor boys rising through hard work to positions of wealth and power, many of us in the United States find it incredible—even unpatriotic—to suggest that this way of life should be modified.

There is another objection to the severe demands made by Orwell and Singer. When compassionate response is made a matter of duty and obligation, there will be resistance. We may squirm with guilt, but then we begin to look for arguments that will excuse us. It may be that most kind people will respond with aid to misery when they feel able to do so. When helping adds to our own happiness, as it often does when we care directly and see the positive results of our caring, we are more likely to continue our efforts (Noddings 2003a). We are different individuals, with different temperaments and talents, leading different lives with different resources and obligations. Under any workable moral code, we should be allowed to choose the arenas in which we will concentrate our care. Our choices will, of course, be guided by the severity of needs. Dorothy Day, who lived her life in solidarity with the poor, never made her caring into a grim duty. She said that we must "keep in mind the duty of delight" (Day 1952, 285). I would prefer "possibility" or "gift" to "duty," but her point is important. Caring for, about, and with others can add to our own happiness. We might even call this an ecological view of caring.

The concerns of global citizens extend beyond economic justice to social/political justice. Rights that we demand for ourselves should be offered to others worldwide. The charter of the United Nations refers to "fundamental human rights," to the "dignity and worth of the human person," and to the "equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small." Its Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted in 1948 and should be studied by all aspiring global citizens. Similarly, students should know something about the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child (United Nations 1959). The world has fallen pitifully short of upholding these ideals (Bigelow and Peterson 2002).

The analysis of social/political rights is, like the other concerns we have discussed, marked by complexity. It is generous and just to extend important rights to all of the world's people. But suppose some people reject one or another of these rights? Rights arise out of expressed needs (Noddings 2002), and different cultures put emphasis on different needs. Moreover, when basic needs are unsatisfied, some rights taken for granted by citizens of advanced democracies may seem frivolous. Should we force our own ideal of rights on others?

Isaiah Berlin (1969) advised caution in deciding for others what is in their best interest. Sometimes, because we are in positions of knowledge and power, we feel justified in coercing others "for their own sake." Berlin cautions, "I am then claiming that I know what they truly need better than they know it themselves" (1969, 133). If this goes too far, he writes:

> I am in a position to ignore the actual wishes of men or societies, to bully, oppress, torture them in the name . . . of their "real" selves, in the secure knowledge that whatever is the true goal of man (happiness, performance of duty, wisdom, a just society, self-fulfillment) must be identical with his freedom . . . (1969, p. 133)

These are important cautionary words and remind us that people or nations may not be grateful when we insist on liberating them by force or imposing the wonders of modernization on them. A guiding principle for both economic and social justice is suggested by Stiglitz:

> Those whose lives will be affected by the decisions about how globalization is managed have a right to participate in that debate, and they have a right to know how such decisions have been made in the past. (2002, p. xvi)

This last comment underscores the importance of *caring for*—the heart of which is listening and responding to what is there. We should certainly offer to extend our own concept of justice and, when it is endorsed by others, we should work to make it a reality. But we should work together. Global citizenship cannot be defined from a single viewpoint.

PROTECTING THE EARTH

Protecting the Earth is one of the most important tasks facing global citizens. Without a hospitable physical environment, we will live with increasing discomfort and, perhaps, even meet extinction. As we consider how to tackle this task, we will encounter several familiar themes, among them greed and lack of moderation.