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Education for global citizenship: Illustrations of ideological pluralism and adaptation

HANS SCHATTLE

Roger Williams University, Bristol, RI 02809, USA

ABSTRACT This article explores the ideological currents emerging within the contested idea of global citizenship in public discourse by focusing on how this term has been deployed within the educational arena. In educational initiatives across the English-speaking world, ‘global citizenship’ is aligned with four ideological constellations: moral cosmopolitanism, liberal multiculturalism, neoliberalism and environmentalism. Identifying and examining some of the more prominent strains of thinking within educational programs for global citizenship contributes to ongoing debates about whether a new, distinct and globally-oriented ideology might be emerging. This article maintains that public discourse related to global citizenship in education does not yet validate a prospective ideology such as ‘globalism’ but does illustrate how established ideologies, most notably liberalism in its plural forms, are adapting alongside increasing public recognition of global interdependence.

Introduction

Public discourse surrounding the idea of global citizenship has increased dramatically in recent years, and nowhere has this term proliferated more rapidly in practice than in the educational arena. Especially in the United Kingdom and the United States, countless schools and universities have crafted mission statements and implemented programs and strategies that invoke the specific term ‘global citizenship’. Any analysis of such programs reveals immediately that they offer a wide range of interpretations of global citizenship and operate across many substantive areas—language learning, environmental awareness, cross-cultural engagement, world history and literature, technological competency, and so forth. In academic disciplines such as political science, sociology and, educational studies, scholars are just beginning to focus on education for global citizenship as a topic warranting close scrutiny.1
My aims in this article are two-fold: (1) to identify the various ideological currents now emerging in educational initiatives for global citizenship, all of which serve to illustrate how ‘global citizenship’ itself is contested the present day; (2) to inquire as to whether public discourse related to global citizenship in the educational arena provides evidence of a new and distinct ideology, such as the prospective ideology of ‘globalism’, or instead remains situated largely within familiar ideologies. In this discussion, I will adopt what John Thompson has labeled a ‘neutral conception’ of ‘ideology’, thereby exploring the patterns of political thinking that actually have been emerging within the universe of educational programs deploying the specific term ‘global citizenship’.2

The first section of the article demonstrates that four ideological constellations are now prominent within educational programs for global citizenship. Numerous initiatives share affinities especially with moral cosmopolitanism and liberal multiculturalism, while other aspects of global citizenship education intersect with elements of environmentalism and neoliberalism, the dominant economic ideology in the current phase of globalization. With the exception of environmentalism—an ideology of its own—these ideological constellations are commonly (though not exclusively) situated under the wide umbrella of liberalism, with its fundamental emphasis upon individual rights and liberties. Then, I will examine some of the ways in which ‘global citizenship’ educational programs have prompted ideological objections and public debate. This leads into my concluding argument that public discourse related to global citizenship in the educational arena provides evidence mainly of how established ideologies are adapting in response to increasing public recognition of global interdependence.

In order to analyze the ideological constellations within global citizenship educational programs and then inquire as to whether they provide evidence of a new ideology or familiar ideologies, it is necessary to establish criteria by which to evaluate the ideological dimensions of this body of thought. In the recent scholarly literature, Malcolm Hamilton has offered a helpful definition of ‘ideology’:

An ideology is a system of collectively held normative and reputedly factual ideals and beliefs and attitudes advocating a particular pattern of social relationships and arrangements, and/or aimed at justifying a particular pattern of conduct, which its proponents seek to promote, realize, pursue or maintain.3

Ideology, in this way of thinking, amounts to more than simply a political belief system. For a collection of beliefs to cohere as a distinct ideology, the beliefs must advocate ‘a particular pattern of social relationships and arrangements’ and also must justify specific patterns of behavior. Similarly, Michael Freeden has proposed useful criteria for establishing whether any given political belief system or body of thought holds the status of an ideology. Freeden calls for scholars to examine the degree of conceptual uniqueness and sophistication, as well as its degree of responsiveness to a broad range of political issues and thirdly, whether it provides effective decontestation claims that remove uncertainty or substantial debate over the belief system’s core principles.4 Amalgamating the criteria from
Hamilton and Freeden, any manifestation of a new and distinct ideology would have to satisfy the following criteria:

1. Advocate particular patterns of political and social relationships and arrangements.
2. Justify specific patterns of behavior, applicable across a broad range of issues.
3. Resolve uncertainty and/or debate about what the prospective ideology means.

We can apply these criteria, then, to examine whether or not public discourse related to global citizenship education provides evidence of a new, distinct and globally-oriented ideology. Note that this inquiry will not treat global citizenship education per se as a candidate ideology but instead will explore whether the emergence and development of educational programs related to the specific term ‘global citizenship’ might be part of a potentially more substantial progression in which a new ideology, such as ‘globalism’, is configuring itself and gaining momentum in the present day.

I approach this topic having recently completed an empirical study—situated at the intersection of international relations, political sociology and political philosophy—exploring more widely how the concept of global citizenship has been interpreted and communicated in contemporary public discourse across the English-speaking world. As I built a database that initially included 600 published references to the term ‘global citizenship’ and its cognates, I was struck immediately by the high proportion of statements regarding global citizenship from teachers and administrators in elementary schools, secondary schools and universities. Among the four arenas that I investigated—government, business, civil society and education—global citizenship discourse was clearly the most prominent within the educational arena. Global citizenship discourse as it has emerged and continues to evolve within schools, colleges and universities offers specialists in political ideologies especially fertile ground in which to investigate the ongoing transformations in the political thinking of everyday people in a global age.

Structuring a discussion of the ideological dimensions of global citizenship education can be a tricky endeavor, since aspects of moral cosmopolitanism, liberal multiculturalism, neoliberalism and environmentalism all co-exist within many educational programs and institutions. In addition, global citizenship initiatives within the educational arena often combine the dual aims of (1) promoting moral visions for a more just, peaceful and sustainable world and (2) enhancing the academic achievement, professional competence and economic competitiveness of the next generation. Both of these overarching goals can be detected in the numerous manifestations of ideological thinking that spring to life in educational programs invoking the specific term ‘global citizenship’.

Moral visions and global citizenship education

Contemporary interpretations of global citizenship often frame the concept as a series of practices, dependent upon actions and outlooks adopted voluntarily by
individuals and groups, rather than as contingent upon any sort of formal legal standing that would be analogous to national citizenship. Just as schools have long served essentially as seedbeds for youngsters to pick up the habits of ‘good citizenship’ within local and national political communities, the educational arena naturally emerges as fertile ground for global civic ideals to take root. Many of the ways in which schools and universities have chosen to articulate the meaning of global citizenship speak to this desire to cultivate informed and ethical citizens who will exemplify good behavior as members of humanity, not just as members and participants within a particular town, province or country. Therefore, educational institutions often define global citizenship in ways that seem primarily focused upon expressing aspirations for the actions of individual persons. Consider, for example, how Daisaku Ikeda, the founder of Soka University of America—with its stated mission ‘to foster a steady stream of global citizens committed to living a contributive life’—expanded in a speech upon what he considers the essential personal qualities of global citizens:

Certainly, global citizenship is not determined merely by the number of languages one speaks, or the number of countries to which one has traveled. I have many friends who could be considered quite ordinary citizens, but who possess an inner nobility; who have never traveled beyond their native place, yet who are genuinely concerned for the peace and prosperity of the world. I think I can state with confidence that the following are essential elements of global citizenship:

- The wisdom to perceive the interconnectedness of all life and living.
- The courage not to fear or deny difference; but to respect and strive to understand people of different cultures, and to grow from encounters with them.
- The compassion to maintain an imaginative empathy that reaches beyond one’s immediate surroundings and extends to those suffering in distant places.

Clearly this is an ethical definition of a global citizen. With qualities such as wisdom, courage and imaginative empathy, global citizenship emerges as a moral vision applicable to individual sentiments and behaviors rather than as a specific call for the development of global governing institutions in ways that would render a more binding model of global citizenship. A similar approach to global citizenship—as a moral imperative reliant upon the thoughts and actions of individual persons—can be found at Haverford College’s Center for Peace and Global Citizenship. Launched in 1999, the center serves largely as a clearinghouse for service and internship programs, at home and abroad, at the Quaker institution just outside Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The Center’s mission statement offers the following definition:

By global citizenship, we mean the imperative to resist parochialism and to take responsibility for the consequences of our actions in a world where individuals, communities, nations, and the environment are inextricably intertwined. The prerequisite for global citizenship is knowledge—knowledge about the ties that bind us in domestic and global communities and the forces that rend us asunder; knowledge about the uses and misuses of power, and the beneficent and unfortunate consequences of public policy; and
knowledge about peoples and cultures at distant removes from ourselves with whose lives we are nevertheless interlinked.

By including blanket allegations of poor government decisions and policies—without further elaboration—this definition of global citizenship presents a moral vision of informed and ethical citizens who understand the roots and significance of global interdependence as well as the shortcomings in government responses to interdependence. And yet, while implying the need for some sort of political and social change, the definition seems to uncouple ‘citizenship’ from any sort of legally binding ties to government institutions—or any struggle to reshape institutions. Once again, global citizenship is framed essentially as dependent upon outlooks and voluntary actions of individuals—and as a fundamentally different model from the institution of national citizenship.

Consider also the ethical content in the following definition of global citizenship from Concordia Language Villages, a summer program in Minnesota that teaches 12 languages to grade-school students in simulated village settings reminiscent of the countries in which the languages are spoken. Affiliated with the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Concordia views the skill of language learning as a means toward fulfilling a lofty moral vision—again, applicable to individual persons. Its mission statement notes that the program’s purpose ‘is to prepare young people for responsible citizenship in our global community’ and includes the following definition:

A responsible world citizen is one who: understands and appreciates cultural diversity, communicates with confidence and cultural sensitivity in more than one language, responds creatively and critically to issues which transcend national boundaries, expresses empathy for neighbors in the global village, (and) promotes a world view of peace, justice and sustainability for all.9

The moral visions inherent in the above definitions of ‘global citizenship’ converge with elements of moral cosmopolitanism and liberal multiculturalism. Often framed in the present day as a logical extension of liberalism’s universal principles relating to human rights and human dignity, the tradition of moral cosmopolitanism10 dates back at least to the ancient Cynics and Stoics and holds essentially that each and every human person warrants equal respect and concern—and that each person carries a corresponding moral obligation to help further well-being across humanity.11 As Joshua Cohen has helpfully encapsulated the cosmopolitan ideal: ‘our highest allegiance must be to the community of humankind, and the first principles of our practical thought must respect the equal worth of all members of that community’.12 Liberal multiculturalism, meanwhile, encompasses moral visions of mutual respect and engagement across cultures as well as the duty to protect the rights of ethnic, religious, linguistic and cultural minority groups within a diversely populated nation-state, thereby encouraging minority groups to maintain particular traditions even in the face of pressures to assimilate into a dominant culture.13

Especially in the United Kingdom, education for global citizenship has placed great emphasis upon issues and goals such as human rights, the alleviation of world poverty, and solidarity across continents and cultures in ways that converge
with moral cosmopolitanism and liberal multiculturalism. Oxfam International, the development and educational organization with its worldwide headquarters in Britain, has been particularly influential in shaping understandings of global citizenship in British educational circles. In 1997, Oxfam Great Britain published a manifesto on global citizenship education that coincided with the election of the New Labour government. When New Labour subsequently introduced citizenship education in general—and global citizenship education in particular—into the national school curriculum (first for England and Wales, and later for Scotland and Northern Ireland), educators looking for ways to implement this imperative and identify specific lesson plans turned especially to Oxfam as well as a coalition of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) focused on issues related to poverty and development. Because Oxfam’s definition and interpretation of the term ‘global citizenship’ has proven so influential, it warrants close attention. Note how once again, global citizenship is framed here as a series of practices adopted voluntarily by individuals:

Global citizenship is about understanding the need to tackle injustice and inequality, and having the desire and ability to work actively to do so. It is about valuing the Earth as precious and unique, and safeguarding the future for those coming after us. Global citizenship is a way of thinking and behaving. It is an outlook on life, a belief that we can make a difference. We see a global citizen as someone who:

- is aware of the wider world and has a sense of their own role as a world citizen;
- respects and values diversity;
- has an understanding of how the world works economically, politically, socially, culturally, technologically and environmentally;
- is outraged by social injustice;
- participates in and contributes to the community at a range of levels from local to global;
- is willing to act to make the world a more sustainable place;
- takes responsibility for their actions.\textsuperscript{14}

Oxfam’s moral vision of global citizenship is presented in such consciously lofty terms—with global citizens cast as presumably enlightened about the world and responsive to their respective roles and obligations within a multiplicity of communities—that it is difficult to imagine how most of us ever would meet Oxfam’s criteria in full. The authors of the Oxfam manifesto seem to admit as much. As they write almost immediately after the definition—in language that further casts global citizenship as a series of voluntary practices that will vary greatly from person to person: ‘This description of a global citizen is the ideal. It may feel like rather a tall order, but don’t be put off! Everyone has the potential to be a global citizen if they wish to, and is somewhere along the path towards that goal. For those willing to take up the challenge, all you need is courage, commitment, and a sense of humour.’\textsuperscript{15}

Oxfam’s sweeping definition of global citizenship, then, has served mainly as a guidepost to which students and their teachers can aspire. In practice, the educational initiatives that have flowed from this definition in recent years tend to be aligned with
one or more items in Oxfam’s criteria, suggesting that Oxfam’s ideal of global citizenship might be elusive in sum but feasible when reduced to small incremental steps. Some of the specific lesson plans and resources produced by organizations in the United Kingdom serve to illustrate the extent that the New Labour government and key voluntary organizations and advocacy groups have collaborated to shape the national curriculum in this regard. An extensive guide of lessons and activities for schools seeking to integrate education for global citizenship across the curriculum—entitled ‘Get Global!’—was produced by a partnership of development NGOs: Oxfam, Save the Children, Christian Aid, Action Aid, and Catholic Agency for Overseas Development. In addition, the Web site globaldimension.org.uk—which provides an enormous catalogue of lesson plans for global citizenship—was produced jointly by the United Kingdom Development Education Association and the United Kingdom Department for International Development, which also co-sponsored the Get Global! Web site. Suggested lessons, to name a few, focus on such themes as the World Cup soccer tournament, the persistence of child labor (a lesson produced by Save the Children), the United Nations Millennium Development Goals, the threats facing animal and plant life native to rainforests in Brazil, the everyday routines and struggles of children who are blind and live in developing countries; and comparisons of food and nutrition in the United Kingdom, Ethiopia and Tajikistan.

News accounts detailing scores of global citizenship educational initiatives taken across the United Kingdom since the implementation of the new national curriculum illustrate the extent that teachers and students are indeed taking on projects that are aligned, in various ways, with the ideological constellations of moral cosmopolitanism, liberal multiculturalism and environmentalism. Pupils at numerous primary and secondary schools in the Somerset countryside marched outside Parliament in April 2004 in a campaign to call for the government’s support in a campaign for all the world’s children, by the year 2015, to receive the opportunity to attend school. Students participating in the event, organized in part by Oxfam, learned that more than 100 million children in the world are left without any sort of schooling.16 Students at Ansford Community School, in Castle Cary, Somerset, held a ‘Fairtrade Day’ in partnership with Traidcraft, a Christian advocacy group that works primarily with farmers and agricultural suppliers and producers in developing countries. Students took part in a simulation of what Traidcraft considers a typical economic interaction of ‘unfair trade’ and also examined what the organization considers a preferable alternative—a case study of a chocolate production and distribution system based in Ghana. At Pentrehafod Secondary School in Swansea, Wales, students met with Sally Keeble, New Labour’s Minister for International Development and urged for the government to do more on behalf of the world’s least advantaged persons. As 13-year-old Emma Bettany reflected on what she had learned in studying about global citizenship: ‘It’s been a real eye-opener. Before, when you bought chocolate, you thought it came from the supermarket, but it comes from parts of Africa where there are farmers who can’t even afford to feed their children. It’s quite scary when you think about it’. Said 12-year-old Sadia Ali, who urged the government to provide
better treatment for asylum seekers: “The media talks about people sneaking into the country. But they’ve been through so much and should be treated with respect”.17

Hundreds of elementary and secondary schools in the United Kingdom have launched partnerships with schools in developing countries—and many schools have also embarked on fund-raising campaigns on behalf of these communities. At Compton Primary School in Plymouth, school children raised more than UK £1000 to help buy a pump for a new well in Ekondo-Nene, a village of 200 persons in Cameroon. Upon meeting a native of the village, the youngsters were stunned to learn that before the well was dug, residents of the village had to walk six miles to reach the nearest stream.18 At St. Mark’s Church of England Primary School in Bromley, children raised more than UK £1400 for the British Leprosy Relief Association to help persons suffering from leprosy in India, Brazil and parts of Africa. Children at Great Bedwyn School in Marlborough, Wiltshire, collected and assembled 120 pencil cases—each filled with pens, pencils, erasers, rulers and pencil sharpeners—for children at Gunjur Lower Basic School in Gambia, West Africa.19 Many such international linkages among schools have been facilitated by the International Education and Resource Network (iEARN), a non-profit organization founded in 1988 that has facilitated partnerships with more than 20 000 schools in 115 countries. The organization’s mission statement echoes a clear commitment to moral cosmopolitanism: ‘Every project proposed by teachers and students in iEARN has to answer the question, ‘How will this project improve the quality of life on the planet?’ This vision and purpose is the glue that holds iEARN together, enabling participants to become global citizens who make a difference by collaborating with their peers around the world’.20

Beyond cyberspace, numerous schools in Britain have also linked the idea of global citizenship with exchange programs and service projects in local communities around the world, most commonly in Africa and South Asia. Ashford Community School, for example, hosted three teachers and 14 students from Mufulira High School in Zambia for three weeks during the summer of 2003, while a delegation from Ashford visited Zambia in 2004. On both exchange meetings, the groups explored the theme ‘Our Land, Our Future’ and visited local farms and industries as well as sites of environmental and historic interest.21 A group of six Year 11 students (ages 15 and 16) and two teachers from Harrogate Grammar School traveled to Bolivia for two weeks in November 2003, joining forces with the advocacy group Quaker Bolivia Link to help dig wells and build homes for a group of indigenous residents known as the Aymara.22 A group of 14 students from Ridgeway School in Plympton and King Edward VI School in Stafford travelled to Malawi in July 2003 with the advocacy group World Challenge to help renovate a community school in a village near the capital of Lilongwe. Members of the group returned to the village in 2004 to help convert an abandoned barn into a residence hall for the school.23

These sorts of initiatives in the United Kingdom serve to illustrate how some degree of coherence is emerging around the idea of global citizenship in British educational circles, with strands of moral cosmopolitanism, liberal multiculturalism
and environmentalism all interwoven together. Indeed, Oxfam’s online guide for teachers uses key words reminiscent of these ideological constellations, noting, for example, that global citizenship can be promoted in the classroom ‘through teaching the existing curriculum in a way that highlights aspects such as social justice, the appreciation of diversity and the importance of sustainable development’. The degree of coherence is attributable in no small measure to the impact of Oxfam and its sister NGOs, coupled with the revamped national curriculum requirements, in helping to shape, from the top down, how global citizenship is taught in British schools. To be sure, scores of elementary schools and secondary schools in the United Kingdom have also implemented their own distinctive global citizenship initiatives from the ground up, but a clear vision of education for global citizenship has been projected forcefully on a national scale. Beyond the United Kingdom, the absence of similar national catalysts might be one reason why the ideological content of global citizenship educational programs sometimes appears more hospitable to neoliberalism, as we shall see in the next section.

Nevertheless, many educational programs for global citizenship in other corners of the English-speaking world also include strong ethical components that converge simultaneously with moral cosmopolitanism, liberal multiculturalism and environmentalism. For instance, at Prairie Crossing Charter School, located in Gray’s Lake, Illinois, environmental stewardship and global citizenship are twinned as cornerstones of the school’s charter. The school has pursued its global citizenship objective in part through numerous initiatives that try especially to instil in youngsters senses of environmental awareness and responsibility. As Victoria Ranney, a former school board member, noted during an interview for this study:

> Whereas many schools would be studying the rainforest, we’re studying our own ecology and drawing conclusions that relate to the rainforest. You can understand flooding everywhere if you understand it here. The natural systems, if you understand them in your own backyard—with our prairies, our wetlands—they work similarly all over the globe. If local citizenship means being a steward of this environment, global citizenship is just a larger version of the same.

In this regard, education for global citizenship at Prairie Crossing begins by helping youngsters understand their local environment in ways that can be applied to broader environmental concerns. At the same time, the approach taken by Prairie Crossing—and by many other schools dedicated to global citizenship—bridges moral visions of environmental responsibility with objectives such as conveying useful information, elevating international understanding, and sharpening the reasoning abilities of youngsters. At Southern Cross Schools, a private primary and secondary school in Hoedspruit, South Africa, that also emphasizes environmental education and global citizenship, the headmaster takes great care to distance the school’s endeavors and its aspirations for global citizenship from some of the perceived stereotypes of environmentalists: ‘What we aim to produce is not a Greenpeace mob or a lot of bunny-huggers but global
citizens who can go out into the world and make a difference with regard to developing and sustaining the earth’s natural resources’.28

The ways in which global citizenship educational initiatives intersect with specific ideologies obviously vary across institutions and grade levels. At Prairie Crossing, for example, the school teaches Spanish to its entire student body—including kindergarteners—and has also established a partnership and sustained correspondence with an elementary school in Pakistan. While the facilitation of dialogue across cultures and countries relates with liberal multiculturalism as well as moral cosmopolitanism, the nuts and bolts of the actual programs are justified for the sake of helping the students become more aware and reflective about the world around them—as well as shaking up naïve assumptions held by youngsters. As the school’s principal, Linda Brazdil, explained in an interview: ‘When they hear things, for example, about how in many cultures, girls don’t go to school, or how they only go to school very young and then they stop, our girls go—‘What? Why would they do that? I don’t understand that’. For them to correspond with people in those cultures is so much better than my saying, ‘Well, they believe this because...’ That has some value but certainly not nearly as much as hearing from people about what their experience is’.

At Soka University of America, approximately 60% of the students hail from outside the United States, and the university’s founders designed its Mediterranean style campus in Aliso Viejo, California specifically to foster face-to-face student dialogue across potential dividing lines. The student residence halls, for example, are integrated across lines of ethnicity and national origin, and the school placed in its main dining hall round tables seating eight to 12 persons, in hope that this number of students per table would spur good conversation and encourage maximum interaction among a culturally diverse student body. Consistent with liberal multiculturalism and its emphasis on fostering mutual understanding and respect across lines of cultural differences, the aim of such arrangements is to encourage students to subject their own ideological presuppositions—whatever they might be—to critical scrutiny. As Michael Hays, the dean of faculty at Soka University of America, noted in an interview for this research: ‘Part of becoming a global citizen here, as we are dealing with it, is realizing that to understand and engage with other people, you must confront your own mental and discursive political and ideological structures. You must be aware of them. You must be aware that there will be conflict—that’s crucial’.29

Competency-based global citizenship education

The goal of helping young people eventually blossom as vibrant, actively engaged citizens who can think rigorously for themselves and act appropriately has long inspired efforts to strengthen civic education. Especially in much of conservative political thinking, the goal of civic competence is championed as a laudable moral vision in itself,30 and the realm of civic competence has expanded from the polity into the market. This is not lost on advocates of global citizenship education who focus primarily upon helping their students develop the wherewithal to
flourish, or at least survive, in the rough and tumble of what is now perceived as inevitable and incessant global economic competition. Civic competence as an ideal increasingly has been fused with a *laissez-faire* outlook on the world economy. The economic arrangements typically associated with neoliberalism—deregulation, privatization, free trade, and cuts in taxes and public services—are justified by advocates of unfettered free capitalism as necessary routes for expanding and sustaining peace, freedom and democracy.\(^{31}\)

Within the educational arena, many global citizenship initiatives focused on competence place emphasis primarily upon academic achievement and professional competitiveness, and the ways in which teachers and administrators define their objectives often emerge as complementary to neoliberalism in at least accepting the validity of the present configuration of the global market. Many global citizenship educational programs endorse, at least tacitly, the idea of unfettered global markets and justify the existence of their programs as increasing the readiness of their students to compete in the world economy. Sometimes this is the case especially at schools and universities in relatively isolated communities, whose children, collectively speaking, are often especially vulnerable to losing ground in the race for global professional talent and the exodus of manufacturing and service industries to lower-wage countries. Consider how the principal of Southland Girls High School, on the remote southern coast of New Zealand, summarized her view of global citizenship upon returning from an international principal’s conference in 1998 at the other end of the world, in Finland: ‘The message that is coming through very clearly is that technology, literacy and numeracy are the keys to global citizenship. We might be relatively isolated in New Zealand, but, through communication, through learning languages and through having an international outlook, we can keep pace with developments in places like Europe’.\(^{32}\) The now-retired principal, Linda Braun, said the term ‘global citizenship’ entered her vocabulary around 1997, as the school began successfully recruiting Asian students from overseas, leading to a much more culturally diverse student body. Alongside the cultural transformation of the high school, Braun connected the term ‘global citizenship’ mainly to ideas of competence and competitiveness.

In advancing a global citizenship agenda for the school, Braun invested NZ$300,000 in a computer network and placed computer terminals in open public spaces rather than in enclosed classrooms. The school provided each student with unlimited Internet access and an e-mail account—something more common at universities than high schools, and a move that at the time put Southland Girls technologically ahead of every secondary school in the region. In promoting civic competence and engagement among her students, Braun championed four extracurricular ‘quadrants’—sporting activities, cultural activities, leadership, and service: ‘We’re constantly saying to the girls, you must develop your abilities and knowledge in all those four quadrants. You must be a good sportswoman. You must be a leader—or at least a good team member—we’ve merged those two. You must have cultural activities like drama, choir, debating, whatever, and service, because that’s part of being a well-rounded responsible citizen’. The strategy
focused on civic competence and professional competitiveness is working: More
than 90% of Southland Girls High School graduates go onto university education,
and half of them become the first university graduates in their families.

Some secondary schools that offer the International Baccalaureate (IB)
credential based on a common, rigorous pre-university curriculum and a
standardized examination have aligned themselves with the specific idea of global
citizenship. Based in Geneva, the International Baccalaureate Organization (IBO)
aims ‘to provide students with a truly international education—an education that
courages an understanding and appreciation of other cultures, languages and
points of view’. Schools affiliated with the IB program generally place greater
weight than their counterparts upon fields such as world history and literature
(from non-western sources), comparative politics, international economics, art and
geography. Some individual IB schools that have incorporated the idea of global
citizenship directly into their mission statements have linked the term with specific
aptitudes, personal qualities and ethical standards. For example, Eugene
International High School—a public high school in Eugene, Oregon—crafted in
2000 the following mission statement, which combines moral visions and desired
competencies: ‘As global citizens at Eugene International High School, we aspire
to value diversity, ambiguity, and discovery and to act with responsibility,
integrity, and compassion’. The school’s former head teacher, Caron Cooper,
who was instrumental in crafting the mission statement, said that the school
especially wanted to instil in its students the capability of understanding and
accepting ambiguity: ‘We try to help students understand that there are multiple
perspectives, that there are multiple theories, and that they weigh those
thoughtfully—that we don’t provide answers; we provide information, and we
invite them to do research and explore and come to conclusions where discourse is
really valued’. Once again, such approaches to global citizenship seem dedicated
primarily to the objective of teaching students to think carefully for themselves as
they learn about the world around them.

A few colleges and universities have gone as far as to provide their students with
an extra line on their résumés by offering ‘certifications’ as global citizens—
conferring a self-defined status of ‘global citizen’ as a way of validating certain
pathways followed by students as they pursue their degrees. Franklin Pierce
College—a small, rural college located in the backwoods of New Hampshire—
offers a Global Citizenship Certificate to students who complete a series of courses
in fields such as cultural anthropology, comparative politics, forest ecology and
international marketing, along with various world regional studies courses.
Students are also required either to study abroad or to complete an internship that
can be linked with the idea of global citizenship. Although Franklin Pierce College
markets the certificate as a credential of sorts, the college defines ‘global
citizenship’ in language that also converges somewhat with moral cosmopolitan-
ism and liberal multiculturalism: ‘Global citizenship involves understanding the
forces that affect cross-cultural connections and being committed to a
global community based on human interdependence, equality, and justice’. The
University of Delaware also has launched a Global Citizenship Certificate
(GCC) program, in which students can receive the certificate either through completion of courses ‘with a global or cross-cultural focus’, or through study abroad, service projects or attending a series of lectures.37

The moral content that can be identified within many competency-based educational programs associated with global citizenship further underscores the ideological pluralism at hand. Indeed, some individual schools and universities have chosen to frame global citizenship in ways that encourage deployment of the concept across a range of ideological constellations, thereby appealing to political lefties and right-wingers alike. Chapman University, for example, has adopted the following credo: ‘The mission of Chapman University is to provide personalized education of distinction that leads to inquiring, ethical, and productive lives as global citizens’.38 This formulation allows for the term to be claimed by faculty and students from across the ideological spectrum. While some of Chapman’s social science courses linked with global citizenship fit within moral cosmopolitanism and also pacifist outlooks in a post-colonial world, some economics faculty members, in contrast, think of global citizenship in ways more closely aligned with neoliberalism—primarily with regard to furthering free trade and international business.39 Indeed, the university based in Orange, California, has awarded its annual Global Citizen Medal to some of the world’s most illustrious conservatives, such as former United States presidents George H.W. Bush (2000) and Gerald Ford (2001), British prime minister Margaret Thatcher (2002) and former Spanish president Jose Maria Aznar (2004).

Ideological objections to global citizenship education

That some manifestations of global citizenship education are packaged in ways that can appeal to the political right is especially interesting given that ideological critics of global citizenship education tend to emerge from the political right. On both sides of the Atlantic, the most vociferous critics of global citizenship education are conservatives with strong nationalist sentiments.40 In Great Britain, the architects of New Labour’s national curriculum for citizenship quickly found themselves fending off allegations from interest groups that teaching material classified under the heading of ‘global citizenship’ would undercut religious education and promote secular morality and socialist ideology.41 For instance, Nick Seaton, of the Campaign for Real Education in Britain, argued that ‘global citizenship’ amounted to a ‘code word for international socialism’ and added, in an interview for this research, that supporters of ‘global citizenship’ have a ‘sinister’ motive: ‘I try very hard not to be a conspiracy theorist, but as I said, there is certainly an international grouping which is seeking to destroy nation-states in favor of international government, through the United Nations, mainly’.42 Once implemented, the revised national curriculum continued to require religious education, as well as a ‘predominantly Christian basis’ to religious instruction within a syllabus agreed upon by the local community.

Other British critics from the political right repeatedly have decried citizenship education as allegedly straying from the necessary basics of education
for the sake of indoctrinating students with left-wing political agendas. In the words of Chris Woodhead, the former chief inspector of schools in England:

The subject is set to become an educational nightmare: ludicrously grandiose in its aspirations, shot through with political correctness and based upon the discredited progressive thinking that has damaged the lives of so many children … If the government really wanted to do something about citizenship, it would tackle illiteracy and ignorance. It would ensure that teaching time was dedicated to the traditional subjects that need to be mastered.43

Perceptions that education for global citizenship amounts to a left-wing conspiracy are not entirely surprising. After all, in the United Kingdom, Oxfam and its sister development organizations are situated to the left of the political center, and the New Labour government claimed to represent a center-left alliance. Overlooked by the critics of global citizenship in education, however, is the extent of ideological pluralism in the actual substance of global citizenship educational programs, taken together. Regardless of whether or not progressive thinking is ‘discredited’, as Woodhead claims, many global citizenship educational initiatives do not stem from progressive ideology, nor are they necessarily ‘shot through with political correctness’. The above passage from Woodhead also seems oblivious to the evidence that many educators link global citizenship very closely with traditional subjects and basic skills, just as Linda Braun of Southland Girls High School directly linked global citizenship with technology, literacy and numeracy. Much of the evidence, in fact, that effectively rejoins Woodhead’s comments serves to illustrate how education for global citizenship commonly places emphasis upon competence.

Setting aside the question of whether Woodhead’s remark about illiteracy accurately pertains to the New Labour government, the reality is that numerous global citizenship educational initiatives have advanced the specific aim of promoting greater literacy at home and abroad. In April 2003, for example, students from all across the United Kingdom joined youngsters from more than 100 countries in what was billed as the World’s Biggest Ever Lesson—organized by the Campaign for Global Education44 and focusing on the disadvantages and obstacles faced by the estimated 862 million adults around the world who cannot read or write.45 Some educational organizations and multinational corporations have even classified ‘global citizenship’ as a literacy skill in itself. As the former president of Bentley College (a university located near Boston, Massachusetts) argued shortly after the terrorist attacks of September 2001, in an essay portraying global citizenship as a hallmark of cultural literacy and an essential element of democracy:

The war against terrorism will not end soon. Colleges and universities can be counted on to continue to play their critical role in a democratic society. This includes educating global citizens who are multilingual and literate in multiple world views, religious traditions, and cultures.46
Specific linkages between global citizenship and literacy abound in the educational arena. Concordia Language Villages, as noted earlier in this article, associates global citizenship with acquiring basic literacy and communication skills in more than one language. Nuestro Mundo Community School, a bilingual elementary school in Madison, Wisconsin, at which all students receive instruction in both English and Spanish, associates global citizenship with fluency in the two languages as well as greater solidarity in the local community across Anglo and Latino cultures. As noted by the chairperson of the committee to create the charter school, which opened in September 2004: ‘We want to create an innovative school setting that sees bilingualism as something positive with a curriculum that is intellectually rigorous. We’ll be creating global citizens who value diversity and who are active in the community’. And a report released in 2003 by the AOL Time Warner Foundation argued that alongside the basic academic competencies, youngsters need to achieve the following literacy skills: ‘communicate effectively, use and adapt to new technology, think creatively and critically, understand and analyze the media, be global citizens and contribute to their communities’. By regarding engagement across cultures—at home as well as abroad—as an important literacy skill in itself, many organizations that have brought together agendas related to literacy and global citizenship appeal, both implicitly and explicitly, to the ideological constellation of liberal multiculturalism—and this might be the real target of Chris Woodhead’s opposition to global citizenship in the educational arena.

Within the United States, as well, members of interest groups on the political right sometimes object to any movement toward education for global citizenship. In Idaho, planned revisions to the state curriculum intended to bolster international education met resistance from conservatives, including some local members of the John Birch Society, which has long campaigned with the phrase ‘Get the U.S. out of the U.N’. While the Idaho educational standards did not make specific reference to global citizenship, the term became a slur used by critics to oppose the standards, without much impact, in this case. One critic, Adrian Arp, wrote a letter to his local newspaper arguing: ‘These standards will make our schools socialistic indoctrination centers for global citizenship’ and ‘promote socialism, humanism, evolution, relativism, internationalism and ignorance’. In a follow-up interview for this research, Arp said he is convinced that the United Nations aims to convert the general population into ‘one-world government citizens’ and also is trying to implement a ‘one-world religion’ that would revolve around the natural environment rather than any sort of deity. Arp portrayed ‘global citizenship’ as inherently oppressive and contrary to his Christian view of the world, which essentially views the sovereignty of nation-states as divine right:

Now I personally feel that we should be obviously global neighbors in the sense that we have free exchange of ideas and trade and so forth, but I also feel that going back to the Biblical context, that the Lord set up countries purposely so that there would be sovereignty and independence, and freedom would reign under independent nations as opposed to everybody under one big, I call it, dictatorial, tyrannical type world government regime which probably would make us all serfs and slaves again under somebody’s control.
A few grains of truth can be identified in portions of the above comments. As we have seen, many global citizenship educational initiatives are aligned with some aspects of environmentalism—though they stop well short of elevating the ecosystem to a deity. In addition, even proponents of strengthening global governing institutions such as the United Nations generally take pains to acknowledge that a top-down, one-world government likely would bring 'the end of all citizenship', as Hannah Arendt forcefully argued. However, ideological objections depicting 'global citizenship' as necessarily socialist and also associated with a supposed world government conspiracy, seem entirely detached from what in fact is actually taught within contemporary global citizenship programs. These days, any agenda of one-world government is entirely off the radar screen of the overwhelming majority of these programs. The same applies regarding key aspects of socialism, such as the nationalization of industries and the consolidation of property and other economic resources into the hands of the state. Even if some strains of socialism—similar to liberalism—evoke cosmopolitan visions of a common humanity or a global community, global citizenship education these days has affinities primarily with capitalism, not socialism. Indeed, many of the world's largest corporations have invoked the term 'global citizenship' in an attempt to gain greater public legitimacy. Finally, contrary to allegations that education for global citizenship must necessarily entail the devaluation or even the repudiation of national patriotism, educators generally seem to portray global citizenship as complementary to national patriotism—and as a different model of citizenship that derives from the voluntary actions and outlooks of individuals and groups. All these rejoinders aside, the mere evidence that global citizenship educational programs often seem to invite ideological contestation—along very familiar political lines separating left and right—serves to reinforce arguments that public discourse surrounding the term 'global citizenship' in the educational arena is dispersed across established ideological constellations and does not, as yet, seem to contribute to a new and distinctive ideology.

Conclusion

The deployment of the term 'global citizenship' in the educational arena illustrates how familiar ideologies are adapting alongside increasing public recognition of global interdependence. It does not yet signal the onset of a new, distinct and globally-oriented ideology. Even in circumstances in which educational initiatives related to global citizenship are taking on a degree of coherence—such as among elementary and secondary schools within the United Kingdom—the elements of coherence are situated mainly within the ideologies of liberalism and environmentalism. Therefore, the answers to all three questions outlined at the start of the article—which serve as criteria for evaluating whether a body of thought might be coalescing into an ideology of its own—are negative.

With respect to the first question—whether public discourse related to global citizenship in the educational arena advocates particular patterns of political and
social relationships and arrangements: Many individual educational programs related to global citizenship do advocate various patterns of political and social relationships. As we have seen, some programs endorse global free-market capitalism while others would support greater efforts to help the world’s least fortunate, while still others place a greater emphasis upon environmental sustainability and the ecological health of the planet. While such agendas are not necessarily at odds with each other, it would be overly ambitious to claim that all these agendas surface consistently in global citizenship educational programs. When looking widely at the landscape of educational initiatives for global citizenship, the various patterns of political and social relationships advocated by specific programs do not seem to fit together. Moreover, some programs do not advocate particular patterns of political or social relationships at all, but instead aim to encourage higher levels of competence and achievement in the next generation, irrespective of the sorts of political and social relationships they might form or encounter. These realities weaken any case that educational programs invoking global citizenship, at least in the present day, are feeding into a new and distinctive globally-oriented ideology.

Turning to the second question—whether public discourse related to global citizenship in the educational arena justifies specific patterns of behavior applicable across a broad range of issues: Although some global citizenship educational programs seem to endorse or justify patterns of conduct—not only among individual persons, but also among collective actors such as nation-states and multinational corporations—any prospect of coherence evaporates when one looks comprehensively at the programs. For example, global citizenship educational programs do not widely share a vision of the proper roles of multinational corporations, nor do they uniformly promote the sorts of behavior patterns championed by many environmentalists. To be sure, numerous educational programs related to global citizenship strive to encourage students to be open-minded, industrious, inquisitive, reflective and respectful, but these sorts of civic virtues, while certainly compatible with liberalism, are not exclusive to any particular ideology.

Finally, taking into account the third question—whether public discourse related to global citizenship in the educational arena has resolved uncertainty or debate about what ‘global citizenship’ means: Rather than resolving such uncertainty or debate, educational programs for global citizenship seem to have opened up new lines of inquiry and new avenues of debate regarding the meaning of ‘global citizenship’—as well as the meanings of the individual terms ‘global’ and ‘citizenship’ standing on their own. Many educational institutions have invited multiple meanings of these terms to compete and co-exist—thereby not even attempting or wishing to resolve contestation. Furthermore, in some instances, specific references to ‘global citizenship’ in curriculum documents have fueled considerable public debate. The lack of widespread and effective decontestation claims is perhaps the strongest indicator that global citizenship educational initiatives are providing evidence mainly of adaptations within familiar ideologies rather than the onset of a new ideology.
So if global citizenship educational programs, at present, remain situated within several constellations that work across familiar ideologies, what then about the viability of ‘globalism’ as a prospective new ideology? Does the evidence presented in this article weaken the case that globalism has taken center stage as an ideology unto itself? Not necessarily. Some attributes of competency-based global citizenship education programs do converge with three of the apparent core claims of globalism Manfred Steger recently has documented: ‘globalization is about the liberalization and global integration of markets’,54 ‘globalization is inevitable and irreversible’, and ‘globalization benefits everyone . . . in the long run’. Of course, these three claims also converge with the established ideological constellation of neoliberalism.

However, global citizenship educational programs are agnostic on the remaining three proposed globalism claims identified by Steger: ‘nobody is in charge of globalization’, ‘globalization furthers the spread of democracy in the world’, and ‘globalization requires a global war on terror’.55 When looking across the entire universe of global citizenship educational programs, any comprehensive ideological affinities with globalism, at least as Steger has framed this prospective ideology, seem elusive. Even if Steger is right to argue that the all six of the above core claims form the basis of a new ideology called ‘globalism’ that has vaulted its way to dominance in the present day, global citizenship educational programs, in total, do not fit into this paradigm. Nor, for that matter, do global citizenship educational initiatives provide us with an obvious competing set of core claims that would signify the emergence of a globally-oriented ideological challenger to ‘globalism’. The United Kingdom programs would seem to have the most potential for coalescing into such a rival ideology, but it would be premature to classify them as such.

It certainly is possible that, as public discourse regarding the idea of ‘global citizenship’ more generally continues to proliferate, one or more new and distinct ideologies might well evolve from this discourse. The extent that any forthcoming ideologies might share affinities with globalism or mount a challenge to this paradigm remains to be seen. At present, however, education for global citizenship seems to offer the most insight into the extent that liberalism continues to mushroom into a family of ideologies undergoing adaptation in response to increasing public recognition of global interdependence. Three of the four most visible ideological constellations of global citizenship educational initiatives—moral cosmopolitanism, liberal multiculturalism and neoliberalism—operate largely as competing strains of thinking within liberalism. The fourth constellation, environmentalism—an ideology of its own—can also be regarded as complementary to liberalism, even if environmentalism challenges particular assumptions, such as the desirability of economic growth and higher living standards, frequently regarded by liberals as unproblematic.56 In the end, global citizenship educational programs provide further evidence especially of the present state of pluralism within liberalism, with multiple versions of liberalism simultaneously competing for validation as public debates about globalization,
along with our collective understandings of global interdependence and its implications, continue to unfold.
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5. This article limits the analysis to educational programs focused on the specific term ‘global citizenship’ rather than looking more widely at ‘citizenship education’ or ‘global education’. The initiatives discussed in this article, then, provide a good, albeit partial representation of contemporary educational programs pertaining to the term ‘global citizenship’, but they should not be taken as representative of the educational arena as a whole. I also have set aside in this discussion any attempt to draw quantitative conclusions as to the attributes of educational programs for global citizenship.

6. Perhaps the most eloquent and comprehensive case for global citizenship education at the university level has come from Martha Nussbaum, who has argued forcefully for universities to apply the Socratic vision of ‘the examined life’ by offering liberal arts courses that enable students to ‘cultivate their humanity’ through critical inquiry and reflection into their personal backgrounds in relation to other traditions and perspectives. Nussbaum aspires for university students to situate themselves within concentric circles, not only in terms of overlapping political communities but ‘groups formed on the basis of ethnic, religious, linguistic, historical, professional, and gender identities’. (Martha C. Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), pp. 60–61.)


10. Cosmopolitanism, of course, is a highly pluralistic ideal in itself—with too many internal divisions to unpack within the confines of this article. See Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins (Eds), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1998); and Catherine Lu, ‘The One and Many Faces of Cosmopolitanism’, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8 (2000), pp. 244–267.

11. Some might argue that what I have framed here as moral cosmopolitanism ought to be uncoupled from liberal ideals as a separate ideology. However, I submit that moral cosmopolitanism can be classified as a logical global extension of liberal principles—just as the US Declaration of Independence framed inalienable
rights and liberties as universal in scope and applicability. As Martha Nussbaum has argued for an ethic of ‘world citizenship’, especially within the United States: ‘If we really do believe that all human beings are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights, we are morally required to think about what that conception requires us to do with and for the rest of the world’. (Martha C. Nussbaum, ‘Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism’, in Joshua Cohen (Ed.), For Love of Country? Debating the Limits of Patriotism (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1996), p. 14.) Charles Beitz has also provided a helpful formulation in this regard, arguing that ‘cosmopolitan liberalism’ amounts to neither a prescription for the best institutional structure for international politics, nor a view of ‘how persons should understand their individual identities and loyalties’. Rather, Beitz has framed cosmopolitan liberalism as a moral doctrine that aims to identify principles for governing institutions, at all levels, that account for all human persons rather than persons within a particular society. (Charles R. Beitz, ‘Social and Cosmopolitan Liberalism’, International Affairs, 75(3) (1999), p. 519.)
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20. iEARN—About Us, http://www.iearn.org/about/index.html
24. A tight link between global citizenship and the environmentalist imperative of ‘sustainable development’ also emerges in a postgraduate degree program at University of Wales, Newport, with the aim of preparing educators interested in these concepts. See ‘University of Wales, Newport—Courses’, http://www3.newport.ac.uk/courses/displayCourse.aspx?course_id = 144
27. The approach at Prairie Crossing certainly fits within the first principle of environmentalism, as articulated by Mostafa Rejai: ‘The Earth as a Whole, For All Time, Must be Seen as a ‘Commons’. (Mostafa Rejai, Political Ideologies: A Comparative Approach (London: M.E. Sharpe, 1995), p. 187.) At the same time, global citizenship educational programs that focus on the environment do not necessarily speak to all the issues of concern to environmentalists—such as overpopulation, global warming, ozone depletion, air and water pollution, deforestation, soil erosion, nuclear contamination, and so forth—let alone adopt positions across these issues that would be judged as satisfactory by those who consider themselves aligned with environmentalism or ecologism. This is also the case for initiatives situated within the other ideological constellations discussed in this article, each of which contains its own internal divisions and competing strains of thinking. In sum, affinities with a particular constellation do not necessarily signify that the educational initiative in question articulates or represents a comprehensive account of that constellation.
30. See, for instance, the work of Lawrence Mead, who has defended work requirements in welfare programs as a means of promoting ‘social competence’ and securing equal citizenship. (Lawrence Mead, Beyond Entitlement (New York: The Free Press, 1986), pp. 250–256.)
31. For one particularly detailed illustration of such triangulation in neoliberal thinking, see Michael Mandelbaum, The Ideas That Conquered the World: Peace, Democracy, and Free Markets in the Twenty-First Century (New York: PublicAffairs, 2004). Some critics of neoliberalism frame the ideology as subordinating all political, social and human goods for the sake of global market expansion. As Susan George has argued: ‘The whole point of neo-liberalism is that the market mechanism should be allowed to direct the fate of human beings. The economy should dictate its rules to society, not the other way around’. (Susan George, ‘A Short History of Neoliberalism’, http://www.globalpolicy.org/globaliz/econ histneol.htm)
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35. Caron Cooper, interview with author, Eugene, OR, 7 July 2004.
40. While nationalism is often taken for granted in public debate as an ideology—and as the most powerful basis of political allegiance and commitment in the world today—among scholars, the ideological standing of nationalism is a matter of contestation. Michael Freeden, for example, has argued convincingly that nationalism is more properly situated within other host ideologies. (Michael Freeden, ‘Is Nationalism a Distinct Ideology?’, Political Studies, 46(4) (1998), pp. 748–765.) Bernard Susser acknowledges that nationalist movements operate across the ideological spectrum but argues that ‘nationalism is probably the most resilient, popular and tenacious form of ideological commitment in the contemporary world’ and that nationalism, similar to other ideologies, ‘legitimizes authority, fosters social cohesion, mobilizes mass support, guides political action, contributes to personal identity’. (Bernard Susser, Political Ideology in the Modern World (Needham, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 1995), pp. 206–207.
41. Much of the furore emerged in March 1998 when Michael Barber, who was serving as head of the standards unit at the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE), argued that education for global citizenship could fill a moral vacuum left by what he considered the erosion of Christianity as a basis for moral education. (For a news account of the speech, see John Carvel, ‘Schools adviser urges moral code to replace God’, The Guardian, 23 March 1998; for a rebuttal, see Geoff Teece, ‘All hell breaks loose over God’s role in the curriculum’, The Guardian, 24 March 1998.)
44. It is interesting to note that the Global Campaign for Education’s mission statement includes language that intersects with moral cosmopolitanism and environmentalism: ‘The GCE believes that in an increasingly knowledge-based economy, exclusion from education will translate into growing poverty, inequality and deprivation … We believe education is a universal human right; the key to poverty alleviation and sustainable human development …’ (‘Global Campaign for Education’, http://www.campaignforeducation.org/about/about_principles.html)
46. Joseph M. Cronin, ‘Lessons in Patriotism and Academic Freedom: Colleges Must Defend Their Independence and Integrity’, The Boston Globe, 2 December 2001. Similarly, as university language departments across the United States reported an increase in demand following 11 September 2001, many professors emphasized that language learning goes beyond the basics of vocabulary and grammar to understanding concepts and values embedded within languages, that help students truly understand countries and cultures around the world. ‘Global citizenship for an educated person ought to include fluency in a second language plus competence in a third’, argued Dr Madeleine Henry, associate professor and chairwoman of Iowa State University’s Department of World Languages & Cultures. (Omar Tesdell, Foreign Language Study Increases at Iowa State U., across nation’, U-Wire, 18 January 2002.)
50. As Arp put it: ‘It’s basically a worship of pantheism, worshipping nature, where nature is God rather than God being God—basically back to worshipping idols’. (Adrian L. Arp, interview with author, Twin Falls, ID, 11 September 2001.)

One could argue that the inclusion of these latter three claims—and especially the claim linking globalism to a permanent state of war—has undercut the prospective coherence of globalism. These latter three claims also do not necessarily differentiate globalism any further from neoliberalism.

For the same reasons, one can also distinguish environmentalism from conservatism and socialism. As Bernard Susser has noted, environmentalism denies that subduing nature through the use of human reason or technology is ‘morally worthy or practically viable’. (Susser, op. cit., Ref. 40, p. 254.) At the same time, Avner de-Shalit has argued convincingly that although liberalism and environmentalism might not be ‘identical twins’, in his words, ‘liberal societies have become a fertile ground for promoting ecological attitudes and environmental philosophy’. This is attributed to the anti-chauvinistic nature of liberalism, which fosters an emphasis upon respect for ‘the other’—all non-human life, in this regard—and campaigns to overturn abuses of power. (Avner de-Shalit, *The Environment: Between Theory and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 66–69.)