Review of International Studies (2000), 26, 179–197 *Copyright © British International Studies Association*

Does cosmopolitan thinking have a future?

DEREK HEATER[1]

It certainly has a past.[2] And that past, especially in its Stoic foundations, reveals a clear ethical purpose: 'As long as I remember that I am part of such a whole [Universe],' explained Marcus Aurelius, '… I shall … direct every impulse of mine to the common interest'.[3] Moreover, the word 'cosmopolitan' derives from *kosmopolites*, citizen of the universe, and *polites*, citizen, notably in its Aristotelean definition, has a decided ethical content. Accordingly, if the citizen of a state (*polis*) should be possessed of civic virtue (*arete*), by extension, the citizen of the universe (*kosmopolis*) should live a life of virtue, guided by his perception and understanding of the divine, natural law. True, in non-academic parlance the word 'cosmopolitan' has, from the eighteenth century, acquired the vague and vulgar connotation for an individual of enjoying comfortable familiarity with a variety of geographical and cultural environments. None the less, the more precise, political–ethical sense of a *kosmopolites* is so much more apposite to our present purpose that this essay will be framed in the main by this meaning.

With the question thus interpreted, it follows that we wish to know whether state citizenship, as we currently understand it, might be paralleled by a world citizenship of comparable content; if so, we obviously also wish to know what the implications must be for the individual's moral and political behaviour and the institutional contexts which would be needed to facilitate this cosmopolitan behaviour. Less obviously, perhaps, because the problem has been relatively neglected, we should wish to know how the novice world citizen can be educated into the role. Now, although state citizenship is itself a highly contentious concept and has developed along the separate republican and liberal pathways, there would surely be little dispute that its essential components are: identity, morality/responsibilities, rights and competence. Accepting this list as a rough rule-of-thumb, in order to respond to the question, 'Does cosmopolitan thinking have a future?', we should proceed along the following lines. We must conceive of these four elements as they would be experienced and lived by a putative world citizen. This exercise would provide an agenda for future cosmopolitan thinking. But—only if these lines of investigation

[1] I wish to record my gratitude to the reader of the first draft of this article for most helpful suggestions for improvements, which I have striven to incorporate.

[2] For the Greek foundations, see H. C. Baldry, *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965). An informative recent article focusing on the Roman period (though rather misleading on Alexander the Great's importance in the history of cosmopolitan thinking) is Lisa Hill, 'The Two *Republicae* of the Roman Stoics: Can a Cosmopolite be a Patriot?', *Citizenship Studies*, 4 (2000), pp. 47–63.

[3] Marcus Aurelius Antoninus (trans. C. R. Haines), *The Communings with Himself* (i.e. Meditations) (London:Heinemann and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press,1961), X, 6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are worthwhile at all. For there is a convinced and strong body of academic opinion that denies this, a point of view that we cannot ignore. Accordingly, at the risk of a little repetition between this section and the next, we need to sketch in the main hostile arguments and the ways in which they can be rebutted.

The debate already underway

As interest burgeoned in the cosmopolitan concept in the second half of the 1990s and exposition was buttressed by advocacy, so scholars inimical to the case engaged in vigorous debate with its supporters: the advocates of communitarianism versus the exponents of cosmopolitanism; those who hold to the view that only a bounded citizenship is proper citizenship versus those who believe that world citizenship is a valid variant.[4] Indeed, the very recency and intensity of these exchanges suggest that the debate is likely to continue.

To start, then, with a summary of some of the main points in the antis' academic armoury. At root, they assert, cosmopolitanism is unreal, floating on the air of vague utopianism. Global institutions do not exist for the exercise of a world citizenship; international law is precisely that—inter-national; and the individual is dependent upon his or her state as the fount of justice. Furthermore, the ideas of a world community and world citizenship do not impinge on the thoughts or imaginations of the vast bulk of humanity. Michael Walzer is characteristically trenchant in articulating this view: he asserts: 'I am not a citizen of the world …. I am not even aware that there is a world such that one could be a citizen of it. No one has offered me citizenship …'.[5] Danilo Zolo takes this absence of a sense of world community one stage further by arguing that democracy is impossible in a heterogeneous population, which the planet's population clearly is.[6] The corollary must therefore be that world citizenship is impossible since in this age only a democratic form of citizenship is conceivable. But, in any case, assert the communitarians, the very essence of citizenship presupposes an exclusive status in a compact community. 'The claim to citizenship,' Rob Walker declares, 'like the claims to individual autonomy and state sovereignty on which the modern concept of citizenship depends, makes no sense except as a way of responding to our celebration of particular patterns of inclusion and exclusion'.[7]

For opponents of world citizenship this is a clinching argument: cosmopolitans are guilty of an abuse of language by having the impertinence to deploy the word 'citizenship' in their discourse; in truth, even the values they seek to promote have little or no meaning outside a state context. Did not Hegel teach us that, 'All the

[4] Two notable sets of argument-on-paper are: Martha C. Nussbaum et al., *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1996); and Kimberly Hutchings and Roland Dannreuther (eds.), *Cosmopolitan Citizenship* (Basingstoke: Macmillan and New York: St Martin's, 1999).

[5] Quoted in Andrew Linklater, *The Transformation of Political Community* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), p. 225, n.5.

[6] Danilo Zolo, Cosmopolis: Prospects for World Government (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997).

[7] R. B. J. Walker, 'Citizenship after the Modern Subject', in Hutchings and Dannreuther, *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, p. 183. For a combative exposition of the communitarian interpretation of citizenship, see David Miller, 'Bounded Citizenship', in the same work.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

value man has, all spiritual reality, he has only through the state'?[8] Gertrude Himmelfarb picks up Martha Nussbaum's list of universal values, which the latter believes provide cosmopolitanism with its moral content and vindication: 'where can we find those substantive, universal, common values? And what are they, specifically, concretely, existentially?' Himmelfarb asks, and replies: 'To answer those questions is to enter the world of reality—which is the world of nations, peoples and polities'.[9]

Two models of identity/loyalty are often used to explain and criticize the notion of world citizenship. Expounding the simple bipolar model, communitarians argue that commitment to the state should be given the clearest priority over commitment to the world community, if any recognition is accorded at all to that latter nebulous idea; furthermore, that patriotism is, as a matter of fact, immeasurably the stronger emotional and moral force. The more complex model conceives a variety of commitments in concentric circles, extending round the individual in ever-increasing distances—family, locality, region, state, subcontinent (for EU members) and the world. According to the communitarian, the world, being most remote in experience and understanding, is bound to be by far and away the feeblest in its attraction of allegiance and rightly so, and definitely not worthy of the title, 'citizenship'.

The purpose of this article is to demonstrate the feasibility and utility of further cosmopolitan thinking, and, by identifying topics for this attention, we shall, at least implicitly, be countering the above arguments of repudiation. Even so, a succinct rejoinder to the components of the negative case will be helpful here.

That cosmopolitanism does not reflect reality is partly false and partly its very point. The proposition is partially false because belief in a Natural Law and its concomitant rights—natural, of man, human, in sequence of nomenclature—have a long tradition: belief in the existence of a morality and an identity above the principles shaped by states has been and still is widely held. And the proposition is partially true because the purpose of the cosmopolitan agenda is to change a reality which it perceives as currently under the strain of obsolescence. Cosmopolitanism is an idea, and it is not necessary to be a Marxist to appreciate his dictum that the point of philosophers is to change the world. If nationhood has a monopoly on citizenship and that monopoly is in practice being shown to be inadequate by such forces as European integration and globalization, then it is the communitarians' attempt to preserve state citizenship as the sole version of the status that is detached from reality. Some current authorities in the field of cosmopolitan thinking have indeed latched on to the word 'transformation' to indicate the depth of change occurring in the contemporary world and the need for an appropriate response.[10] One is reminded of de Tocqueville's designation of the undermining and destruction of the *ancien règime* as 'the great transformation'. Radical change requires radical thinking.

[8] G. W. F. Hegel, *Reason in History*, quoted in Adrian Oldfield, *Citizenship and Community* (London: Routledge, 1990), p. 82.

[9] Gertrude Himmelfarb, 'The Illusions of Cosmopolitanism', in Nussbaum, *For Love of Country*, pp. 74–5.

[10] For example, Linklater, *The Transformation of Political Community*; David Held and Anthony McGrew, David Goldblatt and Jonathan Perraton, *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999); David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2000).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Moreover, this process of transformation at the turn of the twentieth century is having a direct impact on the meaning of citizenship. The central argument proceeds along the following lines. If, because of globalization, states are decreasingly able to defend or promote their citizens' interests, then those citizens are in effect, at least to some degree, disenfranchized. There is a consequent need to re-enfranchize them at alternative levels, both sub- and supra-national.[11] Such an argument, of course, depends on a more flexible interpretation of the word 'citizenship' than communitarians can accept. But they are working to the Aristotelean/republican version of the concept. The Kantian/liberal version does allow for much less rigidity, and it is therefore not surprising that cosmopolitan thinkers place great reliance on the illustrious work of Kant. Thus, if the likes of Walzer do not believe that they are, or can be considered to be, world citizens, then the proponents of world citizenship aver: so much the worse for the world's legal and political systems, still inhibiting the status of world citizenship from developing beyond its embryonic form; and so much the worse for the constrained civic morality of those suffering such parochial attitudes.

No one, after all, is obliged to swallow Hegel's moral prescription. There is an alternative to hand for cosmopolites in the form of Habermas's discourse ethics. Summarized, he teaches that 'norms cannot be valid unless they can command the consent of everyone whose interests stand to be affected by them. … One of its central beliefs is that the validity of the principles on which it acts can only be determined through a dialogue which is in principle open to all human beings'.[12]

We come now to the crucial issue of multiple identity. It is easy enough to demolish the caricatures of both positions; because patriotism is not enough, and the destruction of nations by a world state does not bear contemplating. What is at issue is how far world citizenship could and should balance patriotic citizenship on the bipolar model; and whether progressive ethical weakening by distance on the concentric model could and should be reversed, in some measure even if not completely. It is the possibilities for restructuring the concentric model that has been given the more attention for the obvious reasons that such thinking is both more practicable and closer to the needs of cosmopolitanism than the bipolar model. This is a complex field in itself. To oversimplify: some commentatators draw lessons from the classical Stoic thoughts on the matter;[13] some argue that, since all humans are morally equal, any justification for treating those distant from us any differently from those close must be seriously questioned, not automatically accepted;[14] while others hold that balancing competing duties against others in the several circles should be decided on pragmatic grounds.[15] What cosmopolitan thinkers cannot abide, as being ethically disreputable, is the denial or disparagement of a moral responsibility at the outermost, global circle.

From this hasty presentation of the two sides in the cosmopolitan debate it is surely evident that there is sufficient strength in the communitarians' arguments to

[11] See, for example, Matthew Horsman and Andrew Marshall, *After the Nation-State: Citizens, Tribalism and the New World Disorder* (London: HarperCollins, 1994), pp. 216–33.
[12] Linklater, *Transformation of Political Community*, p. 91.
[13] For example, Hill, 'The Two *Republicae* of the Roman Stoics'.
[14] Charles R. Beitz, 'Cosmopolitan Liberalism and the States System', in Chris Brown (ed.), *Political Restructuring in Europe: Ethical Perspectives* (London: Routledge, 1994).
[15] Chris Brown, 'The Idea of World Community', in Held and McGrew, *Global Transformations Reader*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

warrant further, consolidating thinking by the cosmopolites, and that there is sufficient validity in the cosmopolites' arguments to justify that further intellectual investment. However, before suggesting the lines along which this thinking might profitably be pursued, it is worthwhile outlining an interpretive historical pattern that adds even greater force to the case for continued work.

The historical pattern

The reader is asked to consider the following thoughts derived from the contemplation of the broad historical pattern of the relationship between state citizenship, nationhood and world citizenship.

The truth that forms the foundation of some contemporary scholars' hostility to cosmopolitan citizenship is that citizenship is a status and form of political identity that connects the individual to the state, the 'state', for all intents and purposes, being synonymous with 'nation'. True this pattern may be, but it has not always been so in the past; it may not, perhaps, remain so in the future—whether that future proves to be some distant time or rather sooner.

Political thinking in fourth-century Athens could accommodate the concepts of citizenship as expounded by Aristotle, pan-Hellenic nationhood as expounded by Isocrates and world citizenship as expounded by Zeno, without linking state citizenship and nationhood or assuming the incompatibility of world citizenship with either. This Greek tolerance of three basic and simultaneous forms of political identity is also evident in Rome and in the classical revivals of the Renaissance and, especially, the Enlightenment.

The key factors in this peaceful coexistence of the three concepts were the relatively weak political contents of the cosmopolitan and national ideas. To illustrate briefly: the Stoic philosophy required its adherents to live a life of civic virtue and participation while yet keeping faith with the cosmopolitan ethic: the biographies of Seneca and Marcus Aurelius are models of this ideal. More significant, however, are the traditional notions of nationhood. A 'nation', even as late as the eighteenth century, was understood as a component of, not coterminous with, a state. In France, for instance, the inhabitants of the country were commonly referred to as 'a people of the French nation*s*'[16], while Montesquieu equated the French nation with the 'lords and bishops',[17] and was by no means alone in asserting an elitist meaning to the word 'nation', as distinct from *patrie*.

Nevertheless, all this was changing even as Montesquieu wrote. 'Nation' was being conflated with 'state'. This semantic shift was encapsulated in the 1789 Declaration of Rights, Article III of which proclaimed that 'the principle of all sovereignty rests essentially in the nation'. The state was the people was the nation. This conflation of state and nation in the new theory of popular national sovereignty gave birth to (or was given birth by?) nationalism, an ideology of such power that cosmopolitan thinking was all but expunged in the nineteenth century.

[16] See Guido Zernatto, 'Nation: The History of a Word', *The Review of Politics*, VI (1944), p. 362.
[17] Montesquieu, *L'Esprit des Lois,* XXVIII, p. 9.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This development is crucial for our present purpose. Since cosmopolitan thinking is now being taken seriously, and since, as many would accept, these scholarly investigations and practical proposals are prompted in part by the debilitation of the nation-state, then this historical sketch throws a new light on the current interest. In 1977 Hedley Bull offered us the insight of what he called 'the new medievalism'[18] to describe the increasing diversity of the loci of power, and this image has been recently revived as 'neo-medievalism'.[19] Let us now, however, introduce an alternative historical pattern or analogy, which we may call 'the new classicism'.

To recapitulate and develop, it looks something like this. In classical thinking about sociopolitical identities, from ancient Greece to Enlightenment Europe, citizenship, nationhood and world citizenship were held in mutually compatible, parallel spheres of life. What each portended changed over time: citizenship for Aristotle was not the same as Bodin's concept. What Herodotus meant by nationhood was different from Montesquieu's meaning. Marcus Aurelius had a tighter understanding of world citizenship than Thomas Paine. Yet, over this great span of time, whenever the three identities were thought about, room was found for all. Then, for two hundred years, from *c*. 1800 to *c*. 2000 the nation-state, girded up by the doctrine of nationalism, demanded a single political identity for its people: national-citizenship. Cosmopolitan citizenship, even as an idea, let alone a programme, had, as far as was possible, to be pushed out of human consciousness. This was an aberration—a mere two-century diversion from the more than two-millennia tradition of possible multiple identity. What is now happening, though without any awareness of the classical background, is a separation of citizenship from its fusion with nationhood (by intra- and supra-state trends) and the restoration of cosmopolitan thinking. We are entering a period of classical revival if we did but know it.

Even so, the interpretations, hopes and ambitions of contemporary cosmopolitan scholars and campaigners exceed the mental horizons of the Stoic, neostoic and *philosophe* cosmopolites. Nevertheless, the limitations of these earlier thinkers can be most effectively transcended only if it is possible to model a modern world citizenship on a modern state citizenship. An indication of what this requires must now therefore be attempted.

Components of citizenship

Identity

At the heart of being a citizen is identity. There is not much point in being a citizen, except in the very weakest sense of the term, unless you feel that you are a citizen. The French Revolutionaries understood this: they knew that they had to transform the subjects of Louis XVI into citizens of France, not merely by constitutional draftsmanship, but by nurturing a civic consciousness. True, one's identity as a

[18] Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (London: Macmillan, 1977), esp. pp. 264–76.
[19] See, for example, Linklater, *The Transformation of Political Community*, pp. 193–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

citizen has a dual meaning: one's legal status as shown on a passport, for instance, as well as one's feeling of belonging. It is this latter, psychological meaning that we are discussing here. And in that sense citizens have an identity by virtue of recognizing what they share with their fellow-citizens. In the words of W. J. M. Mackenzie, 'Those who share a place share an identity … whether "the place" is taken to be "space-ship earth"; or a beloved land …'[20] Can individuals have multiple political identities and can one of these identities be cosmopolitan? (For there is no intention, even among present-day world federalists, of cosmopolitanism subsuming state citizenship and nationhood just as nationalist citizenship submerged cosmopolitanism.)

Of course multiple civic identity is possible: it is a fact of life in all federal states and in the EU. What future cosmopolitan thinking must investigate is how a world citizenship identity can be strengthened and spread in order to counterbalance state citizenship and national identities. This is no easy task. The Stoic tradition is but marginally helpful, in part because it was essentially an elitist philosophy: the cosmopolis and its natural law was comprehensible only to those furnished with a sufficiently developed rational faculty. And the neostoics and the *philosophes* did little more than assert the common origins and homogeneity of mankind without confronting the severe problem of the very strongly held cultural, including religious, differences which overlay the fundamental sameness (a problem of which Samuel Huntington has recently reminded us).[21]

More helpful clues concerning ways of firming-up a cosmopolitan identity may be gleaned from the history of state citizenship. Civic loyalty has often been cemented by means of an uplifting mythology, a patriotic history and the bonding enthusiasm aroused by symbols and ceremonies. Even so, transferring, say, the recommendations of Rousseau or the practices of the French Revolution to a global arena presents difficulties. There are no widely known universal myths or heroes, there are no heart-racing universal ceremonies, and there is no well-used history of the world interpreted as an entity. Or, rather, attempts by anthropologists, historians, UN and UNESCO to provide these supports for an imaginative cosmopolitan identity have enjoyed little success. Even at the subcontinental level of the European Community/Union the symbols recommended by the Adonnino Committee in 1985—postage-stamps, flag and anthem—have had feeble effects. Schools, too, have sometimes been expected to perform a role; but this aspect of the means of consolidating a cosmopolitan identity will be more conveniently dealt with, alongside the element of competence, in a separate subsection on education below.

The root contrast between a consciousness of state citizenship and of world citizenship is, of course, that state citizenship has always been a status marking off the citizen from the non-citizen. Originally this was a distinction internal to the polity as well as a means of distinguishing between citizens of different polities. The inter-state type of distinction has been hardened as a means of self-identity by the impact of nationalism: I am a citizen, you are an alien. But, short of the discovery of aliens in the extra-terrestrial sense, putative world citizens will have no other group in contrast with whom they can consolidate their global identity. That, however, is a cosmological, not a cosmopolitan question.

[20] W. J. M. Mackenzie, *Political Identity* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1978), p. 130.
[21] Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1996).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Marcus Aurelius was conscious of being 'a part of the whole Universe controlled by Nature';[22] the neostoic Justus Lipsius knew that all men are 'sprung first out of the same stock';[23] and Paine wished to broadcast the truth that 'mankind of whatever nation or profession they may be … [are] the work of one Creator'.[24] The challenge to today's cosmopolitan thinkers is to give much fuller content to these expressions of cosmopolitan identity and translate them into terms relevant to the present and future world's peoples, who are of diverse religions, or none, and who, for the most part, are limited in their mental horizons to their local and national cultures, sanctified by long generations of loyalty. Moreover, in this process of translation humankind must be brought to understand and care that they are all (in Mackenzie's 1970s parlance) citizens of 'space-ship earth'. If this expression of identities is achievable, it will accelerate the growth of a practicable world citizenship, not least in its ethical dimension.

Morality/responsibilities

Civic identity is a moral identity. Through membership of and by relating to a social group, the individual acquires a moral commitment to that group. The citizen owes loyalty to the state, has an obligation to abide by the laws of the state, has the responsibility of treating fellow-citizens with respect, has the duty to participate in and support the state in its civilian and military needs. This, at any rate, is the prescription of the civic republican style of citizenship. We must then build in the liberal stress on rights, that is, the moral obligation of the state to honour the entitlements of the individual *qua* citizen and the obligation of the citizen to recognize that fellow-citizens have equal rights. We thus arrive at an ethical structure of duties and rights relating citizen to state and citizen to citizen (the so-called 'vertical' and 'horizontal' civic relationships in the current argot).

The act of transferring this moral content of citizenship to the global plane raises two major questions that have, implicitly or explicitly, underlain cosmopolitan thinking throughout its history, and still require further work. One is to define the moral component of world citizenship in the forms of ideals, responsibilities and rights. The matter of rights will be discussed in the subsection below devoted to that aspect of citizenship. The thrust of thinking about ideals and responsibilities will be treated here. The second question has caused a great deal more debate and controversy: this is whether there is any real possibility of individuals adhering at one and the same time to two moral codes: that required of them *qua* state citizens, and that required of them *qua* world citizens.

First, then, what can be identified as cosmopolitan ideals? That a cosmopolitan morality should be seen to have a set of ideals as a kind of collectively-agreed lowest common denominator has been propounded by Janna Thompson, who has written that 'cosmopolitanism is founded on moral ideals. It depends on the notion that

[22] Marcus Aurelius, *The Communings*, X, 6.
[23] Justus Lipsius (ed. R. Kirk; trans. J. Stradling), *Two Bookes of Constancie* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1939), I, ix.
[24] Quoted T. J. Schlereth, *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought* (Notre Dame, IN and London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977), p. 106.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

there are values which everyone in the world ought to accept, whatever their personal interests or community loyalties.' She goes on to list four such ideals, namely, peace and security, self-determination of communities, freedom of individuals and individual well-being.[25] It is permissible, however, to wonder (as additions to a future agenda) whether these ideals are truly acceptable in all cultures, and how they would help to define the individual's sense of moral identity and behaviour as a citizen of the world.

The matter of identifying universal responsibilities has become an interesting political issue at the end of the twentieth century. From 1948 to 1976 there emerged from the UN the Universal Declaration, two International Covenants and an Optional Protocol expounding and committing states to honour fundamental human rights. All very well, but are not human beings, or should they not be, also the bearers of universal responsibilities? If the liberal tradition of citizenship rights has a corresponding notion of universal human rights, surely the civic republican tradition of citizenship duties and responsibilities should also be reflected at the global level. In 1987 the InterAction Council, a group of highly distinguished ex-heads of state and government started meetings in order to draft a set of human ethical standards in the form of a Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities complementary to the Universal Declaration of Rights; it appeared in due course in 1997. The document deserves far greater publicity and discussion than it has in fact received.

We come now to the second question, that is, whether an individual, even if accepting dual identities—state and cosmopolitan—can comfortably accommodate two sets of moral demands deriving from these separate sources. Aristotle famously showed that, 'it is possible to be a good citizen without possessing the excellence which is the quality of the good man'.[26] Since, however, by his own argument, man can achieve his full potential only through the civic life of the *polis*, one feels that this is the goodness to which Aristotle gives priority. Kant, in contrast, prefers the goodness of man to the goodness of the citizen. 'Kant's political theory,' says Kimberly Hutchings, 'is always cosmopolitan in the sense that it is guided by principles which are derived from the universal law'. Yet the dichotomy is still there, as she explains: 'this universalist orientation is necessarily in tension with the actual nature of political and legal order'.[27] Reason, argues Kant, urges us towards the universal moral law; nature urges us towards the political positive law. However, the contribution of Kant to cosmopolitan moral thinking has attracted considerable attention in recent years and perhaps needs little further work.[28]

Let us, therefore, now focus on three issues which throw into sharp relief the ways individuals may be morally torn between their roles as state and world citizens.

[25] Janna Thompson, 'Community Identity and World Citizenship', in Daniele Archibugi, David Held and Martin Kohler (eds.), *Re-imagining Political Community: Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), p. 191.

[26] Aristotle (trans. and ed. E. Barker), *The Politics of Aristotle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948), 1276b; see generally, vol. III, p. iv.

[27] Kimberly Hutchings, 'Political Theory and Cosmopolitan Citizenship', in Hutchings and Dannreuther, *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, pp. 14–15.

[28] See, for example, Daniele Archibugi, 'Immanuel Kant, Cosmopolitan Law and Peace', *European Journal of International Relations*, 1 (1995), pp. 429–56; Kimberly Hutchings, *Kant, Critique and Politics* (London: Routledge, 1996); Andrew Linklater, *Men and Citizens in The Theory of International Relations*, 2nd edn. (London: Macmillan, 1990).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

These ways are: the demand of patriotic loyalty to one's state as a priority before any cosmopolitan moral law; the specific and ultimate temptation to commit crimes against humanity in pursuit of state policy; and the tug of conscience to protect the planet's environment irrespective of the economic policy or interests of one's state.

It is an irony of this field of study that the civic republican style of citizenship, which can be called upon as a model from state-citizenship theory to bolster cosmopolitan responsibility, is in fact used in its modern form of communitarianism to counter the case for world citizenship. The republican-communitarian ideal of civic harmony and commitment depends on the compactness of the community—whether city-state, township or nation-state. A world citizenry of six billion spread over the whole globe is a far cry from Aristotle's view that a *polis* of 'a hundred thousand would exceed its natural proportions' necessary for concord among its citizens.[29] Even so, an attempt might be made to coalesce cosmopolitanism and communitarianism by overt policies to strengthen the understanding and perceived importance of supranational responsibilities. Bellamy and Castiglioni have suggested an approach related to their interest in citizenship of the EU, and boldly call it 'cosmopolitan communitarianism'.[30] They provide an argument that might fruitfully be extended, though admittedly with much greater difficulty, to the global scale. Indeed, a cardinal problem underlying the common use of the EU as a model for moulding a global identity and institutions is the vastly more variegated experiences, traditions, cultures and economies of the world's component states.

That individuals' actions are not circumscribed by the laws and policies of their own states was asserted with unambiguous clarity by the Nuremberg Charter and the Tribunal's judgment. 'The very essence of the Charter', declared the judgment, 'is that individuals have international duties which transcend the national obligations of obedience imposed by the individual State'.[31] We are trespassing now onto the topic of universal rights, the subject of our next subsection; for the duty of an individual to disobey an order to commit a 'crime against humanity' by obeying a higher, moral law is the mirror image of the right of human beings not to suffer such crimes. However, the point to be made here is that the Nuremberg principles are still being widely flouted, so that the question arises: is it possible to sensitize more human consciences to accept that their cosmopolitan duty must override their national duty in circumstances of hideous violence?

Just as the issue of crimes against humanity is usually viewed from the perspective of rights, so the issue of environmental degradation in the context of citizenship is also usually viewed from the perspective of rights—sometimes referred to as 'third generation' rights (after civil/political and social/economic). At their simplest, these rights are intended to protect the individual against the dangers of passive smoking, for example. However, the concept also has temporal and spatial extensions: the right of future generations to inherit as far as possible an environment no less

[29] Aristotle (trans. J. A. K. Thomson), *The Ethics of Aristotle* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1955), IX, 10.
[30] Richard Bellamy and Dario Castiglione, 'Between Cosmopolis and Community: Three Models of Rights and Democracy within the European Union', in Archibugi, Held and Kohler, *Re-imagining Political Community*, esp. pp. 162–7.
[31] Quoted in Ian Brownlie, *Principles of Public International Law*, 4th edn. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 562. See also Geoffrey Robertson, *Crimes Against Humanity: The Struggle for Global Justice* (London: Allen Lane, 1999).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

degraded than that enjoyed by their forebears, and the stretching of many serious problems, such as pollution, well beyond the confines of the state or its capacity to counteract the damage. These two forms of extension of the principle of environmental rights, of course, overlap. Moreover, the problem is without question a crucial and live element in any definition of world citizens' responsibilities and the balancing of their loyalty to their state and their obligations to the planet.

The urgent need for strengthening institutional control and public accountability in this vital global problem area is well voiced in this brief passage:

> No mechanism exists for forcing recalcitrant states into line. But even if this did exist, the democratic status of these processes and outcomes is debatable.
>
> Policy discussion and negotiations are invariably technical and decision-making largely unaccountable. … Yet … there is no issue on which the retention of state autonomy, or even state sovereignty, is so potentially counterproductive and the absence of public accountability so regrettable.[32]

Here, then, is a world-wide problem that cries out for a sense of cosmopolitan responsibility, a consciousness of a world citizenship transcending, indeed at odds with, state citizenship. Active members of such bodies as Greenpeace often find themselves operating against states not their own (for example, Japanese whaling) or multinational companies (for example, Shell). In such instances there is no clash between perceived cosmopolitan responsibility and loyalty to the citizen's own state. This question of choice arises when such individuals campaign on grounds of global ethical consideration and conscience against policies internal to their own state (for example, the nuclear industry). Facing up to choosing between conflicting moral obligations in situations of this kind is assuredly an issue of cosmopolitan thinking that will persist into the future.

Rights

T. H. Marshall firmly embedded into future understanding of citizenship his analysis of the status as consisting of three 'bundles' of rights—civil, political and social.[33] With the addition of 'economic' to 'social', this division will be used in this subsection.

Before examining the cosmopolitan equivalents of these three forms of citizens' rights, however, some preliminary observations are required, observations needed because of the distinction, most notably enshrined in the 1789 French Declaration, between the rights of man and the rights of the citizen. The assumption of the framers of this document was that certain rights (for example, to a say in taxation [Art.XIV]) attach to the individual *qua* citizen, while others (such as freedom of religion [Art.X]) attach to the individual *qua* human being. Marx defined the distinction by characterizing the rights of man as the rights of 'egoistic man, man separated from other men and the community'.[34] Since 1789 it has become common-

[32] Held and McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton, *Global Transformations*, pp. 411–12.
[33] T. H. Marshall, *Citizenship and Social Class and other Essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950).
[34] Karl Marx, 'On the Jewish Question', in David McLellan (ed.), *Karl Marx: Selected Writings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), p. 52.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

place to accept that citizens have rights *vis-à-vis* their state, and since 1948 we have also had the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The distinction appears to persist. Human Rights are pre-political, natural and imprescriptible, cannot be justifiably assaulted by the state; citizens' rights are those positively afforded by the state. Thus it can be suggested that Bills of Rights in state constitutions delineate state citizens' rights, while the International Bill of Rights (the collective term for the four UN documents already referred to) delineate human or world citizens' rights.

But the validity of this neat presentation has been questioned, and will doubtless continue to be an issue of some interest. Four positions need to be taken into consideration, related to the belief that the three basic forms of citizenship rights do or can exist at the global level and be bound together into a holistic theory of human rights as cosmopolitan rights.

The first position is that of Marx, namely, that human rights are those enjoyed by 'egoistic man'. He could not conceive of a man enjoying human rights as a conscious member of a universal community overarching both class and state in a capitalist world. Are we justified in entertaining such a conception? After all, and secondly, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights does not expect individuals to experience these rights except through the agency of the state. For, although, in the words of the Preamble, 'the peoples of the United Nations have … reaffirmed their faith in human rights', it is 'Member States [who] have pledged themselves to achieve … the promotion of [their] universal respect and observance'. So, human rights are dependent upon citizens' rights. But, thirdly, do citizens' rights not, contrariwise, in fact flow from human rights? Alan Gewirth has argued that human rights are necessary for human action. Consequently, the primary justification of governments is that they serve to secure these rights.… The civil, political and social rights associated with citizenship will ultimately be derived from these human rights.[35] Any sharp distinction between citizenship rights and human rights is therefore spurious.

The fourth position is based upon observation of practice. It is that a combination of the phenomenon of migrant workers and states' obligations to honour human rights has blurred the traditional exclusivity of citizens' rights. The British authority on Comparative Jurisprudence, J. P. Gardner, has stated:

> The terms 'citizenship' and 'human rights' both describe aspects of the legal relationship between individuals and the state. There is an overlap between these two concepts which is complicated by the inclusion of catalogues of fundamental rights in the constitutions of many states. This seems to link human rights, fundamental rights and citizenship.[36]

Moreover, because an appeal can be made by alien residents and citizens alike for protection and welfare in accordance with the human rights code, he has felt the need to coin the term 'new citizenship' to distinguish this condition from the exclusive 'nationality citizenship'.[37]

Could this 'new citizenship' be thought of as a quasi-world citizenship? If this is not stretching the term too far, it must none the less be acknowledged that the rights

[35] Quoted in Geraint Parry, 'Conclusion: Paths to Citizenship', in U. Vogel and M. Moran (eds.), *The Frontiers of Citizenship* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991), pp. 173–4.

[36] J. P. Gardner (ed.), *Hallmarks of Citizenship: A Green Paper* (London: British Institute of International and Comparative Law, n.d.), p. 189.

[37] J. P. Gardner, 'What Lawyers mean by Citizenship', in *Commission on Citizenship, Encouraging Citizenship* (London: HMSO, 1990), esp. p. 66.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

enjoyed in this manner are of the civil, social and economic kind, not the political. They include, for example, the right not to be tortured or suffer from discrimination, to have a reasonable standard of living and to own property. Increasingly, the world community is recognizing that intervention in states is necessary to uphold some of these rights by expeditions into parts of the former Yugoslavia, the creation of the Hague and Arusha Tribunals and the proposed International Criminal Court on the one hand, and aid in response to natural disasters including famine on the other. When national citizenship fails to protect people's civil, social and economic rights, their only resort is to hope for better conditions in their alternative capacity as world citizens. But does this linkage between human rights, fundamental rights and citizenship need to be clarified? How can the world citizenship rights—if that is what they are—be more effectively protected?

However one addresses these questions, two basic factors are paramount. One is that abuse of civil rights can be legally defined, and protective and retributive measures can, in principle, be put in train; whereas social and economic rights are relative and qualitative guides, dependent on the availability of resources and the will to distributive justice, legally virtually unenforceable. The second basic factor is the need for better institutional frameworks for the protection of rights, leading on to the issue of universal political rights.

Political rights are the very foundation of citizenship. Even if contemporary state citizenship, let alone world citizenship, cannot precisely live up to Aristotle's formula of 'ruling and being ruled in turn',[38] some form of political involvement is the quintessence of citizenship. At the state level, indeed, Article 21.1 of the Universal Declaration asserts that 'Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives'. This political right is the guarantee, insofar as it can be given, of the state upholding the other citizenship rights. And yet, it is precisely this political right that is lacking at the global level.

Much of the cosmopolitan thinking during the first half of the twentieth century, epitomized by some of the fictional work of H. G. Wells, concentrated on plans for a world state. That is no longer, if it ever seriously was, considered to be either feasible or desirable. Opportunities for individuals to act as political world citizens must therefore be sought in more diffused and flexible forms of popular global participation. Hence the importance of the concept of cosmopolitan democracy as worked out by David Held and those of like mind. (Because this is the subject of the separate contribution by Peter Jones to this collection, it requires no elaboration here.) Yet three questions arise: Would governments be willing to facilitate this development? Would individuals be sufficiently motivated to press governments to act? And, even if the institutional structures were to be put in place, would individuals have the necessary competence to operate the systems?

The first and second of these questions prompted the launch in 1999 of Charter 99—A Charter for Global Democracy. Addressing prospective world citizens, the Charter makes the appeal:

> We call upon you, therefore, to start the new century by initiating the process of democratic global governance.…The first aim is to make already existing processes of world administration and governance accountable.… Finally, if most ambitiously, we want global

[38] Aristotle, *Politics*, 1283b.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

governance to be compatible with the principles of equality, human rights and justice, including social and economic justice.[39]

At the time of writing the Charter had garnered signatories from 119 countries.

After the Second World War a World Citizens' Registry was created and very quickly boasted over three-quarters of a million signatures. Governments ignored it. Can this new initiative, by presentations to parliamentarians, governments and the UN, exert any greater leverage in order to make some headway towards the realization of even a minimal political world citizenship? And even if progress is made, how many 'world citizens' given this opportunity would be capable of acting the role? Assuredly schools must have a function; they should be able to provide signal help in the complementary processes of learning that one is, in fact or potentiality, a world citizen and developing the skills that are necessary to live a global civic life.

Education

The advocacy and practice of education for citizenship has a fascinating history. It reveals so much about what has been thought to be the proper behaviour—in both attitudes and competence—of the citizen of any given state. What Aristotle advocated in mid-fourth-century BC Greece was very different from what the Board of Education advocated in early twentieth-century England, and the practices of the United States of America have been different from those of Nazi Germany. So much is obvious. But if some states have been eager to shape their embryonic citizens to their social and political purposes, doubts can easily be raised as to whether those same states would happily accept, as they might very well interpret it, the diversion of their younger generation's attention from loyalty to the state for the sake of their mental moulding as citizens of the world.

It has to be said, on the other hand, that the history of education for citizenship in modern democratic polities has been undertaken in a halting and inefficient manner. Recognition of both the unsatisfactory nature of this teaching and its crucial importance for the political health of a democratic state has produced a sudden blossoming of interest in many countries in the closing years of the twentieth century.[40] The question accordingly arises whether this efflorescence of concern to improve citizenship education is likely to cause the decay of any work which schools might be undertaking in World Studies: education for world citizenship could be seen not only as a competitor for space in the curriculum, but also possibly subversive of the state's political purpose in promoting civic education at all.

[39] The text of Charter 99 may be obtained from the One World Trust, c/o 18 Northumberland Avenue, London WC2N 5BJ.

[40] See Carole L. Hahn, *Becoming Political: Comparative Perspectives in Citizenship Education* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998); Orit Ichilov (ed.), *Citizenship and Citizenship Education in a Changing World* (London and Portland, OR: Woburn Press,1998); Judith Torney-Purta, John Schwille and Jo-Ann Amadeo (eds.), *Civic Education Across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project* (Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, 1999).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In any case, education for world citizenship has an even less sure place in schools than education for state citizenship. What tradition there is (to strain the botanical metaphor) has only shallow roots. Little thought was given before the twentieth century about what contributions schools might make.[41]

The terms 'Education in' or 'for World Citizenship' seem to have come into fashion in England in the two decades *c*. 1925–45. The distinguished international historian C. K. Webster published *The Teaching of World Citizenship* in 1926 on behalf of the Education Committee of the League of Nations Union (LNU), which was cultivating this kind of work in schools. When the LNU link became embarrassing for schools because of the controversial stance of the League in the late 1930s, this educational activity was continued by the inauguration of a new semi-autonomous body. This was named the Council for Education in World Citizenship (CEWC), which is still functioning. CEWC played a useful role in the creation of UNESCO, but this organization, rather than using 'World Citizenship', preferred the term 'Education for International Understanding', later expanded to the extraordinarily cumbersome 'Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms'. By the 1970s and 1980s educationists were talking in terms of 'World Studies' or, particularly in the USA, 'Global Studies'. Meanwhile, distinct units of work were devised in schools: Development Studies, Multicultural Studies, Peace Studies, Environmental Education, Human Rights Education (HRE).

This proliferation of labels and diversification of curriculum content are especially pertinent to our enquiry. Many educationists have been convinced that young people should have their horizons broadened beyond the traditional insular, national, even nationalistic teaching of some civic subjects, notably History. They were not so sure, however, how to focus their teaching; and, at the same time, were nervous about hostile interpretations of their intentions. Together with the problem of time-tabling already alluded to ('the law of the conservation of the curriculum' in Eric James's vivid phrase), an understanding of these past difficulties will help us to assess the chance of this kind of school learning prospering in the future.

Soon after the establishment of CEWC two of its leading lights expressed their unhappiness about the term 'world citizenship'. Gilbert Murray, the distinguished classicist and keen supporter of the League, wrote, 'It seems to profess too much',[42] and Nowell Smith, headmaster of Sherborne, thought 'education for world citizenship [to be] unattractive and even to most people at first sight or hearing repellent'![43] These comments reflected both the uncertainty concerning the educational objectives of 'education for world citizenship' and the political suspicion it is capable of arousing. If the term means favourably presenting in the classroom the case for some kind of world polity, then this could be construed as unacceptable indoctrination. If it means teaching a hotch-potch of Peace Studies, HRE, and so

[41] See, for example, D. G. Scanlon (ed.), *International Education: A Documentary History* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1960).

[42] Quoted in Derek Heater, *Peace Through Education: The Contribution of the Council for Education in World Citizenship* (Lewes: Falmer Press, 1984), p. 47.

[43] Quoted in Derek Heater, 'Political Education for Global Citizenship', in James Lynch, Celia Modgil and Sohan Modgil (eds.), *Cultural Diversity and the Schools, vol. 4: Human Rights, Education and Global Responsibilities* (London and Washington, DC: Falmer Press, 1992), p. 192.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on, then it could be pedagogically incoherent. And if it means giving global perspectives to traditional subjects, most obviously History, Geography and Religious Education, though more acceptable and manageable, problems still arise in the forms of the absence of a unifying 'world citizenship' framework and the difficulty of reaching agreement to discard established subject-matter in order to provide room in the syllabuses for the new. What is more, replacing 'national' History or Geography with 'world' material can, indeed has been, the cause of some controversy.

In the 1980s the clash between the opponents and supporters of World Studies in Britain became exceedingly acrimonious. Professor Roger Scruton of Birkbeck College attacked:

> World Studies masquerades as a 'discipline' whose aim is to produce an open mind towards the differing cultures and varying conditions of humanity. In reality, however … It is designed to close the child's mind to everything but the narrow passions of the radical.… The World Studies movement … seeks … to replace serious knowledge and formal scholarship with political posturing and infantile, manipulative games.[44]

A counter-attack was launched from the University of York:

> He conveys a veneer of academic respectability whilst, in fact, reaching conclusions based on selective use of a narrow range of evidence … and no school or classroom observation.[45]

One of the authors of this counter-assault, Dr Selby, is currently the Director of a flourishing centre of curriculum research and development at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE). Nevertheless, despite the vitality of the Canadian-based work, the overall impression, as already suggested, is that education for state citizenship is overshadowing education for world citizenship. In England, citizenship education will become mandatory in state secondary schools (Key Stages 3 and 4) in 2002. The Order specifies that pupils should be taught about 'the world as a global community, and the political, economic, environmental and social implications of this' (Key Stage 3) and 'the wider issues and challenges of global interdependence and responsibility, including sustainable development' (Key Stage 4). And learning about human rights features in the lists for both stages.[46]

Even so, the bulk of the listed subject-content for citizenship education in the English National Curriculum relates to citizenship at the local and national levels—as one would expect, though to the disappointment of the proponents of World Studies. The Order is not, however, prescriptive in detail. Schools will need to devise their own appropriate ways of fulfilling these requirements. There is consequently no reason to believe that further thought is either unnecessary or unlikely in the field of education for world citizenship—in England, certainly, at the secondary level immediately and at the primary level with rather less urgency. The hope must be entertained that the confusion and quarrels of the past will not be repeated.

[44] Roger Scruton, *World Studies: Education or Indoctrination?* (London: Institute for European Defence and Strategic Studies, 1985), pp. 30, 39.
[45] Graham Pike and David Selby, 'Scrutinising Scruton: An Analysis of Roger Scruton's Attack on World Studies', *Westminster Studies in Education*, 9, p. 5.
[46] Department for Education and Employment, *Citizenship: The National Curriculum for England*, KS3–4 (London: HMSO), pp. 14, 15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

A likely future?

Scholars engaging in future cosmopolitan thinking, by pursuing the mutual compatibility of nationhood, state citizenship and cosmopolitan citizenship of 'the new classicism' model, can be assured that they are not trying to achieve the untried and impossible. And by investigating the feasibility of developing a world citizenship whose components reflect the structure of state citizenship, future cosmopolitan thought has a possible agenda. These are the core suggestions of this essay. It remains to ask whether cosmopolitan thinking along these lines, or any other, is likely to be continued in the twenty-first century. Tennyson, as we are so frequently reminded, 'dipt into the future' and saw 'the Parliament of Man, the Federation of the World'.[47] Thankfully, the task here is not to predict institutional developments, but to extrapolate current thinking.

The recent literature published in English indicates not only a great welling-up of interest, but also, in many cases, the engagement of scholars of the first rank in work on the cosmopolitan theme.[48] From *c*. 1914 to *c*. 1970 there was, in truth, a great outpouring of writing on world government and on world citizenship. But for the most part, work in the first category tended to be impractical plans for a federation of the world and, in the second category, assertions of faith rather than scholarly analysis. One has only to compare—to be illustrative and invidious—Streit's relatively practical *Union Now*[49] and Cohen's rare philosophical *The Principles of World Citizenship*[50] (for all their positive qualities at the time) with Held's *Democracy and the Global Order*[51] and Hutchings and Dannreuther's symposium[52] to recognize the progress to greater depth of thought that has been achieved in recent years. Without too much danger of exaggeration, we may judge that the best current cosmopolitan thinking is of a higher calibre than at any time in the past.

Damning with faint praise this might seem to be, in the light of the limitations of past thought (*pace* Kant), and inconsiderate of works by a few scholars (again to be invidious) of the likes of Clark and Sohn[53] and Falk[54] in the recent past. What, however, appears to have been happening in the 1990s is the taking up of some older ideas, the development of new ideas, and the involvement of a growing band of writers in work which reveals a realism of commitment and an intensity of original scholarship at least comparable with work in any other branch of the Social Sciences.

This academic work has also seen penetrating publications emanating from meetings of politicians and people with public-service backgrounds, most signi-

[47] Alfred Tennyson, *Locksley Hall*.
[48] The bibliography in Hutchings and Dannreuther, *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, provides a useful list.
[49] Clarence K. Streit, *Union Now: A Proposal for a Federal Union of the Democracies of the North Atlantic* (London: Cape, 1939).
[50] L. Jonathan Cohen, *The Principles of World Citizenship* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1954).
[51] David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995).
[52] See fn. 4 above.
[53] Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn, *World Peace Through World Law* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1958).
[54] A prolific writer; see, for example, *A Study of Future Worlds* (New York: Free Press, 1975); *On Humane Governance: Toward a New Global Politics* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ficantly the Report of the Commission on Global Governance.[55] For example, James Rosenau wrote a paper on 'Changing Capacities of Citizens' for that Commission. Furthermore, the Report accords due weight to ethical considerations, devoting one of its seven chapters to 'Values for the Global Neighbourhood'. At the head of the chapter summarizing the Commission's proposals stands this sentence: 'A global civic ethic to guide action within the global neighbourhood, and leadership infused with that ethic, is vital to the quality of global governance.'[56] The whole book is written on the assumption that further work would be undertaken to assist the process of implementing the recommendations.

But can the momentum of thinking and publishing—of various kinds, by various hands, from both purely intellectual and practical motives—be sustained for any length of time? Several conditions might well be necessary for the continuation of this work. And underlying these conditions is the fact that circumstances in the world outside the scholar's study affect even those whose studies are sited in ivory towers.

This, specifically, is a significant condition for the continuation of cosmopolitan thinking. It is surely unlikely that the burgeoning of this work in the 1990s would have occurred at all had it not been for the coincidence of a number of world developments. These were: the phenomenon of globalization; the belief that the 'billiard-ball' sovereignty of the nation-state was being enfeebled by sub- and trans-national forces; the progressive integration of the EU as a prototype of supra-national citizenship; and the spread of liberal democracy with the collapse of autocratic civilian and military regimes in the former Soviet bloc, Latin America and some states of Africa. If these developments are consolidated, the relevance of cosmopolitan thinking will persist.

Whether these developments will continue to be conducive to cosmopolitan thinking is perhaps more nicely balanced than some authorities tend to suggest. Globalization in the form of the spreading availability of rapid electronic communication may continue to enhance the sense that there does exist a global community. Yet globalization in the form of the growing power of multinational companies may exacerbate the global rich-poor divide and enable them to downplay any responsibility for being accountable to a world citizenry.

Globalization is also weakening the state-citizen tie, as are the processes of federalization, devolution and intensification of feelings of regional nationhood. The loosening of that tie increases the acceptability of a cosmopolitan bond. On the other hand, the processes of decolonization and Yugoslav and Soviet disintegration have multiplied the number of states which still cling to the Westphalian states-system. That system, however, is under strain, most noticeably in Europe, where the EU has a magnetic attraction for applicant and would-be applicant states. The Maastricht Treaty created the status of citizen of the Union, a title which will apply to many millions more as the candidate-states become members, and would be firmed up if talk of an EU constitution becomes a reality. Yet the prospects of strengthening 'Euro-citizenship' is not without its opponents, most evidently in England; and, in any case, the translation of the European formula to a global dimension has only too obvious difficulties.

[55] Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighbourhood* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995).
[56] *Our Global Neighbourhood*, p. 335.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press

But, at least the geographical expansion of state-democracy provides a more hopeful platform for the construction of democratic global governance than ever before. After all, such a hope has the most distinguished lineage from Kant's vision of a league of 'republican' states. On the other hand, is democracy in the Western, liberal sense really in such a healthy condition? Vast numbers in Asia and Africa do not enjoy effective democratic conditions; and in countries such as Russia disillusionment is widespread.

If the braking power of the resistant forces succeed in decelerating the developments which provided the mood for positive cosmopolitan thinking in the 1990s, scholars and public figures who have contributed to this thinking could conceivably become dispirited. Furthermore, will-power of a persistent kind may well be called for in confronting academic opposition from those who either deplore, or at least discount the power of, the forces of cosmopolitanism. However, political thinking surely thrives on debate, even contention. And cosmopolitan thinking would show itself to be a more sickly strain of study than its recent robust nature suggests if it waned before the shadow of those political conditions and academic pursuits that remain untransformed.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001790 Published online by Cambridge University Press