1. Prelude
This first chapter will be unlike most chapters you have read in other texts. First, my words will anger you and challenge you to question some basic assumptions about your—and our—life. Secondly, I will not talk to you but with you. I will invite you to consider, to question, to observe, to research, to examine and to reassess. I invite you to wrestle with ideas and to join me in conversation about those ideas. I will even save you a few steps in contacting me by giving you my email address so that we can, indeed, share thoughts together. I will respond. I will not, however, give you answers or the “Truth.” That is for you to create for yourself. You can contact me at tarcaro@gmail.com.

As a restatement of the above, I offer you the words of the Spanish philosopher and theologian, Miguel de Unamuno. He says everything I have to say more poetically and powerfully in any case. This statement was in response to those who came to him looking for answers:

"My intent has been, is, and will continue to be, that those who read my works shall think and meditate upon fundamental problems, and has never been to hand them completed thoughts. I have always sought to agitate and, even better, to stimulate, rather than to instruct. Neither do I sell bread, nor is it bread, but yeast or ferment." (Perplexities and paradoxes New York: Greenwood Press, 1968, p.8.)

2. Reflexive Statement: some beginning thoughts on being and becoming a global

I am happy for the opportunity to write this chapter in part because it has caused me to reflect upon—and hence rewrite—my personal definition of “global citizen.” I want to share this with you as a way of starting our conversation about our place in this world.

Global citizens understand at a fundamental level that all humans are born with basic rights, share one planet and thus one fate and, further, embrace an ideology of human growth and potential based upon the assumption that all global citizens should work toward creating a global social structure wherein all humans are not only allowed to reach their full potentials—intellectual, physical and spiritual—but are actively encouraged to do so. But, that this fulfilling of human potential is done in such a way as to honor the fact
that humans are only one species among many, and that we must live in sustainable harmony with all life forms on the planet. Further, global citizens understand that just as they have certain rights as global citizens, this role entails an array of important responsibilities.

Having said that, although all of us are global citizens by virtue of living together on this planet, not all global citizens are equally positioned in their lives to either understand or to act on their responsibilities as world citizens. What I am about to point out may appear elitist, but nonetheless I feel it is valid. I can assume with some confidence that you are reading this chapter because it was assigned as part of a college level class somewhere in the English speaking world, most likely the United States. You are literate, [refer to the global village stats that show percentages of people] and, relative to others your age around the world, healthier, wealthier and, in a word, more privileged. You most likely know where and when your next meal will come, and you don’t fear your home will be attacked in the next 24 hours or the rape, torture, mutilation or death that would come from that raid. I do understand that relative to others your age in your country you may not feel exceptional, the fact remains clear that you are in the upper one tenth of one percent in terms of material wealth among the 6,6 [editor’s note: trying to go with the European method here] billion people on this planet we share. As a member of this class of people, your carbon footprint is by a significant factor larger than most others around the world: you consume more resources and create more pollution than 99% of those on Earth. For example, one 20 year old in the United States is “equal to” 40 villagers in rural India in terms of their impact on the planet’s ecosystem. Among the reasons to stress this point is to present the aphorism that most of you have heard from your parents, your pastor, or from some other authority figure in your life who acts as a moral guide, namely, “with great privilege comes great responsibility.”

So, yes, though all of us are global citizens, we who have greater resources in terms of time, energy and raw wealth, have more responsibility to do something with our position, to partner with others and continue the struggle to create a more just world. Think about this in terms of Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of needs (see Maslow’s Motivation and Personality, published in 1954, for the original source) that you learned about in psychology class: those who are struggling for basic needs on a daily basis have neither the time nor energy to work aggressively as global citizens. But those of us who have our basic needs taken care of and are much higher on pyramid can and perhaps should embrace our role as global citizen more aggressively.

After I wrote the above, I rescanned the web site for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the largest private foundation in the world with assets of 50 billion dollars and grant partners in 50 countries around the world. I found this under their “guiding values” section:

There are two simple values that lie at the core of the foundation’s work:
All lives—no matter where they are being lived—have equal value.

To whom much is given, much is expected.
I can anticipate that some of you right now are thinking to yourself, “I have enough trouble keeping my own personal life in order. Where can I find the time or energy to be a responsible world citizen?” A short answer to that is that, yes, your first priority is to stay healthy both mentally and physically. You are no good to yourself, to your loved ones or to the larger world if you are unable to function to the best of your abilities. But when you are stable and healthy, you have to have your eyes open to the world. To be an engaged and responsible world citizen you must be able to dream and to act on your dreams. Nietzsche once wrote, “He who has a why to live for can endure almost any how.” Put more colloquially, “where there is a will there is a way.” This chapter—indeed this book—is all about telling you how to become a more responsible world citizen, but that is not enough. You must have a **why** in order to act. Why should you care about your role as a citizen of the world? That you will have to answer yourself, and this and the other chapters in this book should give you plenty of stimulating ideas to help find inner motivation.

Before I end this section, let me pose some questions to you. Are good global citizens liberals or conservatives? Are they religious or are they atheists? Are they idealists or pragmatists? Are they the “elite” or are they the average Joe or Sue? Quite honestly, I find that I see myself fitting, at various times in my lives, into all the categories above (well, not the Sue one). Where do you find yourself? To answer my own question—but not to let you off the hook in answering it for yourself—I think that a good global citizen can be any of the above. Here are some real-life examples just from the United States:

**Liberal**: President Bill Clinton—The Clinton Foundation with a focus on HIV/AIDS
Jimmy Carter—all of his work on international peacemaking and also with Habitat for Humanity

**Conservative**: President George Bush—Presidents Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR) monies, first 15 billion in 2004 and more recently in 2007 56 billion

**Religious**: Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and the civil rights movement

**Atheist**: Cyclist Lance Armstrong and his global outreach against cancer with the Livestrong Foundation

**Idealist**: Margaret Mead, the anthropologist and her championing of indigenous peoples around the world

**Pragmatist**: John Dewey, educational reformer

**“Elite”**: Oprah building a school for women in South Africa

**Average Joe/Sue**: Any of the thousands of college students who join the Peace Corps each year

These people at some point made the leap—or move, or step, or perhaps they simply stumbled--- into global citizenship. Or at least that’s the way it looks to the outsider. Probably, however, almost all of them arrived at their world view in stages---some short, some long, some sudden and some gradual. I’m almost certain that the journey or transition was not particularly easy or painless. And I’m even more certain that most
people we would think of as global citizens endure the tensions, anxieties and uncertainties that we’ll explore in the rest of this chapter.

3. An inconvenient truth: we may be more racist and xenophobic than is pleasant to admit

“Distance does not decide who is your brother and who is not.”

--Bono

The t-shirt I am wearing now as I write is from the Diversity Emerging Education Program (DEEP) at the school where I am a professor, and its message is both clear and accepted as fact, I am sure, by all most of the people reading this book. It states very simply “NO Human is MORE Human THAN Others.” Indeed, I am sure that no person who is vigilant in his/her fight against racism and sexism would disagree at all with this sentiment, and could even quickly point to various other iterations (religious as well as secular, for example “We are all God’s children” or “All men are created equal”). But before I get to the meat of my argument, let me cite some recent history.

After the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States, there was a literal flood of donations to the Red Cross and other relief organizations both from ordinary American citizens and from citizens and governments from around the world. In the end, the victims of this tragedy and their immediate family members were granted all manner of benefits, essentially securing them –at least financially- for the rest of their lives. Many people who lived in the affected areas of New York City received from the Red Cross cash awards for their inconveniences, and many of these awards were in the six figure range.

In the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina in the late summer of 2005 there were many commentaries and reports that pointed out the glaring disparities between the relief efforts between the two events: 9-11 and Katrina. Specifically, it was argued that because most of those affected in New Orleans and the rest of the Gulf Coast area were poor and of color they did not get the same attention as the victims in Manhattan. To wit, spouses of the victims in 9-11 received as much as $1,000,000, whereas in New Orleans those who survived were lucky if they received minimal relief from our government. Indeed, maybe some of you agreed with Kanye West’s observation that “George Bush don’t like black people.” In comparing the reaction to these two events there is factual evidence that both our government and our nation acted as if some humans’ lives were worth more than others, and many in the media and on the Internet were quick to point that out. Kanye West was not the only one to hurl the epithet racist at many of those in political power. But can the people of the United States really be racist in this way? Let’s think about it. If we were to try to explain “earth behavior” to a Martian, how would we explain the disparity between the aid given to victims of 9/11 and the aid given to victims of Hurricane Katrina in 2005? What might that hypothetical Martian say in response to our explanations?
One way we might choose to explain this disparity would be to say that I am comparing “apples and oranges,” and that a natural disaster is different from a terrorist attack on our national symbols. Let us look, then, at yet another natural disaster and the response that followed. The death toll from Katrina was approximately 2,000, but just over a month later on October 8th, 2005, nearly 80,000 people lost their lives during and in the aftermath of a record earthquake in northern Pakistan. This earthquake made four million homeless, and as I write this many of those people now face another year without adequate shelter from what promises to be a very long and cold winter. By comparison, Hurricane Katrina left about 60,000 without homes, and then only very temporarily. It is estimated that about 2,000-3,000 Pakistani and Kashmiri people have had arms or legs amputated because they could not get timely treatment to their injuries. To underline: 40 times more people died in the Pakistani earthquake and nearly 67 times more people were left homeless. The American people—and American college students—continue to respond to the Katrina disaster with effort, aid, research and rhetoric. At the same time, they have forgotten (if they were ever really aware...were you?) about the millions of Asians who are still suffering from this tragic earthquake.

Our Martian looking down at Earth attempting to discern our values might be forced to conclude that most Americans—as indicated by our respective responses to these two events—believe that some humans are worth more than other humans, or, to be more blunt, are racist.¹ Or at least xenophobic? (Supposing the victims were Australians?)

But let me push this point even further. On September 13, 2007, the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) released to the media its 2007 report. Among the most startling facts contained in this report is that approximately 9.7 million children under the age of five die each year from preventable causes (such as malnutrition, diarrhea, and preventable diseases such as malaria). Simple math leads to the fact that that number—9.7 million—calculates out to nearly 30,000 deaths per day, 1,250 per hour, or about 600 during the time it will take you to read this chapter (just less than 30 minutes). Three thousand people died on September 11th, 2001 in the United States, one tenth the number of children that die each day from preventable causes.

So what is the “inconvenient truth” that we must face? Could it be that by our actions we clearly demonstrate that some people are worth more than others? To say that, “I know that we are ‘all God’s children’ and are all equal, but I have a right to respond with more passion to those I know better (read: look and act more like me)” is a weak defense. The

¹ The definition of racism I always give in my Intro to Sociology classes goes like this: Racism is an ideology of domination and subordination based on the assumption of the inherent biological and/or cultural inferiority of a group of people and the use of this assumption to rationalize or otherwise justify the unequal treatment of these people. One key word in this definition is ideology, and one must always understand that rarely are people explicitly aware of the ideologies that drive their behaviors.
inconvenient truth is that though we say we are not, a strong argument can be made that we are definitely racist in our behavior.

Finally, let’s revisit the quotation from Bono that begins this section. What would your religion say about this statement? Does distance determine who is and who is not your brother or sister? To help you think more deeply about this idea, here is another statement from the same source: “Where you live should not determine whether you live.”

4. Patriotism, nationalism, ethnocentrism and racism: an equation?
As you read this section, think about the question, “Where does being a global citizen fit in here?”

Buckle your seatbelt, make sure your seat is in the upright position and your tray table is up and locked in place. We’re about to take off into what might be turbulent rhetoric.

Consider the word “patriotism.” How would you differentiate this term from “nationalism”? “Similarly, how would you differentiate “nationalism” from “ethnocentrism”? Finally, how would you semantically distinguish “ethnocentrism” from “racism”? Certainly the dictionary definitions of all these terms will help you clarify some differences but, in the end you will note that there are clear overlaps between these words. One way to think about this is to consider putting this question into the form of a Venn diagram:

![Venn diagram](image)

Although these overlap in meaning, it should not be argued that they are the same thing, but only that there are overlapping nuances of meaning. But let’s explore these overlaps and see where this exercise might take us.
Consider: can you be patriotic without being nationalistic? Can you be nationalistic without being somewhat ethnocentric? Can you be ethnocentric without being somewhat racist? And does one lead, in a world where we are forced to generalize and make quick judgment calls, to one bleeding into the next. What kinds of things do “very patriotic” people say? Certainly for some people, reciting the Pledge of Allegiance with our hand over our heart is an act of patriotism. But what does the Pledge of Allegiance ask us to do? Many of you reading this chapter have recited this one sentence countless times, frequently at the beginning of your school day, but have you ever considered what it means?

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Does it imply that you will protect and defend our country? Here is the Oath of Citizenship we ask those new US citizens to recite:

I hereby declare, on oath, that I absolutely and entirely renounce and abjure all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty of whom or which I have heretofore been a subject or citizen; that I will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I will bear arms on behalf of the United States when required by the law; that I will perform noncombatant service in the Armed Forces of the United States when required by the law; that I will perform work of national importance under civilian direction when required by the law; and that I take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; so help me God.

As an important side note let me point out that in 1954 the phrase “under God” was added to the Pledge of Allegiance and that the “so help me God” ending to the Oath of Citizenship, although technically optional, is an implied requirement. Does this make a belief in God a requirement for being patriotic? Indeed, does that make being a “patriotic atheist” a contradiction in terms? Since the beginning of the Cold War against what many in the United States referred to as “godless communists,” there has been both an implicit and explicit conflation of the terms “patriot” and “Christian.” According to several independent research sources, most notably the Pew Research Center, in the United States there are likely more atheists than Jews or Muslims or Buddhists; the estimate is that as many as 20% of the American population is non-religious, though many remain closeted because they fear reprisal or ostracism. In a 1987 interview then President George H. W. Bush said “… I don't know that atheists should be considered as citizens, nor should they be considered patriots. This is one nation under God.” He failed to restate or change his position on this issue in subsequent interviews. As Jeffery Pugh argues in chapter x, religion and culture are interwoven in complex and important ways, and we need to be mindful of how religion makes an impact on all cultures.
But back to the basic question for this section. Insofar as these four “ism’s” overlap, what does this equating these four terms all mean? If, for example, a patriot “put’s country first” does that not imply the plight of others around the world should only tended to after we have taken care of all of our domestic problems? Doesn’t humanitarian aid to, for example, Darfur, take away from hungry and homeless right here in the United States? Is it unpatriotic—as in not putting country first—to donate to the Red Cross for tsunami victims in Sri Lanka while there are some in your own country that will go to bed hungry tonight? To go one step further, are we not saying that some people—people in our country--- are indeed worth more than others?

Then comes the apparent contradiction within our US culture: many would assert that we are a Christian nation. Indeed, many falsely claim that we were founded as a Christian nation (see Boston, 1993 for a very informative discussion of this myth), but if this is true, how is it that our sense of patriotism “putting country first” is on its face un-Christian? Not to put too fine a point on it, but good argument could be made that Jesus Christ was first and foremost a world citizen as in “all God’s children are to be loved.” I’ll ask you: would God “put country first?” Or, perhaps, would He agree with Paul Farmer’s observation that “Humanity is the only true nation?” Can you be a patriot and a global citizen at the same time?

5. One good thing about Sputnik: the unlikely catalyst creating a global community

"The only real nation is humanity."
-Paul Farmer

To say that history changed on October 4, 1957, when the Soviet Union successfully launched Sputnik, is no exaggeration. If a basketball sized satellite could be put into orbit, so could nuclear weapons, and it was only a matter of time until the two superpowers—the United States and the Soviet Union—realized we now lived in a world where mutual annihilation was possible, and with it the likely destruction of all human life on this planet. Rereading some of President John F. Kennedy’s speeches and those of others of the Cold War era, one gets a sense that the leaders of the world knew quite clearly that we are now one world, and would either live or die together, our fates mutually interdependent. The fact that during the cold war we were all living under the (il)logic of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) seeped quickly into popular awareness and changed the way we understood our world forever. Though on December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations proclaimed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, an thus spoke of all humans as members of the same community, it took the Cold War to make these idealistic words have a deeper, more personal relevance.

It is certainly true that many years earlier the idea of a citizen of the world was alive and well in the Enlightenment, at least in its rather limited Eurocentric fashion. Perhaps even
ancient Athens and Rome saw their empires as huge and even global. To be a Roman citizen was to be a citizen of the then-known-world, the Romans at least would have claimed. This idea, though, did not have the same reality that it does now when “citizen of the world” is literally true today.

Certainly not unrelated to the beginnings of our sense of global interconnectedness is the rise of the environmental movement, fueled by books like Rachel Carson’s *Silent Spring*, and which came to a “formal” point of maturity in the spring of 1970, when the first Earth Day was held in the United States. The image of planet earth as seen from space has certainly become an icon not only for the environmental movement but for all of those who seek to create a more global awareness. Very simply, my point is that the last several decades of the 20th century saw a dramatic rise in “global consciousness” in the United States, and though this rise was generated from many social and historical forces, there is no mistaking its importance. As a sociologist, I am struck by how globalization (however one defines that word) has created a new entity, namely a global culture. I will not dare place a birth date for this new global culture (perhaps when the World Wide Web was created?), but it certainly did not exist in 1609 or 1809, and it most definitely does exist now in 2009. The real challenge, I feel, for 21st century global citizens is to describe and understand this new global culture and begin to connect what we know about specific “traditional” cultural entities (like the United States culture) and this new, growing non-national, global entity. Further discussion of this path will have to wait for another essay, but suffice to say having a global awareness has become de rigueur for those who are in positions of leadership in any capacity.

So, how can we relate that to the world both you and I are living in right now, namely the academic world of universities, classes, research, and books? Let’s consider what academic global citizenship might mean.

In the early 1990’s, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education published a report highly critical of American higher education, pointing out that American college and university students were far too insulated and isolated from the rest of the world; they had little global awareness, especially compared to their counterparts in Europe and the rest of the world. Many institutions of higher education responded to the challenge from the Carnegie Commission and reexamined their mission statements and even their core curricula. Elon University (then Elon College) was one of those institutions and, in 1994, the faculty and administration at Elon gutted their General Studies core curriculum and, among other changes, added a required course for all first year students called “The Global Experience.” Elon, like many other institutions, also redrafted its mission statement. It reads now, in part, “We integrate learning across the disciplines and put knowledge into practice, thus preparing students to be global citizens and informed leaders motivated by concern for the common good.” My quick Internet review of the mission statements of many other institutions indicates a similar change has happened in colleges and universities all over the United States. In a sense, the academy is just catching up with a larger movement that exists in many circles in the larger American

---

2 The publishers of Peter Singer’s book *One World* use this view of earth as the “O” in *One* on the cover of the edition I have on my desk.
culture and globally (Bill Gates and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and Bill Clinton with his Clinton Global Initiative are great examples here).

Since I am a sociologist by training, I will use my own discipline to make a point. In 2001, Sociologists Without Borders was established with a mission to work “in solidarity with oppressed peoples.” Their web site further states that, “Sociologists Without Borders supports the right to peaceful meddling, and opposes States’ practices and programs that advance their own sovereignty but diminish peoples' human rights.” Also from its web site we learn that, “Sociologists Without Borders is an academic and professional alliance committed to advancing transnational solidarities and justice.” This organization, along with its sister organizations like Doctors Without Borders, Lawyers Without Borders, Engineers Without Borders, Teachers Without Borders, Reporters Without Borders, and even Mothers Without Borders, is reaching more and more people and as a latent—but perhaps not-so-latent—function, these organizations are furthering acceptance of the sentiment indicated in the Paul Farmer quotation with which I began this section: “The only real nation is humanity.”

However, becoming a global citizen is a stretch for some students (and, frankly, for some faculty and academic disciplines and universities as well) and the process creates some tensions and contradictions.

One example of the complexities of prioritizing various ways of being a global citizen took place recently at my university when two invited speakers from different parts of Central America shared the same table and fielded questions about their projects. One represented “Hope for Honduran Children” and the other “Schools for Chiapas.” These two speakers had been invited by two different student groups, each devoted to their respective projects. As the conversation unfolded it was apparent that there was a tension in the room between the Honduran group and the Chiapan (Mexican) group, and this tension boiled down to the fact that the Honduran group had trouble understanding why the Chiapan group was spending their energies on a cause that was not nearly as acute as theirs (“…the Honduran children are literally starving, while the Chiapan’s at least have food!”). Wisely the speaker representing “Hope for Honduran Children” pointed out that each cause is important and that there are many kinds of philanthropy. As the Javanese told the anthropologist Clifford Geertz long ago, “Other fields, other grasshoppers.” Being a global citizen means understanding that there are many, many injustices in the world and that, unfortunately, individual human effort is finite, restricted by a 24-hour day and limited resources.

A second tension exists between being a local or national citizen and a global citizen. If indeed “the only true nation is humanity,” what becomes of nationalism and patriotism? Consider one of my favorite lines from Archbishop Desmond Tutu:

3 My humanist colleague Olaf Krassnitzky put it this way, “We are one humanity. That should be at the top of any humanist manifesto or creed. We cannot solve the problems of the Sudan. We can only solve our problems in Sudan.” (emphasis in the original; personal communication)
We are bound together by a common humanity, by a common vulnerability, bound together by our common passion for freedom that we can't go it alone, that we are bound up in the bundle of life. We used to say to our white compatriots in South Africa: “You will never be free until we blacks are free, for freedom is indivisible.”

I would add to his statement that just as freedom is indivisible so also is justice, and that just as there can be no freedom until there is global freedom, there can be no justice until there is global justice. To fight for the causes in your own backyard is clearly the right thing to do for many of us, but, to modify for argument what C. Wright Mills taught us long ago, we must see the connection between private (local) problems and public (global) issues. Certainly all of us cannot abdicate our responsibilities as local citizens to live our lives as literal global citizens, but clearly we must more consciously and conscientiously understand our responsibilities as global citizens.

I can think of no better example being both a local and global citizen simultaneously than the Zapatista movement in Chiapas, Mexico. In response to the signing of the NAFTA agreement in 1994, indigenous Mexicans in the state of Chiapas revolted against the Mexican government. Two years later there was an enormous response to the 1996 Zapatista call for a series of continental and intercontinental Encounters that led to an historic gathering in Chiapas in July of 1996. Camped out in tents and makeshift accommodations, over 3,000 grassroots activists and intellectuals from 42 countries on 5 different continents came together to discuss the struggle against neoliberalism on a global scale. What is special about the Zapatista movement is that from the very beginning there was an understanding that they were not just fighting for the rights of property and dignity for Chiapans, but for the rights and dignity of indigenous peoples everywhere. Their words and actions reflect the spirit of Desmond Tutu’s words, and they clearly inspired many outside of Mexico, setting in motion new waves of hope and energy among those engaged in the struggle for freedom and justice all over the world, especially among those fighting for the rights of indigenous peoples.

One final thought about our special responsibility as American global citizens: In his 2008 address to the incoming first year students at Elon University, President Leo Lambert told the assembled students and their parents that with great privilege comes great responsibility. Students attending Elon (or I dare say any of the institutions represented by those reading this book) are among the most privileged people in the entire world and are in a position to leverage resources in ways that would be extraordinarily difficult for their counterparts in the developing world; they have the potential to be extremely useful partners to those who seek justice around the world. What can be said for our students must also be said about us as all as global citizens: with our great privilege comes great responsibility. We must be careful, though, in our desire to be active global citizens and not to frame our actions as “helping the poor downtrodden” around the world. Rather, we should listen closely to the words of Lilly Walker, an Australian Aboriginal woman, who said, “If you are here to help me, then you are wasting your time. But if you come because your liberation is bound up in mine, then let us begin.” To state this differently, we cannot solve the problems of the people in...
Darfur. We can only solve our problems in Darfur. Paternalistic “do-good” behavior done out of guilt or a vague sense of duty is antithetical to the sentiment that Lily Walker is offering because it is based on an assumption that the world is made up of “us” and “them.” As global citizens we must reframe our understanding of our relationship with others in this world: we shouldn’t give aid to others around the world we must partner with them to solve our problems.

Tracy Kidder, Paul Farmer’s biographer, notes that “Lives of service depend upon lives of support.” (Kidder, 2003:108). The point he makes in this comment is an important one that should not be underestimated. We all cannot “save the world” either as individuals or institutions, but those of us who choose to heavily invest in our role as global citizens must recognize, honor, and value those around us who make what we do possible. In Paul Farmer’s case, it is his family (broadly defined) in both Boston and in Haiti who provide the necessary support. In my case, it is my wife and children who supply unlimited love and support for my work on HIV/AIDS. Clearly, to be a global citizen is not everyone’s calling, but those of us, like Bill Gates, Bill Clinton, Bono, and Stephen Lewis, among countless others, who need to lead the way, will always seek to gently nudge others in our lives toward a greater understanding of our global connectedness.

“All evolution in thought and conduct must at first appear as heresy and misconduct.”
-George Bernard Shaw

6. Crushed chick peas, academic freedom, and the blind machine

Al Lee, one of the founders of the Association for Humanist Sociology, says in Sociology for Whom that, “In spite of the contrasts between science and religion, social historians can demonstrate how both have gained from the often unsettling contributions of the heretical.” And further, “Whether heretics are ‘nuts’ or ‘radicals’ or ‘brilliant innovators’ depends upon current vested interests, propaganda struggles, public opinions, and changing life conditions.” He goes on to list various heretics from history, Charles Darwin among them. His book is filled with “…contributions being made to knowledge and social policy by heretical and emancipatory sociologists, persons dedicated to the further development and application if sociology for people” (1986:xii). Predictably and appropriately, Al Lee mentions Thomas Kuhn and his definition of normal science. I will go further than Professor Lee did and state explicitly that what is needed is nothing less than a paradigm shift within the academy as a whole and specifically with those who teach about the nature of global citizenship.

You cannot make hummus without crushing a few chickpeas, and you cannot make fundamental change without committing heresy. So here is my heretical suggestion: as global citizens privileged with a seat (either as faculty or as students) at an institution of
higher education we need to reconsider, both individually and collectively, with what values and priorities we set our study, research and activism agendas.

The 21st century and the global social problems that exist today cannot be effectively addressed under the old paradigm of academic freedom. I say this for many reasons, but the two most important ones have to do with the accelerating rate of social change and the emerging existence of a global culture. However you measure it, the rate of social change is faster now than it has ever been, and there is no reason to believe that it is going to slow down. Just the opposite, most would agree that the future will hurl at us faster and faster. Who among us would be so brave as to predict what technological and social changes will occur in the next twenty years? Who could have predicted twenty years ago the tremendous impact that the Internet has had on all of our lives? Intimately linked to this ever quickening change is the fact mentioned above in this essay that for the first time in our species’ history there is now a global culture, one that has yet to be fully formed and defined, and clearly yet to be fully understood. The problems that we face are more acute, more devastating, more critical in terms of human life on this planet (environmental degradation, anyone?) than ever before, and our global social and environmental problems are only going to become more dramatic. We cannot afford what Thomas Kuhn might call “normal” social science anymore.

I would describe the functioning of the academy (“science” –both social and ‘hard’) as demonstrably acephalous. It has no “head” or mind making decisions about its direction. We are a “blind machine” moving forward with no clear direction. It was Thomas Friedman who not long ago observed that (with regard to globalization and the future), “No one is in charge.” Peter Singer, reflecting on Friedman’s words stated, “For Marx this is a statement that epitomizes humanity in a state of alienation, living in a world in which, instead of ruling ourselves, we are ruled by our own creation, the global economy” (Singer, 2004:11). Indeed, in a free market economy, who is in charge? Although this varies a great deal between disciplines, to a very real extent our academic journals get filled with dross that pads someone’s curriculum vitae and, taken as a whole, moves us no closer to making a purposeful impact on the direction our global culture is headed, that is, to “take charge.” We chant the mantra “academic freedom”[explain the link with academic freedom] [i.e., “to justify our individual tastes in research projects and to excuse our unwillingness to take on socially useful projects??”] as if there were no alternative. We are afraid to imagine a world where, as August Comte argued long ago, sociology and the social sciences,[ that is], governed by [objective ] reason, research and logic, inform and guide the direction of the discipline. [in which we will go.] Certainly there is much to disagree with concerning a great deal of what Comte said, but his basic sentiment, that the social sciences must drive social policy and social change, is shared by most other classical social theorists. The heresy that I am suggesting is grounded in the history of my discipline of sociology, and I would wager that many of our fore parents would lament at the fact that sociology and most of the other social sciences[ have devolved into a demonstratively ] now demonstrably occupy a sidelined role in political and social decision making.
Need transition…e.g. “Why does the direction of academic research matter so much? Shouldn’t academics be allowed to gather knowledge and draw conclusions as they wish? I don’t think we can afford that luxury any more.” As individuals and as global citizens, we should reread Al Lee’s words, “Whatever optimism or pessimism we might have about the future of the human lot depends upon the relative speed with which broader participation may be achieved in the control and employment of social power” (1986:5). I do not believe that “broader participation” means proceeding apace the way we have in the past. The human agency of which I speak is one that embraces the fact that together we can make a difference, but divided by our idiosyncratic and opportunistic research and activism agendas we are not the effective leaders that we could and should be. I propose that, for example, we begin by making a list of study, research and activism activities that reflect what is happening globally, and imagine how we might take steps toward agreeing on how to prioritize our efforts and allocate our resources. This means, yes, giving up one kind of “academic freedom.” [And] It means submitting to the collective wisdom of larger, more globally minded groups and beginning the process of taking more control over our futures and to become the global citizens we need to be. I propose that we act as a model for other people and organizations and begin a movement within the academy. I make the above suggestions in an absolutely sober state; I realize the heresy I am suggesting. I submit that to remain acephalous, or perhaps many headed? though, is not an option. [Note how this section seems to be addressed to faculty, rather than to students.]

[This paragraph relates to the entire argument of the chapter---that to be a responsible world citizen is to believe that human action can change at least parts of the world. Re-think its placement?] As a final note I will point out to the astute reader that you are right in your suspicion that above I was describing the classic “free will versus determinism” dilemma. Restated, the question becomes do we really have control over our future? Read Leslie White’s essay (actually the title says it all!) “Man’s Control Over Civilization: An Anthropocentric Illusion.” He represents an end of the continuum that most of us dare not contemplate too deeply, the end that says that history will unfold despite, not because of purposeful human action. Complex global economic forces beyond the direct control of any group of individuals drive the price of commodities like grains and oil, for example. On the direct opposite end of the pole lies one of White’s contemporaries whose words grace the walls of many undergraduate dorm rooms, namely Margret Mead. Her statement, “Never question whether or not a small group of people can change the world. Indeed, that is the only thing that ever has.” epitomizes the idea of free will and deep faith in human agency, that we are in control of how the future unfolds. What I am proposing is rejecting White and embracing Mead: that we reassess the false freedom that comes with embracing a social world “left alone” by human acts. ]

“Our real desires, our lasting and strongest passions, are not for the good of our species as a whole, but, at best, for the good of those who are close to us.”
7. A fire in the house means we’re not racist?

You see a house on fire and inside, behind one door, is your daughter. Behind another door, right beside it, is another parent’s child. You can only save one child. Which do you choose? Now imagine the same scenario except but with 10 young children behind the other door, now which do you choose? Is there any number of children behind the second door that would turn your hand away from the door behind which your flesh and blood cowers, and save the many others?

This and other similar gedanken (thought) experiments have been researched and tested by several evolutionary psychologists and the results are consistent and predictable. With convincingly high regularity, the choices people make are directly correlated to the genetic closeness of the person behind the door. Moral philosophers have written about this tendency for at least a century:

We should all agree that each of us is bound to show kindness to his parents and spouse and children, and to other kinsmen in a lesser degree: and to those who have rendered services to him, and any others whom he may have admitted to his intimacy and called friends-fellow countrymen more than others: and perhaps we may say those of our own race more than to black or yellow people, and generally to human beings in proportion to their affinity to ourselves. (Sedgwick 1907:246)

I immediately need to use Peter Singer’s own words to make a critical point: “To say that a certain kind of behavior is universal and has its roots in our evolutionary history does not necessarily mean that it cannot be changed, nor does it mean that it should not be changed” (Singer 2002:161). Clearly we are wired to behave in a way that is biased toward those close to us, especially those who share much of our DNA. Few things could be more “real” than parental love. But does that mean that we cannot focus on and give to those who are separated from us either genetically or geographically, that we cannot be good national or global citizens? Of course not, but we should never take for granted how counterintuitive it is for us to give up family time for activities related to being a better global citizen. Are we racist, or simply patriotic, for caring about Katrina victims more than those affected by the Pakistani earthquake? Above I addressed that question and argued that our behavior is racist, or perhaps xenophobic, but now I am not so sure. Perhaps there needs to be a better word to describe the moral dilemma—more than a dilemma: we have more than two roles-- many of us face daily: the role strain between being a family member, a citizen of a country, and at the same time a global citizen. How does one decide where to put their energies and priorities?

But there is at least one more challenge associated with our Darwinian wiring. Additional wisdom from the field of evolutionary psychology indicates that it is not

---

4 See Matt Ridley’s work The Origins of Virtue for a good review of the research on this subject.
5 Quoted from Singer, 2002:153)
“natural” for people to worry about the long future: we are programmed to get our genetic material passed on in our lifetimes. We care about mating and we care about with whom our children mate, but in terms of life beyond our immediate kinspersons, we are not naturally concerned.\(^6\) It is our culture that allows us to see into the future and plan for lives long after ours and also to urge us toward understanding that we are all now “one world”, one global community. Though we can understand this concept intellectually and speak of our futures both in person and in writing, our day to day behavior is guided much more by our unconscious drives, urges and needs than we think. Indeed, perhaps it can be said that “Rather than thinking and proceeding to act, we act and then proceed to explain.” (Richardson, 1976:5) My point is simply that it takes great effort and vigilance to stay focused on the long term and on our connection to and co-dependence with the other six billion people on this planet. We sociologists enjoy a professional life that demands that we stay tuned to cultural trends and look at the world with a keen sociological imagination, but most of those in our families and communities have little truck with ideas of this nature on a regular basis. It is our responsibility to not only keep our focus on our global connectedness, but also to actively introduce others to the growing reality that we are all global citizens.

“…it is important to sound a warning about the habit of conflating the notion of society with that of nation-state. We already live in a global society. Thus, calls of a right to equality must necessarily contend with steep grades of inequality across as well as within international borders. The same holds for analysis of human rights—such as those appearing in, for example, reports from human rights watchdog organizations—may obscure their fundamental transnational nature.”

-Paul Farmer

8. A model for how to proceed as a global citizen

Jeffery Sachs tells us, in fine detail, how to escape the debilitating poverty that grips the developing world in his controversial book *The End of Poverty*. In this book Sachs recounts his experiences in helping to “fix” economic crises in Bolivia and Poland, and argues how what he calls “clinical economics” could work on other parts of the world. The central message of this book is that, “The very hardest part of economic development is getting the first foothold on the ladder. Households and countries at the very bottom of the world’s economic distribution, in extreme poverty, tend to be stuck” (Sachs, 2005:24). With the right assistance from the richer nations, Sachs argues, all nations could effectively end poverty, and in doing so help save, for example, the more than 10,000 Africans who die every day of poverty-related health conditions.

\(^6\) See, of course, Richard Dawkins’ *The Selfish Gene* for some basic ideas along this line.
Jeffery Sachs and Bono are, on the surface, an unlikely pair, but they have come together in an effort to end global poverty. Sachs is one of the intellectual forces behind the United Nations Millennium Development goals. These goals include:

1. Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
2. Achieve universal primary education
3. Promote gender equality and empower women
4. Reduce child mortality
5. Improve maternal health
6. Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
7. Ensure environmental sustainability
8. Develop a global partnership for development

Bono still works at his “day job” as front man for U2, but he has worked tirelessly in the last decade for many global causes. Bono’s One Campaign perfectly compliments the Millennium Development Goal’s, and that is no accident. Through their energy and drive these two men have inspired many others to embrace their roles as global citizens. Bono and Sachs are just two examples out of many I could have cited. The Clinton Global Initiative, led by former President Bill Clinton, focuses on the four interrelated issues of global warming, global health, poverty and race/religious divisiveness. This initiative is not a replacement of but in addition to The Clinton Foundation that is doing so much for HIV/AIDS globally, especially in sub-Saharan Africa. My point is simple: the task of identifying and even prioritizing the most significant social issues we face as global citizens has already been substantially done. As concerned students and faculty, I propose, the question we should ask is, “How can my study, research, publication and activism agenda begin to more regularly address larger issues, especially those related to the MDG’s?”

As an anthropologist and medical doctor, Paul Farmer provides us with a wonderful example of how to function as a professional and global citizen. By establishing Partners in Health and working tirelessly in Haiti for the poor, he has shown it is possible to live as though “humanity is the only true nation.” Can we all be Paul Farmer (or, as he is known by many, “Saint Paul”)? No, of course not, but as individuals and as leaders in our respective communities we can lead the way both for our fellow students and for other organizations a new paradigm for how to function as global citizens. Yes, this means giving up some freedom, but giving up that freedom may be necessary as we more and more become one world. Let me end with a long passage from President John F. Kennedy’s commencement address at American University delivered June 10, 1963:

---

7 These were taken directly from http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/
8 From the One website (www.one.org), “ONE is a new effort by Americans to rally Americans – ONE by ONE – to fight the emergency of global AIDS and extreme poverty. ONE aims to help Americans raise their voice as ONE against the emergency of AIDS and extreme poverty, so that decision makers will do more to save millions of lives in the poorest countries.”
9 Go to http://www.pih.org/index.html for more information.
Let us focus instead on a more practical, more attainable peace, based not on a sudden revolution in human nature but on a gradual evolution in human institutions—on a series of concrete actions and effective agreements which are in the interest of all concerned. There is no single, simple key to this peace; no grand or magic formula to be adopted by one or two powers. Genuine peace must be the product of many nations, the sum of many acts. It must be dynamic, not static, changing to meet the challenge of each new generation. For peace is a process—a way of solving problems.

Let us have the courage to be heretics and respond proactively to the challenges faced by a global culture filled with injustice. First, we can make a gradual change by looking beyond our own families to others within our local communities, and then we can move further outward, to the rest of the nation and to the rest of the world.

To put the suggestion above in more intimate, concrete terms, consider your—or your parent’s—annual giving, both in terms of money and in service/volunteer hours. Here is a typical list: they buy Girl Scout cookies once a year, make a donation to the American Cancer Society when the solicitation comes in the mail, run in the 5K “fun run” to raise money for the local Women’s Shelter, donate some canned goods every so often to the local food bank, and serve meals at the local homeless shelter on Thanksgiving. Your family’s list may be significantly longer than this, but this is enough to illustrate my point. In a large number—perhaps a majority—of families these combined philanthropic outreaches are done with little guiding logic other than to “do good.” There is no conscious and overt attempt to meaningfully prioritize this activity, just the opposite, many family acts of giving seem more guided by personal interest and contacts and sheer serendipity than anything else. But you and your family’s resources are limited—both time and money—and doesn’t make sense to move forward with some overall explicit plan? I argue that now in this 21st century global culture where our lives are all bound together, we need—both as individuals and as organizations—met out our finite resources in the most thoughtful, logical and mindful ways.

How will the rest of this book help you embrace your role as a “global citizen?”

A global citizen leads a mindful life and doles out her time, energy and resources in a manner that reflects a clear understanding of her connection to the world and the appropriate priorities.

A global citizen is one who understands the basic concept of culture and is able to not only understand the concepts of ethnocentrism and cultural relativity but uses these concepts as she/he learns of, writes about and acts upon her/his corner of the world. Basirico and Bolin in “The Joy of Culture” chapter skillfully present their idea of the “web of culture”, effectively communicating the truth that in culture “everything is connected to everything else.” They stand on the shoulders of the like of Darwin who long ago observed that although our world is marked by great diversity, all parts of the
natural —and social— world are mutually interdependent. An effective global citizen makes every effort to understand her/his own culture and the larger global culture and all of the interconnections among and between all cultures.

To know the world effectively and thoroughly a global citizen must read from an array of sources. But mere reading is not enough, we must be mindful about what we choose to invest our time reading and in how we read what we do. Schwind in her chapter “Reading, Writing, and Researching the Global Experience” articulates with great examples and detail how to respond as a thoughtful consumer of the written word, from academic essays to advertising copy. She also provides some provocative and innovative concepts like “tagmemics” as tools for how to more deeply read the variety of texts we encounter. But her chapter provides not only lofty and challenging new concepts but also a carefully laid out series of practical activities that encourages the new global citizen to learn to communicate effectively her/his more nuanced and complex view of the world.

Rosemary: creative writing and global citizenship

One of the most chilling lines attributed to the Soviet leader Joseph Stalin, as quoted in McClearn’s chapter on the importance numeracy (number literacy), is “One death is a tragedy. A millions deaths is just a statistic.” We all tend to be more swayed by anecdotes than numbers, but we can never let numbers remain that: just numbers. Near the beginning of this chapter you were made aware that every three seconds (on average) another child under five dies in the world from causes directly related to poverty. These are real flesh and blood children, not statistics. This cannot be put too emphatically: a responsible world citizen knows how to interpret and understand numbers —quantified information about the world. This global citizen never forgets that each number represents real people that feel pain, cling on to hope, and beg not rationalized into another mass of digits.

The sheer number of sources of information about the world that we have access to is amazing. The Internet alone provides us with video, audio and “print” stories from newspapers around the world, not to mention the vast array of news sites like CNN, BBC, NPR and on and on. This bombardment of information raises many important epistemological questions: how do we know about what is going on in, say, Afghanistan? Given that news and commentary have been blurred together in much of the media both in the United States and abroad, how do we know which side is telling the “truth?” Indeed, how can one know the truth about current social, environmental and political news? Ocke Eke, a communications professor teaching in the United States but raised in Nigeria, presents unique and useful guidance for the aspiring global citizen in his chapter.

Digre: Imperialism as a shaping force

One extraordinarily sobering question Antony Weston asks in his chapter is, “By what right do we suck the Earth dry to leave a hollowed-out and toxic-waste-laced legacy to our grandchildren?” Think about this for a minute. Or two. Or more, and then consider that you are in the middle of seven generations. You may remember or even still visit
your great-grandparents, likely your grandparents, and most certainly your parents. You may now have –or some day soon- children and, after more years, grandchildren, and if you stay healthy, great-grandchildren. A global citizen understands very clearly that we share one precious and irreplaceable Earth. We owe it to ourselves, our ancestors who passed on to us a healthy planet, and our children who deserve to grow up in one, our very best stewardship. This chapter provides many thoughtful observations about our current environmental crisis.

The danger of what I call “monolithic thinking” is ever present when we try to make sense of the world around us. This type of thinking is, in a very real sense, a defense mechanism we use to endure the increasing complexity of modern life: just see things as simple “black and white.” A synonym for monolithic thinking would be overgeneralizing. Such is the case for many people when they hear the word feminist: then tend to plop all “feminists” into one (typically negative) category, and not see the wide diversity of definitions of the word feminist. Since it is, with only some small exceptions, true that females suffer from structured social inequality all over the world, an effective global citizen must understand the social dynamics and historical forces that characterize this unjust treatment. The conceptual tools offered to use in Ann Cahill’s chapter on feminism will help you to better understand such issues as female genital cutting (FGC) and the role women play in agriculture around the world. Is a global citizen necessarily a feminist? Read Ann’s chapter and then decide for yourself.

In the culture wars that characterize much of the dialogue in our modern world, the sacred cow of religion seems to be the single most contentious topic. A global citizen’s ability to separate personal belief from objective analysis is more seriously pressed when it comes to religion than perhaps any other topic. But the fact remains, one must bracket our religious beliefs for study even more carefully than most other dimensions of our cultural life. The study of religion and the role it plays in our lives as global citizens is, in these early years of the 21st century, critical. This research on religion demands that we examine with clarity, rationality and reason our most fundamental ontological, epistemological and axiological assumptions: what is, how we can know what is, and with what values we act upon what is and is known to us. In his chapter on religion Jeffery Pugh presents rich detail, important background information, particularly about Islam, and some effective guidance on how to make sense of the impact religion has on both individual cultures and our interconnected global community.

While you were reading this chapter I think it is somewhat likely that you were using drugs of some sort. Specifically, and most likely, you might have been sipping a soft drink that contained caffeine, drinking a cup of coffee or tea, smoking a cigarette or, perhaps, nursing a beer. In this behavior you are not alone: the use of mild drugs is a cultural universal and has been documented to be a part of cultures world-wide from the earliest recorded civilizations. In many cultures more extreme drug use –for both recreational and religious purposes- is also very common, though at times counter to the formal laws and norms of the culture. To be an effective global citizen you must be aware of cultural universals such as drug use and understand how to put them into a meaningful
context. Mat Gendle’s chapter provides many useful historical and cultural examples of drug use around the world and challenges you to consider his guiding premise that all humans has a natural predisposition to seek drug induced states.

In a 1992 article entitled “Jihad vs McWorld” political scientist Benjamin Barber stated, “The two axial principles of our age—tribalism and globalism—clash at every point except one: they may both be threatening to democracy.” Although Barber himself updates his ideas with a book in 1995, Steve Braye brings the recent developments in global politics, technology, and other important cultural trends into new focus with his reinterpretation of the “Jihad vs McWorld” struggle which appears more important now than when Barber wrote his original article. Braye’s discussion is an important bridge linking the international politics talked about in the Roselle (et al) chapter and Jeffery Pugh’s thoughts about religion. A global citizen must understand some of the macro level social, political and religious forces that shape our everyday world’s both

The personal and the political collided—literally—on September 11th as large jets flew into the World Trade Center towers that historic morning, killing roughly 3,000 people. Though it is critical to view that day in context-30,000 children also died that day and every day thereafter from preventable causes—one lesson that we must take from that day is that as much as we may want to isolate ourselves from all matters political, this is just not possible in this 21st century. What happens in the mountains of Afghanistan does effect the lives of people all over the world and even in the “bubble” that surrounds your university. In Laura Roselle (and colleagues) chapter on international politics you will learn how to make sense of much that is happening all around the world. For example, just understanding the basic difference between a “nation” and a “state” will provide you with a clearer and more useful perspective from which to rethink African history and, perhaps more personally, recent events in Iraq. A responsible world citizen draws away from the seduction of isolationism and ignorance and faces head on the taxing yet rewarding demands of understanding the complexities of global political forces.

END OF CHAPTER QUESTIONS/EXERCISES /ACTIVITIES
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