

Challenging Citizenship

Group Membership and
Cultural Identity in a Global Age

*Edited by
Sor-hoon Tan*

Challenging Citizenship

Group Membership and Cultural Identity in a Global Age

Edited by
SOR-HOON TAN

ASHGATE

© Sor-hoon Tan 2005

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Sor-hoon Tan has asserted her right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as editor of this work.

Published by
Ashgate Publishing Limited
Gower House
Croft Road
Aldershot
Hampshire GU11 3HR
England

Ashgate Publishing Company
Suite 420
101 Cherry Street
Burlington, VT 05401-4405
USA

Ashgate website: http://www.ashgate.com
--

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Challenging citizenship : group membership and cultural identity in a global age

1. World citizenship 2. Globalization - Social aspects
3. Globalization - Political aspects 4. Group identity - Political aspects 5. Identity (Psychology) - Political aspects

I. Tan, Sor-hoon, 1965-
303.4'82

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Challenging citizenship : group membership and cultural identity in a global age / [edited] by Sor-hoon Tan.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-7546-4367-0

1. World citizenship. 2. Globalization--Social aspects. 3. Globalization--Political aspects. 4. Group identity--Political aspects. 5. Identity (Psychology)--Political aspects. I. Tan, Sor-hoon, 1965-

JZ1320.4.C43 2004
303.48'2--dc22

2004021067

ISBN 0 7546 4367 0

Printed and bound in Great Britain by MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall

List of Contributors

Catherine Audard, Lecturer in Philosophy at the London School of Economics, is author of *Anthologie Historique et Critique d'Utilisme, Citoyenneté et Individualité Morale* and *Individu et Justice Sociale*. She has also translated John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* and J.S. Mill's *Utilitarianism* into French.

Daniel A. Bell, Associate Professor at the City University of Hong Kong, has published several works, including *Communitarianism and Its Critics*, *East Meets West: Human Rights and Democracy in East Asia*, *Toward Illiberal Democracy in Pacific Asia*, and *The East Asian Challenge to Human Rights*.

April Carter, formerly of Oxford and Queensland universities, is author of *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship, Authority and Democracy*, and *Direct Action and Liberal Democracy*. She also edited *The Politics of Women's Rights*, *Democratic Theory Today: Challenges for the 21st century*, and *Liberal Democracy and its Critics*.

Baogang He, Associate Professor at Tasmania University in Australia, has authored *The Democratization of China*, *The Democratic Implications of Civil Society in China*, and several journal articles and book chapters on democracy, national identity, and civil society.

Barry Hindess, Professor at the Research Center for Social Sciences, Australia National University, is author of *Choice, Rationality and Social Theory*, *Politics and Class Analysis*, *Freedom Equality and the Market*, *Philosophy and Methodology in the Social Sciences*, *Sociological Theories of the Economy* *Reactions to the Right*, and chapters in several volumes on citizenship and politics.

Will Kymlicka, Professor at Queens University, Kingston, Canada, is author and editor of several works, including *Multicultural Citizenship*, *Liberalism, Community and Culture*, *Contemporary Political Philosophy*, *The Rights of Minority Culture*, and *Ethnicity and Group Rights*.

Alan Montefiore, President of the Forum for European Philosophy and Emeritus Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford, taught Philosophy for many years. His works include *A Modern Introduction to Moral Philosophy*, *Integrity in Public and Private Domains*, *Neutrality and Impartiality: The University and Political Commitment*, and *The Public Responsibility of Intellectuals*.

A.T. Nuyen, formerly Reader at Queens University, Australia and now Associate Professor at the National University of Singapore, has published many articles and book chapters on Continental Philosophy and Confucianism, among a wide range of interests. He is working on a volume on Self and Others in Eastern and Western Philosophy.

Sor-hoon Tan, Associate Professor at the National University of Singapore, is author of *Confucian Democracy: A Deweyan Reconstruction* and several articles and book chapters on Comparative Philosophy, Pragmatism, and Confucianism. She also co-edited *The Moral Circle and the Self: Chinese and Western Approaches* and *Filial Piety in Chinese Thought and History*.

C.L. Ten, Professor at the National University of Singapore, is author of *Mill on Liberty*, *Mill's Moral, Political and Legal Philosophy*, and *Crime, Guilt and Punishment*. He edited the *Utilitas* special issue on *Punishment* and the volume on *The Nineteen Century* in the *Routledge History of Philosophy*. He is also one of the editors of *The Moral Circle and the Self: Chinese and Western Approaches*.

James E. Tiles, Professor at the University of Hawai'i at Manoa, is author of *John Dewey* ("Arguments of the Philosophers" Series), *Moral Measures*, *An Introduction to Historical Epistemology*, and several articles and book chapters on Pragmatism. He also edited *John Dewey: Critical Assessments*.

Cecilia Wee, Associate Professor at the National University of Singapore, has published articles and book chapters on Aristotle, Descartes, and Environmental Philosophy. She has a forthcoming monograph on Descartes.

Foreword

The contributors to this volume were invited to reflect on the concepts of globalization and citizenship and on the connections between them. The results, revised in the light of the lively and intense discussion the first drafts evoked, are embodied in this volume. Unsurprisingly, they display a diversity of understandings of both these concepts, of the problems they raise and of perspectives of political theorists and philosophers coming from the Anglo-Saxon West (including the United States, Britain, and Australia) and what Westerners call the 'Far East' (but excluding points between, and the South).

The chapters in this volume amply confirm that 'globalization' captures some genuinely novel developments in our world, some of them extensions of earlier trends, whose novelty consists in their very intensification. Chief among these, and central to our discussions, are the ever-more salient facts of cultural diversity and cultural conflict and of transnational migration. These raise acute issues of policy – of different models of 'multiculturalism', of how to accommodate national minorities, of what to do with refugees, of how to treat migrant labour, and so on. They also raise difficult issues of principle – of whether 'cultures' can be ranked, or even meaningfully compared, of whether moral and other judgments can be made across cultural boundaries, of whether cosmopolitan concepts and ideals make sense in our time and, if so, what sense they make.

They also raise the interesting question of what thinking about such issues in terms of 'citizenship' entails. What are the positive and what the negative implications of framing them in terms of this increasingly prevalent notion? The positive implications are amply exhibited in the essays here collected. 'Citizenship' focuses our attention on a range of urgent and basic matters. What should be the criteria of membership as citizens of states? What are members' obligations to other members and to non-members who reside within their territories or are trying to enter them? What are the appropriate units of membership? Are nation-states still viable and effective, and in what respects? What rights and obligations does the status of citizen confer and how far do they extend? What do citizens owe non-citizens? Which non-citizens have the greater claims (if any)? To what extent and in what respects is the nation-state still an appropriate source for the identification of citizens and focus for their self-identification? And what constitutes being a *good* citizen? What demands should citizens meet in order for states and other political entities below and above the level of the state to function well? How are such citizens to be formed? What institutional and cultural preconditions must exist for citizens to function as good citizens? How do systems of so-called 'Asian values', notably Confucianism, address and answer these last questions and how do these answers relate to the 'liberal' and 'republican' answers of the West?

It is noticeable that these questions all reflect a range of contemporary preoccupations (are they perhaps more central to the concerns of political theorists

and philosophers than to those of their fellow citizens?) that are marked by the buzz-words of our times: 'identity,' 'values,' 'governance,' and indeed, 'multiculturalism.' The 'citizenship' frame focuses our attention on these issues. They concern how best to respond to a social environment characterized by exponentially increasing mobility and insecurity, in which the inherited political structures and institutions appear increasingly ineffective to control unintended consequences and increasingly unresponsive to people's demands and aspirations. But it may be worth asking what this way of framing questions neglects to address.

'Citizenship' talk is un-, even anti-ideological. It operates, in large part, above the fray, in abstraction from politically partisan positions. The questions of citizenship, such as those listed above, concern, or should concern, people from all, or most, contemporary political standpoints. But there are also fundamental and urgent questions that divide us politically. If you frame these in terms of 'injustice' and 'inequality,' and, more polemically still, 'exploitation,' 'colonialism' and 'imperialism,' you will focus on other aspects of the questions above indicated, and indeed on other questions. We live in a period in which the market-driven politics of neo-liberalism has swept across the globe. In part this was the result of the impersonal pressures of the global economy and in part the outcome of political policy-making inspired by neo-liberal ideology, and one result is that non-market areas of social life are virtually everywhere being transformed into markets. Such alternative vocabularies, expressing a range of different theories and policy standpoints, focus our attention upon the increasingly unequal distribution of resources and opportunities within nation-states and across the globe, and upon the enduring institutional structures which impose vastly unequal access to them. Perhaps, in short, the concept of citizenship offers an interpretation of globalization that directs our attention to some central and urgent questions and away from others.

Steven M. Lukes
Professor of Sociology
New York University

Acknowledgements

The idea for a volume of essays on citizenship in the current context of globalization, exploring the intersections between group memberships and overlapping or conflicting identities, was first suggested by Alan Montefiore and Catherine Audard during their visit to Singapore in year 2000. I am indebted to them for the idea, and especially to Alan for his continued advice and support throughout the process of bringing this book to the press.

C.L. Ten, as Head of Philosophy Department at the National University of Singapore, has been unstinting in his encouragement and assistance. I am grateful for a research grant from the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at the National University of Singapore that facilitated the project. A sixth-month attachment in 2004 at the Asia Research Institute provided the much needed time and a very conducive environment to complete the editing of the work, in the midst of other research.

Taylor and Francis has kindly given permission to use, in Chapter 12, materials from A.T. Nuyen's 'Confucianism and the Idea of Citizenship' in *Asian Philosophy*, vol. 12, no.2, pp.127-39 (available at <http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals>). The figures on page 84 are reproduced from Thomas Janoski's *Citizenship and Civil Society* (Cambridge University Press, 1998), with the author's and publisher's kind permission.

Last but not least, my heartfelt gratitude goes to all the contributors, for their cooperation and patience in the editing process; to Kim-Chong Chong and Alan K.L. Chan, with whom I collaborated on previous projects, for teaching me the finer points of editing a volume of collected essays; and to the editors at Ashgate, especially Kirstin Howgate and Sarah Horsley, for their guidance in preparing the work for publication. I am solely responsible for any errors or omissions.

Contents

<i>List of Contributors</i>	vii
<i>Foreword</i>	ix
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi
1 Introduction: Globalization and Citizenship <i>Sor-hoon Tan</i>	1
2 Migration and Cultural Diversity: Implications for National and Global Citizenship <i>April Carter</i>	15
3 A Refugee and a Citizen of the World <i>C.L. Ten</i>	31
4 Justice for Migrant Workers? Foreign Domestic Workers in Hong Kong and Singapore <i>Daniel A. Bell</i>	41
5 The Globalization of Citizenship <i>Barry Hindess</i>	63
6 Active Citizens or an Inert People? <i>James E. Tiles</i>	75
7 Socratic Citizenship: The Limits of Deliberative Democracy <i>Catherine Audard</i>	89
8 Liberalism, Identity, Minority Rights <i>Alan Montefiore</i>	98
9 Models of Multicultural Citizenship: Comparing Asia and the West <i>Will Kymlicka</i>	110
10 Montaigne's Cannibals and Multiculturalism <i>Cecilia Wee</i>	137
11 Citizenship and Cultural Equality <i>Baogang He</i>	151

12	On the Confucian Idea of Citizenship <i>A.T. Nuyen</i>	169
13	Exemplary World Citizens as Civilized Local Communicators: Politics and Culture in the Global Aspirations of Confucianism <i>Sor-hoon Tan</i>	183
14	Conclusion: Meeting Challenges <i>Sor-hoon Tan</i>	197
	<i>Index</i>	199

Chapter 1

Introduction: Globalization and Citizenship

Sor-hoon Tan

Though the idea of citizenship may be implicit in the city-states politics of Ancient Greece, making it as old as Western political philosophy, its significance as a key to understanding political problems of group membership and individual identity is characteristic of the modern era. The rise of humanism during the renaissance brings with it a radically changed view of human agency and identity; people came to view their destinies as subject to their own individual and collective efforts rather than given by God. The French Revolution pushed the *citoyen* to the forefront of the political stage, replacing the subject under autocracy, signalling the freedom and equality that go with membership in a democratic polity wherein its members do not only obey but have a role in making laws and deciding other matters of the state. Membership in a new form of nation-state, a political identity demarcated by rights and obligations defined by the law, vies with previous primordial and parochial ties as a primary locus of loyalty.

Citizenship used to be the privilege of the few and has been used to exclude entire groups on the basis of gender, race, religion, class, property, ethnicity, place of origin, age, or years of residence in a country. While such exclusion continues, the wave of independence movements after World War II leads to an overwhelming majority of people acquiring citizenship of some sovereign country. Sovereignty or secession movements by various national minorities in existing countries, and migration, mean that many are striving to change their citizenship and some have succeeded. Regional conflicts, political persecution, and even economic deprivation have created large numbers of refugees and migrants both legal and illegal residing where they are without citizenship.

From its very inception, citizenship has been a subject of constant contestation. Periodically, the question of whether the concept can be or needs to be retained is raised. In practice, where the boundaries are drawn between citizens and non-citizens, what rights and obligations belong to citizens, have all been disputed from time to time. Conceptually, its contested nature bears witness to the ever changing relationship between state and individual, to the complex interaction between political and other collective identities, and the impact of these changes on political organization and action. According to Robert Nisbet (1974, p.612), 'Citizenship in the West is more than simply a condition or a status; it is a process, with identifiable phases in time and with contexts in history which unite it in some

degree with other processes such as individualism and secularism'. If so, then even as the concept becomes more widespread, its meaning and relevance become more problematic.

While the workings of the modern nation-state focus attention on citizenship as a legal status, political affiliation has never been totally separate from other affinities. Until the twentieth century, it is often taken for granted that a sovereign state is also a nation, with one language, one culture, and one religion. Diversity is seen as a transient imperfection or dealt with by subordinating primordial ties and obligations of special relationship to a singular political loyalty and civic duties. Immigrants and indigenous population in empires created by colonization have been excluded from citizenship or subjected to harsh assimilation programs even in states that profess respect for freedom and equality. Such approaches have come under attack as resistance to imperialism and ethnocentrism mounts; increasingly cultural diversity and pluralism come to be valued. Citizenship has been associated with the struggle first for political rights, then extended to economic and social rights. It has become a battle ground for cultural equality, a troubled expression of identity caught between political affiliation and cultural affinities.

Globalization as Context

According to Martin Albrow, we now live in the Global Age, which is not just a stage of modernity or its culmination. The Global Age signifies a rupture with the past; it marks the end to modernity, but not the end of history. Nor is it a postmodern age; to Albrow (1996, p.78), 'the postmodern imagination is indeed the hypertrophy of modern innovation rather than the expression of the new age'. He advocates holding on to 'the transhistorical and cross-cultural potential of theory' in order to grasp the nature of novelty by developing concepts more suited to this new age (Albrow, 1996, p.79). The concept of citizenship is certainly among those that need to be reinvented, given its historical association with a concept of the modern nation-state central to the project of modernity. Albrow argues that the Global Age is witnessing the emergence of a new kind of citizenship, which he calls 'performative citizenship', opposed to both the ancient and the modern citizenship. Ancient citizenship is participatory as Aristotle defines a citizen not as one 'who has legal rights' (1275a9) but as one who 'shares in the administration of justice and in offices' (1275a20-21). Modern citizenship, in contrast, focuses on rights and duties in the relationship between the state and the individual citizen. Performative citizenship leaves behind both ancient and modern conceptions of the state and is premised on the activities of individuals 'acting as world citizens' in 'collective organization for global ends'. Albrow believes that 'the encroachments of the modern state on everyday life have actually assisted in the empowerment of people, through education of course, but also in requiring participation in everyday bureaucracy'. So much so that, in the Global Age, 'world citizens are turning to the task of building the global state and it is being made in and through their activities' (Albrow, 1996, p.177).

None of the contributors in this volume assumes a total break with modernity. The global age that contextualizes their discussion implies no more than recognition of the importance of globalization and reactions to or against it in contemporary life. A few imply that, whether or not globalization is important, the most important philosophical problem with citizenship lies elsewhere. Since it was coined in the 1960s, 'globalization' has become the new fad in and out of academia. According to Albrow (1996, p.88), the general informed usage of the term includes making or being made global in individual instances,

1. by the active dissemination of practices, values, technology and other human products throughout the globe;
2. when global practices and so on exercise an increasing influence over people's lives;
3. when the globe serves as a focus for, or a premise in shaping, human activities;
4. in the incremental change occasioned by the interaction of any such instances.

It also includes the generalization and abstraction of such individual instances of making or being made global. Globalization can also mean a process of making or being made global or the historical transformation constituted by the sum of particular forms and instances of making global or being made global.

A recent 'critical introduction' to the topic identifies five conceptions of globalization (Scholte, 2000, pp.44-6). Most uses define globalization as internationalization, an increase in interaction and interdependence between people in different countries. This definition favours the sceptics as internationalization is arguably not new since the nineteenth century witnessed comparable levels of cross-border migration, direct investment, finance, and trade. Others define globalization as liberalization, the removal of regulatory barriers to transfers of resources between countries. Thus defined, it is difficult to see how the concept is distinctive or uniquely useful in understanding contemporary economy and society against the background of an already well-developed discourse about free trade. A third common conception of globalization is universalization, the spread of people, cultural phenomena, ideas, and practices to every part of the globe; but then, past ages already saw worldwide spread of religions and distribution of certain goods in global markets. Definition of globalization as Westernization is popular in arguments over postcolonial imperialism. This definition implies that the West (or more specifically the United States) is the winner in globalization, which is making the world more Western or American. If so, what does globalization as Westernization add to the discourses of postcolonialism and imperialism?

Jan Scholte (2000, pp.46-50) dismisses the above four definitions in favour of a definition of globalization that he believes will provide a new vocabulary to remake an old analysis. This fifth definition of globalization is deterritorialization, the growth of 'supraterritorial' relations between people that fundamentally changes the nature of social space. This approximates Anthony Giddens' (2000a, p.92) definition of globalization as 'the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are

shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa'. Theoretically, the only consensus about globalization seems to be the contested nature of the concept, even as we see a veritable deluge of publications on globalization.¹ As globalization forms the context rather than the subject of their discussion, the authors in this volume mostly assume rather than argue for any specific definition of globalization and their implicit preferences differ.

Not only do those who study and write about globalization disagree about its definition, they disagree about the extent and impact of globalization. Globalists believe globalization is the most important single fact of contemporary history and insist that contemporary social relations have become thoroughly globalized. Opposing them, sceptics dismiss globalization as myth and maintain that, appearances notwithstanding, the world is fundamentally not much different from what it has been for many years or even returning to what it had been in an earlier era.² Like many others, the contributors to this volume occupy positions between these two extremes, treating globalization as a significant trend, but coexisting with various other historical changes as well as continuities.

Technological advances from the invention of the steam locomotive to the internet have revolutionized communication and worldwide travel, making them faster, cheaper, more reliable, and capable of meeting more varied goals. While one should not exaggerate their availability to one and all, significantly more people now travel greater distances and more frequently, come into contact with or are affected by people, things, and events from places far away from their residential locality, and enjoy a wider range of choices of where to live, study, work or play than could be envisaged a century ago. Most understandings of globalization are based on a sense of expanding interdependence stretching across the globe, some going so far as to entertain a vision of a world community, but others see the global age as economically and politically 'a highly fragmented order for what has disintegrated is the stable force of a civic realm and its replacement by disembodied space'.³ Globalization is far from complete, affecting different countries, classes, cultures, and genders unevenly. It also has no absolute logic, inherent direction, or necessary end-point (Albrow, 1996, p.95).

Even as we struggle to find out how much globalization has and will change the world and our lives, whether and how we could control or at least influence the process, disagreement is rife about the value of globalization. Globalists include both promoters and strong critics of globalization. Kenichi Omae (1990 and 1995) and John Naisbitt (1994) praise the 'borderless world'. They see globalization in terms of an economic logic and celebrate the emergence of a single global market and the principle of global competition as the harbingers of human progress. Others warn of global corporations ruling the world, usurping the power of states and local governments without undertaking their social responsibilities (Barnet and Cavanagh, 1994). Street protests against WTO meetings and other world economic summits – Seattle in 1999, Genoa in 2001, Cancún in 2003 – have drawn cross border participants and have been given worldwide media coverage. This 'citizen backlash to economic globalization' or 'global' backlash includes those who wish to roll-back globalization as well as those who are agitating to change the nature of globalization.⁴ Richard Falk (1999) and others advocate resisting 'globalization

from above' with 'globalization from below'. Politically, Francis Fukuyama (1992) looks forward to the 'end of history' and the triumph of liberal democracy on a global scale, provoking a spate of Asian exceptionalism drawing a line between 'the West and the rest' (Mahbubani, 1992).⁵ Nor do sceptics of globalization necessarily believe its opposite would be good for the world's future. Samuel Huntington (1996) predicts a 'clash of civilizations' instead of a new world order of global peace and prosperity.⁶

Religious revivalists and reactionary nationalists attack globalization for destroying traditional cultures. Some view this 'destruction' positively as making room for new identities of hybridity. Postmodernists perceive globalization as contributing to the de-centring of the subject, further fragmenting modern identities. In particular, globalization dislocates that aspect of modern cultural identity formed through one's membership of a *national* culture.⁷ Debate continues about whether the phenomenal growth in the global circulation of cultural goods that is one dimension of globalization will lead to cultural homogenization, which some see as a form of Western imperialism, or greater diversity of cultural participation in global activities and improved quality of life with expanded individual choices.⁸ Some evidence exists of erosion of national identities. Successful packaging of ethnicity for global consumer markets leads to protests against 'MacDonaldization'. However, such US-centric views perhaps ignore evidence that culture flows are not always one-way. Cultural imports need not destroy local cultures; instead they could work to produce a 'complex interpenetration of the global and the local' wherein the local becomes more globally integrated without losing its distinctiveness (Miller, 1995). Or 'local' particularistic identities could be strengthened by resistance to globalization and the weakening of the nation-state identity.⁹

The weakening of nation-state identity could also strengthen universalistic identities which might oppose globalization at least rhetorically. Resistance to globalization in one form could involve globalization in some other form. Some perceive the terrorist attack on the World Trade Centre in New York as targeting the symbol of the global economy. The means employed in planning and carrying out the attack are available only in this global age. As Craig Calhoun (2002, p.87) comments, 'in a sense, the non-cosmopolitan side of globalization struck back on 11 September'. For Teresa Brennan (2003, p.2), 'the new anxieties over terrorist attacks are only the latest in a series of fears generated by globalization in the West'. While many, including some of its promoters, recognize that there are losers and winners in globalization, Brennan argues that even people living in those countries which purport to benefit from it in fact suffer because globalization not only generates cutbacks in welfare, education, and health benefits, but also 'abets terrorism, which is a self-conscious response to global economic policy'.

The results of globalizations are a mixture of good and bad; no conclusive judgment on its normative aspect is likely given the wide range of approaches and perspectives, and the open-endedness of globalization itself. The significance of globalization for this book must be set out in terms of the actual challenges that globalization, variously understood, poses to the concept and practice of citizenship in the new millennium.

Challenges Old and New

The fortunes of citizenship as a major political concept have been bounded up with the rise of liberal democracy in the West. In practice citizenship today is still mostly understood in liberal terms of rights and obligations that accompany politically and legally defined membership in a nation-state. The articles collected in this volume approach citizenship from a variety of perspectives. Some adopt a largely liberal position; others challenge liberal conception of citizenship. Some discuss perennial problems that remain relevant in this global age; others address new challenges and new possibilities generated by globalization. Questions about the adequacy of liberal approaches that dominate theories of modern citizenship, the tensions that confront citizenship when political affiliation and cultural affinity do not coincide, whether citizenship is a 'universal' concept or an ethnocentric Western notion with limited usefulness, are problems that pre-date today's globalization; in a global age, they are posed with greater urgency and intensity. There are also new challenges generated by the varied phenomena identified as globalization. In this global age, could we still think in terms of being citizens of nation-states or do we need to re-conceptualize citizenship and what it entails?

Some see 'the most potent of the meanings of globalization' in terms of 'the transcendence of nation-state boundaries' (Albrow, 1996, p.91). Others worry about the 'auto-destruction' of the global system (James, 2001). Ulrich Beck (2000, p.20) identifies 'one constant feature' in the various dimensions of globalization and the associated disputes, 'the overturning of the central premise of the first modernity: namely, the idea that *we live and act in the self-enclosed space of national states and their respective national societies*'. Beck (2000, p.11) himself defines globalization as 'the processes through which sovereign nation-states are criss-crossed and undermined by transnational actors with varying prospects of power, orientation, identities, and networks'. Richard Langhorne's (2001) study of globalization shows how it produces the many different overlapping plates of activity and organization, global markets and other forms of e-trading, entertainment and leisure interest of every kind, news and information so varied that no complete list could be made, which are creating 'short-circuits' within and challenging existing institutions of nation-states and pre-existing structures of commerce. Global flows of information, goods, capital, and people are changing the way nation-states and individuals perceive themselves and their place in the world, their rights and obligations vis-à-vis groups and individuals. This does not mean that the nation-state is going to 'wither away' anytime soon. And paradoxically, greater mobility across national boundaries has also prompted efforts by nation-states to control if not stamp the flows altogether, and as Michael Smith (1999, p.11) observes, sometimes 'transnational migration has resulted in outbursts of entrenched, essentialist nationalism in both sending and receiving locales' (also Westwood and Phizacklea, 2000). Nevertheless, there is a need to re-imagine political community; nation-states of the global age need to change their self-definition, the way they operate and relate to one another, to their own respective members, and to other groups and individuals.¹⁰ The 'transnational' and 'supraterritorial' aspects of globalization put tremendous pressures on the prevalent

concept of citizenship that was in the words of T. H. Marshall (1964, p.72) 'by definition national'.

In the wake of globalization and the challenges it posed to the traditional nation-state, there has been a revival of interest in cosmopolitanism and its accompanying concept of the citizen of the world, and the closely related concept of global citizenship.¹¹ In Chapter 2, April Carter poses the question of how 'global citizenship' could deal with the cultural diversity resulting from new forms of migration today. She examines how far both republican and liberal approaches could be adapted to the global arena to deal with the contentious and theoretically complex problems about national identity, multiculturalism, and citizenship raised by a significant level of immigration from diverse cultures. Comparing today's migrant with the Enlightenment 'citizen of the world', she notes that the demanding republican conception of citizenship is in tension with the ideal of global citizenship. Carter presents as alternatives three liberal approaches, the first emphasizing freedom of trade and travel, the second offering a critique of economic globalization in the name of social justice, the third a Kantian cosmopolitanism; she argues that the last two provide the starting point for an understanding of global citizenship. In her view, terrorism on a world wide scale are among the problems that obstruct the realization but do not render obsolete the idea of global citizenship, which requires 'a committed defence of cosmopolitan ideals, rather than belief in an emerging world order more conducive to peace, freedom of migration, and respect for both individual and cultural rights'.

The UNDP (1999) reported that economic globalization is increasing the gap between rich and poor states as well as between peoples in the global economy. The problem of justice has worsened in this global age. The media publicizes to a worldwide audience the prosperity gaps between North and South, West and East. Some of the very worst off have responded to their plight by leaving their homeland and seeking a better life elsewhere. Not only has this increased migration, but the number of refugees has increased manifold in recent decades, and their numbers include those seeking entry into a foreign land for economic reasons. C.L. Ten believes the category of refugee should include not only those who suffer persecution for their politics or religion but also those who live in such appalling social and economic conditions that their lives are at serious risk. In Chapter 3, he argues that a country's obligation to accept refugees is a matter of justice rather than charity, because the basic interests of the refugees are at stake, by comparison with which the sacrifices made by members of the host country are relatively small. These obligations to refugees, however, do not extend to other immigrants seeking better economic opportunities. Ten is therefore sceptical of global citizenship if it suggests that nation-state boundaries are *always* morally irrelevant. Existence of standards of global justice is compatible with non-universal special relationship and local identification that does not extend to the entire humanity. Membership in a common humanity takes priority only when human lives are at stake. Less universal affiliations have their place and could be more important in certain contexts.

In contrast to Carter and Ten's liberal approach, Daniel Bell's dialogue in Chapter 4 comparing the lots of foreign domestic workers in Hong Kong and