

# Privileged citizens go global, others go home

A study about the concept of global citizenship

Lauriina Pernu

# Abstract

Global citizenship is an ambiguous concept that is often referred to in political and social contexts, but hardly being defined what it actually entails. This study aims to examine the universal construction of global citizenship, according to which every human being is constructed as the same with same rights. It becomes evident that there are differences when it comes to accessing the global belonging and feeling or identifying oneself as global citizen. With the help of feminist intersectional theory this study discusses the spheres of exclusion and inclusion of the global citizenship, stating that inequalities stem from colonialism and capitalism, reflecting first and foremost in inequalities such as class and citizenship status which directs the possibilities of mobility to different parts of the world. The existing oppressive attitudes of the society are also questioned in terms of whether people can identify themselves as global citizens if they are posed for discrimination in their national countries. Lastly, this study offers some alternatives to further think about and to discuss global citizenship in terms of solidarity, rather than trying to conform to the neoliberal notion of global citizenship.

*Key words:* global citizenship, neoliberal global citizenship, privilege, intersectionality, global identity.

Words: 20671

# Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisor Catarina Kinnvall for her support and good advice.

Also, laughing during the breaks in the library corridor did the trick.

This thesis is dedicated to all lunar citizens.

# Table of contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Purpose and aim.....	2
<b>2</b>	<b>Discussion of theories.....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Citizenship.....	4
2.2	Global citizenship.....	7
2.2.1	Cosmopolitanism.....	10
2.2.2	Communitarianism.....	12
2.2.3	Civil society.....	14
2.3	Feminist perspectives.....	16
2.3.1	Intersecting issues.....	18
2.3.2	Bodies in global spaces.....	19
2.3.3	Politicizing global citizenship.....	20
2.4	Politics of belonging.....	21
<b>3</b>	<b>Methodology.....</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1	Research design.....	24
3.2	Interviews.....	25
3.3	Delimitations.....	26
<b>4</b>	<b>Analysis.....</b>	<b>27</b>
4.1	Who is, what is?.....	27
4.2	Existential issues.....	29
4.2.1	Global status.....	29
4.2.2	Inclusion but not.....	34
4.3	Going global and elsewhere.....	38
4.3.1	Identities – actions.....	38
4.3.2	Alternatives.....	41
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusion.....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>References.....</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Appendix.....</b>	<b>48</b>
7.1	Interview form.....	48

# 1 Introduction

*"I am not an Athenian or a Greek, but a citizen of the world."* – Socrates

Since the times of Antique Greece and the increasing popularity of philosophical thinking the concept of world citizenship has puzzled people. Depending on the context of the use of the term, it might vary from the citizenship of "the universe", "the world", or more recently it has come to be called as "global citizenship", addressing the increasingly globalized world and the physical globe of Earth we live on. The notion of "world" can indicate very different meanings from the word global, as people have identified and explained the world in non-global ways before the global time. Hence, "world" is a general sentiment that includes "global" as "one of its spatial qualities" (Scholte 2005: 65). Given the all-applying, broad sense of the concept of global citizenship, it would appear reasonable to state that all the human beings on this planet should get to be called global citizens. We are living human beings on the planet Earth, living under the conditions of a statist governance system – hence we have the entitlement to be called global citizens. However easy it would be to state that as a fact, it involves a more complex and twisted understanding of the reality of the lived term.

As Nira Yuval-Davis expresses, "citizenship is an elusive concept" (1997: 68) and global citizenship equally so. Citizenship in general has changed its meaning over time, but most commonly it has been used as a political tool to organize people in inclusive and exclusive manners, as well as depoliticizing populations. Most people seem to understand the concept of global citizenship as building on the universalist approach of cosmopolitanism: it constructs all human beings as being the same, to have same fundamental rights in the society and guaranteeing everybody's equal value (ibid.) (hence, the connection to the emphasis on human rights). However, applying feminist theories and the intersectional approach to the concept of global citizenship, one quickly learns that the cosmopolitan idea is idealistic, and – to quote one of the interviewees – "utopian".

The liberal notion of traditional citizenship has offered a base for the formation of global citizenship, and has thus greatly affected the understanding of it. Due to globalization, capitalist forces in this post-colonial world have also added their fair share of influence, making neoliberal citizenship to challenge global identities and spaces. How people perceive global citizenship and to what extent they perceive it to be global helps us to better comprehend to whom global citizenship actually belongs and on what basis. Its spheres of inclusion and exclusion are experienced through the bodies that travel in global spaces.

Although there has been advances in theorizing and debating global citizenship, "global citizenship as a practical ordering ideal and political agency is yet to establish strong roots" (Soguk 2014: 49). This study examines broadly what

global citizenship is, how we can understand it through feminist point of view and how is it seen through individuals (interviews).

## 1.1 Purpose and aim

Global citizenship is an ambiguous concept that should be addressed accordingly, not thrown in the air whenever possible, as the case might be e.g. in liberal contexts. The main difficulty is that it is given nuanced meanings in different situations and even in different cultures, which means that it has to be taken into account whose definition we are talking about and in what way. The concept is multilayered and offers a great opportunity for interpretation that is based on principles of intersectionality. Moreover, spaces, places and scales of globalization are multiple, intersecting and socially and politically constructed. Considering this, the research question is following:

To what extent is global citizenship universal and how does the application of feminist intersectional theory affect the understanding of it?

- In what ways does global citizenship mirror a hierarchical system of belonging?

In order to successfully analyze the concept properly, one has to divide the basic components of global citizenship. First, we have to understand how the general citizenship theories are connected to that. As mentioned above, global citizenship is after all only a concept, not a formal version of tangible citizenship. A proper citizenship or not, it is also important to study what kind of communities this creates. Global citizenship presents a few attributes that characterize it, one being e.g. the attribute of responsibility, which possibly can have some effects on civil society. The word “global” in itself situates the term strongly in the public sphere and that of world politics, making it an interesting concept for both politics and the market. Furthermore, aside from the political theory, it is possible to examine the concept of global citizenship in terms of identity building. It can be debated whether this identity brings a certain feeling of belonging as a political identity, and whether the existence of the concept tries to prove that belonging is not bound to a territory. However, having a broad range of theories that are tied together in the analysis, we can achieve a more profound understanding of global citizenship’s integral parts and sites of inclusion and exclusion.

The way this study is going to critically analyze the content of the concept is by using feminist theories and Crenshaw’s intersectional theory. Regarding globalization and different phenomena it has created, feminist perspectives can help us deepen our knowledge about (in this case) global citizenship’s effects, and how it can be approached from multiple points of view. In order to do a critical analysis about the construction of global citizenship, it is vital to consider race, ethnicity, class and gender. Consequently, these intersections support to form a

critical conceptual analysis and discuss how global citizenship can create otherness and exclude people from accessing certain sites of (global) civil society.

Regarding the research question, this study understands that despite the imagined equal construction of the concept of global citizenship, it is not fully equal: it is situated between public and private sphere, accessible to some and unattainable to others. The obstacles may be physical, but the sense of belonging also affects one's self-identification and identification of others.

## 2 Discussion of theories

To understand the current discussion about global citizenship and why it exists in the first place, one needs to have knowledge and awareness of the historical development of the concept of citizenship, and what academic influences led to the emergence (or rather, re-branding) of the concept of global citizenship. In this chapter, relevant terms are explained and a variety of theories are discussed in relation to the concept of global citizenship. Furthermore, feminist perspectives of intersectionality, agency and identities, as well as inclusive and exclusive dimensions are added to the framework.

### 2.1 Citizenship

Citizenship is one of the first established labels that help us categorize each other from the young age. If one holds a citizenship, one (legally) belongs and there is no question about it. Citizenship, identity and belonging get easily weaved into the same pattern, offering possibilities to interpret it and even exploit it in different ways and in different contexts.

Citizenship is closely connected to the functions of state and society. There are two main ideas of what citizenship is about: “one leading to a conception of citizenship as participation in civil society and the other a view of citizenship as a legal status based on rights and generally defined with respect to the state as opposed to civil society” (Delanty 2005: 93-94). To clarify the two discussions, republican and liberal understandings of citizenship are presented as mainstream debates and they ultimately “balance between rights and obligations and the nature of each” (Lister 2003: 13). The first mentioned view about citizenship embodied as participation in civil society indicates republican political theory (also known as classical republican theory), which emphasizes the existence of citizenship and civil society. Civil society, together with citizenship, creates an active dimension that defines the membership of a political community (Delanty 2005: 94). Civic republicanism highlights citizenship as obligation, in which “political participation as civic duty and the expression of the citizen’s full potential as a political being represent the essence of citizenship” (Lister 2003: 13). An individual, a “political agent”, is believed to be capable of being ruled and of ruling (Campbell et al. 2010: 23). Republican model thus takes a stand in defining the concept of citizenship strongly in relation to democracy.

However, the liberal understanding of traditional citizenship differs from classical republicanism in some ways. Like classical republican thought, the liberal notion concentrates on participation but more so in the context of legal

condition of citizenship, first and foremost the dimensions of rights and duties but also the further dimensions of participation and identity – a so-called full definition of citizenship. Rights and duties refer to the formal mode of citizenship, while participation and identity refer to substantive dimensions (Delanty 2005: 94). Classical liberal approach deems the formal civil and political rights crucial to be able to secure and protect the individual freedom, and those in the tradition of Marshall would also include “social rights as necessary to the promotion of a more positive notion of freedom” (Lister 2003: 15). Indeed, Marshall did clarify the concept of citizenship consisting of three components: civil, political and social rights. As mentioned above, the civil element is about all rights necessary for individual’s freedom, such as freedom of speech and the right to justice. The political element indicates the right to participate in the exercise of political power, for example by voting. Lastly, the social element gathers a variety of rights regarding economic welfare and security, social heritage and “to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society” (Marshall, 1950: 10-11 in Lister 2003: 16). Marshall’s theory of citizenship with its inclusion of social rights has later been interpreted as “the social democratic alternative to liberalism” (Delanty 2000: 20). As illustrated above, liberalism and the liberal notion of citizenship underlines rights within the legal status, whereas conservatism or classical republican theory stresses an individual’s agency and duties (Campbell et al. 2010: 23).

Certainly, social and cultural rights are somewhat contested forms of citizenship rights; they are claimed as too different from civil and political rights, and the validity of the extension beyond those rights is questioned. However, the category of social rights’ existence is important for a couple of reasons. For instance, Raymond Plant (in Lister 2003: 17) argues that individual autonomy should always be protected to enable individual citizens to pursue their own needs. This leads to a statement of human need – that an individual shall have the ability and possibility to determine the conditions of one’s life, and that the notion of autonomy is an integral part of social citizenship rights. This statement, however, becomes dubious in terms of global citizenship: it neglects the aspect of global community, feelings of togetherness and solidarity, and rather supports the way neoliberal global citizenship works. To continue about the existence of social rights, another reasoning is that the recognition of social rights as an element of citizenship helps to “promote the effective exercise of civil and political rights by groups who are disadvantaged in terms of power and resources” (ibid.). Lister means that the absence of the social dimension of citizenship would create such inequalities in the society and that those inequalities would undermine the meaning of equality in the other two parts of citizenship, the civil and political rights (ibid.).

Yet it is highly questionable whether citizenship already creates inequalities despite the existence of social dimension of citizenship or the lack of it. As already mentioned in the beginning of this chapter, the concept of citizenship can be divided as legal status and an activity that have long been in framed in the functions of the sovereign, territorial state (Campbell et al. 2010: 24). For a better understanding of the theoretical discussion, there is a need to clarify the difference

between a state and a nation, and how those are linked to inclusion and exclusion. Statehood is not equivalent to nationhood, since a nation is “a type of group identity”, and a state is a governance system (Scholte 2005: 228). Nations encompass a large population, who interact on different levels in different ways. For example, direct social contact is easier to reach in smaller-scale affiliations such as small ethnic groups and kinship circles. This collective identity is being demonstrated by attaching it to a specific territory, a “homeland” that is rooted in the identity even in some cases of diaspora (ibid. 227). Furthermore, a nation “defines itself through an emphasis of attributes that set it apart from other national groups”, which also means that they celebrate their uniqueness basing it on differentiation of groups (ibid.). A nation’s self-definition through certain characteristics can affect inter-*national* relations and draw contrasts between ‘foreigners’, as well as ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’. Therefore, citizenship and other entitlements can be used to differentiate who are ‘insiders’ and welcome to the community, and who are ‘outsiders’, i.e. rejected in one way or the other to take part in same services. A nation can aspire to become a state – following this logic, a nation-state is understood as a territorial, national homeland that is ruled by a national government. However, the spectrum of governance forms is a fact – many states today are not nation-states and many nations are not state-nations (ibid. 227-228). Similarly to differentiation of statehood and nationhood, citizenship does not equal nationality although state-centered governance structure and nationalist identities have been closely connected. Because of the association that a certain nation is linked with a certain state, they soon became synonymous to each other: when addressing international relations, the actual meaning was “inter-state” relations. Therefore it is important to note that in the same manner citizenship first and foremost refers to governance, while nationality refers to identity (ibid. 228).

According to the liberal-democratic theory, citizenship is supposed to be “the institution that provides political cohesion” (Castles & Davidson 2000: 84) but the *nationality* status has served as a political tool to create contrasts and divide a population. Lister (2003: 44) makes a notion that inclusion and exclusion can operate on various levels of the society. Delanty’s definition of the formal mode of citizenship referred to rights and duties, whereas Lister rather defines that as the legal status of membership of a state (Delanty 2005: 94, Lister 2003: 44). Both definitions indicate though that the legal status is formal but this understanding is connected to rights and duties that are part of the state of belonging to a state. Substantive mode refers to an individual’s general participation within the state, e.g. managing of the duties, but according to Delanty’s definition it also refers to identity (ibid.). By saying that inclusion and exclusion exist on different levels in the society, the focus in the word ‘society’ is not necessarily a nation-state or a state-nation, but it can also be a smaller-scale community or other particular groups. It means that exclusion can happen through visible borders but also through “structural or symbolic barriers” (Lister 2003: 44). Inclusion and exclusion also operate e.g. on supranational level of the European Union, creating cultural and physical boundaries (ibid.). Consequently, the formal citizenship might better favor certain groups of people while exposing others to

discrimination of different kinds. In case one mainly exists within the reach of substantive mode of citizenship, there might be a risk for harassment, violence and racial discrimination in the lack of formal rights to protect the individual(s) (ibid.). At the same time the symbolic holders of substantive mode of citizenship could be able to experience a sense of belonging that reinforces one's individual identity that is not bound to any formal modes or legal boundaries. Hence, exclusion and inclusion are not a binary system but rather a continuum that is shaped by different degrees of substantive citizenship. With regard to this it can be stated that exclusion and inclusion through citizenship can be better understood as a hierarchical system rather than a sharp division between citizens and non-citizens (ibid.).

Besides these interpretations the concept of citizenship can be described and analyzed further in multiple ways. Since globalized conditions have gained more importance, the discussion around citizenship has also evolved. We are supposed to be one human race and one world – but what do we actually call ourselves? Moreover, we are supposed to work for same causes and have a similar mindset to reach those goals – but what is it called and who dictates it? Nowadays the concept of citizenship is constantly undergoing change, and one can state that one of the most important of those changes is the changed relation of citizenship to nationality (Delanty 2005: 96). As to reinforce that statement with the words of Yuval-Davis (2011: 48), “not all citizenships involve the same kinds of participation and not all of them relate to citizenships in a state.”

## 2.2 Global citizenship

Since the times of Ancient Greece, people have been talking about and identifying themselves as citizens of the world or as the citizens of the universe (Campbell et al. 2010). The term global citizenship differs from the before mentioned in a sense that it has stronger connection to globalization and the globalized process of citizenship. The definitions of the origin of the term vary: some believe it started to form properly in the modern world after World War II, when the United Nations was established and the declaration of universal human rights was adopted in the 1940's (Bachelet, 2017). Some definitions rather focus on more recent occurrences, meaning that since the 1990's the term has become better known and more widely-spread mainly because of the acceleration of globalization (Campbell et al. 2010: 25).

Globalization has indeed given new meanings and dimensions to the concept of citizenship (Delanty 2005, Yuval-Davis 2011, Scholte 2005). The ‘holy trinity’ of people, territory and state “was always more fiction than fact” (Yuval-Davis 2011: 31) and the times of contemporary accelerated globalization has made it possible for people to add supraterritorial aspects to their personal identities (Scholte 2005: 116). In the previous chapter it was stated that one way for collective identities to express themselves and their belonging is through a nation and/or a territory. It is important to note that territorialism as the structure of

social space was interlinked with nationalism, and that this was the predominant world structure of collective identity until the middle of twentieth century. Given the acceleration of globalization, spreading interdependency and supraterritoriality and the general globalization of social space, there is an ongoing shift away from territorialism towards nonterritorial identities, which means that identities are increasingly more of a plural and hybrid character (ibid. 225). A “relative deterritorialization of social space” have gradually led to a “relative denationalization of social identity” (ibid.). This kind of process might naturally create counter-(re)actions, of which one example is nationalism. Following Scholte on his definition of nationalism, it is “where people construct their being, belonging and becoming first and foremost in terms of national affiliation” (ibid.). This could also apply to the construction of states and civil society associations, expressed and emphasized with national symbols. Despite the increasing hybrid character of identities, those who promote one’s nation, state or other specific belonging and those who are for the nonterritorial approach can easily end up in conflict with each other.

The idea of the “*kosmou politês* (world citizens)” (Nussbaum 2010: 29) and the term “global citizenship” has always been anchored in the philosophical thought of cosmopolitanism, even though the term “global citizenship” is far more common nowadays than is the term cosmopolitanism (Campbell et al. 2010: 25). Indeed, as Delanty (2005: 98) puts it, there is the idea of locating a form of citizenship in a transnational space, while on the other hand “there is the essentially cultural question of cosmopolitan citizenship, viewed as a particular consciousness toward the wider world” (ibid.). To illustrate the upcoming discussion, below is the definition of global citizenship by the United Nations Academic Impact (UNAI):

*Global citizenship is the umbrella term for social, political, environmental, and economic actions of globally minded individuals and communities on a worldwide scale. The term can refer to the belief that individuals are members of multiple, diverse, local and non-local networks rather than single actors affecting isolated societies. Promoting global citizenship in sustainable development will allow individuals to embrace their social responsibility to act for the benefit of all societies, not just their own.*

Besides the element of cosmopolitanism, there is also the element of citizenship that is a whole other topic in itself (see previous chapter). Global citizenship can be viewed as combining both the republican and liberal models of citizenship: republican model lends the elements of active participation, responsibility and civic virtue (e.g. actively participating in movements that address global issues), while the liberal model’s legacy lies mostly on the “emphasis on the protection of individual rights via its emphasis on protecting basic human rights” (Campbell et al. 2010: 25). Historically, the liberal model’s citizenship rights were extended to conquered people, which made the interpretation of the concept inclusive and expansive – these values are also embedded in global citizenship in its universality “to include all of humanity” (ibid.). As observed in UNAI’s definition

above, global citizenship often promotes the attributes of responsibility and active citizenship, as well as activities that enrich the community but also the individuals themselves. Participation seems to then stem from bottom-up, placing individuals with the will and responsibility to act, rather than the top-down view in which case participation would be ordered by an institution. The community where participation takes place naturally extends beyond the boundaries of a (nation-) state, and therefore challenges the dynamics of traditional citizenship (ibid.).

Citizenship can be approached as a *status*, something that emphasizes the rights of an individual citizen; and it can also be seen as a *practice*, which serves the interests of the wider society (Lister 2003: 15). The question arises in what ways it is possible to apply this to the concept of global citizenship. The status turns into identity – or the status of identity – vs. the practice, that is to say how people live their global citizenship on a regular basis, or how it possibly is institutionalized. But, it is unclear to what extent global citizenship deals with rights and obligations due to its lack of formal existence outside of the national or regional governance structures (Scholte 2005: 243). We can therefore pose the question whether global citizenship ever has the possibility of fulfilling the definition of a so-called full citizenship – or, if it was ever meant to do so in the first place. Since there is no formal kind of global citizenship (something that one can apply for, concretely receive and in that way officially become a global citizen), the above-mentioned definition underlines another dimension of citizenship, identity, as it states that “globally minded” individuals are members of a broad variety of networks, and that they can act on the shared identity. Accordingly, global citizenship is a category that “makes connections among human rights, human duties, and cosmopolitan beliefs” (Campbell et al. 2010: 25-26).

The concept of global citizenship has been criticized for various reasons, of which only few are mentioned on this instance but they are developed later on in the analysis. To begin with, some are skeptical about the coherence of the term: global citizenship is not legally bound to any sovereign state and therefore it might not be considered as legitimate or even convincing. As globalization makes this planet feel smaller, the growth of global civil society goes beyond national borders and boundaries, and we start to question the importance and the role of national citizenship (ibid. 26). Indeed we can pose the question whether the nation-state has become obsolete, but equally we can examine if citizenship has become to be in need of a complete make-over. Some alternatives already exist at least in the theoretical fields of political science and sociology, and a couple of examples will be presented in the end of the analysis (chapter 4).

All in all, this study generalizes the understanding of the concept of global citizenship into two main levels: that global citizenship operates within governance structures and therefore in policies, and within individuals as part of their identities. In the following sub-chapters the terms cosmopolitanism, communitarianism, and civil society will be discussed in relation to the concept of global citizenship, to give an insight of some understandings that have formed the concept of global citizenship as well as other perspectives that are useful for the general theoretical discussion.

## 2.2.1 Cosmopolitanism

In his book, Appiah (2006) starts by stating that we as a society are facing a challenge to reform our ideas and institutions according to the new understanding of living the reality as “the global tribe” (ibid. xi). Instead of proceeding his writings about the themes of globalization and identity, he chooses to focus on the analysis of cosmopolitanism and refusing to focus on globalization, with a particular argument that globalization is “a term that once referred to a marketing strategy, and then came to designate a macroeconomic thesis, and now can seem to encompass everything, and nothing” (ibid.). While this statement might amuse us, it has a seed of truth in it. The word ‘global’ is a buzzword that can be somewhat easily applied to nearly any kind of societal phenomenon. If applied to citizenship, we can ask ourselves whether global citizenship is in the same manner “a marketing strategy”, or such an abstract term that it ends up meaning everything and nothing. As stated above, the idea of global – or world – citizenship borrows its basic views mainly from the cosmopolitan theory. The term cosmopolitan came to signify “citizen of the cosmos”, from which cosmopolitanism was later developed. Regarding the meaning of citizens of the cosmos, a citizen belonged to a city to which they demonstrated loyalty, and the cosmos referred to the whole world, “not in the sense of the earth, but in the sense of the universe” (ibid. xii). Even now, in the so-called era of globalization, modest increases in universalistic cosmopolitanism have been observed, meaning that people indeed do identify themselves with a single community of all humankind that extends everywhere on earth (Scholte 2005: 226).

However, there is not one unified or monolithic understanding of cosmopolitanism (Held 2010: 15), which partly results in the complex and non-monolithic understanding of global citizenship as it is based to a great extent on the thought of cosmopolitanism. Societies are increasingly more interconnected and we are “unavoidably side by side (as Kant put it)” (ibid. 39). Despite this and the emergence of new expressions of citizenship, the existing academic literature does not adequately differentiate between cosmopolitanism and globalization: “Cosmopolitanism is not found exclusively on the global level but is also to be located on the local and national. It can also entail resistance to globalization” (Delanty 2005: 98). But since cosmopolitanism is shaping our common framework of institutional arrangements and citizenship, Held (2010) presents three sustained uses of the term. First account was explored by the Stoics who wanted to replace the central role of the polis in the lives of citizens, and re-determine that relation in terms of a harmonious, universal belonging in the cosmos. According to the Stoic philosophy, we are simultaneously living in two worlds, of which the first one is the local world and the other one is “truly great and truly common” (ibid. 15, 40, Nussbaum 2010: 29-30). The moral realm is a fundamental characteristic for the wider community, as there is equal worth of reason and humanity in every individual regardless groupings according to nation, ethnicity and class – thus these citizens of reason have a greater opportunity to solve collective problems because they are able to cooperate and focus on what is common for everyone. It does not imply that individuals should give up

affiliations to friends and family, but that they instead “acknowledge these as morally contingent and that their most important duties are to humanity as a whole and its overall developmental requirements” (Held 2010: 40). The Stoics also note that human beings are members of polities only by *chance* (cursive added). The boundaries of the polities – borders – blur the common conditions of humankind and thus, “could not have the moral significance frequently ascribed to them” (ibid. 41).

Second, another significant meaning is connected to the Enlightenment and especially the writings of Kant, although based on the work of the Stoics (Brown & Held 2010: 15). Kant linked cosmopolitanism with the standpoint of public reason and examined how that conception of reason can be used to critically analyze civil society. Kant argued that individuals are locked into different roles, practices and organizations of civil society, and therefore cannot fully explore the world. However, he also meant that people are (potentially) members of cosmopolitan society which guarantees them access to a sphere of reason free of authority. To participate in a cosmopolitan rather than a civil society would entitle “to enter the world of open, uncoerced dialogue” (Held 2010: 42), which was partly what Kant called as “cosmopolitan right”. Namely, cosmopolitan right entailed “the capacity to present oneself and be heard within and across political communities”, and to have the right to take part in dialogues without delimitations (ibid.). The third and last main conception of cosmopolitanism is a combination of three key elements: 1) egalitarian individualism – that all human beings are of equal worth and have equal liberty, and that everyone belongs to a single moral realm that presents same status for each and every person, which provides the capacity to make independent choices; 2) reciprocal recognition – which means that everyone acknowledges the status of equal worth of other human beings, not least when it comes to the basic decision-making organs in their communities; and lastly, 3) impartialist reasoning, which simply implies that all of our claims should be treated equally impartially. Equal treatment is consistently based on standards that can be universally shared and upon which all the people can act (ibid: 15, 44-47). All these elements are also intertwined with how cosmopolitanism can be embedded or at least influence global governance.

As becomes apparent in the previous chapter about citizenship, traditional statist approaches argue that rights and duties of a citizen are bound to sovereign communities, which oftentimes are states. According to this logic, citizenship does not have any meaning detached from that sphere (Linklater 1998). However, the cosmopolitan conception formulates the idea of citizenship in an opposite way: (cosmopolitan) citizenship is something that rather cannot be based solely on a territorial community, “but on general rules and principles which can be entrenched and drawn upon in diverse settings” (Held 2010: 179). This thought is constructed on the assumption of the existence of democratic principles and human rights. Consequently, instead of citizenship being a more or less exclusive membership all human beings would have equal rights and duties in the decision-making processes that affect their lives and needs (ibid.). So, *cosmopolitan* citizenship underlines the autonomy of each human being and since it is a universal approach, it is also referred as *world* citizenship. The term *global*

citizenship therefore ties together the notion of all people's equal value and freedom to determine the conditions that shape their lives, and that it is world-wide – global – referring to the globe, the planet Earth. This thesis' definition of global citizenship is based on the notion of cosmopolitan citizenship, as “cosmopolitan citizenship is a term that is best applied to the process by which critical and reflexive forms of belonging enter into discourses of belonging” (Delanty 2005: 98).

There are plenty of matters to discuss how well cosmopolitanist global citizenship has managed to root itself in the bureaucratic and civil society, and in what ways it has benefitted the society. Taking the division of universal and national for example, one could start by stating that national citizenships tend to create tensions with universal ethical commitments, but they also “create obligations to create wider dialogic communities” (Linklater 1998: 24). Indeed, the process of universalization of rights and reducing basic material inequalities have been some of the most powerful developments of modern societies. Honneth (in Linklater 1998: 24-25) also mentions the recognition movements of ethnic minorities, meaning that the practice of universalizing rights is indeed successful and contributes to a more just world. But even as the universalization and globalization's shared identities gain more understanding and popularity, the binary between nationalism and cosmopolitanism exists. Considering that there is a question to what extent the distinction between ‘the citizen’ and ‘the alien’ can stretch, cosmopolitan citizenship's moral relevance is tested and questioned. Whether living the shared identities and global communities is close interdependence or “increasing transnational harm”, it is argued that the nation-state is not the only or most important existing moral community (ibid.). Cosmopolitan sentiment and institutionalized cosmopolitanism have to be distinguished because they are acting on different levels of belonging and following different kinds of principles. The personal experience of cosmopolitanism is based on “a shared collective future” (Delanty 2005: 160), possibly blurring the boundaries of time, space and nation-bound memories. Institutional cosmopolitanism on the other hand embodies the human rights regime that aims to civilize the global society by promoting solidarity, democracy and social justice. However, these human rights regimes do not require diminished state power or the non-existence of nation-states, but they rather exist to address broader global questions and thus affecting global levels of governance (Held 2010: 177-178). That said, cosmopolitan moral norms affect our political and cultural community on local, national and global level, and challenge the national presuppositions. Political identities might still be anchored within a bounded territory, but there is definitely a sense of building a global community that aims to be – in cosmopolitan spirit – equal and equally accessible to every living human being (Benhabib 2006, Held 2002).

### 2.2.2 Communitarianism

The essence of communitarianism is about treating the community as the foundation of all civil society. While cosmopolitan citizenship lays more focus on the moral behavior of an individual, communitarian approach finds a wider community more sustainable. “Community” is often times emphasized in the context of the market and a state as the model of a society, because that is what has been considered as “public”. Yet, communities can naturally take many forms varying from political to cultural communities (and more), and they can be an important part of the process of political participation and identity building. Therefore the discourse about rights and duties, that are such an integral part of the general discussion of citizenship, take a backseat regarding communitarianism (Delanty 2000).

There are many branches of communitarianism that one can analyze, and this part summarizes a few of them only briefly. To begin with, liberal communitarianism addresses the need for “a positive recognition of cultural community” that “is anchored in a basic commitment to the liberal principle of equality” (ibid. 27). However, although the liberal communitarian discussion highlights the shift from universalism to particularism, the state usually recognizes the community of dominant culture as the only concept of community. This also leads to other minority communities and incoming groups having to adapt in the mainstream community, in order to participate in its politics and in other ways taking part in the political community in which citizenship exists. In other words, liberal communitarianism is mainly concerned about cultural identities, but the debate has also taken turns where national identities are praised. Although not populist, that kind of thinking could still undermine some aspects of global citizenship – at least in its purest sense of cosmopolitan citizenship. Particularism as a main point of view brings a very different understanding of the community of global citizens, for instance. While the liberal idea stands for the individual and their actions, communitarianism seeks to limit individual freedom in order to reinforce the power of the group. Hence, the group identities and bonds within a group are strong (ibid. 27-28).

Although it was noted that liberal communitarianism does not primarily center building identity of the community on the notion of the nation, it is more characteristic to the conservative side of communitarianism. Emphasizing values in communities and groups such as family, religion, tradition, nation and a general “culture of consensus”, conservative communitarianism takes a stance to praise national identities (ibid. 29). Because the collective identities of national identities are the predominant ones in this society, it is also obvious that “the promise of overall community must be redeemed” (Miller in Delanty 2000: 28). Accordingly, the community “allows people to regard themselves as active subjects shaping the world according to their will” (ibid.). Participation in that regard is a civic responsibility, but it also gives access to social goods.

Likewise, participation as a strengthening act of civic bonds is characteristic for civic republicanism (also known as civic communitarianism), a third category of communitarianism. In fact, participation is such an integral part of civic republicanism that rather than keeping up loyalty to an abstract ideal or identity, “it is more a question of commitment to achieving a common goal” (ibid. 35).

Civic values are established as publicly constituted, which implies that the emphasis is mostly on voluntary organizations, associations, occupational groups and corporations. Since this tradition differs from the ones mentioned above in regards to identity and the idea of moral responsibility, it can be stated that in comparison it becomes more political and also in more apparent resistance to populism. Although civic republicanism is often related with participatory democratic theory and therefore the theory of civil society, its public participation as the essence of civic bonds is still considered as a radical form of liberal individualism. Namely, individualism is not highlighted as the pursuit of personal interests or autonomy, but as commitment to public life – in other words, self-interest turns into public interest. Second, civic republicanism is considered as a tradition that does not have connections with privatism whatsoever. Given the public nature of civic republicanism, the ideal of the community is ultimately a self-governing mode (ibid. 29-31). This conclusion may result in a discourse challenging the state or at least questioning its functions. It can be debated whether the state decision-making and day-to-day processes are democratic and whether they truly let citizens participate in the public life. It is also worth questioning in what kind of sphere the strengthening of civic bonds takes place regarding the popularization of the concept of global citizenship – is it possible to make public interests matter most in a society that accommodates many different kinds of interests, both private and public? In a capitalism-driven society, is the grass-root level's pursuit of public good enough as it is?

Then again, theoretically speaking, many aspects of these communitarian discussions can be combined into what we call as strong democracy. Undoubtedly, “a democratic political system cannot be reproduced or strengthened without at least some minimum of active political participation of some citizens” (Bader 1995: 227). Strong democracy means that citizens are conceived as neighbors and active participants that are brought together by a common participatory activity, and they live in a political environment that is cooperative and active, encouraging and idealizing reciprocal empathy and respect as well as creating consensus through common talk and work (ibid. 228). Democratic citizenship thus emphasizes active civil society that holds the decision-makers accountable, since (most of) the citizens actively participate in political processes that matter for their community. However, it is contested whether democratic citizenship should be disentangled from membership as state membership. Historically we can see some proof that that kind of disentanglement has already taken place: as Bader puts it, “at the root of all versions of economic, industrial, or social (associational) democracy and of all forms of local, town hall, provincial democracy as well” (ibid. 224). That is to say, in the communities big and small.

### 2.2.3 Civil society

As pointed out earlier, civic republicanism lays the ground for the theory of civil society. One can think about civil society as an arena where the act of

participation in the political life happens. In short, civil society, together with citizenship, creates an active dimension that defines the membership of a political community (Delanty 2005: 94). Talking about the concepts of public sphere and civil society, they are, according to Delanty, frequently confused but “advocate some notion of a global civil society” (2000: 5). The difference between the public sphere and civil society is that they operate in completely distinct areas; the public sphere can be considered a more general domain where civic communication and cultural contestation takes place, whereas civil society is more specifically about mobilization and participation that strongly connects to citizenship and somewhat to the state (ibid.). For instance, civil society groups can work to bring greater public accountability into global politics, to monitor political situations and to lobby for changes. Although the consequences of civil society interaction and participation on global political matters have been modest, civil society actors – such as environmental movements, human rights advocates, local community groups, NGOs, and many more – are still taking steps towards democratic decision-making (Scholte 2005).

Civil society has traditionally been functioning in relation to a governance apparatus, as the statist world order has dictated. The acceleration of globalization has implied the redirection of the whole civil society: as governance dynamics in the world have become more polycentric, so have the focus areas of civil society actors become more diverse (ibid. 218). Mary Kaldor writes that one of the main objections to the notion of global civil society is the absence of the world state, but immediately points out:

*“However, it can be argued that the coming together of humanitarian and human rights law, the establishment of an international criminal court, the expansion of international peacekeeping, betoken an emerging framework of global governance, what Immanuel Kant described as a universal civil society, in the sense of a cosmopolitan rule of law, guaranteed by the combination of international treaties and institutions.”* (Kaldor 2003: 7)

This kind of civil society indeed sounds something where global citizens would probably likely to be operating, or the idea that the public has bought about how global citizens’ society would ideally look like. However, there are other aspects that would be fitting to the context of global citizenship. If one views global civil society as “globalization from below”, it would mean global developments below and beyond the state and international institutions (ibid. 8). For instance, civil society groups could create e.g. global culture, which could benefit global citizens. Alternatively, global citizens themselves – as an active group within civil society – would create and maintain that kind of culture. That situation transitioned to another meaning of global civil society would mean that global citizens could challenge the state power and demand redistribution of power – namely what Kaldor call as the activist version. It radicalizes the notion of democracy but at the same time extends the spheres of participation and autonomy. The activist version calls for active citizenship, although being activist and active citizenship should not be mixed carelessly. Active citizenship is not

quite equivalent to global citizenship: active citizenship rather emphasizes the local connections and the overall active participation in the local community through self-organization outside formal political circles, and is not necessarily operating on a global scale (Yuval-Davis 2011, Kaldor 2003). Given that global citizenship circles around topics like human rights, human duties and cosmopolitan beliefs, active global citizens can then be considered those who seek to understand the links between those topics. The attribute of responsibility is important in this context, as active global citizens try to make well-informed decisions and thus acting accordingly, in responsible ways (Campbell et al 2010: 26). As Delanty (2000: 19) puts it, one of the main problems with Marshall's theory is that his understanding of citizenship is highly passive, privatistic and does not have much to do with agency. However, looking at it from participatory point of view, the question of participation requires the question of rights and vice versa, which leads to the necessity of having an active dimension (ibid.).

According to the third meaning, the neoliberal version, civil society consists of associational life that is non-profit and voluntary. It keeps state power under control, but it can also function as a substitute to certain state functions to facilitate the state's part in economic globalization during the processes of privatization of democracy building, and branding of the civil society mainly as an arena for humanitarian work (Kaldor 2003: 9-10). Furthermore, the postmodern version combines the previous two versions of activist and neoliberal civil societies to create a pluralist understanding of a civil society that yet is built on one universal principle – tolerance. The concept has been criticized to be Eurocentric and that it is forced upon the rest of the world. Therefore some have suggested “a reformulation so as to encompass other more communalist understandings of political cultures” (ibid.).

## 2.3 Feminist perspectives

Feminist interventions in academic studies make an important contribution by arguing for the need to take into consideration matters that are often neglected or overlooked. Such matters can be as following: first, feminist perspectives seek to demonstrate that globalization's many spaces, places and scales are multiple, intersecting and socially constructed. For instance, national borders are socially and politically constructed. Secondly, feminist perspectives often focus on researching or highlighting subjects and actors that are neglected in the literature or some field of study. In this case, the study's aim is to examine how the application of feminist intersectional theory affects the understanding of the concept of global citizenship, and in what ways that mirrors a hierarchical system of belonging. Thus it is speculated that despite its universal name, the concept remains exclusive to certain bodies. That is to say, globalization and feminist studies in general operate and do research on multiple (geographical) scales: on a global, regional and national level, as well as on a community and household level, but also on the level of bodies. In the same manner do Nagar et al. (2002:

279) clarify that a feminist analysis insists on the importance of cultural and political meanings and engages analyzing power, and how power works on the above-named scales.

On Braidotti's account, feminist theory is built on "the question of subjectivity in the framework of questions about entitlement – that is to say, power" (1994: 237). Individuals are thus constructed as agents to whom the power relations are strongly connected to the lived experience and the so-called politics of location. In other words, the theoretical process is not "abstract, universalized, objective, and detached, but rather - - it is situated in the contingency of one's experience" (ibid.). This then implies that the analysis always mirrors one's personal location, as will also be seen in this study's analysis section and the interview materials. How people reflect on the concept of citizenship strongly follow their positions and privileges. The question is whether global citizenship aims to mean a "we" – in which case we can ask who is the "we", what and for who does it speak for and who gets to define the "we" – or whether it directs for a kind of separate imaginative community to which one can belong without any external pressure or the like, such as global citizenship simply being a form of self-identification and nothing else. Then however, it is a fact that the concept of global citizenship is political, and for choosing not to call it political runs the risk of sounding hypocritical due to its many interpretations mainly on social, political and economic levels.

Feminist perspectives can give insights about matters like global citizenship, shedding light on themes of social justice, equality and equity, which will be discussed more in the coming sub-sections and chapters. Following Scholte's approach, to achieve equality is not a process of eliminating all social categories and people becoming the same – "such uniformity is neither attainable nor desirable" (2005: 317). However, naturally it becomes unfair if an individual's social position dictates possibilities or access to resources (ibid.). The neoliberalist globalization has been one of the catalysts for a couple of negative consequences, of which we can name e.g. that people remain divided into social groups, of which all do not have the access to "free" and "open" global spaces. The flow of money and the redistributive mechanisms also matter in regards to global citizenship, as the system was created before globalization took off and the concept of global citizenship was on decision-makers' lips. Although we live in a fairly interconnected world, a realist world-view with governing states is still dominant – think for instance the signing of treaties and agreements that usually end up to favor the already benefitted (ibid. 319-320).

The ambition of this study is also to examine whether global citizenship is easier to attain by some social groups than others. But the analysis depends on how the concept of global citizenship is approached and placed in a wider context: one could solely base it on Marxist thought and claim that global citizenship is merely neoliberalist propaganda that partly is a product of capitalism. On the other hand, we could argue which social obstacle is the gravest in hindering the achievement of global citizenship or feeling the right to identify oneself as such. It is impossible to say which social barrier is the most common, although based on the empirical material it seems to be the economical one; to have enough money

to travel, to be able to look after possibilities in other countries, and to educate oneself. As it will become apparent, intersectional theory will help figure out an appropriate way of analyzing the material by not concentrating on one aspect of inequality, but many intersecting issues.

The upcoming theoretical section is divided into three smaller parts, which each go more into depth of the subject: first, principles of intersectionality are presented, second, body politics and last, neoliberal and postcolonial environment is discussed in relation to citizenship and global citizenship.

### 2.3.1 Intersecting issues

Intersectionality as critical inquiry directs focus on status quo and power relations in the society. As this study approaches the topic of global citizenship from an intersectional point of view, it is to understand human life rooted in the experiences of people. Moreover, it is “an important tool linking theory with practice that can aid in the empowerment of communities and individuals” (Collins & Bilge 2016: 36). If race, gender, ethnicity and other categories would be ignored in the analysis, it would probably result in a very one-sided story of an experienced reality, even in the context of discussing global citizenship. So what does intersectionality mean more specifically? As already expressed, “the events and conditions of social and political life and the self can seldom be understood as shaped by one factor” (ibid. 2). The factors of power are operating in more than one axis, meaning that people are not only divided into social categories like gender and class, but that those factors influence each other and demonstrate a complexity of a self and the society. For example, a person has a legal citizenship status but lacks the money for education (class), and faces discrimination due to their religion and ethnicity (ibid.). Alternatively it could be that a person is earning well enough and has been educated, but is still rejected due to their gender identity. Additionally, the global North-South divisions and its impacts on social equality should be considered (Scholte 2005: 320).

Intersectionality’s core ideas can be divided into six thematic categories: social inequality, power, relationality, social context, complexity and social justice. They first and foremost emphasize different perspectives when it comes to analyzing inequalities and power relations that arise from the intersection of capitalism, neoliberalism and nationalism. Relationality on the other hand emphasizes the analysis of difference between entities, and their interconnections. For example, class situation might not be the only reason for why the concept of global citizenship is not perceived as equal by some. That said, there could be other factors that complement that explanation: ethnicity, gender, race, age, and others in varying degrees. To be able to do all this, the analysis of power relations has of course to be placed in the right context, and consider that its complicity is truly complex. Lastly, the aspect of social justice involves the themes of fairness and discrimination. Fairness is peculiar in a sense that in democratic societies, for instance, “everyone has the “right” to vote, but not everyone has equal access to do so” (Collins & Bilge 2016: 29). One could conclude similarly about global

citizenship: everyone has the right to be part of it (could we even say, that the name almost *invites* people to be part of it), but in the end the reality does not live up to the globally including name of the concept. It is fairly easy to fall into thinking that social equality and fairness are already achieved, and that opinion also tells about the individual's position and privilege to say that kind of thing. In other words, the idea of social justice is to rather question the status quo, than to accept the way the society is at the moment.

### 2.3.2 Bodies in global spaces

“In the feminist framework, the primary site of location is the body” (Braidotti 1994: 238). Indeed, social justices and injustices are always experienced in some people's bodies, and that is why the feminist research that follows the bottom-up approach (or, ladder) makes the analysis of the material all the more interesting. Braidotti (*ibid.*) goes as far as saying: “The subject is not an abstract entity, but rather a material embodied one. The body is not a natural thing; on the contrary, it is a culturally coded socialized entity.” The treatment of bodies reveals e.g. the power relations in the society: are there any certain types of bodies that do not get access to certain places and spaces, and why is that? What are the intersections of their appearance and identity that makes something unachievable?

The dimensions of inclusion and exclusion hence operate alongside with intersectional bodies and global spaces. In fact, inclusion and exclusion are the essence of citizenship as a concept and a practice – citizenship always functions in a more or less including manner (Lister 2003: 44). The consequences of that “are gendered and racialized, albeit in ways which reflect specific national, cultural and historical contexts. - - These patterns in turn generate differential opportunities for and constraints upon the exercise of agency” (*ibid.*). Indeed, feminist analysis tends to emphasize human agency. According to Nagar et al (2002: 279), the emphasis on agency “calls attention to the resilience and creativity with which people and communities survive, accommodate to, and resist global processes”. For instance, citizenship as participation can represent human agency. Likewise, citizenship as rights makes it possible for people to act as agents. The main thought of human agency is that individuals are constructed as autonomous and capable of choices, and as actors that pursue self-development (Lister 2003: 37-38). If everyone is equally constructed as human agents with free choice and self-development, then there should not be any reason why some people would have a greater chance to exercise this capacity than another: “domination of one group by another constitutes a denial of the conditions of equal agency” (*ibid.* 38). In a way global citizens are constructed as agents with free choice and self-development, at least by the understanding of some, but here one must ponder whether that truly applies, or if this is only true to a part of population that has enough social power to be able to demonstrate something like that. Then again, part of the character of human agency is to resist relations of domination and recast individuals as active citizens. Mahmood (2006: 33) also suggests that it is beneficial to try to think about human agency not only as an act

of resistance towards power relations, but “as a capacity that historically specific relations of subordination enable and create”. Yet, human agency is still not that straightforward: following Lister’s (2003) clarification in terms of traditional citizenship, the belief that one can act is the first step that is required for agency. That is also the case in global citizenship – one understands that they have a possibility to act, and maybe they even verbalize the cause for why they act. Consequently, collective action encourages the sense of agency. That is to say, agency is also about *conscious* capacity to choose and act, and that on the other hand is important for individual’s self-identity (ibid. 39).

The concept of global citizenship resonates in a space of a globe, in which the bodies – agents – are operating and in which the experiences take place. “To analyze social phenomena adequately, we have to locate them in space” (Massey, 1993, p. 155 in Castles & Davidson 2000: 76). To put it in the other words, we analyze global citizenship from a feminist intersectional angle, but also taking into account the spatial aspect of it. Certain bodies can enter in certain (global) spaces – that is probably familiar to many from debating international migration flows. Relations and experiences always take place in a space, which implies that “no description of a social circumstance is complete without a spatial component” (Scholte 2005: 60). As pointed out above, the North-South juxtaposition creates inequalities but also spatial inequalities. As it will appear in the analysis, some empirical material states that the global South might put different meaning to the concept of global citizenship and regard it merely as a non-desirable invention rather than something that the Western world urges youngsters to crave. Furthermore, politics of space can be discussed with intersectionality. For example, social space is divided according to class (Elden 2007). As he expresses it, capitalism has made it this far on the sole basis for being flexible in “constructing and reconstructing the relations of space and the global space economy, in constituting the world market” (ibid. 106). Therefore, “there is a politics of space because space is political” (ibid. 107).

### 2.3.3 Politicizing global citizenship

Considering that the concept of citizen is related to the liberal state, then the concept of global citizen implies the neoliberal state (Chapman et al. 2018: 145). The liberal understanding of citizenship places rights and responsibilities as central definitions of citizenship, which also emphasizes the functions of a nation-state. Liberal internationalist world order has become supported and upheld by privatizations and market liberation, which in turn indicates blooming neoliberalism. Due to globalization, the neoliberal state “claims that it seeks to remove the boundaries of nation-states for the purpose of conducting global economic transactions in the name of free trade” (ibid.). Following this logic, the only true global citizens then could be big corporations that have established themselves across the globe (ibid.). Historically speaking, liberalism has been linked with capitalism, imperialism, ableism and the patriarchal state, and has thus been criticized for its exclusive nature. “The liberal dream of universal

citizenship” is restricted to “a small minority of the world’s mostly rich, mostly male, mostly white, mostly straight, mostly Northern and mostly able-bodied people” (ibid. 146-147).

Moreover, given the Western democratic influence on the basic concept of citizenship, signs of white and Western hegemony is still imprinted in the globalized citizenship. First example of this is the sheer lack of non-Western theories in envisioning cosmopolitan citizenship. Secondly, global migrants and those who lack citizenship status are struggling trying to make it in the normative Western hegemonic structure of citizenship, where it is only reserved for a certain group of people (Lee 2014: 76).

Lee (ibid.) extends the description of Western hegemony by describing it as deep and pervasive “Western contamination of citizenship”, which has consequently created a counter-project of decolonization of global citizenship. The liberal dream of global citizenship that Chapman et al (2018) say is dedicated to a small minority of people is indeed a bundle of mysteries to others. Capitalist imperialism has worked its way to able those who already are abled become global citizens, while the rest are seduced by it, yet “mystified” (ibid. 147). The “neoliberal propaganda”, as Chapman et al express it, wants us to believe that there is a global communality between us, but on the other hand it never addresses the inequalities and inequities that are created by favoring an already privileged part of population: “Materially, we are not born equal. Global corporate capitalism would not function if we were” (2018: 153).

However, Lee (2014) comes to the conclusion that while we should strive to challenge the status quo and envision how the world “can be”, or “should be”, the only way to really achieve those visions are through democratic decision-making – state-bound as we are – but because of that process they “can never be fully completed” (ibid. 84). Due to the crisis in neoliberalism there have been attempts to reformulate the meaning of citizenship and other political memberships. If something positive is to come out of this discussion, it is that the state system will never necessarily be able to dictate how individuals are identifying themselves and how they themselves are determining their personal belonging. This process of self-identification can also play a major part in an individual’s feeling of belonging to the global village.

## 2.4 Politics of belonging

Until the accelerated globalization around in the middle of the twentieth century the most predominant way of identifying oneself was through nationalism and a nation, a collective identity. Naturally this process of globalization has created trans-world connections, which have encouraged the emergence of nonterritorial identities and solidarities (Scholte 2005). However, as already stated earlier, the nation-state and national identity have hardly become completely obsolete in today’s world. Many nations actually thrive in this global environment: “the end of *nationalism* has not entailed the end of *nationality* in the sphere of identity”

(ibid. 226). Furthermore, as one's identity attributes intersect and further form the identity, so can geographical identities mix and converge on the individual level. A person might have a state-nationality, region-nationality (for instance, European identity), belong to a global diaspora, as well as having adopted a nonterritorial identity (e.g. global citizenship) (ibid.).

Identities – “constructions of being, belonging and becoming” (ibid. 224) – also question the meaning and matter of home. “Home” is after all rarely directly defined as the globe, and so for many people home is rather a more defined geographical place on earth, like a country or a city, or the unit of family. Identity and belonging also draw upon the meaning of culture. Culture is no longer fully divided into neat categories, and that also contributes to the complex identity construction. Cosmopolitanism means that we incorporate traces of many cultural systems into our lives, but on the other hand this kind of cosmopolitanism is absurd because it attempts to keep cultures unchanged. Cultures constantly change, as do identities, too. As Hall (2002: 27) expresses it,

*“We need attachments but each person can have a variety, a multiplicity of [cultural identities and rights] at their command. They need to stand outside them, reflect them and to dispense with them when they are no longer necessary. And this is a view of ‘the cosmopolitan self’, which is the only kind of self that is adequate to a modern cosmopolitan environment.”*

Likewise, the same applies to global citizenship: the embodied experience of the concept changes the meanings of the self and culture. The liberal universal notion on which the thought of cosmopolitanism is grounded basically means that it guarantees freedom and equality to everyone no matter what background they have. But Hall declares liberal universalism is not changing sufficiently, or fast enough to adapt into its new embedded circumstances, nor is it fully revising itself in the light of those conditions (ibid. 28).

Identification shall be constructed on cultural meaning and embedded in imagined community (ibid.). The sense of belonging in this case is symbolic. Westwood and Phizacklea (2000) open up this understanding by debating “political love” and “correlative imaginaries”. The former, as they put it, is one way to express and emphasize the “nationness”. Alternatively, in this particular case, it would rather emphasize the feeling of belonging as a global citizen, sharing the one world with other people. Westwood and Phizacklea argue that the sense of belonging is formed by “specific moments, which tie individual biography and national history together” (ibid. 11). Although largely focused on nation building, this could be a demonstration of emotional investments that are related to the identity and called upon in certain situations, as e.g. occurrence of environmental problems and issues that are not confined within one nation-state. Relating to identity construction as a global citizen, imagined communities are part of a framework of “correlative imaginaries” in which individuals can place themselves and produce their own form of identification between the self and the social (ibid. 41-42).

Moreover, the wandering and traveling that is sometimes associated in some definitions of global citizenship, reveals yet another layer to analyze. If nomadism

is about *choice*, then, it merely indicates “a liberal narrative of subject who has autonomy and is free to choose” (Ahmed 2000: 83). This demonstrates a subject who indeed is privileged, and for whom the meaning of home does not affect their ability to occupy a space. In other words, global citizens do have a choice, or at least certain autonomy to do independent decisions. Wherever they go on this globe, they are home.

# 3 Methodology

## 3.1 Research design

To begin with, this essay is a qualitative study using conceptual and dialogical narrative analysis to be able to answer to the research question: “To what extent is global citizenship universal and how does the application of feminist intersectional theory affect the understanding of it?” and the sub-question “In what ways does global citizenship mirror a hierarchical system of belonging?” The purpose is to analyze the concept: to deconstruct the concept of global citizenship in all its multilayered character, and study what it entails from a feminist perspective. In other words, the way to interpret the theory is to break it down in a coherent way according to a set of theories that are discussed and examined in contrast.

Conceptual analysis alone could do for this purpose, but with gathered empirical material and other observations it will appear more holistic and complete. Since the research question aims to find out how feminist intersectional theory can help to critically examine global citizenship, it is vital to take into account personal experiences and discuss how those experiences are interconnected to the universality of global citizenship and the lack thereof. Transcribed material can be considered as narratives, and those are usually different kinds of personal stories – especially in this case as the aim was to hear how individuals associate global citizenship or whether they themselves consider being global citizens (see Appendix 7.1). Dialogical narrative analysis (DNA) can be described as stories that “reshape the past and imaginatively project the future”. Moreover, stories are said to “revise the people’s sense of self” (Frank 2012: 33), exactly what this study was prepared to find out. As it will become apparent later in the analysis, some stories overlap in certain similar recounts, but they also stand in strong contrast with some. They tell us interviewees’ views about the political world, their childhood memories, stories that they’ve heard, and what their current situations and opinions are and why. This essay retells parts of those stories that are apprehensible in the theoretical context. However, it should be noted that while analysis and conclusion needs to remain unchanged, research as a dialogue requires constant and continuing change. People tell stories but these, too, change, as does their self-understanding to which stories are based (ibid. 37).

Moreover, this study is also aware of its possible biases. As Jackson (2010) points out, the researcher is ultimately the one who chooses what knowledge to include and what not to include. The researcher should be aware of their own standpoint that in this case is a Master student, born and raised in Finland, and an actively engaged volunteer in the civil society. This might leave its mark in the

study and maybe read between the lines. Biases can be due to the researcher's existing connection to a key group, which in this case is a group of citizens that are interested in reviewing the concept of global citizenship. However, this can be the result of the researcher's holistic view of that part of social reality, and because of our own awareness of multiplicity of epistemic biases (ibid. 157). DNA poses a similar question as well, namely what reasons does the researcher as storyteller have to tell this story at this time. And more interestingly, how does the researcher's identity sustain "in response to whatever threatens to diminish that self or identity" (Frank 2012: 33) when stories can indeed create whole new group identities and understandings.

## 3.2 Interviews

The number of interviews for this study was set to ten, which was found as a suitable number to settle on, as the answers started to get somewhat comparable and similar along the process of gathering data. The length of all interviews ranged between 20-60 minutes and the interview format was semi-structured. This study was able to use some snowballing effect to its advantage, which also shows that people were eager to reflect about the meaning of the concept of global citizenship. While the ambition was to interview individuals from different countries and continents, as indeed successfully happened, most of the respondents held European passports (Turkey and Russia included). All in all, persons who participated in the study held citizenships from following states: Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Russia, Turkey and Ecuador. It might have offered richer points of view if other regions and nationalities had been targeted as well, but then again that group already possesses different kinds of experiences, races and ethnicities, which can contribute positively to the outcome of this study.

As debated in the theoretical section of this paper, there are multiple theoretical understandings that one can relate to the concept of global citizenship. Similarly, it should be taken into consideration that the respondents too had their own ideas of it, although the interviewee group consisted of people who are students in fields of political science, migration, gender and other sociological studies. Conducting interviews with university students possibly studying the subject of course sets a different kind of challenge for the researcher: there is a chance to challenge them and use their knowledge as an advantage for the study, but at the same time their answers are influenced by their acquired knowledge – compared to interviewing people with little or no knowledge on the theoretical subject. Due to our different levels of accessing and understanding the topic, the results are not necessarily easy to generalize.

Although certain risks were acknowledged, the interviewees were selected around the areas of Malmö and Lund only, simply due to the geographical closeness. The main criteria was that the persons would be university students doing their Master degree, around their twenties or early thirties, as the researcher themselves belongs to this target group. However, it was considered that this

particular age group would have a strong connection (or strong opinions) about living the globalized era and possibly identifying as global citizens. Moreover, people who had some theoretical knowledge, opinions or interest on the subject were welcome to participate.

### 3.3 Delimitations

This study naturally faces some delimitations. First of all, it is not a study about how global citizenship affects global migration or vice versa. Topics close to migration naturally come up when researching globalization and free movement is related to citizenship, but in this case migration is only taken into account as how the interviewed persons tell about their experiences and how they think that is connected to global citizenship. Because citizenship is related to belonging and becoming, it is inevitable to mention diaspora movements and migration in general, and in that way, how the bodies are perceived.

All ten interviews provided empirical material so that this study's many theoretical topics could be covered. As in all academic knowledge-production, knowledge shall be constructed through multiple observations. This study has tried its best to make versatile notes and gathering diverse opinions about the concept of global citizenship. It covers quite many subjects ranging from citizenship and community to body politics and identity politics, and therefore may partially seem to remain more or less superficial and simplified. Hearing more stories and/or focusing on certain theoretical parts could of course result in further research in the future.

## 4 Analysis

To begin with, and as it has already come forward, global citizenship can be considered an umbrella term which leaves a considerable amount of space for individuals to interpret the concept according to their experiences and thoughts. The first part of the analysis is going to present thoughts from the interviews about what global citizenship entails and how global citizens can be defined; the second part discusses the issues around the term global and explores the concept from an intersectional point of view; third and final part discusses locations and identifications within the global and elsewhere. Throughout the analysis empirical testimonials are going to be present and make a connection between the already discussed theoretical aspects and the lived experience.

### 4.1 Who is, what is?

Oftentimes we hear global citizenship in rather ambiguous contexts – it “is often simply announced rather than exemplified or substantiated” (Soguk 2014: 49), resulting to many varying conceptions. Theoretically, as Soguk describes, the concept refers to the spheres of (global) citizenship, from human rights activism and environmental advocacy to multinational corporatism. However, the most apparent association with global citizenship is its theoretical closeness with territorial citizenship (ibid.). Interestingly, this is also evident in the respondents’ views: many associated global citizenship with mobility that is connected to an individual’s passport, then to national citizenship, and then to nation-state and nationality. The aspect of mobility is certainly one of the main defining characters in the minds of the respondents. For instance, a holder of Turkish citizenship opines:

*“I would think [a global citizen is] a person with very high chances of mobility, above everything because it really makes the division among the people. Like in this globalizing world some people have possibilities to move a lot, compared to other people. So it is a very important aspect to which I think is related to your citizenship, which intersects with your citizenship because it sort of... citizenships provide you more freedom of movement. Also in life conditions. For example, if you’re from Sweden, and your passport helps you to move more, so you can be in different places, you can travel more, when there is an event you can go. But if you’re from another country with less mobility possibilities, then it is more difficult. So in this sense my first word for global citizenship would be mobility.”*

This description also reveals the thought of “better” passports that guarantee a different freedom, autonomy and possibilities than the rest. Freedom is thus the basic definition of global citizen – a person who is relatively detached of all boundaries and physical borders, being almost like a utopian embodiment. Sceptics may say that global citizenship in that regard does not exist due to the state-centered governance system (which still is dominant to a large extent, despite of globalization and the political changes it has brought with it). If we take into account the comment above about mobility, some would argue that citizenship does not give us the same opportunities, and that the idea of global citizenship is an idealistic dream since we live in the world of states that define our existence. Global citizenship is then deemed as unequal per se because certain citizens have an easier access to global spheres.

Other qualities, like open-mindedness, capability to think critically, being able to relate to the world through the actions of one’s own and of other people, and having knowledge (or having educated oneself) about the world were also listed quite high when determining the meaning of global citizenship. One respondent proposed that global citizens would be against nations and nationality:

*“They are obviously critical of existence of different factors and I believe the basis of this concept can be - - [a] critical approach to nations and nation-states.”*

Likewise, another respondent pointed out that if someone defines themselves as global citizens, “then you really have an opinion about how you want the world to look like”, meaning that the person then is actively involved in trying to fight inequalities and building for a more sustainable world.

One can question where the line is drawn for who are considered as global citizens and who are not. Despite the promotion of global citizenship there are also movements of political nationalism that advocate for self-determination of the nation and the state, borders, and the pursuit of national interests (Held 2010: 93-94). The struggle between balancing nationalistic forces and cosmopolitan approaches is reflected on the subjects’ responses on why they think global citizenship exists or needs to exist. As a Turkish citizen recounts, mobility and freedom can be determined by state structure, but on the other hand the concept of global citizenship can be considered as one’s world view:

*“If you are a person who is nationalist, who has nationalistic values, who is xenophobic, who’s racist, you know... with very hostile towards other ethnicities so then in philosophic dimension of it, you cannot be considered as a global citizen. Because then you don’t imagine a world with less boundaries and more connections between different nations or societies, or you don’t think of post-nations or society, where people are more bound with other bonds than these imaginary national boundaries.”*

As mentioned in 2.2, citizenship can be discussed from a perspective of status or practice, and so we can examine cosmopolitanism in which global citizenship is mostly anchored. Namely, cosmopolitanism as an attitude can signal “a unique outlook” or “a state of mind”, and result in “an intellectual and aesthetic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences” (Vertovec & Cohen 2002: 13). If one is not open to the world, how can one then be a global citizen? By acquiring such an outlook through experiences, e.g. travels, increases the feeling of familiarity and strangeness anywhere in the world (ibid.). Travels and contacts can expand one’s horizons and as Benhabib (2006: 150) writes, Kant meant that to *seek access to others* is a universal moral right. But, this does not mean that “travel and commerce alone can generate a cosmopolitan spirit” (ibid.). German citizen points out an important aspect questioning the care-free cosmopolitan view by separating agents’ different lived experiences and situating their view in the state politics:

*“I think the most problematic thing with global citizenship for me is that [if] you are objected to a structural discrimination in your own community or country, before you are accepted in the country or before your rights are granted in that country, you wouldn't consider yourself a global citizen. You wouldn't consider yourself to be European before you are considered [to be] German. - - Being a global citizen as a self-identity has the tendency to imply the privilege of not having to worry about your local or national identity, or your access to resources and power in your own country. - - It can be a vision but we cannot pretend that we all are global citizens.”*

Hence, global citizens have access and resources to spheres where others cannot enter, they can *choose* to be global citizens, whereas those whose rights haven’t been as clearly defined have to fight to be recognized and treated as global citizens.

## 4.2 Existential issues

### 4.2.1 Global status

Achieving global citizenship is not as simple as taking national citizenship and starting to call it global citizenship. Certain characteristics remain the same, but many things are also in sharp contrast with each other. For instance, as described in 2.1, liberal notion of traditional citizenship emphasizes that formal civil and political rights are crucial to protect and secure individuals’ freedom, but this statement is very problematic in the case of global citizenship. First, one can question what the freedom is actually for: freedom of e.g. traveling or freedom of securing one’s basic human rights are completely different things, yet freedom is hardly determined in terms of global citizenship. The civil element of rights and freedom discussion is, as mentioned, the right to justice. Kant, who greatly

influenced the contemporary discussion about cosmopolitanism, argues that “the greatest problem for the human species, the solution of which nature compels him to seek, is that of attaining a civil society which can administer justice universally” (Brown & Held 2010: 15). His vision of “establishing a perfectly just civil constitution” includes creating a society “in which freedom under external laws would be combined to the greatest possible extent” (ibid.). The power of democratic forces already exists within global civil society, monitoring the general freedom of all people, but the global human rights regime (as all of the global governance organs) are founded upon the international community whose focus primarily lies on the acts of sovereign nations. The diplomatic soft power of humanitarian interventions calls for “the constitutionalization of international law” (Benhabib 2006: 71-72). Coming back to Kant’s influence on the discourse of justice, a German citizen formulates the activities of global citizens as a spectrum, through which one can measure how much they are as global citizens, and urges global policy- and decision-makers to make decisions that truly cover everyone’s human rights and minimize discrimination:

*“As I said, global citizenship has these activities that vary in intensity or on the level in which you are active, or I think if you look at for example identity maybe your identity first needs to be accepted before you can feel that you are a global citizen. Why would you feel yourself as global citizen in your own country, if you experienced racism? - - The dialogue about global citizenship is not accessible for everyone, and the definition – the academia and the policy level – that is not accessible for everybody. Maybe if the concept is implemented in the policy there are more civil society organizations present in the discourse to talk about global citizenship, or to create policies that promote more global justice.”*

As debated in 2.2.2, cultural communities are based on the liberal notion of equality, and according to that, the liberal communitarian discussion highlights the transition from universalism to particularism. We then have to question whether it is possible to compare liberal communitarian theory to the cosmopolitan theory, because otherwise the view of freedom would be contradictory. If the status of global citizenship is not legal, then can we grant any rights based on the liberal view? However, as also discussed in 2.2.2, particularism as a main view would seek to reinforce the power of the group, which could mean that global citizens’ identity would grow stronger. Hence, active citizens that are empowered by this kind of community would also want to shape their society as they wish it to be, and gain access and participate in the democratic decision-making.

As Lister (2003: 18) points out, post-structuralists reject the idea of universal rights completely, and radical feminists tend to “dismiss rights as merely the expression of male values and power”. Historically, women were excluded from accessing citizenship which has resulted in two intertwined constructs of gender-neutral citizen and rendered invisible female citizen. Comparing this to the concept of global citizenship and trying to categorize it, we can see some

similarities: global citizenship falls under “Public, male, citizen” more than it does on “Private, female, non-citizen”. For instance, it could be described as being abstract, disembodied, being “able to apply dispassionate reason and standards of justice”, being “concerned with public interest”, and additionally being independent and active, as well as “upholding the realm of freedom of the human” – that is to say, all of them male qualities of citizenship that through traditional citizenship theory defines the political agency of global citizenship (Lister 2003: 71). In a similar way we can debate to what extent citizenship (and global citizenship) needs to be regarded “as an abstract category of ‘the citizen’ or as an embodied category, involving concrete people who are differently situated in terms of gender, class, ethnicity, sexuality, ability, stage in the life cycle, etc.” (Yuval-Davis 2011: 48). Furthermore, feminists and anti-racists have tended to focus on the embodied category and “thus de-homogenized the notion of citizenship” (ibid.). A Finnish citizen points out the problematics of homogenizing concept and doubts whether the concept of global citizenship can take the particularities into account well enough:

*“For me it [global citizenship] as a concept ties together notions of heterogeneity under homogenizing concept, and then erases particularities in areas where it would have been important to notice particularities, and aims at erasing it. So I think if we’re talking about for instance queer politics, it is really an issue - or the struggle for recognition is an issue for different... I think them saying queer issues are global issue, or civil societal issue, of course it goes under a large umbrella but first and foremost it aims at erasing different nuances that are important to get acknowledged.”*

Some have highlighted the importance of context when addressing the issue of citizenship rights. They “point to the gap that can exist between formal rights and ‘really existing citizenship’, which depends on the ability to access and exercise rights” (Lister 2003: 18). The question is whether free and equal political participation also applies on global citizenship or whether it is only an abstract and for some unattainable reality. A German citizen shares their experience and opinion about a reversed situation, where people “gone global” are actually those creating and upholding boundaries:

*“I think the danger of using the terminology is to possibly also create a facade that you are actually not you living with those principles, but saying you are a global citizen. Coming back to the UN, that you always stay in the hotels and you keep with your expats who are from the same country even though you have been living in Shanghai for years and you don't even speak the language. So I think a few people might on the surface claim that instead of really being it. This could kind of distort the essence of global citizenship. They pretend to be that open-minded but actually expats create a little bubble for their own security and so that their culture can live on, an alienated world almost.”*

Marginalized groups and “outsiders” are that primarily because of their capability of participating less in the decision-making processes and institutional sphere that shape their lives. Thus it results to an “impaired agency” (Held 2010: 45-46) that deceives the basic meanings of cosmopolitanism.

Formal mode of citizenship stands for the legal status of membership of a state (as possessing a passport), while substantive mode of citizenship means the possession of rights and duties within a state (Lister 2003) – neither of them genuinely applies to global citizenship, yet global passport puzzles interviewees and makes them wonder how belonging is achieved and privilege created. If “the freedom of each person underpins the freedom of all others” (Held 2010: 43), the universal system of cosmopolitical governance seems rather ill-advised addressing the uneven distribution of privileges through possession of national citizenship. Passports as the symbol of mobility divide and affect the concept of global citizenship in a following way according to a Russian citizen:

*“Well then there’s the very fact that we are still bounded by passports does not make the concept very falsifiable. It might be connected to some citizens trying to claim themselves as global citizens, oh well having the chance to travel around the world and participate in activities all over the place, all over this planet, this sphere. But for me it has always been a question of class, and citizenship. Like the German citizenship is the best and the Afghanistan citizenship is the worst. And the amount of countries without visa you can get to.”*

Also, a similar testimonial from a Turkish citizen tells that she views e.g. German citizens as automatically global citizens because the passport gives physical access to most countries. Having political influence and being “a strong country” is an asset for guaranteeing its citizens the promise of global citizenship. The same person also gives a practical example:

*“It [global citizenship] can be too idealistic. Like, if my visa is expiring in the end of June, I have to go back to my country of nationality. I have to be there, my body is not wanted in Europe anywhere! Maybe I’m too dramatizing but it’s really like if my residence permit is expiring, I have to leave. Otherwise if I try to pass the border into this... I might not be able to enter Europe again. And then... “I’m a global citizen!” They wouldn’t listen to that.”*

It would certainly be quite complicated to create transnational institutions which secure legal, political, social and cultural rights, implementing the ideals of cosmopolitanism and global citizenship (Linklater 1998: 33). However, to avoid the formation of outsiders and other vulnerable groups, global governance organs should probably concentrate in creating a mutual post-sovereign solution instead of encouraging tightly-knit regional societies. Taking for example European “unification” (Bader 1995: 224), collective political identity develops both contradictions but also possibilities. Cosmopolitan citizenship as a moral belief expresses that “outsiders should not be at the mercy of the economic, political and

military power which one's society or region has at its disposal" (Linklater 1998: 34).

But, although cosmopolitan citizenship is a moral reference, even that concept travels and takes various forms. Cosmopolitanism is often regarded as "a liberating alternative to ethnic and nationalistic chauvinism" (van der Veer 2002: 165). However, it is questionable to what extent one wants to engage with the other, and how much one has to homogenize in order to call it colonialization (ibid.). Considering global citizenship to be a colonialist project, Russian citizen replies:

*"In a way yes in a way it is. It is very neo-colonial. The very concept of global, its current dimension, comes from specific countries and specific interests and specific desires that are similar to what we call "flying democracy", like from the US to Iran. I think here we have to move between two poles of criticism and affirmation, because that's what I find in with the people that I live with: one comes from Hong Kong and the other one comes from Guyana in South America, they have some similarities unexpected similarities because they know how to play cricket because they were colonized by Great Britain. Since we cannot make colonialism undone anymore because it happened and we have to deal with it, there might be some emancipation, some potential that finds the similarity and finds something that allies the people across the borders and the boundaries of nation-state, and also the boundaries beyond race. And the borders of continent, like this part of Asia, this part of South America, which they have in common British language, British colonialism, British sports, and that's already a lot in a fact."*

What is implied here is the Western-centered notion of global citizenship that is spread throughout the rest of the world, and sometimes results in bringing people together in one way or another. The "flying democracy" is like attempting the priority of democracy over capitalism (democratic values being part of the essence of global citizenship). While there is a need of cosmopolitan citizenship and the creation of a more just civil society, "we are still confined to the nation state wherein, alone, the potentially destructive forces of capitalism and democracy were tamed" (Delanty 2000: 5). Nation-states and state membership are the major obstacles to achieve global citizenship, according to many interviewees. They also call attention to the clash of global identity and capitalism. The dominant practice in traditional citizenship has been the market-based model, and as Delanty puts it, "in this tradition, citizenship is related to the emergence of a conception of civil society that is basically pre-political. The civic body of citizens is seen as under threat from government, which constantly becomes a necessary evil, required in order to secure the conditions of market exchange, but undesirable in itself" (ibid. 13-14). Turkish citizen elaborates the relationship between neoliberal state and freedom of the individual from the perspective of global citizenship as global consumerism:

*“The concept is problematic in many ways, because especially in the neoliberal system, the concept of global citizenship has been used to consumerist identity, because citizenship is a political process. It gives you some political responsibilities and some attributions. You are a person who has some political rights and responsibilities, you’re a citizen. - - But lately its [global citizenship’s] meaning has really been emptied, by these neoliberal forces. Because what serves to capitalist international market is not the person who is very critical and politically active, because they don’t need those kind of people, it’s not profitable. Profitability comes from how much you consume. So as long as you do your consumption - even if you’re gay, a feminist woman, or whatever, you can always be marketized. It means that capitalism always produces its resources, in order to categorize you in the market. Then you are a categorized citizen who is actually a consumer. Then your rights are not important anymore but your ability to consume is important.”*

He continues:

*“Global citizenship can also mean how we meet the needs of a hypercapitalist society. Because we are consuming for our nation, for our country, but we need to consume even more now, in global connections. We order something on internet, buy something from another country, do those things, or we travel, we go to other countries as a tourist. Which is the meander component of global citizenship in a way. - - It can be very easily reduced to... and depoliticized to a consumption-based identity.”*

Capitalism has always been a potential factor for both social justice and injustice, and has been shaping global spaces (Scholte 2005: 346, Elden 2007). Neoliberalist globalization affects the way global citizenship has emerged and is understood. Therefore, we should not be arguing which of the structural subordinations created by this economic structure is the most important, but rather focus to get the conversation more feminist and intersectional to get an overview of created hierarchies.

#### 4.2.2 Inclusion but not

Equality and equal opportunities are achieved when all persons have same opportunities and no one has inbuilt opportunities that are the result of hierarchy structures, e.g. place of birth. Equity on the other hand means that everyone has equal chances in life, meaning that there are no arbitrary privileges or imposed exclusions. This is the notion of social justice that represents human security and human rights, and that intends to move society “from a situation of hierarchical poles to one of inclusive circles” (Scholte 2005: 316). It has become apparent that global citizenship has the ability to function as a dividing force rather than a unifying one. A Turkish citizen aptly summarizes: “There is a difference between

those who are global citizens and those who try to be global citizens.” Therefore, we have to take a look into the exclusive spheres of global citizenship. Ecuadorian citizen explains their take on the exclusionary aspect:

*“We can start by saying legal things. - - I am from Ecuador so my passport doesn't allow me to go anywhere without visa. Of course you can get a visa if you are privileged, it's not like anyone can't get a visa. I can get a visa but going through the whole process of having a visa is also like a barrier. If you overcome that barrier of course you can move and whatever. But visa issues... you know these barriers that you have to overcome and overcome... but idea with global citizen is that the persons doesn't have to worry, that doesn't even know how it is to go through a process of getting a visa. Like tomorrow I'm going to go to this place, and the legal requirements they are already there with him or her because of birth because of where you are born. So you are born with the capacity to move. That's not like social capital that you can get in life by accomplishing certain things. So for me, to get a visa I have to be working, I need to have money, I need to have money to apply for the visa, I need to have a level of English,... But these people do not need to have that. It is something that is there because of where they were born.”*

The absence of the principles of equality or equity is already demonstrated above. The interviewee also adds that chances are high that Ecuadorian men earn more salary than women,

*“and in order to get a visa you have to show that you have enough money to, or that you are earning enough money to be able to come back. So if you as a woman have a really low salary that will make the process of getting a visa very hard. And of course if you are black, if you are indigenous the chances are lower that you have a really good salary or a really good social position.”*

The issue therefore becomes an issue of gender and income, but possibly also of race and ethnicity, depending on the culture and policies of the national society. The kind of education one has obtained, the university one went to, the kind of jobs one had and the kind of social spaces one is occupying or the social connections one has – they all are a result of many years of working hard and to becoming more like a “global citizen”. As Ecuadorian respondent concludes, “that is why it is so unfair because people who do not have the possibilities from the very beginning it is really hard for them”. A Turkish citizen takes a different stand and questions the attitudes of the existing society and how it could accommodate the emergence of equal global citizens:

*“If people in their minds already have prejudices towards certain ethnicities or race, then how can you be a part of global society? Or how can you be equal? For example when there's white supremacy, how can you be equal in global society as a black person? Or when the world is heteronormative. How*

*can you be equal as a lesbian? Or if the world is patriarchal, how can you be equal as a woman?"*

Consequently, he concludes that “ethnicity, financial resources, citizenship status, gender, sexuality, they are all very much important to be able to become a global citizen”. When it comes to inequalities one should look at historical conditions and how those are connected to the production of the space we have today. Global citizens’ global spaces are produced as a social formation (hence the reference to historicity of experience), and as a mental construction (Elden 2007: 108-109). Building a network to establish a personal global community was also mentioned by one of the interviewees, as to emphasize the need to “practice global citizenship”. The interviewee compares this kind of space to the university, “a place with global aspect”. But the conclusion remains that in order to access that space, “you should be mobile and able to go to that country. And start your education”. Naturally, forced moving can have a different effect on (global) identity than a free moving by choice. Brah (1996: 182 in Ahmed 2000: 80) provocatively asks: “The question is not simply about who travels, but when, how, and under what circumstances?” If some passports guarantee you a better position as global citizen, one is more privileged. Likewise, if moving is a choice and your passport does not require visa, one is even more privileged. For some scholars, the right of free movement is “the ultimate demand for global citizenship” (Lister 2003: 64).

The very few studies that have been produced about the concept of global citizenship provide a very useful critical backdrop to discuss the subject in this study. For instance, Chapman et al (2018) are as critical as saying that global citizenship is only “a propaganda device serving to mystify young people’s understanding of their place in the world by incorporating them into the benevolent sphere of its operations, while withholding from them, and cultivating their blindness to, the ideological function of the notion itself for neoliberal capitalism” (ibid. 143). Indeed, as we have seen, materially speaking we are not born equal, and “global corporate capitalism would not function if we were” (ibid. 153). Crossing borders, being able to move around freely, and inhabiting a coherent, rational space is part of the construction of a so-called Cartesian subject that global citizens automatically are. It is constructed as white, and while “the brown body can become the settler it can never embody the ideal Cartesian subject” (ibid. 154). To answer the question whether global citizenship can be equally accessible to everyone, a Finnish citizen analyses as follows:

*“No I don’t think so because that notion depends on some people being exploitable and some people not having the access to it, so we can still talk about this ... Like the people who are privileged as the universal category, like this is what we aim for. But in order to exist it needs something to build against to. So actually thinking about that, there’s the norm of being, that is built on responses and something else, so theoretically speaking that is not possible. Philosophy which is built to be against something, like a “Western” philosophy that is built through the subject of the other. - - What I mean is that*

*the subject of the idea of global citizen, the subject that has access to these spaces and has the privilege - or entitlement - to access those spaces, is built on the exclusion of some subjects and therefore it cannot, as a philosophical matter, it couldn't... To some extent it could be made more accessible to more types of subjectivities but as a concept we are all built through the exclusion of some."*

Bodies that become the "Other" cannot embody Northern or Western superiority and become thus a part of an exploitable population (ibid.). Similarly to citizens in imperial states, "Cartesian subjects can cross all borders easily and safely" (ibid. 156), which supports the statements of the interviewees. Since the concept of traditional citizenship is deeply rooted in Western constellation of democratic thought and Westernized political institutional structure, globalizing citizenship has not been able to erase this past of white and Western hegemony (Lee 2014: 76).

The image of cosmopolitanism might also be affected by the fact where most global tourists come from, which may contribute "to an image of cosmopolitanism as 'a predominantly white/First World take on things'" (Vertovec & Cohen 2002: 7). Again, this matches with earlier assumptions about white bodies being able to occupy more global spaces. A German citizen reflects on the position of privilege in a following way:

*"I think the tendency of people who are in position of privilege to say we are all equal is a very convenient way to sometimes avoid facing structural discrimination because you are not discriminating others but I would argue most of the time we do, we are in some position of privilege and we cannot of course change that, and it's difficult to be aware your privilege and discrimination so if it becomes the idea oh there is no discrimination anymore or becomes the blindness of all power structures then I think the concept is misused. "Global citizenship means colonialism and sexism and racism is over and now because we are all equal..." – I think it's like being color blind in racism. I think the lens of global citizenship does not exclude discrimination, it can be misused as any framework. I can see why it would have developed in white Western society because it might not be that critical towards the power structures. But of course it depends how you see it."*

The image of a good global citizen cares for everyone and everything, and advocates for global issues. However, it can also be seen as "a call to action for people in the North to save people in the global South", by using the discourse of unity and ally-ship (Chapman et al 2018: 159). This kind of neo-colonialist action is reprehensible. Living in a state, becoming global citizens is definitely not easy. As Chapman et al. put it, "to suggest otherwise is neoliberal propaganda that only serves to reaffirm the global supremacy of the Cartesian subject, as it, in its various forms, is the only figure to truly embody the global citizen" (ibid.).

## 4.3 Going global and elsewhere

Martha Nussbaum (2010: 27) poignantly describes:

“Under the influence of Nietzsche, eminent thinkers of quite different sorts have felt dissatisfaction with a politics based on reason and principle, and have believed that in the ancient Greek *polis* we could find an alternative paradigm for our own political lives, one based less on reason and more on communal solidarity, less on principle and more on affiliation, less on optimism for progress than on a sober acknowledgement of human finitude and mortality.”

Indeed, this stems similarly from the minds of the interviewees and seems to be the ultimate goal for what going global, or the concept of global citizenship, would entail.

Delanty (2005) offers an idea of a non-exclusive presentation of global citizenship, by which he means that it could be possible to identify at least three levels of embodying citizenship: the local or regional level, the national level, and then the global level. This arrangement would perhaps help mobilize civil society to act for their community and encourage active citizenship on local level. However, in this case the so-called global community serves merely as an image that is removed from the socioeconomic and political structures that “shape and bound actual communities so that the sociological reality and the ideological ideal become confused” (Lister 2003: 85).

Furthermore, the meaning of community might mean home to some – but there are still ways of understanding different meanings of home. For example, home can be where one usually lives, or where one’s family lives, or home is the native country or country of which passport one holds. Some might not identify according to their national passports, but rather identify through “the lived experience of locality” (Ahmed 2000: 89). Movement away tests one’s boundaries as how “homely” one might feel or fail to feel (ibid.).

### 4.3.1 Identities – actions

What global citizenship represents and is, is also intertwined with the aspect of belonging and becoming. Judging by the empirical material, global identity is not formed in an instance. Understandings vary, for example postmodernists emphasize the importance of multiple identities as a precondition for civil society, whereas “for the activists, a shared cosmopolitanism is more important” (Kaldor 2003: 10). German citizen illustrates their thought of shared cosmopolitanism and the problem around it:

*“If the essence of me would boil down to be the very two concepts, which I think can be found in everyone and this is really cheesy but it comes down to*

*appreciating your family, having your friends around you, doing something you enjoy regardless of how we express this. We still have a chance to connect on that basis, but then again everyone wants to feel so individual... But I think that this “snow flaking” is part of the liberal market policy that we have, that they emphasize that we are individuals and that you have to work for your CV. - - If we were able to unite on a bigger basis we could address things a bit more thoroughly instead of being preoccupied by our own individuality and our own problems - -. So by keeping us apart it perpetuates certain power dynamics as well.”*

Uniting with the group and building a “glocal” community would be a realistic next step to bring one closer to achieve global citizenship, as a German citizen suggests below. But, let us also note the difference between the understanding of being global citizen between German and Turkish citizen (the second quote):

*“I think global citizenship can be very useful, to also focus more on the local level: if you really read power structures properly, in many cases you would come to the idea that volunteering in Bangladesh is maybe not that good an idea. So then maybe do something about discrimination or social injustice in your own place but keep in mind the power structures. It always depends on how the term [of global citizenship] is coined in a way, so I don't think we can switch the term every time. Too many people apply bad things to it, but we need to promote that global citizenship means to “think global, act local.”*

*“I wouldn't consider myself as global citizen on material level. Material here is not only about financial resources but I think it's also about status. Like if you're not earning money, or if you don't have a job, that's a minus point. Now I'm in Sweden but I'm not a citizen here, my situation is complicated and that prevents me to be global citizen as well. I cannot even travel, I cannot even leave Sweden because of my residence permit situation which is totally determined by the state and the international law and regulations. So if I want to move and make social and political connections then how can I be a global citizen? It's very difficult. I can do something locally which makes me closer to global citizen, but not having the same opportunities than people who can just go anywhere. - - For example, I cannot go to a conference in Copenhagen, and so I cannot participate. If I cannot participate I cannot be a part of the decision-making, and I cannot be part of that community or social group. So then I'm bound here, I'm limited - so I'm not a global citizen.”*

When encouraging to “act local”, one should not take for granted that it is a completely accessible sphere for all. For this particular person above, participation and activism in the community are the key to the existence of global citizens, which the person is currently not allowed to access. Considering power structures and making conscious decisions requires knowledge and to some extent, access to that knowledge. The importance of upbringing and the role of family in identity construction was emphasized by a few different respondents: the aspect of saving

the world or the individual achievement of doing something grand was not the focus, but rather raising young people to the simple co-existence and feeling in solidarity with other human beings. This way was also connected to feeling and belonging to a nation or a nation-state. As an Ecuadorian citizen recounts:

*“I’m thinking about how I was educated in my family, and of course I do not want to make generalizations, but I think something really common in Latin America and Ecuador is that you get from your family the sense of belonging, like this is your land, this is your country and you are staying here, and the family attachments are really close... so I think here I’m one of the few people that want to go back to my country, all my friends want to stay and they have jobs and I’m like no no no... - - And of course it has to do with colonization, this idea of trying to defend your land, because that’s the only thing that you have and that’s where you belong. So we do not have that sense of mobility.”*

In other words, the colonizer moves around the globe while the colonized find the belonging in the land that they have fought for, just like the Cartesian subject can move without restricting boundaries. This Ecuadorian also strongly takes a stand and distances the concept of global citizenship as something that does not belong to their cultural sphere. Moreover, the importance of the community where one is accepted is highlighted when one moves or is forced to move. Ecuadorian citizen tells further:

*“I don’t think it [global citizenship] is an option available for everyone, especially if you are someone that feels that other countries or other places reject you because of who you are. How can you feel like you belong or are global citizen when not all your existence is valid or not even recognized in other places? Or when your identity as who you are can put you in danger in some places. I know people that are now here and would like to go back to their countries but they cannot because of their sexual orientation or gender identity, so... It’s true. For me going to United States was an option, but as a Latina I’m a target there. Moving is always about going to the place where you feel safe or where you will be feeling that you can improve some of your situation.”*

As discussed in the body politics section, the primary site of location is body which in the intersections of the biological, the social, and the linguistic demonstrates the system how culture operates. Here, one’s embodied situation of reality is that some bodies can enter certain spaces without having to think about possible consequences (Braidotti 1994: 238), which indicates the white privilege of feeling safe in global spaces. As feminists situate subjectivities to subvert cultural codes, so does this Ecuadorian citizen support situating the word global and using it in a critical way to expose its inequalities.

There were only a couple of interviewees that confirmed their identity as global citizens. Belonging globally, however, can be the result of a complex self-identification in one’s country. Boundaries of home and belonging can become

blurred due to unrecognized community within a nation-state, and make the oppressive state membership almost insignificant:

*“If you ask me, I don’t identify myself with some certain citizenship. I mean yes, my passport is Turkish but how Turkish I feel..? Originally I’m Kurdish, but Kurdish citizenship is not even recognized in Turkey so... that’s why my identity is really fluid.”*

The majority of the interviewees claimed that they do not identify themselves as global citizens. Yet, even when saying one is not global citizen it is to take a political stance and locate oneself within the political sphere. In this case it is mostly refusing to identify oneself according to neoliberal and capitalist label, and preferring to recognize one’s multiple identities and other possibilities through feminist and queer perspectives. Identification has to be constructed on cultural meaning, not just on a political system, and it has to be embedded in an imagined community (Hall 2002: 28). This imagined community could focus rather on transversal dialogue that is “informed by recognitions of our differential locations and identifications, and led by a global discourse in which translation, rather than a unitary language, is seen as the cosmopolitan political tool and political projects of belonging are multi-layered, with shifting, contested and porous boundaries” (Yuval-Davis 2011: 175-176).

#### 4.3.2 Alternatives

If the prevailing assumption of global citizenship is the one of neoliberal global citizenship, it certainly requires a complementary alternative. As we have seen in this study, many interviewed individuals have had various, even contrasting opinions of what the concept of global citizenship entails. After all we can conclude that the force within the civil society community shall not be underestimated – rather, if anything, that will challenge the predominant meaning of global citizenship as it exists today. Recognizing the meaning of global citizenship as local actions and not only abstract global happenings, one can state that it requires a certain ability to show consideration towards the community. Indeed, such is the power of social organization upon a solidarity of interests, that “the promise of solidarism is the partial dissolution of the international society of states within this wider world public sphere” (Linklater 1999: 53).

Whether it is about understanding that we all share this one planet, to truly care about fellow human beings with their intersecting identities calls for a great sense of solidarity, which the respondents bring up in a variety of ways. But, admitting the need for solidarity and to possibly suggest that global citizenship has to stand in solidarity in a much more obvious way also requires more optimistic reflection from the individual’s side. To answer the specifying question of whether one has to care to be a global citizen, a Turkish citizen elaborates:

*“Yes because you don’t see the society or the world now as a divided place by border, even though it is like that. But these borders are constructed borders - they are open to change, they can be eliminated in the future. If your mind is set to have a global solidarity, then you shouldn’t consider these borders something that limits your mind and that limits your views.”*

When asking about how one can express solidarity as global citizen, he continues:

*“It’s more like supporting human rights. Because if we bring an ideological dimension from the beginning then it’s very excluding for many people with different political views... If it’s not extreme of course, for example there are liberal people, socialist people, but it’s above them because those are just some ideological divisions. But solidarity in a way of protecting human rights, believing in gender equality, like seeing these problems, or supporting LGBT rights, being against violence, wars, and believing in that people can communicate and support each other in peaceful ways.”*

Kantian conceptions of world citizenship (which in this context is understood as global citizenship) “stress the need for personal responsibility for conduct” and to “defend compassion to peoples elsewhere” (Linklater 1998: 33). Depending on how we see the role of the states in global citizenship, dialogic understandings support efforts “to create new communities of discourse which bring citizens and aliens together as co-legislators” (ibid.) in order to build a strong community to reduce the concern for vulnerable groups. A solidarist arrangement would promote the world citizenship but also govern to protect human rights. Moreover, non-state actors would be the key actors in that kind of process, operating as good citizens within the world public sphere, “in which international norms can be created which do not simply reflect the particular interests and ideological preferences of the great powers and the dominant transnational corporations” (Linklater 1999: 52-53).

Quite surprisingly, one of the interviewees invented an actual alternative to global citizenship. He reflected that perhaps more people would share similar, universal values if there really were no nations and boundaries. That situation would be called, as he suggests, lunar citizenship. According to their reasoning, “global” as the “globe” represents normativity, but Moon, the lunar, can be a metaphor to what is not normative. As he describes it,

*“Then you can build an alternative ideal of citizenship there, one that is more radical and critical, and more in solidarity. But that’s also very difficult to decide what would connect people, these can also be considered as left-wing values of the society, like being radical, critical,... So could this kind of ideological setting unite the world? Or, does it need to be united through another thing? Like, queer people are not expecting everyone to be queer immediately, in order to claim queer society or politics, or queer spaces. So this can be a different approach to citizenship. It can be a norm-critical approach. It doesn’t have to fit for everyone. Because it’s impossible in a way,*

*there can't be one unified idea of world or societies, there will always be a conflict between antagonisms and views. So, this can be one of those views, which would contribute to the world to make it a better place."*

This can be considered a rather sincere wish to make a clear distinction from the neoliberal global citizenship, and at the same time use lunar citizenship to distance one's personal self from the associations that do not belong to their global identities:

*"Because to an extent when you say global it brings you this... Neoliberalism capitalism, and then prevents you to make clear connection with the word and the concept. It's a very conflicted word because it's been used in so many contexts. But lunar is something new, not used before. So it can be a metaphor of an ideal citizenship."*

## 5 Conclusion

*“You think of yourself  
as a citizen of the universe.  
You think you belong  
to this world of dust and matter.  
Out of this dust  
you have created a personal image,  
and have forgotten  
about the essence of your true origin.” – Rumi*

This study has discussed the essence of global citizenship, and how universal it is practically speaking. It has come forward that the view of global citizenship as we know it today, is based on the cosmopolitan political view and the liberal and neoliberal notions of traditional citizenship. The latter alone poses many implications on global citizenship, and it can be criticized in multiple ways. Intersectional understanding helps us to unravel the power structures that the global neoliberal citizenship upholds: first and foremost, class and the ability to move physically from one place to another has constructed the most significant inequality. The passport that one holds – even though it is a national passport – ultimately defines one’s belonging in the state-centered governance system and dictates where in the world one is allowed to move freely. The question of whether moving is a choice and how the availability of choice is formed reveals the status of the citizen. Being able to demonstrate how much income one has, or what the level of English is becomes crucial for a global citizen, barriers that one has to overcome.

Governmental and social systems that oppress people based on their gender, sexuality or race also form a part in how inequalities are reflected in the global status. If one is discriminated or oppressed in their country of residence, then the sphere of global citizenship can either be seen as something completely unattainable or the only possible way to ultimate freedom – the latter being global citizenship as a part of self-identification which no one can take away from one and a sphere in which one can live without the oppressive systems of a state.

To understand where these inequalities stem from, it is important to note the historicalities of experiences and power structures, and in this case locate them in inequalities created by colonialism and capitalism. In that way we can see that global citizenship does mirror a hierarchical system of global belonging that prevents non-privileged bodies to truly call themselves global citizens. For instance, the Cartesian subject is an embodiment of a privileged citizen who, in the post-colonial world, still moves without hinders and is predominantly a white Western or Northern person.

According to Frank (2012: 37), the method of DNA “is not to summarize findings” because it is deemed as an undialogical word which aims to end the conversation and “taking a position apart from and above it”. There are bound to be more stories that vary in their content and sentiments towards global citizenship, and that is why this study has tried to balance by focusing on producing a general conclusion and at the same time taking into account that the meaning of concept can change, since it changes in the minds of individuals.

However, we can conclude in the notion of solidarity that will not end the dialogue between the stories and that encourages for further action. Namely, showing unity through compassion and acknowledging heterogeneity of identities and ways of belonging globally is the ultimate resistance towards the neoliberal structure and all that it represents in terms of global citizenship.

## 6 References

- Ahmed, Sara (2000). *Strange encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality*. London: Routledge.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthoné (2006). *Cosmopolitanism – Ethics in a world of strangers*. London: Penguin Books.
- Bachelet, Michelle (2017). Global citizenship: A new and vital force. *UN Chronicle*, Vol. LIV No. 4, January 2018. <https://unchronicle.un.org/article/global-citizenship-new-and-vital-force> (Accessed 2018-08-15).
- Bader, Veit (1995). Citizenship and Exclusion: radical democracy, community, and justice. Or, what is wrong with communitarianism? *Political theory*, Vol. 23, no. 2 (May, 1995), pp. 211-246.
- Benhabib, Seyla (2006). *Another cosmopolitanism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Braidotti, Rosi (1994). *Nomadic subjects: embodiment and sexual difference in contemporary feminist theory*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brown, Garrett Wallace & Held, David (eds.) (2010). *The Cosmopolitanism Reader*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Campbell, P. et al. (2010). *An Introduction to Global Studies*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Castles, Stephen & Davidson, Alastair (2000). *Citizenship and migration: globalization and the politics of belonging*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Chapman, Debra D., Ruiz-Chapman, Tania, Eglin, Peter (2018). Global citizenship as neoliberal propaganda – A political-economic and Postcolonial critique. *Alternate Routes*, vol. 29, p. 142-166.
- Delanty, Gerard (2000). *Citizenship in a global age – Society, culture, politics*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Delanty, Gerard (2005). *Citizenship*. In Ritzer, George (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Social Theory* (2005). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Elden, Stuart (2007). “There is a Politics of Space because Space is Political”, *Radical Philosophy Review*, volume 10, number 2, pp. 101-116.
- Frank, Arthur W. (2012). *Practicing Dialogical Narrative Analysis*. In Holstein, James A. & Gubrium, Jaber F. (2012) *Varieties of Narrative Analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Hall, Stuart (2002). *Political belonging in a world of multiple identities*. In Vertovec, Steven & Cohen, Robin (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism – Theory, context, and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Held, David (2002). *Culture and political community: national, global and cosmopolitan*. In Vertovec, Steven & Cohen, Robin (2002). *Conceiving*

- cosmopolitanism – Theory, context, and practice. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Held, David (2010). *Cosmopolitanism - Ideals and Realities*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus (2011). *The conduct of inquiry in international relations – Philosophy of science and its implications for the study of world politics*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Kaldor, Mary (2003). *Global civil society - An answer to war*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Lee, Charles T. (2014). *Decolonizing global citizenship*. In Isin, Engin F. & Nyers, Peter (eds.) (2014). *Routledge handbook of global citizenship studies*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis. E-book.
- Linklater, Andrew (1998). Cosmopolitan citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, 2:1, 23-41.
- Linklater, Andrew (1999). *Cosmopolitan citizenship*. In Hutchings, Kimberly & Dannreuther, Roland (1999). *Cosmopolitan citizenship*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Lister, Ruth (2003). *Citizenship: Feminist perspectives*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Mahmood, Saba. (2006). “Feminist Theory, Agency, and the Liberatory Subject: Some Reflections on the Islamic Revival in Egypt”, *Termenos*, vol. 42(1), pp. 31-71.
- Nagar, Richa, Lawson, Victoria, McDowell, Linda & Hanson, Susan (2002). Locating Globalization: Feminist (Re)readings of the Subjects and Spaces of Globalization. *Economic Geography* 78:3, 257-284.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. (2010). *Kant and Cosmopolitanism*. In Brown, Garrett Wallace & Held, David (eds.) (2010). *The Cosmopolitanism Reader*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Scholte, J. A. (2005) *Globalization - a critical introduction*, second edition, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Soguk, Nevzat (2014). *Global citizenship in an insurrectional era*. In Isin, Engin F. & Nyers, Peter (eds.) (2014). *Routledge handbook of global citizenship studies*. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis. E-book.
- Van der Veer, Peter (2002). *Colonial cosmopolitanism*. In Vertovec, Steven & Cohen, Robin (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism – Theory, context, and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vertovec, Steven & Cohen, Robin (2002). *Conceiving cosmopolitanism – Theory, context, and practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Westwood, Sallie & Phizacklea, Annie (2000). *Trans-nationalism and the politics of belonging*. London: Routledge.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira (1997). *Gender & nation*. London: Sage.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira (2011). *The politics of belonging – Intersectional contestations*. London: Sage.

# 7 Appendix

## 7.1 Interview form

1. Describe a “global citizen” with any words or associations that come to your mind.
2. What are global citizens doing? (If anything?) Where do they exist?
3. What do you think about global civil society? What is happening in global civil society?
4. What kind of assets or traits one must have in order to call themselves global citizens or being able to identify as such?
5. What do you think is problematic when talking about/addressing global citizenship?
6. How can one apply intersectional approach on citizenship to criticize it?
7. Can global citizenship be accessible to anyone? (Would you come up with an alternative to global citizenship? Can there be any alternative?)
8. Do you identify yourself as a global citizen? Why? Has this always been clear to you? (Can you tell about an experience when you felt like your identity as global citizen was reinforced?)