The Challenges of Learning to Live Together: Navigating the Global, National, and Local

Liz Jackson[1]

Abstract
How people are to live together well in society, and learn to live together, have been continuously debated. These are challenging tasks, as the world changes over time, while educators aim to prepare young people for a dynamic, undetermined future. Although models and practices of civic education vary around the world, they typically have one thing in common. They tend to employ what can be described as the *concentric circles* model of human relations. In the concentric circles model, people live in spheres of local, national, and global. In academic work, the concentric circles model is associated with Nussbaum, whose political theories have inspired ongoing debates about one challenge of thinking through living in concentric circles. The major question she and many others have focused on is how to prioritise rights and responsibilities, and develop a sense of self, amidst the *competing contexts* of the circles—as part of local, national, and global life. I argue instead that the fundamental challenge of living together well in concentric circles relates to understanding what is *in* each of the circles—the way to know about, and thus be part of, the local, the national, the global. Rarely explored in work on civic education is that the local, the national, and the global are contested. The nature of those groups, their defining cultures and practices, and their implications for living together, are under debate, neither simple nor given. It is often assumed that the concentric circles are known and given. But they are not *a priori* known, and they ought to be subjected to studied scrutiny. The challenge of identifying the nature of these social entities, and thus the meaning of membership within one's locale, one's nation-state, and global society, should be a focus of civic education. I elaborate this argument by exploring educating for citizenship at the global, national, and local levels.

Keywords *(around five words)* civic education, citizenship, localism, globalisation, nationalism

---

1 Liz Jackson
  lizj@hku.hk
  Faculty of Education, Comparative Education Research Centre, University of Hong Kong,
  Runme Shaw, Pokfulam Road, Hong Kong

Introduction

How people are to live together well in society has been deliberated upon by philosophers and others throughout history. In relation, people have continuously debated the role of education to socialise young people. These are challenging tasks, as the world changes over time, while educators aim to prepare young people for a dynamic, undetermined future. What to teach in this context is not obvious, as education ideally prepares young people to engage with new ideas and practices as they are unfolding, rather than simply produce or conserve a singular predesigned social end. It is not enough to introduce young people to the existing world. However, empowering them to effectively interact with, reshape, and enhance the world is no simple task.

This paper uses the concept of civic education to broadly explore such education for learning to live together. Civic education might be labeled in difference societies as national or government education, or citizenship education. Regardless of what it is called and how it is conceived in specific contexts, such education aims to help young people understand their rights and responsibilities, and relate to and identity with (or against) others in the world around them.

Although models and practices of civic education vary around the world, they typically have one thing in common. They tend to employ what can be generally described as the *concentric circles* model of human relations. At the centre of the circles is the individual, and nearest the centre are those they are most closely and deeply related to (like family and friends). A slightly bigger, more distant circle encapsulates those who are not as close, but are still connected, to the person, and their inner circle—the *local*. A larger circle is for the broader society, or nation-state. The biggest circle is for all of humanity. One is thus seen to live in distinctive relations to all others in the world, from near to far.

In academic work, the concentric circles model is associated with Nussbaum, whose political theories have inspired ongoing debates about one particular challenge of thinking through living in concentric circles (Nussbaum, 1994/2002; 1997). The major question she and many others focus on is this: How does one prioritise their rights and responsibilities, and develop a sense of who they are, amidst the *competing contexts* of the circles—as part of local, national, and global life? One's answer to this question implies a particular direction for civic education, for teaching about how to live together. For many, the major debate here concerns the implications of global versus national allegiance (e.g., Appiah, 2002; 2006; Callan, 1997; Nussbaum, 1994/2002). If one contends that national allegiance is vital, they consider how schools can most effectively convey and encourage national or patriotic commitment. Arguments emphasising the place of global citizenship over national allegiance identify different priorities for education.

I argue instead that the fundamental challenge of conceptualising living together well in concentric circles relates to understanding what is *in* each of the circles—the way to know about, and thus be part of, the local, the national, the global (and the cultural). Rarely explored in work on civic education is that the local, the national, and the global are contested concepts. The nature of those groups, their defining cultures and practices, and their implications for learning to live together, are under debate, as they shift within their spheres, neither simple nor given. It is often assumed that the concentric circles as entities are known and given, when debating how to live together and how to learn to live together. But they are not *a priori* known, and they ought to be subjected to studied scrutiny. The challenge of identifying the nature of these social entities, and thus the meaning of membership within one's locale, one's nation-state, and global society, should be a focus of civic education. I elaborate this argument by exploring educating for citizenship at the global, national, and local levels.

Global Citizenship Education: Neoliberalism versus Cosmopolitanism

Globalisation is a contested concept. Globalisation as a concept first appeared in popular and scholarly writings in the 1970s and 1980s (Gur-Ze'ev & Roth, 2007; Jackson, 2016). Many regard globalisation as a new thing, which developed in recent decades. Yet for others, the word functions as a discursive performance rather than as a neutral observation. These positions, of believing in globalisation versus contesting its existence or recent emergence, have been described as 'globalist' and 'sceptic' views (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). *When* one observes globalisation interrelates with their understanding of what globalisation *is*. For sceptics, globalisation is not anything particularly new. As evidence, sceptics show how the cross-border movement of people, technologies, ideas, and economic and financial resources did not just start happening from a place of stasis, from no movement, and no interrelations. On the other hand, Martell (2017) notes that such connections were not as much *global* as *regional* in many cases. The proportion of the population involved, and hence the prominence of supra-national consciousness (let alone global consciousness) was small throughout much of history.

Today one can be a globalist, recognising globalisation as something dynamic and sense new, while also being partly sceptical. Yet the future of globalisation also remains controversial. One might see globalisation as unstoppable, natural, or inevitable. Or it can be seen as something not natural, but political, to be questioned and critically managed. A normative globalist then sees globalisation for its good effects, while the normative sceptic emphasise its bad impacts (Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). Two more specific historical approaches to interacting with and transforming globalisation, and for understanding how to evaluate its impacts, are neoliberalism and cosmopolitanism.

According to the neoliberal view, globalisation provides increased efficiency of transferral of resources and economic production, dissemination, and consumption of goods and services. This view has been associated with the so-called Washington Consensus which sanctioned developing countries 'opening' themselves to foreign investment and trade on terms favourable to globally powerful bodies like the United States, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank (Peters, 2008; Rizvi & Lingard, 2010). According to neoliberalism, with sufficient economic development and interconnectivity in a global sphere, systems will become more efficient and higher quality. According to the neoliberal model, in education standardisation increases efficiency, opens up markets and populations of possible service providers (teachers), provides for niche and personalised production and pricing (such as for international students and scholars), and motivates creativity through intensified competition for customers (students) and providers (teachers).

In contrast to neoliberalism are *compassionate globalisation* and *cosmopolitan* views. These include a variety of historical and contemporary perspectives, rather than one unified lens (Appiah, 2006; Nussbaum, 1997; 2002; Papastephanou, 2008). These approaches are not oriented, as neoliberal globalisation is, toward enhancing the global economy. Instead, they aim to understand how local problems are globally traceable, and how global processes can be shaped to enhance equity and social justice, rather than wealth production or economic efficiency. Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri described 'the multitude' as a leftist collective subject with the objective to resist what it sees as neoliberal globalisation's tendencies toward building a new kind of capitalist-based empire that enables postcolonial inequalities (2004). Such critics have seen neoliberal globalism as a new form of colonialism, rebranding dependency in the so-called independence era, as top-down approaches have been seen to benefit more advantaged parties over disadvantaged ones globally.

Cosmopolitanism can be traced to the Greek word *kosmopolites*, meaning 'citizen of the world' (Appiah, 2006; Nussbaum, 1997; 2002). Cosmopolitan sentiments can be found in many philosophies which recognise common humanity as demanding moral recognition, apart from national, regional and other localised allegiances, biases, and prejudices. One area of debate in cosmopolitan thought relates to universalism and the relationship between national and local identities versus global ones (Todd, 2009). In 1994, Nussbaum argued that while patriotism was rightly significant in people's lives, educators must focus more on cosmopolitanism and humanity as a whole, as a counterbalance or competing priority. Nussbaum noted that this was important because people around the world impact one's local life, such as in the case of air pollution, or global climate change. Yet Nussbaum later eschewed cosmopolitanism, identifying herself as a political liberal who did not support any alternative doctrine including comprehensive cosmopolitanism. This is in contrast to the historical definition of cosmopolitanism, as noted by Robbins (2012): 'For antiquity and the Enlightenment…cosmopolitanism had meant a relatively straightforward antithesis to local loyalties….Those who saw cosmopolitanism as courageously ethical and those who saw it as treasonous, perverse, or politically evasive tended to agree that it was rare, a category destined to remain underpopulated, if not socially empty' (p. 10).

Cosmopolitanism is thus more often promoted today not as a way of life or of substantively describing living well, but as a theory of how one should strive to engage in relations, as well as a sort of 'social phenomenon'. Today Singer (2002; 2009) defends one of the strongest notions of cosmopolitanism and global citizenship in political philosophy. As he notes, nation-state citizenship is not the same as kinship, so there is no reason to love everyone born in one's nation-state more than those outside it. He thus argues that people have responsibilities to enhance life and decrease suffering across national boundaries when they are easily able to do so, and should not only focus on and align themselves to their compatriots. Yet many have argued that Singer's claim is too strong or demanding here: that one cannot in practice psychologically experience (and endure) moral obligations to millions worldwide (e.g., Corbett, 1995). Others contend that one only has a moral obligation to do their fair share from a global view (Pettit, 1997).

Globalisation discourse and/or 'global citizenship education' is evident in educational policy statements and curricular resources around the globe. Yet attitudes of deep global civic allegiance of the cosmopolitan sort are

not likely to be emphasised in relation to competing national priorities. As Kennedy notes, nation-states 'give priority to a global economic agenda', but 'such a priority does not extend to social and political dimensions of life' (2008, p. 22). In these circumstances, a neoliberal orientation toward globalisation and global citizenship is the only one that finds a substantive place in many schools.

However, the neoliberal view of globalisation has clearly had many harmful impacts and consequences. The structural adjustment programs required by the Washington Consensus of many developing countries to enter the global economy often had devastating local impacts. Environmental degradation has been another cost of valuing economic production over all else. These issues can lead to political strife over resources with wide-reaching repercussions. In education, with standardisation of a historically western orientation toward education spread around the planet, regional and local variations and distinctions have been dismissed, neglected, and destroyed. Knowledge from non-western viewpoints has been trashed in the process of global curriculum reform (Andreotti, 2011).

Schools may teach about the negative impacts of neoliberal policy as part of describing the complexity of globalisation. However, they often reduce this complexity to convey simplistically that globalisation has positive economic benefits, thus endorsing a neoliberal view, while deemphasising the place of neoliberal politics in uneven development, deep inequities across and within societies, and environmental destruction. For instance in a guide on globalisation (in required curricula) in Hong Kong, educators are encouraged to focus in part on problems 'caused by globalization', while these are not clearly linked to any specific human social activities or perspectives (CDI, 2015). Rather, private enterprises' interests are taken as aligned with societal interests generally, bolstering a neoliberal view:

> Multinational corporations take advantage of the waves of globalization to expand their operations, actively promote their products and services and maximise profit, even to the extent of being criticised for exploiting developing countries. On the other hand, overseas investments by multinational corporations also create career opportunities, and introduce modern management techniques and capital which benefit the local economies. Thus, multinational corporations and local economies are mutually benefited. (CDI, 2015, p. 7)

'Neoliberalism' is not discussed as a perspective, but undergirds the overall orientation of the guide, as an overarching approach to globalisation, apart from the 'anti' view. Such lessons can hardly develop a strong sense of cosmopolitan allegiance, or allegiance to humanity.

One might think that a cosmopolitan or compassionate global conscious is developed in cases where volunteerism and a sense of service is promoted, such as through service learning. However, where compassionate or cosmopolitan-oriented global consciousness is invoked in education, a neoliberal orientation is often also apparent. That volunteering or partnering with others abroad will make one's resume look more attractive to future employers is often stated or implied by educational and other institutional actors (Jackson & Adarlo, 2016), with a lesser emphasis on the substance and civic value of service. The consciousness invoked and created here can be in line with a voyeuristic view, which can increase negative stereotypes and views of deficiency of those being 'served', creating a clashing rather than a mutually beneficial engagement, without a focus on critical values and awareness (Jackson, 2013).

However, this discussion does not intend to suggest that a deeply cosmopolitan orientation must be better. As critics of Singer noted, a psychological burden may be difficult to swallow if one is to focus on others with pure altruism on the global stage. Not only must one have a critical orientation to engage effectively with others globally (Hytten, 2008). To be effective one must also have a strength of character, or good level of emotional well-being, to grapple individually with issues of deep oppression and inequity. Returning to the broad picture, the debates and challenges related to neoliberalism and cosmopolitanism are not ones students are typically given access to. Student opportunities for cosmopolitan imagining are obscured, when schools implicitly endorse neoliberalism, and encourage student neoliberal engagement in the world around them, dismissing its failings.

Globalisation and attitudes toward it like neoliberalism (and cosmopolitanism) should be taught *about,* and not regarded in classrooms as correct, in relation to civic education and to students' cultivating their sense of identity and civic duty in the world around them. To teach, as schools often do (implicitly, if not explicitly), that neoliberalism should frame their views of themselves in the broad human world is to preclude students understanding, engaging with, and acting autonomously with regard to important social debates about

globalisation, casting critique as simply being 'anti', when more cosmopolitan future-oriented visions, attitudes, and actions can also be considered.

Nationalism and Patriotism in Education

Patriotism and nationalism are controversial concepts. Everyday debates and academic texts consider such issues as whether nations should be considered 'real' or 'imagined', as good or evil, as an approach to community that is outdated, or a legal system that is necessary. By implication, the merits of nationalism are not matters of easy consensus. Patriotism has also been subject to ongoing questioning and argumentation among political theorists, liberal thinkers, and others.

Although sometimes used interchangeably, theorists make distinctions between patriotism and nationalism. Patriotism conveys a sense of love and sentimentality in relation to a civic or governmental entity, compatriots, and/or the principles of a society. Patriotism has support among theorists who see the emotional, relational, and moral qualities invoked by the term as superior to what they may see as an instrumentalism, or hyper-rationalism, of nationalism. Others argue for patriotism as commitment to compatriots, rather than to abstract principles of justice. Taylor argues for patriotism on the ground that dedication to one's fellow citizens can help to decrease inequality in some societies, such as the United States (1996). Callan (1997) argues that a sense of loyalty and care for compatriots is essential and prerequisite to any broader possible cosmopolitan attachments.

Nationalism is a more modern concept. Anderson identified nations as 'imagined communities'. As he observed, a nation is too large for a person to know everyone else within it, yet one feels a sense of kinship and relation to others, in developing national consciousness. Nation-states invoke a sense of permanence, of 'subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists', despite the fluidity underneath the surface (1983, p. 5). Anderson identified 'official nationalism', as 'an anticipatory strategy adopted by dominant groups which are threatened with marginalisation or inclusion' (1983, p. 101). In other words, nationalism can function as both a way of seeing the world, and as a performance (by act or speech) of a particular identity and social relation.

Ethno-nationalism, which conflates the nation with an ethnic group (or groups), is one common approach to nationalism. *Ethno-nationalism* lends support to a sense of community based on ethnic or racial identity. The Nazi Party of Germany is one of the most infamous historical examples of ethno-nationalism. The scapegoating of Jews and promoting of eugenics for the so called Aryan race's development enabled the Nazis' genocide and mass murder of Jews, as well as murder, sterilisation, concentration, and oppression of people with disabilities, those identified as homosexuals, and people from various other ethnic and national groups.

At the turn of the twenty-first century there was much talk of an end of nations and rise of global society (e.g. Fukuyama, 1992), tied in to the emergence of globalist and regional organisations like the European Union. Nonetheless, ethno-nationalism has retained influence. In 2016, the United States Presidential Election of Donald Trump and the majority vote for the United Kingdom withdrawal from the European Union ('Brexit') have both reflected in part a rise in public expressions of xenophobia. Much of the contemporary rhetoric of populist right-wing parties across Europe has ethno-nationalistic themes, identifying global and European-oriented policies as a threat to some 'pure' notion of nations (Ahmed, 2004).

In a nation-state, a nationally constructed community is mapped onto a political organisation (the state) which governs and is said to represent the people of the nation-state abroad. Thus, a more general view of nationalism implies acceptance, loyalty, and/or a favourable orientation toward, if not also special affection for, the people, principles, and/or structures of one's nation-state. This nationalism is similar to patriotism. The key difference is the quality of care, which is most often seen as a duty, rather than as love. This kind of nationalism is less controversial than ethno-nationalism. Many people find practical value to national identity and protection amidst ongoing violent global conflicts and refugee crises. Furthermore, as an orientation to the organisation of the world, it is often seen as less morally problematic and more neutral.

Yet, as with patriotism, how exactly nationalism entails particular allegiances, loyalties, and affectionate feelings to one's co-nationals, and/or nation-state government and its leaders, remains controversial. Most nation-states are diverse. And most are founded by various constitutional principles that can be in tension with one another (i.e., freedom versus security). Thus, what is the best or genuine national orientation within a nation-state is not obvious, but remains a source of debate, even when nationalism is accepted. For instance, some will prefer a conservative nationalism, which may promote the status quo and loyalty and cultural traditions of majority groups. Others may prefer a multicultural orientation, where pluralism and recognition of

cultural differences are promoted (e.g. Banks, 2008; Taylor, 1992). Some will prefer a sense of national citizenship that involves active duty. Other definitions may not require action from good citizens (Banks, 2017).

Schools and educators may provide civic education with a stance toward better and worse nationalisms and/or patriotisms. But they are still likely to endorse some variant, seen as necessary and not harmful or problematic (Kennedy, 2004; 2012). In some schools and classrooms, ethno-nationalism is explicitly taught. This can be seen in recent years in China (Lin & Jackson, 2019), in war-torn societies such as Cyprus (Zembylas, Charalambous & Lesta, 2016), and in more conservative parts of many other countries influenced by populist far-right movements. This type of nationalism invites harm and immoral behaviour, based not on justice or fairness (or benevolence), but based on prejudice.

More typically, schools and educators endorse a non-ethnocentric form of national or patriotic allegiance. They may teach that diversity is one of the strengths of the nation-state, and how to be a good member of the nation-state in relation to such diversity and related ethical principles. Yet mainstream (non-ethnocentric) variants of nationalism and patriotism can also be harmful. Margaret Canovan (2000) rejects the notion that patriotism can imply love and loyalty only to good political principles. In Canovan's view, patriotic discourse about principles serves to evade moral questions about rights to citizenship and inclusion in nation-states in relation to those in need of political protection and welfare. In this context, Canovan suggests that such patriotism has been used to deprive rights to would-be citizens, in the midst of mass migration and refugee movement around the world. As Canovan writes,

> To the vast majority of citizens, even the most Habermasian polity is 'ours' because it was our parents' before us. One of the main purposes of the discourse on 'constitutional patriotism' is of course to play down this obvious point and to lay stress on the kinds of solidarity that settled populations can share with the increasing number of immigrants in their midst.…Either we insist on a nonnational, patriotic polity to which birthright is irrelevant, or we open the door to a national polity understood in racist terms. (2000, pp. 283-284)

The case for patriotic attachment to compatriots faces these same problems. Schools nonetheless tend to teach for national/patriotic allegiance, in alignment with the interests of nation-states, which structure (or at least regulate) education in their borders. Nationalism and patriotism should certainly be taught about, given their importance and controversial status in the world (Hand, 2010). But they should not be taught as moral directives for favouring compatriots, or particular leaders or values over others, in teaching for living together.

Localism in Education

Recently arguments have been made about the need to focus on or 'return' to the local. Many such calls involve encouragements to enhance urban subnational civic identity and allegiance. In some cases, such civic engagement is juxtaposed with national engagement as more simple, straightforward, effective, and efficient. These arguments have also been applied to other subnational units, such as intra-national states or other small-scale political entities, under approaches of decentralisation and localisation.

Barber has written at length about urban models of democracy in the United States. He argues that urban areas are superior entities to nation-states as places for people to work together to get things done, with local and global benefits (2013; 2017). Barber argues that civic engagement in an urban area is easier, because partisan politics and ideology are less visible at the urban level than at the national level. He elaborates that city mayors are more likely to bridge party lines to get things done for the people they serve than national level politicians. He thus contrasts the urban area with the national, describing the latter as unwieldy and hopelessly divided. Barber also describes the city as a more natural entity for one's attachment. As he states,

> People watch national politics for the spectacle but they are much more engaged in and knowledgeable about local politics. People won't be able to tell you who the members of the Supreme Court are or even what the last vice president was called. But they will know the name of their local councilman or mayor—simply because they deal with them on a regular basis. (quoted in Mensel, 2014)

Barber contends that not just local life but also global civil society is served better by urban-level engagement. While the nation-state has had the clearest, most effective role to represent smaller communities on a world stage historically, Barber observes the emergence of city identities as a counterpoint to problematic national politics that preclude global mindedness, as cities enter the world stage in their own right. Barber further

describes city politics as the antidote to recent problematic developments in nationalism: 'We are already witnessing…the breakdown of national governments. Whether it's Brexit or right-wing governments in Poland and Hungary, or anti-immigrant feeling in France and Belgium and Holland, or a crazy man in the Philippines violating civil rights' (quoted in de Haldevang, 2016). As Barber argues, urban area resources can empower people to reject national strategies that are harmful locally and globally, in concert with people in other cities within and outside the nation-state, battling policies and practices that may not be representative of or beneficial to many in the country.

Arguments for educational localism from a philosophical or cultural view have had clear implications for language education and curriculum. One example here is Taylor's arguments for subnational cultural recognition in the case of Quebec. Taylor argued that Quebec should have authority over its own language policies for the sake of its local community interests, which are distinct from those of the Canadian nation-state community at large (1992). Local language preservation and medium of instruction is an increasingly concern, not only in Canada, but in many other countries which are substantially multilingual. Proponents of local language education argue that it can ensure education is effective in early years, help students learn and study in a second language, and boost the sense of dignity, respect, and heritage of a language group (Hornberger, 2009). That education was not previously conducted in local languages but in English or French, for example, are reflections of colonial subjugation rather than free choices made in a context of equality. From this perspective, it may not be best to continue to use such foreign colonial languages in schools where universal access has become a goal. Thus, local language policies can be political statements toward the empowerment of local language speakers in the society, as their grasp of English may be weaker or less effective for learning.

Some other curricula which is localist in orientation emphasise the environmental context of the local, as well as in other environmental education and education for sustainable development. National educational priorities are sometimes deliberately contrasted with local interests in place-based educational approaches. Gruenewald elaborates that 'from the perspective of place, conventional notions of accountability are problematic because they fail to recognise the mediating role that schools play in the production of space (or social context) through the education of place makers (or citizens)' (2003, p. 620). Lane-Zucker also notes that 'In an increasingly globalized world, there are often pressures for communities and regions to subordinate themselves to the dominant economic models and to devalue their local cultural identity, traditions and history in preference to a flashily marketed homogeneity' (2004, p. i).

A related method of localising education may follow a critical pedagogy perspective. Understanding the local as politically framed is a part of critical pedagogy. As Freire observed in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* local people's needs and interests can be at odds with government interests, which he characterised as being related to maintaining the status quo and maintaining local populations' oppression. Freire alleged that in this context teachers often serve as arms of oppressors, teaching knowledge that does not benefit local people. His solution was a pedagogy focused on the needs, problems, lives, and experiences and perceptions of local people. He argued that the political relationship or power struggle between common people and elites should be reconciled so that each could work together for the humanisation of both (1972). He further indicated that ordinary local people had a leading role, to conceive and change the social world to benefit all.

Localising one's orientation to civic engagement is seen as more efficient than participating within larger-scale groups, and it may seem straightforward that one can impact their district or local environment more easily than their nation-state or the world at large. However, the local arena is also marked by competing interests. Thus, to promote changes (or stability) from a local orientation is a political suggestion or claim in the local domain as in others, given a context of diversity of views and positions.

However, there are challenges and limitations to localism and localisation generally and in education. One challenge has to do with essentialism, the perspectives provided and legitimised, and the productive versus exclusionary possibilities of localist discourse. An example here is the case of women's rights, interests, and representation within culturally framed small-scale 'local' communities. Many multicultural appeals to respect local communities or tribal or ethnic groups fail to recognise the historically and traditionally subservient and unequal roles of women across societies, and women's lack of representation in developing the historical traditions of societies. This situation can be exacerbated by employing the discourse of the local for empowerment, as postcolonial conversations that aim to recognise historical oppression of a broad-scale political nature still tends to be binary in such a way that 'local' women feel obliged to identify either with global (white, western) feminists, or with members of their 'local' racial or ethnic group, lacking broad non-binary recognition of their (intersectional) identities (\Mohanty, 1984; Suleri, 1992). Women's experiences can

thus be overlooked by simplified, politically motivated localist discourses, which can present 'local' women with an unpalatable choice between identifying as western feminists, or as apparently non-gendered members of their racial, ethnic, or cultural 'local' community.

One problem with nationalism of any variety is its exclusivity in relation to citizenship, which still typically remains restricted by birth and other factors in an arbitrary way. This issue of exclusion can also be considered in relation to localism. Thinking of Taylor's arguments for Quebec, whether Taylor would provide for non-majority immigrants in Quebec (such as people of colour in the region, who may speak English better than French), or younger or newer members of society by birth, to have an equal say in defining the sense of local identity is unclear here, as the latter represent two politically disempowered groups within the community. When the local is privileged, not everyone is privileged. Thus, when it comes to language policy, the 'local' does not represent a single perspective on what languages students should learn in. Furthermore, many 'local' (mainstream majority) people desire learning in more dominant languages over local languages. This is often seen to be the case among less socioeconomically advantaged groups in a society, who are often treated by (mainstream majority) local elites as ignorant of their own interests when staking their claims.

Finally, as an ideal, localism's intuitive appeal can also be questioned. Barber's urban area is framed as more naturally a source of civic pride and identity than the nation-state. Yet while people may in many cases identify as a Londoner, a New Yorker, or a Hongkonger, this does mean that they all hold similar views and values about that identity. It is not self-evident that many people identify with local areas over national ones across diverse cases.

The push for localisation has clear rationales and some bases in social realities. Meanwhile, it makes sense for young people to learn about life at local levels. At the same time, localisation can be seen as a particular performance of the local, and not simply as an authentic representation of everyone's experiences and interests in a small-scale group. Women and children's views are not always considered or regarded as part of 'the local'. Nor are minorities' views, in many discussions and organisations that are framed as local-level. People who agree with national and global policies and practices can be found at the local level. There is a risk that this discourse oversimplifies and shapes orientations in ways that can be divisive, oppressive, and exploitative to those not represented in the prevalent vision of the local.

In this context, schools might teach about possibilities for local civic engagement and consciousness. However, they should not teach prescriptively for a certain sense of local cultural allegiance as coming before all else, given that the nature and duties associated with this domain are topics of controversy, rather than being undergirded by a broad sense of certainty and robust justification.

Conclusion

Many philosophers and educators have grappled with identifying the best aims for civic education. In relation they have questioned how it is possible to relate local and national allegiances to a sense of global citizenship. For some, the answer has been to extend a national sense of affiliation to the global domain. However, other thinkers find national-level allegiance more difficult to embrace and transcend toward more cosmopolitan attachments. Thus, they may argue for embracing local-global interactions. Another group of scholars emphasise a sense of global social justice as distinct from any national form of allegiance.

Some of this debate makes its way into classrooms, in discussing global citizenship and the multileveled nature of personal and social identity. However, this debate obscures fundamental issues. What is the nature of national identity, and what it requires in terms of loyalty, care, and/or duty, is taken for granted when national identity is simply pit against global citizenship. What it means to be a global citizen may be defined in the course of its promotion. Yet serious challenges to and problems with nationalism, and to global citizenship (particularly neoliberal global citizenship), are not typically taken into account in educational contexts. Meanwhile, local identity is nearly always defined from a majority view, as if all people in a city or town feel the same way, cherish the same things, and desire and benefit equally from one view of local relationships and structures.

Conceptions and educational implications of national, local, and global citizenship and social and interpersonal belonging are controversial. People often have reasonably justifiable alternative views about them. As such these loyalties and identities and what they mean for everyday social practice should be taught *about* rather than *for* (and in some cases, they should be taught directly against). In education, when these things are discussed, or impressed upon young people in other ways, students should be exposed to them as controversial issues. It is

unjustified and potentially indoctrinatory (not to mention, possibly confusing and contradictory) to teach students for particular forms of identity, allegiance, and relations, as if they take priority over others, or over other considerations. As what is known about the nature of interpersonal relations and individual development is contested, students may also face unnecessary, avoidable harms, when individual and social relations are treated in a narrow way by educators, not recognising the diversity of reasonable views about social development of individuals and interpersonal relations. Civic education should be rethought in the context illuminated here to be more effective toward its aims of developing students as effective independent actors in society, in light of the harms and risks of indoctrination.

Acknowledgments

References

Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities.* New York: Verso.

Anderson, J. D., & Byrne, D. N. (2004). *The unfinished agenda of Brown v. Board of Education*. Hoboken: Wiley & Sons.

Andreotti, V. d. O. (2011). The political economy of global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 9(3-4), 307-310.

Appiah, K. A. (2002). Cosmopolitan patriots. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country? Martha Nussbaum in a new democracy forum on the limits of patriotism* (pp. 21-29)*.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers.* London: Allen Lane.

Banks, J. A. (2008). Diversity, group identity, and citizenship education in a global age. *Educational Researcher,* 37(3), 129-139.

Banks, J. A. (2017). Failed citizenship and transformative civic education. *Educational Researcher*, 46(7), 366-377.

Barber, B. J. (2013). *If mayors ruled the world: Dysfunctional nations, rising cities.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Barber, B. J. (2017). *Cool cities: Urban sovereignty and the fix for global warming.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Callan, E. (1997). *Creating citizens: Political education and liberal democracy.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Canovan, M. (2000). Patriotism is not enough. *British Journal of Political Science,* 30, 413-432. Cited in Primoratz, I. (Ed.) (2002). *Patriotism* (pp. 273-293)*.* New York: Humanity.

Corbett, B. (1995). Moral obligations to distant others. *Webster Education.* Retrieved from http://webster.edu.

Curriculum Development Institute (CDI). (2015). *Liberal Studies Curriculum resources booklet series: Globalization.* Hong Kong: Education Bureau.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Trans. M. Bergman Ramos. Victoria: Penguin.

Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Gruenewald, D. A. (2003). Foundations of place: A multidisciplinary framework for place-conscious education. *American Educational Research Journal,* 40(3), 619-654.

Gur-Ze'ev, I., & Roth, K. (2007). Introduction: Education in the era of globalising capitalism. In K. Roth & I. Gur-Ze'ev (Eds.), *Education in the era of globalization* (pp. 1-12)*.* Dordrecht: Springer.

de Handevang, M. (2016). 'Cities will be a powerful antidote to Donald Trump': Social scientist Benjamin Barber on the emergence of a new urban radicalism. *Quartz,* November 15.

Hand, M. (2010). Should we promote patriotism in schools? *Political Studies,* 59(2), 328-347.

Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2004). *Multitude: War and democracy in the age of empire.* New York: Penguin.

Hornberger, N. H. (2009). Multilingual education policy and practice: Ten certainties (grounded in indigenous experience). *Language Teaching,* 42(2), 197-211.

Hytten, K. (2008). Education for critical democracy and compassionate globalization. In R. D. Glass (Ed.), *Philosophy of education 2008* (pp. 333-341). Urbana: Philosophy of Education Society.

Jackson, L. (2013). They don't *not* want babies: Globalizing philosophy of education and the social imaginary of international development. In C. Mayo (Ed.), *Philosophy of education 2013* (pp. 353-361). Urbana, Philosophy of Education Society.

Jackson, L. (2016). Globalization and education. In G. Noblit (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of education.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, L. (2017). Relations of blood? Racialization of civic identity in twenty-first century Hong Kong. *Discourse: Cultural Politics of Education*, published online first/2017.

Jackson, L., & Adarlo, G. (2016). 'Soft power', selfishness, or altruism? Motivations and satisfaction of US-Based international volunteers. *The International Journal of Diversity in Education,* 16(3), 21-34.

Kennedy, K. J. (2004). Searching for citizenship values in an uncertain global environment. In W. O. Lee, D. L. Grossman, K. J. Kennedy, & G. P. Fairbrother (Eds.), *Citizenship education in Asia and the Pacific: Concepts and issues* (pp. 9-24). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.

Kennedy, K. J. (2008). Globalised economies and liberalised curriculum: New challenges for national citizenship education. In D. L. Grossman, W. O. Lee, & K. J. Kennedy (Eds.), *Citizenship curriculum in Asia and the Pacific* (pp. 13-27). Hong Kong: Comparative Education Research Centre.

Kennedy, K. J. (2012). Global trends in civic and citizenship education: What are the lessons for nation states? *Education Sciences*, 2, 121-135.

Lane-Zucker, L. (2004). Introduction. In Sobel, D., *Place-based education: Connecting classrooms and communities.* Great Barrington: Orion Society.

Lin, C., & Jackson, L. (2019). Multiculturalism in Chinese History in Hong Kong: Constructing Chinese identity. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, forthcoming.

Martell, L. (2017). *The sociology of globalization*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Mensel, L. (2014). 'Nation states no longer work': Interview with Benjamin R. Barber, *The European*, March 25.

Mohanty, C. T. (1984). Under western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses. *Boundary 2*, 12(3), 13(1).

Nussbaum, M. C. (2002). Education for citizenship in an era of global connection. *Studies in Philosophy and Education,* 21, 289-303.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1994/2002). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country? Martha Nussbaum in a new democracy forum on the limits of patriotism* (pp. 3-20). Boston: Beacon Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). Kant and Stoic cosmopolitanism. *The Journal of Political Philosophy,* 5(1), 1-25.

Papastephanou, M. (2008). Cosmopolitanism: With or without patriotism? In M. A. Peters, A. Britton, & H. Blee (Eds.), *Global citizenship education: Philosophy, theory and pedagogy* (pp. 169-186). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Peters, M. A. (2008). Between empires: Rethinking identity and citizenship in the context of globalisation. In Peters, M. A., Britton, A., & Blee, H. (Eds.), *Global citizenship education: Philosophy, theory and pedagogy* (pp. 53-70). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Pettit, P. (1997). The consequentialist perspective. In M. W. Baron, P. Pettit, & M. A. Slote (Ed.), *Three methods of ethics* (pp. 163-169). Blackwell: Oxford.

Rizvi, F., & Lingard, B. (2010). *Globalizing education policy.* London: Routledge.

Singer, P. (2002). *One world: The ethics of globalisation.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Singer, P. (2009). *The life you can save: Acting now to end world poverty.* New York: Random House.

Suleri, S. (1992). Woman skin deep: Feminism and the postcolonial condition. *Critical Inquiry*, 18(4).

Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism and the politics of recognition.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Todd, S. (2009). *Toward an imperfect education: Facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism.* New York: Taylor & Francis.

Zembylas, M., Charalambous, P., & Lesta, S. (2016). Human rights and the ethno-nationalist problematic through the eyes of Greek-Cypriot teachers. *Education, Citizenship, and Social Justice*, 11(1), 19-33.