

Extending Civic Rhetoric: Valuing Rhetorical Dimensions of Global Citizenship in Civic Education

REBECCA A. KUEHL

In a March 8, 2011 article in the *New York Times*, columnist David Brooks writes about “the new humanism.” He explains that a new body of research provides additional insight into humanity: that “emotions assign value to things and are the basis of reason,” and that “we are social animals, deeply interpenetrated with one another, who emerge out of relationships” (2011, p. A27). This essay builds on the idea of “new humanism,” positing that civic rhetoric¹ could benefit from a rhetorical view of global citizenship² in

¹ Civic rhetoric is sometimes used to refer to classical accounts of rhetorical or speech education, but I see the terms as mostly interchangeable, depending on the context. Civic rhetoric describes a specific area of scholarship, whereas rhetorical or speech education tends to focus on the practices of how rhetorical scholars specifically teach students the necessary skills to enact citizenship. I use rhetorical or speech education interchangeably in this essay, since the terms are used differently based on historical context. See: Gehrke 2009.

² I purposefully use global citizenship, and not concepts such as cosmopolitanism, world citizenship, or transnational citizenship. Historically, global citizenship is a concept that evolved from philosophies of cosmopolitanism and world citizenship; see: Carter 2001. Because I am concerned with civic rhetoric and teaching rhetorical strategies for practice in citizenship, I use global citizenship as a concept and a practice. Additionally, I do not use transnational citizenship, a common turn in cultural and feminist studies, because I am concerned with conceptualizing citizenship not primarily through the state or territory, but instead through social belonging. For an analysis of the characteristics of transnational activism, see: Keck and Sikkink 1998, pp. 8-16. Transnational citizenship theorists are often concerned with keeping the nation-state intact when analyzing international activism, especially with international funding mechanisms and organizations such as the United Nations or World Bank. In contrast, I am more concerned with thinking

extending the practices of rhetorical education. This perspective describes how human beings identify with one another through different emotional attachments, developing a sense of social belonging to be able to work together to address shared global problems.

Civic rhetoric falls under the larger umbrella of civic education; education has a goal to prepare students to become citizens. Gerard A. Hauser explains the concept of civic rhetoric and its role in civic education: “[Rhetorical scholars] also have a birthright: rhetoric’s role in civic education. That role is not just in the public performance of political discourse but in the education of young minds that prepares them to perform their citizenship” (2004, p. 52). Civic rhetoric is a specific component of civic education, focusing on teaching skills such as critical thinking, speaking, and writing.

Within the area of civic rhetoric, rhetorical scholars often concern themselves with more specific questions of rhetorical citizenship. William Keith and Paula Cossart define rhetorical citizenship as a “set of communicative and deliberative practices that in a particular culture and political system allow citizens to enact and embody their citizenship, in contrast to practices that are merely ‘talking about’ politics” (2012, p. 46). Such a view necessarily includes embodiment and enactment, which are often connected to emotions.³ Rhetorical citizenship is contingent on arousing people’s emotion

beyond the nation-state, specifically through relationships grounded in social belonging. For an analysis of this shift away from cosmopolitan or world citizenship and toward global citizenship as conceptualized through global connections and a commitment to the collective good, see: Rhoads and Szelényi 2011, pp. 22-27.

³ In this essay, emotions and passions are synonymous, because they are often used in contrast to reason and rationality. The difference in usage is often because of historical context. Philip Fisher suggests that it is only through the modern turn (and the split of what is now called psychology from philosophy) that passions have been replaced by the term emotion: “We can see in mid-eighteenth-century English philosophy and rhetoric the banishing of the term ‘passion’ and its replacement by the new term ‘emotion’” (2002, p. 6). For a book length study of this transition from passions in philosophy to emotion in psychology, see: Dixon 2003. Rhetorical scholar Daniel M. Gross does not differentiate between affect, emotion, or passions: “Theory can meaningfully differentiate between different affects (or passions, or emotions) and even between different instances of the same affect, by way of *history*...” (2006, p. 9). Gross seems to see these concepts as generally meaning the same idea; they are used as different terms based on the historical context.

about political issues: “People become engaged [in politics] because issues touch their lives” (Hauser 1998, p. 51). A fully developed understanding of civic rhetoric should involve analyzing the interaction of emotion *with* reason, whether the idea of civic rhetoric is based on civic republicanism or civic liberalism as the political philosophy underpinning civic education. Daniel M. Gross writes that scholars in the humanities rarely turn to the rhetorical tradition when analyzing emotions (2006, p. 9). In conceptualizing global citizenship, a rhetorical perspective analyzes the role of emotional attachments, such as feelings of concern or trust, in how activist groups reach people around the globe, often across identity differences such as culture, religion, ethnicity, and nationality.

To support the claim that rhetorical scholars should extend civic rhetoric to include global citizenship, this essay proceeds in four parts. In analyzing civic education, I first evaluate the lack of analysis of emotion in two political philosophies, civic republicanism and civic liberalism, that often undergird civic education itself. I then show how the civic rhetoric tradition has often relied on national understandings of citizenship. Third, to remedy this emphasis on the nation, I recommend adding global citizenship to the civic rhetoric tradition, as both a concept and a practice. Finally, I suggest two rhetorical dimensions to global citizenship: emotional attachments and social belonging.

Analyzing reason in civic education

Civic education can be connected to two different political philosophies that explain citizenship and its practice: civic republicanism and civic liberalism.⁴ I briefly analyze examples in each tradition that emphasize reason to the det-

For example, Aristotle wrote about “passions,” David Hume wrote about “emotion” and “sentiment,” and 20th and 21st century theorists write about “affect,” but they are all working with a similar meaning, that these concepts indicate intuitive modes of feeling with others. For a summary of some of the current approaches in rhetorical studies regarding the study of affect and emotion, see: Condit, 2013, pp. 3-5.

⁴ I do not address democratic theory writ large or democratic deliberation here, for the purposes of focusing on the different strains of citizenship crucial to understanding civic rhetoric and how citizenship is taught to students in rhetoric classrooms. Democratic deliberation is often included in these discussions as an important part of the process of rhetorical education, and democratic deliberation itself is often grounded in a political philosophy of civic liberalism or civic republicanism.

riment of a full analysis of emotion in articulating citizenship. Because civic rhetoric is a component of civic education, civic rhetoric scholars should consider emotional attachments in addition to reason or rationality, especially since emotions are an important characteristic of how and why people become motivated to take action on a given issue.

Generally, civic republicanism conceptualizes citizenship as a practice (see: Longaker 2007, p. 6; Peterson 2009, p. 57; Peterson 2011, p. 3). Civic republicanism focuses on the characteristics and interests shared by individuals in a community. Some scholars assert that civic republicanism is communitarian (see: Longaker 2007, p. 212; Oldfield 1990, p. 145; Olsen 2006, p. 1), while others keep these two ideas distinct, preferring to compare communitarianism to liberalism more generally as two sides of a continuum (see: Boyte 2003, p. 86; Peterson 2011, p. 9; Vandenberg 2000, p. 9; Voet 1998, p. 133). Erik J. Olsen explains that “republicanism,” “neorepublicanism,” “communitarian republicanism,” and “civic republicanism” all refer to the various theories of virtue and community that emerged in the 1980s as a critique of civic liberalism as a political philosophy that emphasized the “rights, interests, and choices of the individual” (2006, p. 1). Both civic republicanism and communitarianism emphasize the social aspect of citizenship yet do not elaborate on the emotional connections we share with others as part of what motivates us to care and to eventually take action.⁵ For example, Adrian Oldfield asserts that “civic faiths, when they are devised with intent and consciously propagated, are not effective in encouraging a rational commitment to a practice of citizenship” (1990, p. 154). Rationality becomes a defining characteristic of civic republicanism.

In contrast, civic liberalism values the different characteristics of individuals and individual motivation in political and social issues. Reason and rationality become important to the exclusion of emotion in any discussion on civic liberalism, likely because of this tradition’s connection to Immanuel Kant’s universal reason (Peterson, 2009, p. 60). Andrew Peterson explains civic liberalism in terms of rationality: “Based on the understanding of individuals as able to rationally choose and revise their own ends, liberals have advanced a negative understanding of freedom in terms of non-interference” (2011, p. 11). In the classical civic rhetoric tradition, civic rhetoric entails building the individual’s capacity for political involvement, especially the

⁵ See especially Gerard A. Hauser’s scholarship for an important exception to this claim.

capacities of reason and speech (Jackson 2007, p. 185; Walzer 2007, pp. 271-72). Indeed, most traditions of civic rhetoric tend to operate with the assumption that reason is one of the most important capacities to cultivate in individual citizens.⁶ Reason is an important capacity for public discourse; however, the civic rhetoric tradition's understanding of reason needs to be supplemented with a rich analysis of the role of emotion.

Both the civic republican and civic liberal perspectives tend to use the language of rationality and reason to define citizenship. Civic empathy, the ability to feel what others feel in becoming engaged citizens, has "received little critical attention to date" in the scholarship of civic education (Peterson 2009, p. 62). Some rhetorical scholars view emotion as a problem for public discourse and communicating about the world's problems (Jackson 2007, p. 190). In studying the history of speech education, discussion movements relied on certain principles of reasoning that held reason above emotion (Gehrke 2009, p. 42; Keith 2007, p. 158). Civic education – and in turn civic rhetoric – has not yet given sufficient attention to how emotional attachments play a key role in persuading citizens to interact with strangers to resolve global problems.

Reason and emotion are not separate, but shape one another. This is not a novel argument for rhetorical studies; theories of persuasion have long acknowledged that commitment cannot come from reason alone. For example, many teachers of public speaking reference the Aristotelian appeal of *pathos* in evaluating persuasive appeals. However, the political philosophies that undergird civic education, and in turn civic rhetoric, have investments in rational approaches to citizenship rather than accounting for emotion. Since emotional attachments are important to cultivating social belonging, rhetorical citizenship scholars should more fully analyze how emotion works to motivate people to practice citizenship, and civic rhetoric seems especially well-suited to this task.

Extending the civic rhetoric tradition to global issues

Most scholarship on civic education, of which civic rhetoric is an important component, relies on national understandings of citizenship that exclude

⁶ One exception is Hauser's scholarship, which tends to give equal attention to emotion in addition to reason in any rhetorical analysis of public discourse. See especially: Hauser 1999, 51; 2004, 41.

global issues. Scholarship about civic education is mostly centered on nation-states or nationalism (Longaker 2007, p. xii; Vandenberg 2000, p. 15), rather than a more comprehensive view of citizenship in a global setting. For example, Peterson outlines civic education programs in England, Australia, Canada, and the United States (2011, pp. 25-29). However, he approaches each program on a national level, instead of highlighting global concerns. Most civic rhetoric scholars also emphasize civic education on a local, state, or national level, but fail to take citizenship to its next logical step – the global. Mark Garrett Longaker writes: “Academics are encouraged to research public issues, to design classes that engage national, state, and local communities, to teach students responsible democratic citizenship” (2007, p. xi). Such a focus on the national, state, and local is important, but so is teaching students that many issues extend beyond these scales. Conceptualizing global citizenship as an outgrowth of these other types of citizenship, and inclusive of these other types of citizenship (Nussbaum and Cohen 1996, p. 135), can be a productive move in helping students understand how to take action on issues that have global causes and consequences.

Young people’s ability to articulate their ideas to others is one of the most important skills in producing citizens who engage the world. Civic rhetoric is a vital component of civic education, since discourse, discussion, and debate are fundamental to active citizenship (Peterson 2009, pp. 56, 67). Cheryl Glenn writes that “rhetorical education enables people to engage in and change American society” (2004, p. viii). Indeed, civic rhetoric generally involves the tradition of teaching students the skills and basic concepts of persuasion and the art of argumentation, so that students are enabled to participate, criticize, and engage in public life. Longaker suggests that the “civic turn” in rhetoric signifies a move in research, theory, and teaching to promote public discourse, where citizens come together to communicate over shared concerns (2007, p. xii).

Historically, civic rhetoric scholars often derive their approach from two traditions – a classical and a more recent historical tradition in the United States, which originates from the colonial era. Rhetoric has long been connected to the civic republican tradition, especially because of its classical roots in Greek and Roman history (Arthos 2007, p. 198), including the work of Isocrates, and Cicero and Quintilian, respectively (Walzer 2007, p. 271). Specifically, the Greek tradition, *paideia*, includes the instruction of the Sophists, as well as Aristotle (Jackson 2007, p. 183). Greek *paideia* means

that instructors have the goal of helping students lead the lives of active, engaged, and responsible citizens (Hauser 2004, p. 40).

In contrast, some scholars have outlined a more recent history of speech education in the United States and its role in cultivating citizens during the 18th, 19th, and 20th centuries.⁷ Speech education in the United States, especially during the 20th century, served nationalistic purposes in furthering American democracy and government (Gehrke 2009, p. 43). Rhetorical scholars should be aware of civic rhetoric's ideological past (Longaker 2007, pp. xx, 216), and especially its history in contributing to wartime propaganda during the 20th century (Gehrke 2009, p. 34). Aware of that past, scholars should extend the tradition of speech education outward, beyond the nation-state. Global citizenship is not a necessary extension of ideologically-focused or nationalist perspectives on civic education. However, global perspectives help complicate the history of speech education for students, through bringing in examples from other cultures, places, and contexts and relating those examples to their own lives.

Global citizenship as a concept and a practice

I suggest that global citizenship, as a concept and a practice, is useful in extending the civic rhetoric tradition. Robert A. Rhoads and Katalin Szelényi note that global citizenship has not been clearly defined (2011, p. 22), but explain that their view of the concept “incorporates both local/national awareness with a growing sense of the interconnectedness of all nation-states and the importance of forging common ties and connections in terms of global rights and responsibilities” (p. 26). Although Rhoads and Szelényi's definition of global citizenship is still connected to the nation-state, the emphasis on interconnectedness and the importance of rights and responsibilities concerning all human beings is helpful in defining global citizenship. They go on to create a chart that details different types of citizenship, using locally and globally informed on the *x* axis and individualist and collectivist on the *y* axis. Global citizenship, for them, is the globally informed collectivist (p. 27).

While I applaud Rhoads and Szelényi's efforts to create different typologies for citizenship in higher education (2011, p. 27), a rhetorical view

⁷ For recent histories of the relationship between the discipline of speech communication, now known as communication studies, and citizenship, see: Denman 2004; Gehrke 2009; Keith 2007.

of global citizenship is more complex. For example, let us analyze a woman who participates with others in a local food share program, through purchasing food from a farm located just outside her city. By participating with others in the food share, this is clearly a collectivist action. We might be quick to say that this woman is practicing global citizenship, because she is acting in a socially responsible way that shows she is globally aware – that her consumption affects others around the world. However, maybe she is also acting as a locally informed citizen. Perhaps another motivation for participating in the food share is because she likes the taste of locally grown food, because it is fresher than food at the grocery store that travels hundreds of miles. In talking to other citizens about her reasons for participating in the food share, her advocacy is more complex than simply local or global. In analyzing her rhetorical citizenship, or how she communicates with others to persuade them to participate in this food share, we must be careful not to oversimplify her motivations. In this case, the woman would be a locally and globally informed citizen in choosing to participate in and advocate for a food share. This case would not fit neatly into Rhoads and Szelényi's chart (p. 27). Because of the complexity of people's actions, and multiple reasons for those actions, global citizenship is probably too difficult to categorize in such a narrow typology.

Global citizenship can be conceptualized as a specific type of rhetorical citizenship, and can include numerous local and/or global issues that span nation-states. For example, some human rights groups use the concept to argue a connection to strangers, across national, ethnic, or gendered lines. Environmental groups also use global citizenship to describe citizenship in practice, through activism surrounding issues such as reducing pollution. Many issues extend beyond national borders, including hunger, water access, women's rights, online privacy, and the use of natural resources. These commonly debated topics illustrate that the world is interconnected beyond the nation-state.

Global citizenship is not without its limitations, however. Common counterarguments include postcolonial critiques of Western privilege and power, problems connected to globalization and the movement of global capital, including migrants, and the rise of nationalism. When scholars and citizens see global citizenship as merely a way of denoting Western privilege or access to global travel and resources, the concept remains hollow. Homi K. Bhaba suggests scholars start first with analyzing and evaluating local

contexts, before carefully considering global issues in a way that complicates systems of privilege, economic progress, and globalization (1994; pp. xiv-xv). April Carter explains that with the rise of nationalism, global citizenship for some scholars is simply impossible. She analyzes the contributions of Hannah Arendt, David Miller, and Michael Walzer, arguing that each has problems with the idea of cosmopolitanism, or global citizenship. Limitations include the difficulty of citizens' participation at a national scale, let alone a global scale, problems with moral universalism, and a lack of institutional enforcement on a global level (2001, pp. 167-170). Although each counterargument has merit, some scholars suggest that global citizenship has still gained traction in public discourse as a useful concept, especially in practice. Additionally, if the concept is deployed responsibly alongside these counterarguments, students will have a better understanding of a critical reading of power and privilege associated with other concepts such as nationalism, globalization, and the problems accompanying global capitalism and the movements of migrants and refugees.

Despite these limitations, I believe global citizenship is useful for rhetorical studies, especially since numerous scholars have used the concept in diverse fields such as higher education, philosophy and political science (see: Carter 2001; Rhoads and Szelényi 2011; Schattle 2008). As human problems become larger in scope and implicate people across boundaries (Lister 2003, pp. 55-56), scholars need to expand their view of civic rhetoric. Universities are one place in which to introduce the concept and practice of global citizenship (Boyte 2003, p. 96), especially through courses in rhetoric, such as composition, argumentation, public speaking, rhetorical criticism, and persuasive writing. Many colleges and universities are incorporating a global orientation into their mission and value statements (Rhoads and Szelényi 2011, p. 21; Stearns 2009, p. 191). To meet these missions, rhetorical educators should better incorporate global issues into their teaching.

Extending speech education to focus on global issues helps students gain an understanding of other cultures and traditions as well as an ability to then criticize such practices, without being ethnocentric. In teaching students about global citizenship, instructors should include the "study of different cultural traditions and institutional frameworks...but also an appreciation of the kinds of forces that bear on societies around the world... and how these forces have emerged" (Stearns 2009, p. 15). In a summary of the History of Rhetoric Discussion Groups at the 2004 ARS Conference,

Patricia Bizzell and Susan Jarratt noted that the future of rhetorical studies should address multiculturalism and transnationalism (2004, pp. 21-22). Some rhetorical scholars have begun to answer this call, but more work needs to be done, especially in rhetoric classrooms. As a concept, global citizenship illustrates the importance of being able to communicate and interact with strangers who might be geographically removed from students' own local context. If coupled with counterarguments of global citizenship, students will have a more nuanced understanding of the tensions that occur when practicing citizenship among various peoples, places, and cultures, and how to incorporate critiques of power and privilege in their communicative interactions. This critical view of practicing global citizenship means beginning with local actions but recognizing the implications of those actions on others around the world.

Rhetorical dimensions of global citizenship

In this last section, I advance two rhetorical dimensions important to global citizenship: emotional attachments and social belonging. Emotions help us identify with others, which grounds global citizenship in social belonging. Rhetorical educators can teach students how to practice global citizenship, enabling an awareness of how to work across differences while being mindful of critiques of global citizenship.

Valuing emotional attachments in global citizenship

A rhetorical approach to global citizenship does not dismiss emotional means of persuasion, but instead analyzes emotion as a necessary aspect of the decision-making process, especially in choosing to take action on an issue. Rhetorical scholars are shifting their views about the role of emotion in politics and decision-making. For instance, Gross writes that emotions are rhetorical through a power differential, or "uneven distribution" of emotion, between two individuals or groups (2006, p. 5). However, such an "uneven distribution" may be bridged by emotion itself in order to incite action on a particular social or political issue. After all, without a power differential, it would be difficult to convince individuals to support resolving a particular global problem. Emotion is an important component in motivating individuals or groups with less power to change their situation. In contrast, Celeste M. Condit focuses on the possibilities of emotions for social action. Condit views *pathos* as "the deliberate art for the construction of shared public

emotion” (2013, p. 5). People have mistrusted rhetoric’s role in cultivating emotional responses for a long time, especially in rhetorical studies of mobs and propaganda (Gehrke 2009, p. 53). However, humans need emotion to be able to make rational decisions.

Emotion works *with* reason to help us make decisions to become involved in global issues. Kenneth Burke explains that identification is really about people understanding their “joint interests:” “A is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is *identified* with B” (1969, p. 20). This definition of identification as “joint interests” seems important for crafting a rhetorical view of global citizenship. For example, consider human rights. People can have a joint interest in recognizing certain basic human rights for all through an overlapping consensus. That consensus is not achieved through a legal or territorial definition of global citizenship, but instead through discussion and deliberation among people, which are in turn influenced by both rational and emotional appeals.

Burke further explains that identification is linked to consubstantiality in that we become one with another person through identification yet still retain our individual differences. Burke writes: “In being identified with B, A is ‘substantially one’ with a person other than himself [sic]. Yet at the same time he [sic] remains unique, an individual locus of motives. Thus he [sic] is both joined and separate, at once a distinct substance and consubstantial with another” (p. 21). When considering how emotional attachments reinforce identification, identification can be understood as a process that connects us to other people through joint interests while simultaneously recognizing individual differences. For example, take the issue of reducing pollution in a city. People working together on that global issue would have a common goal of reducing pollution for the sake of the planet, although their work is locally focused. In working together to build advocacy campaigns and change polluting behaviors, these people will experience emotional attachments, such as compassion or trust, which will shape their interactions with each other. In coming together around the joint interest of pollution reduction, they are able to work together in advocacy across identity markers, such as race, ethnicity, and gender.

Just as identification can connect human beings across locations and cultures, rhetorical strategies can also be negatively used to diminish a sense of community and create division among people (Tonn, Endress, and Diamond 1993, pp. 167-168). Burke is well-known for theorizing identification

with division (1969, p. 45). Creating emotional connections across individuals, borders, and cultures can be challenging. Cultivating compassion for other human beings is difficult because people often distance themselves as too different from the people who are suffering, especially with geographical distance. Martha C. Nussbaum notes that this distancing is always a possibility in societies that are “divided by class, race, gender, and other identities, particularly when disgust and stigma are involved” (2013, p. 262). Hans Schattle similarly notes that developing a cross-cultural empathy can be almost impossible when faced with racism, sexism, and discrimination (2008, p. 50); however, he cites multiple examples of citizens who overcome their fears in working across difference to practice global citizenship. Citing the ancient Athenian tragic and comic dramas, Nussbaum explains that these plays “were occasions for deep emotion,” and were an important part of civic education. She writes, “These emotions, however, were not considered antithetical to the idea of a democracy based upon deliberation and argument: indeed, just the opposite. They were considered important inputs for political discussion” (2013, p. 260). Both emotion and reason are interconnected ideas that can be used in productive or destructive ways in the context of rhetorical citizenship. Rhetorical scholars need to understand how emotion operates in citizenship so that we can critique destructive strategies and promote productive strategies, especially in analyzing and evaluating public discourse with our students.

Rhetorical educators should teach students the importance of debate and critical thinking as students begin to make their own value judgments about cultures, traditions, and various political issues, always considering the shared interests between students and strangers as well as the power and privilege that might be at work in a larger process of globalization. Peter N. Stearns writes that students need to master global-analytical skills, but that such skills must be practiced through debate and discussion when students are asked to begin making value judgments about global issues (2009, 16). In the classroom, I introduce the concept of global citizenship through using various contemporary news magazines, books, and documentary films that focus on controversial global issues, such as human trafficking. In class, I ask students to read a segment of a book or a brief article, or watch part of a film. Together, we discuss and debate how and why the author or director uses different rhetorical strategies to reach across identity markers, including nationality. Usually, students quickly realize that the rhetor’s goal is civic

empathy, or the capacity to feel what others feel within a civic context. As a class, we interrogate structures of power that shape communicative interactions and public discourse about the issue, including political and economic contexts. For the issue of human trafficking, we discuss economic incentives for traffickers, as well as the political barriers to prosecuting those responsible. To enable students to relate the issue to their own lives, we also try to connect the global issue to a local context. We also take time to discuss various emotional attachments, such as feelings of concern, and how engaging these texts might cultivate empathy inside and outside of the classroom, once students leave the university.

Grounding global citizenship in social belonging

People identify with one another through emotion, which helps us to develop a sense of social belonging to be able to come together with others who are different from ourselves. The view that global citizenship should be grounded in social belonging differs from the more common view that citizenship should be connected to a state or territory, often through law, in scholarship about global citizenship (see especially: Armstrong 2006, p. 356; Butler and Spivak 2007, pp 3-4; Ford 2001, p. 210; Kivisto and Faist 2007, pp. 128-29; Miller 2007, pp. 39, 45; Ng'weno 2007, p. 196; Weil 2001, p. 19). Haldun Güralp explains this traditional view: "The modern nation-state is (ideally) a territorially circumscribed entity, exercising legitimate power within its boundaries. Citizenship in the modern state is (ideally) linked to territorial sovereignty, so that individual members of that community are accepted as equals" (2006, 1). Grounding global citizenship in social belonging makes the mission of civic rhetoric one of teaching students the importance of advancing global social relations and communicating with strangers. Using Rhoads and Szelényi's concept of the social dimension of citizenship, social belonging involves "shared experiences one has within various social collectivities" (2011, p. 17). I would add to this view in suggesting that the "social collectivity" expands outward to the rest of the world in conceptualizing global citizenship. This approach shapes how student-citizens engage issues in the world, especially as these issues become more complex and intertwined in the activities of many different nations.

Social belonging has been conceptualized through ideas such as the union, state, nation, and religion; however, these are not examples that advance social belonging as essential to global citizenship. Instead, I suggest

stranger sociability (Hariman and Lucaites 2003, pp. 36, 58; Warner 2002, p. 75) and vulnerability (Butler 2004, pp. 22-24) are two specific modes of social belonging that ground global citizenship. Stranger sociability involves the necessity of being open to interacting with strangers. Vulnerability entails the understanding that, as human beings, we are never alone. Our identity and actions are shaped through others' perspectives of us. Identification seems to precede emotional attachments, because a person needs to first see similarity to then develop an emotional connection to someone. People can acknowledge division yet still identify with others, however, and this recognition of cultural difference while still being able to work together for a shared political goal seems to echo this understanding of how division and identification work together in human interaction. Current conceptions of state-based or territory-based global citizenship that rely on reason as the primary mode of being able to identify with others fail to recognize how people connect to one another emotionally to be able to relate to a larger social world.

Global citizenship should be based on social belonging, rather than on the state or territory, partly because the technological changes in the world have changed social relations and therefore call for a new view of citizenship (Agosin 2001, p. 10; Rhoads and Szelényi 2011, p. 7). Indeed, the idea of communal obligation is not new to an understanding of civic education (Arthos 2007, p. 190), and is an important characteristic of global citizenship as understood through a rhetorical lens. Rhoads and Szelényi outline one major organizing principle in the variety of terms and definitions associated with global citizenship as "the notion of greater or lesser degrees of ethical responsibility toward human rights and other individual and community rights, as well as moving beyond the nation-state ... in acting upon one's sense of responsibility" (2011, p. 23). Considering our own rights and responsibilities, and how these affect others, is important in explaining global citizenship as a practice to students. The civic rhetoric tradition should strive to include a global ethic as part of the curriculum to instruct students to become engaged citizens.

For students, global citizenship as a practice should become an orientation to engage global issues and to consider the consequences of their actions for their own and others' lives. Civic rhetoric can help students in "developing an awareness and mastery of globally relevant issues, skills, and phenomena and using such understandings in approaching and enacting citizen rights and responsibilities in a local, national, regional, or global

context” (Rhoads and Szelényi 2011, p. 264). Global citizenship does not exclude local, regional, or national contexts, but instead builds upon these contexts in how people conceptualize social relations. This is similar to Nussbaum’s theory of cosmopolitanism as a series of concentric circles of concern, spreading outward from the self toward all humanity (Nussbaum and Cohen 1996, p. 135).

As rhetorical educators, we have a responsibility to cultivate citizens who can engage the world as a result of their university education. Rhoads and Szelényi write: “Just as we have used our sharpest university minds to advance science and technology, we must do the same in terms of advancing global social relations” (2011, p. 8). In conceptualizing global citizenship through creating relationships with others around the world, social belonging becomes more important than the state or territory.

Extending civic rhetoric through global citizenship

If one of civic rhetoric’s goals is to prepare students to engage others in the world through discussion and debate, then global citizenship is a useful addition to the civic rhetoric tradition in expanding students’ awareness of public problems and their role in those issues. The goal of using global citizenship in rhetorical education is to help students see global citizenship as a useful concept and practice, while complicating their understandings of globalization and nationalism. By doing so, students should feel better prepared to contribute to public arguments surrounding global issues and hopefully consider their own actions accordingly.

Accounting for global citizenship in the civic rhetoric tradition is important as students increasingly face political issues and discussions that extend beyond national boundaries. Whether theorizing civic education through a civic republican or civic liberal tradition, this essay suggests that both political philosophies underemphasize the role of emotion in citizenship. Grounding global citizenship in social belonging values different emotional attachments that inform citizens’ decision-making and engagement with often distant strangers. Global citizenship highlights the importance of social relations, which becomes an important model for rhetorical education.

References

- Agosin, M. (2001). Introduction. In M. Agosin (Ed.), *Women, Gender, and Human Rights* (pp. 1-11). Piscataway, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Armstrong, C. (2006). Global Civil Society and the Question of Global Citizenship. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary & Nonprofit Organizations* 17, 348-356.
- Arthos, J. (2007). A Hermeneutic Interpretation of Civic Humanism and Liberal Education. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 40, 189-200.
- Bhaba, H.K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bizzell, P. and S. Jarratt. (2004). Rhetorical Traditions, Pluralized Canons, Relevant History, and Other Disputed Terms: A Report from the History of Rhetoric Discussion Groups at the ARS Conference. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 34 (3), 19-25.
- Boyte, H.C. (2003). Civic Education and the New American Patriotism Post-9/11. *Cambridge Journal of Education* 33 (1), 85-100.
- Brooks, D. (2011). The New Humanism. *The New York Times*, March 8, A27.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Undoing Gender*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. and G. Chakravorty Spivak. (2007). *Who Sings the Nation-State? Language, Politics, Belonging*. London; New York: Seagull Books.
- Carter, A. (2001). *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship, Routledge Innovations in Political Theory*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Condit, C.M. (2013). Pathos in Criticism: Edwin Black's Communism-As-Cancer Metaphor. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 99, 1-26.
- Denman, W.N. (2004). Rhetoric, the 'Citizen-Orator,' and the Revitalization of Civic Discourse in American Life. In C. Glenn, M.M. Lyday and W.B. Sharer (Eds.), *Rhetorical Education in America* (pp. 3-17). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Dixon, T.. (2003). *From Passions to Emotions: The Creation of a Secular Psychological Category*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fisher, P. (2002). *The Vehement Passions*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Ford, R. (2001). City-States and Citizenship. In A. Aleinikoff and D. Klusmeyer (Eds.), *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices* (pp. 209-236). Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: Distributed by Brookings Institution Press.
- Gehrke, P.J. (2009). *The Ethics and Politics of Speech: Communication and Rhetoric in the Twentieth Century*. 1st ed. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Glenn, C. (2004). Rhetorical Education in America (A Broad Stroke Introduction). In C. Glenn, M.M. Lyday and W.B. Sharer (Eds.), *Rhetorical Education in America* (pp. vii-xvi). Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

- Gross, D.M. (2006). *The Secret History of Emotion: From Aristotle's Rhetoric to Modern Brain Science*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gülalp, H. (2006). *Citizenship and Ethnic Conflict: Challenging the Nation-State*, *Routledge Research in Comparative Politics*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Hariman, R. and J.L. Lucaites. (2003). Public Identity and Collective Memory in U.S. Iconic Photography: The Image of "Accidental Napalm." *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 20, 35-66.
- Hauser, G.A. (1999). *Vernacular Voices: The Rhetoric of Publics and Public Spheres*, *Studies in Rhetoric/Communication*. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press.
- Hauser, G.A. (2004). Teaching Rhetoric: Or Why Rhetoric Isn't Just Another Kind of Philosophy or Literary Criticism. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 34 (3), 39-53.
- Jackson, B. (2007). Cultivating Paideweyan Pedagogy: Rhetoric Education in English and Communication Studies. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 37, 181-201.
- Keck, M.E. and K. Sikkink. (1998). *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Keith, W.M. (2007). *Democracy as Discussion: Civic Education and the American Forum Movement*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Keith, W. and P. Cossart. (2012). The Search for "Real" Democracy: Rhetorical Citizenship and Public Deliberation in France and the United States, 1870-1940. In C. Kock and L.S. Villadsen (Eds.), *Rhetorical Citizenship and Public Deliberation* (pp. 46-60). University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Kivisto, P. and T. Faist. (2007). *Citizenship: Discourse, Theory, and Transnational Prospects, Key Themes in Sociology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.
- Lister, R. (2003). *Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives*. 2nd ed. New York: New York University Press.
- Longaker, M.G. (2007). *Rhetoric and the Republic: Politics, Civic Discourse, and Education in Early America*. Edited by John Louis Lucaites, *Rhetoric, Culture, and Social Critique*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Miller, T. (2007). *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitanism, Consumerism, and Television in a Neoliberal Age*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Ng'weno, B. (2007). *Turf Wars: Territory and Citizenship in the Contemporary State*. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press.
- Nussbaum, M.C. (2013). *Political Emotions: Why Love Matters for Justice*. Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M.C. and J. Cohen. (1996). *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Oldfield, A. (1990). *Citizenship and Community: Civic Republicanism and the Modern World*. London; New York: Routledge.

- Olsen, E.J. (2006). *Civic Republicanism and the Properties of Democracy: A Case Study of Post-Socialist Political Theory*. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Peterson, A. (2009). Civic Republicanism and Contestatory Deliberation: Framing Pupil Discourse within Citizenship Education. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 57, 55-69.
- Peterson, A. (2011). *Civic Republicanism and Civic Education: The Education of Citizens*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rhoads, R.A. and K. Szelényi. (2011). *Global Citizenship and the University*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Schattle, H. (2008). *The Practices of Global Citizenship*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Stearns, P.N. (2009). *Educating Global Citizens in Colleges and Universities*. New York; London: Routledge.
- Tonn, M.B., V.A. Endress and J.N. Diamond. (1993). Hunting and Heritage on Trial in Maine: A Dramatistic Debate over Tragedy, Tradition, and Territory. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 79, 165-181.
- Vandenberg, A. (Ed.) (2000). *Citizenship and Democracy in a Global Era*, edited by. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Voet, R. (1998). *Feminism and Citizenship*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Walzer, A.E. (2007). Blair's Ideal Orator: Civic Rhetoric and Christian Politeness in Lectures 25-34. *Rhetorica* 25, 269-295.
- Warner, M. (2002). *Publics and Counterpublics*. New York: Zone Books.
- Weil, P. (2001). Access to Citizenship: A Comparison of Twenty-Five Nationality Laws. In T.A. Aleinikoff and D. Klusmeyer (Eds.), *Citizenship Today: Global Perspectives and Practices* (pp. 17-35). Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace: Distributed by Brookings Institution Press.