Global Intercultural Citizenship: A Critical Radical Humanistic Theory in Intercultural Communication Studies

David BALOSA
School District of Philadelphia, USA

Abstract: In this study, I critique some current notions of global citizenship in intercultural communication studies and propose a theory of "global intercultural citizenship" as a more inclusive approach to foster equity, diversity, inclusion, and human dignity for all. I employ existential sociolinguistics as a theoretical framework and engage in philosophical reflection as this study's research method to address the question: How can the theory of global intercultural citizenship contribute to the decolonization of what I call *econotechnocrac*y and its global sociocultural and politico-economic hegemonic order of anxieties? I argue that a notion of "global citizenship/world citizenship" may have good intentions but falls short in using comprehensive interculturality within its universal moral obligation principle. I conclude by arguing that to deconstruct manipulation by powerful social forces, interest groups, and politico-economic-technological hegemonic influences, we need to cultivate and implement the five principles of the theory of global intercultural citizenship. That is, (1) *sustainable existential intercultural mindset* (SEIM)—a mindset that believes that we are interconnected beings, hence, our survival and prosperity depend on our collective effort and empowerment, (2) *global intercultural solidarity*—honestly working together for the common good, (3) *the knowledge of self*—the consciousness of one's human qualities in navigating intercultural relations, and (4) *existential justice*—the moral obligation to foster equitable application of national and international laws in building more humane relationships or existence for all, and (5) *community diplomacy*— equitable treatment of urban and rural sociocultural, politico-economic, and sustainable development by diplomatic missions within international relations across the Global North and the Global South.

Keywords: Global intercultural citizenship, Critical radical humanism, Existential sociolinguistics, *Econotechnocracy*, Philosophical reflection, Community diplomacy

1.   Introduction

The management of the national and international legal, politico-economic, sociocultural, moral, technologic, and environmental system by global political and intellectual elites has placed greater concentration on cultivating traditions of self-enrichment, self-dominance, and pride in its achievement than on promoting better intercultural relations and better humanity (Chen & Starosta, 2005; Collier, 2002; Galston, 1980; Hersted & Gergen, 2013). Hence, global intercultural citizenship as a critical-radical humanistic theory in intercultural communication studies is an approach whereby issues related to intercultural relations, intercultural communication competence, and self/mutual empowerment are critically and radically analyzed and advocated in fostering human dignity and better existence for all (Goodin, 1985; Marcel, 1963; Rodriguez, 2010). This analysis covers managing spheres of national and international legal, politico-economic, sociocultural, moral, technologic, and environmental global issues and

fostering equity and unity within diversity for a better humanity for all (Cabral, 1979; Cantle, 2012; Tilly & Tarrow, 2015; Tubino, 2015).

As one of the five principles or "five foundations" of existential sociolinguistics, global intercultural citizenship emphasizes the crucial need of recognition, understanding, inclusion, and mutual respect for human and cultural diversity in human, legal, cultural, and international relations (Anderson et al., 2018, p. 37; Balosa, 2022a, p. 155; St. Clair, 2015, p. 12). It promotes intercultural communication competence as a major strategy in advocating the significance of different kinds of intercultural knowledge that encompasses our symbolic universal brotherhood or universal humanity (Fanon, 1952/2008; Marcel, 1963, Martin et al., 2002; Neuliep, 2021). One can perform one's global intercultural citizenship everywhere since it is more at the level of one's mindset than at the physical level. This concept would include both aspects, but further study would be necessary to explain their interrelatedness (Cohen, 2022; Galston, 1980; Gergen, 2009; Humphrey, 1989; Wellman & Simons, 2005). The theory of global intercultural citizenship plays a constructive and expository role in that it proposes ways to deal with the management of intercultural relations across local, regional, national, and international settings. That is, it radically critiques inequalities that lead to the degradation of humanity, at the same time proposes constructive strategies toward a better present and a better future for all (Royce, 1983, p. vi).

1.1.   Toward a Definition of the Theory of Global Intercultural Citizenship

I define global intercultural citizenship as "the comprehensive intercultural mindset that motivates the cultivation of intercultural competence in building more equitable national and international laws and more humane relationships in everyday life across the world". That is, attitudes, reflections, and actions that enable individuals, institutions, and communities to counteract dominant and anti-intercultural forces but to manage and navigate legal, politico-economic, sociocultural, moral, technological, and environmental issues with loyalty, justice, and human dignity (Balosa, 2022c, p. 16; see also Galston, 1980, pp. 108, 192; Marcel, 1967, p. 31). I employ a theoretical framework of critical radical humanism and the method of philosophical reflection to look at global intercultural citizenship from the perspective of symbolic capital to be acquired to better handle and develop human relations and to productively navigate intercultural relations within the contexts of relational development and transnational complexity (Collier, 2002; Martin et al, 2002; Rosaldo, 1993; 2003; St. Clair, 2015; Stocker & Bossomaier, 2014).

Global intercultural citizens maintain their original citizenship and identities while they recognize and respect other people's citizenship and identities as well. They voluntarily participate in fostering the five principles of global intercultural citizenship across the world, that is, *sustainable existential intercultural mindset (SEIM), global intercultural solidarity*; *the knowledge of the self*, *existential justice,* and *community diplomacy* (Balosa, 2022a, 2022c; Fulford et al., 2021; Rüsen & Laass, 2011; Simon & Downes, 2020).

1.2.   The Philosophical Background of the Theory of Global Intercultural Citizenship

This philosophical background of global intercultural citizenship is inspired by the work of French philosopher Gabriel Marcel (1989-1973), that is, by both his lecture at Harvard University 1963, and his book *Problematic Man* (1967). The reason for my focus on Marcel's work is that it bridges philosophical reflections and intercultural communication competence by

articulating the significance of notions such as participation, unity, human dignity, hybrid existence, and the imperatives of the use of wisdom in navigating global realities (Brown, 2007; Marcel, 1954; Stiglitz, 2007; Touraine, 2009; Wallerstein, 2004). Hence, it is crucial that everyone becomes accountable to the present and future of our universal humanity. This model of accountability that public policy scholar David Brown calls "mutual accountability" should remind us of the moral and political obligation of a global intercultural citizen (Brown, 2007, pp. 95, 96). In this regard, the French sociologist Alain Touraine writes: "We have to look upwards, and at leaders and their policies, and not downwards or at cultures and social organizations, to find an explanation for their successes and failures" (Touraine, 2009, p. 187).

2.   Theoretical Framework: Existential Sociolinguistics

Using the theoretical framework of existential sociolinguistics, I emphasize the recognition of the ability of every individual person, as well as cultures, languages, environments, and technologies to foster productive intercultural relations and sustainable development for all. In other words, existential sociolinguistics advocates for the political legitimacy of linguistic minority rights and the inseparability of the treatment of a language from its speakers. I accept the idea of communication as "a mode of being rather than merely a mode of exchanging signs and symbols" (Rodriguez, 2010, p.12). Hence, I argue that "any mistreatment of a language is tantamount to the mistreatment of speakers of that language" (Balosa, 2022a, p. 148). This framework fosters intercultural communication competence in that all human beings, languages, cultures, and both urban and rural areas as existence or presence must be recognized in the national or institutional decision-making processes (Altman & Wellman, 2011; Balosa, 2022a; 2022c; Humphrey, 1989; Simon & Downes, 2020). It sees participation by all in building social cohesion and prosperity or sustainable development as the enactment of political legitimacy expected by both dominant cultures and subcultures or minorities (Danesi, 2020; Douglas & Johnson, 1977). That is, the recognition of all existing sociocultural, politico-economic, and religious forces or presences and the acceptance of their contribution in the building processes demonstrate a mindset of equity and inclusion and appreciation of the universal symbolic brother/sisterhood or human family (Fanon, 1954/2008; Hite & Seitz, 2021; Marcel, 1954/2008; Neuliep, 2021).

The cultural anthropologist Renato Rosaldo has provided us insights on the ways by which what he calls "agents of colonialism long for the very forms of life they intentionally altered or destroyed—under imperialism, people mourn the passing of what they themselves have transformed" (Rosaldo, 1993, p. 69). This insight is important to those of us using existential sociolinguistics because it shows that pre-colonial social or cultural existences or presences cannot just be destroyed or transformed by the ideological will of dominant powers (Fulford et al., 2021; Galston, 1980; Mignolo, 2012). On the contrary, they need to be protected and integrated as universal sociocultural resources for the entire human family to enjoy. This will necessarily also mean some sort of transformation, but done in a participatory, but contested and negotiated manner (Allen & Light, 2015; Anderson, 2006). This is where the theory of global intercultural citizenship is useful. That is, it advocates for intercultural competence in handling common humanity across human, cultural, institutional, environmental, and national relations and resists the exclusive validation of merely dominant and oppressive cultures and powers with their "mechanisms of marginalization and exclusion" (Marcel, 1954/2008, p. 31; Rosaldo, 2003, p. 3).

3.   Research Methodology: The Method of Philosophical Reflection

The method of philosophical reflection consists in using deep questions related to life issues affecting societies. This reflection aims to address established injustices, structures of power as manifested in textual production, discursive and institutional practices, practices in national and international laws, and everyday performance, and propose strategies to transform these injustices and techniques for a better existence for all. Hence, philosophical reflection as a method of research in intercultural communication studies utilizes critical approaches where culture is seen as "a site of struggle where meanings are constantly negotiated and transformed within historical contexts" (Sorrels & Sekimoto, 2016, p. 9). Emphasizing the significance of "reflection," Sorrells (2016) writes: "Reflection is necessary to initiate, maintain, and sustain dialogue across the new and often difficult terrain of intercultural praxis" (Sorrells, 2016, p. 22). Furthermore, reflection helps us understand that cultures are not "innate" but that they are learned (St. Clair, 2015, p. 1). This understanding is important if we are to work together for equity, inclusion, and unity within diversity (Allen & Light, 2015; Anderson et al., 2018; Jones, 2012; Obregón Diaz, 2021).

The international relations scholar Andrew Linklater argues that critical theory helps us understand that knowledge does not arise from the subject's neutral engagement with an objective reality but "reflects pre-existing social purposes and interests; it invites analysts to consider how claims about neutrality can conceal the role that knowledge plays in producing unsatisfactory social arrangements" (Linklater, 2007, p. 45). He adds that critical theory stands opposed "to empirical claims about the social world which assume that existing structures— structured inequalities of power and wealth which are in principle alterable— are immutable" (Ibid.). Furthermore, critical theory "investigates the prospects for new forms of political community in which individuals and groups can achieve higher levels of freedom and equality" (pp. 45, 46). From the critical approach, philosophical reflection as a method of research in intercultural communication studies helps investigate discourses that perpetuate these historically contingent, yet seemingly immutable inequalities and their consequences for human indignity.

In today's globalizing world, intercultural communication competence needs philosophical reflection to help understand and mediate multiple ideologies. For example, in his work *The Age of Ideology: The 19th Century Philosophers* (1956/1984), a scholar of esthetics and ethics, Henry D. Aiken, writes: "Thoughtful readers are to be interested in searching for something that may have relevance to their own intellectual and spiritual perplexities or that sheds some light upon the ideological conflicts which our own age has inherited from its predecessor" (p. viii). About how philosophical reflection can help in the perplexities or ideological conflicts, Aiken argues: "Philosophical reflection is an indispensable adjunct of the conduct of life, an awareness that the fundamental tasks of research or philosophical criticism belong to ideology" (pp. viii, x). Similar reasoning about the complexity or ideological conflict about life in modern societies is presented by some intercultural communication scholars. For example, in their article "A Dialectical Approach to Intercultural Communication," (2002), Judith N. Martin, Thomas K. Nakayama, and Lisa A. Flores argue that intercultural communication is a difficult discipline because of the complexity that is involved in understanding intercultural relations in an ever-changing world. They write: "You need to think in more complex ways about intercultural interactions—there are no simple answers or easy items to memorize about any culture—cultures are dynamic—as you

are—and this ever-changing nature makes any attempt at static pieces of knowledge problematic" (Ibid.).

Indeed, for this reason, I use philosophical reflection as this paper's research method to question the contradiction between the professed global political and intellectual elites' discourses regarding universal humanity and the performance of these discourses upon intercultural relations, equity, and human dignity. In Appendices A, B and C, I cite two cases to highlight the poor performance of the leadership of global political and intellectual elites in a globalizing governance context, namely, the lack to access to electricity for millions of people in the Global South and the crises in the management of the recent COVID-19 pandemic in terms of the distribution of vaccines between the Global North and the Global South. One may have the opportunity to better understand these issues using the method of philosophical reflection. Gabriel Marcel used philosophical reflection to analyze the techniques of domination of less powerful human beings by more powerful ones (Marcel, 1952/2008, p. 31). He also used this reflection to encourage human beings to become more conscious of their existence and their dignity in a technocratic and self-destroying world (Marcel, 1967; 1956/1995). Michel Foucault used philosophical reflection to analyze "the strategies of power, the networks, the mechanisms, and all those techniques of decision-making" (Foucault, 1988, pp. 104, 105). Frantz Fanon used philosophical reflection to denounce colonialism and "the alienated colonized cities dwellers," who, blinded from serving their own people and their own nations, clung to colonialism's benefits (Fanon, 1952/2008, p. 14; 1964/2004, pp. 66, 67). Immanuel Wallerstein has used philosophical reflection to protest about the deep inequalities of "the world-system" that are so politically central to our current times (Wallerstein, 2004, p. xi).

Today, in the age of neo-colonialism, contentious politics, and globalized anxieties, it is reasonable to employ philosophical reflection as a research method to question the status quo, the polarized politics, and the globalized inequity and human humiliation (Cabral, 1979; Tilly, 2015). Michael Sandel advocates for philosophical reflection when he proposes his notion of public philosophy for Americans' liberal versus republican freedom. He writes: "The central idea of the public philosophy by which we live is that freedom consists in our capacity to choose our ends for ourselves. Politics should not try to form the character or cultivate the virtue of its citizens, for to do so would be to 'legislate morality'" (Sandel, 2005, p. 9). The use of philosophical reflection as a method of analysis of topics in intercultural communication studies is a significant way to address this topic with the wisdom and courage required if we are to see a critical and radical transformation in people's condition of life. Many of these issues are almost the same issues addressed by scholars mentioned above, that is, analysis of issues affecting universal humanity or issues affecting interculturality since the 19th century. Finally, using this method helps delve deeply into and ask insightful questions about issues related to intercultural communication studies. For example, issues such as, intercultural communication competence, power relations, intercultural conflict resolution competence, language, worldview, religion, identities, racism, social justice, existential sociolinguistics, human rights, practice of national and international laws, and globalization are complex issues that need more humane reflections to reach peaceable and imagined outcomes (Anderson, 2006; Balosa, 2022a; 2022c; Chomsky, 2017; Said, 1994; 2004; Sorrells, 2016; Nakayama & Martin, 2002).

4.   Definition of Key Concepts

4.1   Global Intercultural Citizenship as an Interdisciplinary Theory

In which way is global intercultural citizenship an interdisciplinary theory? This question appeals to the understanding of the definition of global intercultural citizenship and the importance of its principles in addressing modern transnational and intercultural relations to build what Ted Cantle calls "community cohesion," that is, "what must happen in all communities (across the world) to enable different groups of people to get on well together" (Cantle, 2012, p. 93). As indicated in the introduction of this study, I define global intercultural citizenship as "the comprehensive intercultural mindset that motivates the cultivation of intercultural competence in building more equitable national and international laws and more humane relationships in everyday life across the world". That is, an overarching disposition of constructive attitudes, reflections, and actions that enable individuals, institutions, and communities to counteract dominant and anti-intercultural forces but also to manage and navigate legal, politico-economic, sociocultural, moral, technological, and environmental issues with loyalty, justice, and human dignity (Balosa, 2022c, p. 16; see also Galston, 1980, pp. 108, 192; Marcel, 1967, p. 31). This theory is designed to encourage and demonstrate the acquisition or cultivation of a symbolic universal brother/sisterhood cooperation and mutual empowerment, appreciation, commitment, solidarity, inclusion, and respect for human and cultural diversity and dignity across the globe. It entails trustworthy participation in the processes or social and public policies of the reduction of poverty, existential inequality, illiteracy, and inhumane conditions of living in both the Global North and the Global South (Anscombe, 1963; Bratman, 2014; 2018; Dworkin, 2006). Global intercultural citizenship provides appropriate strategies or principles in navigating life within the self and with others in local, regional, and transnational contexts. These principles are: a *sustainable existential intercultural mindset* (SEIM), *global intercultural solidarity*, *knowledge of self, existential justice,* and *community diplomacy*. I will elaborate on these principles or strategies in the next section. In the face of super diversity in modern humans, cultures, languages, technologies, and environments or ecologies, global intercultural citizenship theory fosters recognitions of this diversity as multiple forces are combined by a human family to resist oppressive "social structures" and build a better existence for all (Crisp, 2015, p. 13; Fanon, 1952/2008, p. 80; Sweetman 2006, 123). That is, a disposition of gathering skills, agency, and ideas in developing and implementing social and public policies which equitably serve the interests of the entire human family.

   Many of today's world social and public policies seem to foster ethnocentrism and what I call "econotechnocracy" (Balosa, 2022c, p.16). That is, they promote the interests of the dominant societies or sociocultural groups rather than the interests of every single human being, every culture, and every environmental space—urban or rural. Tendencies and discourses arguing to work for such interests have not demonstrated a satisfactory outcome for global humanity. For example, colonialism has been described as having a savior mission for indigenous people. Unfortunately, scholars in cultural anthropology and colonial history have described colonialism as a dehumanizing, destructive, and transient and permanent cultural deformation mission (Fanon, 1952/2008, pp. 89-96; Said, 1993, p.130). For example, Frantz Fanon writes: "I wanted quite simply to be a man among men. I would have liked to enter our world young and sleek, a world we could build together. But for the white man, 'Negroes are savages, morons, and

illiterate.' There was this myth of the Negro that had to be destroyed at all costs" (Fanon, 1954/2008, pp.92, 96). In addition, metaphorically, Renato Rosaldo compares colonialism and its imperialistic nostalgia to a criminal. He writes: "Imperialist nostalgia revolves around a paradox: A person kills somebody, and then mourns the victim. Imperialist nostalgia uses a pose of 'innocent yearning' both to capture people's imaginations and to conceal its complicity with often brutal domination" (Rosaldo, 1993, pp. 70, 71). Multiple discourses pronounced by the global political and intellectual elites, most of whom are the product of colonialism or neocolonialism, seem to profess interests in the unity, the fraternity, and the common good of the human family. Again, the fact that there are no concrete results from these discourses makes one associate their discourses to the imperialist nostalgia and "reinforcement of the stereotypes" by which the less powerful humanity is viewed (Said, 1978, p. 26). Rosaldo explains: "The peculiarity of their yearning, of course, is that agents of colonialism long for the very forms of life they intentionally altered or destroyed" (Rosaldo, 1993, p. 70).

Today, this nostalgia and the reinforcement of the stereotype mentality can be noted in ex-colonial powers longing to maintain their hegemony in their old colonies that they call "our brothers" and that they try to provide everlasting 'aid' to poor countries instead of working with them with transparency and mutual respect for equal sustainable development (Allen & Light, 2015; Altman, 2001; Cohen, 2022). For this reason, in my opinion, the global world political culture established since the colonial era undermines human diversity and intercultural communication competence and constitutes a serious obstacle to global intercultural solidary and human dignity. This political culture seems to operate under ethnocentrism and econotechnocracy order. Neuliep (2021) defines ethnocentrism as "the extent to which one perceives one's own group as the center of everything and judges other groups with reference to it" (p. 424). He explains: "Ethnocentrics tend to create and reinforce negative attitudes and behaviors toward out-groups—judgments about in-groups and out-groups almost always are biased in favor of the in-group at the expense of the out-group" (p. 422.). This disposition is exactly what the colonial powers displayed and what the neo-colonial powers today are displaying as well.

They perceive the other nations or cultures as nonexistent. All policies must be elaborated by them then passed on to other groups judged to serve the interests of dominant groups.

Accompanying this disposition, is the global order that I call *econotechnocracy*. I define econotechnocracy as a world-system or a model of world governance which focuses on the economic and technologically powerful individuals and nations. These dominate global social and public policies and global decision-making undermining democratic principles, human and cultural diversity, and equity and inclusion in relations with other people or nations. This order uses democracy to legitimate its domination and politics of global injustices. What they accomplish in their offices after elections is radically different from their campaign slogans and professed concrete actions such as providing electricity, basic literacy, training for employment readiness, decent education, healthcare, housing, and employment (Loeb, 1996; Marcel, 1967; Meynaud, 1964; Williams & Macedo, 2005). Like ethnocentrics, *econotechnocrats* think TINA, that is, "There Is No Alternative"—the slogan of Mrs. Thatcher, who was Great Britain's prime minister from 1979 to 1990 (Wallerstein, 2004, p. ix). In other words, our ways, or no ways! They profess to be democratic leaders and advocates for human dignity but denigrate other political cultures. The distribution of global economy, global infrastructure, and global technology, global healthcare, global food, and global education is managed to better serve first the interests of the super-powerful individuals and nations. As one can note, this order creates a

divided humanity, the humanity of better existence versus the struggling humanity, in other words the Global North, living in reasonably humane life conditions versus the Global South, living in extreme poverty and humiliating life conditions. The economist William K. Tabb calls these conditions: "today's colonialism—a small number of giant corporations are growing more and more powerful through mergers and takeovers that are transforming the structure of global markets through cross-border alliances" (Tabb, 2002, p. 84). It should not be perceived as an exaggeration to describe this system of divided humanity in the dispositions of the ethnocentric and econotechnocratic world as "today's colonialism" and as an econotechnocracy (Fanon, 1964/2004; Goodin, 1980; Hite & Seitz, 2021; Stiglitz, 2013).

5.   Ethnocentrism,   Econotechnocracy,   and   Intercultural   Communication Competence

James Neuliep helps us understand how ethnocentrism, and I will also say, econotechnocracy are obstacles to the acquisition of intercultural communication competence. He writes: "Intercultural communication competence is defined as the degree to which you effectively adapt your verbal and nonverbal messages to the appropriate cultural context—to be interculturally competent you have to adjust and modify the kinds of verbal and nonverbal messages you send" (Neuliep, 2021, p. 422). In regard to the world poverty, living conditions disparities between the Global North and the Global South's citizens, one may agree that the leaders of this world order have not demonstrated any adjustment in their verbal and nonverbal messages to their subjects or citizens. As mentioned in the previous section, there are imbalances and social injustices such as establishing "the center of powers" in metropolitan centers or capital cities, social and public policies centered on improving the existence of the powerful individuals and nations, while rural areas are abandoned in poverty since the colonial era. In addition, favoritism for the cultures and languages of the dominant social groups and nations are evidence of the lack of interest in the cultivation of intercultural communication competence and political culture of equitable public and social policy for the common good by today's global political and intellectual leadership (Meynaud, 1964, p. 111). This lack of intercultural communication competence is tantamount to the lack of global intercultural citizenship (Dworkin; 2006; Seale & Mallinson, 2018). For example, Seal & Mallinson (2018) argue that "language use is both a vehicle for and a reflection of inequality, demonstrating the dialectic relationship between culture and social structure" (p. xxii). The discriminatory politics of languages and the general attitude in the treatment of language use between dominant languages used in urban life and education versus indigenous or local languages used in rural life but not in education nor in public politics is clear evidence of a divided humanity. This humanity perpetuated by econotechnocracy needs the contribution of the theory of global intercultural citizenship to address what legal philosopher Ronald Dworkin calls "the deep principles about human value" such as human dignity, equity, inclusion, and unity within diversity (Dworkin, 2006, p. 8).

Why should this situation be of concern to students, scholars, and individuals interested in intercultural communication competence and related fields of research? Neuliep (2021) provides an answer to this question. He argues: "Ethnocentric groups see themselves as righteous and exceptional and view their own standards as universal and moral. Out-groups are seen as immoral, subordinate, and impotent" (p. 424). As advocates of intercultural communication competence, students and scholars in intercultural communication studies should perceive ethnocentric and econotechnocratic groups as a problem for the intercultural world and inimical

to the notion of global intercultural citizenship. They not only disparage the rest of humanity, but they are inclined to divide and destroy it. Frantz Fanon described this inclination as "the dilemma of 'whiten or perish'" (Fanon, 1952/2008, p. 80). For example, to resist this inclination, Fanon called for "a need for combined action on the individual and the group along the lines of a change in social structure" which he thought to be the real source of the racial conflict (Ibid.). From these perspectives, we should agree that ethnocentrism and econotechnocracy are serious obstacles not merely to intercultural communication competence but also to global sustainable development and human dignity for all (Fanon, 1954; Marcel, 1963; 1967; Sandel, 2005). The recent pandemic of COVID-19 and the war in Ukraine have affected all of us in one way or another (See Appendix C). Ethnocentric and econotechnocratic groups as well as individual citizens need to understand the significance of intercultural communication competence and the significance of adopting the culture of human dignity if we are to combine our actions as individuals and as groups to ensure a better existence for all. This where the notion of global intercultural citizenship helps bring us together under its principle of global intercultural solidarity (see Table 1 in this study).

6.   Citizenship: A Brief Historical Background

In this section I provide a brief history of the notion of citizenship before discussing the difference between the approach taken by global intercultural citizenship versus global/world citizenship (Nusbaum, 2002; Sorrells, 2016). The notion of citizenship is an old and controversial one in the history of human existence. Socrates (469-399 B.C.E), thought he was a citizen of the world (Cahn, 2009; Minogue, 1995), but Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) thought he was as a citizen of Geneva (Cahn, 2009, p. 5). O'Neil (2013) defines citizenship as "an individual's relationship to the state, wherein citizens swear allegiance to that state and the state in return is obligated to provide rights to those citizens" (P. A-16). The political philosopher David Miller argues that the problem of citizenship is easy to state but difficult to solve due to the cultural fragmentations of modern states, that is, members of state with ever disparate set of personal identities as evidenced by their ethnic affiliations, their religions allegiances, their views of personal morality, their ideas what is valuable in life, their tastes in art, music and so forth. David Miller argues that the main lines of the liberal conception of the notion of citizenship derive from the classic statement of T. H. Marshall. That is, in Marshall's analysis, Miller explains, "citizenship should be understood as a set of rights—civil, political, and social rights—enjoyed equally by every member of the society in question" (Miller, 2000, p. 44). Miller questions T. H. Marshall's analysis of citizenship in the context of multiplicity of understandings of the notion of citizenship and in the context of distortion of justice such as in the case of "exclusion of women as citizens" (Miller, 2000, pp. 44, 45; 2013, pp. 66, 67). Miller proposes a "contextualist approach to justice and citizenship" (Miller, 2013, p. 67).

The international relations scholar Andrew Linklater advocates for "the good international citizen" (Linklater, 2007, p. 63). He argues that the good international citizen is the one that supports "foreign policy and the one that must also be animated by more elevated concerns such as promoting world order, encouraging global reform and honoring duties to humanity" (Ibid.). Linklater (2007) insists that complexities aside, the notion of the good international citizen is "an attractive one for at least it promises to overcome the conflict between citizenship and humanity" (Ibid.). It also appeals to address "the mounting problems of world order, and its attractiveness is further underlined by the way in which recent patterns of global change have prompted the

consideration of some past diplomatic conventions and encouraged the development of new international norms" (p. 64).

Due to multiple interpretations of the notion of citizenship, many scholars prefer to use the definition, or the interpretation of citizenship employed by the English sociologist T. H. Marshall (1893-1981). For example, reflecting on what term to designate for the high rank or dignity attributed to every member of the community and associated with their fundamental rights, the legal, social, and political scholar Jeremy Waldron writes: "I might choose the term 'legal citizenship'—what I have in mind is something like the sense of citizenship invoked by T. H. Marshall in his famous book *Citizenship and Social Class*, where he was concerned to tease out different strands of citizenship in a modern society" (p. 60). In addition, in his volume, *Citizenship, Identity, and Social History* (1996), sociologist Charles Tilly turns to T. H. Marshall's formulation of citizenship to answer questions related to the notion of citizenship. Questions such as: what is citizenship? Where did it come from? How does it vary and change? What has citizenship to do with the identities people deploy in everyday life, including class, race, ethnicity, gender, and other identities? How did the strong forms of citizenship we know today come into being? He writes: "Repeatedly we return to T. H. Marshall's influential formulation of half a century ago, which postulated a progression from civic to political to social citizenship, the latter presumably culminating in the full welfare state" (p. 3).

What is T. H. Marshall's definition of citizenship? In his essays, *Class, Citizenship, & Social Development* (1964), T. H. Marshall defines citizenship as:

> civil, political, and social elements which encompasses the rights necessary for individual freedom—liberty of the person, freedom of speech, thought and faith, the right to own property and to conclude valid contracts, and the right to justice; the right to participate in the exercise of political power, as a member of a body invested with political authority or as an elector of the members of such a body; and the whole range from the right to a modicum of economic welfare and security to the right to share to the full in the social heritage and to live the life of a civilized being according to the standards prevailing in the society.
>
> (Marshall, 1964, p. 78)

It is not within the scope of this paper to delve further into the notion of citizenship except to provide a brief overview of this notion as it sheds some significant light on its similarity to the concern of humanity and the way in which it influences the theory of global intercultural citizenship, that is, to advocate for the civil, the legal, the political, the social, the moral, the environmental, and the technological rights of all individuals across the world in the age of globalization or an intercultural world. Our pluralistic universe generates multiple identities and world views or cultures that try to constraint this pluralism to ideological homogeneity. This constraint to ideological homogeneity is tantamount to an anti-humanistic approach to what the classic American philosopher William James calls "our natural experience, our strictly moralistic experience, or radical empiricism" (Tilly, 2005; James, 1909/1996). What does this pluralistic universe entail for the theory of global intercultural citizenship? It entails, as mentioned earlier, the reality that we are interconnected in life. It also means that discriminatory order such as ethnocentrism and econotechnocracy cannot help in promoting global sustainable development nor foster the culture of human dignity. A modern pluralistic world needs to embrace the human

and cultural diversity as a reality to better address the needs for a better existence for all. It is this reality that should interpellate individuals and communities to cultivate more humane qualities (Marcel, 1954, p. 8).

7.   Global Intercultural Citizenship, Global/World Citizenship, and Intercultural Citizenship.

7.1   Global Intercultural Citizenship and Its Five Principles

To understand the difference between global intercultural citizenship and global/world citizenship one has to look at the degree of emphasis that each theory puts on interculturality and the overarching value of intercultural competence. In this regard, one has to understand that one cannot pretend to represent any citizenship without understanding the ways in which that citizenry is shaped. For example, the social psychologist Richard J. Crisp argues that there are ways in which society, culture, and context shape attitudes, behavior, beliefs, ways to figure out who we are, and how these different aspects of our life's structure or social universe are intimately connected to our relationship with others (Crisp, 2015, p. 1). He mentions families, neighbors, co-workers, lovers, enemies, politicians, soap stars, sport starts, and strangers as one's social universe. In my opinion, it is reasonable to argue that any responsible citizenship should demonstrate a certain level of intercultural competence or the understanding of this interconnection of the social universe and that not emphasizing it makes the notion of global citizenship an elitist way of promoting individuals' rights rather than fostering the common good. Hence, the inclusion of intercultural factors in human relationships is the key factor in understating the difference between the theory of global intercultural citizenship (Balosa, 2022b) versus the theory of global citizenship/world citizenship (Nussbaum,1997; 2006; Sorrell, 2016). In my opinion, the notion of global/world citizenship is an abstract notion in that it appeals to a sense of moral value for the common good without articulating the notion of interculturality. Hence, given that the majority of the world population from both the Global North and the Global South cannot afford the econotechnocratic global citizenship, global citizens may consciously or unconsciously serve merely the interest of the political and intellectual elites' discourse of capitalist globalization. As defined earlier, global intercultural citizenship is a concrete and transformational notion that proposes the appreciation and the application of the dialectic between global interculturality and human values for a citizenship that fosters our common humanity and sustain "deep human values" (Dworkin, 2006, p. 8).

   What benefit does the theory of global intercultural citizenship provide to the field of intercultural communication studies and related fields of research? To better address this question, one must discuss the five principles or strategies used by this theory to analyze not merely the contribution of intercultural competence in dealing with the issues of multiple identities and political ideologies, but also the issue of global sustainable development and human dignity for all. As mentioned earlier, the five principles are: a sustainable existential intercultural mindset (SEIM), global intercultural solidarity, the knowledge of self, existential justice, and community diplomacy. The following section defines what each principle entails and explains how each principle may contribute to the overarching benefit of the global intercultural citizenship model. The model will then be represented and summarized under Table 1 in this study.

Sustainable existential intercultural mindset (SEIM) refers to a constant disposition which enables an individual to demonstrate unprejudiced altruistic attitudes and actions for him- or herself and for others wherever and whenever opportunities to do so occur. In a world where individuals and nation-states put themselves 'first,' it is difficult to cultivate a principle of SEIM. However, if many people should adopt policies that demonstrate a balanced and equitable distribution of sociocultural, politico-economic, technologic, legal, and environmental resources, this may change the actual social structure and its human degrading policies. A sustainable existential intercultural mindset should help regulate public and social policies that provide equitable and more humane life conditions for both rural and urban life in the Global North and the Global South (Heller & Rao, 2015; Hite & Seitz, 2021). Applying the principle of SEIM in the management of the relationship between the Global North and the Global South or in navigating individuals' intercultural encounters may help change global entrenched inequalities into more dignifying conditions of life and foster more equal citizens' rights across national and international settings.

Global intercultural solidarity: This principle consists of individuals understanding that the globalizing world and its multiple identities and complexities need everyone's effort to build a better existence for all. This principle entails that an injustice rendered to one human being is an injustice rendered to all humanity. Hence, rather than fostering individuals' and groups' ethnocentrism or econotechnocracy, we should be fostering altruism, justice, and common effort to build collective efforts to respond to new challenges (Miller, 2013; Taylor et al., 2020; Tilly, 1998). Taylor et al. (2020) argue that "currently many local communities do not respond effectively to new challenges" (p. 9). I argue that this attitude of lack of solidarity is also caused by ethnocentrism, econotechnocracy, the political neglect of the powerless citizens, and an overarching intercultural incompetence. Neuliep (2021) defines ethnocentrism as "[t]he extent to which one perceives one's own group as the center of everything and judges other groups with reference to it" (p. 424). He explains that "ethnocentrics tend to create and reinforce negative attitudes and behaviors toward out-groups—judgments about in-groups and out-groups almost always are biased in favor of the in-group at the expense of the out-group" (Ibid.). If Neuliep is right when he argues that "ethnocentric groups see themselves as righteous and exceptional and view their own standards as universal and moral, but out-groups are seen as immoral, subordinate, and impotent" (Ibid.), we should agree that global intercultural solidarity is the principle that may help transform dominant, oppressive, and self-interest mindsets that sustain ethnocentric and econotechnocratic global order into mindsets that foster global intercultural citizenship for the common good and humanistic interests for the present and the future.

The Knowledge of Self: this principle entails the consciousness of who an individual is. That is, the awareness of the extent of one's qualities as a caring human being for human, legal, moral, environmental, and cultural diversity. This quality is crucially important because in a globalizing world, it is difficult to constructively and productively support efforts related to building equity, intercultural competence, and unity within diversity and human dignity if one does not know what he or she stands for. In this regard, Marcel (1954) argues: "To be a human being means not only to possess the biological characteristics of a given species but to live in a human way" (p. 34). He then explains what it means to live a human way and writes: "To live humanly means to live in such material conditions that the human being is not crushed under the weight of care, and that his or her consciousness is able to develop an awareness of both self and other—and also the reality which transcends the opposition between the two" (Ibid, see Marcel, 1963, pp. 94-96). From this perspective one can understand the significance of the knowledge of

self in handling human or intercultural relations in a world of a super diversity. This understanding can boost one's assertiveness in communication and one's adjustment in building more human relationships (Gnagey & Weitten, 1986; Rodriguez, 2010; Schreiber, 2013).

In this age of anxiety and ambiguity, everyone seems to be lost about the future. So altruistic thoughts may seem to be senseless and unrealistic. But for those who understand the globalization of intercultural communication, the knowledge of self is crucial in helping them to adapt or adjust to and smoothly navigate "their natural and social milieus" (Marcel, 1963, p. 95). To navigate our common humanity requires a certain understanding of the components or pieces of this humanity. In this regard, writing about "the self and Ambiguity," Gabriel Marcel writes: "A person's being capable of communing with himself/herself and so of renewing contact with an invisible and limitless reality thereby reveals himself/herself capable of transcending the spontaneous course of life." (Marcel, 1963, p. 94). He explains: "Man's essential characteristic seems to be his ability to let himself/herself be penetrated by this supra-personal light, an ability which is evidently linked in some way to what we call human dignity" (Marcel, 1963, pp. 945, 96). In the world of ambiguity and alienation, Marcel argues that being conscious of the sense of the self or being conscious of one's existence solidifies one's capacity to resist or fight "all that contributes not only to separate us from Being, but even to make the quest for Being appear illusory and, finally, meaningless" (Ibid.).

Indeed, the ethnocentric and econotechnocratic groups seem to operate in dehumanizing as many people as possible by impoverishing them and making them vulnerable and non-resistible to domination. Hence, the knowledge of self as one of the principles of the theory of global intercultural citizenship should provide those individuals who don't have the sense of human dignity to have one and to resist anti-human strategies anchored in ethnocentrism and econotechnocracy's "egoism" and self-centered interests (Nagel, 1970/1978, p. 83). The recognition of the other person's reality, and the possibility of putting oneself in his or her place, is crucial not only to one's self-respect but for the respect and dignity of all humanity living under what sociologist Charles Tilly called "durable inequality" (Tilly, 1998, p. 14) and what I call "existential injustices" (Balosa, 2022c, p. 16). Hence, to radically transform this actual system of inequality, we need a new order based on what I call *existential justice* where "the new pattern of power" should be visible to all (Lasswell, 1965, pp. 1, 2). What does existential justice entail?

Existential justice as the fourth principle of the theory of global intercultural citizenship entails a comprehensive model of national and international legal system for justice for all. That is, a legal system that recognizes that our existence is a collective phenomenon and that any injustice to one individual, to one culture, to one language, to one environment (whether urban or rural), and/or to one technology in a pluralistic universe is tantamount to injustice to the entire humanity. Hence, existential justice encompasses all types of justices, that is, social justice, global justice, special justice, and justice as fairness (Miller, 2013; Sorrells, 2016; Rawls, 1999). Existential justice as a comprehensive justice fosters the wisdom of understanding that happiness and security for all depend on the exercise of equity, inclusion, mutual empowerment, mutual respect, respect for the human rights, and human dignity (Lasswell, 1965; Linklater, 2007; Martin & Nakayama, 2004; Rodriguez, 2010; Sorrells & Sekimoto, 2016). Existential justice also helps foster constructive and expository discussion regarding national and international laws. That is, addressing issues in the legal system, including practices that violate not merely human values, rights, mutual respect, and dignity but that also promote favoritism, bias, prejudice, racism, exclusion, classism, corruption, anti-immigration, and hatred (Altman &

Wellman, 201; Dworkin, 2006). Equitable application of national and international laws should help build more humane relationships and a better common future for all and prevent bias or selective application of national and international laws and policies.

Community diplomacy as the fifth principle of the theory of global intercultural citizenship entails an equitable and inclusive treatment of urban and rural conditions of life by international diplomacy. That is, diplomatic policies should not stop merely at the cooperation of two governments and two capital cities but should expand to all people or communities involved in a given diplomatic mission. Community diplomacy as one of the fingers of the metaphoric hand, the theory of global intercultural citizenship, appeals for more humane and more democratic values and more equitable distribution of infrastructure across national and international relations for the happiness and security of all (Anderson et al., 2018). For example, most of the countries in the Global South face problems with electricity supply, basic infrastructure, illiteracy, and access to basic technology. The questions that community diplomacy asks are: How can international diplomacy transform its colonialist and neo-colonialist politics into an equitable partnership for the good of not merely the political and intellectual elites but also for the common citizens of the countries involved? How can international diplomacy adopt policies that treat all countries as communities of our common humanity and provide equitable support to all without bias and discriminatory attitudes and actions (Chomsky, 2017; Said, 1978, 1994)? It is for the sake of appropriate answers to these questions, for the sake of an overarching adjustment within national and international relations, and for the sake of promoting personal and communal growth for all rather than sustaining the status-quo that intercultural communication studies and related studies should approach the theory of global intercultural citizenship and its principle of community diplomacy today and in the future (Gnagey & Weiten, 1986; Schreiber, 2013).

How do these five principles contribute to the overarching benefit of the model? The answer to this question is that this model encourages the cultivation of wisdom and adjustment for more humane relationships and better common existence for all. That is, commitment to attitudes and actions directed to personal and communal sustainable growth, peace, and human dignity. For example, in his book *The Decline of Wisdom* (1954), Gabriel Marcel reminds us about the injustice of the modern economic order and the way in which it generates generalized poverty, insecurity, and human indignity. He writes: "an individualized economy is inadequate to the existence of the masses whose needs must be satisfied" (p. 14). Marcel perceives the industrial civilization and the technicality of knowledge or what I call *econotechnocracy* as a process of dehumanization since the world system's planning or "the technicians" of this system perpetuate injustices and calamities (p. 15). Furthermore, Marcel articulates the ways in which modern technology has destroyed the notion of Socratic philosophic reflection which implied the idea of self-knowledge— the idea of being between the knower and the known and the way in which this idea has been replaced by less and less respect for the subject of the human beings (pp. 16, 17). He states: "Following upon the hyperbolic development of technics, the subject tends less and less to be treated as a subject and is consequently less and less respected. Hence that spreading violation of privacy which is one of the most horrifying features of the modern world" (Ibid.). Indeed, these features have much to do with the injustices perpetuated by the modern world's social structures and its treatment of intercultural relations. The exercise of global intercultural citizenship through all its principles should help transform the actual unjust world-system into a just, wise, and balanced world-system where human dignity prevails over ideologies that sustain econotechnocratic dominance for the self-centered interests of the dominant groups. As a matter of fact, using the five principles of the theory of global

intercultural citizenship as a continuum should help all of us acquire and develop intercultural communicative competence to handle intercultural relations and join efforts toward a more humane existence for all (James, 1909/1996; Tilly, 2005).

Table 1. The Theory of Global Intercultural Citizenship in Intercultural Communication Studies Model

The Theory of Global Intercultural Citizenship in Intercultural Communication Studies Model

1. Sustainable Existential Intercultural Mindset (SEIM)	**William James (1842 - 1910) Gabriel Marcel (1989-1973) Frantz Fanon (1925-1961)**	**A sociopsychological, anthropological, and moral-philosophical overarching strategy in handling self and others within mutual empowerment, mutual respect, unity in diversity, and human dignity.** (Obregón, 2021; Said, 1993, Tubino, 2015)
2. Global Intercultural Solidarity	**Erich Fromm (1990-1980) Paulo Freire (1921-1997) Agostinho Neto (1922-1979)**	**A sociocultural, educational, and politico-philosophical strategy in building more humane relationships, i.e., in building interpersonal, intercommunal, interregional, and international relationships.** (Crisp, 2015; Fanon, 1952/2008)
3. Knowledge of Self		**An existential sociolinguistic, existential anthropological, social psychology, and the philosophy of belonging strategy in building trust in one's and others' capacities in fostering critical radical humanistic perspectives for a harmonious common humanity.** (Andeson, 2006; Balosa, 2022a; Fishman, 1986; Heyns, 1958; Sargent, 2010)
4. Existential Justice	**Ronald Dworkin (1931-2013) Michael E. Bratman (1945—)**	**A historical and legal philosophical strategy in building policies and national and international laws beyond power struggles but equity, inclusion, rights, peaceful coexistence, democratic humanism and human dignity for all.** (Altman & Wellman, 2009; Fulbright, 1966; Foucault, 1978; James, 1996; Lewis, 1986; Miller, 2013)
5. Community Diplomacy	**Alfred N. Whitehead (1861-1947) Michel Foucault (1926-1984)**	**A cultural and economic geography and process-relational political philosophy strategy in handling legitimacy and power in international relations and governmentality in rural and urban context** (Sandel, 2009).

Global Intercultural Citizenship model is an interdisciplinary model in fostering intercultural understanding, equity, unity in diversity, within the overarching philosophy of belonging.

7.2.   Global Intercultural Citizenship versus Global/World Citizenship

Global intercultural citizenship as a metaphoric hand and its five fingers enables us to treat our common humanity with radical and exemplary commitment with respect to protecting and defending the values of diversity and human dignity across the universe by means of self-discipline with respect to power, personality, adjustment to life experience, national and international laws, and building more humane relationships (Lasswell, 1962; Linklater, 2007; Rodrigues, 2010). It also enables us to enjoy our original national, cultural, and individual identities while we promote mutual respect, mutual appreciation, and mutual empowerment of human, cultural, linguistic, moral, and environmental diversity as national and universal resources. For example, global intercultural citizenship suggests a consideration of material, social, political, and cultural aspects of all communities of the world both in urban and rural areas. These aspects include infrastructures, electricity, general education/literacy, healthcare, employment, human respect between men and women, equitable application of regional, national, and international laws, mutual respect among nations, inclusion of the use of minorities/indigenous languages in regional, national, and international public political and social spaces (Balosa, 2022a; 2022c). Hence, global intercultural citizenship perceives both moral and socio-material needs of human beings across the world as critical aspects to the practice of citizenship. Hence, talking about citizenship is tantamount to talking about both the moral and socio-material condition of life of each human being and each community as a constituent of our common humanity.

The notion of "Global or World Citizenship" in my opinion, focuses on a broad moral concern rather than on a comprehensive diversity, conviviality, and interculturality (Sorrells, 2016, pp. 233, 235). While global intercultural citizenship focuses on the equitable and dignifying recognition, appreciation, and use of human, cultural, linguistic, moral, and environmental voices' uniqueness across localities or communities of the world, global citizenship focuses on understanding and big moral ideas that may never address the indigenous people's issues. Hence, the good intention of proponents of "global/world citizenship" (Nussbaum, 2002, pp. 6,7; D'Antoni & Mayes, 2023, p. 7) are appreciated and encouraged, but in my opinion, it falls short of the big picture of what Frantz Fanon calls "individual and collective efforts to change the existing social structures" (Fanon, 1954/2008, p. 80). Its moral obligation to the world sounds like the discourse of the global political and intellectual elites in that it does not mention the notion of interculturality which would embody the concern of subcultures and diverse life in rural spaces. Spaces where, since the colonial era, there has been no infrastructure, no electricity, and no literacy. Do these individuals yet count as citizens of their own countries? Does the notion of global/world citizenship apply to them? Can they benefit from the privilege of being called global or world citizens? Can they participate in the politico-economic, sociocultural, moral, environmental, legal, and technological world policies? If not, which groups of people then enjoy the legitimacy of being called global citizens? This is where the theory of global intercultural citizenship tries to foster the awareness of these injustices and tries to call for a critical radical humanistic approach in framing political and intellectual discourses on intercultural issues across the world. Through the theoretical framework of existential sociolinguistics, which also draws from critical-radical humanist approach, global intercultural citizenship critiques global/world citizenship with respect to its, in my opinion, merely moral argument.

For example, in the discussion of the qualities of global citizenship, Sorrells (2016) advocates "wisdom, courage, and compassion/empathy, capacities for global citizenship — capacities that reimagine citizenship based on human needs rather than rights" (p. 235). My critique of this approach is that humanity is made of needs and rights which within interculturality, generate policies anchored on the five principles of the theory of global intercultural citizenship to ensure the inclusion of human, linguistic, cultural, technological, legal, and environmental needs, and rights of a humane existence (Balosa, 2022a, p. 155). In my opinion, to generate these policies would imply much more than the capacities and qualities mentioned by Sorrells (2016). Hence, I think that implementing global intercultural citizenship encourages and motivates individuals across nations and communities to treat others with mutual respect and human dignity to promote the culture of our common humanity first—the culture in which all human beings deserve to live within moral and physical dignifying conditions of life no matter whether they live in the Global North or in the Global South. This entails comprehensive intercultural communication competence not for self-centered interests, but for a better understanding and better management of human relations and better existence for all.

7.3.   Global Intercultural Citizenship versus Intercultural Citizenship

Global intercultural citizenship draws its inspiration from the work of English intercultural communication scholar Michael Byram's work on education for intercultural citizenship. For example, Byram (2008) and Byram et al. (2017) discuss the ways we should move from traditional principles and practices in education of cultures to education for intercultural citizenship. Byram (2008) defines intercultural citizenship as "an integrated approach for education for democracy learning and for language teaching for intercultural communicative competence that focuses on competences rather than identities and that adds a new dimension by combining language education with political education as a response to internationalization" (pp. 157, 177). In this context, Byram explains, "intercultural communicative competence in foreign language education involves engagement with other languages and cultures and the search for cohesion of a different sort" (Ibid.). Byram's (2008) approach is different from the approach of "education for cosmopolitan citizenship" advocated by Osler and Starkey (2005a).

Contrary to the notion that education for cosmopolitan citizenship must necessarily be about enabling learners to make connections between their immediate contexts and the global context and the notion that education for cosmopolitan citizenship encompasses citizenship learning as a whole or broader understanding of national identity, Byram thinks that the major point to be made here is "certain competences" (Byram, 2008, p. 157). He writes: "Irrespective of identities and the role of education in developing allegiances and identification with entities, people need certain competences in order to be able to act sensibly in and across political entities, at whatever level" (Ibid.). While I agree with Byram's theory of intercultural citizenship education and the framework from which this theory operates (Byram, 2008, pp. 238, 239), I think that the theory would have a more inclusive or global appeal by extrapolating its context of applicability to the global or universal humanistic context. For this reason, I think the theory of global intercultural citizenship is a more comprehensive theory in comparison to the theory of intercultural citizenship. That is, in global intercultural citizenship, voices of the non-Western world, indigenous groups, and rural worlds are seen not only to promote intercultural competence and the education of politics, identities, cultures, and languages (Byram, 2008, p. 177), but also to treat with equity and dignity all languages, all cultures, all human beings, all environments, and

all humanity (Balosa, 2022a, p. 146). In other words, the theory of global intercultural citizenship goes beyond intercultural competence to foster what I call "existential justice" (Altman, 2001, p. 11; Balosa, 2022c, p. 16).

Table 2. Global Intercultural Citizenship, Global/World Citizenship, and Intercultural Citizenship: Comparative Analysis

Models of Citizenship	Points of Convergence	Points of Divergence
Global Intercultural Citizenship (Balosa, 2022a; Marcel, 1967; Sargent, 2010)	Moral - Courage, love, wisdom, humility, common humanity - Human rights, diversity, unity human dignity - Intercultural competence - Immigration integration policy - Humanistic perspective	Moral and socio-material visibility across the world - infrastructure, quality education and health care for all, inclusive and equitable public and social policies, electricity for all, drinking water for all, literacy/technology for all, eradication of poverty - same treatments for urban and rural lives - application of national/international laws' issues - concrete/utopian intentions - interculturality as an imperative - political and public exemplarity - utopianism
Global/World Citizenship (Nussbaum, 1986; Sorrells, 2016; D'Antoni & Mayes, 2023)	Moral - Courage, love, empathy, wisdom, humility, common humanity, solidarity - Human rights, diversity, unity human dignity - Intercultural Competence - Immigration integration policy - Humanistic perspective	Elitist approach - good-abstract intentions, - politico-discursive approach - conscious/unconscious support for cultural homogeneity - no attention paid to sociopolitical and hegemonic ideologies, - interculturality not an imperative - cosmopolitanism
Intercultural Citizenship (Byram, 2008, Byram et al., 2017)	Moral - Courage, love, empathy, wisdom, humility, common humanity, solidarity - Human rights, diversity, unity human dignity	European model of interculturality - cultural exchange, foreign language education, multilingual policy for the European Union, immigration integration policy - integrationism

	- Intercultural competence - Immigration integration policy - Humanistic perspective	

Table 2 summarizes the similarities and differences of the three models of citizenship discussed in this study. It provides, in my opinion, the ground for argument in the debate or the discussion about issues related to the notion of citizenship in intercultural communication studies and related fields. While similarities are based on the moral background (see the column *Points of Convergence*), each of the models diverges from one another in the way I interpret its discourse or emphasis (see the column *Points of Divergence*). For example, with respect to socio-material conditions of the people among whom the majority are inhabitants of the Global South, I argue that this category and the subcategories in the related box distinguish the focus or discourse of the global intercultural citizenship model from the two other models. I insist that it is difficult to promote the notion of world citizenship without addressing the entrenched inequality, injustice, and elitist political and intellectual leadership within international and intercultural relations of today's world. The good intention or the moral argument of the proponents of global/world citizenship within the cosmopolitanism vision and the western-centered model of intercultural citizenship within the integrationism vision need also to address the social-material factors such as the injustice of national and international laws vis à vis people of different nationalities or continents. They also need to address the inhumane poverty that contributes to the suffering of many people across the world today. The good intention of cosmopolitanism in appealing for people to be caring, humble, and mutually empowering individuals and communities across the world may not suffice to address the divide in political management of citizenship issues, since this moral appeal may not satisfy the interest of power politics and geocultural hegemony (Appiah, 2007; Byram, 2008; Byrd Clark & Dervin, 2014; Dworkin, 1978; Said, 1994).

Global intercultural citizenship advocates for the marginalized voices, the indigenous voices, the inhumane conditions of life of rural inhabitants in the Global South such as the lack of electricity, infrastructure, technology, literacy, drinking water, political participation, political legitimacy of linguistic minority rights, economic issues, and basic health care. These inhabitants also deserve opportunities that derive from the concept of citizenship to contribute to world affairs. Not paying attention to the marginalization of the inhabitants of rural regions of the Global South but putting more emphasis merely on European or Western world integration and intercultural competence is tantamount to failing to recognize the overarching interdependence of the modern world. It is also tantamount to refusing to recognize the existence of other inhabitants of the world and their right to citizenship status (Dworkin, 1978; Rattopoulos, 2019). In this regard, Alfred North Whitehead argues: "Having regard to the universality of reactions with environment, the distinction is not quite absolute, but it cannot, however, be ignored" (Whitehead, 1978, p. 105). This is where, the global intercultural citizenship model, within the vision of utopianism, intervenes to make the difference. That is, it advocates for a concrete recognition for all differences or diversity and sustainable development for all people, languages, and cultures in both the Global North and the Global South to promote individuals' and communities' self and communal growth and human dignity as exemplary citizens and

communities (Claeys & Sargent, 2017; Dworkin, 1978; Lanzón, 2009; Sargent, 2010; Weissberg, 1999). For the interest of the recognition for all differences, the global intercultural citizenship model entails creating and theorizing about ways of life not regulated by econotechnocracy and its dominant and humiliating sociocultural and politico-economic ideologies but by humane values based on self and communal humanity, order, unity, security, and equity (Balosa, 2022b, p. 7296; Claeys & Sargent, 2017, p. 1).

8.   The Contribution of Gabriel Marcel's Philosophy to the Theory of Global Intercultural Citizenship

The French philosopher Gabriel Marcel (1889-1973) has enormously contributed to the theory of global intercultural citizenship. His work epitomizes what the theory of global intercultural citizenship entails. In our intercultural and pluralistic world (James, 1909/1996), the application of global intercultural citizenship's principles, that is, a sustainable existential intercultural mindset (SEIM), global intercultural solidarity, the knowledge of self, existential justice, and community diplomacy should help those interested in critical-radical humanistic values to properly advocate for the present and the future of humanity. These principles have been inspired from the work of Gabriel Marcel entitled *The Decline of Wisdom* (1954). In this work, Marcel argues that what should be catching our attention the most is not the ruins and the irreparable damage caused to our humanity, but the state of mind from which that destruction is perpetuated. He advocates for "the notion of spiritual heritage" to lead us to the advent of what he calls "a new world, a renewed humanity" (p. 21). In the same spirit, global intercultural citizens are individuals who are conscious of the misery of our common humanity, hence, advocate for conjunctive efforts, humility, altruism, equity, mutual respect, and dignity for a better existence. As Marcel's prayer for the advent of a renewed humanity, they pray for the love of justice and diversity to insure prosperity, integrity, security, conviviality, and human dignity for all (Fanon, 1952/2008; Foucault, 1994; Fromm, 1947).

The French sociologist Alain Touraine calls these citizens (global intercultural citizens), "subjects" (Touraine, 2007, p. 107). That is, individuals who take a stand, assume all the risks, but "without ever giving saving lives" (Ibid). These individuals, full of passion, wisdom, integrity, and respect for every human being, accept voluntarily to be engaged in one way or another in numerous struggles across the world. They never abandon saving other individuals and strive to make all voices to be heard, understood, and dignified. Their global intercultural citizenship skills are remarkable. They do not "seek to derive some minor personal advantage from the adventure of evil" but work for the cause of healthy and secure present and future humanity (pp. 107, 108, see also Brown, 2007, pp. 95, 96; Marcel, 1929/1998, p. 107).

The contribution of Gabriel Marcel to global intercultural citizenship and to intercultural communication studies in general is to be seen as a boost to intercultural communication competence and human dignity as crucial to human relations and global sustainable development. Contrary to an econotechnocratic world system and its materialistic discourse, Marcel's philosophy is an interdisciplinary concrete approach that brings to intercultural communication studies the focus on the consciousness of human existence and the responsibility of understanding that we are who we are because there are other people outside of ourselves. Marcel called this notion, "hybrid existence" (Marcel, 1967, p. 33; see also Marcel, 1954, p. 34). To have true or genuine intercultural relations, both parties, individuals, or groups involved must be full participants, that is, the consciousness of each member of the interaction must be felt and

the outcome evaluated. Marcel called this notion "participation" (Marcel, 1963). Finally, we may all agree that the purpose of human communication is to assure human survival and better existence. That is, an existence within security (comprehensive security), peace, conviviality, solidarity, and human dignity. Marcel discusses this notion in terms of true unity, living humanly, and radical change in the climate of the mind that perpetuates the ruin of our common humanity. He writes: "The disappearance of common sense is a phenomenon of immeasurable gravity and one which must inevitably bring about a radical change in the climate of the mind" (Marcel, 1954, p. 46).

Marcel goes further into educational settings and deplores how curricula are more artificial than focused on human qualities. He writes:

> For we are confronted everywhere with enormous agglomerations which are increasingly mechanized, so that individuals are linked in much the same way as the parts of a machine. This seems to me one of the most terrible effects of the predominance of the State (politics). It could be said that the moment common sense goes out of institutions and civic relationships it is also driven from the human mind. There are countless examples of this: I am thinking especially of the burdening of teaching and school life by examination of programs which are often drawn up in defiance of common sense, so that the means of selection are made increasingly artificial and take less and less account of those human qualities which ought surely to be considered before all others. The spirit of abstraction is gradually taking hold of human beings and alienating them increasingly from the sense of life and living realities, while at the same time it makes of them a field which is dangerously favorable to the growth of totalitarian ideologies.
>
> (Marcel, 1954, pp. 46, 47)

Indeed, the reality of the world as described by Marcel is degrading for all of us. As a teacher of French and Philosophy in one of the major public schools in the United States, I experience this reality on a daily basis. But I am engaged to bring to my students' attention the theory of global intercultural citizenship to instruct them about questioning these injustices, these processes of alienation, and making the connections with the rest of our common humanity. I stimulate in them the desire of striving to play their part as exemplary members of their communities in their attitudes and actions toward other human beings by *building more humane relationships* (BMHR) (Douglas & Johnson, 1977; Schreiber, 2013). Marcel invites us to understand that the modern world's mindset is in an infinitely tragic spiritual situation. He finally calls to humility and altruism. He writes: "I cannot protest too strongly against the notion that our thinking nowadays is only valid if it is on a world-wide or planetary scale. Here as everywhere, it is the sense of the neighbor that needs awakening, for it is the only safeguard against calamities which indeed are certain to be world-wide" (Marcel, 1954, p. 56).

Applying Gabriel Marcel's philosophy in intercultural communication studies brings the voice of a critical-radical humanistic approach, that is, an approach whereby interests of common humanity are secondary to none. Human dignity has no price and a wasted life of one individual by poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, political mismanagement, political violence, rebellions influenced by transnational corporations is tantamount to the wasted life of the entire humanity. This philosophy leads everyone to reflect on the reasons for "social injustices and the discrepancy in life conditions" between the citizens of the Global North and those of the Global South (Marcel, 1952/2008, p. 31). For example, many countries in the Global South don't have

productive and humane life infrastructures, electricity, hospitals, educational system for basic literacy for all, and rural life lacks conditions to be creative and active participants in national and international affairs. The discrepancy between urban and rural sociocultural, politico-economic, and environmental conditions of life in the Global South demonstrates the failure of ethnocentric and econotechnocratic world order. Since the colonial era, the Global South's rural areas were not of interest for the colonizers' project of development; the same politics is applied today by the new political and intellectual elites, many of them close allies to their former colonial powers and today's neo-colonial global political and intellectual elites. The Global South's metropolitan cities are crowded, and many people live in such extreme poverty that whenever and wherever a pandemic may erupt, all the world or all the humanity is vulnerable. Under this circumstance, how wise is ethnocentrism and econotechnocracy in an interdependent world? Are not we all being affected by insecurity, poverty, and war caused by ethnocentrism and econotechnocracy in certain parts of the world? (see Appendices A, B, C).

Today, there is evidence of the resonance of Gabriel Marcel's work through interdisciplinary scholarship. For example, in their work *Age of Anxiety: Meaning, Identity, and Politics in the 21st-Century Film and Literature* (2020), Anthony M. Wachs and Jon D. Schaff point out: "Anxiety typifies the modern experience as the fragmentation of a variety of once-stable narratives leaves individuals with little guidance as to how they might lead a meaningful life" (p. 3). That is, a life free of "trivial information that is largely disconnected from meaning social or political action" (Ibid.). Wachs and Schaff (2020) admit that "in this kind of uneasiness, the world becomes increasingly incoherent" (Ibid.). Another example of recent voices on issues of global anxieties can be found in the work *Intercultural Communication: A Contextual Approach* (2021) by James W. Neuliep. Neuliep's observation regarding how in many cases, "microcultural groups are considered subordinate or treated subordinately in some way, perhaps politically or economically" is another sign of today's world anxieties (p. 15). These couple of examples paint our world or humanity not only as incoherent and unloving, but also as an insecure place and one without a place for human dignity. This may lead us to ask ourselves: How can we be able to achieve successful intercultural relations and manage loving concern for the present and the future of humanity in an increasingly incoherent and unloving world or, as Gabriel Marcel puts it, a "Broken World" (1929/1998, p. 107)? The answers to this question will also address this study's research question: How can the theory of global intercultural citizenship contribute to the decolonization of what I call *econotechnocracy* and its global sociocultural and politico-economic hegemonic order of anxieties? In other words, how can we liberate ourselves as human beings conscious of our dignity and interdependence from the dehumanizing domination of ethnocentric and econotechnocratic groups? Given that our humanity is an interconnected entity, and given the evidence of global crises' mismanagement (Covid-19 and other global calamities), how can we as critical radical humanists resist the politics of self-destruction that characterizes today's political order?

9.   The Management of COVID-19 Global Pandemic: Evidence of Econotechnocratic World Order Failure

Appendices A, B, and C reveal how inequalities in the treatment of issues of serious concern to our common humanity such as global pandemic, poverty and lack of electricity are unjustly tackled by the global political and intellectual elites. Marcel reminds us about the causes of today's world anxiety or what he calls the "uneasiness in the world today" (Marcel, 1967, p.

131). He mentions the lack of understanding or the failure to recognize our "hybrid existence" or the reality of global intercultural relations and geographical interdependence as the major cause of this anxiety. Indeed, when there is no recognition or knowledge of a shared space, the common price to pay is intercultural relations mismanagement. There can be no way to think, plan, and care about places that don't exist in the minds of policymakers or plan-designers. This may lead to catastrophic consequences for humanity in its entirety because cases of disastrous diseases, terrorism, extreme poverty, pandemics, and other conditions of life destroying certain parts of our common humanity can also reach us and strike us alike. Marcel writes: "Much more than the men of the nineteenth century, we see ourselves today under the obligation of interrogating ourselves upon the future of humanity, or more exactly, upon the significance which it is or is not possible to attach to human adventure considered as a whole" (Ibid.). The concern for the future of humanity cannot be taken seriously when self-motivated interests are the principles governing the world order or when democracy is just a façade or a mask covering a world order which I call *econotechnocracy* (Balosa, 2022c, p. 16). If the global political and intellectual elites can invent traditions for self-enrichment, they should also be able to invent traditions to address equitable global issues (Hobsbawn & Ranger, 1983).

The world system that shows concern for the future of humanity should be a system of caring human beings and institutions conscious of global intercultural relations and geographical interdependence's imperatives (Dahl, 1974/2005; Wallerstein, 2004). That is, individuals, groups, and institutions inspired and motivated by a leadership anchored in critical-radical humanistic values. This disposition seems appropriate for the management of the present and the future of humanity in that it may inspire global political and intellectual elites to reform their *econotechnocratic* global order (Dahl, 1985, pp. 84—85; Fromm, 1947, p. 130; Stiglitz, 2007, p. 3). Marcel articulates the significance of this leadership when he argues: "The repercussion of what takes place at certain nerve-centers of the earth's crust upon the destiny of the entire species can no longer be contested but by those who seek to blindfold themselves voluntarily" (Ibid.). He appeals to individual responsibility or to everyone's citizenship to step up efforts and cultivate loving human qualities that demonstrate concern for the present and the future of our common humanity. Marcel's appeal reads:

> Nowadays it must be taken literally, and it bears upon our entire destiny, I mean upon the destiny of each of us. Each of us is called upon to become aware that his personal life can be disrupted from top to bottom following events which take place in a part of the world where he or she has never set foot and of which he or she perhaps only forms the vaguest of images.
>
> (Marcel, 1967, p. 132)

Many will agree with me that Marcel's appeal to the recognition of our geographic, economic, social, political, and cultural interdependence in surviving from catastrophic world events reminds us of the significance of global intercultural citizenship. Marcel's perception of our modern existence as "hybrid existence" sheds light on the significance of the principles of global intercultural citizenship mentioned above (p. 133). To emphasize the imperative of working together in honest and loving ways for our common security, Marcel insists:

> It seems that each of us must give up continuing with himself or herself a little world under cover, a little enclosed world, behind partitions whose imperviousness is assured by a set

of precautions of all kinds. No one can henceforth be completely protected against a certain disorder, a certain malaise, which corresponds to this disturbance. This hybrid existence has a great deal to do with the pressure that it exerts everywhere.

(Marcel, 1967, pp. 132, 133)

Indeed, more than half a century since Gabriel Marcel wrote his observation of the world anxiety and the concern for the present and the future of humanity, new voices are being raised to advocate the same concern. These interdisciplinary voices cannot be ignored if we are going to deconstruct econotechnocratic global order and its self-interest-centered leadership successfully, critically, and radically.

10.   Research Question and Answers

How can the theory of global intercultural citizenship contribute to the decolonization of what I call *econotechnocrac*y and its global sociocultural and politico-economic hegemonic order of anxieties? This question has a two-fold answer. First, it advocates critical radical humanistic values and secondly, by applying the global intercultural citizenship framework. Critical radical humanistic values advocate for never betraying mutual respect, human dignity, and human qualities embedded in justice, wisdom, love, power/courage, humility, altruism, and all actions sustaining overarching human values. These qualities enable one not to bend under the pressure of inhumane ideologies and alienation (Marcel, 1954, p. 56). That is, each individual and each nation should be able to look at not merely self-interests or the interests of its sociopolitical alliance as it is case in today's econotechnocratic order but should look at and work for the interests of the survival and sustainable development of all people and all nations (Cabral, 1979; Fanon, 1952/2008; Tilly & Tarrow, 2015).

Applying the global intercultural citizenship framework entails applying principles and practices as strategies that promote and build more humane relationships (Cantle, 2012; Rodriguez, 2010). These principles are: a sustainable existential intercultural mindset, global intercultural solidarity, the knowledge of the self, existential justice, and community diplomacy. As Gabriel Marcel argues, a radical transformation of the mindset or the disposition that leads to the ruin of our common humanity today should be the major concern of those who adopt critical radical humanism for a better existence for all and a better humanity for today and for tomorrow (Fanon, 1964/2004; Miller, 2013). In the same vein, the theory of global intercultural citizenship encourages a critical and radical transformation of the mindset governing global issues today. Through its five principles, it provides not merely a moral boost to this transformation but also a boost for dignifying politically responsible attitudes and actions such as visible infrastructures, quality education and health care, electricity, participation in national and international political actions, visible respect of human rights and human dignity for all. It is this model of sociopolitical and intellectual leadership and citizenship that can help tackle what Tilly (1998) calls "durable inequality" (p. 3) which, in my opinion, is a self-destructive inequality to our common humanity. This is where the theory of global intercultural citizenship may intervene through its principle or strategy of global intercultural solidarity. That is putting in the work in understanding that the suffering of an individual or a nation, is tantamount to the suffering of our common humanity (Said, 2004; Tubino, 2015). This is where the overarching critical-radical humanism framework influences global intercultural citizenship. What does critical-radical humanism entail?

11.   Critical Radical Humanism

Critical radical humanism refers to an approach whereby issues related to human diversity and human dignity come first in navigating intercultural relations issues. Fanon (1952/2008) calls for "new humanism" (P. 8) or a humanism of mutual respect or absolute reciprocal dignity. Marcel (1954) calls for a "renewed humanity" (p. 21) or a humanity where human beings are not reduced to things or treated like pieces of machines. The German American social psychologist and philosopher Erich Fromm defines radical humanism as "a global philosophy which emphasizes the oneness of the human race, the capacity of man to develop his own powers and to arrive at inner harmony and at the establishment of a peaceful world" (Fromm, 1947, p. 19; Durkin, 2014, p. 41). From this perspective, self-empowerment and mutual empowerment through principles of the knowledge of the self and global intercultural solidarity can help us in overcoming the dehumanizing treatment of our common humanity (Milbank & Pabst, 2016; Hess & Ludwig, 2017).

Today, we would reduce tremendous political and intercultural tensions, unnecessary conflicts, and humiliations of subcultural groups in both the Global North and the Global South if critical radical humanism is applied in human affairs. Critical-radical humanism may help build trust, altruism, and humility in the minds of global leaders and lead them to implement more equitable and human dignifying attention and redistribution of global resources to the symbolic brothers and sisters of our symbol human family. Critical radical humanism thinks that global political and intellectual elites have masked the econotechnocracy world order and management of intercultural relations with the label of democracy while it is, in reality, a system where economic and technologic power minorities dominate and control human affairs of the majority across the globe (Linklater, 2007; Marcel, 1954; Milbank & Pabst, 2016; Sandel, 2012). Although we live, as Sandel (2012) puts it, "at a time when almost everything can be bought and sold" (p. 5), critical radical humanists refuse to sell themselves and to buy into anti-intercultural manipulative political and intellectual ideologies (Bratman, 2018; Fanon, 1964/2006; Fromm, 1946; Durkin, 2014; Said, 2004).

In his book *Critical Humanism: A Manifesto for the 21st Century* (2021), UK Sociologist Ken Plummer discusses different humanisms and their contested claims they bring about what it means to be human. He argues that "critical humanism engages with (and tells the stories of) the perpetual narrative reconstructions and conflicts over what it means to be human. Ultimately it does this with the goal of building on these contested understandings to find pathways into better futures and worlds" (p. 5). Plummer adds that "critical humanism is an emerging project to remake sense of the debate on humanism. It enables us to ask questions about what kind of human world we want to live in, what kind of person we want to be in that world, and how it needs to be transformed" (Plummer, 2021, pp. 6, 7). Critical radical humanism adds to these questions, how can we build better intercultural relations, promote global intercultural citizenship, and foster the culture of human dignity for all without bending to pressure of political and self-interest-centered ideologies? For ourselves, for our communities, and for humanity, "how do we develop a new way of thinking and endeavor to create a new man/woman" (Fanon,1964/ 2004, p. 239). How do we adjust our lifestyle to inclusion and diversity and to the enjoyment of all voices, rural and urban voices, men's and women's voices, old and young voices, and all fellow human voices (Bratman, 2018; Dahl, 2006; Hornberger, 2008; Seale & Mallinson, 2018). Indeed, critical radical humanism as an overarching theoretical

framework provides valid insights to the theory of global intercultural citizenship and in my opinion, should also provide insights to other theoretical frameworks within intercultural communication studies. It is these insights that may enable political and intellectual elites and other citizens to become effectively and consciously what Michael Bratman calls "planning agents" (Bratman, 2018, p. 199; Danesi, 2020, p. 36). That is, engaging in planning agency for sociocultural, politico-economic, national and international laws, language policies and planning, technological, and environmental outcomes that benefit our common humanity.

12.   Conclusion and Recommendations

In the face of the failure of the actual global leadership, the theory of global intercultural citizenship can enable more individuals, societies, and institutions to adopt critical and radical humanistic perspectives in fostering SEIM, global intercultural solidarity, the knowledge of self, existential justice, and community diplomacy principles. These principles should inhibit one from engaging in anti-intercultural and humiliating treatments of other humans, attitudes, and actions. This study has analyzed the ways in which "ethnocentrism is clearly an obstacle" not only to intercultural communication competence, but also to sustainable development and human dignity. It has also analyzed the ways in which econotechnocracy is masked in democratic model of governance by the political and intellectual elites who themselves perpetuate anti-democratic and anti-intercultural model of governance such as promoting politico-economic and sociocultural hegemony. It has further argued about the way in which econotechnocracy side by side with ethnocentrism are factors contributing to the divide that characterizes the conditions of life between the Global North and the Global South.

Hence, this study encourages intercultural communication and other interdisciplinary studies to look at the insights provided by critical radical humanism to address dehumanizing conditions of life today. In my opinion, these conditions are destructive and humiliating to our oneness, self-empowerment, and mutual empowerment. Hence, this study's proposal of employing global intercultural citizenship framework in intercultural communication studies and other interdisciplinary fields may help remediate and foster constructive and expository individual and transnational relationships for a happy common humanity today and in the future (Freire, 1974/2005; Gergen, 2009; Royce, 1983). For example, addressing the difference among notions of global/world citizenship, intercultural citizenship, and global intercultural citizenship provides a clear perspective about how the theory of global intercultural citizenship fosters transformational-process-relational philosophy and psychology in building a world of more humane relationships. That is a world which is sensitive, appreciative, respectful, and solidary to difference and super-diversity (Cantle, 2012; Schreiber, 2013; Tubino, 2015).

For this reason, this theory helps to create balanced, just, and wise policies for the global common good. Global political and intellectual elites must acquire intercultural communication competence and the culture of human dignity for all (Bratman, 2018). Neuliep (2021) defines intercultural communication competence as "the degree to which you effectively adapt your verbal and nonverbal messages to appropriate cultural context" (p. 422). He argues that "the knowledge component of intercultural competence consists of how much one knows about the culture of the person with whom one is interacting" (p. 243). Neuliep suggests that "to be perceived as culturally knowledgeable, minimally, one should have some comprehension of the other person's dominant cultural values and beliefs—one should know whether the other person is from an individualistic or collectivistic, high-or low-context, large or small power distance,

and high or low uncertainty avoidance culture" (Ibid.). In my opinion, Neuliep makes a valid point in fostering the responsibility of individual citizens in building more humane relationships. It is the overarching comprehension of the other that generates more humane arguments in planning and addressing issues affecting human relations (Lee, 2002).

This study has added the *knowledge of self* as a subcomponent of the knowledge component to intercultural communication competence. As one of the principles of global intercultural citizenship, the knowledge of the self is crucial in becoming a major advocate of the theory of global intercultural citizenship. Within the knowledge of self, one feels self-empowered and ready to engage in the processes of self-adjustment and mutual empowerment (Gnagey & Weiten, 1986; Heyns, 1958). He or she demonstrates confidence, courage, altruism, and humility in interculturally willing to learn from and work with others. He or she sees himself or herself as a part of the symbolic universal brother-sisterhood, hence, ready to reject "pride" (Ehrmann, 2022, pp. 6-8; Marcel, 1956/1995, p. 32) but to enjoy both the rights and duties as a global intercultural citizen (Marcel, 1954, p. 56).

12.1 Recommendations

Given the points mentioned above, I propose the theory of global intercultural citizenship as a critical-radical humanistic approach to intercultural communication studies to counteract the manipulative political discourses that perpetuate social injustices and imbalances in intercultural relations. This theory should enable students and scholars of intercultural communication studies and related fields to critically and radically counteract political and intellectual elites who foster ethnocentrism and econotechnocracy for their self-centered interests instead of promoting participatory democracy, existential justice, and human dignity for all (Balosa, 2022c, p. 16). Another recommendation is that philosophical reflection as a research method should be employed in intercultural communication studies to help elevate the debate on issues related to intercultural communication competence and the culture of human dignity for all in intercultural communication studies as one of the major fields of research in the world today. In my opinion, this method creates a balanced, just, and wise analysis of the multiplicities of arguments or discourses in relation to the management of intercultural relations and strategies needed to counteract the established anti-intercultural political and intellectual elites' policies. It also promotes the culture of human dignity for all, that is, the culture of equity, inclusion, respect for self and for diversity, and national and international laws' equal applicability to all should be visible and operational in national and international politics (Foucault, 1994; Touraine, 2007; 2009).

References

Aiken, Henry D. (1956/1984). *The age of ideology: The 19th century philosophers*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Allen, Danielle & Light, Jennifer S. (2015). *From voice to influence: Understanding citizenship in a digital age*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Altman, Andrew. (2001). *Arguing about law: An introduction to legal philosophy*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Altman, Andrew & Wellman, Christopher Heath. (2011). *A liberal theory of international justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, Benedict. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism (Rev. ed.).* New York: Verso.

Anderson, Sheldon; Peterson, Mark Allen, & Toops, Stanley W. (2018). *International studies: An interdisciplinary approach to global issues (5\4^{th} ed.).* Boulder, Co: Westview Press.

Balosa, David M. (2022a). Existential sociolinguistics: The fundamentals of the political legitimacy of linguistic minority rights. In: Makoni, Sinfree; Severo, Cristine G.; Abdelhay, Ashraf, & Kaiper-Marquez, Anna (Eds.), *The languaging of higher education in the Global South: De-colonizing the language of scholarship and pedagogy* (pp. 147-162). New York: Routledge.

Balosa, David M. (2022b). Integrationism: Roy Harris Artspeak, artistic creativity, and human diversity in the age of globalization. In: *Fórum Linguistico*, Vol. 19, Special Issues, Feb. 2022, (7280-7298).

Balosa, David M. (2022c). The relationship between Portuguese and indigenous languages in the community of Portuguese Language Countries: An existential sociolinguistics perspective. *Conjuntura Austral: Journal of the Global South*, *13* (63), 13-28.

Bratman, Michael. E. (2014). *Shared agency: A planning theory of acting together.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bratman, Michael. E. (2018). *Planning, time, and self-governance: Essays in practical rationality.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Brown, L. David. (2007). Multiparty social action and mutual accountability. In Ebrahim, Alnoor & Weisband, Edward. (Eds.), *Global accountabilities: Participation, pluralism, and public ethics* (pp. 89-111). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Byram, Michael. (2008). *From foreign language education to education for intercultural citizenship: Essays and reflections*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Byram. Michael; Golubeva, Irina; Hui, Han, & Wagner, Manuela. (Eds.) (2017). *From principles to practice in education for intercultural citizenship*. Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters.

Byrd Clark, Julie S. & Dervin, Fred. (Eds.) (2014). *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education: Rethinking multilingualism and interculturality.* New York: Routledge.

Cabral, Amilcar. (1979). *Unity and struggle: Speeches and writing of Amilcar*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Cahn, Steven. M. (Ed.) (2009). *Philosophy of education: The essential texts*. New York: Routledge.

Cantle, Ted. (2012). *Interculturalism: The new era of cohesion and diversity.* New York: Palgrave.

Chen, Guo-Ming. & Starosta, William J. (2005). *Foundations of intercultural communication.* Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Chomsky, Noam. (2017). *The responsibility of intellectuals*. New York: New Press.

Cohen, Geoffrey. L. (2022). *Belonging: The science of creating connection and bridging divides*. New York: Norton & Company.

Claeys, Gregory & Sargent, Lyman Tower. (2017). *Utopia reader* (2nd ed.). New York: New York University Press.

Collier, Mary J. (2002). Transforming communication about culture: An introduction. In M. J. Collier (Ed.). *Transforming communication about culture: Critical new directions*, pp. ix-xix. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Crisp, Richard, J. (2015). *Social psychology: A very short introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dahl, Robert. A. (1974/2005). *Who governs? Democracy and power in an American city*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Dahl, Robert. A. (1985). *A preface to Economic democracy*. Berkely, CA: University of California Press.

Dahl, Robert A. (2006). *On political equality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Danesi, Marcel. (2020). *Language, society and new media: Sociolinguistics today* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.

D'Antoni, Dinah & Mayes, Clifford. (2023). *Becoming a global citizen: Traditional and new paths to intercultural competence.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Douglas, Jack D. & Johnson, John M. (Eds.) (1977). *Existential sociology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Durkin, Kieran. (2014). *The radical humanism of Erich Fromm.* New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Dworkin, Ronald (1978). *Taking rights seriously*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Dworkin, Ronald (2006). *Is democracy possible here? Principles for a new political debate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fanon, Frantz. (1952/2008). *Black skin, white masks.* Trans. from the French by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press.

Fanon, Frantz. (1964/2004). *The wretched of the Earth*. Trans. from the French by Richard Philcox. New York: Grove Press.

Foucault, Michel. (1994). *Power*. New York: The New Press.

Fromm, E. (1947). *Man for himself: An inquiry into the psychology of ethics.* New York: An Owl Book.

Fulford, Amanda; Lockrobin, Grace, & Smith, Richard. (Eds.) (2021). *Philosophy and community: Theories, practices, and possibilities.* New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Galston, William A. (1980). *Justice and the human good*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Gergen, Kenneth J. (2009). *Relational being: Beyond self and community*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gnagey, William J. & Weiten, Wayne. (1986). *Study guide and personal explorations for psychology applied to modern life: Adjustment in the 80s* (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Wadsworth.

Goodin, Robert E. (1985). *Protecting the vulnerable: A reanalysis of our social responsibilities.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Heller, Patrick & Rao, Vijayendra. (Eds.) (2015). *Deliberation and development: Rethinking the role of voice and collective action in unequal societies.* Washington, DC: World Bank Group.

Hersted, Lone & Gergen, Kenneth J. (2013). *Relational leading: Practices for dialogically based collaboration.* Chagrin Falls, OH: Taos Institute Publication.

Hess, Edward D. & Ludwig, Katherine. (2017). *Humility is the new smart: Rethinking human excellence in the smart machine age*. Oakland, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishing.

Heyns, Roger W. (1958). *The psychology of personal adjustment*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Hite, Kristen A. & Seitz, John L. (2021). *Global issues: An introduction* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Son.

Hobsbawm, Eric & Ranger, Terence. (Eds.) (1983). *The invention of tradition.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hornberger, Nancy H. (Ed.) (2008). *Can schools save indigenous languages? Policy and practice on four continents.* New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Humphrey, John Peters. (1989). *No distant millennium: The international law of human rights.* Paris, France: UNESCO.

James. William. (1909/1996). *A pluralistic universe.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Jones, Andrew. (2012). *Human geography: The basics*. New York: Routledge.

Lasswell, Harold D. (1965). *World politics and personal insecurity*. New York: The Free Press.

Leob, Harold (1996). *Life in a technocracy*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Lee, Steven, P. (2002). *What is the argument? Critical thinking in the real world*. Boston, MA: The McGraw-Hill Company.

Linklater, Andrew. (2007). *Critical theory and world politics: Citizenship, sovereignty and humanity.* New York: Routledge.

Marcel, Gabriel. (1954). *The decline of wisdom*. London: The Harvill Press.

Marcel, Gabriel. (1963). *The existential background of human dignity.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Marcel, Gabriel. (1967). *Problematic man*. Trans. by Brian Thompson. New York: Herder & Herder.

Marcel, Gabriel. (1956/1995). *The philosophy of existentialism*. New York: Carol Publishing Group.

Marcel, Gabriel. (1929/1998). *The broken world.* Trans. by Katharine Rose Hanley. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press.

Marshall, Thomas Humphrey. (1964/1977). *Class, citizenship, and social development: Essays.* Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Martin, Judith N., Nakayama, Thomas K. & Flores, Lisa A. (2002). A dialectical approach to intercultural communication. In: Martin, Judith N.; Nakayama, Thomas, K. & Flores, Lisa A., *Readings in Intercultural Communication: Experiences and Contexts* (2nd ed.), (pp. 3-13). New York: McGraw Hill.

Meynaud, Jean. (1964). *Technocracy.* Trans. by Paul Barnes. New York: The Free Press.

Mignolo, Walter D. (2012). *Local histories/Global designs: Coloniality, subaltern knowledges, and border thinking.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Milbank, John & Pabst, Adrian. (2016). The politics of virtue: Post-liberalism and the human future. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Miller, David. (2000). *Citizenship and national identity.* Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Miller, David. (2013). *Justice for earthlings: Essays in political philosophy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Minogue, Kenneth. (1995). *Politics: A very short introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Nagel, Thomas. (1970/1978). *The possibility of altruism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Neuliep, J. W. (2021). *Intercultural communication: A contextual approach*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Nussbaum, Martha C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, Martha C. (2002). *For love of country?* Boston, MA : Beacon Press.

Obregón, Diaz. (2021). *The philosophy of belonging* (2nd ed.). Columbia, SC: Ediciones Universitarias.

O'Neil, Patrick H. (2013). *Essentials of comparative politics* (4th ed.). New York: Norton & Company.

Osler, Audrey & Starkey, Hugh. (2005). *Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education*. New York: Open University Press.

Raftopoulos, Evangelos. (2019). *International negotiation: A process of relational governance for international common interest.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rawls, John. (1999). *A theory of justice.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rodriguez, Amardo. (2010). *Revisioning diversity in communication studies.* Leicester, UK: Troubador Publishing.

Rosaldo, Renato. (1993). *Culture & truth: The remaking of social analysis.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Rosaldo, Renato. (Ed.) (2003). *Cultural citizenship in Island Southeast Asia: Nation and belonging in the hinterlands.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Royce, Josiah. (1983). *The spirit of modern philosophy: An essay in the form of lectures*. New York: Dover Publications.

Rüsen, Jörn & Laass, Henner. (Eds.) (2009). *Humanism in intercultural perspective: Experiences and expectations.* Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Said, Edward W. (1978). *Orientalism.* New York: Vintage Books.

Said, Edward W. (1993). *Culture and imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Said, Edward W. (1994*). Representations of the intellectual.* New York: Pantheon Book.

Said, Edward, W. *(2004). Humanism and democratic criticism.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Sandel, Michael J. (2005). *Public philosophy: Essays on morality in politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sandel, Michael J. (2012). *What money can't buy: The moral limits of markets.* New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.

Sargent, Lyman Tower. (2010). *Utopianism: A very short introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Schreiber, R. (2013). *Gurdjieff's transformational psychology: The art of compassionate self-study.* Sebastopol, CA: Present Moment Press.

Seal, Elizabeth & Mallinson, Christine. (Eds.) (2018). *Rural voices: Language, identity, and social change across place.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.

Sorrells, K. (2016). *International communication: Globalization and social justice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Sorrells, Kathryn & Sekimoto, Sachi. (Eds.) (2016). *Globalizing international communication: A reader*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

St. Clair, Robert N. (2015). The stratification of cultural networks. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 24(1), 1-22.

Simon, Catherine A. & Downes, Graham. (Eds.) (2020). *Sociology for education studies: Connecting theory, settings, and everyday experiences.* New York: Routledge.

Stiglitz, Joseph. E. (2007). *Making globalization work*. New York: Norton.

Stiglitz, Joseph. E. (2013). *The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future*. New York: Norton.

Stocker, Robert & Bossomaier, Terry. (Eds.) (2014). *Networks in society: Links and language.* Singapore: Pan Stanford Publishing.

Sweetman, Brendan. (2006). *Why politics needs religion: The place of religious arguments in the public square*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Tabb, William K. (2002). *Unequal partners: A primer on globalization*. New York: The New Press.

Taylor, Charles; Nanz, Patrizia & Taylor, Madeleine Beaubien. (2020). *Reconstructing democracy: How citizens are building from the group up*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Tilly, Charles (Ed.) (1996). *Citizenship, identity, and social history.* New York: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.

Tilly, Charles. (1998). *Durable inequality.* Berkely, CA: The University of California Press.

Tilly, Charles. (2005). *Trust and rule.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tilly, Charles & Tarrow, Sidney (2015). *Contentious politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Touraine, Alain. (2007). *A new paradigm for understanding today's world*. Trans. by Gregory Elliott. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Touraine, Alain. (2009). *Thinking differently*. Trans. by David Macey. Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Tully, William T. (2020). *The decline of humility and the death of wisdom.* Aequanimitas Publishing.

Wachs, Anthony M. & Schaff, Jon D. (2020). *Age of anxiety: Meaning, identity, and politics in the 21st-century film and literature*. Lanham, MD: The Rowman & Littlefield.

Waldron, Jeremy & Dan-Cohen, Meir. (2012). *Dignity, rank, & rights*. New York: Oxford University.

Wellman, Christopher Heath & Simmons, A. John. (2005). *Is there a duty to obey the law?* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Weissberg, Robert (1999). *The politics of empowerment.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Williams, Melissa S. & Macedo, Stephen. (Eds.) (2005). *Political exclusion and domination.* New York: New York University Press.

Whitehead, Alfred North (1978). *Process and reality* (Corrected ed.). New York: The Free Press.

Author Note

David M. Balosa (Ph.D.) is a French and Philosophy senior teacher for the School District of Philadelphia in the State of Pennsylvania in the United States. His research interests include sociolinguistics, intercultural communication studies, political/critical discourse analysis, post-colonial studies, Lusophone studies, Luso/Hispanophone studies and African Literature; and legal, moral, social, and political philosophy. He has taught French, Portuguese, Spanish, Swahili, at LaSalle University, Penn State University at Abington, and Delaware State University. His recent publications include the book chapters, "Existential Sociolinguistics: The Fundamentals of the Political Legitimacy of Linguistic Minority Rights" in Makoni et al., *The Languaging of Higher Education in the Global South* (2022), Chap. 8, (pp. 147-162), Routledge; "Existential Literacy: Promoting the Culture of the Dignity of All Languages in Modern Languages Classroom" in D. Hird (ed.), *Critical Pedagogies for Modern Languages Education: Criticality, Decolonization, and Social Justice* (Bloomsburg Publishing, 2023, Chap. 1) and the

articles, "Integrationism: Roy Harris Artspeak, Artistic Creativity, and Human Diversity in the Age of Globalization", *Fórum Linguistico*, 19 (Special Issues), (7280-7298); "The Relationship Between Portuguese and Indigenous Languages in the Community of Portuguese Language Countries: An Existential Sociolinguistics Perspective", *Conjuntura Austral*, *13* (63), pp. 13-28.

Appendix A

Aljazeera (17 Jun 2021)

"Time to make energy poverty in Africa a thing of the past"

Cheap renewables offer the key to universal electricity access in Africa.

Across the globe, nearly 800 million people live without any access to electricity – about 600 million of them in sub-Saharan Africa. In a world of deepening inequalities between the haves and have-nots, this is a glaring injustice. With cheap renewables and green investments following the pandemic, we can make energy poverty history within the next decade. Universal energy access by 2030 is possible, but we need to start making great strides, and soon. The International Energy Agency (IEA) and the European Union, therefore, invite other partners to join us in putting energy access at the center of cooperation with Africa.

Lack of electricity inhibits those aspects of daily life that many of us take for granted. Electricity powers our economies: we need it in schools, offices, and hospitals, where it now refrigerates life-saving vaccines. We need to expand electricity access on an industrial scale to enable families in sub-Saharan Africa to aspire to the same standard of living as families in other parts of the world.

Technological progress and an unprecedented drop in the cost of renewables can now deliver the cheapest electricity humanity has ever seen. In the past 20 years, the massive global expansion of electricity access was mainly driven by coal plants. But it no longer makes sense to invest in coal. Africa is the world's premium location to harness solar energy and is already demonstrating that a cleaner path is possible.

Between 2014 and 2019, 20 million people a year in Africa got access to electricity for the first time, with much of the growing demand met by increasingly competitive solar and hydropower installations. Harnessing these abundant energy sources on the African continent can help develop local jobs and avoid expensive import bills. Unfortunately, despite technological progress, the world is not on track to deliver on our global commitment to universal energy access by 2030. The COVID-19 crisis has caused significant setbacks. Without action, this can develop into a lasting negative trend.

This text is quoted from: https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2021/6/17/time-to-make-energy-poverty-in-africa-history

Appendix B

The Washington Post

"Can Africa 'leapfrog' the traditional electricity model?
Slow progress on national power grids leaves many households looking to off-grid sources"

Analysis by Carolyn Logan
and Kangwook Han

April 22, 2022

[Photo caption:] Workers install solar panels at a photovoltaic solar park on the outskirts of the coastal town of Lamberts Bay, South Africa, on March 29, 2016. (Schalk Van Zuydam/AP)

Countries have been slow to extend the power grid
The importance of household energy supply to well-being and economic development is no secret. Images of children studying, parents running small businesses from their homes, and families enjoying fans, fridges and entertainment highlight the many ways in which access to electricity can transform lives. But for Africans who have been waiting for national electric grids to extend, improve or become more affordable, the news is not good. Based on 48,084 face-to-face interviews in Round 8 (2019-2021) of our periodic surveys, we found that about two-thirds (68 percent) of Africans live in areas served by a national electric grid — that's just four percentage points higher than a decade ago. The challenge is particularly acute in rural areas, where only 45 percent of residents have potential access to the grid, compared with 94 percent among their urban cousins.
Even fewer — 57 percent — report that their household is actually connected to the electricity grid, a proportion that has remained essentially unchanged since we first asked in 2014-2015. While citizens in Tunisia (99 percent), Mauritius (99 percent) and Morocco (98 percent) enjoy nearly universal electricity coverage, fewer than 1 in 4 households in Malawi (14 percent), Burkina Faso (22 percent) and Niger (24 percent) are connected.

The general failure to extend the grid, improve access or increase the reliability of supply explains why, on average, fewer than half (46 percent) of Africans say their governments are doing a good job of providing a reliable supply of electricity.

This text is quoted from:

https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/22/africa-electricity-grid-solar-afrobarometer/

Appendix C

WHO urges countries to build a fairer, healthier world post-COVID-19
World Health Day 2021, 6 April 2021, News release

Geneva, Switzerland

COVID-19 has unfairly impacted some people more harshly than others, exacerbating existing inequities in health and welfare within and between countries. For World Health Day, 7 April 2021, WHO is therefore issuing five calls for urgent action to improve health for all people.

Within countries, illness and death from COVID-19 have been higher among groups who face discrimination, poverty, social exclusion, and adverse daily living and working conditions – including humanitarian crises. The pandemic is estimated to have driven between 119 and 124 million more people into extreme poverty last year. And there is convincing evidence that it has widened gender gaps in employment, with women exiting the labor force in greater numbers than men over the past 12 months.

These inequities in people's living conditions, health services, and access to power, money and resources are long-standing. The result: under-5 mortality rates among children from the poorest households are double that of children from the richest households. Life expectancy for people in low-income countries is 16 years lower than for people in high-income countries. For example, 9 out of 10 deaths globally from cervical cancer occur in low- and middle-income countries. But as countries continue to fight the pandemic, a unique opportunity emerges to build back better for a fairer, healthier world by implementing existing commitments, resolutions, and agreements while also making new and bold commitments.

"The COVID-19 pandemic has thrived amid the inequalities in our societies and the gaps in our health systems, " says Dr Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, WHO Director-General. "It is vital for all governments to invest in strengthening their health services and to remove the barriers that prevent so many people from using them, so more people have the chance to live healthy lives."

This text is quoted from:

https://www.who.int/news/item/06-04-2021-who-urges-countries-to-build-a-fairer-healthier-world-post-covid-19