
*Catalina Rebas Segura, CES Alberta Giémenez, Spain*

Over time many human groups or individuals have experienced migration, from the first human beings who left Africa in search of food and better living conditions until this century, in which we are witness to multitudes moving around the Earth seeking a better life, usually escaping from famine, wars, poverty or natural disasters. Although the concept of “globalisation” was mainly defined and used in the mid-late 20th century, it can be argued that globalisation, understood as the exchange of world views, products, knowledge and people, has its origins well before this period.

The term “globalisation” is considered a valid framework to debate international migration in the 21st century and it is understood as an ideology affecting the relations among countries, cultures and peoples which reshapes the world and has a strong focus on economy (Castles and Miller 53). As Stephen Castles and Mark J. Miller (2009) define in their *The Age of Migration. International Population Movements in the Modern World*, the “basic premise [of globalization] is ‘the leadership of civilization by economics’ (Saul, 2006: xi)” (Castles and Miller 53).

The term “globalisation” can be approached from three main points of view. The first is to consider it an economic process, with multinational corporations and global financial and trade markets. The mechanisms that control this neoliberal world economy are mainly the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization, whose aim is “to ensure that all economies and societies are opened up” to competition (Castles and Miller 53). These mechanisms have had a meaningful say in the development of the current economic crisis and have proven their influence on the decisions taken by many governments, especially in Europe. As Manuel Castells develops in his *The Power of Identity* (2010), some protest groups have appeared as a response to the globalisation movement, such as “the World Social Forum, which would meet exactly at the same time as the World Economic Forum to debate its own alternatives to the proposals being discussed by the global elites” (146), or the International Forum on Globalization, “a network of intellectuals proposing alternative policies for globalization” (148). Castells also explains that the anti-globalization movement... is made up of a plurality of social struggles from around the world. These struggles are inter-related and communicated through a combination of Internet networks, media diffusion, discussion forums, and convergence in protest events that move around the world (151-152).
Thus, this movement approaches globalisation from a political point of view, that is to say, understood as “a new world order with its own institutions and configurations of power that have replaced the previous structures associated with the nation-state, and that have created new conditions in peoples’ lives all over the world (Petras and Veltmayer, 2000: 2)” (Castles and Miller 52). Consequently, globalisation has changed the home politics as well as the international politics of countries. Neoliberal globalisation, Castles and Miller claim, was supposed to reduce poverty and enhance economic growth in poor countries and help them reach the living standards of the richer ones. This has certainly been the case of some social groups in some countries, such as China, India or Brazil, where a minority part of the society has become rich. However, the premise of the reduction of social inequality has been proved incorrect as disparity among countries – and even among social classes in the same country – has widened. As a result, globalisation can be perceived as “a new form of imperialism, designed to reinforce the power of core Northern states and their ruling classes (Weiss, 1997; Hardt and Negri, 2000; Petras and Veltmayer, 2000)” (Castles and Miller 53), but bearing in mind the emergence of non-Western countries.

The third approach is explained by Held and others (1999), who define globalisation as a process which encompasses different layers of social relations at an international level. In their own words, globalisation is

- the widening, deepening and speeding up of worldwide interconnectedness in all aspects of contemporary social life [such as] finance, trade[,] .... democracy, good governance, cultural and media products, environmental pollution and... people (Castles and Miller 51)

All these areas mould the way individuals relate to each other and to their surroundings, although there is no explanation on the authors’ conception of “good governance.” Manuel Castells (2010), on the other hand, develops this topic when analysing anti-globalisation movements. Castells claims that

the glue that binds the ... movement together, in the mind if not in organization, is the shared project toward alternative forms of democratic representation and governance. It is not a movement against globalization, but a movement for democratic globalization, for a system of governance that would fit democratic ideals in the new context of decision-making that has emerged in a global, network society (Castells 154).

The reason why this can happen is because the anti-globalisation movement is not unified but it congregates various groups with different values and goals, such as “environmentalism, labor rights, social rights, solidarity against poverty, indigenous rights, women’s rights, and the like” (Castells 152). Their main commonality is that these groups oppose “a process of
globalization [which is] perceived as unjust, [and it] has paved the way for heated debates on what kind of society the movement should put forward to replace the current system” (Castells 152).

As a result of the economic and political changes experienced in the 20th century, massive movements of peoples have also been enhanced and the numbers of migrants have risen exponentially. Castles and Miller (2009) provided an estimate account in 2007: “200 million or approximately 3 per cent of the world’s population of 6.5 billion people” (5). As Castles and Miller (2009) specify,

The vast majority of human beings remain in their countries of birth. Migration is the exception, not the rule… [However,] People tend to move not individually, but in groups. Their departure may have considerable consequences for their area of origin. Remittances (money sent home) by migrants may improve living standards and encourage economic development. In the country of immigration, settlement is closely linked to employment opportunities and is almost always concentrated in industrial and urban areas, where the impact on receiving communities is considerable. Migration thus affects not only the migrants themselves but the sending and receiving societies as a whole. (Castles and Miller 7)

These sending and receiving societies try to organise the entrance and departure of population and have envisaged many categories to govern the movement of individuals. Each label implies more or less rights and duties and, therefore, visas are related to the political approach to migration. The term “global citizenship,” then, cannot be understood as the document that grants somebody rights and duties in all countries in the world. On the contrary, Michael Byers (2005) explains that the term “global citizenship” can have different meanings. On the one hand, it can mean “the growth of exchanges and interdependencies – including shared economic, environmental and security vulnerabilities – among the political entities and peoples of Planet Earth” (Byers 3). That is to say, it can be related to the third approximation to the term “globalisation” as explained by Held and others (1999). But, on the other hand, “global citizenship” can imply “some sense of collective responsibility that unites peoples of this planet” (Byers 3). Byers explicates that

Global citizenship empowers individual human beings to participate in decisions concerning their lives, including the political, economic, social, cultural and environmental conditions in which they live… It is expressed through engagement in the various communities of which the individual is a part, at the local, national and global level (6).

Network organizations, like Change.org or Avaaz.com, or international organizations such as
International Amnesty, Greenpeace, World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF) or Doctors without Borders, for example, are just some of the platforms that individuals can use to make their voices heard at a global level and pressure governments and institutions to change their attitudes in a number of issues.

This approach to “global citizenship” is the one that interests me the most as I understand humans as holistic and a person’s identity to be more complex than the classification given by a passport or the number of generations lived in one place. Here we can find one of the main paradoxes with the question of “identity” or “identities”: while political and migration studies advocate for a fixed label, literary and cultural studies defend that “identity” is not a fixed concept but it implies a constant evolution, that there exist many aspects that form a person’s sense of self, which can be compared to a kaleidoscope since, when one changes, the other ones are also affected but they are still part of the same person.

Some of these unfit labels are “first-generation migrant” (a person who resides in the country s/he migrated to), “second-generation migrant” (a person who is the son or daughter of a migrant parent) or “third culture kid” (the offspring of an expatriate who go back to the parent’s country of birth as adults). In the 20th and 21st centuries an increasing number of individuals are born and raised in one country and live in a different one, some of them have parents who were born and raised in a third country and partners of a different culture. For these humans, the labels of “first-generation migrant,” “second-generation migrant” or “third culture kid” do not define their perceptions of their own selves.

One such example is Pico Iyer, who was born in Oxford (England) to Indian parents, spent his adolescence in England and early adulthood in California and lives in Japan with his Japanese wife. He is an essayist, novelist and travel writer who explores the concepts of identity, belonging, home and space in many of his texts. In a talk in June 2013, he wondered where home is and he claimed that

where you come from now is much less important than where you are going. More and more of us are rooted in the future or the present tense as much as in the past. And home, we know, is not just the place where you happen to be born. It’s the place where you become yourself. (min. 7)

The concept of becoming oneself implies a process and an evolution, movement, possibilities, freedom, future, the unknown. Conversely, the terms “first-” or “second-generation migrants” and “third culture kids” are fixed and established by a fact: either moving and living in a different country, or having at least one parent who migrated from her/his country of birth; or having parents who need to work in a second country, going with them and then returning to the home country of the parents.

This understanding of home as inclusive of past, present and future seems, in my opinion,
more pertinent to approach individuals who travel often, live in different places, are aware of
the influences each place has on them and approach identity as a holistic and inclusive notion. I
have not been able to find a label for the notion that Pico Iyer describes but maybe the term
“global citizenship” as defined by Michael Byers (2005) could be a possibility to be considered,
debated and developed. Byers describes “global citizenship” as a way human beings are related
because of their sense of collective responsibility. This applies to all levels of interpersonal
relations, not just at the political or economic level of the nation-state. Therefore, this term
allows space for personal growth as the influence of the past, the present and the future can
affect a person’s citizenship.

A literary example to this same understanding of home as “the place where you become
yourself” (Iyer 2013) regardless of one’s or one parent’s country of birth is Aristides George
Paradissis. Before Iyer, Paradissis investigated this approach in some of his texts. Paradissis was
born in Chefoo (now Yantai, China) in 1923 and died in Melbourne (Australia) in 2005. His
parents were from Greek upper-middle-class families: his father was born in Smyrna (Greece,
now Izmir in Turkey) and his mother in Egypt to parents from the Greek island of Cephalonia.
He was raised in China but, when his father died during World War II, he, his mother and his
brother migrated to Egypt. They stayed there for two years and Paradissis met his future wife. In
1949 Aristides George Paradissis, his mother and his brother moved to Tasmania (Australia),
where he worked as a teacher of English and French in secondary schools. Then he moved to
Melbourne to wait for the arrival of his fiancée, married her and worked at La Trobe University.
He obtained a BA and an MA in Spanish Studies and a PhD in French Studies at La Trobe
University, where he taught World Literature, French and Spanish Languages and Literatures.

As an author of works of fiction, Aristides George Paradissis published six books of poetry
between 1971 and 1996. Some of these texts were written in Spanish, Greek or French and were
presented with the English translation of each poem. He also published one novel, Dragonsleep,
in 1995, and two books of short stories: The Balzac Stories. From Paris to Parramatta and
Other Tales, in 1996, and The Shanghai Chronicles and Other Stories, in 1998. Most of the
main characters in these texts are first- or second-generation Greek migrants who live in China
or in Australia, are upper-middle class, healthy, educated, multilingual and with a strong interest
in world affairs.

In his novel, Dragonsleep, Paradissis explored the concepts of interpersonal relations,
stereotypes, place and belonging. Set in Chefoo (China) in 1931, the main female character is
Miss Clio Panatos, the Greek secretary of American Commander Peter McLead, who has been
appointed by the Chinese government and the US Navy to locate six deserters who are suspect
of opium trafficking. As part of his undercover mission, McLead sets up a silk trade business
and two of the workers he hires are Mr Chu, a Chinese agent who deals with Chinese producers, sellers or customers, and Miss Panatos.

Born and raised in China, Miss Panatos has "been educated in a British school, and [is] living with her parents" (Paradissis 1995: 15). She is 25 years old, but she is a widow and has a 5 year-old son. She also has two brothers and two sisters, all of them born and raised in China. All the members in the family are multilingual (Greek, Mandarin, English and French). Her family lives comfortably and they have many Chinese servants. Paradissis' portrait of migration is inclusive and positive as characters learn from all the cultures and are better because of them.

The notion of belonging and patriotism is explored in the character of Clio. She considers herself Greek, as she confesses: "We Hellenes are nothing if not a practical people, despite our unfortunate tendency to turn so many of life's foreordained incidents into drama, even high drama" (Paradissis, 1995: 77-78). However, at the end of the novel, she questions her feelings towards China and accepts her love for this land:

I knew these Shantung people; their love for their country and their native province was deep, sincere... I had been born in China. Was I not Chinese too, in my way? I had lived among these people for so long that I could not but share their sentiments. (Paradissis, 1995: 120-121)

This declaration takes place towards the end of the novel. In it, Clio accepts that her identity is different from that of other Greeks, as well as different from those of other Chinese. Clio distinctly states her duality, as both Greek and Chinese. Before this moment, she considered herself a second-generation Greek migrant in the diaspora, but now she thinks of herself as a Greek-Chinese. At the beginning of the novel, the reader learns that she will get married to Commander McLead and they will live a happy life in America, where Clio will feel at ease.

This revelation Clio has may be considered a turning point in her life as she begins to approach her identity as a union of past and present, free from limiting labels and different from the concepts of others. Clio had been negating the Chinese in herself and only when she comes to terms with it, does she include her present and future in her identity.

Paradissis continued to develop the notions of identity, belonging and home in his last collection of ten short stories: *The Shanghai Chronicles and Other Stories*, published in 1998. Alexander is the main character in five of them and through him Paradissis explores the possibility of a global identity. In the short story "Another Happy Day in Hobart", set between 1947 and 1949, Alexander lives in Hobart (Tasmania, Australia) with his mother and sister. He teaches English and French at the high school in the capital. Alexander is part of the Greek community in Hobart and he is also friends with local people, such as teacher Bob Budger, from whom Alexander learns "a lot about Australian idiomatic speech" (Paradissis, 1998: 53). One weekend Bob and Alexander are invited for tea by Felicity Willowes, a colleague. When they
get to her parents’ house, they find Mr and Mrs Willowes, Felicity and Bob’s father, who is a friend of Mr Willowes. As this is the first time that Alexander meets the parents of Bob and Felicity, Mr Willowes interrogates him and asks about his life in China. Alexander explains aspects of

Chinese traditions and customs elaborating on the family, weddings and funerals, respect for older people and ancestors, the celebration of New Year and other festivals, the formalities of public behaviour, footbinding, pigtails, the national language, dialects and minorities, and the people’s suffering first during the fourteen-year war against Japan and then during the subsequent civil war (Paradissis, 1998: 55).

As Alexander is talking, he realises he misses China in spite of his “deep Greek roots and the flowering of the loyal feeling of Hellenism planted in me by my dear parents” (Paradissis, 1998: 55). As a consequence, when the party are walking towards the dining room, Alexander wonders

was there not room for two or even more such sentiments to grow in the human soul or was it that I had acquired two souls? Would not my love of Australia blossom to be just as bright one day? (Paradissis, 1998: 55).

Alexander’s feelings of patriotism and belonging are stirred by the conversation. Until this moment, Alexander considers himself a Greek in the diaspora, but also a Chinese as that is his nationality and where he has been born and raised. His identity included his past and that of his parents. With this question about his future feelings for Australia, Alexander tries to include his present and future in his identity and understands that where he is going is more important than where he comes from, as Pico Iyer says.

This is the reason why I can claim that, within the minority group that migrants represent in relation to the whole population in this planet, there exists another group who could be considered a second-generation migrant as a child and a first-generation migrant in another country as an adult, but for whom these labels do not show their understanding of home, belonging and identity as inclusive of past, present and future. Pico Iyer and Aristides George Paradissis provide examples of this other type of identity, which maybe could be labelled “global citizenship” if Michael Byers’ definition is opened up and formulated in a way that also includes a person’s perception of self.
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