

A Review of the Continuation of Global Citizenship and the Move towards Universal Rights, with Emphasis on Solidarity

Prof. Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR¹, Dr. Ramazan Ahmadi², Dr. Nasratullah Morad³, Mohammad Masoud Moradi⁴, Mohammad Kazim Amini⁵

¹Dean of the Faculty of Law, International Science and Technology University, Warsaw, Poland.

²Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Bamyan University, Afghanistan.

³Department of Language and Literature, Turkish Language and Literature, Kabul University.

⁴PhD Candidate in Agriculture Faculty, Department of Agricultural Economics, Ankara University.

⁵PhD Candidate. History of Islam. Faculty of Literature and Literary Sciences. University of Tehran.

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3198-5212>

 <https://orcid.org/0009-000895521912>

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6007-2995>

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8299-7080>

 <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-4923-1325>



Article History

Received: 12.08.2025

Accepted: 08.09.2025

Published: 17.09.2025

Corresponding Author:

Prof. Dr. Mohammad
Ekram YAWAR

Abstract: The purpose of this research is to analyze the concept of global citizenship in relation to the progression toward universal rights, with particular attention to solidarity. The study employs a descriptive–analytical method.

Globalization, as a natural and accelerating phenomenon since the Second World War, has expanded through the establishment of international organizations such as the United Nations, processes of decolonization, the rise of newly independent states, the expansion of the global economy, and the increasing role of transnational actors, including multinational corporations and non-governmental organizations. The rapid development of information and communication technologies has further provided the structural infrastructure for this transformation.

This phenomenon has had profound effects across economic, cultural, political, and civil spheres. The notion of citizenship, shaped by its social dimensions, has undergone multiple historical transformations in which the interrelations of its constituent elements have evolved.

The findings indicate that, under the influence of globalization, the meaning of citizenship has shifted in parallel with the emergence of global civil society. This process has facilitated the rise of a global citizen, whereby individuals assume roles beyond the political boundaries of nation-states, independent of their formal legal identity as state citizens. Advanced communication networks, integrated global markets, and the growing influence of multinational corporations have progressively eroded the material and psychological boundaries that once defined social membership, thereby diminishing the traditional significance of citizenship within the framework of legal modernity.

Keywords: Citizenship, Globalization, Global Citizen, Universal Rights, Solidarity, Harmonization.

Cite this Article

Prof. Dr. Mohammad E. YAWAR, Dr. Ramazan. A., Dr. N. Morad, Mohammad. M. Moradi, Mohammad. K. Amini, A Review of the Continuation of Global Citizenship and the Move towards Universal Rights, with Emphasis on Solidarity (2025) *GRS Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies*, Vol-2(Iss-9),106-114

Introduction

Citizenship emerged as a distinct social and political phenomenon in urban societies during the nineteenth century and was primarily conceived as a two-way interaction between the state and the nation. At the same time, the membership of individuals within nation-states became one of the central political and social issues of modernity.

Citizenship is regarded as one of the most dynamic concepts of contemporary societies, forming the foundation of modern civil society through its reliance on social institutions and civic

structures. In its essence, citizenship represents a reciprocal social contract encompassing rights and responsibilities between *the state and the people* and *the people and the state*. It also embodies a shared sense of national and social identity within a defined political territory (1).

What makes citizenship universally appealing is its dual character: it incorporates both individualistic and collectivistic dimensions. As a relational construct, it implies cooperation among individuals for the management of their lives, and it consists of rights, duties, and obligations (2).

In recent decades, globalization has emerged as one of the most significant transformations in the international system, producing far-reaching structural changes. Globalization is a multidimensional and multi-layered process that has intensified cross-border interactions, increased interdependence among states, reshaped forms of power, expanded the number and diversity of international actors, and broadened the scope of international linkages. Within these dynamic, national boundaries have progressively lost their rigidity, pushing the global order towards increasing homogeneity, particularly in economic, political, social, and legal spheres. This development reflects a movement from plurality toward unity. While the vocabulary of globalization gained currency in the 1960s, the term “global” has been employed in scholarly and literary texts for nearly four centuries (3).

In the present globalized context, where interconnectivity defines nearly every domain of life, the concepts of “global citizenship” and “universal rights” have become indispensable. Understanding these concepts is vital to advancing toward universal rights. Indeed, the sustainability of the international system depends upon recognition of global citizenship and the consolidation of a legal framework protecting universal rights.

Global citizenship implies identification with a community larger than the nation-state and a sense of belonging to humanity as a whole. It fosters education and socialization aimed at cultivating empathy and responsibility toward other individuals and societies worldwide. A global citizen shares responsibility for addressing global challenges such as climate change, poverty, terrorism, and inequality.

Correspondingly, universal rights refer to a set of rights and freedoms belonging to all people across the globe, including fundamental political, economic, social, and cultural rights. Rooted in the principles of equality and global justice, these rights are designed to protect individuals against oppression and discrimination.

A review of the existing literature reveals that much of the scholarly discourse on global citizenship has adopted a one-sided approach, emphasizing the rights and entitlements of global citizens without adequately examining the role of global citizenship in shaping universal rights. This oversight constitutes a major gap in current research. The innovative contribution of the present study lies in its dual focus: not only on describing the characteristics of global citizenship but also on analyzing its relationship with universal rights and proposing pathways for advancing global citizenship rights.

Accordingly, the central research question guiding this study is: **What is the role of global citizenship in advancing the movement toward universal rights?**

1. Concepts

The central concepts of this study are *globalization* and *global citizenship*, which must be examined separately in order to clarify their scope and interrelationship.

1.1 Globalization

The concept of globalization entered scholarly discourse most prominently after the publication of Marshall McLuhan’s works in the 1960s, which explored communication and its transformative effects. From this perspective, globalization was largely associated with the free flow of capital and the integration of economies,

ensuring the smooth functioning of industry and trade. Thus, technological advancements in communication, coupled with the liberalization of financial flows, became the principal drivers of globalization.

Globalization reduces barriers to trade and investment, thereby enabling economic actors to operate with greater ease across borders (4). It may be broadly defined as a process that fosters interaction and integration among individuals, corporations, and governments worldwide. Facilitated by advances in communication and transportation technologies, globalization accelerates international exchanges of goods, services, ideas, and cultural practices. Initially, globalization was primarily understood as an economic phenomenon; however, over time it has expanded to encompass social, political, and cultural dimensions. Importantly, diplomacy and conflict have also been inherent features of globalization, particularly in the modern era. As a coherent process, globalization not only broadens international linkages but also diminishes the significance of locality and national identity. It is, in essence, a product of industrial advancement, technological revolutions, and the expansion of capital markets. When implemented effectively, it has the potential to foster societal development; however, it can also generate corruption and inequality. In this dynamic, civil societies increasingly complement and sometimes challenge the role of traditional nation-states by fostering cooperative mechanisms and balanced interaction. Accordingly, globalization, while promoting wider interconnectedness and collective progress, is also accompanied by structural challenges and systemic shortcomings (5).

Scholars and policymakers have provided a wide range of definitions of globalization, often shaped by their intellectual backgrounds and ideological perspectives. Some emphasize its economic dimensions, while others highlight political, cultural, or relational aspects (6). Robertson, for example, defines globalization as the *compression of the world* and the intensification of global consciousness. He argues that globalization in the twenty-first century heightens interdependence and raises citizens’ awareness of global conditions. Similarly, Proton characterizes globalization as a *multifaceted process*, influencing economic, political, cultural, military, technological, and environmental domains (7). From another perspective, globalization is interpreted as the natural extension of modernization. Advocates of this view link it to the spread of free markets, liberal democracy, efficiency, and competition, portraying it as a progressive and value-laden force. Within this framework, the capitalist system is regarded as a normative ideal that promotes development and economic prosperity. This interpretation, embraced especially by dominant powers in the global capitalist order, positions globalization as a logical and necessary stage of human evolution (8).

1.2 Global Citizenship

Traditionally, a citizen is defined as an individual entitled to participate, directly or indirectly, in lawmaking, judicial processes, and policymaking. Citizenship entails full membership in a political community or state, conferring fundamental rights and distinguishing the individual from outsiders such as foreigners, slaves, or subjects (9).

By contrast, a *global citizen* is one who is informed about contemporary global issues, recognizes their civic role beyond the nation-state, and engages in actions grounded in respect for

diversity and universal values. Such an individual views the world as an interconnected entity and works toward advancing both personal interests and the collective interests of humanity (10). Brigham emphasizes that global citizens must understand how global systems operate, adopt perspectives of equality and social justice, and challenge prevailing injustices through critical thinking and active participation (11).

Global citizenship transcends geographical boundaries and can be understood through the lens of *trans-urbanism*, which defines identity not merely by location but also by factors such as race, gender, and social class. For instance, a person of African descent living in the United States may retain civic attachments to Africa. Thus, human rights and global democracy often serve as normative frameworks alongside legal citizenship (12).

Global citizenship encompasses more than cultural knowledge; it shapes individual responsibilities across all spheres of life—from family to nation to humanity as a whole. Importantly, it is cultivated through socialization beginning within the family, nurtured through education, and strengthened through shared experiences across cultural boundaries.

While definitions vary, global citizenship generally refers to loyalty and responsibility that transcend geographic divisions, applying rights and duties universally. The characteristics of a global citizen may be outlined as follows:

- **Rights and Duties:** Global citizens are bound by the reciprocal obligations of citizenship, expressed through the recognition and enforcement of rights and responsibilities. Although national legal systems differ, the effective implementation of laws remains central.
- **Democratic Participation:** A defining attribute is active participation in decision-making processes, exercised through elections, courts, civil society, and media.
- **Engagement in Non-Governmental Systems:** Membership in international civil society organizations represents another feature, enabling individuals to contribute voluntarily toward global objectives (13).

In the global era, citizens are increasingly drawn to new social movements, unions, political organizations, and activist networks, while traditional forms of political participation have declined. Global citizenship, therefore, serves as a mechanism for defending universal rights and compelling states to respect fundamental moral obligations. These rights, transcending national sovereignty, are grounded in global moral principles of kindness, compassion, and solidarity.

Despite this normative vision, national citizenship retains primacy as an objective legal status, while global citizenship is often more conceptual than tangible. Every individual is subject first to the obligations of their nation-state before claiming a global identity. Hence, comparing national and global citizenship involves contrasting concrete legal realities with aspirational ideals. Nevertheless, global citizenship represents a progressive development in which national citizens themselves play an active role in shaping and advancing its realization (14).

1.3 Universal Rights

Rights may be broadly defined as a set of normative rules designed to regulate social relations, varying according to the history, needs, and institutions of each society. The notion of *universal law* refers

to the application of a unified set of legal principles across the globe. Such laws may emerge through international organizations, global consensus, or parallel legal developments across jurisdictions.

The pursuit of universal rights dates back to antiquity, when scholars envisioned reducing disparities among legal systems and promoting legal harmonization. Throughout history, jurists and theorists have emphasized the significance of developing comprehensive legal frameworks applicable both domestically and internationally. Accordingly, international law is understood as a body of rules, guidelines, and decisions formulated at the global level and applied across states.

2. Factors Shaping Global Citizenship

2.1 Identity Crisis

In the context of globalization, social interactions have become increasingly dynamic, complex, and fluid. Consequently, identities constructed within this framework are equally fluid, variable, and relatively transient. In contemporary societies, individuals constantly reconstruct their identities by reshaping the composition of their identity components and reordering their priorities and values. This process significantly reduces the possibility of identity consolidation.

A major factor contributing to this condition is the decline of state sovereignty and the erosion of rigid national borders. This weakening of external authority over national identity and culture leads to blurred identity boundaries. At the same time, awareness of belonging to a global community and of sharing a common global destiny has become an essential feature of modern life. Some scholars argue that such awareness constitutes the most distinctive element of globalization. In particular, the present generation exhibits far greater consciousness of global interconnectedness than preceding generations (15).

Thus, national identity under globalization cannot be regarded as irreducible or fixed; rather, it evolves in a multilayered fashion. New forms of identity commitments emerge, shaping multiple spheres of loyalty such as family, tribe, religion, neighborhood, nation, civilization, and ultimately, the global community. This layered framework suggests that globalization does not entail the dissolution of the nation-state, but rather the coexistence of global identity alongside other levels of belonging.

2.2 Global Security Issues

As globalization deepens, societies become increasingly interdependent, creating compact structures of coexistence that extend across borders. While this interconnectedness facilitates cooperation, it also generates new vulnerabilities. A crisis in one part of the world now reverberates across regions, underscoring the global consequences of local events. For instance, the collapse of the Soviet Union triggered crises and security tensions that transcended national boundaries, raising global awareness of the risks inherent in interdependence.

Ethnic crises, often stemming from identity fragmentation and nationalist movements, have destabilized security in regions such as the Middle East, the Balkans, and Africa. Likewise, the globalization of public health threats—such as the coronavirus, avian influenza, and SARS—demonstrates the borderless nature of epidemics and the inability of states to combat such crises in

isolation. These realities highlight the necessity of transnational solidarity and cooperation.

Globalization has also amplified challenges such as religious fundamentalism, extremist nationalism, and the rise of new racisms. These phenomena foster disharmony, violence, and insecurity, thereby threatening world peace. More broadly, other pressing threats include:

- **Instability of the nation-state model:** Weakness in political systems and the erosion of effective state-society relations often result in insecurity, instability, and declining public trust.
- **Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction:** The spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons intensifies the risk of catastrophic accidents or misuse.
- **Access to weapons by non-state actors:** Rogue states and terrorist organizations acquiring advanced weaponry pose grave threats to global peace and stability.
- **Environmental degradation:** Issues such as climate change, ozone depletion, acid rain, and pollution jeopardize ecological balance, public health, and intergenerational sustainability.

These transnational threats affect all humanity regardless of nationality, thereby challenging the sufficiency of national identity alone. They underscore the urgency of cultivating solidarity and empathy at the global level. Addressing these issues requires moving beyond the confines of the nation-state and embracing global citizenship as a framework of shared responsibility.

2.3 International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs)

International non-governmental organizations (INGOs) constitute another major factor shaping global citizenship. Their activities are primarily concentrated in development assistance, humanitarian relief, and human rights advocacy, particularly in regions where states are unable or unwilling to act. Projects such as HIV/AIDS awareness, malaria prevention, water purification, girls' education, and emergency disaster relief exemplify their contributions to global welfare.

INGOs also play crucial roles in environmental governance, responding to natural disasters such as floods, storms, and droughts. Beyond service delivery, these organizations promote human rights by establishing judicial standards, empowering marginalized states, and functioning within transnational networks alongside governments and intergovernmental institutions. In this sense, INGOs contribute to the emergence of human rights as a form of *global public policy*.

Their work spans three interrelated levels:

- **National level:** INGOs collect information, assist victims, conduct fact-finding, and issue reports to hold states accountable.
- **International level:** They collaborate with the United Nations, treaty-monitoring bodies, and international courts, using national-level findings to prosecute violators and strengthen human rights enforcement.

- **Standard-setting level:** INGOs participate in drafting international treaties and norms, shaping the evolution of universal human rights law.

In addition to their normative functions, INGOs play vital roles in education and public awareness, empowering citizens to claim their rights. They also exert pressure on states by publishing reports and mobilizing international opinion. Over time, INGOs have become indispensable actors in global governance, particularly in advancing human rights and strengthening global citizenship.

2.4 Global Communication Tools

The rapid proliferation of communication technologies represents another decisive factor in shaping global citizenship. These tools foster interconnectedness and a sense of shared belonging by enabling the instantaneous transmission of information across borders. A century ago, for example, a devastating earthquake in Japan remained largely unknown to societies such as Iran. In contrast, contemporary natural disasters, such as droughts in Somalia, not only attract immediate global attention but also elicit international humanitarian responses.

Modern communication technologies—satellites, the Internet, social media, and international press outlets—have diminished political barriers and facilitated global exchanges. Unlike earlier eras of one-way media dissemination, today's interactive platforms allow individuals to engage directly with news and global events. Consequently, governments can no longer monopolize or fully control information flows.

Although local and identity-based networks continue to flourish, global media plays a distinctive role in transforming human relations into symbolic forms of connection. By reducing distances and linking individuals across vast geographies, communication networks integrate human societies into a global system. In this way, communication serves not only as a technical tool but also as a symbolic foundation for constructing global solidarity and citizenship.

3. Pillars of Promoting Global Citizenship

3.1 Participation: From Liberal Democracy to the Information Society

Participation is a central component in the definition of citizenship, particularly in its connection to democracy. Within the context of globalization, the democratic model—traditionally grounded in the nation-state—faces external pressures that challenge its stability. Democracy itself is a contested concept, encompassing both **representative models**, in which elected officials embody the will of the people, and **participatory models**, which emphasize direct citizen involvement in decision-making.

While representative democracy integrates participation through elections, genuine democratic engagement extends beyond voting. True participation requires equitable access to information. In the absence of such access, the legitimacy of democratic participation is undermined. This tension highlights the interdependence of political participation, citizenship, and economic modernity.

Globalization and the proliferation of new communication technologies have transformed access to information, transcending geographical boundaries and reshaping the contours of political

engagement. These technologies facilitate global civic networks, enabling citizens to mobilize across borders and exercise agency beyond traditional nation-state structures. In this sense, information technologies provide new avenues for **participatory democracy at the global level**, reinforcing the emergence of global citizenship.

3.2 Rights: From Citizenship to Humanity

The discourse on human rights gained prominence in international law and politics in the aftermath of atrocities such as those committed during World War II. Despite their significance, human rights have historically received limited attention in sociology due to their abstract universality and their dismissal by some traditions as ideological or capitalist constructs.

Turner (1990) argues, however, that human rights are indispensable to modernization and embody a “common humanity that transcends cultures.” Unlike citizenship, which often confines rights to membership within the state, **human rights transcend nationality, ethnicity, gender, and religion**, affirming the equal dignity of all human beings. In this sense, the sociology of human rights shifts the analytical lens from national frameworks toward global inclusion.

Grounded in Kant’s principle that human life should never be treated merely as a means to an end, this framework underscores the universality and indivisibility of rights. Globalization provides both a platform and a necessity for the articulation of human rights as part of public debate, making them essential to the consolidation of global citizenship.

3.3 Membership: From Political State to Multicultural Society

Historically, citizenship was equated with membership in the political community of the nation-state, defined by inclusion and exclusion. Yet globalization and large-scale migration have destabilized this model, producing what Hall (1992) refers to as “new identities” or “new nationalities.” These challenge the assumption of exclusive loyalty to a single state.

Multiculturalism introduces a profound challenge to the traditional understanding of membership. Instead of homogeneity, individuals today embody multiple and overlapping affiliations—local, ethnic, religious, national, and global. This pluralization of identity undermines the fixed, stable membership associated with the nation-state and redefines belonging in terms of **multicultural and transnational affiliations**.

Thus, membership in the global era is no longer exclusively political but also cultural, social, and transnational, reflecting the fluid realities of contemporary identities.

3.4 Human Rights Education

Despite progress in international law, violations of human rights remain a global challenge. Article 55 of the United Nations Charter affirms respect for human rights as a foundation of international peace and security. One of the most effective mechanisms for realizing this principle is **human rights education (HRE)**, which seeks not only to disseminate knowledge but also to cultivate values, skills, and behaviors conducive to human dignity.

The UN Decade of Action for Human Rights Education underscores the universality of this process, framing it as a **transformative educational practice** that fosters critical thinking,

social change, and the internalization of human rights values. Beyond knowledge, HRE emphasizes action—encouraging citizens to actively defend and promote rights within their communities.

In this way, human rights education contributes to building a universal culture of rights, equipping citizens with the tools to bridge the gap between awareness and practice, and linking knowledge with action in pursuit of justice and peace.

3.5 Multicultural Education

The increasing cultural and ethnic diversity of contemporary societies poses both challenges and opportunities for citizenship. Unlike earlier assimilationist models, multicultural education emphasizes **recognition, equality, and inclusivity**, ensuring that minorities’ identities are respected while enabling their full participation in society.

Schools today are tasked with incorporating pluralism into curricula, replacing nationalistic or colonial narratives with inclusive perspectives. Multicultural education, therefore, plays a central role in fostering civic values that prepare individuals for global citizenship. It highlights the multiplicity of identities—family, community, nation, and humanity—demonstrating that citizenship is not restricted to one exclusive category but is shaped by diverse layers of belonging.

In this regard, multicultural education nurtures tolerance, empathy, and dialogue, positioning diversity not as a threat but as a resource for global citizenship.

3.6 Environmental Education

Environmental challenges such as climate change, pollution, and resource depletion underscore the global nature of human responsibilities. These issues transcend national borders and necessitate collective action. Environmental education emerges as a crucial mechanism for fostering awareness, empowering citizens to participate in decision-making, and cultivating sustainable practices.

Education in this domain is not limited to scientific knowledge but also integrates social responsibility, emphasizing the interconnection between ecological well-being and human development. By linking environmental awareness with civic engagement, environmental education fosters a sense of **shared responsibility for the planet**, a cornerstone of global citizenship.

3.7 Information Technology

The rapid advancement of information technology (IT) has redefined communication, knowledge dissemination, and education. While IT is often framed in terms of economic utility, its broader implications for democracy and citizenship are profound. Access to information enhances transparency, enables informed participation, and supports the development of direct or participatory forms of democracy.

However, disparities in access to technological tools create a “digital divide” that risks reinforcing inequalities. For IT to contribute meaningfully to global citizenship, it must be integrated into educational systems not only as a vocational skill but also as a means of fostering civic engagement, cross-cultural dialogue, and democratic participation.

In this sense, IT is both a tool and a platform for cultivating global citizenship, offering new avenues for political action, education, and cultural exchange on a transnational scale.

4. Impacts of Global Citizenship on Global Rights

4.1 Unification

Unification of global rights represents a complex and ambitious goal, given the significant economic, cultural, and political differences among countries. The realization of unified rights is strongly constrained by **national sovereignty**, legal traditions, and institutional frameworks, making absolute unification practically unattainable (Pradl, 2004, p. 161).

Despite these challenges, unification remains a strategic objective, aiming to establish **uniform laws and standards** across jurisdictions. Effective implementation requires a shared interpretation of laws, ideally facilitated by a common judicial framework. However, care must be taken to prevent states from imposing regulations driven by national or economic interests.

In practice, legal unification is feasible primarily under conditions of **similar jurisdictions, shared culture, and comparable economic development**. Two main approaches are employed:

1. **Establishing common principles and minimum standards** to be implemented in participating countries.
2. **Regulating and adopting a uniform set of laws** across countries, allowing states to modify their domestic laws to align with common standards.

The second approach has been applied in areas such as economic regulation, environmental protection, internet governance, social policies, criminal law, and anti-terrorism measures. European countries provide a noteworthy example: the **European Union** demonstrates legal harmonization across multiple domains due to shared development levels, economic integration, and cultural similarities (Shayganfard, 2006, p. 49).

Legal unification has been particularly successful in **commercial law**, where uniformity directly facilitates cross-border trade and commerce. By contrast, areas like **family law**, which are closely tied to social traditions and moral norms, have experienced more limited harmonization.

Other examples of regional unification include the **Scandinavian countries**, which have adopted uniform laws for both commercial and non-commercial matters, such as checks, document validity, adoption, and marriage effects. Similarly, the **1930 Geneva Convention on Commercial Documents** provided a framework for harmonizing commercial regulations across countries such as Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Greece, Austria, Germany, Italy, and France, reducing uncertainty and enhancing coordination.

At the international level, the **International Criminal Court (ICC)** illustrates the application of unified legal standards in cases of gross human rights violations. The ICC's jurisdiction, limited to crimes such as genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity, demonstrates that harmonization of laws is possible in specific domains. The Court emphasizes the principle that individuals are members of the human family, not merely nationals of a particular state, thereby reinforcing global rights and responsibilities.

Nonetheless, the experiences of Europe and specialized institutions like the ICC cannot be universally generalized. Political, cultural, civilizational, and ideological differences across societies present significant obstacles to full unification. Consequently, a **harmonization approach**—adapting global legal frameworks to

local contexts while promoting common standards—is recommended as a practical strategy in the globalization of laws.

4.2 Harmonization

Globalization is an extraordinary and ongoing process, but it does **not require absolute uniformity** of laws across nations. Instead, **harmonization**—the alignment and approximation of common strategic principles—is essential to ensure that diverse national legal systems can **coexist and function compatibly** in a globalized world. Harmonization is especially important for developing countries, as it respects **national sovereignty** while enabling participation in international legal and economic frameworks.

Harmonization involves **bringing national regulations closer together** without erasing differences. It creates **coherence and predictability** between legal systems, allowing for international cooperation in areas such as trade, human rights, environmental protection, and cybersecurity. Unlike uniformity, which seeks to impose **identical rules**, harmonization emphasizes **flexibility**, accommodating cultural, economic, and legal diversity while still promoting shared objectives.

For example, environmental standards can vary from country to country due to different levels of industrial development. Harmonization allows these nations to adopt **complementary environmental policies** that address global challenges—such as climate change—without forcing identical measures. Similarly, harmonization in commercial law, such as contract regulations or intellectual property rights, enables cross-border trade while **preserving national legal traditions**.

The process relies on identifying **common strategic principles recognized by the international community**. Regional and international conventions—especially human rights treaties and international trade agreements—provide a practical foundation for harmonization. By setting **minimum standards**, these instruments create a baseline that countries can adjust according to their legal systems, ensuring both compatibility and respect for national differences.

4.3 Limitation of National Sovereignty

The modern state was historically built upon the consolidation of national sovereignty, secularization, and strong administrative institutions such as taxation systems, judiciary structures, and armed forces. Sovereignty granted states supreme authority within their borders and reflected the historical struggles of societies to achieve **freedom, justice, and self-determination**. The emergence of democratic republicanism, particularly during the French Revolution, further strengthened the principle of **popular sovereignty**, linking national identity to shared culture, language, and religion.

In the contemporary era of globalization, classical concepts of sovereignty are **increasingly challenged**. States are no longer isolated actors; they are deeply influenced by international norms, global markets, transnational networks, and supranational institutions. Sovereignty is thus **limited**, not entirely lost, as states voluntarily adopt international commitments to participate effectively in the global system. For example, Islamic democratic countries, while retaining sovereignty, may **cede certain powers** by ratifying international treaties or joining global institutions such as the United Nations, World Trade Organization, or regional human rights bodies.

These voluntary limitations are strategic, allowing states to **benefit from cooperation and integration** while maintaining domestic authority. In practice, globalization requires a **balance** between preserving national identity and participating in global governance. Sovereignty is no longer absolute; instead, it has become **negotiable and dynamic**, evolving with international norms, economic interdependence, and the global diffusion of human rights standards.

4.4 Defining the Principle of Non-Interference and Moving Towards a Global Commons

The principle of **non-interference** in the internal affairs of states has long been a cornerstone of international law, emphasizing the sovereignty, equality, and independence of nations. Article 2, Paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter explicitly states: *"Nothing in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are within the domestic jurisdiction of any state."*

Yet, in the modern global context, strict non-interference is increasingly **untenable**, particularly in cases of systemic human rights violations or severe humanitarian crises. Compliance with human rights and democratic norms has become a measure of a state's **legitimacy and international credibility**. States must consider **moral legitimacy** in addition to legal authority, as international NGOs, supranational bodies, and global public opinion can exert pressure to enforce accountability—often through **non-military means** such as sanctions, diplomatic engagement, or monitoring mechanisms.

Human rights have become **universal concerns**, no longer confined to domestic jurisdiction. International institutions, non-governmental organizations, and civil society actors collaborate to ensure adherence to global norms. This development has effectively **limited absolute national sovereignty**, demonstrating that human rights obligations extend beyond borders. Through these mechanisms, the harmonization of rights at a global level becomes feasible, enabling states to cooperate in addressing shared challenges.

The concept of a **global commons** emerges as a logical extension of this process. A global common refers to shared spaces—physical, social, or institutional—where nations and societies interact for **common objectives**. Building such a common can occur through:

1. **Regional expansion**, where strong intra-regional cooperation forms the basis of interconnected global networks, allowing countries to collectively address shared challenges.
2. **Qualitative strengthening**, where collaboration between states and communities enhances coordination, communication, and mutual support on a global scale.

These approaches are **interdependent**, fostering a global society characterized by cooperation, participation, and shared responsibility. Regional common societies serve as foundational units, demonstrating that **sustained local and regional cooperation** can gradually evolve into a cohesive global community. In this way, a **global common** represents a long-term goal, achievable through deliberate, collaborative, and multi-level engagement across nations and regions.

Conclusion

Since ancient times, the concept of a global citizen has been contemplated by philosophers, thinkers, and scholars, and early theories related to it were even embedded in divine religions. The idea of the global citizen, as both a philosophical and practical reality, has profoundly influenced, transformed, and reshaped all dimensions of human life, from social norms and political structures to legal systems and cultural interactions.

Traditionally, various aspects of human life were governed and regulated by national laws, but the process of globalization has significantly **challenged and reshaped these national frameworks**. Laws are increasingly influenced by global standards, and national legal systems are now part of a broader **path toward global legal convergence**. The presence of the global citizen has made state sovereignty more **defined, constrained, and accountable**, while simultaneously increasing the influence and role of international and non-governmental organizations. Consequently, states have been compelled to **cede some discretionary powers** by participating in international agreements and joining global institutions.

This trend has also impacted the principle of non-interference in domestic affairs, which was once considered inviolable. Today, international norms such as the **responsibility to protect (R2P)** may justify interventions when fundamental human rights are violated, even if such interventions challenge a state's internal authority. Similarly, the erosion of absolute sovereignty has encouraged states to strengthen governance by promoting **transparency, accountability, responsiveness, participation, justice, civil equality, and the rule of law**.

Moreover, the increasing prominence of international organizations, multinational corporations, and non-governmental organizations has elevated the role of individuals in shaping global human rights, environmental standards, and international policies. The reduction of strict national borders has facilitated closer interactions between nations, leading to the emergence of shared global norms, values, and rules.

In this context, citizenship extends beyond mere national affiliation and encompasses **rights, responsibilities, participation, and identity** on a global scale. Historical developments across the premodern, modern, and postmodern periods have continuously reshaped the relationships between these elements. In the postmodern era, propelled by globalization, the concept of the global citizen has emerged as a **reconceptualization of modern citizenship**, integrating identity, rights, duties, and social dimensions at a global level.

The implementation and strengthening of rights for global citizens are possible through two primary mechanisms: **standardization** (establishing uniform global norms) and **coordination** (aligning national systems while respecting local differences). However, asymmetries may arise in legal systems due to political, economic, cultural, and historical variations. Despite these challenges, the evolving notion of the global citizen highlights the importance of fostering **solidarity, cooperation, and shared responsibility** among nations, communities, and individuals, ultimately paving the way toward a more inclusive, interconnected, and just global society.

References

1. Ameli, S. Globalization: concepts and theories, Organon Philosophical, Literary, Cultural Quarterly, Volume 10, Number 24, 1-58, 2017.
2. Faulks K. Dimensions of citizenship rights. Translation: Delfrooz, Mohammad Taghi. Tehran: Kavir Publications. Second edition, 2011.
3. Nahavandian M. Us and Globalization (cognition and policy proposal). Tehran: Fakhrakia Publishing House, 2008.
4. Shahabi M, Rahmatifar S. Evolution of the process of creating legal rules in the era of globalization of law, Quarterly Journal of Strategic Studies of Public Policy, Volume 4, Number 13, 104-128, 2012.
5. Zarrokh E. Globalization and its impact on international courts and tribunals. Judicial Journal, Year 4, Number 84, 32-35, 2009.
6. Mirmohammadi D. Globalization, dimensions and approaches. Journal of National Studies, Year 3, Number 3, 59-84, 2010.
7. Mohajeri Tehrani Z. Threats and opportunities of the phenomenon of globalization on higher education. Master's thesis, Payam Noor University, Tehran center, 2012.
8. Akbari M, Aghaari H. Identifying the factors related to the trend towards the globalization of culture among the students of Islamic Azad University, Tabriz branch. Sociological Studies, 6(19), 39-55, 2012.
9. Hywood A. Key Concepts in Politics and International Relations. Macmillan Education UK, 2017.
10. Hanson L. Global citizenship, global health, and the internationalization of curriculum: A study of transformative potential. Journal of Studies in International Education, 14(1), 70-88, 2018.
11. Jafari S. Identifying and validating the components of global citizen education from the experts' point of view: a mixed research, Learning Education Studies, Volume 11, Number 2, 153-174, 2018.
12. Manafi K, Zamani E. Education of a global citizen (within the framework of the institution of education). Tehran: National Center for Globalization, 2014.
13. Tully J. The challenge of Reimagining Citizenship and Belonging in Multicultural Societies in: The demands of Citizenship, Catriona Mc Kinnon and Iain Hampsher-Monk (eds), Continuum, London, 2014.
14. Sharifi Tarz Kohi H. (2012). An introduction to global citizenship. Tehran: Mizan Publications. First Edition.
15. Gulmohammadi, Ahmed. (2016). Globalization, culture. Identity Tehran: Ney Publishing. Ninth edition.
16. Byrne B M. (2015) Structural Equation Modeling with Amos. New York: Rutledge. 17(1), 99-120.
17. Hall, C. M., & Lew, A. A. (2012). Understanding and managing tourism impacts: An integrated approach. Routledge.
18. Nawab, Fariba. (1386). Investigating some methods of teaching human rights. legal 1(37), 129- 168.
19. Delmas Marti, Miri. (1386). International Criminal Court and interactions of domestic and international law. Legal, -(37), 297-312.
20. Mohammadi, Abolhasan (2014), Rules of Jurisprudence, Tehran: Yalda. Mohammad , E. Y. (2025). The Place of Culture in International Relations Theories. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*, 2(2), 105-123. <https://doi.org/10.69760/egjlle.2500191>.
21. Ekram Yawar, M. (2025). A Review of the Chinese School of International Relations: Moral Realism. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis Et Linguarum*, 2(4), 105-128. <https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.0250040005>.
22. Ekram Yawar, M. (2025). An Overview of Refugee Rights In International Documents. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities* , 2(1), 76-86. <https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.01012025010>
23. Dursun, E., Ekram Yawar, M., & Amani, A. (2025). The Role and Importance of National Economic Law in The International Legal Order. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*, 2(2), 46-74. <https://doi.org/10.69760/egjlle.2500082>
24. Dursun, E., Amani, A., & Ekram Yawar, M. (2025). The Legal Framework of the World Trade Organization from the Perspective of Game Theory in International Law. *Global Spectrum of Research and Humanities* , 2(2), 71-98. <https://doi.org/10.69760/gsrh.010120250019>
25. Ekram Yawar, M. (2025). Space Grand Strategy in the Light of International Relations Theory. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*, 2(4), 25-43. <https://doi.org/10.69760/egjlle.2504003>
26. Ekram Yawar, M. (2025). A Review of the Chinese School of International Relations: Moral Realism. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis Et Linguarum*, 2(4), 105-128. <https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.0250040005>
27. Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR, Dr. Ramazan Ahmadi, Muaiyid Rasooli PhD, & Lec. Abdul Jamil Sharify. (2025). Examining Diplomacy for Environmental Sustainability in Interaction with Artificial Intelligence. İçinde GRS Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies (C. 2, Sayı 8, ss. 88-92). GRS Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16902942>
28. Yawar, M. E., & Sadat, S. A. (2025). Problems of Using Artificial Intelligence as a Judge in Legal Proceedings. *Akademik Tarih ve Düşünce Dergisi*, 12(1), 403-420. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15627539>
29. Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR, Dr. Ramazan Ahmadi, Muaiyid Rasooli PhD, & Lec. Abdul Jamil Sharify. (2025). In the National and International Policy-Making System: The Place of Environmental Protection. İçinde GRS Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies (C. 2, Sayı 8, ss. 93-100). GRS Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16902966>
30. Dr. Mehmet Uçkaç, PhD, & Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR. (2025). Examining the Position and Role of Biotechnology in the Development of International Environmental Law. İçinde GRS Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies (C. 2, Sayı 1, ss. 26-36). GRS Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16886409>
31. Dr. Mehmet Uçkaç, PhD, & Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR. (2025). Systematic Literature Review - Talent Management, Succession Planning and Organizational Sustainability. İçinde GRS Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies (C. 2, Sayı 1, ss. 1-7). GRS Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16886511>

32. Dr. Mehmet Uçkaç, PhD, & Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR. (2025). International Law and Nuclear Right. İçinde GRS Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies (C. 2, Sayı 1, ss. 8-12). GRS Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16886386>
33. Dr. Mehmet Uçkaç, PhD, & Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR. (2025). The Status and Provisional Implementation of International Treaties in International Organizations. İçinde GRS Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Studies (C. 2, Sayı 1, ss. 18-25). GRS Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16886404>
34. Ekram Yawar, M., Abdul Sharify, J., & Abdullah Sadat, S. (2025). Artificial Intelligence and International Peace and Security. *Acta Globalis Humanitatis Et Linguarum*, 2(2), 49-61. <https://doi.org/10.69760/aghel.02500205>
35. Ekram Yawar, M. (2025). Long-Term Change in International Relations. *Porta Universorum*, 1(2), 13-22. <https://doi.org/10.69760/portuni.010202>
36. Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR, & Dr. Mehmet Uçkaç, PhD. (2025). A Review of International Relations and (Civilizational Theorizing). İçinde GRS Journal of Arts and Educational Sciences (C. 1, Sayı 2, ss. 44-52). GRS Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16885973>
37. Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR, & Dr. Mehmet Uçkaç, PhD. (2025). In the Theories of International Relations and Geopolitics: The Study of Location (The Concept of Conflict). İçinde GRS Journal of Arts and Educational Sciences (C. 1, Sayı 2, ss. 53-60). GRS Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16885993>
38. Prof, Dr. Mohammad Ekram YAWAR, & Dr. Mehmet Uçkaç, PhD,. (2025). In the International Foreign Policy of Countries: Soft War of Satellite Networks in Fluidity. İçinde GRS Journal of Arts and Educational Sciences (C. 1, Sayı 2, ss. 61-68). GRS Publisher. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.16886009>
39. Mohammad , E. Y. (2025). The Place of Culture in International Relations Theories. *EuroGlobal Journal of Linguistics and Language Education*, 2(2), 105-123. <https://doi.org/10.69760/egjille.2500191>.