

Chapter 8

An Ethical View of Globalization in the Post-Epidemic Era: Reflections on Multiculturalism and Patriotism

Cheng-Hsi Chien

National Pingtung University, Taiwan

Chien, C.-H. (2022). An ethical view of globalization in the post-epidemic era: Reflections on multiculturalism and patriotism. In M. Wu (Ed.), *Moral education during the global pandemic* (pp. 119–138). The Asia-Pacific Network for Moral Education. https://doi.org/10.978.98876579/03.ch_008

ABSTRACT

The Covid-19 epidemic first struck (and infected) several countries around the world in 2020, and greatly impeded global exchanges. In this paper, the author re-examines the discussions of liberalism in the context of western political philosophy in the 1980s from the economic and political disputes in the wake of the pandemic. As we know, in the 1980s the Western world began to reflect more deeply upon liberalism, communitarianism, and multiculturalism. The collective consciousness was revived and patriotism was once again valued. On the other hand, the disadvantages of the gap between the rich and the poor under neoliberal globalization was also being criticized. Here I will try to show that multiculturalism and patriotism, if not carefully watched and nurtured, may hinder globalization, and will provide some philosophical reflections on the possible directions of globalization in the post-epidemic era. I argue that globalization in the post-epidemic era will have an important ethical dimension, replacing the earlier wave of globalization which only focused on economic expansion. I use the wave of Western stigmatization of Asian people wearing masks as an example to show that multiculturalism in the future should still be based upon concrete medical and scientific knowledge, thus denouncing the prejudices brought by relativism. I also invoke Primoratz's ethical patriotism as a theoretical basis for global civic education in the post-epidemic era. In a nutshell, through the dramatic changes brought about by COVID-19, we can rethink the vision of a global ethics in order to promote world cooperation.

KEYWORDS: Covid-19, global ethics, multiculturalism, patriotism, sustainable development

INTRODUCTION

In 2020, Covid-19 began to ravage the world, and it so far has infected more than 482,237,066 people and killed more than 6,126,226. In the United States alone, as of March 29, 2022 more than 79,995,485 people have been infected and more than 977,687 have died. This article was conceived and written in July of 2020, and the number of infections and deaths is increasing almost every day, which is really alarming. With the exception of very few places, including Taiwan, in-person classes were eliminated in most countries. Of course, new environmental policies may be an important strategy in bringing this epidemic under control; along with virus transmission, the symbiosis between human beings and other species are clearly crucial issues. This paper focuses on the reconstruction of the global order in the post-pandemic era.

During the trade war between China and the United States, the epidemic also involved complex international political conflicts. For example, the frequently accused China, in particular the WHO Secretary-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, and withdrew from the WHO during the Trump presidency. Wuhan, the “birthplace” of the pandemic, also an inland city of China where the revolution initiated by Dr. Sun Yat-Sen overthrew the Qing dynasty in 1911, launched the first COVID lockdown, isolating itself off from the outside on the 23rd of January in 2020. Some western countries accused the Chinese government of violating human rights, but many of them had to take similar measures to prevent the pandemic from getting worse in their countries.

What was worse, global traffic became also paralyzed, with the airports of many countries remaining almost completely closed. Suddenly, people began to realize that the process of globalization we had taken for granted in the past could be suspended at any time. The wave of globalization driven by British and American neo-liberalism after the 1980s had already raised academic doubts since 2000. Many scholars believe that numerous injustices resulted from the worldwide failure to give due importance to the issue of equality. But no man is an island, and no country can afford the economic shock of fragmentation. Even the U.K. and the U.S., which advertise themselves as

liberal countries, have taken drastic measures to block China's Huawei recently. In July 2020, President Trump publicly expressed the desire to force China to sell TikTok to the U.S. Western countries have accused China of state capitalism and thus of violating the spirit of liberalism, while the U.S. has been violating the spirit of free trade in a wave of trade wars. Given this complicated international political and economic situations, I wonder whether we should choose to continue with these regional confrontations and bring an end to post-pandemic globalization or, rather, to establish a new global ethics that goes beyond the globalization that once was dominated by neo-liberalism.

Since 2000, liberalism in British educational philosophy has led to debates between J. White and other scholars (White, 2003), while criticism of neoliberalism in educational policy has become common (Marshall, 1996; Olssen et al., 2004). Since the 1980s, critiques of Western liberalism from the perspectives of Communitarianism and Multiculturalism have become prominent even in political philosophy. Multiculturalists highlight the peculiarity of individual cultures, and hold that a universal culture should not be allowed to suppress or stifle any specific culture. Furthermore, the communitarian scholar A. MacIntyre regards the tradition of Kant's universal laws of morality as making these laws too abstract and isolated. He believes that the morality based on the virtues of cultural practices, rather than the morality of rule, should be at the root of human ethics and happiness. MacIntyre (1984) also re-authenticates the necessity of patriotism as a virtue in civic education. However, traditional Western liberals have always been concerned that patriotism will encourage national chauvinism abroad and hide the abuse of power by leaders who are engaged in domestic affairs. Thus, liberal countries do not advocate placing too much emphasis on patriotism in civic education.

Of course, it is noteworthy that Donald Trump adopted Ronald Reagan's 1980s campaign slogan "Let's Make America Great Again" when he ran for president in 2016. The difference is that Reagan supported the neo-liberal spirit of globalization in dealing with the Soviet Union, whereas Trump's blatant right-wing patriotism violated the free trade spirit that both the United States in the past and China recently were trying to

maintain. After China joined the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 2001, it launched the “Silk Road Economic Belt” and the “21st Century Maritime Silk Road” in 2013, thus reflecting the need for integrating free trade and globalization. Paradoxically, both the East and the West have blamed each other’s political acts undertaken in the name of patriotism. Moreover, in the U.S., a white policeman killed an innocent black man in the line of duty, leading to large-scale black-white racial conflicts. Then in January of 2021, Trump’s supporters stormed Capitol Hill after his defeat. This event has become a test for the U.S. with regard to the issue of how to resolve racial conflicts by implementing patriotic and democratic policies.

I majored in Philosophy of Education, and so I am not the most qualified person to speak on these international economic and political issues. However, in this paper I re-examine the discussion of liberalism in Western political philosophy in the 1980s in the context of international political and economic disputes. Also, I provide some philosophical reflections on the direction(s) taken by globalization in the post-epidemic era.

THE SPIRIT OF LIBERALISM AND ITS CHALLENGES

Challenges From Multiculturalism and Communitarianism: Recovery of Collective Rights and Patriotism

Western liberalism manifests itself in politics primarily as a distrust of state power. Its advocates believe that collective power suppresses individual freedom; in other words, Western liberalism focuses on moderating the potential evil of collective power. R. Dworkin (1978) stresses the neutrality thesis: a country or group should accept the variety in values and treat them equally, rather than favor any specific value or lifestyle. Thus governments should recognize individual differences and treat each value fairly. Liberals value diversity and focus on respect for individual autonomy or choice, whereas communitarianists or multiculturalists reject this atomistic view of the self, and it holds that individuals make value choices or decisions in the context of their culture.

The collective rights of ethnic minorities are recognized by multicultural theorists. In their view, the individual diversity proposed by traditional liberalism fails to really

respect the cultures of minority groups. A good example of this is the case of *Wisconsin vs. Yoder*, where we see the Amish minority guarding its religious lifestyle, refusing the last two years of compulsory education so as to protect their future and prevent it from sinking into oblivion due to the influence of mainstream American values. Here we also see the impact of multiculturalism on liberalism after the 1980s in the West. However, even the liberal pluralist W. Galston, who appreciates multiculturalism, also agrees that society's minimum requirements should include protection of human life (via a ban on human sacrifice), guaranteeing the normal development of basic capacities of individuals (via a ban on impeding physical growth of baby or children), and promoting social rationality (the kind of understanding need to participate in the society, economy, and polity). Moreover, if any groups neglect these requirements, the state has a right to intervene (Galston, 1995, pp. 524–525). W. Kymlicka advocated for external protection of minority groups to prevent them from being assimilated or controlled by more powerful majority groups. But internal restrictions are still absolutely necessary; that is, ethnic minorities cannot restrict the civic rights of their own people (Kymlicka, 1996, pp. 34–48). In my view, the reason why these scholars wish to revise liberalism and emphasize collective rights is not to deny personal autonomy, but to highlight the pluralistic spirit of respecting “difference.”

Throughout human history, patriotism has always been regarded as a commendable virtue, while nationalism leads to the sordid history of xenophobia among countries. Since the Second World War ended in the mid-1940s, individual freedom and the rule of law have secured the foundation of Western liberal-democratic countries, lest the power of the state encroach upon individual liberty. However, in Western countries in the 1980s, under the influence of the aforementioned policy of collective rights, there was also a revival of patriotism. MacIntyre (1984) emphasizes that patriotism was and is a virtue with intrinsic value. Although Miller (1988), Tamir (1993), Viroli (1997) and others all agree on the importance of patriotism, they are also committed to harmonizing nationalism (patriotism) and liberalism. On the other hand, there arise certain doubts on the part of traditional liberals. Nussbaum (1996) worries that a narrow form of patriotism in some countries may ultimately be harmful to world peace. Starting from Tagore's novel and the Stoics in ancient Greece, Nussbaum rebrands cosmopolitanism. That Keller (2005) takes patriotism as a form of bad faith is

another typical example. In the context of civic education, this has attracted the attention of scholars in the philosophy of education.

Interestingly, J. White (2005), who stands for the liberal tradition in the Anglo-Saxon philosophy of education, argues that states (or countries) should emphasize on cultivation of their national identities, while the liberal feminist Enslin (1999) still doubts that national consciousness is conducive to democracy. Stevens (1999) and Archard (1999) also disapprove of White's argument and restate their concerns about patriotism, insisting that patriotic education should be carried out carefully. Given the context of international politics in today's post-epidemic era, these debates are worth rethinking in the West.

Deficiencies of Neo-liberalism

Classical liberalism seeks to establish institutions that can mediate power and guarantee individual freedoms through the separation of powers, checks and balances, a multi-party system, and freedom of speech and of the press. The libertarian thinking of F. A. Hayek and M. Friedman even promotes the minimization of state power in order to prevent inappropriate economic interventions. Perhaps influenced by Keynes, who emphasized the positive role of public construction during the Great Depression of the 1930s, and stimulated by classical Marxism, the U.K. and the U.S. pursued the ideal of egalitarianism as far as possible after the Second World War, though not to the extent of completely adopting Hayek's approach.

However, after U.S. President Ronald Reagan and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher began to advocate neo-liberalism in the 1980s, the operation of international finance became more conducive to the accumulation of transnational capital due to the improvement of technology. Governments took measures such as tax reduction and other schemes favorable to enterprises, resulting in the growth of GDP and wealth. However, these measures eventually benefit only a few people, and most people cannot enjoy the results. The free flow of capital also makes it easier for transnational corporations to avoid taxes, so that it becomes more difficult for governments to achieve a reasonable level of social welfare protection.

Briefly, with the ever-widening gap between the rich and the poor, Hayek's minimal government policy has caused governments to shirk their responsibilities. On

the other hand, due to the electoral mechanisms of democracy, governments are apt to become linked with consortiums whose effects are much broader and farther away from Hayek's ideal of restricting state power. What is worse, in recent years, Western parliamentarianism has become disabled and populism has been increasingly manipulated by politicians. However, the original democratic competitions among political parties has descended into wrangles among classes, religions, ethnic groups, and even advocates of various immigration and refugee policies, thus increasingly corrupting the spirit of democratic politics.

Gewirtz (2002, p.32) reminds that from the welfare state to the post-welfare state, the quality assurance and consumerism driven by neo-liberalism also reduced the original purpose of education to the accountability under the new-managerialism. Countries tend to emphasize so-called accountability and an evidence-based orientation that focuses on educational output, even going so far as to distort educational subjectivity. Biesta (2010), in criticizing the educational indicators coming from the European Union, OECD, and PISA, contends that the widespread use of the measurement of educational outcomes has actually displaced the true purpose of education. The point is that an educational system that stressing "learnification" tends to depersonalize education, so that teachers begin to lose their capacity for making wise judgments (Biesta, 2016). Not just education and student performance, but the whole practice of government by bureaucratic management has become shackled by technocracy (Marshall, 1996). In one word, the globalization of neo-liberalism has weakened the ideal of the welfare state, resulting in the evils of capitalism. Thus education is becoming reduced to a technocracy that merely serves as the commercial logic of capitalism, and the ideal of equal educational opportunity becomes a slogan.

Overcoming the above-mentioned deficiencies certainly requires the reflections of intellectuals, professional managers, and statesmen. The point of these reflections is not the pursuit of greater profit, but the co-existence and co-prosperity of all human beings. In any serious attempt on the part of many countries to get back to a global-ethical vision, education will clearly still play an active role.

ETHICS AND GLOBALIZATION IN THE POST-EPIDEMIC ERA

Here I concentrate on the question of how communitarianism and multiculturalism challenge liberalism and the debates concerning patriotism. First, I try to show that the central idea of “respect” from multiculturalism, while respect should be based on the certainty of values or of facts, by looking at the issue of “masks or no masks” during the epidemic. Then, in the context of the debates of Western scholars regarding patriotism, I argue that the ethical patriotism of I. Primoratz can become the middle ground, and thus can be conducive to international cooperation in the post-epidemic era.

RECONSTRUCTING THE MULTICULTURAL IDEAL BASED ON THE CERTAINTY OF VALUES AND FACTS

Since the SARS outbreak in 2002, wearing masks to protect oneself from the disease in Asian countries (at least in Taiwan) has come to be seen as something that benefits both oneself and others. However, we also have seen that during the COVID-19 pandemic, Westerners have tended to discriminate against Asian-Europeans or Asian-Americans who wear masks, and even to discriminate against Asian students. Along with the ongoing trade war between China and the U.S., the stigmatizing of China has become more serious. President Trump even publicly referred to COVID-19 as the Chinese (or “China”) virus. In addition, we have continued to hear about the many protest marchers in the West who refuse the mask mandate in public places. This is indeed an interesting phenomenon as it involves the point of liberalism and multiculturalism, and it deserves to be taken seriously. Liberalism itself attaches great importance to the ideal of having respect for people, as Peters regards Kant’s respect for people as a procedural principle (Peters, 1966, Ch.8).

The cultural collective rights to which multiculturalists attach importance also call for the identification of different cultures. According to multiculturalism, there is no single definitive value, and the cultures of different countries should be respected. If the cultures of different countries were respected, there would be no cases of Westerners beating Asians wearing masks on the subway. I believe that some people in the West still discriminate against Asian people who wear masks, a practice still be based on an incorrect perception of the facts.

Perhaps we need not insist, as Siegel (1997, p. 151) claims, that all forms of multiculturalism and of universal “respect” for social class as well as gender and ethnicity can be demonstrated in the epistemology of the Enlightenment or the ethics of Kant. But Siegel also reminds us that respect has both moral and epistemological meanings. When we regard respect only as a moral term, we may miss its epistemological significance. Rachels (1998, pp. 21–22) also points out that cultural relativism leads to three consequences: we can no longer say that the customs of other societies are morally inferior to our own, we cannot decide whether actions are right or wrong just by consulting the standards of our society, and we will be forced to realize that the ideal of moral progress has been called into doubt. Rachels thus reminds us that different cultures act out their different values, and that there is less disagreement than it seems. The value of cultural relativity is to keep an open mind and be able to recognize that the customs of different societies may be specific products of their cultures, and not strictly right or wrong. However, it cannot be concluded as a measure or policy without right and wrong.

This brings us to the epistemological dimension of “respect.” We may find it inconvenient to wear masks. I illustrate the syllogism of reasoning in the context of mask-wearing as follows:

(a.1)

Everyone must take responsibility for his/her own life.

Wearing masks can efficiently prevent oneself from being infected.

I should wear a mask outside. (My right)

Everyone should have the right to wear a mask outside and not be discriminated against.

(a.2)

We are responsible for others' lives.

Wearing masks can efficiently prevent us from infecting others.

I should wear a mask outside. (My obligation)

Everyone should (or has an obligation to) wear a mask outside.

(b.1)

When it comes to not hindering others, the government should not be allowed to restrain individual freedom.

There is no clear relationship between wearing masks and preventing this disease.

The government should not force people to wear masks outside.

(b.2)

We are responsible for others' lives.

People who wear masks may still get infected.

Those who suffer from infectious diseases should stay at home.

All people who do not wear masks outside are healthy.

The government should not force people to wear masks outside.

(a.1) and (a.2) give general reasons for wearing a mask. (b.1) and (b.2) provide reasons to oppose the government's mandate that citizens wear masks. (a.1) states that an individual has the right to wear a mask, whereas (a.2) states the obligation to wear a mask to protect others. Whether or not (a.2) can justify successfully that everyone has an obligation to wear a mask outside, as well as whether or not (b.1) is correct in that the government should not force people to wear masks outside, both conclusions depend on whether the minor premise is objective or not—wearing a mask prevents infection of others efficiently. In my opinion, it is (b.2) that touches upon the difference between Eastern and Western cultures. I suppose lots of Westerners believe that it is necessary to wear masks only when people are sick. The vast majority of people do not wear masks when they are not sick. However, even if we accept the reason of (b.2) that the western idea of not wearing a mask until you are sick, it is a remarkable fact that it does not work to not wear masks outside when faced with so many asymptomatic infections of COVID-19.

In this post-modern era, many multiculturalists and feminists invoke the perspective of the relativism of knowledge.¹ They claim that mainstream social absolutism might oppress others, and thus that post-Enlightenment rationalism should

¹ Postmodernists criticize the Western tradition of rationality and tend to assume a relativist position in their epistemology. Siegel (1987) combats this relativistic epistemology with all his might, and he also extensively discusses the errors of the relativism of postmodernism, multiculturalism, and feminism (Siegel, 1997). However, the limit of the article prevents me from going into greater detail here.

be subverted. Is multiculturalism really a form of relativism? Siegel (1987, pp.112–114) suggests that a weak sense of relativism means that knowledge is fallible. However, if there are no absolute standards of knowledge, as we see with the in-commensurability of Kuhn’s different paradigms, Siegel reminds us that it has been absolutism in their own paradigm when we adhere to different paradigms and have no objective standards. What is worse, absolutism actually encourages a sense of self-righteousness with regard to each paradigm, and that leads to dogmatism. Siegel (1997, p. 183) emphasizes that respect for diversity does not necessarily presuppose the relativity of knowledge, nor does a belief in the absoluteness or certainty of knowledge necessarily hinder diversity. Postmodernism and multiculturalism need not negate the universal standard of knowledge in order to highlight marginalized and disadvantaged voices. Inclusion is not necessarily the patent of post-modernism.

In a word, given the dispute between East and West regarding the epidemic, the issue of “masks or no masks” in both the East and the West makes it clear that a respect for multiculturalism should be based on medical facts and the certainty of medical knowledge. It is clear to suggest that post-modernity and multiculturalism, with their emphasis on the relativity of knowledge and values, bear the positive spirit of inclusion and tolerance. But the spirit of inclusion and tolerance may betray the spirit that post-modernity and multiculturalism brightly boast. The journal *Scientific American* (October 1, 2020) had not explicitly expressed its position in the presidential elections in its 175 years of the U.S. history. However, unprecedentedly, this journal explicitly endorsed Joe Biden and denounced Donald Trump because the latter has done and said many things that betray the spirit of fact and science. Thus, we can suggest that the future international cooperation in the post-epidemic times will, too, depend more on professional but not arbitrary knowledge.

AN ETHICAL UNDERTAKING OF GLOBALIZATION: ETHICAL PATRIOTISM

If it is widely agreed that a respect for multiculturalism cannot be contrary to the basic facts, then this still applies equally to the discussion of patriotism. I can agree with MacIntyre’s view that patriotism has intrinsic value. According to MacIntyre’s critiques, traditional liberalism looks at the relationship between individual and state in terms of contract theory, focusing on instrumental values based on reciprocity, which cannot explain the spontaneous feelings of individuals for or against their state. But

even MacIntyre (1984, pp. 13–14) uses the case of Adam von Trott against Hitler to show that citizens of a country they love may not be loyal to a particular politician or government. A. Gutmann (1996) believes that the spirit of cosmopolitanism promoted by the democratic humanism of Nussbaum is very similar to the democratic citizenship we associate with liberalism, since democratic civic education is based on individual rights, equality, and justice, which may not serve the purpose of being or remaining loyal to a particular community.

However, Gutmann (1996) reminds us that constructing a global community in the name of cosmopolitanism might be arbitrary. The international-cooperation organizations of the United Nations must also act effectively within individual countries to achieve the best results of cooperation. We can agree with the cosmopolitan ideal that it is difficult to operate at the state level, for as White (2005, p. 184) observes, “A large part of the social, cultural, economic and political framework of our lives is the national community. Around the world we find health and welfare systems. Mass media, whether public or private, operate largely within national frontiers, keeping each part of the nation in touch with all the others.” Nussbaum’s idea/ideal of cosmopolitanism which encompasses common humanity is moving,² the cosmopolitanism at the state level may face the struggling between community and nationalism. In addition to perpetuating the Cold War conflict between the West and Russia, nationalism or patriotism also played an important role in Russia's invasion of Ukraine in 2022.

I would hold that the view of citizenship cultivated by I. Primoratz’s (2015) ethical patriotism embodies the reconciliation of patriotism and cosmopolitanism. The focus of ethical patriotism is not on achieving national glory, but on the hope that our fellow countrymen can reflect on themselves, care about the ethical performance of their country, and have a clear sense of collective responsibility. This kind of ethical responsibility makes patriotism something that is not arbitrarily exclusive. Primoratz (2015) defines patriotism as love for and identification with one’s country, which means showing concern for the welfare of one’s country and compatriots, and he also emphasizes the importance of collective responsibility; i.e., what the state does should correspond to its moral requirements and promote moral values both domestically and

² The position of Nussbaum (1996) is still inclined toward cosmopolitanism and disparages patriotism. Later, she also reconciled patriotism and cosmopolitanism (Nussbaum, 2008).

abroad. Each nation must strive for a just and humane world and strive to extend itself beyond its borders to show its support of common human solidarity. The state can also face up to its past history and then admit, apologize, and make amends for past injustices so as to avoid making the same mistakes in the future. Thus, the real point of ethical patriotism is not national glory but a profound reflection and caring about the current state of our compatriots, that is, assuming collective responsibility for all of us.

How is ethical patriotism possible? Primoratz (2015, pp. 94–100) offers three proposals: Firstly, citizens are in the optimal position in their countries. They can compare and make judgments regarding the moral conduct of other countries, while also caring about and promoting their own country. Secondly, citizens are responsible for examining their own conduct, which might be unjust, while they are also benefitting from their country. Thirdly, citizens in democratic countries who participate in the process of legislation and policy formation can also take charge of their own country's policies.

Primoratz thus attempts to show that ethical patriotism is positive and possible if citizens have this consciousness, that is, they feel guilty if they do not become ethical patriots. Primoratz declares that if people think about and deeply feel for their country and compatriots, then they have the duty to show a special concern for their own and others' moral well-being.

I am significantly moved by Primoratz's ethical patriotism, as my birthplace, which values patriotism, fails to criticize the patriotism education itself. At the beginning of the COVID-19 outbreak, Taiwan exported masks extensively and won worldwide acclaim. At the same time, however, the government banned exports to mainland China. Political realities have also prevented Taiwan from assisting the Mainland Chinese people in a timely manner. Thus I am deeply moved by Primoratz's ethical patriotism. I have no intention of making any judgments about Trump personally. Taylor (2017) has pointed out that the emergence of atypical political figures in various countries, critical thinking, autonomy and open minds are more important. M. Peters, a critic of neoliberal globalization, also points out that Trumpian patriotism is hardly the right way to block globalization. He worries that patriotism will replace globalism as an even greater disaster in the future (Peters, 2020). Even with President Trump out of the White House, we still cannot ignore the impact of Trumpism.

During the period of the spread of COVID-19, international communication has come close to being suspended. It is reasonable that countries impose quarantine measures. However, it is a pity that some countries inhibit each other from collaborating for their own interest. In the first year of the COVID-19 outbreak, I called in my class for countries in the northern hemisphere to work together to prevent the spread of the epidemic to countries in the southern hemisphere. It is regrettable that the countries of the northern hemisphere are too busy to assist the countries of the southern hemisphere. The problem now is that rich countries in the northern hemisphere have mastered the technology for developing vaccines, and yet they have been unable to commit themselves to an equitable distribution of vaccines in the countries of the southern hemisphere. In this post-epidemic era, I sincerely hope that ethical patriotism will finally mean a new level of globalization for citizens of the world.³

ETHICAL PATRIOTISM AND CIVIC EDUCATION

Citizenship education in this paper generally refers to the development of appropriate levels of individual responsibility and commitment, embodying the support of individuals and communities for the shared values of the communities they live in. School curriculum subjects such as ethics, social studies, and history all play an important role. Primoratz's ethical patriotism has shown that the individual has to reinforce the ethical mission of the state in order for the state to show greater ethical responsibility. Curren and Dorn (2017) also discuss the emphasis on patriotic education in the era of globalization.⁴ They present the virtues of morality, while also stressing that civic duties should not be confined to the countryside. By framing virtuous patriotism within this wider context of civic virtue and responsibility. Curren and Dorn

³ Another example may help the rationale of my argument: Taiwan's area of forests account for more than two-thirds of the island. During the period of Japanese rule (1895-1945), it witnessed a period of heavy logging. In 1991, deforestation was completely banned in Taiwan. However, statistics show that Taiwan's timber production rate is only 1.02%, which is much lower than Japan's 36.6% and Korea's 15.2% in 2020. The ethical predicament thus emerges: On the one hand, we protect Taiwan's own forests, but on the other hand, we exploit other countries' forests. Scholars point out the objective fact that banning deforestation without making effective use of forest thinnings can also exert a harmful impact on the forest conservation. In recent years, Taiwan has gradually increased the timber self-sufficiency rate. Our ethical principle of banning deforestation must always rely not only on objective professional knowledge, but also on a global ethical vision of co-existence and co-prosperity.

⁴ I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for recommending the work of Curren and Dorn (2018).

(2017, p. 102) recognize that a virtuous form of patriotic sentiment could play a limited if significant role in motivating acts of civic responsibility.

Curren and Dorn define civic intelligence, civic friendship, and civic competence as components of civic virtue. Civic intelligence reflects the tradition of liberalism (such as Rawls' public reason), and it is necessary to cultivate students' ability to use reason and knowledge to pursue the interests and well-being of the community. Civic friendship represents a sense of belonging of the individual to the group. Schools must also adopt a cooperative learning approach to foster a just community consisting of students from different regions or cultures. And by the teaching of history, geography, and literature, students can go beyond the level of face-to-face friendship to promote the common friendship of mankind. Furthermore, civic education is not just about ideas. It is about action. Participation in public affairs, community service, problem-solving skills, and engagement in international cooperation are all highlights of civic education in schools.

In the previous section, I mentioned that neo-liberalism has created a lack of wealth equality both domestically and internationally. At the beginning of the epidemic in the U.S., M. Sandel, a communitarian who emphasizes virtues, proposed the questions, "Are we all in this together?" and "What do we owe one another as citizens?" in order to illustrate how the unity of Americans is hindered by the inequality between the rich and the poor. He hopes that after this COVID-19 outbreak, the U.S. will rethink the economic measures of the past 40 decades, which have divided the people but also revived American unity. He says that "We need to ask whether reopening the economy means going back to a system that, over the past four decades, pulled us apart, or whether we can emerge from this crisis with an economy that enables us to say, and to believe, that we are all in this together" (Sandel, 2020).

Sandel's call applies not just to the U.S. but to all countries in the world. Although Primoratz, Curren and Dorn do not oppose patriotism, they all face up to the urgent need for a global ethics and emphasize the global need for a patriotic ethics and international cooperation. Let patriotism serve its positive function and avoid any negative side effects. Sandel does not use patriotic words, but he points out that economic injustice can hinder the unity of our citizens. If we agree with this view, then we must agree that patriotism should be endowed with an ethical mission in the realms

of history, geography, social studies, ethics or morality, and other school subjects. Internally an emphasis should be placed on the equal well-being of subgroups, and externally on international mutual understanding in civic education. Even scientific subjects—such as physics, chemistry, and the earth sciences—should bear greater global responsibility (e.g., the greenhouse effect, climate change mitigation). Indeed, the sustainable development goals (SDGs) formulated by the United Nations should be the focus of citizenship education in every country at present.⁵

CONCLUSION: RECONSTRUCTING THE PROSPECTS OF GLOBALIZATION IN THE POST-EPIDEMIC ERA

At the end of the last century, globalization based on neo-liberalism led to the evils of capitalism, which has long been criticized by scholars. COVID-19 is raging, forcing us to slow down as much as possible the forces of globalization. The stagnation of our global economy also shows that we cannot completely deny the economic value of the interactions between countries shared each other by globalization. We really should take this opportunity to reconstruct a new political and economic order. Regrettably, the performance of the U.S. and other Western countries at the beginning of COVID-19 not only reflects domestic epidemic-management problems, but also seems to hinder the possibility of international cooperation due to the facts of the China-U.S. trade war and the U.S. presidential election. The Russia-Ukraine war seems to have led to more serious conflicts and confrontations between the East and the West. It would be a pity if after the epidemic the value of globalization is completely denied and international interactions are impeded.

Global ethics is not new. Peter Singer (2003) looks at global ethics from the perspective of climate change. Singer (2016) devotes himself to the ethical issues concerning animal rights, global poverty, and biotechnology from the perspective of utilitarianism. The challenges of the post-pandemic era force us to think about the ethical mission of globalization. After all, no man is an island. We have only one earth.

⁵ Of course, SDGs cannot be implemented in a manner of instrumental reason without truly understanding the spirit of it. For example, some schools simply use the top-down education policy and then avidly compete to obtain and implement the resources of the policy, such as the improving of university rankings. This can, however, easily lead to disadvantages.

If we place the controversies of political philosophy in the Western world after the 1980s—including the challenges of multiculturalism to liberalism and the revival of patriotism by communitarianism—in the context of the post-epidemic situation, we can provide a new perspective for the interpretation of globalization. First, in the last wave of globalization, science and technology promoted financial circulation, promoted industrial upgrading, and created the accumulation of overall human wealth. However, what we sacrifice is social equity and our responsibility to the disadvantaged, which means a lack of consideration of ethics. The spread of COVID-19 has broken down barriers between countries and reminded people of the importance of our ethical commitments to each other. Moreover, the mutual respect between different countries and cultures should not become mere lip service. The example of mask prevention shows the importance of having an ethical consensus. This applies not only to domestic governance, but also to international cooperation.

Finally, strengthening the literacy and responsibility of world citizens through ethical patriotism should also be the focus of our citizenship education in the future. On the other hand, if countries take advantage of the epidemic to block the development of globalization by a narrow nationalism and create alliances or confrontations among regions, they will truly miss the opportunity given us by the epidemic to test the co-existence and prosperity of all mankind. At the beginning of the outbreak, more than half of the world's school terms or classes were suspended. During this tough time, China took the lead at first, chanting the slogan “classes suspended but learning continues” and made full use of networking and other measures to develop teaching plans, including those for replacing face-to-face teaching. The futures of video technology and net-teaching are also bound to change the whole landscape of school education. New technological advances will also accelerate in the future. How to commit digital technology more to the promotion of global ethics is worth thinking about, although this matter is beyond the scope of the present article. All this comes to the fore as the conflict between Russia and Ukraine remains unresolved. Determining how nationalism and patriotism can strengthen domestic unity without triggering international conflicts remains a difficult challenge. Let us, at this critical juncture, learn from the past, embrace hope, and renew the ethical mission of globalization in the post-epidemic era.

REFERENCES

- Archard, D. (1999). Should we teach patriotism? *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 18(4), 157–199.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, politics, democracy*. Routledge.
- Biesta, G. J. J. (2016). *The beautiful risk of education*. Routledge.
- Curren, R., & Dorn, C. (2018). *Patriotic education in a global age*. Chicago University Press.
- Dworkin, R. (1978). Liberalism. In S. Hampshire (Ed.), *Public and private morality*. (pp. 113–143). Cambridge University Press.
- Enslin, P. (1999). The place of national identity in the aims of education. In R. Marples (Ed.), *The aims of education* (pp. 100–111). Routledge.
- Galston, W. A. (1995). Two concepts of liberalism. *Ethics*, 105(3), 516–534.
- Gewirtz, S. (2002). *The managerial school: Post-Welfarism and social justice in education*. London: Routledge.
- Gutman, A. (1996). Democratic citizenship. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: debating limits of patriotism* (pp. 66–71). Beacon Press.
- Keller, S. (2005). Patriotism as bad faith. *Ethics*, 115(3), 563–592.
- Kymlicka, W. (1996). *Multicultural citizenship: A liberal theory of minority rights*. Clarendon.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). *Is patriotism a virtue?* University of Kansas Press.
- Marshall, J. D. (1996). Foucault and new-liberalism: Biopower and busno-power. In A. Neiman (Ed.), *Philosophy of education 1995* (pp. 320–329). Philosophy of Education Society.
- Miller, D. (1988). The ethical significance of nationality, *Ethics*, 98(4), 647–662.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1996). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 2–20). Beacon.

- Nussbaum, M. C. (2008). Toward a globally sensitive patriotism. *Daedalus*, 137(3), 78–93.
- Olssen, M., Codd, J., & O’Neill, A. (2004). *Education policy: Globalization, citizenship and democracy*. Sage.
- Peters, M. (2020). Trump’s nationalism, “the end of globalism,” and “the age of patriotism”: “the future does not belong to globalists. The future belongs to patriots.” *Educational philosophy and theory*, 52(13), 1342–1346.
- Peters, R. S. (1966). *Ethics and education*. George Allen and Unwin.
- Primoratz, I. (2015). Patriotism: A two-tier account. In J. Kleinig, S. Keller, & I. Primoratz. *The ethics of patriotism* (pp. 73–103). Wiley Blackwell.
- Rachels, J. (1998). *The elements of moral philosophy*. McGraw-Hill.
- Sandel, M. (2020, April 13). Are we all in this together? *The New York Times*.
- Siegel, H. (1987). *Relativism refuted: A critique of contemporary epistemological relativism*. D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Siegel, H. (1997). *Rationality redeemed? Further dialogues on an educational ideal*. Routledge.
- Singer, P. (2003). *One world*. Yale University Press.
- Singer, P. (2017). *Ethics in the real world: 82 brief essays on things that matter*. Princeton University Press.
- Stevens, D. (1999). The case of the Chingford skinhead: John White on education and special obligations between fellow nationals, *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 33(3), 353–370.
- Tamir, Y. (1993). *Liberal nationalism*. Princeton University Press.
- Taylor, R. M. (2017). Education for autonomy and open-mindedness in diverse societies. *Educational Philosophy and Education*, 49(14), 1338–1350.
- Viroli, M. (1997). *For love of country: An essay on patriotism and nationalism*. Oxford University Press.

White, J. (2003). Five critical stances towards liberal philosophy of education in Britain: With responses by Wilfred Carr, Richard Smith, Paul Standish and Terence H. McLaughlin. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 37(1), 147–184.

White, J. (2005). Education and nationality. In *The curriculum and the child: The selected works of John White* (pp. 181–195). Routledge.