

# COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

## 1: cosmopolitan | Definition of cosmopolitan in English by Oxford Dictionaries

*Define cosmopolitanism. cosmopolitanism synonyms, cosmopolitanism pronunciation, cosmopolitanism translation, English dictionary definition of cosmopolitanism. adj. 1. Pertinent or common to the whole world: an issue of cosmopolitan import.*

Given the diverse nature of the global village, tolerance and understanding are the bywords. Supporters of cosmopolitanism, dating back to the Stoics and Cynics of classical antiquity as well as to Judaism and Christianity, insist that they advocate building bridges of understanding and do not support cultural, social or religious homogenization. Cosmopolitanism has implications for the economic, moral and political spheres. Along with multiculturalism, it has been at the center of an often contentious debate about the place of Western civilization in the K school curriculum. On one side of the debate are conservatives who argue that cosmopolitanism should be part and parcel of a civic education that places a high value on Western civilization and its views on such topics as human rights and democracy. On the other side of the debate are liberals who view cosmopolitanism as synonymous with multiculturalism, the view that there is a de facto moral equivalence between different cultures, meaning in turn that Western civilization should not be privileged in the educational system. Multicultural Keywords Civic Education; Conservatism; Cosmopolitanism; Cynicism; Homogenization; Liberalism; Multiculturalism; Stoicism; Tolerance; Western Civilization Overview Cosmopolitanism, like democracy, had deep roots in Western philosophy and civilization before it came to the shores of America through British colonization. We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness. In essence, cosmopolitanism has much to say about what it means to be an American living in a country and a world marked by profound diversity. As used in this essay, cosmopolitanism is the idea that all human beings are world citizens with responsibilities that extend beyond national borders, as well as to those in what Charusheela has called the diaspora at home. The emphasis is on an ongoing dialogue, or conversation, between those of different races, cultures and religions to arrive at an ever-deepening level of tolerance born of mutual understanding and respect. As sociologist Ulrich Beck argues, "Cosmopolitanism, then, absolutely does not mean uniformity or homogenization. Individuals, groups, communities, political organizations, cultures, and civilizations wish to and should remain diverse, perhaps even unique. But to put it metaphorically: Behind cosmopolitanism is the conviction that there are certain values - democracy, respect for human rights, freedom of the press, freedom of speech and so forth - that are the common inheritance of humankind and are worthy of preservation. These values are not "Western" or "Eastern," but universal: What cosmopolitanism does not permit, however, is a kind of flaccid relativism; it insists that there are some universals-basic human rights, for instance-which are non-negotiable. Otherwise, it says, difference and disagreement are so much grist for mutually enriching dialogue Brookes, , Introduction. As these values spread around the globe, a truly transcultural, cosmopolitan human society will become a reality, and that society will be far more peaceful than one ravaged by religious wars, ethnic hatreds and nationalist fervor. Cosmopolitanism in the Real World How does cosmopolitanism work in practice? Pogge makes an important distinction between weak and strong cosmopolitanism. Weak cosmopolitanism, which is predominately passive, considers all humans as having equal worth. Strong cosmopolitanism, which is more active, treats all human beings as equally worthy. Pogge considers weak cosmopolitanism to be a truism, while he believes strong cosmopolitanism to be self-evidently false. Seeking to steer a path between the two extremes, Pogge suggests an "intermediate cosmopolitanism" wherein "all persons have a negative duty of very high stringency toward every human being not to collaborate in imposing an unjust institutional order upon him or her" Pogge, , p. That is, human beings must not be active participants in building, supporting or imposing institutions of oppression upon their fellows. Despite these clarifications, the meaning of cosmopolitanism remains somewhat nebulous. For some scholars, cosmopolitanism must be

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

contrasted with multiculturalism, while in the context of education the two terms are sometimes used almost interchangeably cf. In a recent interview, Kwame Anthony Appiah cited in Brookes, noted that the term still carries considerable negative baggage for some: From the right it was used as a term of anti-Semitic abuse, and their point was that people who had a sense of responsibility to the human community as a whole were going to be bad nationalists, bad patriots. The other direction of attack, from the left, was that cosmopolitanism was something very elitist. It came to mean a kind of free-floating attitude of the rich person who can afford to travel all over the world tasting a little bit of this culture and that one and not being very responsible about any of it Appiah, cited in Brookes, The idea of cosmopolitanism was in the air in ancient Athens, the most liberal city-state in ancient Greece, where Socrates and his student Plato spoke of universal truths applicable to all humanity. The idea of a common humanity was further popularized by the philosophical school known as Stoicism in the 3rd century B. Political events also conspired to foster the cosmopolitan idea: Stoic cosmopolitanism in its various guises was enormously persuasive throughout the Greco-Roman world. In part, this success can be explained by noting how cosmopolitan the world at that time was. Still, the cosmopolitan idea in the Greco-Roman world was most often advocated by those who were not the power brokers in society, but the outcasts and those of the lower classes, which helps to explain why cosmopolitanism has had, to say the least, a spotty record of progress. Today there continues to be general agreement in the West, though perhaps not based any longer on religious presuppositions, that some form of cosmopolitanism, whether interpreted radically or not, is correct. Indeed, cosmopolitanism in our time has been buttressed most notably by all of the scientific breakthroughs in the 20th and 21st centuries. For example, evolutionary biology, as documented in the results of the Human Genome Project, has shown that all human beings homo sapiens sapiens share a common ancestor who lived in Africa in the remote past, between , and , years ago cf. Oppenheimer, ; Mellars, , p. As evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins puts it, "All your ancestors are mine, whoever you are, and all mine are yours. Not just approximately, but literally" Dawkins, , p. We are one genetically, if not metaphysically. Intellectual assent to our common humanity is not the same as cosmopolitanism, of course. While many throughout the centuries have paid lip service to the idea that what united human beings as a species is far more profound than the superficial differences in skin color, language or religion that divide us, the bloody history of humanity shows that peaceful coexistence through mutual understanding has been more the ideal than the reality. The entire section is 4, words. Unlock This Study Guide Now Start your hour free trial to unlock this page Cosmopolitanism study guide and get instant access to the following:

# COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

## 2: Cosmopolitanism Research Paper Starter - [www.enganchecubano.com](http://www.enganchecubano.com)

*The word 'cosmopolitan', which derives from the Greek word kosmopolitēs ('citizen of the world'), has been used to describe a wide variety of important views in moral and socio-political philosophy.*

History of Cosmopolitanisms 1. In this culture, a man identifies himself first and foremost as a citizen of a particular polis or city, and in doing so, he signals which institutions and which body of people hold his allegiance. He would then be counted on for help in defending the city from attacks, sustaining its institutions of justice, and contributing to its common good. In this way, his own pursuit of a good life is inextricably bound to the fate of the city and to the similar pursuit carried out by other inhabitants of the city. By contrast, the good person would not be expected to share with or serve any foreigners who live outside the city. Any cosmopolitan expectations on a good Athenian extended only to concern for those foreigners who happen to reside in Athens. It would, however, be wrong to assume that Classical Greek thought was uniformly anti-cosmopolitan. It would be more accurate to call the Classical emphasis on the polis unc cosmopolitan. Yet even as Plato and Aristotle were writing, other Greeks were issuing cosmopolitan challenges. Perhaps the most obvious challenges came from the traveling intellectuals who insisted on the contrast between the conventional ties of politics and the natural ties of humanity. Gentlemen present "I regard you all as kinsmen, familiars, and fellow-citizens" by nature and not by convention; for like is by nature akin to like, while convention, which is a tyrant over human beings, forces many things contrary to nature. Socrates, too, it can be argued, was sensitive to this more cosmopolitan identification with human beings as such. At least as Plato characterizes him, Socrates avoids traditional political engagement as much as he can, in favor of an extraordinary career of examining himself and others, and he insists that these examinations are both genuinely political Gorg 66"8 and extended to all, Athenians and foreigners alike Apol 23b4"6. Apol 37c5"e2 and Meno 80b4"7. Whether Socrates was self-consciously cosmopolitan in this way or not, there is no doubt that his ideas accelerated the development of cosmopolitanism and that he was in later antiquity embraced as a citizen of the world. In fact, the first philosopher in the West to give perfectly explicit expression to cosmopolitanism was the Socratically inspired Cynic Diogenes in the fourth century BCE. By identifying himself not as a citizen of Sinope but as a citizen of the world, Diogenes apparently refused to agree that he owed special service to Sinope and the Sinopeans. The most natural suggestion would be that a world citizen should serve the world-state, helping to bring it about in order to enable the later work of sustaining its institutions and contributing to its common good. But the historical record does not suggest that Diogenes the Cynic favored the introduction of a world-state. In fact, the historical record does not unambiguously provide Diogenes any positive commitments that we can readily understand as cosmopolitan. The best we can do to find positive cosmopolitanism in Diogenes is to insist that the whole Cynic way of life is supposed to be cosmopolitan: A fuller exploration of positively committed philosophical cosmopolitanism arrives only with the Socratizing and Cynic-influenced Stoics of the third century CE. These Stoics are fond of saying that the cosmos is, as it were, a polis, because the cosmos is put in perfect order by law, which is right reason. They also embrace the negative implication of their high standards: But the Stoics do not believe that living in agreement with the cosmos "as a citizen of the cosmos" requires maintaining critical distance from conventional poleis. Of course, the Stoics recognize that political engagement will not be possible for everyone, and that some people will best be able to help other human beings as private teachers of virtue rather than as politicians. The motivating idea is, after all, to help human beings as such, and sometimes the best way to do that is to serve as a teacher or as a political advisor in some foreign place. In this fashion, the Stoics introduce clear, practical content to their metaphor of the cosmopolis: This content admits of a strict and a more moderate interpretation. On the strict view, when one considers whether to emigrate, one recognizes prima facie no special or stronger reason to serve compatriots than to serve a set of human beings abroad. The evidence does not permit a decisive attribution of one or the other of these interpretations to any

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

of the earliest Stoics. Things are a bit different for at least some of the Stoics at Rome. On the one hand, the cosmopolis becomes less demanding. Whereas Chrysippus limits citizenship in the cosmos to those who in fact live in agreement with the cosmos and its law, Roman Stoics extend citizenship to all human beings by virtue of their rationality. On the other hand, local citizenship becomes more demanding. This is a moderate Stoic cosmopolitanism, and empire made the doctrine very easy for many Romans by identifying the Roman patria with the cosmopolis itself. But neither imperialism nor a literal interpretation of world citizenship is required for the philosophical point. The maximally committed cosmopolitan looks around to determine whom he can best help and how, knowing full well that he cannot help all people in just the same way, and his decision to help some people far more than others is justified by cosmopolitan lights if it is the best he can do to help human beings as such. Stoic cosmopolitanism in its various guises was enormously persuasive throughout the Greco-Roman world. In part, this success can be explained by noting how cosmopolitan the world at that time was. But it is wrong to say what has frequently been said, that cosmopolitanism arose as a response to the fall of the polis or to the rise of the Roman empire. Under the successor kingdoms and even " though to a lesser degree " under Rome, there remained substantial room for important political engagement locally. Still, there is no doubting that the empires under which Stoicism developed and flourished made many people more receptive to the cosmopolitan ideal and thus contributed greatly to the widespread influence of Stoic cosmopolitanism. Nowhere was Stoic cosmopolitanism itself more influential than in early Christianity. Early Christians took the later Stoic recognition of two cities as independent sources of obligation and added a twist. For the Stoics, the citizens of the polis and the citizens of the cosmopolis do the same work: The Christians respond to a different call: On this view, the local city may have divine authority John This development has two important and long-lasting consequences, which are canonized by Augustine. First, the cosmopolis again becomes a community for certain people only. Augustine makes this point most explicitly by limiting the citizenship in the city of God to those who love God. All others are relegated to the inferior " though still universal " earthly city by their love of self. Second, the work of politics is severed from the task of building good human lives, lives of righteousness and justice. In a nutshell, the debate now opposed the secular and the religious, and not the local and the cosmopolitan. But his case draws from Aristotle and Roman history, not explicitly from the ideal of a cosmopolis or of world citizenship, and he remains deeply concerned to adjudicate between the pope and the Holy Roman Emperor. Despite the fact that ancient cosmopolitan sources were well-known and that many humanists emphasized the essential unity of all religions, they did not develop this idea in cosmopolitan terms. A few authors, however, most notably Erasmus of Rotterdam, explicitly drew on ancient cosmopolitanism to advocate the ideal of a world-wide peace. Emphasizing the unity of humankind over its division into different states and peoples, by arguing that humans are destined by Nature to be sociable and live in harmony, Erasmus pleaded for national and religious tolerance and regarded like-minded people as his compatriots *Querela Pacis*. Early modern natural law theory might seem a likely candidate for spawning philosophical cosmopolitanism. Its secularizing tendencies and the widespread individualist view among its defenders that all humans share certain fundamental characteristics would seem to suggest a point of unification for humankind as a whole. However, according to many early modern theorists, what all individuals share is a fundamental striving for self-preservation, and the universality of this striving does not amount to a fundamental bond that unites or should unite all humans in a universal community. Still, there are two factors that do sometimes push modern natural law theory in a cosmopolitan direction. First, some natural law theorists assume that nature implanted in humans, in addition to the tendency to self-preservation, also a fellow-feeling, a form of sociability that unites all humans at a fundamental level into a kind of world community. The appeal to such a shared human bond was very thin, however, and by no means does it necessarily lead to cosmopolitanism. Second, early modern natural law theory was often connected with social contract theory, and although most social contract theorists worked out their views mostly, if not solely, for the level of the state and not for that of international relations, the very idea behind social contract theory lends itself for application to this second level. Grotius,

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

Pufendorf, and others did draw out these implications and thereby laid the foundation for international law. The historical context of the philosophical resurgence of cosmopolitanism during the Enlightenment is made up of many factors: This prepared them to think in terms other than those of states and peoples and adopt a cosmopolitan perspective. Under the influence of the American Revolution, and especially during the first years of the French Revolution, cosmopolitanism received its strongest impulse. A cosmopolitan was someone who was not subservient to a particular religious or political authority, someone who was not biased by particular loyalties or cultural prejudice. Furthermore, the term was sometimes used to indicate a person who led an urbane life-style, or who was fond of traveling, cherished a network of international contacts, or felt at home everywhere. Especially in the second half of the century, however, the term was increasingly also used to indicate particular philosophical convictions. Some authors revived the Cynic tradition. Despite the fact that only a few authors committed themselves to this kind of cosmopolitanism, this was the version that critics of cosmopolitanism took as their target. Yet most eighteenth-century defenders of cosmopolitanism did not recognize their own view in these critical descriptions. They understood cosmopolitanism not as a form of ultra-individualism, but rather, drawing on the Stoic tradition, as implying the positive moral ideal of a universal human community, and they did not regard this ideal as inimical to more particular attachments such as patriotism. Others developed a cosmopolitan moral theory that was distinctively new. According to Kant, all rational beings are members in a single moral community. They are analogous to citizens in the political republican sense in that they share the characteristics of freedom, equality, and independence, and that they give themselves the law. Their common laws, however, are the laws of morality, grounded in reason. Some cosmopolitans developed their view into a political theory about international relations. The most radical of eighteenth-century political cosmopolitans was no doubt Anacharsis Cloots Jean-Baptiste du Val-de-Grace, baron de Cloots, Cloots advocated the abolition of all existing states and the establishment of a single world state under which all human individuals would be directly subsumed. His arguments drew first of all on the general structure of social contract theory. Most other political cosmopolitans did not go as far as Cloots. He argues that the league of states should not have coercive military powers because that would violate the internal sovereignty of states. The early Fichte transformed the concept of sovereignty in the process, by conceiving it as layered, and this enabled them to argue that states ought to transfer part of their sovereignty to the federal level, but only that part that concerns their external relations to other states, while retaining the sovereignty of the states concerning their internal affairs. Especially the first objection has been repeated ever since, but more recent interpretations have questioned its legitimacy Kleingeld , , arguing that Kant can also be read as advocating the loose league as a first step on the road toward a federation with coercive powers. Because joining this stronger form of federation should be a voluntary decision on the part of the peoples involved, to honor their political autonomy, the strong federation is not a matter of coercive international right. In addition to moral and political forms of cosmopolitanism, there emerged an economic form of cosmopolitan theory. The freer trade advocated by eighteenth-century anti-mercantilists, especially Adam Smith, was developed further into the ideal of a global free market by Dietrich Hermann Hegewisch Kleingeld His ideal was a world in which tariffs and other restrictions on foreign trade are abolished, a world in which the market, not the government, takes care of the needs of the people. Against mercantilism, he argued that it is more advantageous for everyone involved if a nation imports those goods which are more expensive to produce domestically, and that the abolition of protectionism would benefit everyone. If other states were to gain from their exports, they would reach a higher standard of living and become even better trading partners, because they could then import more, too. As national governments are mostly focused on the national economy and defense, he argued, their future role will be at most auxiliary. The freer the global market becomes, the more the role of the states will become negligible. First, in the nineteenth century, economic globalization provoked fierce reactions. Marx and Engels tag cosmopolitanism as an ideological reflection of capitalism. They regard market capitalism as inherently expansive, breaking the bounds of the nation-state system, as evidenced by the fact that production and consumption had become attuned to faraway lands.

# COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

## 3: Ulrich Beck's Cosmopolitanism | Micropaedia

*Cosmopolitanism is the ideology that all human ethnic groups belong to a single community based on a shared morality. A person who adheres to the idea of cosmopolitanism in any of its forms is called a cosmopolitan or cosmopolite.*

These four key pillars determine relations between nations, and form modern international society, and as such are the basis upon which the cosmopolitan international order stands. While the Security Council enforces the balance of power, and the implementation of international law in concert with the International Criminal Court ICC which upholds and prosecutes that law. Cosmopolitanism is often mistaken as little more than a framework for moral judgements rather than as a perspective political framework for world order. The ICC is probably the single best example of a cosmopolitan political structure as it has a global reach that rises above national sovereignty. It seeks to enforce international standards of behaviour in war, and bring the perpetrators of genocide and tyranny to justice. The International Order that cosmopolitans strive for is therefore simply defined as a secular network of global institutions that strive to establish norms of behaviour throughout the international system, based on western concepts of human rights, and representative governance. It aims to achieve this goal through a number of means the primary and most visible one being the globalisation of international trade. This has brought the world closer together and made nation states more dependent not only on their own economic and political stability but also on the political and economic stability of their major trading partners, and international financial markets. This growth in international trade and the emergence of an identifiable global economy has also led to the need for structural controls, and the creation of rules and obligations that apply to the whole of the international economy in order to ensure fair and free trade on a level playing field. Despite the fact that all three of these organisations are criticised by many cosmopolitan commentators as existing and operating in a moral vacuum the spread of their power and values has had a positive effect on the cosmopolitan agenda. All three organisations work transnationally and uphold western economic ideals, which promote certain types of government, property right and individualism. These developments are seen widely by many sociologists and historians as the keystones that led to European political enlightenment and eventual democratic reform. This therefore is what the international cosmopolitan order is, and the institutions mentioned above are the vehicles for its spread and its success. However, this bold idea held aloft by many western intellectuals, and implemented rather cynically by bureaucrats and politicians is not without challenge. The primary non-western ideology that gains the most media attention and creates the greatest debate is Islamic fundamentalism, and theocracy in general, but this is not the only non-cosmopolitan view of the world. The key principles of this movement can be summarised as a belief in the primacy of national sovereignty and consequently of non-intervention of foreign powers or international organisations in their internal affairs. This later point when taking into account the type of government prevalent within the members of this international grouping is problematic for moral cosmopolitanism. These governments can be generally defined as autocratic and repressive yet with diverse and rapidly growing capitalist economies. The remaining communist nations of China, Vietnam, North Korea and Cuba also have very different opinions on the nature of the world order they wish to see prevail. These powers are strongly opposed to international institutions that promote or aim to project what they see as uniquely western values. Believing that the ultimate vision for the international order is a cooperative and self-sufficient society established along socialist principles. Asian values in Malaysia and Singapore meant liberal legislation to control the aspirations and behaviour of youth. However many see this simply as a justification for tyranny and repression, that seeks to justify and give legitimacy to human rights violations within Asian states on the back of cultural preservation. This is the common position of many who argue against the adoption of international norms and values with regard to human rights and the ideal of representative government. They argue the imposition of western values on Asian or African societies is cultural imperialism, or Americanisation. There is however an important distinction to be made here as regards to the nature of these

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

non-cosmopolitan perspectives, with the Non-Aligned Movement and the Asian Values debate on one side and religious extremism on the other. While all three represent different non-cosmopolitan perspectives on the nature of international order, the latter two are conducted within the traditional structure of international relations and diplomacy. They do not actively seek to undermine and ultimately destroy the cosmopolitan agenda, but to maintain themselves as independent, existing outside the cosmopolitan agenda. Their policies seek to weaken the institutions created as part of the cosmopolitan international order so as to maintain opt-out clauses to meet their specific requirements. With all the Non Aligned Movement states recognising the legitimate authority of the United Nations, and using these institutions to promote their interests internationally. Religious extremism, with a particular emphasis on Islamic fundamentalism, does not operate on the bases of debate within international bodies such as the UN. The various strands of their argument do not recognise cosmopolitan institutions and more particularly the post war balance of power. Whereas the previous perspectives aim to persuade and argue using the structures of international society as aides, Islamic fundamentalists preach the destruction of these institutions with the publicised aim of undermining cosmopolitan societies and doing so through terrorism and the fear and distrust it spreads. It is a common mistake amongst the media and popular debate to portray the terrorist threat as not representing a genuine threat to the current international order. Furthermore, the individuals behind these terrorist groups are seen as largely simplistic in their approach and possessing no overall global strategic plan for confronting cosmopolitan society. Whereas it is true to say that the disparate bands of Islamic fundamentalism are not in intimate contact with one another through some James Bond style evil network, they are in common agreement as to their aims and methods. They are also equally not blind to the clear vulnerabilities of our open pluralistic societies, where freedoms of speech and movement are considered sacrosanct. Not only did it shake the confidence of the United States, but it also hit the confidence of all the Western Powers, and all those who believe in a cosmopolitan global order. The primary goal of terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda is to establish Taliban style governments across the Middle East, and eventually the rest of the Islamic world. The cause of Islamic extremists is one that is utterly opposed to that of cosmopolitans; the two agendas are bipolar opposites that can only clash, as has been argued by realist academics such as Samuel Huntington and Benjamin Barber. Osama Bin Laden was hailed as a hero from the West Bank to Jakarta by fundamentalist groups who stir up support amongst the young disaffected and oppressed populations of Islamic countries. Benjamin Barbers Jihad vs. Poor living conditions and few opportunities for improvement have created a young frustrated urban population. This lack of political and economic reform has led to a democratic deficit in the Arab world that drives these young populations into nationalism fundamentalism, and a hatred for the perceived evils of a corrupt international western regime that is weighted against them. The answer therefore to the question of whether non-western views undermine the building of a cosmopolitan international order is dependent on the nature of the non-western perspective in question. As I have previously argued the cultural protectionist arguments of the non-aligned movement and the religious fundamentalists is a smoke screen for unrestrained oppression and violence towards civilian populations. However in the case of the Non-Aligned Movement it does not threaten the construction of an international cosmopolitan order. On the contrary taking into account their economic integration with the rest of the international system in the long run it will strengthen calls for democratic and plural societies within these countries. However with regard to the Middle East and the Islamic world, the democratic deficit a term coined by a recent United Nations Report on the state of political institutions and representation in the Middle East conducted by Arab academics, is resulting in the spread of a misplaced doctrine of hate towards Western Society and cosmopolitanism. This must be confronted through the active promotion of political and economic reforms within these states, only then can a peaceful cosmopolitan international order be established. If anything can stop the development of a cosmopolitan international order it is in my opinion the uncontained spread of religious fundamentalism which is spreading instability and violence not only within the Middle East and the wider Muslim world but also within Muslim communities throughout the western world. American and European Muslim communities are

## **COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf**

having a wedge driven between themselves and the wider cosmopolitan societies they live in. This is creating a source of tension within previously tolerant societies. The recent brutal terrorist killing of Drummer Lee Rigby, a serving British soldier on the streets of his home town and the reactions of right wing political elements in the UK demonstrate this point vividly. Events such as this are aimed at causing a breakdown in tolerance and mutual respect between different communities within multi-cultural societies. They constitute a major threat to a way of life that we have come to consider civilised and in my opinion stand as the greatest force against the spread of cosmopolitan values in the world today.

# COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

## 4: Cosmopolitanism | Kwame Anthony Appiah

*Cosmopolitanism is the ideology that all human beings belong to a single community, based on a shared morality. A person who adheres to the idea of cosmopolitanism in any of its forms is called a cosmopolitan or cosmopolite.*

The relationships between cosmopolitanism and universalism are then best understood when the latter is seen as a key analytical presupposition rather than an externally imposed normative outcome of cosmopolitan approaches. This article is part of a wider research project into the relationship between social theory and natural law that is partly funded by the Chilean Council for Science and Technology Grant. Exciting, because it has been able, within a reasonably short period of time, to gather a great variety of scholarly and disciplinary traditions while making them think about the conceptual and normative challenges of our current global modernity. Welcome, because despite its excesses and shortcomings, it has decidedly contributed to the critique of different essentialist, chauvinist and indeed nationalistic ways of thinking that have present throughout the history of the social sciences. Cosmopolitanism is now a common term within a number of different scholarly communities and intellectual traditions – look no further than this very compendium for a concrete expression of this trend. To this positive scenario, however, at least one note of caution may need to be added. Whether we understand cosmopolitan developments as constitutive elements of our contemporary sociohistorical or institutional landscape, or we see them more as regulative ideas that are needed to defend certain principles that by definition will never be fully actualised, it is my contention that thinking in cosmopolitan terms compels us to favour a universalistic orientation. In so doing, we will surely have to criticise the ways in which previous universalistic arguments and presuppositions have been deployed and defended. But these shall ultimately turn into forms of self-criticism as the core of cosmopolitanism as an intellectual project lies in the redefinition and refinement, rather than the abandonment, of its universalistic orientation. The relationships between cosmopolitanism and universalism are best understood when the latter is seen as a key analytical presupposition rather than an externally imposed normative outcome of cosmopolitan approaches. An important consequence of this is that a cosmopolitan project may not necessarily be best served by those who speak explicitly in favour of them but by those who are actually committed to a universalistic conception of humanity. Section II deals with the first two of these charges by reconsidering the problem of universalism in early cosmopolitan thinking. The argument I offer there is that, right from their inception, universalistic arguments were already having to engage with questions their ability to explicate sociohistorical variation and normative disagreement. The problematic centrality of universalism in cosmopolitan thinking. While the claim that universalism is a central tenet of contemporary social science may not be too contentious, it would be most commonly used as an indictment on its current shortcomings and unlearned lessons. Or more closely related to the specific concerns of this article, Raewyn Connell has identified universalism as one of the major shortcomings of grand social theory which have led to an absolute neglect of colonialism in mainstream sociology. Universalism is seen here as wholly problematic it is a contradiction in terms that can never be adequately justified, mistaken it is to be rejected everywhere and in any shape or form, and pernicious it is a wolf dressed up as a sheep from which nothing good can come out. A fierce critic of the development of American social science during the twentieth century, philosopher Leo Strauss, offers what I think is a more insightful comment on how the question of universalism has come to impinge on our disciplines. His argument is that a fundamental tension indeed, an *aporia* inheres in the social sciences because, whereas on the one hand they are bound to engage with the problem of universalism, on the other hand they are intrinsically unable to handle adequately the challenges that this universalistic orientation brings with it. However much the science of all cultures may protest its innocence of all preferences or evaluations, it fosters a specific moral posture. Since it requires openness to all cultures, it fosters universal tolerance and the exhilaration deriving from the beholding of diversity; it necessarily affects all cultures that it can still affect by contributing to their transformation in one and the same direction; it willy-nilly brings about a shift of

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

emphasis from the particular to the universal: For him, it constitutes a definitive demonstration of the futility of the modern efforts devoted to the empirical study of sociopolitical life because they have conceded too much ground to positivism and its restrictive view of the normative. Strauss' Cosmopolitan approaches require a strongly universalistic conception of humanity that cannot be justified in terms that are acceptable for conventional scientific claims. Chernilo b, a. In fact, we can formalise the main arguments that are usually raised against universalism as viable intellectual orientation as follows: The question of its original locale. The question of stability. Universalism emphasises unity, homogeneity and necessity over difference, heterogeneity and contingency. Therefore, universalistic propositions are fundamentally unable to account for historical change and sociocultural variation. The question of reification. As a generalisation of a certain Western particular, universalism is bound to pre-decide in favour of, and therefore reify, values, institutional arrangements or forms of life that are closer to its original substantive experiences. The question of idealism. Universalism is nowhere to be found in empirical reality. I do not think these four arguments adequately capture what universalism is, and the role it plays in current understandings of cosmopolitanism, but they are surely worth revisiting. In what follows, I should try to address, and refute them, by sketching a trajectory of universalism in cosmopolitan thinking. The problems of particular origins and stability. The standard narrative has it that cosmopolitanism is a long-standing intellectual tradition that, from the time of Stoic philosophy, has defended ideas of universal belonging. But we seem to be imposing retrospectively a sense of cultural mission that the texts themselves did not have. Not only the underlying logic but also the actual implications of this standard picture can be questioned, however. Historian of political ideas Eric Voegelin has argued that a strong universalistic orientation is in fact central to all known world religions. He argues that universalistic claims were already being imported from non-Western contexts even before that: And quite crucially, as this is something that will reappear below, he suggests that a universalistic orientation has always been difficult to separate from imperial aspirations: Universalism does require ideas of unity and homogeneity and they raise legitimate doubts over its potential for current social scientific purposes. Unpacking argument 2 requires us to interrogate whether, and how, is this universalistic orientation able to handle such issues as historical change, sociocultural variation and normative disagreement. The argument I should like to make in that context is that however dogmatic an early universalistic orientation actually was, it was decidedly based on the empirical recognition that human life is only lived through its multiple variations and particularities. Ernst Troeltsch seems to have had precisely this in mind when he chose the question of different natural-law doctrines as the topic for his address to the First German Congress of Sociology in 1906. The Stoic legal and social philosophy is, like the entire Stoic ethic, a product of the disintegration of the ancient polis and the world-kingdom of a created cosmopolitan horizon. In place of positive law and morality emerges the ethic derived from a universal, law-abiding reason. From this human ideal comes a fully free *Gemeinschaft* or community. Troeltsch. On the other side, it equally asserts that this new way of looking at human affairs has a certain self-propelling capacity: But rather than simply arguing that we acknowledge the interrelationships<sup>7</sup> between universalism and particularism, Troeltsch points out that there is a real gap between the actual historical conditions of crisis that made the appearance of universalism possible and the explicit admission that a universalistic resolution will work only at the level of ideal projections. In terms of argument 2, then, it is my contention that rather than stability, universalistic ideas emerge out an acute awareness of diversity and conflict. Reinhart Koselleck has also reflected on the problems raised by argument 2; the gap between newly born universalistic ideals and the clear consciousness that these ideals will be impossible to realise as all-encompassing principles for the organisation of actual sociopolitical life. Koselleck argues that the central innovation of Stoic philosophy was that of universalism taking a sharper conceptual rather than political character. Central to this early cosmopolitan programme was not the idea of a world state or of a single political community; rather, at stake was a philosophical principle that sought to rearrange theoretically our understanding of who we are as human beings – the idea of a singular species that is constituted through its full diversity. Such a rearrangement, moreover, is still wholly embedded in a strict separation between ambits

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

of human action that were susceptible of human intervention and design not least among them political life itself and those that are organised on transcendental or natural conditions: The Stoics considered the cosmos, governed by logos, as their home in which all humankind – freeman and slave, Hellene and Oriental, just as much as the gods and the stars – had a part. Political agencies were built into the cosmopolis, although the Stoics could never have identified the supervening with the empirical order. We do not have here mutually exclusive concepts but rather supplementary concepts of varying magnitude, which are intended to mediate between the political tasks of the day and the general philosophical apprehension of the world Koselleck. As particularities were up to that point being conceived of as naturally or divinely construed, the early connections between universalism and particularism remained unmediated: First, because the particular belonged in actual socio-political life while the universal only inhabited in the realm of ideals; second, because proposals for making particularities compatible with a sense of universal human belonging could only be justified in hierarchical i. These linkages are of course central to postcolonial criticisms of universalism and cosmopolitanism and have remained a recurring problem, but they need not be seen as their necessary condition. In order to turn universalistic arguments against justifications of empire, however, we still need two steps. Particular forms of life and identities, indeed all kinds of differences, need now to be seen as the result of human action and human action alone – thence universalism starts to be seen as a fully immanent frame of reference. It becomes a social fact rather than, as before, the result of natural or divine differences. The question now is whether, and how, can universalistic ideas be ascertained only through human-made justifications. But things are not so simple and within this new unity, he argues, the older dualism was nonetheless preserved; it was simply recast, without relinquishing the continued division of all humanity into Hellenes and Barbarians. The distinction that had formerly been made spatially come to be deployed horizontally as a universal criterion of differentiation: Thus, this new antithesis, which was organized around education, no longer derived from natural qualities: The critical threshold that has been overcome, and the key thesis to reject argument 2, is that while particularities remain central to universalistic arguments there is now a clearer awareness that they are actually grounded on social relations themselves. Even more crucially in my view, it becomes potentially open to all because it is a matter of human beings adopting a particular education, values and institutions that are themselves made by human beings. Argument 3 on reification remains why does it have to be Greek education and language? Let me try to recapitulate my argument so far. Against argument 1, I questioned that Greek classical philosophy be regarded as unproblematically Western and also that the rise of universalism be explicated as an endogenous Western development. Against argument 2, then, I tried to show that early concerns with universalism were not dismissive or antithetical to sociohistorical transformations, but actually emerged from the recognition of, and the attempt to find a solution to, periods of social crises. This early connection between universalism and cosmopolitanism accepted that conflict and disagreement were ubiquitous in actual political life and did so by restricting universalism to the realm of ideals, on the one hand, and by placing resorting to notions of natural or hierarchical differences, on the other. That is, this early universalism was built upon a strong hierarchical principle that could offer an orientation to actual conflicts only because its own justifications were fundamentally transcendental. Eventually, however, universalism becomes more and more immanent as it begins to explicate and accommodate the particularities of human beings as all being human-made. Early universalistic ideas are best seen as attempts to think about solutions to these crises by redefining the terms within which we think about ourselves and seeking to imagine a wider, potentially universal, sense of belonging. They do not assert definitive blows to cosmopolitanism as a meaningful intellectual orientation. A fundamental tension is set thus: The rise of modern cosmopolitanism: Kant and the problems of reification and idealism Kant is a somewhat obvious choice for the continuation of this exploration. Not only is he a key transitional figure in the formation of the modern social sciences but his work is explicitly concerned with the interconnections between universalism and cosmopolitanism. Indeed, his formulation was also a way of making individuals the fundamental bearer of rights irrespective of their nationality within as much as beyond Europe. To these, Kant adds three definitive articles that closely define

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

and interrelate the domestic, the international and the cosmopolitan levels. But the idea of universal justice finds another expression in Kant, and this refers to his attempt at the radical reformulation of philosophy as being based exclusively on immanent grounds. Universal justice has now to do with the procedures through which we decide about moral maxims and actions, so that they be based on purely rational grounds. No doubt, Kant was aware that this kind of self-sufficient knowledge posed a very difficult challenge indeed: Here, then, we see philosophy put in fact in a precarious position, which is to be firm even though there is nothing in heaven or on earth from which it depends or on which it is based. Here philosophy is to manifest its purity as sustainer of its own laws, not as herald of laws that an implanted sense of who knows what tutelary nature whispers to it, all of which "though it may always be better than nothing at all" can still never yield basic principles that reason dictates and that must have their source entirely and completely a priori Kant Here, then, I will concentrate on how this universalistic orientation reinforces a fully immanent account of human knowledge and morality. The reasons behind this lack of sympathy towards universalism have less to do with its non-religious connotations and more with arguments 3 and 4. And we need to address them directly now. Being formulated at the dawn of modernity, it already reflects an enhanced global sense sociocultural diversity. There is little doubt that Kant was already aware that attempts to determine positively the definitive or substantive contents of the good life were hugely problematic "if not outright impossible. As a general procedure that allows us to reflect on how we can arrive at moral justifications, the categorical imperative replaces substantive concerns with the reasons and rules that allow us to arrive at particular moral decisions. In its classical formulation, then, the categorical imperative states: As he expands on it, Kant adds two further dimensions: The charge of formalism is possibly the most notable one as it concentrates on the fact that its a-priori foundation and somewhat solipsistic formulation obtain in a restrictive view of what constitutes adequate moral reasons. But its long-lasting contribution lies in that its procedural dimension allows for its dialogic underpinnings to be unpacked from within, as it were Habermas Furthermore, the categorical imperative offers a way of thinking about moral issues that accepts the universalistic potential of particular cultural contents always provisionally, that is, until its open-ended nature as a procedure requires us to revise the actual grounds on which we justify those cultural contents as potentially valid for humanity as a whole. Criticisms of general principles or specific institutional contexts do not have to be raised on behalf of abstract principles; much more often, they emerge from very concrete concerns:

# COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

## 5: Forms of Cosmopolitanism - Los Angeles Review of Books

*Viewed as a question of identity and identity formation, a cosmopolitanism concerns self-definition in relation to and in relationship with the world beyond one's immediate local conditions.*

It is an "international cosmopolitan" audience, "likely to be struck by the unexpected contrast between the archetypal literary site and reminders of the unmarked scene identified with Peru" This structure is largely comprised of two sections: Culler, however, dismisses the section that "present[s] the lore of the Maehiguengas," because "[t]he novel presents no warrant for these chapters" This exclusiveness applies not only to the audience, but also to the narrators and the other characters of the novel. Culler does not apply the cosmopolitan condition to this character, which may be due to the fact that, in his interpretation, "readers eventually come to take" the tribal storyteller "as Saul Zuratas himself" Culler In any case, both Anderson and Culler implicitly concur in denying the cosmopolitan condition to the Machiguenga narrator. This example shows the need to be cautious when approaching the concept of cosmopolitanism, which is commonly opposed - as both Anderson and Culler seem to advocate in their readings of *El hablador* - to the concept of nationalism. However, as Vinay Dharwadker reminds us, cosmopolitanism is a much older idea than the nation The way in which narrators, characters, readers, and readings have been grouped as either national or cosmopolitan may ultimately explain why both Anderson and Culler have missed a crucial issue: This is true nationally, largely due to how it handles the indigenist issue De Castro It is also true internationally, mainly because of what has been perceived- as its lower degree of technical complexity Rivas I do not intend to address this issue here. World literature in *El hablador* emerges with a reference to Dante which, argues Culler, "does not need explanation" for the "European reader" Nor is there any mention of the fact that Dante himself is a conspicuous example of an author who decides to abandon the "big world" Latin universalism in favor of a "local vernacularism. A reflection on the relation between cosmopolitanism and world literature unpredictably leads us to a discussion of institutional boundaries and disciplinary lacunae. In the last chapter of *The Literary in Theory*, symptomatically entitled "Comparative Literature, at Last," Culler argues that the reason people are drawn to comparative literature is not "world literature," but a "polyglot experience" or an "idea of cosmopolitanism" What I want to stress is how his argument on this disciplinary differentiability pinpoints the absence of cosmopolitanism in world literature studies. Let us take as a piece of evidence a ground-breaking book, *What is World Literature?* The absence of the cosmopolitan idea in world literature studies correlates with the scant attention to world literature in cosmopolitanism studies. Such a situation appears even more paradoxical when one notes that etymologically "cosmopolitan" means "citizen of the world. But what for Kant and, to a large extent, Goethe was a "normative horizon" Cheah It is the situation described by Marx in *The Communist Manifesto* that we experience as globalization today, or, to speak with Walter D. Mignolo, a "homogeneity of the planet from above" economically, politically, and culturally" Mignolo If cosmopolitanism and world literature are so closely related, to the point where one may wonder whether "cosmopolitan literature" is synonymous with "world literature" some arguments against such an identification will be discussed further on , a question that needs to be answered is why the concept of cosmopolitanism plays such a minor role in world literature discussions. It is my contention that one important reason for this lies in disciplinary boundaries, that is to say the boundaries between comparative literature and world literature. Much of the legitimacy of world literature in the US academe is rooted in its self-proclaimed paradigm shift in relation to comparative literature Thomsen And cosmopolitanism is a key concept in the genealogy of comparative literature. A completely different but not wholly unrelated issue is that of the epistemological legitimacy of the substitution of "universal literature" for "world literature. For Texte , an authority in European literary studies and the first to occupy a chair of comparative literature in France University of Lyon, , cosmopolitanism is equivalent to "exoticism" Texte Contrary to Goethe and Texte, however, who attributed the increasing worldliness of literature to a growth of communications,

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

exchanges, and translations, for these other scholars in an Arnoldian vein worldliness was but the result of the intrinsic humanism and universalism of European literature, whose expansion remained inexplicably unrelated to the colonial and imperial expansion of Europe. For a parallel mystification at the end of the twentieth century, see Grewal From the s to the s, this idea of European literature as "universal literature" was bitterly attacked by comparatists such as Rene Etiemble and Adrian Marino see Sayeh in this volume , and this opposition gathered considerable momentum at the ICLA Congress, when a whole section was devoted to "Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism in Literature. Their emphasis, however, was still on "literary universals. It is this association that led A. Owen Aldridge, as late as , to still advocate "universal literature" as either "any work which reflects attitudes, situations or experiences which are felt or understood by human beings in all cultures" or "any work which contains elements broad enough to appeal to the average person in any literary culture" Aldridge It is here that the substitution of "universal literature" for "world literature" provides epistemological soundness and has far-reaching ontological consequences. Any future assessment of the relationship between cosmopolitanism and world literature should contend with both the cosmopolitan tradition within comparative literature which I have just mentioned and the history of cosmopolitanism per se. As for this second issue, though it is obviously a rather restricted view, I will concentrate for the sake of my argument on the period and its aftermath for a comprehensive history of the concept of cosmopolitanism, see Delanty and Inglis Note, firstly, how Damrosch defines world literature as: My aim is to chart some points of intersection within what - drawing on Scott L. Neither the number of cosmopractices, nor their discussion here, is meant to be exhaustive. See also Lionnet in this volume. World-literature may represent a valuable tool to avoid ahistorical interpretations of world literature, including ahistorical interpretations of literary circulation. The six modes in which literatures and environments relate, according to Beecroft, are a significant contribution in this direction, which may be implemented from a cosmopolitan perspective. What Beecroft calls "panchoric literature" broadly corresponds to what Sheldon Pollock has termed "cosmopolitan literature. Both of them are modes of literary and intellectual and political communication. It is a "literary communication that travels far, indeed, without obstruction from any boundaries at all, and, more important, that thinks of itself as unbounded, unobstructed, unlocated" Pollock Cosmopolitan literatures are, therefore, world-literatures, but with an emphasis on the cultural process itself. Pollock has tested both cosmopolitanism and vernacularism beyond the "narrow European analytical and temporal frameworks" 18 via a comparison between Western European and South Asian literatures. This comparison highlights how similarities are equally as important as differences. Whereas Western European vernacularization "of necessity" was concomitant to the production of the nation-state, Southern Asian vernacularization "of accommodation" was concomitant to the production of the "vernacular polity" First, it shows in methodological terms that we still lack a macro-historical comparative perspective and a cosmopolitan vocabulary; the latter meaning that analyses of cosmopolitanism rarely survey how this idea is conceptualized in non-Western cultures. The same may be said of "world literature. This perspective throws new light on the process whereby, around the eleventh century, writers decided to "reshape the boundaries of their cultural universe by renouncing the larger world for the smaller place" This is a fruitful intersection for testing how cosmopolitanism may contribute to avoiding the danger of "insistent presentism" in world literature studies "that erases the past as a serious factor" Damrosch The closer one looks into the positions defended by the "pioneers in the field of cosmopolitan theory" Schoene Conversely, the closer one looks into the positions advocated by "critical" or "realistic cosmopolitans," the more difficult it seems to equate "cosmopolitan" with "world literature. As a globalized version of literature engaged Between aesthetics and ethics, a distinct group of cosmopolitan writing has been emerging during recent years. In , Brennan praised the "epical dimension" of cosmopolitan writing as summarized in eight features - from a dismissal of European confidence about its influence on Latin American and African works and hostility to the legacy of decolonization; to the extension of aesthetic criteria such as complexity, subtlety and irony Brennan ; These features show how the discussion was centered at that moment around the Jamesonian category of "Third World literature" and the power relations fostered by the

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

"literary semiperiphery. Walkowitz and Berthokl Schoene are the main proponents of a "cosmopolitan corpus. Sebald, and Kazuo Ishiguro employed the salient features of modernist narrative to promote a "critical cosmopolitanism," which means "think- ing beyond the nation but also comparing, distinguishing, and judging among differ- ent versions of transnational thought; testing moral and political norms, including die norms of critical thinking; and valuing informal as well as transient models of community" Walkowitz Adorno suspicion of instrumental action and responsible theory and Stuart Hall cultural politics rooted in differentiation and, on the other hand, a suspicion of "planetary humanism. Versus Benedict Anderson, Schoene thinks that the novel may adapt to a vaster space beyond the nation. It is this new location which gives the "cosmopolitan novel" its defining feature of representing a "worldwide human living and global community" His stress on a view from inside is best represented by the attempt to conceive of cosmopolitanism as a way of bridging "the rift between the world of globalised business Cosmopolitan reading of world literature as a practice of conviviality Starting from his definition of cosmopolitanism as "universalism plus difference," Kwame Anthony Appiah calls "cosmopolitan reading" the reading that rejoices at difference Appiah The importance of time may be traced back to T. By "deep time" Dimock understands a "set of longitudinal frames, at once projective and recessional, with input going both ways, and binding continents and millennia into many loops of relations, a densely interactive fabric" Dimock It is, instead, a dif- ferent setting, one wherein cosmopolitanism is understood as a "network of inter- connectedness and solidarity that could resonate across boundaries, reach across distances, and evade other cultural and economic obstacles" 5. In any case, what should not be overlooked is that neither mirrors nor windows grant access to the whole. What Scheffler seems to take as a sign of a theoretical shortcoming, I regard instead as a sign of several "discrepant cosmopolitanisms" Clifford The "cosmo-practices" around world literature that I have outlined here are three examples of such dis- crepant cosmopolitanisms. When cosmopolitanism is viewed as action rather than as a single declaration one is entitled to speak in a more fruitful and promising way of its banality. When applied to nationalism, "banal" names the "ideological habits which enable the established nations of the West to be reproduced" Billig When applied to cosmopolitanism, however, I contend that "banality" stresses the lack of a supporting international polity for its project on "planetary conviviality" Mignolo It is a process from below shaped by its longing for global responsibility and world citizenship, where "from below" should not be confused with a Utopian egalitarianism and prophecy. Correspondingly, banality refracts differently when applied to national literature and world literature. In contrast to national literatures, world literature "as in the case of cosmopolitanism - lacks a supporting international polity. This gives fresh evidence regarding a cosmopolitan approach to world literature as a "form of detached engagement with worlds beyond our own place and time" Damrosch Bibliography Aid ridge, A. Acta Comparationis Litterarum Univenarum, 10 1: Cosmopolitanism and the cultivation of detachment, Princeton, NJ: New locations in literature and culture, New York: Ethics in a world of strangers, London: Cosmopolitanism now, Cambridge, MA: The powers of mourning and violence, London: The cosmopolitan today," in Ph. Thinking and feeling beyond the nation, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. Cultural Studies, New York: Cosmopolitanism in its time and place," in V. American literature across deep time, Princeton, NJ: Melancholia or convivial culture? The Postcolonial and ihe Qlobal, Minneapolis: Cheah and B, Robbins eds. Duke University Press, pp. International canonization and transnational literatures, London: Seix Barral; The Storyteller, trans.

# COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

## 6: Cosmopolitanism and the Question of Universalism | Professor Daniel Chernilo - www.enganchecubano

*Cosmopolitanism is a western notion that epitomizes the need social agents have to conceive of a political and cultural entity, larger than their own homeland, that would encompass all human beings on a.*

Leave a comment The German sociologist, Ulrich Beck, has made key contributions to ideas of how to understand the global in recent times. His understanding of cosmopolitanism is rooted in how current academic discourse is concerned with theorising about the organisation and reconstruction of social and cultural life within a global framework. Cosmopolitanism [1] is thus a rethinking of how society, and, by extension, individuals are understood to enable an exploration of the effects these changes bring and to facilitate a well-informed and well-deliberated response. It is precisely these two claims of Beck that this essay seeks to address. Cosmopolitanism Defined Cosmopolitanism as a concept, however nebulous, has its origins with the ancient Greeks Stoics and with the Enlightenment Kant. The former is used to delineate a modernity based on territorial affiliations that has networks based on a nationalistic weltanschauung at its epicentre. This then gives rise to a number of unforeseen consequences that are all interlinked. The collective patterns of life, progress and controllability, full employment and exploitation of nature that were typical of this first modernity have now been undermined by five interlinked processes: The real theoretical and political challenge of the second modernity is the fact that society must respond to all these challenges simultaneously Beck These challenges that second modernity brings are characterized by their being unanticipated, global and come as a total surprise. Consequently, Beck sees the need for a paradigm shift that restructures the face of sociology so as to build a new frame of reference for changing social and political phenomena. The concept of imagining the Other and the difficulty therein has its genealogical roots in the philosophical writings of Bertrand Russell and the political works of John Rawls. It was Russell who suggested that in order to judge whether our sentiments are based on moral assessments or preconceived prejudiced notions, we should, when reading the newspaper each morning, substitute and alternate nouns. This is where there is too much of an emphasis on the elimination of a nation based weltanschauung and consequently overlooks power structures that underlie such phenomena. This, according to him, undermines the power of global cooperation and negotiating transnational agreements Beck Consequently, he calls for a paradigm shift within sociology that is more adequately applicable and appropriated to address global phenomena. He sees the need to move from a nation based outlook to a more Cosmopolitan one as paramount; not doing so, he believes, will result in perpetuation of nation based interests in the geo-political world resulting in the rise of hegemony and imperialism. This is a clear case of academic myopia; the urgency to prove Cosmopolitanism leads Beck to overlook and deny the underlying power structures. Martell states that this inconsistency can be seen: The existence of these counter arguments suggest that human rights arguments can be used to legitimise the pursuance of national aims, which can be imperialistic and hegemonic. Even with the supposed all-embracing Beckian Cosmopolitanism the trajectory has always been centred in the West *ibid*. Here there are two implications being made: Both these claims are contestable. These themes do no portray anything beyond policing cultural diversity. Conclusion In light of the considerations I have noted above, it does not show more than a European endeavour aimed at tolerating the peripheral Other. The very problem of Cosmopolitanism is, as noted by Pollock and others, is that its genealogy is traced through the Stoics and Kant and then projected on to the world; it is based on one culture and then disseminated outwards Pollock, Bhaba et al. Furthermore, in an attempt at realizing his Cosmopolitan ideal he does not taken into consideration the underlying structures of power, inequality and conflict. What remains thereafter is a mere wishful optimism of global humanism. Moreover, there are conspicuous contradictions in his thought with regards to the role of agency. Islam at the Crossroads. Power in the Global Age. Provincialised Cosmopolitanism and Connected Sociologies. Who Speaks for Indian Pasts? The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff. The Difficulty of Imagining Other Persons. The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence. New York, Continuum Publishing:

# COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

## 7: Works by Jason D. Hill - PhilPapers

*Definition of cosmopolitan (Entry 2 of 2) 1: having worldwide rather than limited or provincial scope or bearing his cosmopolitan benevolence, impartially extended to all races and to all creeds.*

World wars, human rights abuses, ethnic cleansing, and genocide characterized much of the twentieth century. There is no assurance that the twenty-first century will be better, but if moral improvement is to take place, the philosopher Kwame Anthony Appiah believes that a revival of an ancient ideal, cosmopolitanism, will be essential in that process. In space and time, people live closer than ever, but never have there been so many potentially hostile strangers. Amid these similarities and differences, while immense changes in the world have taken place and indeed partly because of them, a long-standing tradition has grown over the centuries: Cosmopolitanism is an idea with links to a variety of significant and long-standing ideals, including the view that all human beings are members of one family, the conviction that there are universal human rights and obligations, and the hope that there can be a cooperating league of nations that advances goals that are beneficial for humankind. On a personal level, cosmopolitanism embodies much needed virtues that include respect for people who are different from ourselves, resistance against discrimination and prejudice, and hospitality toward strangers. Appealing though these ideals may be, Appiah recognizes that the history of cosmopolitanism has its problems. How, for example, does this outlook fit with the fact that human life is always lived in specific times, places, and cultures, which require loyalties that are particular and local? The cosmopolitan person, it could be argued, will be rootless, which is scarcely a desirable way to live. Another problem is that cosmopolitanism may not be as universal as it sounds. Values, it seems, are relative to particular times and places. No individuals or groups, not even philosophers, have a privileged access to absolute and objective truth. In fact, cosmopolitanism may be cultural or national imperialism in disguise. Furthermore, the objections continue, cosmopolitanism is simply unrealistic because differences between human groups are too strong. In the twenty-first century a clash of civilizations, reflected especially in terrorism and a war against it, has eclipsed cosmopolitan dreams. To the contrary, his ethics in a world of strangers underscores that differences between people and particularities about them are crucial for meaningful lives. It follows that life cannot be lived well in conditions where differences and particularities are not respected. Cosmopolitanism affirms the importance of respect for differences and particularities. This respect, however, cannot be practiced by one person or group and ignored by others. The ethical logic of cosmopolitanism insists that the respect must be

The entire section is 1, words. Unlock This Study Guide Now Start your hour free trial to unlock this page Cosmopolitanism study guide and get instant access to the following:

# COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

## 8: Cosmopolitanism - Wikipedia

*Cosmopolitanism is the view that all human beings are world citizens (Greek, kosmopolitḗas) with responsibilities that extend beyond national borders. Given the diverse nature of the global.*

And then there are the historical poems. The repetition of dates and interlacing of historical figures throughout the Cavafy canon, much like rhyme and meter, reorganize our expectations and make possible implausible connections. Hi[m] â€ Alexandrian History, especially post-colonial history, is crucial to the alternative archive Hala Halim has created in her Alexandrian Cosmopolitanisms. She reads the famous Alexandrian triumvirate of Cavafy, E. Forster and Lawrence Durrell for the parts of their stories that owe more to Egypt than England. The fact is that in the English-speaking world we have been overly schooled in the British colonial reception that Halim is out to dislodge. Yet I also wonder if my lack of recognition has something to do with the broad-stroke approach entailed by such an ambitious rewriting. Though Halim tells us Cavafy is cosmopolitan, it is difficult to attend to the forms of this cosmopolitanism when the terms of her discussion emphasize ethnicity and cover such an expanse â€ individual chapters on Cavafy, Forster, and Durrell, as well as a final longer chapter on Zogheb. But surely the point Cavafy makes through his poems about being Greek in Egypt is that one must incorporate and thereby defend the mix and slippage of identity formally â€ in the look and sound of the poem, not simply as a political mandate. To be an Alexandrian is to be Greek, and Barbarian, and Philhellene, Hellenophone and Egyptian, but also the spaces and commas in between. My first question to the author addressed the aesthetic imagination of her archive. How do the poems make the mix and slippage happen? This is a more descriptive approach to Cavafy that many of his own poems â€ certainly the ones Halim uses to parse out ethnic tensions â€ can be read as resisting. In those that show Greeks with the other, oppositions are repeatedly transformed and dissolved. The poet Rafael is asked to pour his Egyptian feeling into a Greek epitaph for the dead poet Ammonis. He seeks to make a poem and to make love merge, creating a new kind of Alexandrian citizenship for what Keeley aptly called the sensual city: Into a foreign tongue our sadness and love pass. Spill your Egyptian feeling into a foreign tongue. Through punctuation, typography, homophonic rhymes, and different linguistic registers, the ancient binarism of Greek and Barbarian is replaced by an amalgam â€ Hellenistic, Byzantine, Ottoman, Phanariot, and most importantly, Alexandrian. To separate out ethnicities and pit East and West against each other ignores the poetics. If we follow the logic of the poem with its call and refrain through to its final synthesis in the last two lines, we can see how the geographical space of the poem acts out cosmopolitanism as a practice of living between languages and inhabiting the sounds of the other. The poem goes back and forth until we reach the final response with its surprising revelation that there are no barbarians, followed by a long dash and two final lines that merge question and answer and close the poem like a capstone with a question that is an answer: And some returned from the borders, and said that barbarians no longer exist. Those people were a kind of solution. The Barbarians Oi varvaroi , as we know, were the others, but, as we also know, they were called that because they spoke incomprehensibly var-var-var. To be a barbarian was not so terribly different from what an American means today when he or she says: Yet the point of how the poem unfolds is that the barbarians are only different if they are far away. The barbarians become anthropoi, people. The foreignness, their different habits, the incomprehensible var-var-var is no longer there. By bringing the foreign sound into the Greek language, they have become us. And if they are us, then they can no longer be a solution for our concept of ourselves as greater than or less than the other. Barbarity is always relative and under erasure when language is elastic and multilingual. Difference is overcome and accommodated on two sides of the same coin, in the liquid flow of translation, in the homophony of the border. It is, therefore, telling that Halim, who writes at length about the Greek-versus-Barbarian dichotomy, never gets around to discussing this poem. She refers to poems that support her argument about identity and excludes poems that have a less essentialist concept of the cosmopolitan. There is no doubt that the poems in the canon need the non-canonical poems for the kind of

## **COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf**

important cultural study Halim is doing, but they also talk back through their form. This is the part Halim leaves out. Surely the problem for Cavafy is that the poems, in order to be his poems and unlike his prose pieces, had to be able to endure the test of time and do the work that spoke to history. First Rae Dalven gave us a Modernist translation with its introduction by Auden and emphasis on voice, though still at times Victorian in its prudishness. Then Edmund Keeley and Phillip Sherrard brought us Cavafy as poet-historian with a conversational style and notes that made accessible to an American audience the complicated, ironic story of a Hellenic past. George Economou takes up the mantle of James Merrill who only translated a few poems but gave us our first sense of what a formally experimental Cavafy might look like. But again, as with her focus on the non-canonical at the expense of the canonical, she chose to use a translation that weighed the argument down on the side of paraphrase. This is true in her other chapters as well. But such issues repeatedly take the back seat to her concern with how ethnic groups are represented. On Durrell she concludes: Close reading is what you can do on a panel with a few faculty, like the evening we spent at NYU, or with 15 students over a semester, as in my Cavafy seminar at Columbia. This is where you can finally see what is hard to read in the eroded stone and therefore worth spending the unspectacular time it takes to sit and ponder:

# COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

## 9: Cosmopolitanism (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

*Pollock's definition of cosmopolitanism deserves special attention here. It is a "literary communication that travels far, indeed, without obstruction from any boundaries at all, and, more important, that thinks of itself as unbounded, unobstructed, unlocated" (Pollock 22).*

Philosophical roots[ edit ] Diogenes Cosmopolitanism can be traced back to Diogenes of Sinope c. Of Diogenes it is said: The task of world citizens becomes then to "draw the circles somehow towards the centre, making all human beings more like our fellow city dwellers, and so forth". For Levinas, the foundation of ethics consists in the obligation to respond to the Other. In *Being for the Other*, he writes that there is no "universal moral law," only the sense of responsibility goodness, mercy, charity that the Other, in a state of vulnerability, calls forth. Ethics, he claims, is hospitality. Pure, unconditional hospitality is a desire that underscores the conditional hospitality necessary in our relationships with others. Isolation is not a feasible alternative in the world, therefore, it is important to consider how best to approach these interactions, and to determine what is at stake for ourselves and the others: Further, both theories reveal the importance of considering how best to interact with the Other and others, and what is at stake. You also have St. Paul in the Christian tradition, also a certain call for a citizen of the world as, precisely, a brother. Paul says that we are all brothers, that is sons of God, so we are not foreigners, we belong to the world as citizens of the world; and it is this tradition that we could follow up until Kant for instance, in whose concept of cosmopolitanism we find the conditions for hospitality. But in the concept of the cosmopolitical in Kant there are a number of conditions: Derrida cited in Bennington *A Discussion with Jacques Derrida*. A further state of cosmopolitanism occurred after the Second World War. As a reaction to the Holocaust and the other massacres, the concept of crimes against humanity became a generally accepted category in international law. This clearly shows the appearance and acceptance of a notion of individual responsibility that is considered to exist toward all of humankind. The boundaries between nations, states, cultures or societies are therefore morally irrelevant. A widely cited example of a contemporary cosmopolitan is Kwame Anthony Appiah. Globalization, a more common term, typically refers more narrowly to the economic and trade relations and misses the broader cultural, social, political, environmental, demographic, values and knowledge transitions taking place. No cleanup reason has been specified. Please help improve this section if you can. February Learn how and when to remove this template message A number of contemporary theorists propose, directly and indirectly, various ways of becoming or being a cosmopolitan individual. Therefore, to be responsible is to recognize and understand suffering, which then leads to compassion. It is through this process that others can be recognized as people. Other theorists, philosophers, and activists contend that recognizing suffering is necessary to end violence. In *Scared Sacred*, Velcrow Ripper takes a journey to different sites of great suffering that ultimately leads him toward developing compassion. It is the deconstruction of these ideologies that can lead to the compassion and humanization of others. Thus individual responsibility is being aware of what Judith Butler calls the precariousness of life in self and other; being a cosmopolitan seems to be, above all, a social, ethical enterprise. Ethics in a World of Strangers, Kwame Anthony Appiah notices something important about how social ethics seem to operate: Whatever obligation one might have to another, especially a foreign other, that obligation does not supersede the obligations one has to those people most familiar to them. However, as Judith Butler questions, "at what cost do I establish the familiar as the criterion" for valuing others? For Gilroy, being cosmopolitan seems to involve both a social, ethical enterprise and a cultural enterprise. Both Hurndall and Corrie removed themselves geographically from their home cultures, presumably both physically and mentally estranging themselves from their own cultures and histories. Hurndall and Corrie were both killed in in separate incidents and their stories might serve as affirmations of familiarity, rather than models of estrangement. Some forms of cosmopolitanism also fail to address the potential for economic colonization by powerful countries over less powerful ones. Further, Mahmood

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

Mamdani in *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim* suggests that the imposition of Western cultural norms, democracy and Christianity to name only two, has historically resulted in nationalist violence; [18] however, Appiah has implied that democracy is a pre-requisite for cosmopolitan intervention in developing nations. Now, with the advance of globalization and the increased facility of travel and communication, some thinkers consider that the political system based on the nation-state has become obsolete and that it is time to design a better and more efficient alternative. Rejecting as muddled the metaphysical notion of free will, he focuses on political freedom, the absence of coercion or interference by others in personal decisions. Because of the tendencies to violence and aggression that lurk in human nature, some constraint on freedom is necessary for peaceful and fruitful social interaction, but the more freedom we enjoy, the better. From this point of view, the Internet provides a much more attractive model than the nation-state. Neither is there any just reason for restraining the free circulation of people, ideas, or goods. He proposes a world without sovereign nation-states, territorially organized in small autonomous but not-sovereign cantonal polities, complemented by strong world organizations. Criticizing the abstract nature of most versions of cosmopolitanism, Charles Blattberg has argued that any viable cosmopolitanism must be "rooted," by which he means based upon a "global patriotism. She uses Richard Rorty as a triangulation point in that he remains neutral about multiculturalism, but his philosophical analysis of truth and practice can be deployed to argue against Searle and in favor of Taylor. Thus, rather than finding solidarity through national culture, or a particular traditional religious doctrine, society would be unified by its adherence to political values, i. Nation-state theory sees power relations only among different state actors, and excludes a global economy, or subjugates it to the nation-state model. Cosmopolitanism sees global capital as a possible threat to the nation state and places it within a meta-power game in which global capital, states and civil society are its players. For Beck, imposing a single world order was considered hegemonic at best and ethnocentric at worst. Rather, political and sociological cosmopolitanism rests upon these fundamental foundations: For Levinas, the Other is given context in ethics and responsibility; we should think of the Other as anyone and everyone outside ourselves. According to Levinas, our initial interactions with the Other occur before we form a willâ€”the ability to make choices. The Other addresses us and we respond: After the formation of the will, we choose whether to identify with the addresses by others and, as a result, continue the process of forming identity. Even in situations where we engage in the most minimal interaction, we ascribe identities to others and simultaneously to ourselves. Our dependence on the Other for the continuous formation of language, culture, and identity means that we are responsible to others and that they are responsible to us. When we have gained the capacity for recognition, the imperative is to perform that recognition and thereby become ethically responsible to the Other in conscience. However, the theory deviates in recognising the differences between world cultures. Human dignity, however, is convoluted because it is necessary to first distinguish who has the right to be respected and second to consider what rights are protectable. Under cosmopolitanism, all humans have rights; however, history shows that recognition of these rights is not guaranteed. The Powers of Mourning and Violence. Thus, there is the idea that not all "human" lives will be supported in the same way, indeed, that some human lives are worth more protection than others. Others have extended this idea to examine how animals might be reconfigured as cosmopolitan, present the world-over with varying identities in different places. Thobani notes that it is through media representations that these ideas become naturalized. Individuals who embrace Western ideals are considered fully "human" and are more likely to be afforded dignity and protection than those who defend their non-Westernized cultural identities. States would also utilize the power of civil society actors such as Non-governmental organizations NGOs and consumers to strengthen their legitimacy and enlist the help of investors to pursue a cosmopolitan agenda. These scholars argue that a truly cosmopolitan identity of Global Citizen will take hold, diminishing the importance of national identities. The formation of a global citizens movement would lead to the establishment of democratic global institutions, creating the space for global political discourse and decisions, would in turn reinforce the notion of citizenship at a global level. Nested structures of governance balancing the principles of irreducibility i. It advocates some reforms in

## **COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf**

global governance to allow world citizens to take more directly a part into political life. A number of proposals have been made in order to make this possible. Cosmopolitan democracy, for example, suggests strengthening the United Nations and other international organizations by creating a World Parliamentary Assembly. Rootless cosmopolitan "Cosmopolitanism" became a rhetorical weapon used by nationalists against "alien" ideas that went counter to orthodoxy. European Jews were frequently accused of being "rootless cosmopolitans."

## COSMOPOLITANISM : A DEFINITION AND THE QUESTION OF TOLERANCE pdf

Action plan for anaphylaxis 33. Group 2 indian history material in telugu On heroes, hero-worship and the heroic in the history Bibliography of early modern algebra, 1500-1800 The valley of hunger Lukes way of looking On the edge of the volcano McGraw-Hills SAT II chemistry The home health industry : understanding the system Karen Vance They Ran For My Life Nature of business ethics Beavers (Animals Animals) Sherlock Holmes (Mystery Collection) Feasibility assessment, 75, 121, 135-136; Bulwers plays: being the complete dramatic works of Lord Lytton (Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer, bart. . 12. The Feminization of Global Scarcity and Violence Cold river bywilliam judson The shifting structure of private pensions Peter drucker management tasks responsibilities practices 1973 Never again anywhere Like Hot Knives to the Brain My Little Pony Friends Forever Book and Rubber Stamp Set (My Little Pony) Brides, Boots Booties (3 novels in 1) Honda civic 1996 service manual On faith, reason and responsibility Vw golf tdi owners manual Can we trust our researchers? The socio-legal perspective of child protection in Cameroon Team teaching in the elementary school Antenna theory balanis second edition Warlords III, reign of heroes Alternate Generals III (Alternate Generals) Sermons on the Christian year Masters, servants, and orders in Greek tragedy Little Phils cavalier destruction of lives and careers Calculus early transcendentals 6th edition solutions Christ Church, Montreal Through a time sieve Sing a song of sixpence Joy Hewitt Mann Family of Greek gods