

# The Idea of Cosmopolitanism from Its Origins to the 21st Century

*Anna Busetto*

A volume on the notion of citizenship cannot fail to address, even briefly, the “broader” and super-nationalistic typology of a topic as cosmopolitanism. This concept seems to be the most authentic exponent of our age of globalization, aimed at dissolving the boundaries that define nation-states. But the massive dissemination of the word has banalized its meaning to such an extent that the richness and complexity of the term in philosophical and political discourse for over two thousand years has faded at times.<sup>1</sup> In fact, the etymological and conceptual roots of cosmopolitanism in the Classical Greek and Hellenistic world—as well as through centuries of Western thought and civilization—are so deep that the term has become an excellent tool for connecting distant periods and mentalities, each of which has invested the concept with its own perceptual paradigms of “world citizenship.”

For this reason, retracing the history of the notion of “cosmopolitanism” through time may contribute to the current effort of Western culture to examine itself introspectively.<sup>2</sup> This is the spirit in which I offer the present contribution, which does not attempt to be a complete and exhaustive discussion of the topic, prohibited by reasons of space and unadvisable for reasons of intellectual honesty. Instead, I have chosen to present an overview of the history of the concept from its origins to the present. Insofar as the contemporary period is concerned, I shall limit myself to charting the myriad directions in which a commentary on the notion of cosmopolitanism quickly branches out.

I knowingly reject any attempt to draw definitive conclusions here: rather than present univocal answers and interpretive strategies, I prefer to suggest some points to consider for further reflection and research by revealing the underpinnings of new research. The inquisitive reader may pursue these avenues in more depth, using the rich bibliography that has appeared in the past

---

1 See Beck (2006) 40–44 (*How everyday life is becoming cosmopolitan: banal cosmopolitanism*).

2 I share Scuccimara’s ([2006] 7) position.

ten years which evinces the lively attention given to cosmopolitanism by the social sciences.<sup>3</sup>

The first clearly-stated reference in Western civilization to an idealized and borderless existence is found in a fragment of Democritus of Abdera: ἀνδρὶ σοφῶι πάντα γῆ βατή· ψυχῆς γὰρ ἀγαθῆς πατρις ὁ ξύμπας κόσμος<sup>4</sup> (fr. 247 D.-K.). Such a statement crystallizes an aspiration to transcend the traditional boundaries of state (and therefore of identity) imposed by the polis and affirms the early stage of an egalitarian conception of humankind based on principles of wisdom and goodness. These concepts are echoed in contemporaneous philosophical thought and literary production, testifying to the spread in 5th-century BC Greece of a shared desire for cultural, social, and political openness that coincides with an intellectual departure from the traditional order of the polis<sup>5</sup> and a new polemical redefinition of the concepts of “citizen” and “foreigner.”<sup>6</sup>

It is with Post-Socratic philosophy, however, that this perception is first expanded theoretically<sup>7</sup> and then condensed into the word κοσμοπολίτης coined by Diogenes of Sinope, the founder of Cynicism, who scandalized his contemporaries with his eccentric way of living and provocative attitudes (so much so that Plato described him as “a completely deranged Socrates”<sup>8</sup>). Diogenes Laertius narrates in his biography that when asked about his own origin, he appositely declared that he was a “citizen of the world.”<sup>9</sup> In this neologism (which must have already seemed quite subversive, given that the *polites* was by defini-

3 Among the most recent monographs on the subject, besides Scuccimarra (2006) and Beck (2006), also see Taraborrelli 2011 (hereafter referred to in the recent English edition: Taraborrelli [2015]); Rovisco—Nowicka (2011). With regard to ancient world, a quite accurate overview is offered by Richter (2011), while the miscellany edited by Lavan—Payne—Weisweiler (2016) focuses on the relationship between cosmopolitanism and imperial power in the Near East and Mediterranean. Also see the bibliography cited throughout this article.

4 “Every country on earth is the domain of the wise man, because the homeland of a good soul is the entire universe.” For a general discussion of Greek and Latin cosmopolitanism, see Konstan (2009).

5 Cf. for instance Anaxag. test. 1 D.-K. (= Diog. Laert. 2.7), Antiph. Soph. fr. 5 Gernet; Soph. *Tereus* fr. 591 Radt; Eur. *Alex.* fr. 61b Kannicht; even Socrates, according to Cic. *Tusc.* 5.108 considered himself *mundanus* (but on the critical fortune of this anecdote see Heater [1996], 6–7). On Greek “cosmopolitanism” before cynicism see Baldry (1965) 37–45; Lana (1973).

6 On the “Socratic paradox” of feeling like a stranger in one’s own country—a topic with a vast bibliography—Scuccimarra (2006) 31–37 and its appended bibliography.

7 Cf. for instance Aristotle’s “intercultural” speculation in Nussbaum (1997) 55–56.

8 Diog. Laert. 6.54 Σωκράτης μαινόμενος.

9 Diog. Laert. 6.63 ἐρωτηθεὶς πόθεν εἶη, “κοσμοπολίτης,” ἔφη.

tion a member of the polis), Diogenes both conflates his intention of denying his own exclusive membership in a restricted civic, political and geographic community—asserting that social ties and the bonds of citizenship were not conducive to subjective goodness—and connotes his own more universal aspirations and interests. Consequently, cynical cosmopolitanism should be understood as indifference and intolerance in relation to the traditional communitarian bonds represented by family, property, and citizenship: as an idealistic vision, it was “individualistic and dissociative, and did not look to the unity of mankind”.<sup>10</sup>

Thanks to Alexander the Great’s universal project that forever changed the Greek way of seeing the world, the notion of “citizen of the world” was also assimilated by Stoicism. However, this school “mitigated” the term and made it more compatible with civic life as a paradigm of one’s acceptance of every individual as a fellow citizen, by virtue of the communality of universal *Logos* based on a natural law.<sup>11</sup>

The concept was transferred from the Greek to the Roman world where Cicero was its first significant interpreter. In *De officiis*, he transforms the notion into a veritable code of ethics, classifying the typology of duties to others<sup>12</sup> and thereby transforming the historical sense of “universal brotherhood” from a moral to a legal obligation. Elsewhere, in the *Tusculanae disputationes*, Cicero proclaims that *patria est ubicumque est bene*,<sup>13</sup> in a re-working of the earlier Epicurean dictum that now becomes the banner cry of the socio-political “apology for socio-political de-racination.”<sup>14</sup>

The condition of the stateless person and the concept of “freedom in exile” became especially widespread during the dark days of political and moral crisis in the imperial age, taking the form of a proud refusal of servitude confined

10 Sinclair (1952) 251. On cosmopolitan cynicism, also see Moles (1996).

11 Cf. for example Chrys. fr. 336–337 (*SVF* 111), which illustrate a vision of cosmopolitanism based on the relationship between νόμος and φύσις.

12 In *off.* 1.20–21 Cicero distinguishes the duties of *iustitia*, grounded in a respect for all human beings and their possessions, from the duties of *beneficentia*, based on a commitment to the good of others. His discussion will particularly influence the discussion of “the just war” of 17th-c. natural law (especially for Hugo Grotius) and Immanuel Kant’s politico-legal and ethical cosmopolitanism: cf. Nussbaum (1997) 59, Taraborrelli (2015) XI–XII and (for a general discussion of the “cosmopolitanism” of the Latin philosophers Cicero and Seneca), Scuccimarra (2006) 60–80, and its ample bibliography. Seneca will also theorize a brand of “philanthropic universalism” that finds its fullest expression in *homo res sacra homini* (*epist.* 95.33; cf. also *ira* 2.31.7).

13 Cic. *Tusc.* 5.108.

14 This expression is a translation of the one which can be found in Scuccimarra (2006) 70.

to one's country. In *epist.* 28.4, Seneca declares that one ought to live with the following conviction: *non sum uni angulo natus, patria mea totus hic mundus est.*<sup>15</sup> Committed to following a path of spiritual perfection, the philosopher could find everywhere substance that could give meaning to his existence: *natura communis et propria virtus.*<sup>16</sup> Later, the Emperor Marcus Aurelius would confirm this thought in the famous maxim Πόλις και πατρις ὡς μὲν Ἀντωνίνῳ μοι ἢ Ῥώμῃ, ὡς δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ ὁ κόσμος.<sup>17</sup>

The Stoic ideal of *civitas universalis*, which will be politically embodied a few decades later in the *Constitutio Antoniniana* in 212,<sup>18</sup> is also echoed in Christian thought,<sup>19</sup> which assembles all men into one community by the possibility of receiving salvation through true faith and which preaches the extraneousness to the Christian of any terrestrial roots.<sup>20</sup>

The principle of the unity of the Christian community (that could be summarized in the words of Saint Augustine *omnium enim christianorum una respublica est*)<sup>21</sup> is the basic ideological and dogmatic premise of medieval Europe. Nevertheless, the ongoing vacillation of the center of power between papacy and empire and the transformation of the individual into a subject caused this consideration to hinge itself more on the notion of “global state” than “citizen of the world”: there was a shift from the level of subjective action to that of forms of power. Dante Alighieri's *De Monarchia* is emblematic of this shift, proposing a political model of “world order” that should concern all humanity and would integrate and oversee systems of local government through a universal monarch.<sup>22</sup> Consequently, although Dante “dreamed a

15 “I was not born to be attached to only one place. My homeland is the entire universe.” Cf. also Sen. *Heb.* 9.7 *Num dubitas quin se ille [Marcellus] tantus vir sic ad tolerandum aequo animo exilium saepe adhortatus sit: “quod patria cares, non est miserum: ita te disciplinis inbuisti ut scires omnem locum sapienti viro patriam esse [...]”*. (“That man [Marcellus] – would you doubt it? –, such a great man, would often urge himself to endure exile resolutely in this way: ‘there is no pain in being deprived of one's homeland: you have learned enough to know that any place can be a homeland to a wise man.’”).

16 Sen. *Heb.* 8.2.

17 MAur. 6.44.2 (“My city and country, so far as I am Antoninus, is Rome; but so far as I am a man, it is the world.”)

18 On this topic, I refer readers to A. Besson's article also in the present volume.

19 Cf. Tert. *apol.* 38.3 *Unam omnium rem publicam agnoscimus, mundum* (“The world is the only state that we recognize.”). On Stoicism as it is reflected in the thought of the Church Fathers, see Spanneut (1957) and Colish (1985).

20 Aug. *civ.* 15.1 and 17.

21 Aug. *op. monach.* 33 (“all Christians are members of a single state”).

22 See, for instance, Dante, *Mon.* 1.14.4–8 *Sed humanum genus potest regi per unum sup-*

world of *government*, he did not dream a world of *citizenship*;<sup>23</sup> it is true nonetheless that in this work one can find “the first systematic and detailed analysis in the history of cosmopolitan political thought of the concept of world government.”<sup>24</sup>

Between 15th and 16th century, reflections on cosmopolitanism reveal an intuitive awareness of a principle of universal philanthropy<sup>25</sup> and a longing for a *res publica litterarum* as a shared homeland of scholars, “an ideal city where men could establish a productive commerce of ideas based on the exchange of thoughts and knowledge.”<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, the most characteristic instance of all cosmopolitan speculation in this period is the attempt to reconcile considerations from Antiquity with those of the Church Fathers: the most outstanding representative of this “Christian Humanism” is certainly Erasmus

---

*premiū principem, qui est Monarcha. Propter quod advertendum sane quod cum dicitur ‘humanum genus potest regi per unum supremum principem’, non sic intelligendum est, ut minima iudicia cuiuscunque municipii ab illo uno immediate prodire possint [...] Sed sic intelligendum est: ut humanum genus secundum sua comunia, que omnibus competunt, ab eo regatur et comuni regula gubernetur ad pacem. Quam quidem regulam sive legem particulares principes ab eo recipere debent, tanquam intellectus practicus ad conclusionem operativam recipit maiorem propositionem ab intellectu speculativo, et sub illa particularem, que proprie sua est, assumit et particulariter ad operationem concludit. Et hoc non solum possibile est uni, sed necesse est ab uno procedere, ut omnis confusio de principiis universalibus auferatur.* (“Now humanity can be ruled by one supreme Prince who is Monarch. But it must be noted well that when we assert that the human race is capable of being ruled by one supreme Prince, it is not to be understood that the petty decisions of every municipality can issue from him directly [...] But rather let it be understood that the human race will be governed by him in general matters pertaining to all peoples, and through him will be guided to peace by a government common to all. And this rule, or law, individual princes should receive from him, just as for any operative conclusion the practical intellect receives the major premise from the speculative intellect, adds thereto the minor premise peculiarly its own, and draws the conclusion for the particular operation. This government common to all not only may proceed from one; it must do so, that all confusion be removed from principles of universal import.” transl. Aurelia Henry Reinhardt). On Dante’s political thought in *De Monarchia* also see Vasoli (1983) 561–576 and Canning (2011) 60–80. For a broader view of “medieval cosmopolitanism” see the collection of case studies in Ganim—Legassie (2013).

23 Heater (2004) 14.

24 Heater (1996) 37.

25 This would correspond to the ideal of a “universal culture of mankind that strives to emphasize harmony rather than discord and the shared profile of all people, which remain constant through time and from place to place” (Garin [1992] 131).

26 See Bigalli (1995) 12, in reference to Poggio Bracciolini’s conceptual horizon of ideas.

of Rotterdam, the incarnation of the rootless nomad intellectual who sometimes felt Dutch, sometimes German, sometimes French,<sup>27</sup> and who ultimately declined Zwingli's offer to become a citizen of Zürich, declaring that he preferred instead to consider himself a *civis mundi*.<sup>28</sup> In his indefatigable search for a lasting peace, Erasmus also became the sponsor of a "Christian pacifism and ecumenism," although he was not opposed to the humanistic ideal of a supranational community of scholars steeped in classical culture.<sup>29</sup>

A decisive contribution to considerations of universalism was made by the "geographic revolution" in the 15th century. The discovery of heretofore unknown and inconceivable territories and peoples configured a new conception of globality: "For the first time in the history of Western civilization, the *epistemic representation* of the world—traditionally driven by the concept of *oikoumene* ('the inhabited world')—began to overlap with the actual physical reality".<sup>30</sup> Consequently, the gradual broadening of intellectual as well as physical horizons led both to a further recognition of the constitutive heterogeneity of humankind and to attempts to reconcile the idea of universal brotherhood with the first elaboration of a political structure of truly global proportions.

Michel de Montaigne and Justus Lipsius<sup>31</sup> (as well as Guillaume Postel, who should be mentioned not in the least for coining the term "cosmopolite," the

---

27 "L'humanisme chrétien est un esprit, une volonté, une méthode. Un esprit d'optimisme, de mesure et d'adaptation. Une volonté d'être "homme en perfection". Une méthode de philosophie religieuse totale, faisant appel à tous les dons de l'homme, à toute son expérience, à toutes ses vertus, à toutes ses virtualités" (Halkin [1987] 31–32. On the contribution of Erasmus' extensive travels to the development of his philosophy, also see Halkin [1987] 393–404). See also Margolin (1995) 380–407 esp. and Thompson (1955).

28 Letter to Huldrych Zwingli, Basel, 3 September 1522, in Allen—Allen (1906–1958), vol. 5, 129.

29 On the pacifism that is characteristic of Erasmus' political thought, culminating in the major works *Querela pacis* (1517) and *Dulce bellum inexpertis* (1526), see Margolin (1973); Fernandez (1973); on Erasmus' *respublica litterarum* see Yoran (2010) 37–104 and 107–132 esp.

30 Scuccimarra (2006) 162. See also *ibid.* 165: "only then does the discourse on the *cosmos* as a unitary form of life move beyond the horizon of an unconsciously fragmented perspective to immerse itself in a fuller dimension of the real. The result is not simply an expansion of the geographic limits of the *oikoumene* as the epistemic horizon of reference for experience, but an equally extreme revision of the traditional modalities of representing mankind as an *extensive and relational totality*." (Transl. from Italian by Anna Busetto).

31 Limitations of space do not allow us to present the long list of European thinkers in the period who were concerned with this topic; we prefer to include only two of the most significant. On the subject in general, see Todorov (1982), Rubiés (1993), Pagden (1993).

first modern translation of the word from Classical Greek<sup>32</sup>) count among the representatives of this curiosity to explore the “other.”

In the Age of Enlightenment, the concept of cosmopolitanism was further confirmed with renewed vigor. The entry “Cosmopolitain ou Cosmopolite” in the *Encyclopédie*, which suggests the equivalence of the term “*philosophe*” and “citizen of the world”,<sup>33</sup> made explicit by Voltaire in his affirmation that “le philosophe n’est ni Français, ni Anglais, ni Florentin; il est de tout pays”<sup>34</sup> evidences the refusal that Enlightenment thought opposed to the tyranny of a restricted sense of territorial belonging. The restoration of the humanistic notion of the *respublica litteraria* also characterizes 18th-century thought in a more élitist paradigm where it becomes a *topos* for the public self-representation of the Enlightenment. The 18th-century *république des lettres* occupies a transnational dimension, participatory and egalitarian, of critical confrontation and intellectual cooperation,<sup>35</sup> exclusively reserved for a society of learned men: the *philosophes* considered themselves to be “a race apart,” a unique social class, the only one to which the notion of “citizen of the world” could be ascribed.<sup>36</sup> Their “cosmopolitan sociability” permeates their correspondence, journals, and cultural institutions (*académies, sociétés savants, sociétés de sciences*)<sup>37</sup> and addresses the problematics of the search for a universal language that would facilitate communication between *hommes de lettres*.<sup>38</sup>

However, such intellectual snobbery and the refusal to recognize territorial rootedness demonstrated by the *philosophes* also precipitated negative

---

On Montaigne in particular see Kristeva (1988) 171–183 and Scuccimarra’s discussion and ample bibliography in Scuccimarra (2006) 211–238.

32 On the expression “Gaulois cosmopolite”, as he preferred to call himself, see Kristeva (1988) 183–186.

33 Diderot—D’Alembert (1751–1765), vol. 4 (1754), 297. See also Schlereth (1977) 1: “The typical eighteenth-century philosophe aspired to be a cosmopolite, and in turn, the cosmopolite was, by the Enlightenment’s own presumptuous definition, pictured as a typical eighteenth-century philosophe»”.

34 Voltaire (1816), vol. 4, 164, s.v. “Cartésianisme”.

35 Scuccimarra (2006) 366 and 369.

36 Schlereth (1977) 14. On this subject, also see Bots—Waquet (1977) and Goodman (1994).

37 Schlereth (1977) 15–17.

38 See Diderot—D’Alembert (1751–1765), vol. 5 (1755), 637A: “Un idiome commun seroit l’unique moyen d’établir une correspondance qui s’étendit à toutes les parties du genre humain, et qui les liguât contre la Nature, à laquelle nous avons sans cesse à faire violence, soit dans le physique, soit dans le moral. Supposé cet idiome admis et fixé, aussitôt les notions deviennent permanentes; la distance des tems disparaît; les lieux se touchent; il se forme des liaisons entre tous les points habités de l’espace et de la durée, et tous les êtres vivans et pensans s’entretiennent”.

readings of the notion of cosmopolitanism,<sup>39</sup> especially prevalent in the final decades of the century, together with the emergence of a growing emphasis on issues of national identity and patriotism that will take on new significance in the 19th century. Consequently, the cosmopolitan became perceived as a social egotist whose vagabond nature—physical and intellectual—was a disgraceful vehicle for pursuing one's own happiness and living like a parasite, thereby avoiding the ethical burden of the evils and miseries of the world.<sup>40</sup> The sense of cynical individualism intrinsic to cosmopolitanism may be inferred from Jean-Louis Fougeret de Monbron's autobiographical novel *Le Cosmopolite, ou Le citoyen du monde*, whose protagonist travels between Europe and the Ottoman Empire, declaring his refusal of any form of political or social adherence with pervasive contempt and the same lack of consideration for all places.<sup>41</sup> The permutation of cosmopolitanism in a commercial context—where the free access to resources becomes indiscriminate pillaging—is aptly synthesized in the words of the unscrupulous monopolist depicted by Guillaume-Thomas Raynal: "Périssent mon pays, périssent la contrée où je commande. Périssent le citoyen et l'étranger. Périssent mon associé, pourvu que je m'enrichisse de sa dépouille. Tous les lieux de l'univers me sont égaux. Lorsque j'aurai dévasté, sucé, exténué une région, il en restera toujours une autre, où je pourrai porter mon or et mon jouir en paix".<sup>42</sup>

The most interesting and fruitful aspect of the Enlightenment attitude, although changeable and contradictory,<sup>43</sup> toward the concept of "citizenship of the world", is its critique, stemming from Erasmus, of the folly of war. In a period marked by conflicts between nations, also characterized by expansionist efforts sustained by warfare, reflections on peace became a viable line of thought. The idea of a universal human community was transformed into a political and legal doctrine, capable of providing practical proposals for the foundation of

39 The disparaging acceptance of the term *cosmopolite* is emblematic of its entry in the fourth edition of the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie* (1762) 409: "A man without a country. A cosmopolitan is not a good citizen."

40 Moreau (1757) 105: "Les Cacouacs [= *les Philosophes des Lumières*] ne respectent aucune liaison de société, de parenté, d'amitié, ni même d'amour: ils traitent tous les hommes avec la même perfidie".

41 Fougeret de Monbron (1761) 164–165.

42 Raynal (1780) 398. On Fougeret de Monbron and Raynal see Tundo Ferente (2009a) 388.

43 The case of Jean-Jacques Rousseau is emblematic of this duality. Rousseau was both a supporter of the foundation of a supranational organization that would resolve conflicts and a partisan of the uniqueness of each nation and the virtuousness of the love of one's country. See on this subject Cavallar (2015) 76–91 and 102–105.



a supranational state. In the broad array of proposals brought forth, all ascribable to the categories of federalism or unions among states,<sup>44</sup> Immanuel Kant provided the most convincing proposition.<sup>45</sup> In his essay *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* (1795), he suggests granting each state a civil republican constitution, and on the level of international law he proposes the establishment of a stable federal alliance—a “league of nations” or *Völkerbund*—upheld by a “cosmopolitan right” (*Weltbürgerrecht*) that recognizes every person’s right to travel to a foreign country without hostile treatment. The merit of Kant’s project is that he was the first to address the problematics of international relations at the highest possible level of legal-political categorization, in other words, at the cosmopolitan level: the constructive tension of his philosophical project enable him to move beyond the more restricted view of other earlier and contemporary thinkers, making him the first true standard bearer of “universal cosmopolitanism.”<sup>46</sup>

The development of the concepts of nation, country, and patriotism in the 19th century required that the discussion of cosmopolitanism consider (and reconcile itself with) the acknowledgment of particular national characteristics.<sup>47</sup> As such, it fades into a more generic internationalist and universal vision and becomes conceptually depleted, or at least conceptually reconfigured.<sup>48</sup> In Marxist ideology, for instance, the weakening of the concept of the state enables the development of a dual internationalist conception of socio-economic reality. On the one hand, there is the international nature of the market that has assumed global proportions. The Communist Manifesto states

---

44 See Archibugi (1992), Archibugi and Voltaggio (1991), Tundo Ferente (2009a) 393–394.

45 On this complex topic, which has been the object of numerous studies, see, for instance among recent bibliography, Wallace Brown (2009), Kleingeld (2013), Cavallar (2015).

46 Mori (2005) 235.

47 In the early 20th century Rudolph Meinecke points to the existence of a substantial harmony between the cosmopolitan idea and the national idea, thereby discrediting Rousseau and Voltaire’s prophecies of the irreconcilability of the two positions (cf. Angelini [2012] 45). On the intersections of cosmopolitanism and the national idea, see for instance Giuseppe Mazzini’s original politico-philosophical discussion in Urbinati and Recchia (2011).

48 Mori (1992): “A partire dall’Ottocento vengono dunque progressivamente meno le condizioni storiche e culturali del cosmopolitismo, sia perché il principio di nazionalità si radica ormai definitivamente nella coscienza dei popoli, sia perché perde sempre più vigore l’idea di una società naturale delle nazioni. Dovendo necessariamente partire dal riconoscimento delle singole realtà nazionali, l’aspirazione a superare i limiti di prospettive localistiche o angustamente patriottiche assume il carattere dell’internazionalismo, anziché quello del cosmopolitismo.”

that “through its exploitation of the world market, the bourgeoisie has imposed a cosmopolitan design on production and consumption in all countries”:<sup>49</sup> here the term “cosmopolitan” has negative connotations related to the effects of capitalistic globalization. On the other hand, Marxism also recognizes the internationalism of the proletarian class struggle, efficiently condensed in the famous admonition *Proletarier aller Länder, vereinigt euch!* “Workers of the world, unite!”.<sup>50</sup>

Contemporary thought on cosmopolitanism<sup>51</sup> as well as *history* itself, especially in the first half of the 20th century, is nevertheless more indebted to the twofold moral and legal-political version of the Kantian cosmopolitan vision. As Michael Scrivener confirms, “Kant’s faith that history was on the side of cosmopolitanism has been rendered absurd (by several centuries of extraordinarily violent nationalism, including two world wars), but also paradoxically prescient (by the subsequent creations by nation states of cosmopolitan structures like United Nations) [...] and there are other transnational institutions that approximate the spirit if not the letter of Kant’s practical proposals for avoiding war: the International Criminal Court, the Kyoto Accords, the European Union and international human rights organizations”, to which we would leastwise include the foundation of the Red Cross in the 19th century. “If one takes the long view, it is difficult to escape the perception that because of objective historical forces [...] societies are moving, as Kant thought they would, toward cosmopolitan formations and away from narrowly conceived national interests.”<sup>52</sup>

49 Marx-Engels (1848), chap. 1: “Die Bourgeoisie hat durch ihre Exploitation des Weltmarkts die Produktion und Konsumption aller Länder kosmopolitisch gestaltet”.

50 Mori (1992). For a more detailed analysis of the relationship between marxism and cosmopolitanism, see most recently Achcar (2013) 103–164.

51 Theoreticians of judicial pacifism like Hans Kelsen, Norberto Bobbio, and Jürgen Habermas count themselves among the heirs of Kant’s thought; so do theoreticians of cosmopolitan social justice like Charles Beitz and Thomas Pogge; theoreticians of cosmopolitan democracy like David Held and Daniele Archibugi, and of ethical cosmopolitanism like Onora O’Neill and Martha Nussbaum (On Kant’s contemporary legacy see more extensively Cavaller [2015] 165–180). In this company we must include Hannah Arendt, for whom the simple fact of being human implies a “cosmopolitan existence” that is critically nurtured by the development of a sense of community in every individual (cf. Beiner [1989] 75). More recently, Seyla Benhabib has developed a theory of global justice that is mindful of the problem of the fair distribution of resources and rights and attempts to reconcile Kantian philosophy with Hannah Arendt: cf. Benhabib (2004); Benhabib (2006).

52 Scrivener (2016) 10–11.

The philosophical discussion of cosmopolitanism was revived especially in the second half of the 20th century, “as a theoretical resource upon which to draw in order to cope with the structural changes triggered by globalization processes and to respond to the challenges raised by them, above all with reference to problems of political and social justice”.<sup>53</sup> Regarding the 20th century and the present, it is more appropriate to speak of pluralistic cosmopolitanisms: the speculative horizon and the tradition echoed by many thinkers are as multifaceted as the range of disciplines they span.

To conclude this brief overview of the history of cosmopolitanism, it seems fitting to outline a taxonomy of contemporary cosmopolitanisms:<sup>54</sup> *moral cosmopolitanism* (represented respectively by Charles Beitz and Thomas Pogge, in its interactional and institutional forms), according to which membership in to a political community cannot be a source of moral privileges, so that arbitrary facts like borders and citizenship cannot influence the administration of justice.<sup>55</sup> *Ethical cosmopolitanism* (represented by Martha Nussbaum) focuses its discussion on the importance of an education that gives young people a sense of being citizens of the world, defining themselves not in relation to their own place of origin but endowing them with more universal goals and interests that draw their attention to the rest of the human community.<sup>56</sup> Diversely, the ethico-cultural cosmopolitanism of Kwame Anthony Appiah, a major theoretician of *rooted cosmopolitanism* (which respects an individual's local roots), attempts to reconcile universalism and patriotism by accepting human diversity while recognizing ethical significance.<sup>57</sup> These trends are typical of the North American discussion, whereas the current of *politico-judicial cosmopolitanism* is more European and related to the project of a *cosmopolitan democracy*. This concept was originally presented for the first time in *Cosmopolis. È possibile una democrazia sopranazionale?* (by Daniele Archibugi, Richard Falk, David Held and Mary Kaldor) and influenced Jürgen Habermas' contemporaneous thinking on this topic.<sup>58</sup> The essay was written at a time when the international community was confronted by the news of the massacres in

53 Taraborrelli (2015) XIII. See also Fine (2003) and Fine (2007).

54 I am using to Taraborrelli's classification (in Taraborrelli [2015]) here, a valuable reference for a thorough assessment of each typology as well as the bibliography for each theorist. On contemporary cosmopolitanism also see Tundo Ferente (2009b).

55 See e.g. Beitz (2004) 11–27, Pogge (2007), Pogge (2008).

56 Besides Nussbaum (1997), also see Nussbaum (2007) and Nussbaum (2011).

57 Appiah (2002), Appiah (2005), Appiah (2006).

58 Archibugi, Falk, Held and Kaldor (1993). The influence of this work on Habermas' thought is especially evident in Habermas (1995).

Yugoslavia, the invasion of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein, and the civil war in Somalia. It begins with a recognition of the crisis in the relationship between western democracy and the nation state (or “the discomfort of democracy,” to cite the title of a recent essay by Carlo Galli)<sup>59</sup> and examines the possibility of reforming political and judicial institutions in a truly cosmopolitan way in order to provide a global extension of democracy as a form of government that is not bound to a single state. In the following years, some of the authors articulated their own vision of the topic, sparking an ongoing debate between civil cosmopolitanism (Mary Kaldor) and political-legal cosmopolitanism, subsequently divided between social cosmopolitanism (David Held) and liberal cosmopolitanism (Daniele Archibugi).

In the 21st century as never before, with the birth of the European Union and the escalation of global relations together with the spread of technology, the term “cosmopolitanism” is used more and more to designate a standpoint and a way of life, and the cosmopolitan dimension is what characterizes all of us who often perceive ourselves as citizens of one vast “global village.” In this sense, the cosmopolitan perspective is a methodological tool for analyzing current reality and the projection of future realities, as well as the reality that everyone must practice in everyday life. As Ulrich Beck states, “What is enlightenment? To have the courage to make use of one’s cosmopolitan vision and to acknowledge one’s multiple identities—to combine forms of life founded on language, skin colour, nationality or religion with the awareness that, in a radically insecure world, all are equal and everyone is different”.<sup>60</sup>

So we have seen how a word and a concept that were provocatively born over 2400 years ago have crossed through the centuries, preserving an extraordinary vitality every step of the way before landing center stage in the current debate among specialists in the field as well as ordinary people. This is an extraordinary instance—more concrete and interdisciplinary than ever—of the “modernity of the classics.”

---

59 Galli (2011). As Taraborrelli (2015) XIII confirms: “It is thus from a cosmopolitan standpoint that it is possible to grasp and understand the crisis caused in democracy by the ongoing processes of globalization which, by undermining the principle of territorial sovereignty and the autonomy of states, have contributed to conditioning, to weakening or even to overriding the democratic and political decisions available to the individual states.”

60 Beck (2006) epigraph. The same author also addresses “methodological cosmopolitanism” elsewhere in Beck (2006) 75–78.

## Bibliography

- Achcar, G. 2013. Marxism and Cosmopolitanism. In Id. *Marxism, Orientalism, Cosmopolitanism*, 103–164. London.
- Allen, P.S. and H.M. Allen, eds. 1906–1958. *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*. Oxford.
- Angelini, G., ed. 2012. *Nazione democrazia e pace tra Ottocento e Novecento*. Milano.
- Appiah, A.K. 2002. Cosmopolitan Patriots. In *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism: Martha Nussbaum with Respondents*, ed. J. Cohen, 21–29. Boston.
- Appiah, A.K. 2005. *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton.
- Appiah, A.K. 2006. *Cosmopolitanism. Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York—London.
- Archibugi, D. and F. Voltaggio. 1991. *Filosofi per la pace*. Roma.
- Archibugi, D. 1992. L'utopia della pace perpetua. *Democrazia e diritto* 1: 349–378.
- Archibugi, D., R. Falk, D. Held and M. Kaldor. 1993. *Cosmopolis. È possibile una democrazia soprannazionale?*. Roma.
- Baldry, H.C. 1965. *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought*. Cambridge.
- Beck, U. 2006. *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge. (English transl. of *Der kosmopolitische Blick, oder: Krieg ist Frieden*. Frankfurt am Mainz, 2004).
- Beiner, R., ed. 1989. H. Arendt. *Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy*. Chicago.
- Beitz, C. 2004. Cosmopolitanism and Global Justice. *The Journal of Ethics* 9: 11–27.
- Benhabib, S. 2004. *The Rights of Others. Aliens, Residents and Citizens*. Cambridge.
- Benhabib, S. 2006. *Another Cosmopolitanism*. Oxford.
- Bigalli, D. 1995. Le arti della scrittura e la cultura delle corti. In *Storia della filosofia*, vol. 111, eds. P. Rossi and C.A. Viano, 3–18. Roma–Bari.
- Bots, H. and F. Waquet. 1997. *La République des lettres*. Paris.
- Cacciari, G. 2003. *Geofilosofia dell'Europa*. Milano.
- Canning, J. 2011. *Ideas of Power in the Late Middle Ages, 1296–1417*. Cambridge.
- Cavallar, G. 2015. *Kant's embedded Cosmopolitanism. History, Philosophy, and Education for World Citizens*. Berlin–Boston.
- Colish, M.L. 1985. *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to Early Middle Age*, vol. 2, *Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought through the Sixth Century*. Leiden.
- Dictionnaire de l'Académie*. 1762. Fourth edition.
- Diderot, D. and M. D'Alembert, eds. 1751–1765. *Encyclopédie ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*. Paris.
- Fernandez, J.A. 1973. Erasmus on the Just War. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 34: 209–226.
- Fine, R. 2003. Taking the “ism” out of cosmopolitanism; an essay in reconstruction. *European Journal of Social Theory* 6 (4): 451–470.
- Fine, R. 2007. *Cosmopolitanism*. London.
- Fougeret de Monbron, J.-L. 1761. *Le Cosmopolite, ou Le citoyen du monde*. London.

- Galli, C. 2011. *Il disagio della democrazia*. Torino.
- Ganim, J.M. and S.A. Legassie. 2013. *Cosmopolitanism and the Middle Ages*. New York.
- Garin, E. 1992. Problemi di religione e filosofia nella cultura fiorentina del Quattrocento. In Id., *La cultura filosofica del Rinascimento italiano. Ricerche e documenti*, 127–142. Firenze.
- Goodman, D. 1994. *The Republic of Letters. A Cultural History of the French Enlightenment*. Ithaca.
- Habermas, J. 1995. Kants Idee des Ewigen Friedens—aus dem historischen Abstand von 200 Jahren. *Kritische Justiz* 28: 293–319.
- Halkin, L.E. 1987. *Erasme parmi nous*. Paris.
- Heater, D. 1996. *World Citizenship and Government. Cosmopolitan Ideas in the History of Western Political Thought*. New York.
- Heater, D. 2004. *Citizenship: the Civic Ideal in the World History, Politics and Education*. Manchester and New York. Third edition.
- Kleingeld, P. 2013. *Kant and Cosmopolitanism. The Philosophical Ideal of World Citizenship*. Cambridge.
- Konstan, D. 2009. Cosmopolitan traditions. In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*, ed. R.K. Balot, 471–484. Chichester – Malden (Mass.).
- Kristeva, J. 1988. *Étrangers à nous-mêmes*. Paris.
- Lana, I. 1973. Tracce di dottrine cosmopolitiche in Grecia prima del cinismo. In Id. *Studi sul pensiero politico classico*. 231–253. Napoli.
- Lavan, M., R.E. Payne and J. Weisweiler, eds. 2016. *Cosmopolitanism and Empire. Cosmopolitanism and Empire: Universal Rulers, Local Elites, and Cultural Integration in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*. Oxford.
- Margolin, J. 1973. *Guerre et paix dans la pensée d'Erasme*. Paris.
- Margolin, J. 1995. *Erasme precepteur de l'Europe*. Paris.
- Marx, K. and F. Engels. 1848. *Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei*. London.
- Moles, J.L. 1996. Cynic Cosmopolitanism. In *The Cynics. The Cynic movement in antiquity and its legacy*, eds. R. Bracht Branham and M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, 105–120. Berkeley.
- Moreau, J.-N. 1757. Premier mémoire sur le Cacouacs. In Id. *Nouveau mémoire pur servir à l'histoire des Cacouacs*. Amsterdam.
- Mori, M. 1992. Cosmopolitismo. In *Enciclopedia delle scienze sociali*. Roma ([http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/cosmopolitismo\\_%28Enciclopedia-delle-scienze-sociali-%29/](http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/cosmopolitismo_%28Enciclopedia-delle-scienze-sociali-%29/)).
- Mori, M. 2005. Europeismo e Cosmopolitismo in Kant. In *Kant e l'idea di Europa*, eds. P. Becchi, G. Cunico and O. Meo, 219–236. Genova.
- Nussbaum, M. 1997. *Cultivating Humanity. A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Nussbaum, M. 2007. The Capabilities Approach and Ethical Cosmopolitanism: A Response to Noah Feldman. *Yale Law Journal* 117 (<http://www.yalelawjournal.org/>)

- forum/the-capabilities-approach-andethical-cosmopolitanism-a-response-to  
-noah-feldman).
- Nussbaum, M. 2011. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Pagden, A. 1993. *European Encounters with the New World. From Renaissance to Romanticism*. New Haven–London.
- Pogge, T.W.M. 2007. Cosmopolitanism. In *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*, eds. R.E. Goodin, P. Pettit and T.W.M. Pogge, 312–331. Oxford.
- Pogge, T.W.M. 2008. *World Poverty and Human Rights: Cosmopolitan Responsibilities and Reforms*. Cambridge (Mass.).
- Raynal, G.T.F. 1780. *Histoire philosophique et politique des établissements et du commerce des Européens dans les deux Indes*. Genève.
- Richter, D.S. 2011. *Cosmopolis: Imagining Community in Late Classical Athens and the Early Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Rovisco, M. and M. Nowicka, eds. 2011. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Cosmopolitanism*. Farnham.
- Rubiés, J.P. 1993. New Worlds and Renaissance Ethnology. *History and Anthropology* 6: 157–197.
- Schlereth, T.J. 1977. *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in the Enlightenment Thought. Its Form and Function in the Ideas of Franklin, Hume and Voltaire, 1694–1790*. Notre Dame (Ind.).
- Scrivener, M. 2016. *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in the Age of Revolution and Reaction, 1776–1832*. London–New York.
- Succimarra, L. 2006. *I confini del mondo. Storia del cosmopolitismo dall'Antichità al Settecento*. Bologna.
- Sinclair, T.A. 1952. *A History of Greek Political Thought*. London.
- Spanneut, M. 1957. *Le Stoïcisme des Pères de l'Église de Clément de Rome à Clément d'Alexandrie*. Paris.
- Taraborrelli, A. 2015. *Contemporary Cosmopolitanism*. London–New Dehli–New York–Sydney (English transl. of *Il cosmopolitismo contemporaneo*. Roma–Bari, 2011).
- Thompson, C.R. 1955. Erasmus as Internationalist and Cosmopolitan. *Archiv für Reformationgeschichte* 46: 167–195.
- Todorov, T. 1982. *La conquête de l'Amérique. La question de l'autre*. Paris.
- Tundo Ferente, L. 2009. L'utopia cosmopolitica moderna. *MORUS—Utopia e Rinascimento* 6: 381–396. [= Tundo Ferente (2009a)]
- Tundo Ferente, L. 2009. *Cosmopolitismo contemporaneo. Moralità, politica, economia*. Perugia. [= Tundo Ferente (2009b)]
- Urbinati, N. and S. Recchia, eds. 2011. *Giuseppe Mazzini. Cosmopolitismo e Nazione—Scritti sulla democrazia, l'autodeterminazione dei popoli e le relazioni internazionali*. Roma.

- Vasoli, C. 1983. Papato e Impero nel tardo Medioevo: Dante, Marsilio, Ockham. In *Storia delle idee politiche, economiche, sociali*, ed. L. Firpo, vol. 2, t. 2., 543–665. Torino.
- Voltaire (*scil.* Arouet, F.-M.). 1816. *Dictionnaire philosophique*. Paris.
- Wallace Brown, G. 2009. *Grounding Cosmopolitanism. From Kant to an Idea of Cosmopolitan Constitution*. Edinburgh.
- Yoran, H. 2010. *Between Utopia and Dystopia. Erasmus, Thomas More, and the Humanist Republic of Letters*. Plymouth.