

**COSMOPOLITANISM:
The Philosophical Concept of Cosmopolitanism
Juxtaposed to John Calvin and the Total Depravity of the
Human Condition and the Possibility of Cosmopolitanism
The University of Chicago, Divinity School
Reverend David P. Bridges,
Breathed Bridges Best, LLC ©**

This paper will clearly define cosmopolitanism relative to Stoic thought; juxtapose the Reformed Christian position relative to John Calvin; explore the possibility of global cosmopolitan world structures; and conclude by thinking about collective as well as individual cosmopolitanism. The first argument conceived by the Stoics regarding how humans actually become cosmopolitan in nature is in Part I. The paper will examine the cosmopolitan argument from ancient times, focusing on the thought of Cicero and Marcus Aurelius. The second argument in Part II will address the Christian tradition's position through the viewpoint of John Calvin, which is in opposition to Stoic thought in terms of understanding human nature. The Christian tradition, which traces the origins of its thought to the Garden of Eden in the Old Testament book of Genesis, places a great deal of emphasis upon the human fallen condition. The essential question remains: if our condition is fallen, how can we ever aspire to become 'high-minded/virtuous' and cosmopolitan in nature?

The final part of the paper begins with the work of the German/American theologian Reinhold Niebuhr and some insights from his works on the nature of humanity. In the continuation of Part III the paper analyzes the possibility of having an international governing structure which enables citizens to be cosmopolitan in nature. The most recent thinkers on the subject of cosmopolitanism believe that a world order and government structure must be proposed if we are ever going to become cosmopolitan, both collectively and individually. Philosophers, political theorists, economists and theologians have wrestled with the question of human nature and its capacity throughout the ages. There may be no conclusive arguments regarding human nature and cosmopolitanism, however there is certainly hope for an evolving human nature in the future.

PART I

Marcus Tullius Cicero was born as a Roman in 106 B.C.. His book: On Duties has held its place in literary history because of its emphasis on social and political morality. It has been said of this important piece that nearly every 'Englishman Aristocrat' throughout history has had a copy of On Duties sitting on his or her desk as a reference book. Cicero's thought placed a great deal of emphasis on human duty to society and his teaching point to the goal of becoming virtuous in living. The Stoics believed that virtue was the only good and to live well was to live virtuously. In order to be cosmopolitan, according to Stoic thinking, humans simply needed to aspire toward 'high-minded/virtuous' behavior and thought. The following quote explains this goal toward which the Stoics lived: "'Perfection' is constituted by virtue, here presented as agreement or harmony of conduct... for this reason few if any men are regarded as perfect, most are regarded as

imperfect. For a man is not perfect unless he possesses all the virtues. Primary virtues are four: prudence, moderation, courage and justice. Virtue summed up as ‘the natural perfection of a rational being as a rational being.’” 1

The Stoic philosophers’ basic view of the human condition was that it could become ‘high-minded/ virtuous’ to the point that humans could elevate beyond the desires of the flesh. In so overcoming the desire of the flesh, humans could focus on the Whole or becoming cosmopolitan in nature. The Stoic tradition taught that humans can become god-like through focusing human minds toward Reason. Reason was purely divine, hence through training human minds to become virtuous, humans could eventually remove fleshly desire and take on the mind set of a God. Through setting the goal of becoming high-minded/virtuous humans are theoretically capable of becoming cosmopolitan. The following quote helps to explain Cicero’s thought on this principle: “For the power of the spirit, that is its nature, is twofold: one part of it consists of impulse, called in Greek *horme*, which snatches a man this way and that; the other of reason, which teaches and explains what should be done and what avoided. Reason therefore commands, and impulse obeys... we understand that bodily pleasure is not sufficiently worthy of the superiority of man and that it should be scorned and rejected.” 2

Cicero was deeply influenced in his thought by Plato (429 B.C.-347 B.C.). Plato was concerned with “‘the ascent of the soul to the intelligible realm’ (Republic) the restless tendency to grasp the eternal so that the temporal may be understood.”3 In order to fully grasp Cicero, Platonic thought is vitally important in understanding the devaluing of the fleshly/temporal realm and valuing the spiritual/soulful world of the eternal. Cicero even moves this train of thought into the arena of temporal finances and money, as the following quote illustrates: “Therefore you must avoid these, and shun also the desire for money. Nothing is more the mark of a mean and petty spirit than to love riches; nothing more honorable and more magnificent than to despise money if you are without it, but if you have it to devote it to liberality and beneficence.”4

According to Cicero’s thought, external advantages such as health, wealth, and so on are not good, but merely ‘preferable’; sickness, poverty, even death, not bad, but ‘unpreferable’. Most importantly for this argument, wealth is to be used to the liberality and beneficence of helping others. Cicero is moving toward defining another major attribute which is important to cosmopolitanism. In order to be cosmopolitan and virtuous in nature humans need to place fleshly desire and temporal concerns, money etc. as secondary concerns while having as a priority the cause of meeting human need. Cicero went on to say: “There are two methods here: one may show kindness to the needy either by personal services, or by giving money. The latter is easier, especially for a wealthy man; the former, however, is both more brilliantly illustrious, and more worthy of a brave and notable man. For both involve a liberal willingness to gratify others; but the one draws upon a money-chest, the other upon one’s virtue.”5

When humans are elevated beyond material concerns, pleasure and fleshly desire included, humans are free to fulfill responsibilities to fellow human beings in an ascending order from immediate family to all human beings worldwide. The following quote outlines that order to

which each human being is responsible if humans are to attain the goal of becoming cosmopolitan: “There are indeed several degrees of fellowship among men. To move from the one that is unlimited, next there is a closer one of the same race, tribe and tongue, through which men are bound strongly to one another. More intimate still is that of the same city, as citizens have many things that are shared with one another: the forum, temples, porticoes and roads, laws and legal rights, law-courts and political elections; and besides these acquaintances and companionship, and those business and commercial transactions that many of them make with many others. A tie narrower still is that of the fellowship between relations: moving from that vast fellowship of the human race we end up with a confined and limited one... the first fellowship exists within marriage itself, and the next with one’s children... the bonding of blood holds men together by goodwill and by love; for it is a great thing to have the same ancestral memorials, to practice the same religious rites, and to share common ancestral tombs.” 6

The concept of cosmopolitanism is further defined by this quote in that it is humanity’s duty to serve other human beings in the order mentioned above. Fulfilling these duties and responsibilities essentially defines what cosmopolitanism is about in regards to how humans need to behave and respond to fellow human beings. Humans are not born for individual selfish fulfillment alone; but our country claims for itself one part of our allegiance and our friends and family another. The Stoics believed everything produced on the earth is created for the use of humanity, and humans are born for the sake of other humans. And through fulfilling cosmopolitan duties, humans are able to assist one another in living virtuous lives.

The thought of Marcus Aurelius was influenced by Cicero who lived and taught many years prior to his birth. Marcus Aurelius was born in A.D. 121. He succeeded the Roman Emperor Antoninus Pius in A.D. 161. He was trained in rhetoric, and, being more serious-minded, Marcus turned away from rhetoric and focused on philosophy. Marcus became increasingly religious in his writings and spoke in terms of divine care and of Logos or Reason as an almost personal god. Congruent to Cicero’s thought, a great deal of emphasis was also placed upon the process of becoming more virtuous in nature. His writing career was almost as well-known as his ruling emperor ship. His greatest work, The Meditations, was completed sometime before his death in military conflict in A.D. 180.

Marcus Aurelius in the following two quotes first defines ‘high-mindedness’ and then shares how ‘high-mindedness’ leads to becoming a world citizen working for the Whole: “‘High-mindedness’ meant the elevation of an individual’s thoughts above the stirrings of the flesh whether pleasurable or painful, above vainglory, death, and all other such things.”⁷ Again, this teaching illustrates how Stoics devalue the fleshly temporal and set as a valuable goal that of becoming virtuous through Reason. Marcus Aurelius continued his thought by saying: “Nothing is more conducive to high-mindedness than the capacity to examine methodically and with truth everything that one meets in life, and to observe it in such a manner as to understand the nature of the universe, the usefulness of each thing within it, and the value of each in relation to the Whole and in relation to man as a citizen of that Whole, the greatest city of which other cities are but households.”⁸ Marcus Aurelius was teaching that through Reason humans could

move past desires of the flesh in order to attain the higher goal of becoming servants to fellow humans as a part of the whole. This concept further supports Cicero's thought in terms of becoming cosmopolitan in nature.

The desires and longings humans have for what is beautiful, for what makes sense, for what is true, for service to fellow human beings is at the heart of what it means to be cosmopolitan. The Stoics recognized that these longings and aspirations for the Whole or virtue remain in the human heart even after every temporal need seems to have been met. The flesh could and should be transcended because it was thought to be of lesser importance in comparison to aspiring to perfect Reason and virtuous living. According to Marcus Aurelius, becoming a part of the Whole meant being 'in relation to man as a citizen of that Whole' which entailed benevolence toward humanity in the ascending order which Cicero taught. In order to serve our fellow human beings it was vitally important to transcend the temporal and aspire to service of others. This is a large part of what virtuous living was about and the temporal impulses only distracted humanity from its real objective, service to others.

To further grasp this idea of cosmopolitanism "one should continually think of the universe as one living being, with one substance and one soul. How all its actions derive from one impulse, how all things together cause all that happens, and the nature of the resulting web and pattern of events."⁹ The number one goal in life for a cosmopolitan was to become a virtuous world citizen or one in nature. This was accomplished, to varying degrees, by eliminating the desires of the flesh through Reason. Marcus Aurelius almost looked at death as a friend who brought comfort from the agony of fleshly living. "Death is a rest from the dichotomy of sense perception, from being jerked like a puppet by the strings of desire, from the mind's analysis and the service of the flesh."¹⁰ The Stoics saw the body as a shell and they welcomed death as removal from the shell which kept them temporal in nature. The goal was to enter into the Whole and soul of the universe, to become virtuous in living by following Reason's path to becoming god-like in nature. Living as temporal human beings was a labor to the Stoic mind, something humans entered into because humans were born. Consequently, if humans are to labor for the good in this temporal existence humans should serve others. This is indeed virtuous behavior congruent with becoming cosmopolitan, according to Cicero and Marcus Aurelius.

Concentric circles, or what Cicero referred to as our duty to be benevolent to others in an ascending order from family to all humanity, is important to understand. The following analogy is helpful in giving this concept meaning. Consider throwing a rock into a pond and then observing the ripple affect expanding from a small splash, to eventually the perimeter of the whole pond. These are concentric circles and they are understood, in the context of this paper, to mean humans are responsible for others who are part of the universal Whole. Marcus Aurelius taught that the inner circles of family and friends are important, however the outer circles of all humanity are equally as important to serve. The Stoics hold that "the world is governed by divine will: it is as if we were in a city and state shared by men and gods, and each one of us is a part of this world. Hierocles teaches that this arrangement of 'concentric circles' is learned behavior. We have an instinctive disposition to show affection to our relatives as well as

ourselves, but without training we remain self-centered and treat others as increasingly alien.” 11 This quote illustrates that Reason is the vehicle to virtuous living and imperative if humanity is ever going to serve the outer circles of the concentric circles. It was strictly a matter of willing or training the individual mind to overcome human self-centered behavior enabling virtuous behavior like serving fellow human beings of all the rings in the concentric circles concept.

Furthermore, it was “altogether possible for a man to be godlike and not to be recognized as such by anyone.” 12 Stoics were inclined to believe that the human condition could become divine in nature through controlling thought. Hence, humans could overcome the human innate nature through Reason. In transition to Part II it is important to note that the Stoics rejected any concept of original sin, which the Christian tradition teaches as a cornerstone to understanding the human condition. Part II of this paper will explore the Reformed Christian tradition’s teachings originating in John Calvin’s thought. The focus of Part II will be upon Calvin’s thinking that humans have no ability to become godlike in our nature through controlling human thought. This is in direct opposition to Stoic teachings which taught that through Reason humans could become god-like and virtuous in nature.

PART II

The Reformed Christian tradition, enhanced by John Calvin’s thought, teaches that humans are basically depraved or incapable of becoming cosmopolitan because humans are trapped in a sinful/fleshly condition. As a consequence of the fall, humans are eternally locked into a nature that is inclined toward the fleshly/temporal side of life. In this aspect of the argument, the Stoics agreed with Calvin; in fact the Stoics likely influenced his thinking. The Christian Reformed tradition teaches the temporal/fleshly nature to which humans are destined is an obstacle to high-minded/virtuous living. The Stoics would agree with this element of Christian teachings, however this is as far as the agreement goes. The Christian tradition teaches that the human condition, as it stands alone in its nature with no outside influences, is incapable of becoming cosmopolitan.

John Calvin’s most famous and profound writings were entitled Institutes of the Christian Religion. John Calvin was born in the French city of Noyon in 1509. Young John went to Paris to be educated and he received his Master of Arts in 1528. His father urged him to leave theology and study law at the University of Orleans. He received his law degree in 1531, the same year his father died, and he returned to Paris to continue his studies of classical literature. By 1534, religion loomed large in Calvin’s life and he had become a reformer, hostile ideologically to the French authorities. Consequently, he fled in fear for his life to Basal, Switzerland. His first draft of the Institutes were published in 1536 and it was not until 1559 that the final books were released with five times the amount of material as the original publication. The Institutes is not a systematic theology but an organization of Biblical themes to aid the reader of Scripture in understanding the text. In regard to human nature, Calvin was fully aware of the Stoic thinkers basic premise. The following quote reflects Calvin’s knowledge of both Cicero and Plato: “I do not say, as Cicero did, that errors disappear with the lapse of time, and that religion grows and becomes better each day. For the world tries as far as it is able to

cast away all knowledge of God, and by every means to corrupt the worship of him...Plato meant nothing but this when he often taught that the highest good of the soul is likeness to God, where, when the soul has grasped the knowledge of God, it is wholly transformed into his likeness.” 13

Calvin was not able to see the human condition free from ‘errors,’ as Cicero reported he was capable of seeing the human condition. Nor was Calvin able to see the human condition taking on the ‘likeness of God’ and being transformed, under its own accord. The initial human condition was uncorrupted and pure, and Adam and Eve represented in this mythological story depicted in the Garden of Eden at first were in a pure state. This initial state was pure but then corrupted, according to the myth, when Adam ate the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. As a result of eating the forbidden fruit the nature of Adam and Eve was corrupted and no longer remained in its pure initial state. The following quote reflects Calvin’s thinking: “While it would be of little benefit to understand our creation unless we recognized in this sad ruin what our nature in its corruption and deformity is like...and to be sure, before we come to the miserable condition of man to which he is now subjected, it is worth-while to know what he was like when first created.” 14

Calvin was influenced by the mythological stories in the Old Testament. He formulated his opinion regarding the nature of the human condition based upon the story. He saw the fall of Adam in the Garden of Eden as the defining moment in human history which forever affected the human condition with ‘original sin’: “As it was the spiritual life of Adam to remain united and bound to his Maker, so estrangement from him was the death of his soul. Nor is it any wonder that he consigned his race to ruin by his rebellion when he perverted the whole order of nature in heaven and earth ... This is the inherited corruption, which the church fathers termed ‘original sin,’ meaning by the word ‘sin’ the depravation of a nature previously good and pure... Therefore, good men labored to show us that we are corrupted not by derived wickedness, but that we bear inborn defect from our mother’s womb...therefore all of us, who have descended from impure seed, are born infected with the contagion of sin.” 15

Calvin concluded that original sin was an inherent part of the human condition deeply rooted in humanity’s very being from ‘our mother’s womb.’ Therefore, humans are not capable of aspiring through human individual effort or Reason to high-minded/virtuous living as the Stoic philosophers taught. The myth depicted by the Old Testament story of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden has historically been used to teach how far away humans are from the purity that was bestowed upon Adam and Eve initially in the Garden. As a consequence of the fall in the Garden, humans are destined to live in the state of the temporal/fleshly sinful nature. Calvin furthers his argument by next quoting the Apostle Paul in his various New Testament Epistle writings as follows: “Original sin, seems to be hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature, diffused into all parts of the soul, which first makes us liable to God’s wrath, then also brings forth in us those works which Scripture calls ‘works of the flesh’ what Paul properly calls sin.” 16 Humans are inherently destined to the realm of a temporal sinful/fleshly state, trapped with a nature which never allows us to move past self interest. Calvin went on to say: “‘What is born of flesh, is flesh’ (Gospel of John 3:6), man is very clearly shown to be a miserable creature...

‘For to set the mind on the flesh,’ as the apostle testifies, ‘is death because there is enmity against God, it does not submit to God’s law, indeed it cannot’ (Epistle to the Romans 8:6-7)” 17

Calvin moves forward with his argument concerning human nature by introducing the divine concept of grace. Grace is important to understand because for the Christian it is the outside influence which potentially transforms individuals. Calvin’s teachings indicate that through the grace of God, God brought hope to the human condition in the incarnational act of Jesus Christ. He first states that humans are created in God’s image (Old Testament book Genesis 1:27), because humans are like God. When His image is placed in humanity, a tacit antithesis is introduced, which raises humanity above all other creatures and separates humans from other creatures. This thought derived from Institutes begins our recovery through a restoration or regeneration which the Second Christ, Jesus Christ works to restore humans to a true and complete relationship with God. Christ can potentially transform us to God’s image, which brings us full circle to placing us in the likeness of God. What is important to note in opposition to Stoic thought is that the transformative power to make humans in the likeness or image of God comes from outside the human ability to Reason it.

This concept of restoration or regeneration is vitally important to the Christian faith. Through this thought, humanity is made to conform to God, not by an in-flowing of substance, but by the grace and power of the Spirit. Adam destroyed us with himself; but Christ restores us to salvation through grace. In Calvin’s thought, virtuous living is not attained through Reason and overcoming our temporal nature through willing our thoughts. Stoics taught that humans alone have the power to will human thought in order to become virtuous, Calvin would have taught this is not possible without the grace of God intervening and transforming the human spirit. Having recognized human sinful nature, humans are able to overcome human nature through the grace of God found in Jesus Christ. This concept is supported by this quote: “Because of the bondage of sin by which is held bound, it cannot move toward good, much less apply itself thereto: for a movement of this sort is the beginning of conversion to God, which in Scripture is ascribed entirely to God’s grace”.¹⁸ It is not within human power to become virtuous as the Stoics taught, but only through the grace of God can humans be transformed to the image or likeness of God.

The following quote from Calvin’s Institutes perfectly sums up his thinking on how the spirit and the grace of God together transform humanity’s corrupted nature into a good nature capable of overcoming self-indulgent behavior: “By which divine grace corrects and cures the corruption of nature....When the apostle tells the Philippians he is confident ‘that he who began a good work in you will bring it to completion at the day of Jesus Christ’ [New Testament, Philippians. 1:6], there is no doubt that through ‘the beginning of a good work’ he denotes the very origin of conversion itself, which is in the will. God begins his good work in us, therefore, by arousing love and desire and zeal for righteousness in our hearts; or, to speak more correctly, by bending, forming, and directing, our hearts to righteousness. He completes his work, moreover, by confirming us to perseverance. In order that no one should make an excuse that good is initiated by the Lord to help the will which by itself is weak, the Spirit elsewhere declares what the will,

left to itself, is capable of doing: ‘A new heart shall I give you, and will put a new spirit within you; and I will remove the heart of stone from your flesh, and give you a heart of flesh. And I shall put my spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes’ [Old Testament, Ezekiel. 36:26-27].... I will not deny that man’s heart can be molded to obey the right, provided what is imperfect in him be supplied by God’s grace...I also say that it is created anew; not meaning that the will now begins to exist, but that it is changed from an evil to a good will. I affirm that this is wholly God’s doing, for according to the testimony of the same apostle, ‘we are not even capable of thinking’ [New Testament Epistle, II Corinthians. 3:5]. Therefore he states in another place that God not only assists the weak will or corrects the depraved will, but also works in us such that everything good in the will is the work of grace alone.” 19

Calvin believed that human hearts could be molded to obey the right, provided what was imperfect in humans be transformed by God’s grace. Amid the human corrupted nature is some place for God’s transforming grace, which opens the human spirit to the possibility for good and service to others. The essential important difference between what Calvin taught and what the Stoics taught is that the will to transform is not within human power, it comes from the grace of God discovered in the transforming example of Jesus Christ. The desire to serve humanity comes from an outside source, God’s grace, which then through the spirit, transforms the natural human corrupted condition.

In conclusion to this part of the argument the concept of regenerating the soul needs to be introduced: “Regeneration is the beginning of a new life in which the believer and the believer’s works are justified by faith alone in the sense that the righteousness of Jesus Christ covers one’s former sinfulness before God.” 20 This important Christian tenant teaches that a new spirit is placed in humans hearts which enables humans to transcend the self centered human nature. To be regenerated or born from the spirit is a vitally important component to understanding Christian faith. Humans are incapable of striving to be god-like unless humans are inspired from the spirit found in Jesus Christ or affected by the grace of God discovered in Jesus Christ. The distinction can be made between Stoic high-minded thought and Reformed Christian thought. The transforming spirit does not come through the human will, as Cicero and Marcus Aurelius taught, but it is derived from the grace of God found in Jesus Christ.

PART III

How all this affects collective and individual cosmopolitan thought will now be explored in the final argument of Part III. Reinhold Niebuhr was an authority on human nature and his thought was in agreement with John Calvin’s. Consequently, he is a strong theologian to introduce in this final portion of the paper. Reinhold Niebuhr was a German American Protestant theologian who gave much thought to the essential nature of the human condition. He was born in Wright City, Missouri in 1892 and became the foremost public theologian in the United States during the first half of the twentieth century. He entered Eden Seminary in St. Louis and later Yale Divinity School in order to sharpen his scholarly acumen and learn the Reformed Tradition. His greatest work, The Nature and Destiny of Man was first delivered in Edinburgh, Scotland, in the year of 1941 under the title of The Gifford Lectures.

Niebuhr believed that all human achievements, even the best intentioned and most gracious, are marred by human limitation, flawed by human finiteness, capable of equations of exploitation and destruction. However, this is not the final end for Niebuhr in that he taught that the realm of human struggle allowed for human freedom to act, to aspire to the good, and to seek fulfillment. For Niebuhr, faith in God's saving grace is the crucial thread in the complex fabric of self, society, history and God's Kingdom on earth. Niebuhr wove together his lifelong dedication to great thoughts as one of the greatest modern theologians to ever write. He was focused intensely on the nature of the human condition.

One of the greatest impediments to becoming truly cosmopolitan in nature is the existential fact that the human condition is essentially self-centered or sinful in its nature. Both Calvin and Niebuhr taught this vitally important concept. No matter which world culture one studies, the essential nature and destiny of humanity is the same: the human condition is self-absorbed and self-centered. The Stoics would support this concept through the realization that humanity is trapped in the temporal and only through Reason can it will its thinking to become virtuous in nature. However, basic Christian doctrine would never support this idea and can only accept God's grace, acting through the spirit, as being the transformer of human nature. This portion of the paper supports this position and both Calvin and Niebuhr are in agreement in regards to how the spirit is transformed. Niebuhr further supports Calvin's argument with the following quote: "Intellectual pride is thus the pride of reason which forgets that it is involved in a temporal process and imagines itself in complete transcendence over history. The Christian doctrine of original sin with its seemingly contradictory assertions about the inevitability of sin and man's responsibility for sin is a dialectical truth which does justice to the fact that man's self-love and self-centeredness is inevitable and a natural necessity." 21

Acceptance of both Calvin's and Niebuhr's basic premise, the human condition is basically self centered, enables expansion of the argument to include larger bodies of humanity, namely governments. One can extrapolate the argument to include governmental structures on a world level. If governments are composed of individuals who are innately sinful, then how can one expect governments to rise above self centered collective behavior? If we are ever going to have a cosmopolitan world government, which is the final argument in this paper, then we must find some possibility to transcend our basic human sinful nature collectively. In the book Realizing Rawls, Thomas W. Pogge states the following: "There are no realistic prospects of establishing peace through a world state, because no national government can come to rule the world without a global war, and the strongest governments won't allow the creation of independent effective mechanisms of adjudication and enforcement."22 The truth is manifest in that governments will never allow cosmopolitan structures because of states' self interests. Charles R. Beitz in his book Political Theory and International Relations makes note of the argument that political realism makes a strong argument against a cosmopolitan world structure: "Any attempt to lay the groundwork for normative international political theory must face the fact that there is a substantial body of thought, often referred to as 'political realism,' that denies this possibility. Skepticism about international morality derives from a variety of sources, such as

cultural relativism, apprehension about the effects of ‘moralism’ on foreign policy, the view that rulers have an overriding obligation to follow the national interest, and the idea that there can be no moral principles of universal application in a world order of sovereign states.”²³ He furthermore adds that: “Leaders should follow the national interest because that is their obligation as holders of the people’s trust...that is that a state is always morally justified in acting to promote its perceived interests.”²⁴ Hence, it is possible to conclude that taking into consideration individual sinfulness, governmental leaders are not capable of acting on behalf of the people they represent without a self-serving bias. This self-serving bias would make it difficult to ever have a world governmental structure develop and be effective on a global level.

Hobbe’s psychological egoism supports the view that, “his theory of obligation is purely prudential; people have no obligation to perform actions when performance cannot be shown to advance their (long-range) self-interests.”²⁵ From the point of view of self-interest, humans choose that action or policy which best serves one’s individual interests. The principle would also apply to states in that leaders respond with the self interest of the overall state in mind. This understanding of human nature is consistent with Calvin’s concept of the ‘total depravity of humanity’ which is sinful in nature. If cosmopolitan moral rules must advance the interests of everyone to whom they apply and Beitz says all states will act out of self-interest, then the argument concludes that there is no possibility for an international cosmopolitan governmental structures. If this is the argument in political theory which is most concrete, then it is nearly impossible to see how a cosmopolitan world structure could ever become a human norm.

However, there is one argument that has been titled *modus vivendi* which states the following: “The participants in a *modus vivendi* are primarily motivated by their own self-defined interests and do not much care about one another’s interests as such. Yet each has reason to support a shared institutional scheme--that is, a system of rules and conventions, practices and procedures, organs and offices--that accommodates the interests of other parties to the point where they find it in their best interest to participate as well. On the surface, a *modus vivendi* is then an agreement among a plurality of parties to restrain their competitive behavior in certain ways. Since the scheme is to be designed so that continued participation is in each party’s best interest, the terms of the scheme must satisfy the condition of prudential equilibrium, that is, must be such that all parties have reason to participate on the going terms.”²⁶

This concept takes into consideration Calvin’s notion of self-centered human nature in that all are motivated to participate in a *modus vivendi* because it is mutually advantageous to the parties involved. Self interest can be taken into consideration and each party derives a net benefit from participation in the *modus vivendi* as compared to remaining in total isolation from the other committed parties. Under this argument for a cosmopolitan world structure, the human sinful nature is taken into account and understood as the one factor that could keep governments negotiating at the table. However, Beitz finally concludes that: “In international relations, there is no similar sense of community; nor are most people moved to act by any commitment to ideals like global justice. One might think that the world is simply too large, and its cultures too diverse, to support a global sense of justice. ...Thus, it is unlikely that a sense of global

community comparable to the sense of national community will develop.” 27

The final chapter of Niebuhr’s Moral Man and Immoral Society is entitled ‘*The Conflict Between Individual and Social Morality.*’ This is an appropriate source from which to conclude this very detailed argument of the nature of humanity and the possibility of cosmopolitan community on a world wide basis. The chapter begins: “A realistic analysis of the problems of human society reveals a constant and seemingly irreconcilable conflict between the needs of society and the imperatives of a sensitive conscience. This conflict, which could be most briefly defined as the conflict between ethics and politics, is made inevitable by the double focus of the moral life. One focus is in the inner life of the individual, and the other in the necessities of man’s social life. From the perspective of society the highest moral ideal is justice. From the perspective of the individual the highest ideal is unselfishness. Society must strive for justice even if it is forced to use means, such as self-assertion, resistance, coercion and perhaps resentment, which cannot gain that moral sanction of the most sensitive moral spirit. The individual must strive to realize his life by losing and finding himself in something greater than himself. These two moral perspectives are not mutually exclusive and the contradiction between them is not absolute. But neither are they easily harmonized.” 28

Conclusion

To conclude this paper by saying that the individual’s interests and the states’ interests are not easily harmonized is not a fitting ending to the arguments presented in this paper. To summarize the thoughts presented in Parts I and II, one could argue there are a great many similarities between the two traditions of thought. Both basically taught that humans are to strive for certain objectives in living. The Stoics believed the goal was living virtuously, through Reason or thought, removing the temporal desires and concerns from life which enabled humans to live for others or fellow human beings. The Christian tradition, represented by John Calvin’s Reformed thought, taught much of the same concept in regards to living for objectives. The objective in Christian thought is focused on Christ and living a Godly, Christ centered life, synonymous in many ways with living virtuously. Both of these traditions have as an objective service to our fellow human beings as an ultimate priority. In order to serve purely human self interests need to be bridled and sacrificed for the higher good of serving others. The one major objection which John Calvin would certainly have voiced in opposition to Stoic thought is the means as to how self interest and temporal concerns are bridled.

The Stoics taught that the will to overcome self interest came from within the human condition. Reason was the source of power within the soul that could control behavior and thoughts to the ends of virtuous living. Whereas Calvin was certain that the will to overcome self interest came from God through the means of Christ’s transforming example and the grace of God. The human spirit or soul was transformed by the grace of God and self interest was then sacrificed for the greater good of service to fellow human beings. The Stoic and Christian tradition are therefore realistic in regards to the nature of the human condition, but at odds as to how that human nature might be transformed. Consequently, the individual is capable of becoming cosmopolitan to varying degrees; however, our human nature is not naturally inclined to becoming cosmopolitan.

Seriously taking into consideration human nature, it is difficult to see a world cosmopolitan structure developing. States in such a political structure could consistently be counted upon to act according to the interest's of their human populations. The self interest of the state would always come before the interests of the commonwealth structure. To further compound the matter the leadership of the states could always be expected to respond out of their individual self interest. The daily newspapers are continually reminding the reader of the truth in this statement. Consequently, a cosmopolitan world order could never succeed based upon what this paper has explored in regard to human nature.

Modus vivendi is one hopeful idea which realistically takes into consideration human nature at the world negotiating table. Because there is more to be gained by staying in the cosmopolitan order than by dropping out into isolation, states are likely to participate. This simple principle takes into full consideration the nature of humanity. It acknowledges the human sinful condition, realizing individual and collective behavior is predictable when self interest is taken into consideration. Even with this glimmer of hope the probability that humans will currently participate in a cosmopolitan world order is marginal at best.

However, this does not mean that the human condition has finally evolved. The introduction of new genetic material into the current gene pool is not likely to happen because most all human populations have been discovered. Therefore, the hope is that our behavior can continue to evolve in a virtuous or Christ-like Godly manner. Humans have moved in a positive direction over the past 3 million years, who know what the future holds. With the advent of high speed communication humans are more likely to avoid war and miscommunication through immediate responses. God has been the divine spark luring the process of evolution forward to this point. The process will continue to evolve in a divine, loving and virtuous manner. Consequently, there is hope that Reason will prevail and cosmopolitanism will one day be the norm for all humans and all human community.

NOTES

1. Long, A.A. & Sedley, D.N.. *The Hellenistic Philosophers, Volume 1*. Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1987. p.383
2. Cicero, Marcus, T. *On Duties*. Edited by M.T. Griffin & E.M. Atkins. Mass: Cambridge University Press, 1991. p.39-41
3. Hundersmarck, Lawrence F. *Great Thinkers of the Western World*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1992. p. 21
4. Cicero, Marcus, T. *On Duties*. Edited by M.T. Griffin & E.M. Atkins. Mass : Cambridge University Press, 1991. p.28
5. *ibid* p.83
6. *ibid*, p.22
7. Aurelius, Marcus. *The Meditations of Aurelius, Marcus*. Translated by G.M.A. Grube. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 1983. p.100
8. *ibid*, Book III p.23
9. *ibid*, p.33
10. *ibid*, p. 54
11. Long, A.A. & Sedley, D.N. *The Hellenistic Philosophers, Volume 1*. Mass : Cambridge University Press, 1987. p. 353
12. Aurelius, Marcus. *The Meditations of Aurelius, Marcus*. Translated by G.M.A. Grube. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 1983. p.72
13. Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John T. McNeill. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1940. Book I, Chapter III, p.46
14. *ibid*, Book I, Chapter XV, section I p 183
15. *ibid*, Book II, Chapter I, Section 5 p. 246-248
16. *ibid*, Book II Chapter I Sec. 7 p.251
17. *ibid*, Book II, Chapter III p.289
18. *ibid*, Book II Chapter III Section 5 p.294
19. *ibid*, Book II Chapter III, Sec. 6 P.298
20. Allen, Loyd W.. *Great Thinkers of the Western World*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1992. p.157
21. Niebuhr, Reinhold. *The Nature and Destiny of Man, Vol. 1 Human Nature*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941. p.263
22. Pogge, Thomas W. *Realizing Rawls*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1989. p.222
23. Beitz, Charles R. *Political Theory and International Relations*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1979. p. 13
24. *ibid*, p.24-25
25. *ibid* p.30
26. Pogge, Thomas W.. *Realizing Rawls*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1989. p.219
27. Beitz, Charles R. *Political Theory and International Relations*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1979. p.64, p.155
28. Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932. p.257

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aurelius, Marcus. *The Meditations of Aurelius, Marcus*. Translated by G.M.A. Grube. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 1983.

Beitz, Charles R. *Political Theory and International Relations*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John T. McNeill. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1940.

Cicero, Marcus, T. *On Duties*. Edited by M.T. Griffin & E.M. Atkins. Mass : Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Long, A.A. & Sedley, D.N.. *The Hellenistic Philosophers, Volume 1*. Mass : Cambridge University Press, 1987.

McGreal, Ian P. Editor. *Great Thinkers of the Western World*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, 1992.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1932.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. *The Nature and Destiny of Man, Vol. 1 Human Nature*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1941.

Pogge, Thomas W. *Realizing Rawls*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1989.

The philosophical concepts of Emmanuel Levinas, on ethics, and Jacques Derrida, on hospitality, provide a theoretical framework for the relationships between people in their everyday lives and apart from any form of written laws or codes. 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 [citation needed]. More general philosophical reviews of cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism are also available. Carol Nicholson compares John Searle's opposition to multiculturalism with Charles Taylor's celebration of it. Cosmopolitanism is a moral perspective that emphasizes the inherent worthiness of human beings regardless of their location. It takes as its community the entire planet, a perspective that puts it at odds with the nation-state. Cosmopolitans argue that empathy does not decline with distance and that national borders are artificial constructions that unnecessarily divide peoples and demonize those on the other side. This entry summarizes the history of cosmopolitanism, starting with the classical Greeks and Stoics and the Kantian version that emerged during the Enlightenment. It notes that the philosophical concepts of Emmanuel Levinas, on ethics, and Jacques Derrida, on hospitality, provide a theoretical framework for the relationships between people in their everyday lives and apart from any form of written laws or codes. For Levinas, the foundation of ethics consists in the obligation to respond to the Other. 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.[5]. On the Taxonomy of Cosmopolitanisms. On Contemporary Cosmopolitanisms, For and Against. Academic Tools. The historical context of the philosophical resurgence of cosmopolitanism during the Enlightenment is made up of many factors: The increasing rise of capitalism and world-wide trade and its theoretical reflections; the reality of ever expanding empires whose reach extended across the globe; the voyages around the world and the anthropological so-called "discoveries" facilitated through these; the renewed interest in Hellenistic philosophy; and the emergence of a notion of human rights and a philosophical focus on human reason. Kant also introduced the concept of "cosmopolitan law," suggesting a third sphere of cosmopolitanism is a demanding and contentious moral position. It urges us to embrace the whole world into our moral concerns and to apply the standards of impartiality and equity across boundaries of nationality, race, religion or gender in a way that would have been unheard of even fifty years ago. It suggests a range of virtues which the cosmopolitan individual should display: virtues such as tolerance, justice, pity, righteous indignation at injustice, generosity toward the poor and starving, care for the global environment, and the willingness to take responsibility for change on a global