

2007

# A Pragmatist Cosmopolitan Moment: Reconfiguring Nussbaum's Cosmopolitan Concentric Circles

Marilyn Fischer

*University of Dayton*, [mfischer1@udayton.edu](mailto:mfischer1@udayton.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://ecommons.udayton.edu/phl\\_fac\\_pub](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/phl_fac_pub)



Part of the [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#)

---

## eCommons Citation

Fischer, Marilyn, "A Pragmatist Cosmopolitan Moment: Reconfiguring Nussbaum's Cosmopolitan Concentric Circles" (2007).  
*Philosophy Faculty Publications*. 135.  
[http://ecommons.udayton.edu/phl\\_fac\\_pub/135](http://ecommons.udayton.edu/phl_fac_pub/135)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Philosophy at eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Philosophy Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of eCommons. For more information, please contact [frice1@udayton.edu](mailto:frice1@udayton.edu), [mschlangen1@udayton.edu](mailto:mschlangen1@udayton.edu).

A Pragmatist Cosmopolitan Moment:

Reconfiguring Nussbaum's Cosmopolitan Concentric Circles

Marilyn Fischer, Ph.D.

University of Dayton

Abstract

Robert Fine and Robin Cohen conclude their essay, "Four Cosmopolitan Moments," by stating that developing cosmopolitanism "has become an urgent moral necessity" (2002, 162). As resources for this task they offer the Stoics, Kant, Arendt, and Nussbaum as particularly important "moments" in the history of cosmopolitanism. In this paper I suggest a large project and carry out a small part of it. The large project is to propose early twentieth-century American pragmatism as another "cosmopolitan moment." The small project is to use essays written around the time of World War One by Randolph Bourne, W.E.B. DuBois, and Jane Addams to assess the Stoic metaphor of cosmopolitan, concentric circles of affiliation. Using Nussbaum's presentation of this metaphor to focus the discussion, I show how these pragmatist cosmopolitans unsettle Nussbaum's implicit background assumptions that the circles are conceptually distinct, and that the way to develop allegiance to the widest circle of humanity is through Kantian rationality. This small project will demonstrate how a pragmatist cosmopolitan moment can be a fruitful resource for today's "new cosmopolitans."

A Pragmatist Cosmopolitan Moment:  
Reconfiguring Nussbaum's Cosmopolitan Concentric Circles

Marilyn Fischer, Ph.D.

Robert Fine and Robin Cohen conclude their essay, "Four Cosmopolitan Moments," by stating that developing cosmopolitanism "has become an urgent moral necessity" (2002, 162). As resources for this task they offer the Stoics, Kant, Arendt, and Nussbaum as particularly important "moments" in the history of cosmopolitanism. David Held shares their sense of urgency, but worries that a Kantian understanding of political communities gives an inadequate basis for this task (2002, 57). David Hollinger identifies as "new cosmopolitans" an array of scholars who articulate alternatives to Nussbaum's universalism and Kymlicka's pluralism, in attempting "to connect the notion of a species-wide community to actual politics, to the complex of possibilities and restraints found on the ground" (2001, 238). Noting these scholars' penchant for attaching adjectives to "cosmopolitanism," Hollinger lists their modifiers as including 'vernacular,' 'rooted,' 'critical,' 'comparative,' 'national,' 'discrepant,' 'situated,' and 'actually existing' (2001, 237).

In this paper I suggest a large project and carry out a small part of it. The large project is to propose early twentieth-century American pragmatism as another "cosmopolitan moment." Several of the early pragmatists were engaged in precisely the task Hollinger describes above of connecting a species-wide community to on-the-ground politics; their work could serve as a historical resource for today's new cosmopolitans. The small project is to use essays written around the time of World War One by Randolph Bourne, W.E.B. DuBois, and Jane Addams, three American pragmatists and public intellectuals, to assess the Stoic metaphor of

cosmopolitan, concentric circles of affiliation. Using Nussbaum's presentation of this metaphor to focus the discussion, I will show how these pragmatist cosmopolitans unsettle Nussbaum's implicit background assumptions that the circles are conceptually distinct, and that the way to develop allegiance to the widest circle of humanity is through Kantian rationality. This small project will demonstrate how a pragmatist cosmopolitan moment can be a fruitful resource for today's new cosmopolitans.

### **I. A Pragmatist Cosmopolitan Moment**

Global interconnectedness, wide-scale migration, the morally problematic character of national sovereignty, and the growing global gap between rich and poor motivate many of today's scholars of cosmopolitanism. In their introduction to *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism* Vertovec and Cohen write that "only a cosmopolitan outlook can accommodate itself to the political challenges of a more global era, marked by the overlapping communities of fate, multi-layered politics and new identity formations" (2002, 21). While these issues take distinctive forms today, they are not new, but were debated vigorously in the early twentieth century. Migration was widespread, not only to the United States, and not only from Europe (Guarneri, 2007, 170-186; Takaki 1993). John Hobson's widely-read *Imperialism* (1902), from which Lenin drew heavily, expressly connected economic imperialism with military force and empire-building. Before and during World War I many prominent intellectuals debated whether national sovereignty was a morally harmful anachronism and whether the harm could be mitigated by transnational institutions of global governance (see, for example, Dickinson, 1914, 1915; Russell 1917). Resources from the early twentieth-century can provide patterns to stimulate creative thought about contemporary world conditions.

Pragmatism is particularly well-suited for theorizing about on-the-ground realities. For pragmatists, theory is intimately and integrally connected with practice. Using Darwinian evolutionary thinking as a pattern, pragmatists stress context and process, conceiving of inquiry as experimental, and knowledge as reconstruction. Pragmatists view an organism, an individual agent, or an institution in terms of its continuing interaction and engagement with its physical and cultural environment (Dewey 1916, 146; 1917, 7-9, 26). Historical processes are constitutive; what a thing “is” is never static, but grows out of past interactions and engages in continual reconstruction, as organism and environment continually modify each other. Ends are shaped by the means used to attain them (Dewey 1916, 112-113); it is futile to theorize about cosmopolitanism as a goal without also attending to the means for attaining it.

Pragmatism contrasts with liberal perspectives by decentering and contextualizing individuals and institutions. For example, pragmatists appreciate individual autonomy, but rather than casting it in the lead role, as David Held does, they define and assess autonomy in terms of an individual’s specifically located, on-going interactions within given social and physical environments (D. Held 1995, 221-225; Dewey 1935, 34-40). Pragmatists think of institutions as concentrations of habits, which bear strongly the imprints of political power, personalities, and specific historical events (Dewey 1927, 287-89, 325-26). Kok-Chor Tan, in *Justice Without Borders*, gives his spotlight to principles of global justice as he investigates institutional structures (2004, 21-28). Pragmatists appreciate this focus on institutions, but offset investigations of abstract principles of justice with careful historical analysis.

I think it is particularly important to add this pragmatist cosmopolitan moment to the study of cosmopolitanism because of the way its historical context challenges conceptions of cosmopolitanism that draw heavily on Kant and the Enlightenment. With World War One the

mask of western civilization split wide open, exposing the fragility of enlightenment progress and reason. Historian Barbara Tuchman writes, “The Great War of 1914-1918 lies like a band of scorched earth dividing that time from ours” (1994, xi). French writer Paul Valéry remarked soon after the war, “We modern civilizations have learned to recognize that we are mortal like the others. . . . And now we see that the abyss of history is deep enough to bury all the world. We feel that a civilization is fragile as a life” (1919). Cosmopolitan theorists who stress the Stoics, Kant, and Nussbaum, three of Fine and Cohen’s cosmopolitan moments, need to confront and come to terms with the lessons of World War One.

## **II. A Pragmatist Critique of Nussbaum’s Cosmopolitan Concentric Circles**

To demonstrate the potential of this pragmatist cosmopolitan moment, I will use the cosmopolitan thinking of Bourne, DuBois, and Addams to critique the metaphor of cosmopolitan concentric circles. Metaphors both advance and cloud our thinking. These pragmatists help us see how this metaphor, with its image of movement from center to periphery, turns our attention away from historical, transnational links of affiliation and horror, and masks how the most intimate circles, including the self, can be shaped and distorted by actions at the periphery. Nussbaum’s use of the metaphor provides a good focus, not only because she figures prominently in discussions of cosmopolitanism, but also because, unlike many other discussants but of central importance to pragmatists, she elaborates on how to get from here to there with her extensive discussions of multicultural education.<sup>i</sup>

Nussbaum does not discuss Arendt in *Cultivating Humanity*, but her work rests on Fine and Cohen’s other two cosmopolitan moments: the Stoics and Kant.<sup>ii</sup> In explaining her vision of cosmopolitanism, Nussbaum takes us back to the Stoics and their image of concentric circles of affiliation, going from self and family, out to the nation, and finally to the widest circle that

embraces all of humanity. Nussbaum recommends we adopt Stoic cosmopolitanism and, like Diogenes, become “citizens of the world” (1997, 52). We should give priority to the widest circle because our affiliation with the whole of humanity is based on universal principles of justice and equality. Throughout the book Nussbaum acknowledges that the circle lines are permeable, and that we need to learn to work over and through them (115). Nonetheless, her discussion assumes that these lines, while bridgeable, are conceptually distinct. She gives the Stoics’ image of concentric circles and their conception of cosmopolitanism her strongest endorsement, stating, “These ideas are an essential resource for democratic citizenship. Like Socrates’ ideal of critical inquiry, they should be at the core of today’s higher education” (53).

I admire *Cultivating Humanity* for its strong defense of multicultural education.

Addressed to critics, Nussbaum demonstrates how to value the western canon and traditional disciplines while presenting clearly and emphatically how citizens of today’s world need the knowledge and sensitivities that come with multicultural and interdisciplinary perspectives. I imagine Bourne, DuBois, and Addams would appreciate these things as well, while still criticizing the image of concentric circles and the Kantian rationality that are foundational perspectives for Nussbaum’s book. For this project I chose these three pragmatists, rather than the better-known James, Dewey, Mead or Royce, because they, more than the latter group, based their cosmopolitanism on their own lived experience. All were “outsiders” because of physical disability, race, or gender.<sup>iii</sup> Bourne died young, but DuBois and Addams drew on decades of social justice activism on the local, national, and international levels in developing their conceptions of cosmopolitanism. Also, their cosmopolitanism strongly shaped their responses to World War One. Bourne and Addams on pragmatist grounds remained pacifists through the war at great personal cost. DuBois supported the US entry into the war, but his reasoning differed

greatly from Dewey, Mead, and other supporters of President Wilson's war to "make the world safe for democracy" (Lewis, 515-16, 525-26).

### **Bourne's Transnational Tapestry**

The pragmatist cosmopolitan moment of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century came at a time of heavy immigration to the United States. The majority of these immigrants were Catholics and Jews from Southern and Eastern Europe. Already suspect, pressure on these groups to conform intensified as World War I unfolded, as many of them came from areas aligned with the Central Powers. (See Menand, 2001, Chapter 14; Vaughan 446-49). Israel Zangwill gave the assimilationists their reigning metaphor with his 1908 play, "The Melting Pot." Randolph S. Bourne entered this debate with his 1916 *Atlantic Monthly* article, "Trans-National America." Bourne had studied the works of William James, John Dewey, and Josiah Royce at Columbia University (Clayton 1984, 69-75). Like Addams, Bourne remained a pacifist during World War One and in "War and the Intellectuals" (1917) gave a scathing critique of Dewey's support for the war, arguing that it could not be justified on pragmatist grounds.<sup>iv</sup>

Bourne begins "Trans-National America" by declaring bluntly that there is no melting pot in America; immigrants have never "melted" or assimilated to the prevailing culture, nor is it desirable that they do so. The earliest European immigrants had had no intention of melting or assimilating to the Native Americans. They and their descendants held onto their Anglo-Saxon customs with a tenacity rarely matched in Britain itself. Bourne thought that calls for assimilation and Americanization were in fact attempts to impose Anglo-Saxon culture on other groups (1916a, 87-89).<sup>v</sup>

Bourne writes, "There is no distinctively American culture. It is apparently our lot to be a federation of cultures" (91). He notes that subsequent immigrant groups—Germans,

Scandinavians, Bohemians, and Polish people—brought their cultural practices with them and maintained their ethnic affinities, not rigidly, but in a way Bourne describes as “distinct but cooperating.” Subsequent generations used their cultural traditions as creative materials, both maintaining and recrafting them in a “fluid and dynamic” process. These groups provide the energy and vitality to “cross-fertilize” Anglo-Saxon customs and keep them from stagnating (88-90).

Because this pattern was being replicated by immigrants from many nations, Bourne calls the United States “the first international nation,” and “a cosmopolitan federation of national colonies” (93). In contrast to Horace Kallen’s pluralist vision of a patchwork nation of separate enclaves (Kallen 1915), Bourne envisions a tapestry with ethnic threads interwoven, but still distinct. However, these threads are not tied off at geographical boundary lines. Bourne’s image is an international tapestry, in which the threads of America’s fabric extend to its inhabitants’ many cultures and places of origin. He writes, “America is coming to be, not a nationality but a trans-nationality, a weaving back and forth, with the other lands, of many threads of all sizes and colors” (1916a, 96). The tapestry’s strength is reinforced by the many inhabitants who hold “dual citizenship,” at least in the cultural sense of maintaining personal and cultural affiliations in both the United States and abroad. Bourne specifically mentions unskilled migrant laborers, so despised by assimilationists, as particularly important transmitters of cosmopolitanism, as they migrate back and forth between the US and their countries of origin (95-6).

While Bourne thought transnationalism was to a degree already achieved in America, it was also an ideal toward which America should continue to strive. Troubled by coercive measures toward assimilation, Bourne explicitly defines progress toward this cosmopolitan ideal in terms of social justice, of excluding economic exploitation at home and abroad, and of

opposing militarism (93). Writing before the US entered World War I, Bourne sees American transnationalism as a creative alternative to the clashing nationalisms then fueling the war in Europe (91). In a 1916 speech, “The Jew and Transnational America,” Bourne worried that the uniform culture sought by assimilationists would be easily swayed by nationalist calls for war. By contrast, a tapestry of cultural groups holding “dual citizenship” would be a resource for peace (1916b, 277-78). The creative energy released through cross-cultural encounters could give participants a path toward a Roycean “Beloved Community,” and “the new spiritual citizenship . . . of a world” (1916a, 97, 96).<sup>vi</sup>

Bourne’s pragmatist sensibility is at work here, with James’s “multiverse” providing the pattern (James 1909, 146; Vaughan 452). Transnational communities and selves emerge when people from different cultural groups meet and live in shared spaces. Cultures are not static, but change over time, as foods, music, family customs, and work patterns are juxtaposed. For pragmatists, the “new” is stitched into and around habits carried from the past, sometimes easily, sometimes through painful reconstruction. Jaggedness often remains. For Bourne and for pragmatists, the past can be and needs to be continually reconstructed, but it is a tragedy when it is bleached out. The assimilationist’s ideal is insipid, Bourne thinks, when “distinctive qualities (are) washed out into a tasteless, colorless fluid of uniformity” (1916a, 90).

Bourne’s transnationalism challenges the cosmopolitan concentric circle metaphor at each turn. In many locations, the “local”, both in the community and in the self, is heterogeneous, containing within itself strands from multiple cultures. These strands of affection, affiliation, and tension go past and through nation-state lines, reaching out into the world. This makes Bourne’s cosmopolitanism both narrower and wider than Nussbaum’s. It is narrower in not asking individuals to be citizens of the whole world, identified with everyone; it

is wider in that selves, communities and nations are themselves cosmopolitan. By contrast, the cosmopolitan figures in Nussbaum's widest circle of humanity are wispy, vague creatures. Using Stoic and Kantian perspectives, Nussbaum describes the members of this widest circle with phrases such as: "humanity—and its fundamental ingredients, reason and moral capacity" (1997, 58-9); "the community of human argument and aspiration that 'is truly great and truly common'" (52); and "the moral community made up by the humanity of all human beings" (59). She never says the widest circle is made up of actual living, breathing, embodied human beings, i.e., the beings with whom we will need to live cooperatively while working toward justice and peace. Bourne's cosmopolitanism is descriptive of how some people already live as embodied, creative, and evolving selves, and also articulates an ideal to strive toward, containing within it a vision of a pacifist, just world.

### **DuBois and the Tapestry of Shame**

DuBois's 1915 essay, "The African Roots of War," ends with glowing cosmopolitan sentiments. "If we want real peace and lasting culture," he writes, "we must extend the democratic ideal to the yellow, brown, and black peoples" (1915, 712). His vision is of "a new peace and a new democracy of all races: a great humanity of equal men" (714). Nussbaum refers approvingly to DuBois's "inclusive, humanistic vision of culture" (1997, 150). DuBois's pragmatist sensibilities are evident in this essay. He is working with a pragmatist conception of democracy, very close to that of Dewey and Addams (Campbell 1992, 572). Campbell notes several parallels between DuBois and James; for both, the self contains multiple selves, and both envision a pluralist society containing multiple social or national ideals (573-73). Posnock suggests that DuBois's pragmatism is better understood as "a creative revisionary practice," and "a temperament, a mode of conduct," rather than a set of principles or beliefs (1999, 34, 35), as

DuBois mines suggestive wisdom from Hegel, Marx, Freud, and other theoretical and empirical resources.<sup>vii</sup>

DuBois's explanation for World War I shows how the cosmopolitan concentric circle model is historically naive, and masks how global exploitation of "the darker races" is deeply implicated both in national institutions and culture, and in the very construction of white people's selves. The root cause of the war, DuBois claims, was the so-called scramble for Africa and Asia. Between 1885 and 1914 the imperial powers of Europe carved up virtually all of Africa and much of Asia among themselves. The US, as an emerging world power, acquired Puerto Rico, Cuba, and the Philippines from Spain (Hobsbawm, 1987, 59). DuBois writes regarding Africa, "The methods by which this continent has been stolen have been contemptible and dishonest beyond expression. Lying treaties, rivers of rum, murder, assassination, mutilation, rape, and torture have marked the progress of Englishman, German, Frenchman, and Belgian on the dark continent" (1915, 708). Late nineteenth century imperialism was not new, but merely continued the centuries-long trauma of the trans-Atlantic slave trade, upon which the British Empire and the American Republic were built, and that left the African continent in ruin (708). Why the pillage? The West wanted Africa's rubber, cotton, ivory, gold, diamonds, and human labor power for its own project of modern industrialization (710). These nations' economies and cultures were constructed out of this history and functioned to sustain the exploitation.

Not only these modern nations' economies, but the growth of national democracy in Europe and the United States, was contingent upon this exploitation. DuBois explains that through the nineteenth century, working class people in Europe and the United States became less and less willing to see newly acquired and created wealth concentrated in the hands of

bourgeois employers. So wealth in the industrialized nations became “democratic” in the sense that the working class, or at least white, skilled workers, shared in the benefits that came from exploiting non-white races (709). DuBois calls this a “new democratic despotism.” Modern democracies, in spite of their rhetoric of freedom and equality, in fact function as a kind of reconfigured feudalism, with the few—in this case capital and skilled white labor, determining the fate of the many, i.e., “the darker races of the world” (709). National institutions and cultures of so-called democratic nations were shaped by past exploitation on a global scale and are maintained as this exploitation continues. DuBois gives a stunning definition of a nation when he writes, “Nations reel and stagger on their way; they make hideous mistakes; they commit frightful wrongs, they do great and beautiful things.” And then he asks, “And shall we not best guide humanity by telling the truth about all this, so far as the truth is ascertainable?” (1935, 714). These mistakes and the wrongs are of international dimension; if this defines the national circle, it is not something cosmopolitans should want to expand. I doubt that any sort of cosmopolitanism can be achieved until this truth is told and knit thoroughly into “reconstructed” national histories.

For DuBois the war was essentially an in-house fight among European powers over how colonial maps would be colored in and under whose control the natural resources and labor power of the native peoples would be placed (1920, 72). *That* these parts of the world would be under colonial control was not in question (65). To DuBois the awful slaughter of trench warfare was no surprise. “In the awful cataclysm of World War, where from beating, slandering, and murdering us the white world turned temporarily aside to kill each other, we of the Darker Peoples looked on in mild amaze. . . . (and) said: This is not Europe gone mad; this is not aberration nor insanity; this *is* Europe; this seeming Terrible is the real soul of white culture . . .

stripped and visible today” (60-62). The soul of white culture in imperial nations and their “greatness” are predicated on white entitlement to “the ownership of the earth” and to the natural resources and the labor of “the darker races.” Buried deep inside this entitlement is a passionate hatred of those they exploit (56). These crimes of exploitation reach to the very center of Nussbaum’s concentric circles, distorting the self. White people’s sense of entitlement to bodies, lands, and resources of non-white people is writ into their souls; the line of exploitation crosses right through all of the concentric circle lines (see Sullivan 2006). Until this entitlement ceases, war will not end nor can democracy be attained (DuBois 1920, 711-712).

DuBois’s poses a question that liberal cosmopolitans such as Nussbaum need to address directly: “How can love of humanity appeal as a motive to nations whose love of luxury is built on the inhuman exploitation of human beings?” (1915, 712). We can translate this question into the challenge: “Can a people become cosmopolitan until these intertwined local-national-global injustices are eliminated and replaced by just economic, social, and political relations?” The closest Nussbaum comes to discussing these issues is in her sentence, “We need to gain a more adequate understanding of non-Western cultures partly because in so doing we come to understand intellectual and moral wrongs in which our predecessors have been implicated” (1997, 116). Notice that Nussbaum refers to wrongs committed in the past. With DuBois’s historically-based analysis, her line between past and present does not hold. Past exploitations established structures of injustice that shape today’s policies, practices, and intellectual assumptions. Those included in the “we” of Nussbaum’s sentence should place the study historical interactions between western and non-western cultures within the larger project of restructuring currently unjust economic and political systems.

### **Addams: Becoming Cosmopolitan**

For both Nussbaum and Addams, cosmopolitanism is an achievement. But if Nussbaum's cosmopolitanism, by her own description, is lonely and abstract,<sup>viii</sup> Addams's cosmopolitanism is crowdedly social and concrete. Addams writes that she learned about cosmopolitanism by living in the Hull House neighborhood of Chicago. When she arrived there in 1889, 3/4 of the city's population was made up of immigrants and their children. In the nineteenth ward, over 44,000 people, representing eighteen different nationalities, lived together in overcrowded tenements (Knight, 2005, 179, 194).<sup>ix</sup> Addams spent her life fostering a cosmopolitanism that sounds remarkably close to David Held's description of cultural cosmopolitanism (2002, 57-8). Working at the local, national and international levels, she spent a lifetime demonstrating connections among cosmopolitanism, democracy, social justice, and peace in both word and in deed (Fischer 2006). In this section I will compare Nussbaum's and Addams's methodologies for becoming cosmopolitan.

Nussbaum identifies three capacities as essential to cultivating humanity and becoming a citizen of the world. Socrates' examined life is the model for the first, which Nussbaum describes as "the capacity for critical examination of oneself and one's traditions" (1997, 9). Exercising this capacity frees people's minds from "the bondage of habit and custom" (8) and opens the way for democratic citizens base political choices on justice and the common good, rather than their own self-interests (19). Second, people need to develop the capacity to see themselves and others as members of a Kantian kingdom of ends. Membership in this kingdom rests on what is most fundamental to humanity; "namely (people's) aspirations to justice and goodness and their capacities for reasoning in this connection" (60). Finally, to become citizens of the world, people need to cultivate a narrative imagination (Chapter 3). Nussbaum recommends literature and the arts as particularly effective means for doing this. They help

people develop understanding and compassion for others' situations and to see that all people share common vulnerabilities to dislocation, tragedy and death (90-93).

In discussing cosmopolitanism, Addams sometimes referred to fostering an "international mind." Her use of the term gave a gentle, ironic twist to its usual associations at that time. Nicholas Murray Butler, long-time president of Columbia University and a leader in prominent peace societies before World War One, gave the phrase its prominence (Butler 1912; Herman, 1969, Chapter 2). His image of internationally minded persons probably overlaps quite a bit with Nussbaum's: well educated and traveled; able to think past local and national affiliations and view matters from an international point of view. Addams, by contrast, looked to immigrant populations in large cities and to migrant workers to find internationally minded people.

In *Twenty Years at Hull House* Addams explains how her largely illiterate, uneducated, unsophisticated neighbors were achieving cosmopolitanism and thus were resources for peace. She writes,

I would cite the indications of an internationalism as sturdy and virile as it is unprecedented which I have seen in our cosmopolitan neighborhood: when a south Italian Catholic is forced by the very exigencies of the situation to make friends with an Austrian Jew representing another nationality and another religion, both of which cut into all his most cherished prejudices, he finds it harder to utilize them a second time and gradually loses them. He thus modifies his provincialism, for ...(his) old enemy working by his side has turned into a friend. . . . I hoped that this internationalism engendered in the immigrant quarters of American cities might be recognized as an effective instrument in the cause of peace" (1910, 178).

Addams's example here reflects the historic tensions between Austria and Italy dating back to the days of the Holy Roman Empire. Living side by side, working on shared projects, and finally, friendship brought these former enemies to the point where they could not imagine settling their differences by armed combat. This cosmopolitanism was enacted in the daily activities of Hull House; Shannon Jackson, for example, describes the Hull House theater as a performance of Hollinger's postethnicity (2000, 226). We can think of Addams's Hull House neighborhood as a historical predecessor to the cosmopolitan neighborhood Hiebert studied in Vancouver between 1996 and 2002 (2002), with Hull House providing the hospitality Hiebert recommends, as well as initiating the many agencies and social service practices that immigrants need.<sup>x</sup> Using a pragmatist understanding of democracy as a way of life, Addams viewed all the activities and initiatives of Hull House, not as philanthropy, but as enacting democratic citizenship (1910, 75-76).<sup>xi</sup>

Now Addams's cosmopolitan neighbors were people Nussbaum would include among "groups whose humanity has not always been respected in our society." In her discussion of the narrative imagination Nussbaum recommends poets and novelists because they "promote our sympathetic understanding of all outcast or oppressed people, by giving their strivings voice" (1997, 96). Addams would agree with this, but also would go beyond it. Yes, "habits and customs" can put a mind in bondage, as Nussbaum worries, but these same "habits and customs" can also be serviceable as rich resources for justice and peace. Because Addams's neighbors had immigrated, many from rural peasant European settings, to noisy, congested, industrialized Chicago, they had "an unusual mental alertness and power of perception" (1907, 12). And they brought gifts, a wealth of experiences from which middle-class Americans could learn. In one of many examples, Addams points to her Greek neighbors, who, benefiting from centuries of casual

interactions among peoples on both sides of the Mediterranean, brought “habits and customs” of dealing with race relations with more sophistication and ease than most white Americans (1910, 149).<sup>xii</sup>

Reflecting on her neighbors’ experiences, Addams came to see how intellect, emotion, and imagination could become cosmopolitan when engaged and transformed through concrete action. During World War I she extended this thinking to the international arena. Working with Herbert Hoover’s Food Administration, Addams encouraged women all over the United States to contribute to the effort to feed the hungry in Europe. Addams’s explanation brings together intellect, emotion, and action. She writes, “A great world purpose could not be achieved without woman’s participation founded upon an intelligent understanding and upon the widest sympathy, at the same time the demand could be met only if it were attached to her domestic routine, its very success depending upon a conscious change and modification of her daily habits” (1922, 47). That is, an “international mind” and cosmopolitan relations are fostered through a synthesis of intellect, sympathy, and daily practical activity, in this case, focused on meeting the most basic human needs. While it is anachronistic to call Addams an ethics of care theorist, much of her work anticipates that of contemporary scholars such as Fiona Robinson and Virginia Held who theorize the potential of care ethics for international relations and global transformation.<sup>xiii</sup>

One of Addams’s neighbors, looking up at Hull House’s new construction and down at the mire on the street, commented to Addams, “You can afford to spread out wide, you are so well planted in the mud” (1910, 90). Nussbaum, attentive though she is to cultural diversity, gives us a cosmopolitanism that is thin because it keeps trying to escape the mud of life. Her strategy is to use reason and narrative imagination to cut through what is “conventional and habitual,” beyond the “accidents of birth,” and to identify what all humans share: rationality,

moral capacity, and common human vulnerabilities to death and tragic loss. Now this is all very fine, but it misses many of the issues we must address to find justice and peace. While Nussbaum may be right that “where one is born is . . . an accident; any human being might have been born in any nation” (1997, 58), the conditions one enters because of that “accident” are not themselves accidental. The conditions one enters are shaped by history; today’s conditions were and are powerfully shaped by the national and international exploitation DuBois so vividly describes. And even though all humans share a common vulnerability to death, the time and cause of death are not common vulnerabilities. The millions who died on the middle passage or in King Leopold’s Belgian Congo, the millions of people who die each year from lack of potable water, and the tens of thousands dying now in Darfur, are just as dead as my grandmother who died a good death in her own time. Their deaths were and are unjust; hers was not.

I am not interested in debating whether what is most really real about humans is Kantian rationality and moral capacity. I do not think that question is helpful for what discussions of cosmopolitanism are trying to accomplish. If the point of such discussions is to lead to social justice and peace, then we want a description and conception of world citizenship for human beings who are planted in the mud: fully embodied, loving, hating, sometimes rational, sometimes not, strongly attached to their habits and conventions. Maybe in our minds we can strip all that away, but in real life, to find just and peaceful ways of living together, those are the very qualities we have to deal with, and they matter a lot. Bourne, DuBois, and Addams offer images of cosmopolitanism that keep humanity in all its concreteness fully in view.

---

<sup>i</sup> Vertovec and Cohen note that “practically all the recent writings on the topic remain in the realm of rhetoric. . . . One important exception has been Nussbaum’s call for ‘cosmopolitan education’” (2002, 21).

<sup>ii</sup> *Cultivating Humanity* gives an expanded version of “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” the lead essay in *For Love of Country* (1996), which includes responses to Nussbaum by sixteen theorists.

<sup>iii</sup> See Clayton on Bourne’s status as an outsider (Clayton 1984, 54-57, 214). Major pragmatist theorists can also serve as resources for cosmopolitan thinking. See, for example, Orosco on Royce (2003) and Aboulafia on Mead (2001).

<sup>iv</sup> On June 30, 1917, Addams wrote to Bourne, “May I tell you how very much I admired your article in the June Number of “The Seven Arts.” She sent 500 copies to the Woman’s Peace Party and another five hundred to the Union Against Militarism to distribute to their members (JAPM reel 10, frames 1551-1552). For discussions on Bourne’s criticism of Dewey, see Stuhr (2004), and Westbrook (1991, 203-212).

<sup>v</sup> Vaughan (1991) distinguishes Anglo-conformity from assimilation to a hybrid, but homogenous “American” identity, considering them as distinct alternatives. She sees Bourne’s transnationalism as an alternative to these and to Kallen’s pluralism. Hollinger (1975) explores the connection between Bourne’s transnationalism and the left-leaning intelligentsia that was prominent in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s.

<sup>vi</sup> Andrew Walzer (1997) reads “Trans-National America” in light of Bourne’s unpublished manuscript, “The State,” and thus places Bourne’s cosmopolitanism clearly as a corrective to the State’s drive toward war. Walzer also considers Bourne’s writings to be in continuity with nineteenth-century narratives of the sublime with their explicitly masculinist assumptions, and thus finds Bourne’s conception of cosmopolitanism problematic.

---

<sup>vii</sup> For example, Sullivan discusses how DuBois drew on psychoanalysis and pragmatism in his concept of unconscious racist habits (2006, 21-23, 43-44). Posnock places DuBois as “the pivotal figure” in his discussion of black cosmopolitanism (2000, 804). Briggs sees DuBois as a predecessor to Bhabha’s “vernacular cosmopolitanism” and Appiah’s “rooted cosmopolitanism” (2005, 77).

<sup>viii</sup> Nussbaum writes, “One sometimes feels a boundless loneliness, as if the removal of the props of habit and convention, the decision to trust no authority but moral reasoning, had left life bereft of a certain sort of warmth and security” (1997, 83).

<sup>ix</sup> DuBois refers to “the cosmopolitan catholicity of Hull House” (1985, 10). This quotation is taken from *The Horizon: A Journal of the Color Line I* (March 1907).

<sup>x</sup> Contemporary scholars and activists interested in “local” transnationalism would find the work of people connected with Hull House very helpful. Hull House undertook extensive sociological research of its immigrant neighborhood. For example, *Hull House Maps and Papers* served as a model for DuBois, *The Philadelphia Negro*. Several former residents of Hull House assisted DuBois in his study of Philadelphia (See Deegan, 2002, 51-62).

<sup>xi</sup> Addams was very aware of the concerns recently voiced by Calhoun that democracy needs to “grow out of the life world” and “empower people not in the abstract but in the actual conditions of their lives” (2002, 92). For discussions of Addams’s understanding of democracy, see Addams (1902/2002), Seigfried (2002), and Hamington (2004).

<sup>xii</sup> For an appreciative, but skeptical analysis of Addams’s notion of reciprocity between ethnic groups and white Americans, see Sullivan (2006, 168-180).

---

<sup>xiii</sup> See Fiona Robinson (1999) and Virginia Held (2006, Chapter 10). For a discussion of Addams and the work of these scholars, see Fischer (forthcoming). For an extended analysis of Addams's cosmopolitanism as feminist and pragmatist, see Sarvasy (forthcoming).

#### Works Cited

- Aboulafia, Mitchell. 2001. *The Cosmopolitan Self: George Herbert Mead and Continental Philosophy*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Addams, Jane. 1902/2002. *Democracy and Social Ethics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1907/2007. *Newer Ideals of Peace*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1910/1990. *Twenty Years at Hull-House*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1922/2002. *Peace and Bread in Time of War*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. *The Jane Addams Papers, 1860-1960 [Microform]*. ed. Mary Lynn McCree Bryan, Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms International.
- Bourne, Randolph S. 1916a. "Trans-National America." *Atlantic Monthly*. 118 (July): 86-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1916b. "The Jew and Trans-National America." *Menorah Journal* 2: 277-84.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1917/1964. "The War and the Intellectuals." *Collected Essays, 1915-1919*. ed. Carl Resek. New York: Harper & Row, 3-21.
- Briggs, Charles L. 2005. "Genealogies of Race and Culture and the Failure of Vernacular Cosmopolitanisms: Rereading Franz Boas and W.E.B. DuBois." *Public Culture* 17(1): 75-100.
- Butler, Nicholas Murray and John Haynes Holmes. 1912/1972. *Before the War: Last Voices of Arbitration, Comprising the International Mind; an Argument for the Judicial Settlement of*

---

*International Disputes, by Nicholas Murray Butler, and the International Mind, by John Haynes Holmes.* New York: Garland Publishing.

Calhoun, Craig. 2002. "The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travellers: Towards a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism." *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice.* ed. Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen. New York: Oxford University Press, 86-109.

Campbell, James. 1992. "DuBois and James." *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society* 28(3): 569-81.

Clayton, Bruce. 1984. *Forgotten Prophet: The Life of Randolph Bourne.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Deegan, Mary Jo. 2002. *Race, Hull-House, and the University of Chicago.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Dewey, John. 1916/1985. *Democracy and Education.* In *The Middle Works of John Dewey*, vol. 9, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1917/1980. "The Need for a Recovery of Philosophy." In *The Middle Works of John Dewey*, vol. 10, ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 3-48.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1927/1984. *The Public and Its Problems.* In *The Later Works of John Dewey*, vol. 2. ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 235-372.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1935/1991. *Liberalism and Social Action.* In *The Later Works of John Dewey*, vol. 11. ed. Jo Ann Boydston. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1-65.

Dickinson, G. Lowes. 1914. "War and the Way Out." *Atlantic Monthly* 114: 820-37.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1915 "War and the Way Out: A Further Consideration." *Atlantic Monthly* 115: 516-24.

DuBois, W.E.B. 1915. "The African Roots of War." *Atlantic Monthly* 115: 707-14.

- 
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1920/2003. "The Souls of White Folk." *Darkwater*. New York: Humanities Press  
Reprint, 55-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1935/1970. *Black Reconstruction in America; an Essay Toward a History of the Part  
which Black Folk Played in the Attempt to Reconstruct Democracy in America, 1860-1880*.  
New York: Atheneum.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *Selections 1985; Selections from the Horizon*. ed. Herbert Aptheker. White Plains,  
N.Y: Kraus-Thomson Organization.
- Fine, Robert and Robin Cohen. 2002. "Four Cosmopolitan Moments." *Conceiving  
Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*. eds. Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen.  
New York: Oxford University Press, 137-162.
- Fischer, Marilyn. 2006. "Jane Addams." *A Companion to Pragmatism*. eds. John Shook and  
Joseph Margolis. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 79-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. forthcoming. "Caring Globally: Jane Addams, World War One, and International  
Hunger." *Global Concerns: Feminist Ethics and Social Theory*. eds. Rebecca Whisnant and  
Peggy DesAutels. New York: Roman and Littlefield.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Guarneri, Carl. 2007. *America in the World: United States History in Global Context*.  
New York: Mc-Graw Hill.
- Hamington, Maurice. 2004. "Addams's Radical Democracy: Moving Beyond Rights." *Journal of  
Speculative Philosophy*. 18(3): 216-223.
- Held, David. 2002. "Culture and Political Community: National, Global, and Cosmopolitan."  
*Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*. eds. Steven Vertovec and  
Robin Cohen. New York: Oxford University Press, 48-58.

- 
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. *Democracy and the Global Order : From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Held, Virginia. 2006. *The Ethics of Care : Personal, Political, and Global*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Herman, Sondra R. 1969. *Eleven Against War; Studies in American Internationalist Thought, 1898-1921*. Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press.
- Hiebert, Daniel. 2002. "Cosmopolitanism at the Local Level: The Development of Transnational Neighbourhoods." *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*. eds. Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen. New York: Oxford University Press, 209-223.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. 1987. *The Age of Empire, 1875-1914*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Hobson, John A. 1902. *Imperialism*. New York: James Pott & Company.
- Hollinger, David A. 2001. "Not Universalists, Not Pluralists: The New Cosmopolitans Find their Own Way." *Constellations: An International Journal of Critical & Democratic Theory* 8(2): 236-248.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1975. "Ethnic Diversity, Cosmopolitanism and the Emergence of the American Liberal Intelligentsia." *American Quarterly* 27(2): 133-51.
- Jackson, Shannon. 2000. *Lines of Activity: Performance, Historiography, Hull-House Domesticity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- James, William. 1909/1977. *A Pluralistic Universe*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kallen, Horace. 1915. "Democracy Versus the Melting-Pot." *Nation*. 100: 190-94, 217-20.
- Knight, Louise W. 2005. *Citizen: Jane Addams and the Struggle for Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- 
- Lewis, David Levering. 1993. *W.E.B. DuBois: Biography of a Race, 1868-1919*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Menand, Louis. 2001. *The Metaphysical Club*. New York: Farrar Straus and Giroux.
- Nussbaum, Martha. 1997. *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha, et al. 1996. *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Orosco, Jose-Antonio. 2003. "Cosmopolitan Loyalty and the Great Global community: Royce's Globalization." *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*. 17(3): 204-215,
- Posnock, Ross. 1999. "Going Astray, Going Forward; DuBoisian Pragmatism and its Lineage." *The Yearbook of Research in English and American Literature* 15: 33-45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. "The Dream of Deracination: The Uses of Cosmopolitanism." *American Literary History* 12(4): 802-18.
- Robinson, Fiona. 1999. *Globalizing Care : Ethics, Feminist Theory, and International Relations*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Russell, Bertrand. 1917. "National Independence and Internationalism." *Atlantic Monthly*. 119: 622-628.
- Sarvasy, Wendy. forthcoming. "A Global 'Common Table': Jane Addams's Theory of Democratic Cosmopolitanism and World Social Citizenship." *Jane Addams and the Practice of Democracy*. eds. Marilyn Fischer, Carol Nackenoff, and Wendy Chmielewski. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Seigfried, Charlene Haddock. 2002. "Introduction to Reprint Edition." Jane Addams, *Democracy and Social Ethics*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- 
- Stuhr, John. 2004. "Old Ideals Crumble: War, Pragmatist Intellectuals, and the Limits of Philosophy." *Metaphilosophy* 35(1/2): 82-98.
- Sullivan, Shannon. 2006. *Revealing Whiteness : The Unconscious Habits of Racial Privilege*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Takaki, Ronald T. 1993. *A Different Mirror : A History of Multicultural America*. Boston, MA: Little Brown & Co..
- Tan, Kok-Chor. 2004. *Justice without Borders : Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism, and Patriotism*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuchman, Barbara. 1994. *The Proud Tower*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Valery, Paul. "On European Civilization and the European Mind."  
<<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/valery.html>>.
- Vaughan, Leslie. 1991. "Cosmopolitanism, Ethnicity and American Identity: Randolph Bourne's 'Trans-National America'." *Journal of American Studies* 25(3): 443-59.
- Vertovec, Steven, and Robin Cohen, eds. 2002. *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism : Theory, Context and Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walzer, Andrew. 1997. "The Cultural Criticism of Randolph Bourne: A Usable Past for Multicultural America?" *Canadian Review of American Studies* 27(2): 1-22.
- Westbrook, Robert B. 1991. *John Dewey and American Democracy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.