Volume 20 Issue 62
Originally issued as F6

Global Journal of human-social science: F
Political Science
Volume 20 Issue 6 Version 1.0 Year 2020
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism

By Smriti Singh
University of Delhi

Introduction- There are many different definitions of cosmopolitanism and nationalism. Each of these terms cannot have one precise definition because there are many theories, principles and issues that overlap in defining the terms. To define both cosmopolitanism and nationalism one may have to consider factors like border-crossing, individ Nationalsmualism, citizenship or international justice (Kaunonen 23). Cosmopolitanism may incorporate aspects of nationalism and therefore there interrelationship that comes into play when giving a compressive definition to these terms.

Cosmopolitanism involves wide range views on moral and socio-political beliefs and practices. Initial shared thought about cosmopolitanism suggested that all humankind, regardless of their different affiliations should exist as one community. With time different views have created different versions of cosmopolitanism either based on moral customs, political alignments or geographical influences. Philosophical roles have always centered on cosmopolitanism debate. Cosmopolitanism arguments have always revolved around breaking bonders and other human interaction limitations. The scope of defining people in a dimension of world citizenship brings into light the ideological concept of cosmopolitanism.

GJHSS-F Classification: FOR Code: 360199



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:

© 2020. Smriti Singh. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism

Smriti Singh

I. Introduction

There are many different definitions of cosmopolitanism and nationalism. Each of these terms cannot have one precise definition because there are many theories, principles and issues that overlap in defining the terms. To define both cosmopolitanism and nationalism one may have to consider factors like border-crossing, individ Nationalsmualism, citizenship or international justice (Kaunonen 23). Cosmopolitanism may incorporate aspects of nationalism and therefore there interrelationship that comes into play when giving a compressive definition to these terms.

Cosmopolitanism involves wide range views on moral and socio-political beliefs and practices. Initial shared thought about cosmopolitanism suggested that all humankind, regardless of their different affiliations should exist as one community. With time different views have created different versions of cosmopolitanism either based on moral customs, political alignments or geographical influences. Philosophical roles have always centered on cosmopolitanism debate. Cosmopolitanism arguments have always revolved around breaking bonders and other human interaction limitations. The scope of defining people in a dimension of world citizenship brings into light the ideological concept of cosmopolitanism.

Nationalism is a varied, multidimensional ideology that reflects on a shared communal identification and association with a specific nation or state. Nationalism definition may depend on a nation context that is applied. It is a term that creates socio-political belonging and autonomy. Political advancement in 18th and 19th century created a need for nation's sovereignty that led to revolutions in different part of the world. It is during this period that nationalism became a strong socio-political agenda for initiating change in different nations' leadership and relationships. Nationalism was one of causes of World War I (Horne 37). Different nations where seeking a sense of identity and belonging of course in relationship to other nations beliefs and ideologies. It was the question of nationalism factor in determining who was an ally or a foe. These were some of challenges that intensive nationalism created.

II. Discussion

Cosmopolitanism is not guided by demands of singularity or wholesomeness. In support of cosmopolitanism (Will 127) says "it is an identity insistently mindful that the abundant possibilities of life may not be fully realized within the horizons of one tradition or culture and that the fabric of one's self is enriched by being stitched together from cloths of different colors and hues." This statement raises concerns of nationality breach. The actual nature of cosmopolitanism means knowing no boundaries in human interaction.

Cosmopolitanism ideologies are multi-level concepts. For one to adequately define cosmopolitanism they have to consider the levels that the ideology operates in. Different requirements set the levels of cosmopolitanism. Moral demands is such a requirement. In other cases, legal requirements can set a level of cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanism is also characterized by common linking of humanity.

The debate about nationalism takes into account history revolution of mankind. Historical inclinations and occurrences have always influenced dimensions of nationalism (Houghton 203). Some nationalists argue that nations are ageless trends. Since the formation of the world in terms of nation alignments nations has been on a progressive trend of defining their nationalism scope. Nationalism approach in recent history has viewed nations as contemporary constructed establishments.

Cosmopolitanism debate has had an equal share of evaluation by different scholars and philosophers. According to (Neilson 126) "since the early 1990s there has been a growing attempts in the US academy to free the term cosmopolitanism from its traditional implications of rootlessness and privilege and to make it work in the context of post colonialism and globalization." Neilson explores the debate on different forms of cosmopolitanism such as comparative, rooted and post-colonial cosmopolitanism. Comparative cosmopolitanism engages a broad analysis on social, cultural and political dynamics in search of self-consciousness.

Cosmopolitanism rides on the effects of cultural hybrid (Blainey 14). This means that creation of universal enlightenment and relationship is a component of cosmopolitanism. Although geographical limitation may affect scopes of cosmopolitanism, recent development of globalization has reduced geographical factors in Cosmo politics dimensions. In another different viewpoint cosmopolitanism has a geopolitical context. This means a close focus on inter-communal politics and their effects on the international interactions and relations.

Author: *e-mail: mithilabagai@gmail.com*

© 2020 Global Journals

The relationship between cosmopolitanism and nationalism is a contradicting correlation. Nationalism incorporates politics as a primary focus which set guidelines for defining any nation. Cosmopolitanism ideologies on the other side to break the boundaries set by nationalism. It is this relationship that makes the relationship of the two ideologies be an intricate delineation.

An assertion by (Nussbaum, 19) gives an extensive scope of nationalism and cosmopolitanism, when he quotes "I am willing… top serve my country; but my worship I reserve for Right which is far greater than my country. To worship my country as a god is to bring curse upon it". Americans seemed to embrace aspects of nationalism at the expense of ideal cosmopolitanism. Their emphasis on nationalism seemed exaggerated and was seen as an isolation element. In justification of nationalism Americans argued that they couldn't define themselves well unless when associated with a common national identity. Seeking justification of nationalism to Americans had numerous advantages. This was an approach that was supposed to unite Americans, regardless of their ethnic, racial, religious or political difference.

The role of politics in nationalism and cosmopolitanism couldn't be ignored in America history. Although in other continents such as Asia cosmopolitanism might have autonomously evolved without nationalism, America had integration of these two ideologies. Nussbaum argues that forces of nationalism defeated the noble principles of cosmopolitanism. According to Nussbaum discussion "proponents of nationalism in politics and in education frequently make a thin concession to cosmopolitanism." This is a viewpoint that tries to define the role of education in creating international awareness and national identity.

A statement by Diogenes, a Greek philosopher provides intriguing approach of cosmopolitanism (21). When people inquired about his origin, this philosopher replied that he was a citizen of the world. This definition was not subject to nationalism approach. The philosopher refused to be identified along notational tags and opted for a more universal and broader definition. A universal definition gives a bigger moral obligation. According to the ideologies of this Greek philosopher, it did not matter which nation one was born. Being born in any nation was just an accident, and therefore defining one according to the nation was a nun-fundamental allegiance. According to this argument, no social restriction such as nationality differences, ethnical attachments, or geographical origins should create should we should not allow differences of nationality or class or ethnic membership or even gender to erect walls between mankind. The importance of recognizing humanity was regardless of any affiliation was a fundamental aspect of universal allegiance. This view was based on the assertion that human beings live in social circles. The circles are then integrated in national values. National values are further integrated in humanity values.

There are three main principles that form core values of cosmopolitanism. Universalism is a core principle at the hub of cosmopolitanism. This is a view that all humanity is equal; regardless of any difference. Generality is the second principle of cosmopolitanism. This is an approach that human being should not be confined in small ideology groups characterized by cultural practices and beliefs. If humanity had common association parameters according cosmopolitans life would be more fascinating. Lastly, individualism principle is a concern for cosmopolitans. Cosmopolitanism disregards element of individualism in humanity interaction.

Just has mentioned earlier, moral obligation can only be created through a bigger global picture of taking responsibility even in our beliefs. It is an aspect of cosmopolitanism that is critical in understanding nation's position globally. Cosmopolitanism creates a universal approach that takes into account importance of world unity. In the world of intense political lobbying cosmopolitanism neutralizes political tension that would cause sour international relationship if left unchecked.

The discourses between cosmopolitanism and nationalism also involves globalization debates (Friedrich 163). Globalization being a tool of technological manifestation has centered itself in the nation's relationships. Whether friends of foes, globalization has persistently proved that it knows no barriers. The extent at which human beings interact either through international trade or social media is immeasurable (Eilsler 76). Nationalism bottle-necks don't limit this kind of interaction. Distinction of effects of globalization and cosmopolitanism effects is minimal.

It is important to assert that different continents however have always maintained different cosmopolitanism ideologies. While some continents may be busy building cosmopolitanism others may be busy pushing their self-interest Agenda (78). This scenario has created a paradox on how various continents view cosmopolitanism. For instance, many people perceive that America is drifting towards political cosmopolitanism. However the only available prove are political incidences that are not adequate to define this stand.

Explaining the cosmopolitanism and nationalism approaches is like a puzzle. Different theories have been applied in explaining this puzzle. International relation theory has mostly concentrated on diplomacy while sidelining the cultural aspect. Previous world history still influences how nations or continents relate. Cosmopolitanism cannot define relationship of

© 2020 Global Journals

countries that have had historical political differences. Why? It is believed there chances of history repeating itself are high and this therefore would amount to engaging in a risky relationship.

As the debates ranges on, cosmopolitanism has caused various global impacts. Different global civil societies such as Amnesty International are products of cosmopolitanism. The social power of cosmopolitanism has been useful in promoting world peace. Different political structures are involved in cosmopolitanism establishments. The relationship between nationalism and cosmopolitanism is characterized deep integration of the two concepts.

According to (Thomas 12), universal community can be created in nations don't limit themselves to self-imposed barriers. For instance, religion should not be a limitation for cosmopolitanism. Spread of religious beliefs across the continents should be an ingredient of cosmopolitanism. Ideology differences can be a complex matrix in achieving cosmopolitanism. How can the world come together when it is sharply divided along strong religious, racial or geo-political lines? For cosmopolitanism to operate these differences have to be overcome. The need for a universal integration has to be bigger than the resistance barriers.

Element of cultural domination cannot be left out on the discussion of nationalism and cosmopolitanism. If cosmopolitanism is established on cultural background it does not have ability to cross international borders (Karl-Dieter 88). Cultural variants are therefore would be best suited in defining nationalism. This form community is based on a restricted geographical area. Cultural values would be much more appreciated in nationalism umbrella than in cosmopolitanism view. Unlike nationalism, cosmopolitanism tries to defeat barriers of political institutions'. When political twist is incorporated in cosmopolitanism, a new form of association is formed. In this set-up cosmopolitanism can only work if political powers are universally distributed across the institution. According to (Newman 11) political cosmopolitanism may not need to make cultural manifestations. On the other hand, cultural cosmopolitanism does not need to make political claims.

Liberal culture practices are seen as a threat to nationalism. The cultural practices may cross border and cause undesired friction. While nationalism may embrace diverse cultural practices, these are only limited within a geographical location. Therefore culture needs cosmopolitanism to cross into the rest parts of the world though it may be restricted by commitments demands. The guiding principle of nationalism is that each nation is permitted to its own state restrictions. Cosmopolitanism movement's ideologies go across nation's boundaries.

This ongoing discussion highlights the broader definition and evaluation of two allied ideologies. According to (Butler et al. 22) "the historical record shows an association between cultural and political manifestations of cosmopolitanism and nationalism, there have been enough instances of a political cosmopolitanism and cultural nationalism" The dual ideologies of nationalism and cosmopolitanism suffer one common limitation; the political influences. It is complex two separate politics from either of the ideology. Political liberals however believe that political institutions' should only serve as a tool encouraging equality across humanity.

Political enlightenment of the western in 19th century desired both cosmopolitanism and nationalism (Butler et al 24). Their argument was that once nationalism is established and grounded it would require bigger theme to sustain. This therefore introduced the need of cosmopolitanism in sustaining nationalism.

It is essential to evaluate how other continents like Europe incorporated cosmopolitanism ideologies in their existence. With increased modernization in Europe, many European states changed their nationalism criteria especially in the line of citizenry. The boundary limits of ethnic alignments and immigration activities were also reduced. The aspect of pluralism and multicultural practices were also incorporated. This was cosmopolitanism formation. The minority groups and non-citizens where beginning to receive fair treatment. European Union (EU) played an indispensable in promotion of cosmopolitanism in Europe (Grafton et al. 34).

III. Conclusion

This extensive discussion has closely evaluated cosmopolitanism and nationalism as a brother and a sister. Although these two ideologies have great similarities, it is essential at this point to highlight their striking contrasts. First, Nationalism sets a limited unifying dimension of humanity. The argument here is that universal humanity destroys sense of belonging. This means confinement along a nation or state group. In contrary, cosmopolitanism its scope goes beyond individualism of a nation.

Another major contract between cosmopolitanism and nationalism is territory alignment. While cosmopolitanism encourages mobility of people ideas, and cultural beliefs nationalism operates under specific territorial dimension. Closely related to territory alignment contrast is the sentiment of these two ideologies. While cosmopolitanism runs under calm spirit, nationalism is characterized by scalding spirit and loyalty.

Cosmopolitanism discussion cannot be conclusive without referring to some its benefits highlighted by its supporters. Cosmopolitanism enables human beings to learn more about themselves. It is a

© 2020 Global Journals

platform that limits personal sense of belonging and preferences and acts like a mirror for self-reflection (Kwame 98). Through cosmopolitanism nations can realize their ignorance and incorporate new aspects as part of their norms. Cosmopolitanism creates international cooperation (Honey et al 13). Nature does not obey the law of boundaries restriction. Why should nations be restricted to interact by their bonders? How can nations solve global world problems such as climate change without cooperation that cosmopolitanism nurtures? These global dialogues cannot be conducted in nations don't share a universal agenda and key basic principles like cooperation (Gartzke 149).

This discussion has scrutinized various aspects of cosmopolitanism and nationalism in regard to human interaction subtleties. The relationship between cosmopolitanism and nationalism has been extensively evaluated. Integration of the two ideologies is based on commitment that factors in diversity, globalization effects and of different legal structures governed by political formations (Dickerson 104). Modernization has worked for and against cosmopolitanism while globalization has broken overlapping boundaries and identities. Reducing nationality scope and technological creation of a global community is creating a cosmopolitan tradition.

Harmonization of cosmopolitanism and nationalism can help in solving the modern crisis of racial discrimination and cultural restrictions (Griswold 22). It is necessary to highlight that cosmopolitanism cannot be a supra-nationalism that operates in disregard of a nation. Each ideology needs each other to be fully conceptualized. The fact remains that no matter how passionate a nation embraces cosmopolitanism, it cannot escape from it initial self; nationalism. Political class is mostly the determinants of direction that cosmopolitanism and nationalism takes. Political interest should not isolate either of the ideology in favor of the other since both have great importance in society.

Works Cited

1. Blainey, Geoffrey. A Very Short History of the World. Penguin Books, 2004.
2. Butler, David and Bruce Cain. Congressional Redistricting: Comparative and Theoretical Perspectives. New Yolk: Macmillan, 1992.
3. Dickerson, M. O. An Introduction to Government and Politics. Cengage Learning, 2009.
4. Eilsler, Riene. The Real Wealth of Nations: Creating A Caring Economics. Berrett-Koehler Publishers, 2007.
5. Friedrich, Mainecke. Cosmoplitanism and the National State. NJ: Princeton University, 1970.
6. Gartzke, Erik. Economic Freedom and Peace. Vancouver: Fraser Institute, 2005.
7. Grafton, Anthony and Ann Blair. The Transmission of Culture in Early Modern Europe. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.
8. Griswold, Daniel T. Peace on Earth, Free Trade for Men. New York: Cato Institute, 1998.
9. Honey, Martha and Raymond Gilpin. Tourism in the Developing World. Washington: US Institute of Peace, 2009.
10. Horne, John. A companion to World War 1. New York, 2012.
11. Houghton, Valerie. Social Movement: Theories and Motives. 25 June 2016. 22 March 2017 (Web).
12. Karl-Dieter, Opp. Theories of Political Protest and Social Movements. New York: Routledge, 2009.
13. Kaunonen, Leena. Cosmopolitanism and Transnationalism Visions,Ethics and Practices. Helsinki: Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, 2014.
14. Kwame, Appiah. Cosmopolitanism:Ethics in a World of Strangers. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2007.
15. Neilson, Brett. "On the new Cosmopolitanism." Review Article (1999): 1-14.
16. Newman, Gerald. The Rise of English Nationalism: A Cultural History. Basingstone: Macmillan, 1997.
17. Nussbaum, Martha. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." The Boston Review (1994): 1-8.
18. Thomas, Gossert. race, The History of an idea of America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1963.
19. Will, Kymlinka. "The Right of Minority Cultures." Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternative (1995): 93-122.

© 2020 Global Journals