

# COSMOPOLITANISM, GLOBALIZATION AND THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION/FORMATION

DOMINADOR BOMBONGAN, JR.

*God loves from whole to parts: but human soul  
Must rise from individual to the whole.  
Self-love but serves the virtuous mind to wake,  
As the small pebble stirs the peaceful lake;  
The centre moved, a circle straight succeeds;  
Another still, and still another spreads;  
Friend, parent, neighbour first it will embrace'  
His country next; and next all human race;  
Wide and more wide, the o'erflowings of the mind  
Take every creature in, of every kind;  
Earth smiles around, with boundless bounty blest,  
And Heaven beholds its image in his breast.*

ALEXANDER POPE, *AN ESSAY ON MAN*

**I**nterdisciplinarity as a study promotes the mutual exchange and interaction of at least two presumably independent disciplines of knowledge. By doing so, it facilitates the communication and pooling of resources of these seemingly self-contained disciplines for the purpose of achieving a greater understanding of a particular reality as well as providing a swift resolution to a specific problem. In this sense, interdisciplinarity “provides a democratic, dynamic and co-operative alternative to the old-fashioned, inward-looking and cliquish nature of disciplines.”<sup>1</sup> Eventually, however, the purpose

---

1. Joe Moran, *Interdisciplinarity* (London & New York: Routledge, 2002), 3.

lies more in the rejuvenation of stale and inflexible knowledge into more vibrant ones as a consequence of this intermingling. Hence, it has an epistemological concern, that is, the production of new forms of knowledge. Not any kind of knowledge though. The resultant knowledge should be one that is transformative.<sup>2</sup> Ultimately, the objective is for these disciplines to achieve enrichment as a result of the interface.

The aim of this article is a modest one, that is, to bring into contact two presumably unrelated and autonomous fields of knowledge, namely, social science and theology. On the one hand, the social sciences are now concerned with the pressing issues of globalization and cosmopolitanism. On the other hand, theology has an enduring interest in the on-going formation and education of faith-communities for the purpose of adequately preparing them to meaningfully live their Christian faith in these fast changing times. Behind this proposed encounter and meeting of disciplines lies the fundamental hope that theological education/formation may benefit from the new knowledge gained from the mutual inter-communication. It is, however, beyond the purview of this article to talk about the impact of theology on the discourse of the social sciences.<sup>3</sup> From yet another angle, this article argues that interdisciplinarity is fostered by nourishing a cosmopolitan imagination. This imagination is open to consider the legitimate uniqueness or even the strangeness of the other – whether persons, cultures, traditions, rationalities, etc. From such imagination, a praxis of openness and willingness to engage the other is expected to emerge, all for the purpose of human well-being and the flourishing of the rest of creation.

The article will unfold as follows: first, it will deal with the process of globalization and issues related to it; second, it will then speak of the cultivation of a basic attitude or orientation towards

---

2. Ibid., 14.

3. The theme of cosmopolitanism is present in Scriptures; see for example, Ephesians 2, 19-20: “And so, therefore, you are no longer foreigners or metics in a foreign land (*xenoi, hospitēs*), you are fellow-citizens of the Saints, you belong to the House of God”.

receptivity to “difference” and concern for all plus the needed structures for negotiating the issues raised by globalization. This will be discussed under the rubric of cosmopolitanism. Third, the article will end with certain propositions for theological education or formation for Christian cosmopolites<sup>4</sup> of the global village.

## GLOBALIZATION

The *conditio humana* of the 21st century, claims Ulrich Beck, can no longer be understood only nationally or locally but also globally.<sup>5</sup> Beck’s perceptive comment refers to a fundamental change that has gripped our world and the concomitant need for a reordering/reorganization of the framework of human interactions that goes with this gargantuan change. Experts have referred to this multifaceted historic process as globalization. David Held identifies four-spatio-temporal elements in analyzing globalization.<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, these four elements allow a more systematic assessment of globalization by providing “insights into the changing historical forms of globalization; sharper identification and comparison of the key attributes of, and the major disjunctures between, distinctive forms of globalization in different epochs.”<sup>7</sup> Held names the four elements as (1) the extensity of global networks, (2) the intensity of global interconnectedness, (3) the velocity of global flows, (4) the impact propensity of global interconnectedness. For Held, the enormous trans-regional interconnections that the globalization process creates lead to the *stretching of* socio-political and economic activities across frontiers (extensiveness of networks of relations and connections).

---

4. I prefer to use the word cosmopolite rather than cosmopolitan. The former is more attuned to the original Greek meaning of being a citizen of the world. The latter has gained very consumerist meanings lately, hence not conducive to the transformative meaning of cosmopolitanism that I am suggesting in this short article.

5. Ulrich Beck, “The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies,” *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 no. 1-2 (2002): 17-44. I am using the online version found in <http://www.sunysb.edu/sociology/faculty/Levy/Beck> (accessed August 2006).

6. David Held, *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 15.

7. *Ibid.*, 17.

Consequently, events, decisions as well as activities in one region can no longer be contained or limited within its boundaries; rather their impact overflows to individuals and communities in distant regions of the globe.<sup>8</sup> Such global interconnectedness, rather than being the exception, becomes the regular conduct of things in a globalized world. These “regularized” or patterned interactions generate a deepening and growing intensification of patterns of interactions and interconnectedness (the intensity of flows and levels of activity within these networks). As worldwide systems of transport and communication innovate and increase, the swiftness of global interactions and rapidity of transmission and movements of ideas, goods, information, capital and people accelerate as well (the velocity or speed of interchanges). For that reason boundaries between the personal, local and the global become fluid and blurred. A global event can have a reverberating effect on local development while even the most local can have profound global consequences (the impact of these phenomena on particular communities). Held then defines globalization in the following way:

A process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions - assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity, and impact-generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power.<sup>9</sup>

From the above definition, one recognizes that globalization is not a singular condition but a multidimensional process involving the careful interplay economic, political and the cultural dimensions – experts consider it as “the central driving force behind the rapid

---

8. Anthony Giddens refers to this as action-at-distance. Globalization can then be defined as “the intensification of world wide relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.” This process involves the “intersection of presence and absence, the interlacing of social events and social relations ‘at distance’ with local contextualities.” See Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992), 64. See also, Anthony Giddens, *Beyond Left and Right: The Future of Radical Politics* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1998), 4.

9. Held, *Global Transformations*, 16.

social, political and economic changes that are reshaping modern societies and world order.”<sup>10</sup> It might be instructive to examine briefly the changes that globalization brings.

From an economic point of view, globalization is characterized by the massive flow of money and capital (finance capitalism) across political boundaries. Daily transactions in foreign exchange involve billions of money affecting national economies in terms of their interest rates, employment, government tax revenues, etc. Transnational corporations (TNC) have gained prominent role in the world economy.<sup>11</sup> Through space shrinking technologies, TNC’s global production and strategies have involved alliances among firms across different boundaries making TNC truly a globalized enterprise. Economic globalization, claims Rob Van Drimmelen, is the “process of growing and intensifying interaction of all levels of society in world trade, foreign investment and capital markets. It is abetted by technological advances in transport and communications, and by a rapid liberalization and deregulation of trade and capital flows, both nationally and internationally, leading to one global market.”<sup>12</sup> Susan Strange, a political economist, specifies three major changes that have led to economic globalization. One, we notice the accelerated internationalization of production measured by “the rising production (and of sales) of goods and services that is under the direction and control of enterprises outside the frontiers of the state.”<sup>13</sup> Second, there is a sharp increase in the mobility of capital as expressed in the

---

10. Ibid., 6.

11. According to Peter Dicken, the TNC “is the single most important force creating global shifts in economic activity” for three reasons: First, TNCs have the ability to control economic activities in more than one country; secondly, they too have the ability to take advantage of geographical differences between countries and regions in factor endowments (including government policies); and lastly, they are geographically flexible, that is, they easily shift their resources and operations between locations at a global scale. TNCs are mainly channeled through foreign direct investment (FDI). See Peter Dicken, *Global Shift: The Internalization of Economic Activity* (London: Paul Chapman, 1992), 47.

12. Rob Van Drimmelen, *Faith in a Global Economy: A Primer for Christians* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1998), 7-8.

13. Susan Strange, “An International Political Economy Perspective,” in *Governments, Globalization and International Business*, ed. John H. Dunning, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 137.

preponderance of the international financial market (e.g., foreign exchange, bonds, shares, etc.). Third, there is a growing importance of the mobile character of knowledge and information brought about by communication technologies. With such rapid changes in the world economy, Robert J. Holton has made the observation that “[t]hese flows of investment, technology, communications, and profit across national boundaries are often seen as the most striking symptom of global challenge to the nation-state.”<sup>14</sup> Some would see economic globalization as the eventual triumph of capitalism, leading to the inexorable advance of a singular global market patterned after the American (consumerist) free market.<sup>15</sup>

From a political point of view, globalization suggests a “reshaping of political practices and institutional structures in order to adjust and adapt to the growing deficiencies of nation-states vis-à-vis the forces of globalization.”<sup>16</sup> The emerging global politics redefines the rights and obligations, powers and capacities of nation-states.<sup>17</sup> In terms of the state’s capacities, globalization has curtailed and expanded it, (even) allowing it to continue to perform a range of functions which cannot be sustained any longer in isolation from

---

14. Robert J. Holton, *Globalization and the Nation-State* (London: MacMillan Press, 1998), 80.

15. See John Gray, *False Dawn: The Delusion of Global Capitalism* (London: Granta Books, 1999), 3. See also Leslie Sklair, *Sociology of the Global System* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1991). He argues that the cultural-ideological project of global capitalism is to persuade people to consume above their own perceived needs in order to perpetuate the accumulation of capital for private profit, in other words, to ensure that the global capitalists system goes on forever. In short, the ideology of the transnationalist capitalists is consumerism.

16. Philip G. Cerny, “Paradoxes of the Competition State: The Dynamics of Political Globalization,” *Government and Opposition* 32, No. 2 (Spring 1997): 253.

17. See David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), 208. On pages 91-92 of the same book, he asserts that the traditional functions and responsibilities of the state have been limited as well as widened by the intense process of connectivity or globalization. As a consequence, for the state to continue to operate well in the context of globalization, it has to collaborate with different political actors on different levels (national, regional, global, etc.) – the institutions, organizations and regimes that have been created to serve as “a basis for the orderly management of global affairs, that is global governance.” Global governance does not refer to

global or regional relations and processes.”<sup>18</sup> Such reorganization of the nation-state’s functions is occasioned by the massive flows of ideas and economic items across borders; the shared running of communications and defense systems with other nation-states; the nation-state’s integration into larger political/economic units (EU, ASEAN) and international organizations (UN, WTO) as well as the collaborative global response it has in relation to the common social problems such as human rights issues, environmental degradation, and the AIDS pandemic facing humanity. Referring to the latter, Malcolm Waters holds that the collective response also involves what he calls a process of the “nationalization of global issues”<sup>19</sup> or a local response to a global issue. For him, global problems contravene the exercise of state sovereignty for three reasons, namely: “it redirects individual political preferences; it delegitimizes the nation-state as a problem solver; it sets up new international organizations to which some elements of state sovereignty are progressively surrendered.”<sup>20</sup> While this may be the case, it is a total misunderstanding to say that the nation-state is dead. We may say that political globalization creates a global polity composed of worldwide networks of relationships among diverse political actors that cut across national societies. These actors are the nation-state, the interstate-system, transnational agencies in the forms of IGOs (inter-governmental organizations) or INGOs (international non-governmental organizations). Some may refer to them as transnational social movements. They make up the global milieu. Andrew McGrew cleverly illustrates the complex interactions among these diverse actors using a cobweb image<sup>21</sup> to indicate the complex and decentered character of the current political landscape.

---

a supranational state with its monopoly of coercive and legislative power. Rather, it is a new form of global politics “where the possibility of political cooperation and order” is deepened and enforced. Examples of these institutions are the EU, Greenpeace, IMF, etc.

18. Ibid.

19. Malcolm Waters, *Globalization* (London & New York: Routledge, 1995), 101.

20. Ibid., 111.

21. Anthony McGrew, “Conceptualizing Global Politics,” in *Global Politics: Globalization and the Nation-State*, ed. Anthony McGrew, Paul G. Lewis, et. al., (Cambridge: Polity Press 1992), 3.

From a cultural point of view, the popular understanding of globalization reflects itself in expressions like Americanization,<sup>22</sup> Western Imperialism, Coca-colonization or McDonalization.<sup>23</sup> However, this is only one side of the story. The other side is captured in terminologies like inculturation, hybridity, indigenization, creolization, etc. The latter terms indicate the need not only to take into account the global prevalence of Western goods, but also to focus on the consumers or “cultural agents as active participants in the process of cultural exchanges.”<sup>24</sup> Put differently, cultural globalization is always about a global-local dialectic. Hence, it is not only an “out-there” phenomenon but also an “in-here” event, i.e., referring to specific locals, places and identities. Roland Robertson refers to this relationship as ‘glocalization’ or the universal-particular connection where the particularization of universalism “involves the idea of the universal being given global-human concreteness”<sup>25</sup> and the universalization of particularism “involves the extensive diffusion of the idea that there is no limit to a particularity, to uniqueness, to difference and to otherness.”<sup>26</sup> In Jonathan Friedman’s view, the ethnic and cultural fragmentation and modernist homogenization constitute two trends of global reality.<sup>27</sup> As such we may describe cultural globalization also as a complex decentering process. It is characterized

---

22. For a discussion of this theme see Robert Holton, *Globalization and the Nation-State* (London & New York: Macmillan 1998), 161-185. See also Malcolm Waters, *Globalization* (London & New York: Routledge, 1995), 139-145.

23. George Ritzer argues that our societies and hence our world are more and more following the principles applied by fast-food restaurants especially that of McDonalds. Principles such as efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control of human beings through material technology are in a sense constituent parts of the “rationality” that drives the world towards the direction of greater conformity. George Ritzer, *McDonalization of Society* (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge, 1993).

24. See John Tomlinson, “Cultural Globalization and Cultural Imperialism,” in *International Communication and Globalization*, ed. Ali Mohammadi (London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage Publication, 1997), 180.

25. Roland Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (London & New Delhi: Sage, 1992), 102.

26. Ibid.

27. Jonathan Friedman, “Being in the World: Globalization and Localization,” *Theory, Culture & Society* 7, no. 2-3 (June 1990): 311.

by an “image of a decentered network, in which the patterns of distribution of power are unstable and shifting and, indeed, in which power is in some ways diffused rather than concentrated.”<sup>28</sup> In this decentered process, the revival of ethnicities happens either through translationist ethnicity or traditionalistic ethnic revival.<sup>29</sup> The former reaction develops “new forms of expression that are entirely separate from their origins”<sup>30</sup> while the latter rediscovers the untainted origins of an ethnic group in its history. An example of the first process is the emergence of new identities like the Afro-American (black) consciousness and Quebec nationalism which may not be tied up already with a particular territory.<sup>31</sup> The second process can be demonstrated in the rise of ethnic revival in Eastern Europe such as Estonia, Slovakia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, etc. It is in ethnicity where people find a space to speak about themselves. It is peoples’ guarantee for their authentic identity. The response then can go in two separate directions – a defensive way and an expansive way. Faced with the threat of globalizing forces, ethnic groups can retreat into their own exclusivist and defensive enclaves. This is a point where ethnicity becomes dangerous – “the refusal of modernity which takes the form of a return, a rediscovery of identity which constitutes a form of fundamentalism.”<sup>32</sup> Part of the rise of ethnicities is the rise of a discursive space for the marginalized, emergence of new subjects, new genders, new ethnicities, new regions, new communities, hitherto excluded from the major forms of cultural representation, unable to locate themselves except as decentered or subaltern, argues Stuart Hall.<sup>33</sup> From our discussion, we can say that national cultures will remain robust in the context of globalization for this is the source of cultural and moral attachments, meanings for a particular people.

---

28. Tomlinson, “Cultural Globalization and Cultural Imperialism,” 185.

29. Waters, *Globalization*, 137.

30. Ibid.

31. For further explanation see Waters, *Globalization*, 137-138.

32. Stuart Hall, “The Local and the Global: Globalization and Ethnicity,” in *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*, ed. Anthony D. King, (London: Macmillan, 1993), 36.

33. Ibid., 34.

The aforementioned novel changes that globalization has set off have led some to rethink the proper ways to come to terms with the enormous development it brings. In the face of these changes, we need to recast the ways we relate to the socio-economic, cultural and political realities of our times. We are living in a world of “‘overlapping communities of fate’ where the fate of nations is significantly intertwined.”<sup>34</sup> What is then the most adequate mediating idea and political praxis to significantly respond to these global transformations of today? To this issue we now turn.

### COSMOPOLITANISM

Recently, cosmopolitanism has generated a renewed and widespread appreciation in social and political theories. Such a fresh interest in the said issue has been occasioned by the pressing issues I have raised above such as the growing concern about the scope and extent of justice and duties across the boundaries of nation-states; the emergent awareness of transnational coverage of political and social realities; the mounting consciousness of complex affiliations, meaningful attachments and multiple allegiances to issues, people and places;<sup>35</sup> the nascent vision for global democracy and world citizenship. Patrick Hayden has grouped these developments into three constitutive conditions, namely, globalization, global governance and global civil society.<sup>36</sup> For him, they are responsible for the continuing significance of cosmopolitanism for our times.

In general, cosmopolitanism refers to *being a citizen of the world*. It traces its origin back to the Stoics. The cynic philosopher Diogenes of Sinope (ca. 400-323 BCE) is believed to have set off this cosmopolitan sentiment in his famous statement, “I am a citizen

---

34. David Held, “Globalization, Corporate Practice and Cosmopolitan Social Standards,” in <http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/Publications/Publications/ProfHeld/GlobalizationCorporatePractice.pdf> (accessed August, 2006).

35. See Steven Vertotec and Robin Cohen, “Introduction: Conceiving Cosmopolitanism,” online version pg 1: <http://www.oup.co.uk/pdf/0199252289.pdf> (accessed, August 2006).

36. Patrick Hayden, *Cosmopolitanism: Global Politics* (Aldershot, Hants: Ashgate, 2005), 5ff.

of the world” (citizen of the cosmos).<sup>37</sup> His eccentric behavior (residing in a tub, excreting in public, etc.) and his deliberate proclamation of his world citizenship were gestures repudiating the commonly accepted socio-political arrangement of his time. During those times, the Aristotelian ideal of the *politês* gained much attention. The *polis* was seen as the most appropriate socio-political system that is best suited to enhance the potential and full development of the individual. For Diogenes, however, the human being is a multicultural animal rather than a political animal as Aristotle would claim it to be. Hence, Diogenes “rejected the status of a *politês*, a citizen, in favour of that of a *kosmopolitês*, a citizen of the ‘cosmos’, the universe.”<sup>38</sup> In a sense then, stoics argue that, first and foremost, human beings are ‘citizens of the world’ (*kosmou politê*) and only secondarily or accidentally members of a single political community (local origins, local group membership). Their decisions and aspirations should reflect the universal moral concern for the good of any person belonging to the human community. Therefore, no ethnic, national, class or even sexual barriers should prevent any person from respecting the humanity/dignity of all rational and moral beings.<sup>39</sup> All human beings, the stoics hold, constitute a single community where every person possesses moral worth equivalent to one’s own.

This general ethical sensibility that guided the world of the Stoics will gain more concrete and actual legal and juridical stipulations among 18<sup>th</sup> century Enlightenment thinkers, particularly, Immanuel Kant.<sup>40</sup> Kant holds that all human beings, as rational beings, possess a (good) will. The will is the source of moral laws for it seeks only

---

37. This meaning, being citizen of the cosmos, may be more convivial to ecological considerations. Present day interest in cosmopolitanism may be attributed to the burning issues related to the common protection of our abused and exploited environment.

38. Derek Heater, *World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and Its Opponents* (London: Continuum, 2002), 27.

39. See Martha Nussbaum, “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” online version found in, <http://www.soci.niu.edu/~phildept/Kapitan/nussbaum1.html> (accessed August 2006).

40. Vertotoc argues that “...cosmopolitanism is not some known entity existing in the world, with a clear genealogy from the Stoics to Immanuel Kant, that simply awaits more detailed description at the hands of scholarship.” See Vertotoc, “Conceiving Cosmopolitanism,” 4.

the good of humans and their freedom. The protection of the freedom of the *humanum* is guaranteed by developing moral laws that are the natural expressions of what is truly present in the rational nature of human beings. In general, Kant refers to these moral laws as categorical imperative.<sup>41</sup> Such an imperative is an extension of the longing and desire for perfect happiness and supreme goodness found in the good will of every rational human being. The categorical imperative is an objective standard in which rational human beings continuously refer to regulate their very subjective passions and desires. It is therefore universal in scope (shared by all and applied to all) and it is of utmost necessity to all (for freedom's sake). Kant for example writes, "[s]o act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means."<sup>42</sup> Hence, to act in ways consistent with the values coming from the goodwill of humanity guarantees the utmost exercise of one's freedom. Kant's notion of categorical imperative is corollary to his notion of an ideal moral community called "kingdom of ends". The kingdom of ends, a sort of a legislative body is the methodical union of rational beings who actively participate in creating universal laws meant to guide them in their exercise of justice and freedom.<sup>43</sup> Kant's moral theology dovetails with his juridical framework of public law. Accordingly, public law has three components namely: the civil law (*ius civitatis*), international law (*ius gentium*) and cosmopolitan law (*ius cosmopolitanicum*). Civil laws deal with the internal politics of individual states. Individual states are mandated to create domestic/municipal laws (civil constitution)

---

41. A categorical imperative necessitates an absolute and universal moral obligation. The idea was popularized by Immanuel Kant. He would say, "Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it become a universal law." His ideas on the subject matter is inscribed in the "Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals" (1785) and his "Critique of Practical Reason" (1788).

42. Patrick Hayden, *Cosmopolitanism: Global Politics*, 18.

43. Patrick Hayden reckons that Kant's concept of the Kingdom of Ends is an ideal conceptual framework for a political community "composed of free and equal human beings, each person being regarded as a legislative citizen who freely participates in making the laws of the community, the content of those laws being directed toward the full realization of the dignity of every other member of the community." See Hayden, *Cosmopolitanism: Global Politics*, 19.

based on the republican ideals of freedom and equality.<sup>44</sup> International laws, in contrast, regulate the external relations among independent states. Kant envisions a confederation of states guided by a single common law aimed at attaining peace. Cosmopolitan laws, likewise, aim at stipulating the laws concerning the right of hospitality to strangers as well as the universal rights of humanity to all individuals to be respected by nation-states. Strangers, accordingly, have the right to travel to other countries and must not be treated in a hostile manner by the receiving state (hospitality). Furthermore, the stranger may also claim a *right to resort* based on the fact that each one has the right to the common possession of the earth's surface as a member of the human community. Cosmopolitan laws are not meant to create a world government; rather they are meant to enhance different levels of governance from the local up to the global level. Such laws can be embodied in a cosmopolitan constitution where a common set of laws can be stipulated as a shared basis to bring about peaceful mutual relations and reciprocal understanding among nations (league of independent states).

Contemporary theorists of cosmopolitanism often times differentiate between institutional cosmopolitanism (reshaping of political structures to meet the changes of the times) from moral cosmopolitanism (setting up of moral standards to make sure that political theory and practice respect the "humanum" as the ultimate unit of moral concern). Several typologies<sup>45</sup> on cosmopolitanism have been presented; most agree on three basic tenets of cosmopolitanism, namely: (1) that individual persons are the ultimate

---

44. A republican constitution is founded upon three principles: firstly, the principle of freedom for all members of society (as men); secondly, the principle of the dependence of everyone upon a single common legislation (as subjects); and thirdly, the principle of legal equality for everyone (as citizens). It is the only constitution which can be derived from the idea of an original contract, upon which all rightful legislation of a people must be founded. Thus as far as right is concerned, republicanism is in itself the original basis of every kind of civil constitution, and...it is the only constitution which can lead to perpetual peace. *Ibid.*, 20.

45. See the book of Derek Heater where he presents six major typologies based on six authors. Derek Heater, *World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and Its Opponents* (London and New York: Continuum, 2002).

units of concern, not states or other particular forms of human association; (2) the status of equal worth and recognition should be enjoyed by all; (3) this status of equal worth should be acknowledged by all persons without any exception. Albert Pogge succinctly elaborates on this universalism:

Three elements are shared by all cosmopolitan positions. First, individualism: the ultimate units of concern are human beings, or persons - rather than, say, family lines, tribes, ethnic, cultural, or religious communities, nations, or states. The latter may be units of concern only indirectly, in virtue of their individual members or citizens. Second, universality: the status of ultimate concern attaches to every living human being equally - not merely to some subset, such as men, aristocrats, Aryans, whites or Muslims. Third, generality: this special status has global force. Persons are ultimate units of concern for everyone - not only for their compatriots, fellow religionists, or suchlike.<sup>46</sup>

Oftentimes cosmopolitanism is equated with being privileged, bourgeois, elitist or being an intellectual/scholar, in addition to being a frequent traveler, a tourist, or to what some refers to as being a cosmocrat.<sup>47</sup> These designations give cosmopolitanism shallow meanings that are limited to consumption or mere aesthetic considerations. I argue for more positive and transformative meanings to the term denoting respect for others, dialogue, formation of complex identities, shared human values, etc.

### **AN APPEAL TO IMAGINATION**

Cosmopolitanism is about imagination. By imagination, I mean an active act of consciousness that discloses what is in the world but at the same time reveals what is possible in the world. It is a mediating act between what is and what the imagined relationships

---

46. See Thomas Pogge, *World Poverty and Human Rights* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2002), 169.

47. Cosmocrats are the new global economic elite, a meriocratic but elusive ruling group, e.g., wealthy jet setters, corporate managers, financial experts, intergovernmental bureaucrats and academics who have been trained abroad. See Vertotec, "Conceiving Cosmopolitanism," 5.

of the self, the world, and the future could possibly hold for all. Described differently, as a form of imagination, cosmopolitanism would attempt to ask questions like: what happens if the self is enmeshed in a wider constellation of other selves? What becomes of one's self-identity when other different life stories are readily available for examination? What probable horizons are open for a world that is rapidly interconnected? What is the future of cultures, of politics and of ethical discourses in a world where there are no outsiders? Such kind of questioning is facilitated by what Ulrich Beck calls a dialogic imagination. It is a form of imagination that necessarily recognizes the legitimate uniqueness, distinctiveness or even the strangeness of the other – whether these are persons, cultures, traditions, civilizations, rationalities, other ways of life, heritages, etc.<sup>48</sup> Cosmopolitan imagination allows one to “compare, reflect, criticize, understand, contradictory certainties”<sup>49</sup> about life in general. It involves a basic act of negotiating and disclosing varied and even contradictory cultural experiences into the very center of one's day-to-day personal decisions in life. Hence, cosmopolitanism does not only take into consideration the on-going process of the transnationalization of experiences brought about by globalization but the personal and the local experiences as well. This is then a rooted form of cosmopolitanism. “There is no cosmopolitanism without localism,” Beck argues.<sup>50</sup> “Cosmopolitan forms of life and identities are ones that are ethnically and culturally simultaneously global and local”.<sup>51</sup> Dialogic imagination brings into one's cognizance the following realizations:<sup>52</sup> (1) that clashes of cultures happen in our life; (2) that we have globally shared collective futures in a world risk society where everyone is implicated, therefore, the need for global responsibility; (3) that dialogic imagination entails commitment

---

48. A cosmopolitan model nourishes a dialogic imagination while a nation-state model of societies develops a monolithic form of imagination. The latter is exclusive and involves an either-or looking at the world. It always excludes what does not belong to its boundaries. See Beck, “Cosmopolitan Society,” 18, online edition.

49. Beck, “Cosmopolitan Society,” 18.

50. *Ibid.*, 19.

51. *Ibid.*, 36.

52. *Ibid.*

to dialogue, hence it is against violence; (4) that it is we who construct/invent/create our personal/communal identities through the process of self-reflexivity as we encounter others. This imagination has an aversion for an environment that nurtures:<sup>53</sup> (a) ethnic nationalism and postmodern relativism leading to sectarian acts of violence and eccentricities of extremists (fundamentalism); (b) neo-liberal globalization (globalism) which threatens democratic freedom by radicalizing social inequalities and revoking fundamental social justice and security; (c) democratic authoritarianism resulting to the loss of achieving consensus in a democratic way. Put differently, dialogic imagination attempts to be inclusive and if possible to defend our place as one open to the world.<sup>54</sup> The enemies of cosmopolitan imagination are those who think that life is monochromatic. The danger of monolithic imagination is that it is one-sided and cannot allow for the existence or even the survival of the different.

### **A PERSPECTIVE, AN ORIENTATION**

Cosmopolitanism is also a perspective. By this, I mean a basic orientation or stance in life. As a perspective, it reveals where one locates himself or herself on certain issues. Hence, in the process, it also declares what one considers significant in life. As an orientation, it mirrors a way or a path in which one makes sense of life in general, as well as the manner in which one manages or creates meanings in life by navigating through the web of meanings available simultaneously to the person. If I readily make the “stranger” a significant part of my life, then in my decisions, aspirations and commitment, they considerably play a crucial part. As a perspective or orientation, it needs to be cultivated or nourished the way one perfects a particular craft. In the end, cosmopolitan perspective becomes really a matter of competence. This is the claim of Ulf Hannerz. He argues that a genuine cosmopolitanism is “first of all an orientation, a willingness to engage with the Other. It is an intellectual aesthetic stance of openness toward divergent cultural

---

53. *Ibid.*, 38.

54. *Ibid.*, 35.

experiences, a search for contrasts rather than uniformity.”<sup>55</sup> Through “listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting” the cosmopolite develops a competence/skill/talent to participate in other cultures but also to make sense (maneuver through systems of meanings) of these diverse experiences in himself or herself.<sup>56</sup> To be a cosmopolite entails a mastery of one’s culture plus a surrender to the others’. But by surrendering, one also achieves further mastery of one’s own. For through the lens of the other, he/she understands, clarifies even corrects more his or her own ideas, praxis and background. It is in this sense that we can say that cosmopolitanism has a therapeutic function. It cures the myopia, that is, our short-sightedness and lack of (dialogic) imagination and intellectual insight about the power of the strange or the unfamiliar to give us a general sense of well-being. Some would say that this may be true for as long as the “stranger” does not make much trouble or for as long as they are contained within the specified boundaries set by society. But again, we need to think that in this day and age, the “suppressed” voices of the stranger and the different can no longer be contained. Perhaps cosmopolitanism can offer a venue and a basis to bring these legitimate concerns out in the open and perchance rationally discuss them publicly. For it is a tenet of cosmopolitanism to accord due respect to every rational and moral being without exception. The doors of dialogue should always remain open even to those who commit violence to express their cause.

#### A CONCRETE REFERENCE OF ACTION

In a world characterized by the growing reality of multifarious and even competing political and cultural actors, cosmopolitanism offers a possible unifying framework beyond the claims of nation-states<sup>57</sup> (conventional locus of authority and power) to galvanize people toward a particular objective. It puts forward

---

55. Ulf Hannerz, “Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture,” in M. Featherstone, “Global Culture.” *Theory, Culture and Society* 7, no. 3-4 (June 1990): 239.

56. *Ibid.*

mediating structures aimed at developing common principles as a general reference point and form institutional arrangements for diverse groups, political entities and associations to deal with the complex socio-political-cultural issues afforded for by the process of the trans-nationalization of experiences. As products of a genuine dialogue by all involved parties, these arrangements seek the protection of basic humanitarian values regardless of countries of origin. In fact, these cosmopolitan structures may even come into conflict with “national” laws.

In the political arena, for instance, David Held, among others (Daniele Archibugi, Andrew Linklater, etc.), advocates a global political agenda with his notion of cosmopolitan democracy. Accordingly, persons should be protected by a juridico-political system to ensure that human beings can exercise their autonomy. The principle of autonomy, in the sense of the human capacity to reason self-consciously, to be self reflective and self-determining, must be assured by a cosmopolitan democratic law. Our times, he argues, is marked by overlapping communities of fate (e.g., the air pollution of Manila can find itself somewhere in other countries or the Bird Flu pandemic is a health problem for all) and multilayered politics composed of government bodies as well as NGO's and transnational civil society groups. With this new context, cosmopolitan political and ethical spaces need to be created. These spaces are there to bridge simultaneously local, national, regional and global concerns. This is also where trans-boundary issues (beyond the nation-state) are resolved.<sup>58</sup> Issues like people's equal moral worth, their active agency and the requirements for their autonomy and developments

---

57. David Held names the essential elements of a nation-state paradigm: (1) members have a common socio-cultural identity; (2) there is a common framework of prejudices and objectives leading to a common political ethos; (3) an institutional structure exists which protects and represents the community; (4) congruence and asymmetry prevail between a community's governors and governed; (5) members enjoy a common structure of rights and duties due to the preceding items mentioned above. See David Held, “National Culture, the Globalization of Communications and the Bounded Political Community,” *Logos* 1, 3 (Summer 2002) on line edition: <http://www.logosjournal.com/issue-1.3pdf> (accessed August 2006).

58. Vertotec, “Conceiving Cosmopolitanism,” 13.

can be threshed out.<sup>59</sup> The formation of cosmopolitan political agents who can “reason from the point of view of others” is a must. If given such formation, people of our generation are better equipped to resolve fairly, the challenging trans-boundary issues occasioned by our shared fate that requires a collective solution.<sup>60</sup> “Unlike political nationalism, cosmopolitanism registers and reflects the multiplicity of issues, questions, processes and problems which effect and bind people together, irrespective of where they were born or reside.”<sup>61</sup>

Culturally, cosmopolitan principles and institutions offer venues where issues related to identity politics, ethnicity, immigration, issues on multiple affiliation/allegiances or citizenship can be talked about. Individuals can now assume complex, overlapping, changing and often highly individualistic choices of identity and belonging.<sup>62</sup> So, for Held, we need more and more to learn how to behave as cosmopolitan citizens. Cosmopolitan citizenship “involves a growing mediating role: a role which encompasses dialogue with the traditions and discourses of others with the aim of expanding the horizons of one’s own framework of meaning, and increasing the scope of mutual understanding.”<sup>63</sup> The political democratic communities of the future should afford multiple citizenships to people. “Faced with overlapping communities of fate they need to be not only citizens of their own communities, but also of the wider regions in which they live, and of the wider global order.”<sup>64</sup> As Nick Stevenson would put it, cultural cosmopolitanism is going beyond national exclusivity, or the dichotomous forms of gendered and racial thinking or even the rigid separation between nature and culture. It seeks to appreciate the various ways in which humanity in general is involved in layers of intercultural involvements. For him then, cosmopolitan thinking involves “the transgression of boundaries and markers and the

---

59. Held, “Cosmopolitan Social Standards,” 9.

60. Ibid.

61. Held, “National Culture, Globalization,” 11.

62. Vertotec, “Conceiving Cosmopolitanism,” 14.

63. Held, *Global Transformations*, 449.

64. Ibid.

development of an inclusive democracy and citizenship.”<sup>65</sup> This is achieved through creating cultural spaces for communities of communication and consent.

Economically, cosmopolitan ideals related to economic practices can be a starting point to discuss the repercussions of a neo-liberal form of economic globalization especially to the disadvantaged countries. Here a cosmopolitan framework of accountability and regulation — a cosmopolitan social standard — can be developed to “reframe neoliberal economic globalization.”<sup>66</sup>

### **TO BE OR NOT TO BE A COSMOPOLITE**

The prevalence of transnational experiences alone is not enough in making us all cosmopolites. Not because we live in a global world that we are all cosmopolites. The above reasoning is what Beck refers to as a cosmopolitan fallacy.<sup>67</sup> What we also need is the cultivation of a conviction/motivation that goes hand in hand with the institutionalization of cosmopolitan organizations to reinforce cosmopolitan practices as argued above. It needs to be stressed here that as embodied creatures, we do not only need a motivation to act. We also need to leave a cosmopolitan imprint on our praxis.

A strong motivation for being a cosmopolite especially to those genuinely concerned with the future of humanity and the disadvantaged is the adverse effect produced by the enormous economic and technological progress our present world is currently undergoing. Many are still rendered vulnerable, made impoverished and turned victims by globalization in spite of the opportunities it also provides. We need to be cosmopolites because of these vulnerable and suffering humans we encounter not only in our midst but even beyond ours. Their proximity and nearness are made more tangible by the global means of communication. Any person

---

65. Nick Stevenson, *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Questions* (Berkshire, England: Open University Press, 2003), 5.

66. See Held, “Cosmopolitan Social Standards,” 11-14, for his proposal on this issue.

67. Beck, *Cosmopolitan Society*, 29.

regardless of his or her place or political convictions deserves to live a life worthy of a human being. More than this, however, we need to nourish cosmopolitan values because whether we like it or not the process of globalization (action-from-distance) implicates us directly or indirectly, in the “act of impoverishing” others in our global village. We need to realize that we are accountable even in our small ways (supporting a soap label that employs children for its production) to their plight. Hence, we need to keep alive a story about universal accountability, genuine solidarity with the other, by reaching out and learning about their plight, being concerned that justice does not only apply to us but also to them. In the end, cosmopolitanism is in effect a question of social justice. Social justice implies justice not only for me but for the rest of the cosmos (environmental cosmopolitanism).

#### **COSMOPOLITANISM: A WESTERN IMPOSITION?**

Is cosmopolitanism another story of Western imperialism? Not because the idea comes from the West that it is imperialistic in nature. We need to distinguish its origin from its validity. Even a truly local idea can have negative consequences when uncritically espoused, e.g., xenophobia, sectarianism, fundamentalism. I argue that if there is a genuine concern for others, not condescension, as well as genuine dialogue and solidarity for humanity, this imperialistic/totalitarian tendency will be minimized. The “universal” idea that “all humans deserve to be respected” is pruned of its imperialistic leanings once different cultures/traditions contribute to an on-going widening of the scope of accepted conceptions or principles regarding respect for humanity. In a global world, an idea catches fire in different cultural milieus if and when it is predisposed to absorb a more particular cultural garb. What is needed is a rooted form of cosmopolitanism cognizant of the local (local cultures) and the global (western powerful cultures) dialectics of power play. This kind of cosmopolitanism itself will find the mechanics so that the powerful will not readily monopolize the agenda while the suppressed/oppressed can have their voices heard. The challenge is to find a way to navigate between unity and diversity, the national and the global. In nationalism, our own cultural uniqueness is affirmed and

in cosmopolitanism, our common values as human beings are acknowledged. To be solely nationalistic or patriotic may lead to racial bigotry while to be exclusively global may mean the annihilation of what is unique and peculiar to the other. A rooted cosmopolitanism avoids both pitfalls. Differently stated, our local struggles in the age of globalization should be attached to global agenda. The search for a minimal common standpoint then is not aimed at uniformity but serves as a basis in which different local struggles can consolidate themselves to have a stronger bargaining power.

### **ON THEOLOGICAL FORMATION FOR COSMOPOLITANISM**

One central function of theological education is to form not only learned people but learning people. While it offers materials (“what to think about”) for study, it is, however, more concerned with providing tools (“how to think about”) to examine and reflect on these resources. The primary function then is to enable persons and communities of faith to develop their God-given potentials by offering them basic tools (resources, knowledge, and skills) to examine, reflect and process issues related to the self, with God, with society, etc. It “leads” forth (*educere*) communities of faith to the challenges of the times, as it also prepares them to adequately respond to these new conditions. Put differently, the aim of any religious education or formation is the molding of the total personality of the Christian so that he or she becomes more equipped and sensitized to ways in which God discloses God-self in worldly affairs.

Cosmopolitanism places the responsibility on the shoulders of theologians and religious educators to prepare faith communities to look beyond their immediate surroundings and cast their gaze on the wider inter-connecting horizons of peoples. Such kind of education seeks not only what separates (uniqueness/difference) us from each one but more so to look at what binds us together (common values). This kind of education elevates or raises (*educare*) students above the common and the comfortable to the strange, the uneasy and the unexpected. So for the great religious educator, Thomas Groome, the educator should have “the ability to lead students out to new places where even the educator has never been.”

For a cosmopolitan theological education to prosper, the theological enterprise needs some efforts to recover important forgotten aspects of it.<sup>68</sup> Primarily, we need to reestablish the fact that theology is a communal activity and not the exclusive domain of a few. This realization shatters the myth of exclusion, where theology becomes the exclusive zone of usually white-male-clerics and clericalized laity. Theology as a communal activity involves women, people of color, grassroots laity as dialogue partners. This kind of perspective in theology corrects the false idea that in a community of faith, reasonable dissent (which often boils down to the emergence of new insights) has no place. While it is correct to say that communities of faith are formed and made steady by a common story of God's outpouring of love for all of humanity as definitively manifested by Jesus of Nazareth, this story is also put to an on-going clarification by diverse members of the vibrant community of faith. Each one is given a space to contribute to this life-long process of understanding God's revelation. Cosmopolitanism, however, stretches farther than these spaces, to include faith-communities beyond one's own, making it a truly trans-communal endeavor. Put differently, a cosmopolitan Christian trains himself or herself to be truly Catholic in outlook, being open and responsible to all and everything. Trying to find ways on how to negotiate between the realities of the (one) unity and the many (diversity) expressions of Christian faith. The attitude of basic openness to the whole inhabited world develops not in a vacuum. It starts already in one's own backyard but moves from there. Here then, being Catholic just like being a cosmopolite ventures further than a geographical consideration. It speaks of a basic quality, an attitude and even a vocation to respect every human being regardless of what place or culture the person might come from. Rolando Espin beautifully captures what we mean here: The Church is "catholic" because it refuses to assume that one human culture is superior to others, or that one human culture or nation is better

---

68. The three points we will raise above originally came from Ronald Thiemann, "Making Theology Central in Theological Education". Originally published in *Christian Century* (Feb. 1997): 106-108. However, I took the liberty of developing these themes myself.

suites as witness and bearer of the Christian gospel. Indeed, it is part of the very definition of catholicity that national, cultural, racial, political, gender, and economic barriers must come down as a direct consequence of God's revelation in Christ.<sup>69</sup>

Theology has also to retrieve its formative function in the community. It does not only function to train our minds; it too is responsible for the formation of a solid kind of identity and character. In this cosmopolitan formation, plasticity (ability to be molded, altered or even reshaped because of new situations) coupled with gracefulness (ability to maintain proportion and balance in the fluidity of things) is encouraged. These traits allow cosmopolites to "haggle" with life and come up with a reasonable settlement in terms of one's faith identity and character. Solidity in faith is maintained by one's ability to construct a more coherent narrative of faith based not only on existing solid faith-claims/themes/truths but also relying on the unfamiliar and uncommon narratives of faith made available by our encounters with people – with the stranger. But cosmo-politanism puts a further challenge: the task is not to simply embellish the acceptable faith-claims with a cultural garb; perhaps we are even challenged to "shatter" these very truth-claims and the cultural garbs we have dressed them to allow a possible novel encounter with God to happen, one that has never been narrated yet. To the cosmopolite the issue is not necessarily novelty of religious identity; more appealing perhaps is receptivity to a possible transformation of one's identity when one is confronted by somebody else's identity.

Theology is critical reflection on praxis based on a constructed tradition of the Christian faith. Hence, it involves a critical function. To achieve such a dignified task, those involved in Christian formation/education can come up with a provisional common standard of reflection on doing theology as basis for critical reflection. This can be a common basis for orthodoxy and orthopraxis in theology where different theological works can be submitted for evaluation. The provisional character of this shared standard lessens the danger of not recognizing other theological voices. As new and

---

69. Orlando Espín, "Immigration, Territory and Globalization: Theological Reflections," *Journal of Hispanic/Latino Theology* 7, No. 3 (February 2000): 55.

valid expressions of faith come in, these common standards can be continually revised. Again here the purpose is not the creation of a universal/perennial theology but the naming of certain indicators to help adjudicate a more authentic from a less authentic theological reflection.

### ON COSMOPOLITAN EDUCATION IN GENERAL<sup>70</sup>

A cosmopolitan formation involves learning more about ourselves by learning from others. So, for example, an inter-religious dialogue involving the different major religions can enhance not only the appreciation and respect for each but a clarification of one's faith, as well as a corrective, to the way one's faith is adhered to and practiced in life. Integral to this form of education is for educators to have the ability to expose students not only to familiar ideas, places and cultures, but also to bring them to unfamiliar territories. The objective is not simply to know more about them but to learn from them.

A cosmopolitan formation holds that since we share a common future and a common world, it is more effective and efficient to enter into a sort of global dialogue to solve our common problems. There is more wisdom if we put our brains together. Here, programs of education should move more and more toward interdisciplinary collaboration. Already happening on this level is the global ethic agenda which builds on the rich heritage of world religions.<sup>71</sup>

---

70. This short part of the paper relies on Martha Nussbaum's article entitled "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." Her article provides an educational program for training students on cosmopolitanism. See citation above.

71. See works of Hans Küng related to this: *Global Responsibility: In Search of a New World Ethic*. New York: Crossroad, 1991. Hans Küng and Karl-Josef, eds., *A Global Ethic: The Declaration of the Parliament of the World's Religions* (London: SCM Press, 1993). Hans Küng, ed., *Yes to a Global Ethic* (London: SCM Press, 1996). Hans Küng and Helmut Schmidt, eds., *A Global Ethic and Global Responsibilities: Two Declarations* (London: SCM Press, 1998). See also: InterAction Council, *In Search of Global Ethical Standards: Report on the Conclusions and Recommendations by a High-Level Expert Group* (Vienna: March 1997); *A Universal Declaration of Human Responsibilities: Report on the Conclusions and Recommendations by a High-Level Expert Group Meeting* (Vienna: April 1997).

Cosmopolitan education enables us to think that duties, rights and laws are not only for me or for my immediate family, or my nation but extends to all rational and moral human beings. This form of education also takes serious account of the environment which is heavily under pressure from human activities. We should train students to think that rights know no borders. It does not stop when we reach the geographical boundaries of our countries. If they cannot physically cross-borders at least students should be given the imagination to cross frontiers of nations, races and cultures.

We might be giving the false hope that this kind of education will take place easily. The difficulty in cosmopolitanism perhaps can be likened to the intricacies involved in arriving at a consensus among groups and individuals who have their own agenda to protect. It takes time, courage, a lot of perseverance and level-headedness to do this. For now, however, modern technologies of communication are making it a possibility for the future.

**Dominador F. Bombongan, Jr.**  
**Theology and Religious Education Department**  
**De La Salle University**  
**Manila, Philippines**