

Andrew Fiala

ON THINKING GLOBALLY AND ACTING LOCALLY: RESURGENT NATIONALISM AND THE DIALECTIC OF COSMOPOLITAN LOCALISM

ABSTRACT

This paper considers the extent to which we already live in a cosmopolitan era. Resurgent nationalism is explained as a reactionary response to the success of cosmopolitanization. Cosmopolitanization is further explained as a dialectical process. Contemporary cosmopolitanism emerges against the backdrop of Eurocentric globalization associated with the colonial era. While the Eurocentric legacy must be rejected, it has left us with a cosmopolitan world. Other dialectical processes emerge in consideration of the importance of local and multicultural issues. Cosmopolitanization is a process that must work to connect global processes with local concerns. The paper situates this argument in consideration of events in Peru, in connection with the rise of Donald Trump in the United States, and in relation to several examples of the cosmopolitan dialectic. Despite some dialectical setbacks, the paper concludes that we are already operating in a world in which globally diverse ideas and practices are already in dialogue. The challenge is to continue the cosmopolitanizing conversation, while remaining responsive to the needs of local communities.

Keywords: Cosmopolitanism; localism; eurocentrism; nationalism; multiculturalism; dialectics.

The motto “think globally, act locally,” is familiar from environmental ethics and activism.¹ To engage the world authentically, we must focus on concrete, lived, and local experience; but we must also never lose sight of the fact that local experience is formed by global circumstances and that our local actions often have global implications. In the 21st Century, as a result of long centuries

¹ The phrase likely originated out of reflection on Christian theology, associated with the work of French theologian and anarchist Jacques Ellul, who is often cited as the source of the phrase. See Ellul, J. 1981. *Perspectives on Our Age: Jacques Ellul Speaks on His Life and Work*. Toronto: CBC, 21.

of colonialism and capitalist globalization, our conceptual apparatus is undeniably global: we already “think globally,” to a certain extent. The concepts of the European enlightenment are universalizing concepts that are embodied in the hegemonic structures of the global status quo. The sciences and the humanities have already been globalized as a result of a long process that also unfortunately depended on prior colonization. Ulrich Beck has called this the methodological “cosmpolization” of the sciences.² Methodological cosmpolization and the globalization of economic, political, and cultural life seems inevitable as Beck and others argue.³ And while the prior colonial history is shameful, the resultant cosmopolitan situation can be embraced for its progressive values, including “norms and institutions that channel parochial interests into universal benefits,” as Steven Pinker has recently explained.⁴

Art, religion, science, and philosophy have been globalized, along with technology and economics. This parallels the globalization of trade and pop culture (film, music), as well as evolving international norms of social and political life. Indeed, during the 20th Century, international institutions grew in importance: the U.N., WTO, World Bank, IMF, as well as international treaties and NGO’s. At the same time there has been a growing sense that *thinking* itself is and ought to be cosmopolitan: we ought to read and discuss widely, engaging in a broad dialogue with the world’s cultures and traditions. One example of this is found in the work done by the Parliament of the World’s Religions in the past 100

² Beck, U. 2011. “We Do Not Live in an Age of Cosmopolitanism but in an Age of Cosmopolitisation: the ‘Global Other’ Is in Our Midst.” *Irish Journal of Sociology* 19,1 16–34. I have changed the spelling of this term to reflect American spelling/usage—which shows us some other aspect of this process: the translation of terms from one language to another, as well as the social construction of language, spelling, and usage which often reflects norms of the academic world, which is globally diverse and yet also interconnected.

³ There is a vast and growing literature on cosmopolitanism and localism, global justice, globalization, and so on. See: Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2006. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: Norton; Beck, U. 2000. *What Is Globalization?*. Cambridge: Polity Press; Beck, U. 2006. *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity Press; Beitz, Ch. 2005. “Cosmopolitanism and Global Justice.” *The Journal of Ethics*, 9; Benhabib, S. 2006. *Another Cosmopolitanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Brock, G. 2015. “Cosmopolitanism.” In: *Bloomsbury Companion to Political Philosophy*. Fiala, A. (Ed.). London: Bloomsbury; Simin Davoudi, Ali Madanipour (Eds.). 2015. *Reconsidering Localism*. New York: Routledge; Fiala, A. 2016. *Secular Cosmopolitanism, Hospitality, and Religious Pluralism*. New York: Routledge; Gregg, B. 2003. *Coping in Politics with Indeterminate Norms: A Theory of Enlightened Localism* Albany, NY: State University of New York; Habermas, J. 2007. *The Divided West*. Cambridge: Polity; Huntington, S. P. 1996. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. Simon and Schuster; Miller, D. 1995. *On Nationality*. Oxford University Press; Moellendorf, D. 2002. *Cosmopolitan Justice*. Boulder, CO: Westview; Sandel, M. 1995. *Democracy’s Discontent*. Harvard University Press; Scheffler, S. 2003. *Boundaries and Allegiances*. Oxford University Press; Smith, A. D. 2010. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*. Polity Press; Tamir, Y. 1995. *Liberal Nationalism*. Princeton University Press; Wills, J. 2016. *Locating Localism: Statecraft, Citizenship and Democracy*. Chicago: University of Chicago.

⁴ Pinker, S. 2018. *Enlightenment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress*. New York: Random House, 28.

years. The Parliament is guided by the idea of a “global ethic” (as articulated by Hans Küng and others from across the globe who joined the Parliament in its declaration of global ethics in the 1990s).⁵ Other documents like this exist: the United Nations’ Declaration of Human Rights along with other treaties, agreements, statements, and manifestos.

In many of these documents there is an implicit (and sometimes explicit) critique of Eurocentrism. Indeed, the cosmopolitanization of theory is closely related to the general critique of Eurocentrism. This critique strikes deep at the heart of prior modes of globalization. Under the banner of “enlightenment,” native cultures were destroyed, people were enslaved, and colonial exploitation created a world of haves and have-nots. The critique of Eurocentrism has long been underway, as a parallel counter-movement to the development of colonial hegemony—as articulated by scholars such as Enrique Dussel, Anibal Quijano, and others.⁶ Quijano is important for the context in which the present paper was originally presented (at the conference of the International Society for Universal Dialogue in Lima, Peru). Quijano is of Peruvian origin. He reminds us of the lingering effects of what he calls “the coloniality of power.”⁷ But Quijano’s critique circulates in the cosmopolitan sphere of academic scholarship, demonstrating one of the ways in which prior hegemonies develop dialectically: this critique of Eurocentrism is articulated by a Peruvian scholar residing in the United States using the global interconnections of the Internet and the academic world, which are being summarized in a paper written by a North American for an international conference held in Lima, Peru.

The critique of Eurocentric cosmopolitanism is sometimes understood as emphasizing the “local” against the universal. We might suggest that the general critique of Eurocentrism should be subjected to a form of intersectional analysis which emphasizes the various ways that European hegemony manifested itself: as “Orientalism” (with regard to the Arab world), as “Tropicalism” (with regard to India and the tropics including Latin America).⁸ Such a diversified critique may encourage us to focus primarily on the local. But this critique is still articulated in terms of the universal—as the claim that we have a global/universal responsibility to respect the diversity of local cultures, practices, and values. The critique of Eurocentrism is a dialectical development that grows out of European colonialism. Universal norms and institutions—human rights, international law, etc.—are retained, even as they open the door to multiculturalism

⁵ See Parliament of World’s Religions “Global Ethics:” https://parliamentofreligions.org/pwr_resources/_includes/FCKcontent/File/TowardsAGlobalEthic.pdf

⁶ Dussel, E. 1995. *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of the Other and the Myth of Modernity*. New York: Continuum; Amin, S. 2009. *Eurocentrism*. New York: NYU Press.

⁷ See Quijano, A. 2000. “Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America.” *Nepantla: Views From the South*, 1, 3, 533–580; at: <https://www.unc.edu/~aescobar/wan/wanquijano.pdf>

⁸ See Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House; and Arnold, D. 2006. *The Tropics and the Wandering Gaze*. Seattle: University of Washington.

and other version of localism. In the end, there is a dialectical interplay between the local and the global. At one time, the values of European cosmopolitanism were understood as uniquely European gifts that were destined to enlighten the world. That narrative was obviously ideologically flawed—since European cosmopolitanism included slavery, imperialism, colonialism, Christian exclusivism, and so on. But cosmopolitan enlightenment has grown beyond its flawed Eurocentric roots. Today, cosmopolitanism holds that thinking ought to be open-minded, hospitable, globally informed, and at home in the broad and wide world. Cosmopolitanism is intersectional, liberationist, anti-imperial, and post-colonial, while also remaining committed to universal values such as human rights, respect for persons, and nonviolence. Post-European/post-colonial cosmopolitanism also respects the claims of the local, the particular, the indigenous, and that which remains diverse and unique.

This dialectic helps to explain and criticize the revival of nationalism we have witnessed in recent years—in the era of Trumpian “American First” foreign policy, the Brexit, and so on.⁹ Renascent nationalism in the cosmopolitan era is absurd. Indeed, those who are attempting to return the world to old-fashioned patriotism and nationalism are viewed as ludicrous and confused—even when the renascent nationalists hold power. This became clear as President Trump spoke to the U.N. general assembly in September of 2018. Trump said, “We reject the ideology of globalism, and we embrace the doctrine of patriotism.” But most of the world’s nations and their leaders—meeting at the United Nations, after all!—reject that view. Trump was laughed at by those assembled.¹⁰ Admittedly the Trump administration is working against the emerging cosmopolitan order. At the United Nations, Trump reiterated the United States rejection of the legitimacy of the International Criminal Court, for example. But

⁹ In the U.S., this resurgent nationalism is seen in Donald Trump’s “America First” policies. In Britain, the “Brexit” provides an example. Right-wing parties in Europe have begun to challenge the growing cosmopolitanism of the European Union. At the same time, there is continued critique of transnational and international organizations, treaties, and institutions. The United Nations (UN) has been severely criticized, as has the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and so on. “America First” Trump-ism in the United States is based upon a severe critique of many these institutions. And in some cases, Trump has deliberately subverted international treaties and institutions: for example, the Paris Climate Treaty and the Trans-Pacific Partnership. There are a variety of other local and regional movements that seek to retreat or secede from larger political organizations including previously existing nation-states. The Catalanian secession movement is fueled by Catalan nationalism. We see similar movements in South Asia: in Kashmir and in the so-called Khalistan movement. In North America, there is (less serious) secessionist talk in California and the Pacific Northwest, as well as more substantial secessionism in Quebec. Similar issues arise in the U.K., with the movement for Scottish independence. And so on.

¹⁰ Trump’s speech at the United Nations, Sept. 25, 2018: <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/09/25/trump-un-speech-2018-full-text-transcript-840043>; analysis including laughter and reaction: <https://www.politico.com/story/2018/09/25/trump-united-nations-globalism-840045>

the global consensus is that old-fashioned patriotism, racism, sexism, ethnocentrism, and religious exclusivism are regressive and nonsensical.

We have already been “cosmopolized” (to adopt Beck’s terminology). The fact is that in the sciences and humanities we hold international conferences, read translated works, and correspond with international colleagues. International, intercultural, and interfaith dialogues have a long and productive history. The same cosmopolization occurs in technology, commerce, financial markets, and so on—even including in friendship and family life. The cosmopolitan era is here. Renascent nationalism is an absurd reaction to cosmopolitanism since we cannot simply revert to the values, institutions, and structures of pre-cosmopolitan nationalism. Indeed, the idea that there was once a time when national and other local identities were pure and protected is mythological. Westphalian nation-states developed out of the background of the Holy Roman empire and in the context of colonialism, the slave-trade, the conquest of the Americas, and so on. The dream of regressive nationalism is ideological: it is based upon a mythic notion of national and racial purity/identity that never existed (or only existed in short intervals in local spaces).

And yet, there is some wisdom in the renaissance of nationalism, which reflects the necessity of the local in the “think globally, act locally” dialectic. We can only really live and act locally. There is wisdom in a kind of localism, which recognizes that the idea, for example, of loving your neighbor as yourself requires you to behave well to your concrete, local neighbors. A different kind of localism emphasizes buying local products and supporting local businesses—as a moral act that is ecologically progressive and resistant of the worst outcomes of transnational corporate capitalism. Nationalists, racists, and ethnocentrists appeal to this sense of the moral value and practical necessity of the local. But unlike the ecologically-minded and anti-corporate consumers mentioned above, the nationalists and racists are not appealing to a kind of progressive globalism. Instead, they imagine a reversion away from the emerging cosmopolitan future. The nationalists and racists simply have no interest in relating to others who are not local or not like themselves. To avoid this ideologically driven closed-mindedness, *reasonable* localism must remain connected to cosmopolitanism.

The risk of localism is that it becomes parochial, nationalistic, and racist. The risk of cosmopolitanism is that it becomes abstract, disengaged, elitist—and imperialistic. This shows the need for a dialectical concept that unites *progressive cosmopolitanism* with a kind of *enlightened localism*. We must develop *cosmopolitan localism*.¹¹ This concept may appear to be paradoxical or oxymo-

¹¹ There is unavoidable terminological complexity here. A few definitions might help. First, there is a form of localism that is parochial, provincial, or narrow. These forms of localism are regressive when seen from the vantage point of internationalism, transnationalism, globalism, or cosmopolitanism. The latter set of terms have been defined in various ways, with differences among them resulting from various ways of evaluating the import of local or national values and

ronic. But in reality, what is needed is a synthetic and dialectically complex idea that brings together the best insights of both localism and cosmopolitanism.

identities. Internationalism in its most basic form results from relations among nation-states, taking these as given realities of the political world. Internationalism can be simply a form of realism, which does not offer a normative account of either nation-state legitimacy or the emerging norms of the international order. A more substantially normative account, known as liberal internationalism will maintain that the emerging international order should rest upon liberal-democratic norms—both within nations and as a standard for international behavior in treaties, in warfare, in trade, and in other relations. Liberal internationalism will also often encourage the development of forms of representative democracy grounded in human rights and public reason at the international level, such as is outlined, for example, in Rawls' Law of Peoples—even though, on the Rawlsian account, non-liberal regimes are still encouraged to participate in the emerging liberal international order (Rawls, J. 1999. *The Law of Peoples*. Harvard: Harvard University Press). Transnationalism begins with a descriptive account of how people, ideas, institutions and organizations operate in the spaces between and among nations. Here we might speak of transnational corporations, for example, as actors who straddle and work among nation-states. Individual persons can also operate in a transnational fashion—traveling, trading, and interacting with people from diverse locales. A form of normative transnationalism would claim that those transnational relations are good and should be supported, for example, by allowing for transnational citizenship (citizenship in more than one national entity) or the development of extraterritorial corporate entities, trade organization, and so on. Globalism is related to the concept of globalization. Globalization is primarily a descriptive term, used to describe the force of global political, cultural, and economic power. At one point this was colonial and imperial power spreading globally; but now in the post-colonial era globalization is primarily the result of transnational capitalism, creating global trade and markets. We could also speak of the globalizing agenda of religious groups and ideologies (such as Marxist Communism). Globalism is the normative claim that globalization is good. Since, as noted, there are various forms of globalization, the norms of globalism will be fleshed out in various ways (as capitalist, Marxist, Roman Catholic, Muslim, and so on). Finally, cosmopolitanism can also be understood as either a descriptive or normative claim. We might claim that in reality we are all “citizens of the world” as the etymological root of cosmopolitanism discloses. We might also claim there are in fact some individuals, the cosmopolitans or the cosmopolitan class, who inhabit non-local space, as made possible by telecommunication, global transportation systems, and the structures of economic globalization—and whose values transcend the confines of local communities. A more robust form of normative cosmopolitanism declares that there are universal moral values that ought to govern our treatment of persons and that borders, boundaries, and provincial identities and interests are less important than a common cosmopolitan humanity. A cosmopolitan ethic may allow that local, regional, and national identities are useful and of value—but such a cosmopolitan ethic would maintain that the status of these local values would have to be re-evaluated in light of the importance of the common, universal set of cosmopolitan norms.

Thus we might develop a sort of cosmopolitan localism, which we might also call enlightened localism or rooted cosmopolitanism (See Ackerman, B. 1994. “Rooted Cosmopolitanism.” *Ethics*, 104, 3 (April), 516–535; Appiah, K. A. 1997. “Cosmopolitan Patriots.” *Critical Inquiry*, 23, 3 (Spring), 617–639; idem; 2005. *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Chapter 6: “Rooted Cosmopolitanism”; also: Gregg, B. 2003. *Coping in Politics with Indeterminate Norms: A Theory of Enlightened Localism*. Albany, NY: State University of New York. The idea here would be that we should assert local identity claims and sink our roots deeply in the local and regional, while emphasizing that the right to a local identity is a cosmopolitan right that must interact with and find support from emerging cosmopolitan norms and the ideals of universal ethics and human rights. Cosmopolitan localism is the best hope for progressive human development: it is committed to a universal ethic, while recognizing a plurality of possibilities for manifesting ethical humanity in concrete, lived experience.

These insights include: respect for human rights, a basic commitment to nonviolence, and ongoing dialogue about interweaving the needs and values of local communities into the growing cosmopolitan system. We need to continue to work to develop cosmopolitan norms and institutions, while we also need to work to preserve the integrity of local and regional values and value systems. The motto for this idea is to “think globally while acting locally.” The key to doing this well is ongoing dialogue that is framed by cosmopolitan values but which is open and sympathetic to the needs of local communities. Thinking is dialogical—and ought to grow in an inclusive and cosmopolitan direction; but action is local and ought to remain grounded in the needs of concrete others.

Some of the renascent nationalists are simply racist and ethnocentric. But other forms of regressive nationalism can be understood as a response to the discontent caused by certain forms of globalization. We might sympathize with some forms of resurgent nationalism (without condoning it) as a reaction against the disenchanting impact of the fast leap that we have made toward cosmopolitanism. Some people have not benefited from the cosmopolizing leap. Life is still lived in concrete locales: work, friendship, family, and political engagement remain predominately tied to the local. This is especially true for the vast majority of the working class, who remain at home in the local, even as the forces of globalization change the structure of local economies, creating unemployment, competition for resources, and waves of immigration. Regressive nationalism can be understood as a reactionary response to the forces of economic globalization. But it can also be understood as the felt need for concrete and grounded thinking and life—as a defensive posture protecting cultural, religious, ethical, political, and philosophical ideas that are associated with local customs and beliefs. Thus regressive nationalism shares some of the basic insights found in more progressive communitarian and multiculturalist critiques of larger/dominant structures that undermine traditional identities and local autonomy. The political and psychological impetus behind regressive nationalism makes sense given negative impacts of economic and cultural globalization—especially on poor and marginalized people—and in light of the perceived negative impacts that cosmopolizing theory has on local ways of thinking.

What is needed, if we are to continue developing in a progressive cosmopolitan direction is a response to the political, psychological, and even epistemological need to affirm some of the insights of the communitarians. We need the best aspects of localism, while continuing to embrace cosmopolitan values. Such a synthetic or dialectical view is not an easy notion to comprehend. But the complexity of the contemporary world demands that social and political theory reflect this complexity. Said differently, it would be wrong to demand cosmopolitanism without also recognizing the legitimate complaints of those who want to preserve local claims about identity and value; and it would be wrong to retreat to localism entirely and thus to abandon the ethical universalism of cosmopolitanism. In short, we need a cosmopolitanism that is rooted in recognition of the local and a

localism that aspires to build a cosmopolitan world. We need a dialectical synthesis that cosmopolizes and localizes at the same time.

SITUATING THE COSMOPOLITAN-LOCAL DIALECTIC: SIMÓN BOLÍVAR AND ABIMAEEL GUZMÁN

The history of the modern world involves a contest between globalizing forces and the claims of local communities. Anti-colonial and liberation movements can be understood, for example, as local responses to the globalizing imperative of European colonialism. One important feature of the reaction against globalizing movements is to reassert the primacy of the local, the particular, and the small.

The occasion of the conference of the International Society for Universal Dialogue in Peru provides a focal point—a concrete local context—for reflecting on this dialectic. We see various interactions between localizing and cosmopolizing ideas unfolding in the context of Peru. A useful place to begin thinking about this is in the work of the great liberator of Latin America, Simón Bolívar. Bolívar drew attention to the local and the small in his famous “Letter from Jamaica” (1815): “The distinctive feature of small republics is permanence: that of large republics varies, but always with a tendency toward empire. Almost all small republics have had long lives.”¹² This generally positive estimation of the small and the local forms the heart of most libertarian and anarchist critiques of political centralization. We see this in the thinking of the New England transcendentalists—who are roughly contemporaries of Bolívar—and which I mention here because of my own local identity as a U.S. philosopher. Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, and their utopian and anarchist friends—William Lloyd Garrison, Bronson Alcott, and Adin Ballou—were all critical of the power of centralized government and big, impersonal institutions. A generation later, the United States philosopher William James built upon this critique of centralization and “bigness.” James was critical of U.S. Imperialism and of the alienation created by big, centralized systems. He once said: “I am against bigness and greatness in all their forms [...] The bigger the unit you deal with, the hollower, the more brutal, the more mendacious is the life displayed. So I am against all big organizations as such, national ones first and foremost ...”¹³ And also: “I am becoming more and more an individualist and anarchist

¹² Bolívar, S. 1815. “Letter from Jamaica;” <http://faculty.smu.edu/bakewell/bakewell/texts/jamaica-letter.html>; accessed April 20, 2018.

¹³ 2004. *Correspondence of William James*. University of Virginia Press, vol. 8, 546. Or consider this line from a letter to the pacifist Ernest Howard Crosby (October 1901): “Through small systems kept pure lies the most prominent line of betterment” (*Correspondence*, vol. 9, 551). I discuss the anarchist strains in U.S. philosophy including James in Fiala, A. 2013. “Political Skepticism and Anarchist Themes in the American Tradition.” *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy*, 2, December.

and believer in small systems of things exclusively.”¹⁴ There is a kind of hollowness and mendacity in big, impersonal organizations. This idea is reflected in the ideas of anarchists and localists—from Bakunin and Kropotkin to John Zerzan and contemporary anarcho-primitivists.¹⁵

But struggles against colonialism, imperialism, and other forms of “bigness” are often dependent upon other “big” systems and institutions. Thus if there were a “localist” or “anarchist” party it would have to engage in organized struggle against globalizing, imperialistic states and other forms of institutionalized colonial power. This dialectic has played itself out in various ways throughout the past couple of centuries. For example, Bolívar saw the need for pan-American unity in the struggle against Spain. But unity was not easily achieved. In 1826, Bolívar called for a pan-American conference to be held in Panama—the failed “Congress of the Isthmus.” Bolívar himself remained in Lima and the conference failed to produce unity or agreement. He eventually imagined a smaller union of the Andean nations: Peru, Bolivia, and Colombia. But finally, he gave up on his “cosmopolitan” (in this case pan-American or Pan-Andean) aspirations. In 1825, for example, Bolivia gained its independence from Peru, just four years after Peru had declared its independence from Spain (in 1821). As he left Peru to return to Venezuela, Bolívar wrote a letter to General Andrés de Santa Cruz, who would go on to take over the Presidency of Peru from Bolívar. In the letter Bolívar explained that he was giving up on his cosmopolitan plan in order to devote himself to the cause of nationalism. He said:

“I intend to do all the good I can for Venezuela without attempting anything further. Let you and your colleagues, therefore, do the same for Peru. Our native land must take preference above everything, as its elements have shaped our being [...] Are there any more sacred claims upon love and devotion? Yes, General, let each serve his native land and let all other things be secondary to this duty.”¹⁶

And so we can see the nature of the cosmopolitan-local dialectic. In this case, the local and the small are asserted against the more cosmopolitan concerns of pan-American unity—as he says here, “our native land” is preferred because “its elements have shaped our being.” This is an ontological claim about the importance of the local.

¹⁴ 2004. *Correspondence of William James*. University of Virginia Press, vol. 9, 362. See discussion in Cotkin, G. 1994. *William James, Public Philosopher*. University of Illinois Press; also see Coon, D. J. 1996. “‘One Moment in the World’s Salvation’: Anarchism and the Radicalization of William James.” *The Journal of American History*, June.

¹⁵ I discuss the anarchist literature in: Andrew Fiala, “Anarchism” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/anarchism/>); Fall 2017; and Andrew Fiala *Against Religions, Wars, and States: Enlightenment Atheism, Just War Pacifism, and Liberal-Democratic Anarchism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2013.

¹⁶ Quoted in Lynch, J. 2007. *Simón Bolívar: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 215.

But such an assertion also depends upon the need for unity and cohesion among groups in the struggle against larger forces of global power. And, in the South American case—as in many others—ongoing struggles ensue between the assertion of the local and the need for greater unity. Resistance and liberationist movements are often local: their goal is to preserve the values and autonomy of local populations. But in the struggle against the unified global power of colonialism and capitalism, indigenous resistance movements benefit from broader alliances as well as by appealing to emerging cosmopolitan norms regarding human rights.

The 19th and 20th centuries involved long struggles for autonomy against Spanish, British, U.S., and other forms of colonialism. This period also included struggles among global forces—most notable between the forces of economical liberalism and Marxist–Leninist–Maoist alternatives. These struggles played out in various ways, including in Peru, with tragic impact. Radical guerilla and separatist groups such as the Maoist insurgency in Peru known as the Shining Path (*Sendero Luminoso*) fought against the forces of global capitalism. The ideology of Shining Path was formulated by the philosopher Abimael Guzmán. Guzmán, also known as “Chairman Gonzalo,” wrote a dissertation on Immanuel Kant, one of the early philosophers associated with cosmopolitanism. As we know, Marxists criticized Kantian cosmopolitanism (along with post-Kantian and Hegelian philosophy) for its tendency to accommodate the bourgeois status quo.¹⁷ At any rate, Guzmán brought his study of Marxist-Leninist-Maoist ideology to local communities in Peru, creating an uprising of peasant and indigenous peoples, who fought against imperialism and global capitalism. Maoist ideology is grounded in claims about the need to build power for agrarian, peasant, and local people. But as a development within the dialectical materialism of Marxist-Leninist thought, Maoism is also a globalizing ideology: it seeks the global revolution by way of local peasant revolutions. The fact that there are “Maoists” in Peru, Nepal, and other places—including in the U.S. in the Black Panther party, for example—shows us the global influence of this idea.¹⁸ Indeed, essential for Maoism is an emphasis on the local—what Mao calls “the concrete.” Mao explains that the emphasis on the local/concrete is an essential feature of Leninism: “Lenin meant just this when he said that the most essential thing in Marxism, the living soul of Marxism, is the concrete analysis of concrete conditions.”¹⁹

¹⁷ See for example, Lukács, G. 1967. *History and Class Consciousness*. New York: Merlin.

¹⁸ On the Black Panther connection see: Chao Ren. 2009. “Concrete Analysis of Concrete Conditions: A Study of the Relationship between the Black Panther Party and Maoism.” *Constructing the Past*, 10, 1, article 7 (at: <http://digitalcommons.iwu.edu/constructing/vol10/iss1/7>)

¹⁹ Mao Tse-Tung. 1937. *On Contradiction*; at: https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_17.htm

COSMOPOLITANISM, NONVIOLENCE, AND LOCAL DIALOGUE

The problem with Maoism is its advocacy of violence as the assertion of the concrete. The violence in the Peruvian case shows us the problem: the Maoist insurgency and backlash killed approximately 70,000 people.²⁰ This cautionary tale reminds us of the need for dialogue. It is dialogue that will bring the local concerns of peasants and indigenous people to the attention of globalizing forces. While some—those inspired by Marxist critique of ideology—will view this as naïve or ideological, the point is to leverage the insights of European (Kantian) cosmopolitanism, while also building upon the tradition that has roots in Thoreau and the North American philosophical tradition of civil disobedience and conscientious refusal. Critics will complain that the forces of globalization are rapacious, immoral, and unwilling to respond to the pleading of the oppressed. The history of old school colonialism is certainly appalling: the same Europeans who espoused enlightened cosmopolitanism also enslaved, expropriated, and murdered Africans and Americans. But if we are to avoid violence, the best and most pragmatic course of action is to appeal to the emerging norms of global cosmopolitanism along with the tradition of nonviolent social protest that traces its roots back through Martin Luther King, Jr. to Gandhi and Thoreau—and behind this to the very norms espoused by Kant himself: the value of reasonable dialogue, respect for autonomy, and the need for nonviolence.

One important feature of the Gandhi-King tradition is that it is locally engaged. Gandhi worked in India, King worked in the United States—addressing the concrete needs of local communities. Although each was inspired by universal norms—and each was a “cosmopolitan” in the sense that they travelled and carried on dialogue with people around the world—their activism was local. In this tradition, liberation movements must be locally grounded, even though—like the Marxist-Leninist-Maoist revolutionaries—the nonviolent tradition aspires toward the liberation of all peoples in opposition to all forms of imperialism, colonialism, racism, and so on. But the revolution is to be carried out by nonviolent means. Gandhi and King imagine global justice but they understand that the hard work of liberation occurs in local nonviolence and the community dialogues that result—changing the world one mind at a time.

The moral norms that ground the Gandhi-King tradition—and behind this in the moral cosmopolitanism of Kant—are focused on creating conditions that allow for dialogue, mutual understanding, and the development of rational consensus. This tradition rejects colonialism, imperialism, and rapacious capitalism—despite the fact that critics who follow Marx and Mao will argue that dialogue and nonviolence remain too closely wedded to the bourgeois ideology and the history of colonialism. Rather, the norms of the “Kant-to-King” tradition

²⁰ See NYTIMES: <https://www.nytimes.com/2003/08/29/world/peru-report-says-69000-died-in-20-years-of-rebel-war.html> (accessed April 22, 2018).

provide the basis for an inclusive dialogue, in which those who have suffered under colonialism, slavery, and oppression can publicly articulate their complaint and seek redress by appealing to universal ideas about human rights, the dignity of persons, the importance of tolerance, the need for hospitality, and so on.²¹ Building upon these ideas, through the latter half of the 20th Century, there has emerged a new and improved form of global cosmopolitanism, grounded in international law and universal moral norms with roots in the liberal political tradition and in the Kant-to-King moral tradition.

RESURGENT NATIONALISM

Unfortunately, recent history has generated new forms of reaction against emerging cosmopolitanism. Resurgent nationalism, ethnocentrism, racism, and other reactionary ideas have come to the fore in the midst of nations and institutions that were previously among the vanguard of cosmopolitan development: in Western Europe and North America. Admittedly, the specific, concrete content of these more recent examples will differ—since they are driven by *local* concerns. However, the structural similarity uniting these cases is what we might generally call “regressive localism”: a deliberate turning away from the cosmopolitan effort to develop larger, more inclusive institutions based on universal moral and political values. Regressive localism is not interested in a global proletarian revolution or in global capitalism. In its simplest form it merely wants to devolve power and reassert the values of the local community.

Resurgent nationalism and regressive localism are reacting against larger cosmopolitan normative inclusion. This development is disheartening for those who advocate on behalf of growing cosmopolitan interdependence based upon a global ethic that is democratic and which emphasizes universal human rights. But at the same time there is a kind of wisdom in the move toward localism and the focus on self-sufficient and autonomous local communities—a wisdom that reflects ideas expressed by the transcendentalists, liberationists, and anarchists mentioned above.

Even committed internationalists understand that the emerging international system is fragile and in need of repair. For example, French President Emmanuel Macron remains committed to the European Union and what is called “globalism,” even while leading a campaign to reform the E.U. and other transnational organizations.²² There is dialectical conflict within progressive politics that

²¹ I discuss this in much more detail in: Fiala, A. 2016. *Secular Cosmopolitanism, Hospitality, and Religious Pluralism*. New York: Routledge Publishing 2016; and Fiala, A. 2018. *Transformative Pacifism*. London: Bloomsbury.

²² 2018. “Macron’s Lonely Road: Saving Globalism From Itself.” *Wall Street Journal*, April 20, <https://www.wsj.com/articles/macrons-lonely-road-saving-globalism-from-itself-1524216601> (Accessed 4/20/18)

puts the cosmopolitan imperative of global ethics at odds with the lived reality of local identities and communities that experience the forces of globalization as a source of dislocation and discontent. Resurgent nationalism should not be confused with more progressive and benevolent expressions of the importance of localism—the move toward increasing engagement in local politics, the move toward regional food collectives, the focus on regional/local/ethnic identities, and the call for local autonomy with regard to social challenges—in education, welfare, health care, and so on. Progressive localism is perhaps best understood as a form of communitarianism or multiculturalism.²³ But progressive localism shares a structural similarity with regressive localism and resurgent nationalism.²⁴

MULTICULTURALISM

An important concept in discussions of the dialectical relationship between cosmopolitanism and localism is multiculturalism. Multiculturalism aims to recognize the rights and values of ethnic, religious, and other forms of groups and identities within larger political collectives. While multiculturalism is often viewed as a progressive development which builds upon liberal cosmopolitan norms in order to recognize the importance of local values and identities, others worry that multiculturalism depends upon some claims that look reactionary and old-fashioned from the vantage point of cosmopolitanism. The progressive interpretation of multiculturalism focuses on the ways that minorities are forcibly integrated into larger liberal polities. Progressive multiculturalism focuses on the rights of sub-national, regional, and local groups to resist the move toward liberalism's ideal of homogeneous citizenship, which treats all citizens exactly alike. When globalized, the problem is that cosmopolitanism postulates a common humanity that is abstract and empty—and which ignores important differences in ethnic, religious, and other forms of identity.

The literature on communitarian resistance to liberalism's homogenizing hegemony provides an example of this dialectical problem. Communitarians will argue that local identities need to be preserved and defended against the encroaching universalism of liberal regimes. A similar argument could be made about the universalizing tendencies of forms of liberal cosmopolitanism. Not only do local communities have to resist being incorporated into a larger liberal

²³ Elizabeth Fraser writes, for example: "We have seen, then, that locality and a measure of local autonomy are central to political communitarianism. It is also notable that 'community' tends to be central in the thought of students and theorists of local government" Fraser, E. 1999. *The Problems of Communitarian Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 147.

²⁴ Resurgent nationalism is often based on claims about identity and culture that have connections with old-fashioned racism, ethnocentrism, and religious fundamentalism. Nonetheless, the structure of resurgent nationalism is similar to what we find in progressive localism.

polity but they also have to worry about further incorporation into global economic systems and the emerging cosmopolitan order. Admittedly, a friendly cosmopolitanism and liberalism wants to allow for the autonomy of local communities. But there is obvious tension here—and the power and ubiquity of global structures and cosmopolitan norms poses an ongoing threat to local values and communitarian identities. These tensions have led to the development of more robust theories of multiculturalism which attempt to find ways to synthesize liberal universalism with the desire to respect local autonomy.

Following Charles Taylor, Will Kymlicka, and other multiculturalist theories, we might want to allow for differential group rights that track local and minority values. The cases considered by Taylor and Kymlicka are often also of local interest, as their thinking about these things grows out of the Canadian context in which they write. Again the point is that there are local influences on our thinking, even when we are thinking about larger issues of global concern. At any rate, as is well known, the multiculturalist critique results in a challenging problem for the liberal (and thus for the cosmopolitan and global) consensus. It is possible for the power and value of group rights and local autonomy to offer considerable resistance to overarching liberal political systems and the emerging cosmopolitan order. To make this concrete, we might consider the question of whether we should tolerate minority groups that are racist, sexist, and generally illiberal. And in the extreme case, one wonders whether secession is to be tolerated under a multicultural scheme. Indeed, Kymlicka has written: “Perhaps we should be more willing to consider secession ... After all, liberalism is fundamentally concerned, not with the fate of states, but with the freedom and well-being of individuals, and secession need not harm individual rights.”²⁵ He cites, for example, the secession of Norway from Sweden in 1905 as an appropriate and progressive example that points to the breakdown of larger political organizations. And before that—to provide other examples that link to the examples discussed above—we should consider the creation of Bolivia and the rest of the political fragmentation that followed upon Bolívar’s failed attempts to establish pan-American unity; and along with that the secession struggle that led to the United States Civil War in the 1860’s. The U.S. secession struggle pitted more cosmopolitan norms of the Northern States (i.e., the abolition of slavery and respect for the dignity of those of African lineage) against the regressive values of the Southern slave states. But it is possible to imagine other struggles to devolve political structures and assert local control, which are not regressive—perhaps as in the case of Norway.

Kymlicka is right, I think, to suggest that we—progressive, liberal-minded, cosmopolitans—would not condemn Norwegian nationalism in the early part of the 20th century. But the problem is that a political party that aimed to “make Norway great again” and which was modeled after the image of Trump’s

²⁵ Kymlicka, 1995. *W. Multicultural Citizenship*. Clarendon Press, 186.

“America First” policy would now seem regressive. One important point to be made here is that these concepts and political movements are historically located and best understood in dialectical terms. Thus Norwegian nationalism has a certain value in 1905, which “America first” nationalism does not have in 2018. Thus the secession of states and assertion of local power in 19th century North or South America looks different than it would in the 21st century. And so, for example, the unrest in Bolivia in 2007—in which some regions declared autonomy—looks different than did the Bolivian secession in the 19th Century. And so on.

While there are parallels and analogies between resurgent nationalism and the communitarian and multiculturalist impulse, resurgent nationalisms are concrete, diverse, and uniquely dependent upon prior local history. Today resurgent nationalism is a dialectical response to the prior dialectical interplay of cosmopolitanism and localism, as developed after the demise of colonialism, the creation of the United Nations and so on. Furthermore, resurgent nationalism in the 21st Century is informed by the multiculturalist and communitarian challenge to liberal internationalism and cosmopolitanism—as well as by the localist challenge mounted by anarchists and libertarians throughout the past couple of centuries. In short, contemporary movements must be analyzed dialectically and historically, as a further stage in the ongoing movement of conceptual, material, and cultural forces. Such analyses are concrete and historically complex. In realizing this complexity we engage the dialectic and take a progressive step beyond the old-fashioned and monolithic narratives of Kantian/Enlightenment cosmopolitanism.

HISTORICAL AND DIALECTICAL DEFINITION OF COSMOPOLITANISM AND LOCALISM

Thus “cosmopolitanism” has a history. As discussed already, cosmopolitanism is an idea that develops out of and in dialectical relation to claims about local political identity—and in relation to historical processes that are in the process cosmopolizing. The word “cosmopolitanism” itself gives us a clue: it is an ancient Greek term that has grown and spread around the globe.²⁶

Through the past millennia, we have developed a variety of claims about identity and nation sovereignty. An important part of this development was the

²⁶ The historical root and etymology of the term can be traced back to Diogenes the Cynic, who—when asked to identify his national identity and name the *polis* from which he hailed—said he was “a citizen of the world,” a “*kosmopolites*.” This concept only makes sense against the background of non-cosmopolitan political identity: in other words, even for the ancient Greeks, cosmopolitanism is dialectically defined, as the other to what is conceived as a “normal” or “natural” political identity and affiliation—i.e., the natural/normal as thoroughly local identification with one’s *polis* (city, ethnicity, state, etc.).

existence of trans-national empires. In Europe this included the Roman Empire and the later Holy Roman Empire. We could also cite the Ottoman Empire, the British Empire, and even the Soviet Union—as transnational political entities that united in various ways local, ethnic, national, and religious groups. In the early modern period, there emerged the notion of Westphalian national identity, which linked political sovereignty to a sense of national identity. And thus there emerged the idea of the right of nations or peoples to unite and govern themselves—a principle that became increasingly important after the First World War and throughout the post-colonial era. Again, the emergence of Westphalian nationalism only makes sense against the backdrop of imperial/colonial power. But during this same time—during the early modern and contemporary era—there emerged a newly invigorated cosmopolitanism. The source for this idea is Kant and other modern moral and political philosophers who argue in favor of universal moral norms, who worry about wars between nations, and who imagine that there is a common humanity governed by reason, logic, and the moral claim of universal human rights. Kant and the other thinkers of the European Enlightenment were limited by racist and Eurocentrist assumptions, which viewed the Enlightenment as the unique and precious child of white, Christian Europe.²⁷ In post-Enlightenment political and moral philosophy, the cosmopolitan ideal has grown beyond these roots—again in a dialectical development. In the contemporary era—as a dialectical response to the nadir of nationalism in the First and Second World Wars—a more inclusive (dare we say more “enlightened”) cosmopolitanism emerged, along with the growth of transnational, international, and global institutions and structures, such as the U.N., the World Bank, and a variety of conventions, corporations, and non-governmental organizations. Finally, in response to the development of globalism, we have also seen the re-emergence of localism, as a response to the anonymous, cold, and impersonal nature of global institutions. And now, in recent years, a form of resurgent nationalism has developed, which builds upon some of the critical insights of the localists, especially their critique of the way that global capitalism hurts the working class and the need to preserve a certain form of ethno-nationalist identity and culture against the homogenizing tendencies of deracinated globalism.

This brief history shows that cosmopolitanism and localism are dialectically intertwined. In what follow here, I offer further analysis of the ontological and normative commitments of cosmopolitanism and localism. Keep in mind in this analysis that these concepts share a dialectical development.

Cosmopolitanism tends to hold that we are all citizens of the globe with a shared set of common interests, responsibilities, and rights, which are defined by some form of a global ethic that transcends national borders and concrete

²⁷ See Park, P. K. J. 2013. *Africa, Asia, and the History of Philosophy: Racism in the Formation of the Philosophical Canon, 1780–1830*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, or Bernasconi, R. 2001. “Who Invented the Concept of Race? Kant’s Role in the Enlightenment Construction of Race.” In: *Race*. Bernasconi, R. (Ed.). Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

particular identities. Cosmopolitanization or cosmopolization (following Beck, as discussed above) teaches us that we are globally interconnected as a matter of descriptive fact. As a normative theory, cosmopolitanism claims that we ought to focus our normative commitments on our shared, common, and globalized human identity—and furthermore, in some cases, that we ought to actively build cosmopolitan or global institutions and communities, while moving beyond the parochial confines of local communities and identities.

Localism, on the other hand, tends to hold that we are inevitably bound to local identities and a fundamental sense of communal-belonging that is defined in local terms. Localism as a normative theory further states that it is right and good: to celebrate local and regional identities; to eat, shop, vote, and pray locally; to work to build local and regional systems of interdependence. Localism goes even further in some cases in maintaining that we ought to devolve away from a global cosmopolitanism that devalues traditional local identities and commitments.

In both cases, ontological claims are made about the basis of human identity, community, and value. And in both cases, normative claims are made about the value of local and/or global values. It is possible to distinguish between the ontological and the normative in a variety of ways. One could, for example, claim that local identities are ontologically constitutive and developmentally primary, while also claiming that we ought to work to develop a sense of global interconnection. One could also, to cite an opposite sort of case, claim that our global interdependence is simply a given fact of the world, while maintaining that life is better when lived in a provincial and parochial fashion.

In general, the distinction between these two points of view is further explained in the sorts of normatively-loaded terminology that is used to describe them. On the one hand, critics of cosmopolitanism will claim that it encourages a kind of up-rooted-ness noted in the pejorative description of “rootless cosmopolitanism.”²⁸ On the other hand, proponents of cosmopolitanism will emphasize the enlightened maturity of post-national and non-parochial identity. A laudatory description of localism will claim that it encourages us to sink our roots deeply within the local community and bioregion. A pejorative description will claim that localism is narrow-minded and provincial.

THE CASE OF TRUMP

As globalization spreads, there is often a corresponding decentralization. The decentralizing aspect of post-national modernity allows for re-rooting in the local. This seems paradoxical. But dialectical analysis helps show that one can both (1) affirm the importance of cosmopolitan norms (including human rights

²⁸ This term is often employed as an anti-Semitic pejorative.

and global justice) and (2) advocate for localism, the devolution of political power, and the spread of de-centralized self-sufficiency. The trick is to do this without fanning the flames of racism, ethnocentrism, militaristic nationalism, religious fundamentalism, reactionary politics, and the like.

Let us pause to consider a concrete example. The case to be considered is the election of Donald Trump in the United States. It is well-known that Trump appealed to the economic interests and sense of American identity of a large number of Americans who felt disenfranchised, abused, and neglected by the so-called “cosmopolitan elite.” In the United States, this phrase picks out two related classes of people. On the one hand, the political and economic establishment in Washington, D.C. and on Wall Street is viewed as being out of touch with the lived reality of people living outside of these centers of power. The values of the governing elites were, furthermore, thought to be closely aligned with a kind of transnational cosmopolitanism that was in favor of open-borders, free trade agreements, and international regulation. Thus Trump promised to close the borders, build a border wall, limit immigration, rip up free trade agreements, impose tariffs, and back out of international agreements such as the Paris climate agreement, the North American Free Trade Agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, and so on. This also included strong criticism of the United Nations, NATO, and other organizations that were long identified with the emerging international order. Trump even named his policy “America First,” which echoed his campaign promise to “Make America Great Again.” The America First policy was articulated in detail, for example, in Trump’s National Security Strategy. The statement asserts: “We are enforcing our borders, building trade relationships based on fairness and reciprocity, and defending America’s sovereignty without apology.”²⁹ This idea of defending America’s sovereignty without apology is typical of the resurgent nationalism I am describing here.

What is interesting about Trump’s resurgent nationalism is that a number of the policies and ideas contained in the policy overlap with criticisms that have been made by more progressively-minded people who emphasize localism. Criticism of NAFTA and other free trade agreements has also been made by people who are wary of global capitalism and who want to defend the rights of indigenous peoples against the neo-liberal economic order. The idea of defending national identity by limiting immigration is another point that has been made by defenders of local ethno-religious identity (for example, in Tibet, where an influx of Chinese has threatened Tibetan culture). The idea of protecting national industries through the use of tariffs and import regulations has also been advocated in cases that have had progressive advocates—for example, in efforts to protect cheese or wine in France and other European countries. Further examples could be cited. The point is that the localist critique is not merely

²⁹ <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/NSS-Final-12-18-2017-0905.pdf>

reactionary. There are good reasons to want to preserve and protect national, local, and regional identities, values, industries, and cultures.

There is something odd about an imperial, globalist, and cosmopolitan power invoking the localist critique. American industry, capital, products, ideas, and culture have been on the march across the globe. Americans have been among the chief proponents of building an international liberal order that is based on neo-liberal economic structures. It is ironic—and even more strongly stated, it is disingenuous—for Americans to pull out of the developing cosmopolitan world. Perhaps the present moment is a response to a growing equalization of global power. Americans no longer control the global order. There are threats to the mono-polar world that was run by the United States—in the growth of terrorism, in the global immigration crisis, in the demographic surge of non-Christian and non-White people, in the emergence of China as an economic powerhouse, in the development of the power of the European Union, in the emergence of Latin American power, and in the reemergence of Russia. In the midst of these threats to global leadership of the United States, the nationalistic retrenchment represented by Trump makes sense, as a response occurring within the global-local dialectic.

CONCLUSION

Even though resurgent nationalism occurs as a response within this larger dialectic, the prevailing trend is toward continued cosmopolitanization. Furthermore, the ethical and political tradition that extends from Kant-to-King has itself been cosmopolitanized. The cosmopolitan normative imperative is defensible on both deontological grounds (as a matter of the rights of individuals qua global citizens) and consequentialist grounds (as a matter of human well-being and global justice). The same is true, of course, of the localizing imperative: we have a right to our local identities and we do better when we form local cooperatives that build self-sufficiency and promote community. The irony, of course, is that normative localism will be articulated in terms that are already cosmopolitan: using Kantian or other language (human rights, political liberalism, communitarianism, multiculturalism) that is cosmopolitanized and available to local populations including indigenous people across the globe.

The current cosmopolitan-local dialectic is global: it emerges out of the prior social and political philosophy of the nation-state and challenges to these ideas as articulated by the anarchists, the Maoists, the Marxists, and so on. The nation-state and nation-state citizenship are a result of previous models of political sovereignty and social identity. And across the globe, these ideas are in dialectical movement. Bolívar and his liberation movement represent one possibility. Global capitalism represents another. The Marxist-Leninist-Maoist movement represents yet another. As does Gandhi-King nonviolence, Canadian multiculturalism, and so on.

All of this points toward the continuing success of cosmopolization. One cannot simply retreat to old-fashioned nationalism, racism, ethnocentrism, and religious exclusivism. Our *thinking* has been globalized. Resurgent nationalism represents an absurd attempt to fend off further cosmopolizing. Resurgent nationalism will likely give way to further growth of the sense of cosmopolitan interconnection, as a global response to resurgent nationalism develops. There is no denying that we live in an era of cosmopolization, as Beck suggests. The basis for a just and benevolent cosmopolitan future is to find ways to take seriously the facticity of the local, while not giving in to the regressive movement of nationalism, racism, ethnocentrism, and the like. As I have tried to show in the sources and issues considered in this paper, we already live in a cosmopolitanized world, where it is possible to talk about Kant, Bolívar, Marx, Thoreau, Lenin, Mao, Gandhi, King, Guzmán, Beck, Kymlicka, and Quijano, as well as a variety of others, in a meaningful way in a single paper. We are already operating in a world in which globally diverse ideas and practices are already in dialogue. The challenge is to continue the cosmopolitanizing conversation, while remaining responsive to the needs of local communities.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR — PhD, Professor of Philosophy and Director of the Ethics Center at California State University, Fresno. He is the author or editor of more than a dozen books and author of more than 50 scholarly articles and book chapters. His research focuses on ethics, religion, and political philosophy. Recent titles include: 2016. *Secular Cosmopolitanism, Hospitality, and Religious Pluralism*. Routledge; 2015. *The Peace of Nature and the Nature of Peace*. Brill; 2015. *The Bloomsbury Companion to Political Philosophy*. Bloomsbury; and (with co-author Barbara MacKinnon), the 9th 2017 edition of *Ethics: Theory and Contemporary Issues*. Cengage Publishing. Fiala is former editor of the journal *Philosophy in the Contemporary World* and past President of Concerned Philosophers for Peace. He writes a weekly column on religion, politics, and ethics for the Fresno Bee: <https://www.fresnobee.com/living/liv-columns-blogs/andrew-fiala/>

E-mail: afiala@csufresno.edu