COSMOPOLITAN ETHICS AND CONTRACT WITH HUMANITY

Xunwu Chen*

Abstract: The essay purports to define cosmopolitan ethics as the ethics of being together of diverse human beings under common moral norms and rules. It explores the three core operating principles of cosmopolitan ethics: the principle of basic human rights, the principle of cultural toleration, and the principle of humanity. It demonstrates that cosmopolitan ethics proffers an alternative both to multiculturalist ethics and universalist ethics, as well as liberal ethics and republican ethics. It shows that cosmopolitan ethics operates with three cornerstone principles: the principle of basic rights and dignity; the principle of cultural toleration, and the principle of humanity.

COSMOPOLITANISM HAS become a main ethical philosophy in our epoch and is part of the spirit of our epoch, amid cultural diversity, which is an enduring reality of the time in which we live. What is cosmopolitan ethics? What is its nature? What are its basic tenets? Present philosophers disagree on this. For Thomas Pogge (1994, 2012), cosmopolitan ethics is the ethics of equal dignity and value of individuals. It is the Aristotelian-Zhuangzi doctrine that all individual persons as substances are of equal dignity, worthiness, and rights. For Martha Nussbaum (2019), cosmopolitan ethics is the ethics of humankind as a community of common fate and ethics wherein our first ethical-moral affiliation is with rational humanity. For Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006), cosmopolitan ethics is ethics in the world of strangers and thus ethics of "being together of strangers", to borrow Iris Young's metaphor of city life. It is the ethics of how people as strangers in the world ought to live together. Appiah claims that cosmopolitanism has two core precepts: (1) genuine curiosity of and opening to different cultures and (2) the rule of law. That is to say, people as strangers to each other in the world ought to, and can best, live together by two ethical principles: cultural toleration and abiding by laws.

Thus, I would like to propose that cosmopolitan ethics is the ethics of being together of diverse human beings under the rule of laws; cosmopolitan ethics is a form of contractarian ethics and a rise of the contract with global humanity; it underscores human beings' ethical-moral affiliation and bond with humanity, and thus the duty and obligation which the contract with global humanity imposes. Its norms of cultural toleration and the rule of law prescribe the way for diverse human beings to be together and extend their lives together. Cosmopolitan ethics is based on the core idea of our epoch spirit that all human beings must have solidarity with and commitment to the unity of global humanity amid their cultural diversity; all human beings must abide by their contract with global humanity. By this token, cosmopolitan ethics synthesizes insights of Kantian ethics and the ethics of contractarianism; Kant's cosmopolitanism is a milestone of cosmopolitanism in history.

* Dr. XUNWU CHEN, Professor of Philosophy, Department of Philosophy & Classics, The University of Texas at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX78249; E-mail: xun.chen@utsa.edu.

I.

Cosmopolitan ethics advocates inter- and intra-cultural openness and toleration as its norm of ethical life. However, cultures are not the most basic units of ethical and moral concerns and deliberation in cosmopolitan ethics. Instead, individual persons are. As Thomas Pogge (1994, 2012) claims, one of the core tenets of cosmopolitanism is individualism, that is, the doctrine that individual persons are the most basic units and objects of ethical, moral, and political concern and deliberation. Cultural tolerance in cosmopolitan ethics is that one must not imprison himself/herself by his/her cultural concepts of good and happiness and must not close his/her mind to and be intolerant of other cultural concepts of goods, happiness, duty, and obligations. It expresses the idea of respect for the rights and dignity of individual persons. Here, it is not cultural rights or preservation of different cultures that are the ultimate concern of cosmopolitan ethics. Instead, it is the rights and dignities of individual persons of liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that cosmopolitan ethics is concerned with.

The cosmopolitan tenet of cultural openness and toleration is a tenet that individual persons who are necessarily predicated by and embedded in diverse cultures must not be imprisoned by what predicates them. Instead, they must be autonomous, open-minded thinkers in themselves and also recognize people of other cultures as autonomous thinkers who have the equal right to live by their concepts of good, happiness, duty, and obligation. Liberation from the prison of culture; respect for individual persons' rights and dignities implies respect for their rights and dignities to live in cultures in which they are brought up; one must recognize others as individual persons of equal worthiness regardless of their cultural predicates. To spell it out differently, in cosmopolitan ethics, the tenet of cultural toleration is grounded in the tenet of respect for individual persons' rights and dignity and in the tenet that individual persons are the most basic units of ethical, moral concerns: their rights, dignities, happiness, and suffering are the primary concerns of ethics and morality. Individual rights and dignity make cultural toleration necessary, and cultural toleration substantiates the rights and dignity of individual persons. Cosmopolitanism marries individualism, not culturalism or multiculturalism.

Cosmopolitan ethics recognizes what Isaiah Berlin claimed: "The world in which what we see as incompatible values are not in conflict is a world altogether beyond our ken; that principles which are harmonized in this other world are not the principles with which, in our daily lives, we are acquainted." (Berlin, 1997, p.13). It recognizes what the Charter of the United Nations claims: there are diverse ways of being humans in the world we live. It recognizes individuals' rights and liberty to choose their cultural ways of living as human beings and to pursue self-realization and happiness. It purports to produce "an ethical and political space" for individual persons of different cultures and nation-peoples to co-exist (Held, 2010, p.79). For this reason, it seems to share territories with multiculturalist ethics. However, Cosmopolitan ethics is not culturalist or multiculturalist ethics. Their fundamental differences are as follows.

First, in cosmopolitanism, a person's cultural particularity and universal humanity, diversity and commonality, as well as individual autonomy and human solidarity, are both emphasized in global ethics and politics. The dual emphasis is given to both individual persons as unique individuals and individual persons as human beings. In contrast, in multiculturalism, persons' universal humanity is canceled in order to emphasize their cultural particularities; commonality is exiled in order to welcome diversity, and solidarity is retired in order to host autonomy. Samuel Beck (2006) claimed that "multiculturalism rapturously celebrates the social accommodation of diversity, but it lacks a sense of cosmopolitan realism." (Beck, 2006, p.66). Multiculturalism disperses a community into different cultural groups and produces cultural division, while cosmopolitanism unites a community through cultural toleration and inclusion.

Second, as Beck indicates, multiculturalist ethics is grounded in cultural essentialism (Ibid., p. 67). It "postulates an essentialist identity and rivalry among cultures." (Ibid). It

claims that one's cultural identity and belonging are the source of normativity—that is, legitimacy, validity, and authority—of one's concepts of value, happiness, duty, and obligation. Moreover, cultures become the primary, basic units of ethical-moral and political concern and deliberation. In comparison, cosmopolitan ethics is grounded in humanist individualism. As Pogge points out, in all forms of cosmopolitanism, the ultimate units of moral concern are human beings, or persons—rather than, say, family lines, tribes, ethnic, cultural, or religious communities, nations, or states. This cosmopolitan tenet is "affirmed by contemporary theorists such as Brian Barry (1998, p. 146; 1999: sec. IV, esp. pp. 35-5), Charles Beitz (p. 114, pp.124-5; p. 199c), Martha Nussbaum (1996, pp. 2-17), and Peter Singer (1972, pp. 229-43; 2002)." (Caney, 2005, p. 4).

Third, in cosmopolitan ethics, the concern for the so-called cultural rights cannot override the concern for individual persons' rights and dignity, and accordingly, the concern for the so-called public good or collective good cannot override the concern for individual persons' rights and dignity. In multiculturalist ethics, the concerns of cultures can override those of individual persons, e.g., their rights and dignity. Thus, "according to multiculturalism, there is no such thing as an individual. Individuals are merely epiphenomena of their cultures." (Ibid.). In multiculturalist ethics, individuals are replaced by the collective, and respect is for cultures, not for individual persons. In comparison, in cosmopolitanism, individual persons are the most basic units of moral concern. Pogge defines cosmopolitanism in terms of three basic tenets: "Three elements are shared by all cosmopolitan positions. First, individualism: the ultimate units of concern are human beings, or persons…Second, universality: the status of the ultimate unit of concern attached to every living human being equally…Third, generality: this special status has global force." (Pogge, 1994, p. 89; Caney, 2006).

Fourth, cosmopolitan ethics operates with the principle of inter- and intra-cultural openness, inclusion, and toleration. In contrast, in multiculturalist ethics, intra- and intercultural openness, inclusion, and tolerance are set aside, if not rejected outright. Cultural fundamentalism is emphasized. For this reason, cosmopolitan ethics leads to communitarianism, while multiculturalist ethics leads to tribalism and sectarianism. Robert Audi indicates that resistance to sectarianism is "common to cosmopolitanism and nationalism" (Audi, 2009, p. 375). In short, in cosmopolitan ethics, toleration is a norm, a value, and a virtue. In multiculturalism, toleration is not a norm, value, or virtue.

Fifth, cosmopolitan ethics purports to build public space among peoples of different cultural backgrounds, while multiculturalist ethics reduces public space in a society. In cosmopolitanism, intercultural intersubjectivity is the starting point for cultural interaction. As Appiah indicates, "the cosmopolitan curiosity about other peoples does not have to begin by seeking in each encounter those traits that all human beings share. In some encounters, what we start with is some small thing we two singular people share." (Appiah 2006, p.). In multiculturalism, cultural subjectivity is the starting point for the people of a culture to interact with peoples of other cultures.

As a result, cosmopolitan ethics purports to enlighten peoples to be culturally open, inclusive, and tolerant, while multiculturalist ethics regulates peoples in cultural self-closeness, exclusion, and intolerance. Cosmopolitan ethics emphasizes individual persons' autonomy, while multiculturalist ethics emphasizes persons' cultural belonging and solidarity. Cosmopolitan ethics recognizes the cultural embeddedness of individual persons' concepts of value, happiness, duty, and obligation, but also insists on universal human value, happiness, duty, and obligation, while multiculturalist ethics claims that persons should subscribe only to the cultural concepts of value, happiness, duty, and obligation that their cultures subscribe to. Multiculturalist ethics rejects concepts of universal human values, happiness, duty, and obligation.

That being said, married with individualism and emphasizing individual persons as the most basic units of ethical-moral consideration, cosmopolitan ethics is also not universalist ethics either. Kant's cosmopolitanism is a milestone of development in the history of

cosmopolitan ethics. Yet, Kantian ethics is a form of universalist ethics, but cosmopolitan ethics is not. Seyla Benhabib asserts that "Cosmopolitanism is a normative philosophy for carrying the universalistic norms of discourse ethics beyond the confines of the nation-states." (Benhabib, 2006, p. 18). Held follows suit, claiming that cosmopolitanism is about "universal principles which shape and limit all human activity." (Held, 2010, p. xi). Catherine Liu suggests that a cosmopolitan ethics is "a universalistic morality that eschews parochial, especially national, limitations or prejudices." (Liu, 2000, p. 245). However, to claim that cosmopolitan ethics has a universal dimension is one thing. To identify cosmopolitanism with universalism is quite another. To conflate the distinction between them is erroneous.

Universalist ethics starts exclusively from the assumption of the universality of all human beings, e.g., universal needs, universal nature, or universal humanity. Cosmopolitan ethics starts from both the diversity of individual persons and the universality of human beings in the world, e.g., diversity of cultural predicaments and universality of embodying the same human substance and belonging to the same family of humankind. Accordingly, the operating principles of universalist ethics give due only to the universality of all human beings, while the operating principles of cosmopolitan ethics give due to both the particularity/diversity and universality of human beings. Universalist ethics recognizes only universal concepts of human value, happiness, duty, and obligation, while cosmopolitan ethics recognizes both universal and culturally particular concepts of value, happiness, duty, and obligation.

Notwithstanding, cosmopolitan ethics and universalist ethics differ in their approaches to the relationships between the universal and the particular, the global and the local, identity and diversity, commonality and uniqueness, solidarity and sovereignty. Universalism recognizes only the universal and the identical. In contrast, the cosmopolitan view is beyond the either/or model of thinking. Cosmopolitan ethics has a dialectical perspective of the relationship between the particular and the universal, as well as the individual and the collective. Thus, cosmopolitan ethics recognizes not only universal goods, duties, and obligations of humankind, but also particular goods, duties, and obligations of particular peoples. Universalist ethics is hegemonic and oppressive of the particular, while cosmopolitan ethics is democratic, inclusive, and tolerant of difference.

Correspondingly, though respect for cultural others is emphasized in both cosmopolitanism and universalism, in the name of respect for others as equal human beings, universalism "does not involve any requirement that would inspire curiosity or respect for what makes others different." (Beck, 2006, p. 49). Instead, "universalism thereby becomes twofaced: respect and hegemony, rationality and terror." (Ibid). In the final analysis, "the universalistic project is hegemonic: the voice of others is granted a hearing only as the voice of sameness, as self-confirmation, self-reflection, and monologue." (Ibid, p. 51). In contrast, in cosmopolitanism, respect for others includes respect for difference and what makes others different. Universalist ethics is incompatible with nationalist or republican ethics that emphasize the values of a particular nation-people, as well as with individualist ethics that emphasize individual initiative and creativity. Cosmopolitan ethics is compatible with both nationalist/republican ethics and individualist ethics.

In summary, ethical cosmopolitanism is an ethical philosophy of cultural openness, inclusion, and toleration. It is an ethical philosophy of being/living together among diverse people, grounded in intersubjectively recognized and contractually developed human values, norms, and standards of conduct. In cosmopolitan ethics, individuals are autonomous thinkers and actors on the one hand, and the ultimate units of ethical-moral concerns and deliberation on the other. In cosmopolitan ethics, it is individual persons' rights, worthiness, dignity, human status, welfare, and happiness that are sources of normativity in the ethical life. In contrast to multiculturalist ethics, the perspective of cosmopolitan ethics has individual persons' and universal dimensions, not just a cultural dimension, and is a constellation of individual, cultural, and universal perspectives. In contrast to universalist ethics, the perspective of cosmopolitan ethics has individual persons' and cultural dimensions, not just

the universal, humanist dimension, and is a constellation of individual, cultural, and universal perspectives.

II.

Essential to cosmopolitan ethics is the tenet, as it is essential to Kantian ethics, that all human beings on the earth are members of the same family or community; humanity is the shared substance of all human beings on the earth; each person has duty and obligation to all other human beings, and all human beings have the reciprocal duty and obligations to every human being on the earth; human beings should not see each other as "a stranger," regardless of their cultural difference. In cosmopolitan ethics, for all human beings on the earth, "the first form of moral affiliation for the citizen should be her affiliation with rational humanity." (Nussbaum, 1997, p.5). As the Charter of the United Nations teaches us, cosmopolitan ethics enkindles the insight that fellow human beings are not strangers to one another, but family members. Cosmopolitan ethics purports to enlighten and enkindle the world so that in our epoch, human beings recognize each other as human beings.

Cosmopolitan ethics is the ethics of global humanity. Its operating principles include, first and foremost, the principle of respect for individuals' human rights and dignity. Its voice of conscience is the voice of humanity. Its core vocabularies include "the norm of humanity", "duty of humanity", "human rights", "human status", "human dignity", "human happiness", "human welfare", "humankind in whole as a community", "obligations of human beings to human beings", "duty of humankind to humankind", "evils and crimes against humanity", "cultural openness", "cultural inclusion", and "cultural toleration", and the like. It is the ethics of being/living together of all humankind as a family amid the cultural diversity of human beings on the earth. It enlightens people to be humans, and for humans.

While its starting point is that human beings are culturally diverse, the standpoint of cosmopolitan ethics is that all humankind on the earth belongs to the same family of humanity, and humanity is the shared Aristotelian secondary substance of all human beings. Accordingly, in cosmopolitan ethics, the concept of humanity connotes a norm of duty and obligation, a value, and a virtue. The concept of humanity first connotes a norm of duty and obligation. That is to say, being a human and recognizing and treating oneself as a human being, and other persons as human beings, is a norm of duty and obligation. Not alienation from the species-substance called "humanity" is a duty and obligation. The species-substance called "humanity" determines a way of human living as justified, legitimate, and acceptable, and determines human beings to be beings that are qualitatively differentiated from other species of beings. All the same, the idea of humanity imposes a set of duties and obligations of justice on all human beings. For example, the Kantian categorical imperative that one acts only on the maxim in which one treats one's humanity, as well as other persons' humanity, also as an end, not merely as a means to another end. In cosmopolitan ethics, humankind as a whole is also a collectivity to which human activities must be answerable and held accountable.

In cosmopolitan ethics, being a human is of the greatest value and importance for all human beings, and human alienation is the greatest evil. There is such a thing as "human dignity". In the view of cosmopolitan ethics, being a human is foundational for all of us. In the cosmopolitan view, if we were not human beings, whatever we would be, we would be absurd; thus, alienation from our humanity is not the loss of a property or quality, but the loss of our family-substance, which results in making s/he who loses it absurd. Thus, Immanuel Kant memorably claimed: "Out of the crooked timber of humanity no straight thing was ever made (*Aus so krummem Holze, als woraus der Mensch gemacht ist, kann nichts ganz gerades gezimmert warden*)." (Kant, 1912, vol. 8; Berlin, 1997, pp. v-vi). Moreover, there are values (e.g., happiness, justice, the rule of reason, tolerance, open-mindedness, etc.) that are necessarily instrumental to the supreme value of humanity, and these values are universally human values. All the same, in cosmopolitan ethics, humanity is the supreme and

foundational value of humankind, and it also determines a set of values to be necessarily, universally human values.

In cosmopolitan ethics, the concept of humanity connotes a virtue. In cosmopolitan ethics, the perfect excellence of a person is being fully human, as it is insisted by Confucian ethics. All human virtues serve to build a person into a full human being. The idea of humanity connotes the ultimate level and objective of excellence in human life and existence. Accordingly, one ought to act in a way that makes one a better human being and ought to abstain from action if the performance of such an action makes one a worse human being. Here, what matters is not so much what is bad to us as what makes us better or worse human beings. Thus, for example, we ought to practice cultural tolerance because this makes us better and more virtuous human beings. Conversely, we ought not to practice injustice because this makes us worse human beings.

In short, cosmopolitan ethics is the ethics of humanity. In cosmopolitan ethics, as Kristine Korsgaard (2016) insists, our humanity-identity is the foundational source of normativity of our being. The idea of humanity imposes duty and obligation, connotes the highest value and virtue, and dictates that only human happiness is truly happiness and worth being pursued. Notwithstanding, the principle of human rights and human dignity is a core operating principle. It goes as follows: (a) act on only the maxim that respects and protects human rights, and (b) act only on the maxim that respects and protects human dignity. Since the *UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in 1948, global ethics obliges peoples to respect basic human rights in terms of global justice and universal human good, so is ethical theory that is universally plausible. ethics. The idea of human rights imposes universal ethical-moral duty and obligation, is a universal human value and virtue, and defines the kind of human happiness that is legitimate and worth being pursued. A life without basic human rights and human dignity is not worth living. Basic rights are necessary, instrumental values to true human happiness.

In our epoch, armed with the *UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights* in 1948, "cosmopolitanism imagines a global order in which the idea of human rights is an operative principle of justice, with mechanisms of global governance established specially for their protection." (Fine, 2009, p.8). "Human rights are a social form of right that has arisen in our own times and is an achievement of our age … Human rights exist not just in the mind but as a determinate form external to our own subjective feelings and opinions of it. It has a legal status within international law and has percolated into other areas of international and domestic law." (Ibid). It is claimed in cosmopolitan ethics that one acts only on the maxim that gives individual persons' basic human rights and dignity their due, and that promotes and protects individual persons' basic human rights and dignity.

Moreover, cultural toleration is also a core operating principle of cosmopolitan ethics. Cosmopolitan ethics recognizes that in the world we live in, ways to be human can be diverse, and individual persons have the right to choose their ways to be human and thus to choose the cultures in which they live and with which they cultivate themselves. The principle of cultural toleration in cosmopolitan ethics is made by the Charter of the United Nations as the epochal norm of duty and obligation. The UN Charter claims what Robert Nozick (1992) claimed: diversity makes toleration necessary, and toleration makes diversity sustainable. Cosmopolitan ethics is the ethics of tolerance and inclusion. Meanwhile, the UN 1995 *Declaration of Principles of Tolerance* states: Tolerance is respect, acceptance and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world's cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human. It is fostered by knowledge, openness, communication, and freedom of thought, conscience, and belief. Tolerance is harmony in differences.

All the same, in cosmopolitan ethics, recognition of the diversity of humanity makes cultural tolerance a duty and obligation of justice, a universal human value, and a universal human virtue. Tolerance manifests the respect for basic rights and liberty of individual persons, and is necessary, instrumental to the value of humanity and true human happiness, and designates a human virtue that makes one a better human being and more competent to

live a worthy and happy life, and defines the kind of human happiness that is legitimate and worth being pursued. Finally, open-mindedness, broad-mindedness, and tolerance, which are necessary for cultural toleration, are also human virtues that make a person a better person.

The unique characteristic of cosmopolitan ethics can be seen in a comparison to socialist/communist ethics here. In socialism and communism, the idea of human rights is criticized by communist thinkers as bourgeois rights and the legacy of bourgeois ideology, and thus not an ethical-moral principle. Indeed, what is most paradoxical about communism is its concepts of justice and good without rights. Admittedly, communism is originally devoted to developing a global society where there will be no oppression and exploitation. That being said, in communist ethics, the elimination of oppression and exploitation is not achieved through the recognition and promotion of basic human rights, but through the abolition of private ownership, including John Locke's immortal "rights of property"—the rights of liberty, happiness, and the pursuit of happiness. As Marx and Engels said, "The theory of Communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property." (Marx & Engels, 1998, p.18). "The abolition of bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom is undoubtedly aimed at." (Ibid.).

A distinction exists between the promotion of equality and that of human rights around the globe. Promotion of equality and promotion of basic rights are related. Part of the idea of basic rights is that basic rights are equal for all. That being said, promotion of basic rights promotes equality, but not all kinds of promotion of equality are to promote basic human rights. For example, the promotion of equal poverty does not promote basic human rights. Promotion of basic rights does not presuppose equality of private-property ownership either. The failure to draw such a distinction is the Achilles' heel of communism. In communism, the elimination of inequality in the world is achieved through the abolition of private ownership of private property and "bourgeois individuality, bourgeois independence, and bourgeois freedom". In communism, Rawls's first principle of justice—" Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others"—does not exist (Rawls, 1971, p. 60). No wonder, communist ethics is totalitarian ethics, totally inconsistent with the spirit of our epoch. In communism, equality is an intrinsic value in itself. In cosmopolitan ethics, equality is merely an instrumental value to the value of basic rights and true human happiness.

Notwithstanding, cosmopolitan ethics is the ethics of basic humanity—that is, basic human rights, dignity, and status as inalienable rights of individual persons' properties, to borrow a metaphor from Locke. Cosmopolitan norms of justice and humanity constitute the ethical-moral basis for protecting and promoting human rights, human dignity, and each person's human status. Cosmopolitan ethics takes justice as giving due to global humanity as its standpoint. The "political stance of the cosmopolitan is intrinsically valuable: for it recognizes in persons what is especially fundamental about them, most worthy of reverence and acknowledgement." (Nussbaum, 1997, p.8). In cosmopolitan ethics, a citizen's humanity-identity is "the source of all reasons and values." (Korsgaard, 1996, p.122). They indicate that "We must treat our humanity identity as a form of practical, normative identity." (Ibid., p.132). In cosmopolitan ethics, humanity is not just a quality, but also the shared family substance of all human beings.

"Why are times so dark, men know each other not at all?", asked the late medieval French poet Eustache Deschamps in the fifteenth century (Josephson, 1962, p.17). Should we not ask the same question today? In his *History of the Present*, Timothy Garton Ash observes: "That Europe at the end of the twentieth century is quite as capable of barbarism as it was in the Holocaust of mid-century." (Ash, 1999, p.368). Cosmopolitan ethics has become part of our epochal spirit since the second half of the 20th century, importantly because our time is yet to be enlightened so that all humankind knows each other again. purports to enlighten our sensitivity to our humanity belonging and humanity identity, and to enkindle our sensitivity that our humanity identity is a main source of normativity in ethical-moral life. While

obligation, value, and virtue make us humans, the obligation of humanity, our humanity identity, and our humanity belonging express our being humans. (Cf. Korsgaard, 1996, p. 5).

Anthony Giddens argues that "cosmopolitan morality itself needs to be driven by passion." (Giddens, 2000, p. 68). Such a passion is humanity's passion. The project of cosmopolitanism is characteristically driven by a passion for humankind's global belonging—that is, humankind's humanity-belonging. It is driven by the sentiment of one's affiliation with global humanity. It is driven by the sentiment that "justice pursued consistently must be justice pursued globally." (Jone, 2007, p. 6). It is driven by the sentiment that, as Kant put it, "Out of the crooked timber of humanity no straight thing can ever be made." Talking about how best we can live together in a world of racial diversity, Cornel West insists that we should develop a new ethical-moral and political framework of understanding; "to establish a new framework, we need to begin with a frank acknowledgement of the basis humanness and Americanness of each other." (West, 1993, p.8). Cosmopolitan ethics is ethics that enkindles our basic sense of common humanity.

In summary, cosmopolitan ethics is not so much a form of ethics in the world of strangers as it is a form of ethics in the kingdom of humanity and a form of ethics of being together of diverse human beings on the earth. It is a form of ethics of ethical-moral contract with global humanity. It imposes global duties and obligations on all human beings under the contract of humanity. It is a form of contractual ethics that explores the norms and standards for a good, worthy, and happy life for human beings from the perspective of global humanity. It is a form of ethics from the perspective of global humanity in the sense that its perspective is the perspective of the contract with humanity, which all human beings on the earth have entered. Thus, the ethical norms, values, and standards of human practices and institutions that cosmopolitan ethics advocate are contractual norms, values, and standards of global humanity, for global humanity, and by global humanity. Cosmopolitan ethics is about the contract with global humanity and always the contract with global humanity.

III.

The nature of cosmopolitan ethics as the ethics of the contract with humanity determines that the cosmopolitan account of ethical praiseworthiness and blameworthiness refers to the principles of individual rights and dignity, cultural tolerance, and humanity, and that cosmopolitan ethics is not identical to liberal ethics. Cosmopolitan ethics insists on individual persons' humanity, belonging, and identity on the one hand, and sensitivity to individual persons' cultural embeddedness and belonging on the other hand, while prioritizing individual rights, dignity, and basic liberty above so-called "cultural rights" and "collective rights". Cosmopolitan ethics is distinguished by its tenet that respects for individual persons' basic rights of liberty, life, and pursuit of happiness is achieved by both the respect for individual persons' rights to choose their cultural ways of living and thus to think, choose, and act as autonomous individual persons and the emphasis on individual persons' humanity belonging that obliges individual persons to think, choose, and act as human beings. It constellates teleological ethics and deontological ethics.

Thus, there are three core operating and cornerstone principles in cosmopolitan ethics: the principle of individual rights and dignity, the principle of cultural toleration, and the principle of humanity. And cosmopolitan ethics has a unique understanding of such principles as follows:

A. The principle of individual rights and dignity: Act only on the maxim that redeems individual persons' rights of basic liberty, life, and pursuit of happiness, and that redeems human dignity; an act is wrong if its performance under the circumstance would be disallowed by a system of rules for generation regulation of behaviors to redeem persons' basic rights and human dignity.

B. The principle of cultural toleration of diversity of humanity: Act only on the maxim that gives due respect and recognition of individual persons' diverse cultural ways of living, compatible with the principle of respect for others' basic rights and human dignity.
C. The principle of solidarity with, loyalty to and commitment to global humanity: Act only on the maxim that recognizes individual persons of cultural other as legitimate members of the family of global family of humanity; act only on the maxim that brings oneself, as well as all other peoples, into the family of humanity, not alienate oneself, or other persons, from the family of humanity.

The three principles described above constitute the core of cosmopolitan principles by which one ought to live one's life in order to pursue a worthy and happy life. They are principles of duty, obligation, value, and virtue.

As Martha Nussbaum (2019) indicates, cosmopolitanism is grounded in the moral idea that human beings have equal rights and worthiness; individual persons' human dignity is "non-hierarchical" (Nussbaum, 2019, p. 2; Von Eschenbach, 2020, p. 660). This gives rise to the principle of individual rights and dignity. The principle of individual rights and dignity dictates the source of ethical-moral duty and obligation in cosmopolitan ethics. In cosmopolitan ethics, ethical and moral obligation is not only to community and general humanity, but also to concrete individual persons as particular, primary entities and units of concern. The principle of individual rights and dignity also constitutes the basis for value and virtue in cosmopolitan ethics. The principle of individual rights and dignity is the operating principle of the spirit of our time, and so is the operating principle of cosmopolitan ethics.

Cosmopolitan ethics recognizes duty and obligation in terms of individual rights and dignity. It recognizes that the realization of individual persons' happiness and values is among the ultimate objectives of ethical-moral concerns. It thus differs from both multiculturalist ethics and universalist ethics. In universalist ethics, the consideration of the redemption of individual rights and dignity gives way to the consideration of the universality of duty, obligation, value, and virtue. Thus, cosmopolitan ethics draws on Kantian ethics for insights into the consideration of humanity, but does not adopt the universalist stance that Kantian ethics does. In multiculturalist ethics, the consideration of redemption of a person's rights and dignity gives way to the consideration of redemption of cultural rights and a culture as a substance and subjectivity. No wonder, as Alex Zakaras (2004) indicated, insisting on value pluralism as the enduring reality of the world we live in, Berlin does not advocate multiculturalism, but suggests cosmopolitanism.

Correspondingly, in cosmopolitan ethics, the greatest happiness for a person is the experience in which s/he actualizes himself/herself as a full human being, living a life that individualizes his/her humanity. In cosmopolitan ethics, individual autonomy and authenticity are the necessary conditions for true happiness. This is also the case wherein there is conflict between individual rights and so-called cultural rights; individual rights and freedom have priority. To spell it out differently, the principles of individual rights and dignity imply two precepts: the precept of universal duty and obligations to respect and give due to individual persons' human dignity and rights of basic liberty, life, and pursuit of happiness, and the precept of the priority of individual persons' human dignity and rights over so-called cultural rights and common good.

The principle of individual rights and dignity demarcates cosmopolitan ethics from multiculturalist or culturalist ethics on the one hand and universalist ethics on the other hand. It also demarcates cosmopolitan ethics from nationalist or republican ethics that emphasize the values of the nation-people over individual rights, although they are compatible. It epitomizes the cosmopolitan tenet of individualism that individual persons are the ultimate units of ethical-moral concern and deliberation. It epitomizes the cosmopolitan belief that the individual and particular is as valuable as the universal, and worth being recognized in its own rights. With this principle, cosmopolitan ethics is free of any form of totalitarianism.

Both the principle of individual rights and dignity in cosmopolitan ethics and the no-harm principle in liberalist ethics emphasize respect for individual rights of basic liberty. The subtle difference is that, in the cosmopolitan principle, the concern for individual persons' human dignity sets the limit on individual persons' liberty, while, in the liberalist no-harm principle, it is possible harm to others that sets the limit on individual liberty. Fair to say that the Mill Harm principle, which makes a person's rights and freedom not absolute, is still recognized in cosmopolitan ethics. Still, in cosmopolitan ethics, it is an ethical-moral duty to act only on the maxim of duty and obligation to respect and give due to individual rights and the freedom to pursue happiness in accordance with their conceptions of value and happiness.

Meanwhile, the principle of cultural openness and toleration epitomizes the unique cosmopolitan ethical and moral understanding of human situations in our epoch: the diverse possible ways of being human. The principle of cultural toleration embodies a different form of respect for individuals' rights and dignity. It actualizes respect for individual persons' rights in the form of respect for individual persons' rights and dignity of individual choices of cultural ways of being and of happiness. It expresses the cosmopolitan view that while the greatest happiness is the experience of one's self-realization, then individual persons' self-realizations are their self-realizations in accordance with their chosen concepts of human happiness and values in diverse spaces, times, natural and social situations; thus, there can be diverse cultural ways of self-realization and being humans; and there can be diverse cultural conceptions of good, value, and happiness embody long inherited possible insights of ethical-moral understanding. Cosmopolitan ethics rejects the view that the aspiration for universal human values and true happiness is incompatible with respect for particular cultural values and concepts of happiness. Instead, cosmopolitan ethics insists that the universal and the particular are not separable; the universal is embodied in the particulars, and the particulars embody the universal. Political cosmopolitanism aspires for a world of cultural inclusion and toleration under the rule of law.

Cosmopolitan ethics recognizes that human beings are culturally diverse. The cosmopolitan understanding is summarized beautifully in the lyrics of the song, "Colors of the Wind", as follows:

> You think the only people who are people
> Are the people who look and think like you
> But if you walk the footsteps of a stranger
> You'll learn things you never knew you never knew
>
> Have you ever heard the wolf cry to the blue corn moon
> Or asked the grinning bobcat why he grinned
> Can you sing with all the voices of the mountains
> Can you paint with all the colors of the wind
> Can you paint with all the colors of the wind
> (https://www.disneyclips.com/lyrics/colors-of-the-wind.htm)

Thus, for culturally diverse people to co-live and co-thrive together, cultural toleration is a norm, a principle, and a standard. It is the openness to and inclusion of the different, the unfamiliar, and the stranger based on all human beings' universal contract with humanity.

Meanwhile, in cosmopolitan ethics, the principle of cultural openness and toleration insists not only on inter-cultural openness and toleration, but also on intra-cultural openness and toleration. Inter-cultural openness is cultural openness to other cultures. It involves what Appah would call genuine curiosity about other cultures. It involves the willingness to be spoken to by other cultures and to recognize their legitimacy. Intra-cultural tolerance involves a willingness to allow open competition over different interpretations and understandings of values and happiness within a culture. The principle of cultural toleration demarcates cosmopolitan ethics from universalist ethics, globalist ethics, and essentialist ethics. It indicates that in cosmopolitan ethics, not only is the universal legitimate, but the cultural is

also legitimate. It indicates that in cosmopolitan ethics, not only is the global legitimate, but also the national and cultural are legitimate. Thus, Jeff Noonan (2006) rightly criticized David Held's globalism as insufficient in addressing ethical, moral, and social problems that Held criticized. Yet Noonan failed to note that this means Held's interpretation of cosmopolitanism is inadequate. Instead, Noonan considered that Held's inadequacy is the inadequacy of cosmopolitanism itself. Noonan should recognize that cosmopolitan ethics emphasizes not only our shared needs and capacities as members of the global human community, but also the particular needs and capacities of individual persons as cultural beings. The principle of cultural toleration also frees cosmopolitan ethics from the danger of totalitarianism. It rejects oppression and repression as detrimental to true human happiness.

Moreover, cosmopolitan ethics is grounded in the sensitivity that, in spite of their cultural embeddedness and differences, all human beings on the earth are members of the same family and species. Therefore, being a human for all human beings is a norm of obligation, the highest value of being, and the foundational virtue. Accordingly, to be is to be a human first for every human being. If one were not a human, one would be absurd, no matter what else one is. No one can be truly happy or have true value if one were not a human. No self-realization, that does not imply making one a true, full human being. Equally crucial, human rights, human dignity, and human status are necessary properties, capacities, and conditions of a person's being human. Respect for them is an inviolable duty and obligation. Correspondingly, in cosmopolitan ethics, an act will be praiseworthy when it treats one's humanity, as well as other persons' humanity, also as an end, not merely as a means to other ends, is a duty of humanity, and an obligation of justice as giving due to humanity. All human beings have a duty and an obligation to recognize and honor each person's basic human rights and human dignity. To spell it out differently, all human beings have the 2.0 version of the Kantian categorical imperative.

Notwithstanding, the principle of cultural openness and toleration is not a principle of anti-culture or a principle of postmodern disregard of established rules of conduct. Cosmopolitan ethics is not postmodern ethics. It emphasizes that human conduct is, and should be, governed by universal rules of humanity, as well as various contractual rules for conduct in specific spaces and times. A unique ethical-moral account of cosmopolitan ethics is that an act is praiseworthy if it promotes humanity and contributes to the realization of humanity in a person and in a community. An act is blameworthy if it alienates a person or any other human beings from the family of humanity. An act is evil if it excludes a [person or any other human beings from the family of humanity. Political cosmopolitanism aspires for a world of humanity. Cosmopolitan ethics aspires to a human community in which the concept of humanity connotes a norm, the highest value, and the foundational virtue. Thus, as Pogge (1994), Nussbaum (2019), Benhabib (2006), and various others insisted, cosmopolitan ethics emphasizes one's affiliation with global humanity. Nigel Rapport (2019) proposes cosmopolitan love of humanity as the glue for cultural inclusion and toleration in the world we live in today.

By this token, cosmopolitan ethics shares two common points with Kantian ethics as a form of universalist ethics, while Kant is also a central philosopher in the history of cosmopolitanism, and Kant's cosmopolitanism itself is a milestone in the history of the development of cosmopolitanism. Both cosmopolitan ethics and Kantian ethics emphasize individualism, wherein individual persons are the primary ethical-moral entities that think and that are thought, while teaching about individual persons' global belonging to the global family of humanity or humankind. Both forms of ethics operate with the principle of humanity, which Kant immortally characterized as a categorical imperative. In both cosmopolitan ethics and Kantian ethics, duty and obligation to one's humanity, other persons' humanity, and humanity as the shared substance of all humankind are emphasized to the utmost. In both forms of ethics, humanity as the universal, supreme, and foundational human value is emphasized utmost. In both forms of ethics, it is emphasized that out of the crooked timber of

humanity, nothing straight can be built; there are such things called "the rules of humanity" as the basis of general regulation of human conduct. Thus, Georg Cavallar (2012) claimed that Kant's ethics have a cosmopolitan dimension; his political cosmopolitanism and his ethical cosmopolitanism entail one another.

In summary, rights, tolerance, and humanity are the three core principles of cosmopolitan ethics. These three principles embody the spirit of our epoch and exhibit cosmopolitan ethics as our epochal ethics. These three principles are principles of duty, obligation, and value, and they thus reveal the nature and uniqueness of cosmopolitan ethics that integrates the concern of good and value of teleological ethics with the concern of duty and obligation of deontological ethics. They express cosmopolitan ethics as an ethical theory in which thinking in terms of duty and obligation is integrated with thinking in terms of good, value, and virtue.

IV.

In conclusion, cosmopolitan ethics is our epochal ethics. It redeems the core beliefs and values of our epochal spirit: justice as giving due to humanity, cultural toleration, and a global order under the rule of humanity's law. It redeems all human beings' contract with global humanity. It is an alternative to both universalist ethics and multiculturalist ethics. It supersedes liberalist ethics, humanist ethics, utilitarianism, and contractualism. Ethical cosmopolitanism is a philosophy for diverse human beings to live together, to redeem their values, and to be happy diversely yet humanly. It is the kind of ethical philosophy that rekindles both our sensitivity to our cultural heritages and our sense of humanity-bond and humanity-belonging. It is the kind of ethical philosophy that enables us to recover the idea that individual persons are the most basic units of ethical-moral deliberation, on the one hand, and that individual persons live in concrete spaces, times, and cultures, on the other hand.

The characterization of cosmopolitan ethics as the ethics in a world of strangers is an illustration, but an inadequate or good characterization, because a core tenet of cosmopolitan ethics is that human beings are not strangers to each other in the world, and we must not see people of cultural difference as strangers, but as neighbors and fellow citizens of the kingdom of humanity. Cultural toleration is not to treat others as strangers, but to include others as the same as oneself.

Cosmopolitan ethics purports to enlighten the truth that cultural others are not strangers, amid their cultural differences, as the story of the Good Samaritan in the Gospel of *Luke* teaches. Strangers may not have an ethical-moral duty and obligation to each other, but human beings have an ethical-moral obligation to each other as human beings. Strangers may not share any common values and concepts of happiness. But all human beings must recognize universal human values, and their happiness must have a common dimension-the human dimension.

References

1. Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2006. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
2. Beck, Ulrich. 2006. *The Cosmopolitan Vision*, Cambridge: Polity.
3. Beitz, Charles. 1994. "Cosmopolitan liberalism and the state system," in Chris Brown (ed), *Political Restructuring in Europe: Ethical Perspectives*, London: Routledge.
4. Benhabib, 2006. *Another Cosmopolitanism*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Berlin, Isaiah. 1997. *The Crooked Timber of Humanity*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
6. Caney, Simon. 2005. *Justice Beyond Borders*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. Cavalla, Georg. 2012. "Cosmopolitanisms in Kant's Philosophy," in *Ethics and Global Politics*. 5(2): 95-118.

8. Fine, Robert. 2009. “Cosmopolitanism and human rights: Radicalism in a global age,” in *Metaphilosophy*, 40:1. Pp.8-23.
9. ———. 2003. “Kant’s theory of cosmopolitanism and Hegel’s critique,” Philosophy and Social Criticism, 29:6, pp. 609-630.
10. Fine, Robert & Smith, Will. 2003. “Jürgen Habermas’s theory of cosmopolitanism,” in *Constellation*, 10:4. Pp.469-487.
11. Gidden, Anthony, 2000. *Run Away World: How Globalization is Reshaping Our Lives*, New York: Routledge.
12. Habermas, Jürgen. 1998. *The Inclusion of the Other*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
13. ———. 2008. *Between Naturalism and Religion*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
14. Held, David. 2010. *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and Realities*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
15. Höffe, Otfried. 2006. Kant’s Cosmopolitan Theory of Law and Peace, Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.
16. Josephson, Eric & Josephson, Mary Josephson (ed). 1962. *Man Alone*, New York: Dell Publishing Corporation.
17. Kant, Immanuel. 1983. *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays*, Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.
18. Kleingeld, Pauline. 2000. “Kantian Patriotism,” in Philosophy & Public Affairs, vol.4. Pp.313-341.
19. Korsgaard, Christine M. 1996. *The Source of Normativity,* Cambridge University Press.
20. Noonan, Jeff. 2006. “Cosmopolitan globalism and Human Community,” *Dialogue*, 45 (4): 697-712.
21. Nussbaum, Martha. 1996. “Patriotism and cosmopolitanism,” in Joshua Cohen (eds), *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Boston: Beacon Press. Pp.2-17.
22. 2019. *The Cosmopolitan Tradition: A Noble but Flawed Ideal*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
23. Pogge, Thomas. 2012. “Cosmopolitanism: A Path to Peace and Justice,” in *Journal of East-West Thought*, 4:2, pp.9-32.
24. ———. 1994. “Cosmopolitanism and sovereignty,” in Chris Brown (ed), *Political Restructuring in Europe: Ethical Perspectives*, London: Routledge. pp.89-122.
25. Von Eschenbach, Warren J. 2020. “The cosmopolitan Tradition: A noble but Flawed Ideal,” *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 70:28, pp. 660-663.
26. West, Cornel. 1993. *Race Matters*, New York: Vintage Books. New York: Lexington Books.
27. Young, Iris M. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.