

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

By Dr Neville Buch, MPHA (Qld)

2 June 2019

As we saw in the previous session, the time before the last, there were different versions of nationalism which developed from the ideas of the Age of Revolution (1774-1865) and beyond. In the last session we looked at the various schemas involved in the New Imperialism and Globalisation (1870 to the present). The final two sessions goes to what has been argued, in recent decades, as the passing of the Age of Modernity into the Age of Post-Modernity. From my own historiographical view, I would argue that this historical framing is too premature, and if we look at the various arguments of 'post-modern' philosophies they are only shifting variants on modern debates of the last three hundred years or so. There is nothing really new from our position in the historical development, just different arguments that either scale radically or moderately. It is like living in fifteenth century Europe and trying to debate ideas to which we now differentiate between the different periods of 'renaissance' thinking, over its previous three hundred years (1201-1500).

The focus of The Philosophy Café program in the last six months has been social philosophy, political philosophy, and what once was called 'world philosophy'. Our aim, from the beginning in the ancient civilisation of Greece and Rome, was to achieve a public and general horizon worldview from the 'western tradition' called 'philosophy'. These same ideas were framed differently in 'eastern tradition', but we have attempted to recognise those other philosophical influences in the evolution of 'world philosophy'; and these are all umbrella terms that do not reduce disjunction between traditions and culture, but simply to recognise the fact of the globalisation in knowledge and otherwise belief. The two final sessions then comes to a long list of social and political themes of our times which are understood as concept schemas. For the ability to have the time to cover these all important schemas for late nineteenth and twentieth century intellectual history, I have grouped the list under two convenient headings.

The table below provides a road map for the essays and discussions. What has to be appreciated is that the themes, conceptual schemas, and insights from the philosophers listed are interconnected – reality and facts are tightly compacted networks of ideas and life experiences, and we artificially, but necessarily, disassemble and reassemble for the sake of knowledge and understanding.

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

NEW INTERNATIONALISM & COSMOPOLITANISM (2 June 2019)	PERSONHOOD AND HOW TO LIVE TOGETHER (14 July 2019)
<p>Focus on New Militarism, International Peace, New Nationalism, Multi-Culturalism, Persons, and the Crisis of Humanity (1870-2000)</p> <p>Karl Marx Bertrand Russell Isaiah Berlin Emmanuel Levinas</p> <p>Covering Cosmopolitanism, Prussianism, Britannia-ism, New Internationalisms, Multilateralism, Commonwealth of Nations, Hyper-Nationalism (Progressivist ‘New Nationalism’).</p>	<p>Focus on New Militarism, International Peace, New Nationalism, Multi-Culturalism, Persons, and the Crisis of Humanity (1870-2000)</p> <p>(Emmanuel Levinas as a previous introduction on 2 June)</p> <p>William James William Clifford C.S. Peirce (Isaiah Berlin as a previous introduction on 2 June)</p> <p>Martin Heidegger Jean-Paul Sartre Friedrich Nietzsche Charles Taylor John Gray A.C. Grayling</p> <p>Covering Hyper-Nationalism (Fascist, Social Darwinism and National Socialist), Cultural Pluralism and Critical Thinking, Phenomenology, Existentialism (as Dasein and as Humanism), Personhood, Modern Humanism and its ‘Post-Modern’ Critics.</p>

Table 1: A road map in the Age of Modernity and Post-Modernity

As a guide to the above table, we have a focus on *historical* themes. Those historical themes have been interpreted by philosophers into their own *concept schemas*. We then go back to the history, but in a different way, we examine the themes of the *philosophic history* or *historical sociology*.

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

Karl Marx and the New Internationalism in the Politics of the Economy

Since there is hardly any need to have to introduce Karl Marx (1818-1883), here is a good place to start the discussion on the philosophies of our time. Marx in *The Communist Manifesto* (1848), stated, “A specter is haunting Europe—the specter of Communism. All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this specter; Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French radicals and German police spies.” The nineteenth century names have changed for those of the twentieth century, but the shadow of Marx loomed over the Age of Modernity, not only from the Communists, but also in the divergent applications of Marxism from socialists and unorthodox Marxists, as well as the large forces of anti-communism or anti-socialism. And that is the key point about the new internationalism in the twentieth century. Whether supported or opposed, Marx’s philosophy reshaped how the society and individual was thought. The basic philosophical tenet of Marx was, as is often pointed out, that it flipped Hegel’s Transcendental Idealism. Whereas for Hegel the Idea summated everything, the bedrock (base) of all politics and cultures, it was now the economy, more so, the political economy – the forces that structured capital, profit, production, distribution, and the conditions of work. Everything else, the superstructure of the cultural and political system, was subject to the materialistic forces of the economic base. For Marx, the pure ideology was a hard determinism of economic (re-) evolution. Juxtaposed to John Stuart Mill’s liberalism, the individual is irrelevant, a cog in the machine. This is what modern economics has largely come to, both for Capitalism, in which Marx seeks to herald its inescapable demise, and for all the Marxist experiments in the economy. Even for the later ‘Marxism with a Human Face’, the economics eats up the person.

Hence we have come to live in a time when economics controls too much of life, and has created a crisis of humanity. This is true if we accept that the heart of humanity is the person (all persons as *principally* equal in high value; what life is for a human being). However, I am jumping ahead here in the argument. The point here is that the neo-liberal economists, F.A. Hayek (1899-1992) and Milton Friedman (1912-2006), who opposed all Marx’s communist tenets, have not done any better in tackling the de-personalising modern economics. For all their libertarian values, economics reduces the individual to a unit cost. Generally the fundamental problem of the sociology has been overlooked. Whether in a Capitalist society, a Socialist society (i.e. in mixed economies), in a Communist society (including Maoist), or even, as Marx also predicated, in the disappearance of the State (Anarchism), we struggle to find ways to live together without violence and poverty. Modern economics is its own worst enemy as a predictive science. There is a great suspicion that economics does no better than blind-chance gambling. This is because the

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

achievements or successes that can be pointed out are the *ad hoc* benefits of a few within any society. Arguments of 'trickling-down' or 'all-boats-rise-with-tide' are very hollow in the face of life struggles of billions of human beings. And the criticism still holds even as we can measure the vast improvement of humanity over time and on the global scale.

It appears that modern economics is a Spenserian game (Herbert Spencer 1820-1903). There came from Marx's economics and sociology, however, a new internationalism. In this sense, Marx could be said to be the first modern globalist. The alternative ideologies were looking at their loci of power elsewhere: Conservatives to the monarchical states, Liberals to nation states, and the non-Marxist socialists to the 'natural states'. Marx had argued in *The German Ideology* that capitalism will end through the organised actions of an international working class. This is the rationale of the communist organisations, the First International (1864–1876), the Second International (1889–1916), and the Third International (Comintern, 1919–1943). This is why the collapse of the communist international order in the face of World War I, and the creation of the first permanent Communist state in 1917, is significant. It meant that, instead of the disappearance of the state, the reverse condition was created – Totalitarianism (the total control of the State over society and culture).

Bertrand Russell and the New Internationalism in a Liberal Rationality

Generally, Liberals looked to nation states; however, there was in the latter half of the nineteenth century a rise of various international organisations among liberals, as well as among the non-Marxist socialist and anarchists. In New Settler societies, particularly led by New Zealand, Australia, Canada, and the United States, these social liberals – as opposed to classical liberals – forged alliances with the non-Marxist socialists to become known as 'Progressivists'. The United Kingdom was also an emerging and major centre for progressivist politics from the creation of the socialist Fabian Society (1884) and with Edwardian liberal's social welfare programs. The Progressive Era is a demarcation of American history from 1896 to 1916. The Progressive Party was a third party in the United States formed in 1912 by former President Theodore Roosevelt, with a populist platform known as 'New Nationalism'. Progressivists could be both very nationalistic or be committed internationalists.

The People's Party (also known as the Populist Party or the Populists) was formed in 1892 with an agrarian platform, in the interests of farmers and against 'big city' beliefs. The party

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

collapsed after it nominated Democrat William Jennings Bryan in the 1896 United States presidential election, but as informal politics, more often than not, it continued against progressivist policies to improve or reshape society. Bryan would end his life in 1925 as the infamous witness in the Scopes Trial. The episode was the great marker in the *Anti-intellectualism in American Life*, the book that historian Richard Hofstadter published in 1963. Bryan was called 'The Great Commoner', the advocate of the populist common sense philosophy which declared any higher learning beyond basic education or technical know-how as a 'fool's paradise'. Knowledge was not progressive but owned by the common folk.

In the other direction, the politics of the progressivists is difficult to narrow-down and sometimes to untangle. Progressivists in Australia were the advocates of the White Australia Policy, so there is no simple alignment with what people generally would take today as progressivist policies to improve society. The national and international campaigns of the Progressivists covered a large number of issues, e.g. temperance, women's emancipation, universal suffrage, world peace, labour and industrial reforms, banking reforms, and other issues which today would come under the term 'social justice'. There was no manifesto of uniform valuing among these matters, and each progressivist would disagree among their 'comrades' as to what political or legislative action would improve society. The movement, however, centred on three ideals: i) history as progress, ii) education and higher learning for both societal development and self-improvement, and the iii) 'brotherhood' / 'sisterhood' of humanity – the ideal of international collaboration which accumulated into the creation of the League of Nations (1920).

Into that world stepped the philosopher Bertrand Russell (1872-1970). Russell was a social liberal, a collaborator with the Fabian socialists, and the most famous world peace philosopher. There are several works that one could consult to illuminate Russell's impact on modernity and the historical themes of the twentieth century. Indeed, one could write a few books on Russell's shaping of modern social and political philosophy. Perhaps, one small book does sum up Russell's philosophy in this regard, *What I Believe* (1925). This book, an essay really, could be summed in his statement: "The good life is one inspired by love and guided by knowledge". Russell's modern social and political philosophy was modest for the very reason of his rigorous logical positivism. This approach to modern logic, language, and science divorces philosophy from ordinary life. Russell had a similar stance to Stephen Jay Gould's (1941-2002) Non-overlapping magisterial. For Russell, philosophy had little to instruct for the matters of society and culture; philosophy was a sphere of logic and the hard sciences unrelated to the affairs of 'mankind'. And yet this did not prevent Russell from using the traditions of social and political philosophy to make his pronouncement on life. In

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

Russell's meta-philosophy view, such pronouncements from the philosophic traditions somehow ceased being philosophy when it was applied.

It is a strange epistemic model for a logician who demanded preciseness and clarity in knowledge. Nevertheless, the benefit of this approach was a modest demand for rationality and knowledge. His logical positivism and engagement with the Vienna Circle (1924-1936) led him away from the impossible hard-rationalism of the previous century, epitomized by the Rationalist Press Association (founded in 1885). Such a demand for perfect rationality was illogical when applied to the matters of life and humanity. However, Russell did *not* then conclude, as some of his fellow logicians did, that all matters outside of logic were talk of nonsense.

Life and humanity required more than logic, reason, and knowledge, for it to be understandable, for it to make sense. In the essay, *What I Believe*, there was also love that was required for the good life. Russell also refers to happiness. His key point is, "Happiness is none the less true happiness because it must come to an end, nor do thought and love lose their value because they are not everlasting." Although Russell does not refer to him, I would believe that his conclusion on the good life as being for an increase of human happiness owes much to the philosophy of John Stuart Mill (1806-1873). 'Happiness' is a key tenet in modern liberalism, and very different to the traditional and Aristotelian concept of *Eudaimonia* – a modern rendering as 'Flourishing'. The older concept has a view of the human good that is objective, inclusive, individualized, agent-relative, self-directed and social. 'Happiness' in liberalism is more related to the pleasure principle as shaped by Epicurus (341-270 BCE), Jeremy Bentham (1747-1747), and Sigmund Freud (1856-1939). From Mill, such pleasure was not the gross pleasures of popular culture, and it did require refinement from the same knowledge Russell talked about for the good life: as Mill put it, "it is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied. And if the fool, or the pig, are of a different opinion, it is because they only know their own side of the question."

The philosophic threads of Marxism, Liberalism, Progressivism, with the wider social philosophies from Marx, Mill, and Russell, and others, created the Age of the New Militarism, International Peace, and New Nationalism (1870-1945):

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

- New Militarism because the Franco-Prussian war (1870-1871) heralded the movement, which ended in the crushing of the very first but brief communist state (Paris Commune) and also signalled the nature of its conclusion in World War I. In both France and Germany there is also, in this new militarism, a debate over liberalism and the social welfare state.
- International Peace because World War I was a bloody argument about modernity, between two different visions for society and culture: Prussianism – primarily an anti-liberal vision of a society structured in military order, and Britannia-ism – a vision for empire of ‘fair’ and free trade, one that is on *principle* multi-racial and multi-cultural, but within the reality of the imperial ideal it was singularly to the economic benefit of the monarchical centre (my argument in an ongoing debate in imperial & colonial histories).
- New Nationalism because it was the Hyper-Nationalism of the first half of the twentieth century with the primary aim to destroy the international order, any international order. Oddly it began as Roosevelt’s progressivist ‘New Nationalism’, which was about pure Americanism. And it gained an even more sinister frame in Fascism and Nazism.

By 1920 the modern world had emerged, as we have come to look back upon the twentieth century and understand it. And yet it was only the beginning.

Isaiah Berlin and the Cosmopolitanism in Non-Inference Liberalism

Rather incredibly there is one life, one philosopher, who lived that whole history throughout the twentieth century. Isaiah Berlin was a Latvia-born-British social and political theorist, philosopher and historian of ideas. At the age of six, he witnessed the revolutions of 1917 in Petrograd, Russia. He was in Germany in 1933. As a student at Oxford, he befriended Freddie Ayer, Stuart Hampshire, Richard Wollheim, Maurice Bowra, Stephen Spender, Inez Pearn, J. L. Austin and Nicolas Nabokov. He even engaged Ludwig Wittgenstein at Cambridge University in a discussion (no mean feat). He worked for the British Information Services in New York from 1940 to 1942, and for the British embassies in Washington, DC, and Moscow from then until 1946. He met with poet Anna Akhmatova in Leningrad in November 1945 and January 1946. He translated works by Ivan Turgenev from Russian into English. From 1957 to 1967 he was Chichele Professor of Social and Political Theory at the University of Oxford. He was president of the Aristotelian Society from 1963 to 1964. In 1966, he played a role in founding Wolfson College, Oxford, and became its first President.

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

He not only wrote with extraordinary insight on the political ideas and theories for the last three hundred years, he was at key positions during his lifetime to witness the Russian Revolution, the Nazi Revolution, and the Cold War.

As a result of such formal education and informal life-long learning, Berlin has to be considered among the greatest philosophers of liberalism, even more than John Rawls (1921-2002; and with all respect to Rawls' achievements). It was not simply the education, it was what it produced for modern liberalism: two key ideas, i) the essay, "Two Concepts of Liberty", delivered in 1958 as his inaugural lecture as Chichele Professor of Social and Political Theory at Oxford; ii) and his particular thesis of value pluralism, understood as the incommensurability of values. There are other key ideas ('the Counter-Enlightenment', and 'The Hedgehog and the Fox') but these two ideas reshaped the debates with and inside liberalism. In 'Two Concepts of Liberty' Berlin made the distinction between policies which are framed as freedom *for* something, or framed as freedom *from* something. In the former is a positive action to impose its freedom ('Positive Liberty'). We can see in Progressivism this positive freedom. The latter is a state of non-interference, a negative action of allowing freedom ('Negative Liberty'). The thesis of two concepts explained why totalitarian regimes have the language of freedom and why such language is authentic – the freedom is an imposition in the actions desired by the regime, but as such seeks to destroy the negative freedom of others to be allowed to live as they choose. Politically, what Berlin is doing is to unmask the rhetorical conflation, and show the plurality and incompatibility of human values, and the need to distinguish and trade off analytically between, rather than conflate, political values.

This leads to Berlin's second thesis. Unlike both relativism and absolutism, Berlin's value pluralism argues that, in judgement, there is not one or an unlimited number of values – there are many but a limited number of values. Berlin is not interested in counting them or assigning a numeric value to the plurality. What he is saying is that human life is not absolutely fitted in a number, nor is it in an infinite vacuum of time-space. There are the many, but we are each (the person) only capable of a choice moment-by-moment. In politics this is why liberty may clash with social justice. Critics have felt that Berlin has avoided seeing where values are commensurable in the extent to which they contribute to the human good. However, his thesis can accommodate this criticism. In social or political decisions, even personal ones, at any given moment, there is at least *some* incompatibility of human values, where a choice has to be made. The solution is in compromise and trade-offs, but it is not guaranteed as a safe solution. Some compromise and trade-offs prove to be tragic. An important insight from the incommensurability thesis is the challenge to reductionism – the argumentative device to reduce everything else to simply one's favoured

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

value or state of affairs (e.g. “there is no person, no individual, no consciousness, there is only the material”).

Emmanuel Levinas and the Cosmopolitanism in the Humanism of the Other

It is not too difficult to see, from these two important tenets of modern liberalism, the rise of modern Cosmopolitanism. From value pluralism and Non-Interference Liberalism, we have the ethical framework for allowing different cultures, and different peoples and their values, to co-exist within the same space – a nation or a suburb. However, it may not be enough. In recent times, Cosmopolitanism has been criticized for its negative liberty and non-interference, in that such a stance becomes a cover for allowing a diminishing or disappearance of a culture and people. This was, in fact, Australia’s old Aboriginal governmental policies – protect a ‘dying race’ but provide no positive action for their welfare. Multi-Culturalism is the new global (including Australia) policies which replaced the negative non-interference. The policies are positive actions at providing multiple cultural flourishing in the one space. It is the idea that the presence of one culture or people should not come at the cost of another. Commensurability is its aim.

In my historical analysis there are two directions that one can take to achieve this commensurability. The first is to look outwards to the commonality – to the world and common humanity. Organisationally, and in world politics, the different arrangements on offer are the United Nations, One-World movement, Multilateralism, and Commonwealth of Nations. These are different models which should be noted as important historical themes, but it is the not most profitable direction, I suggest, in exploring our common humanity. I see more fruitful insight, not from large political questions, but from the direction of the inner life – from ethics and what is to be a person.

It would seem, whatever outer organisation there is to provide a solution, nothing is achieved unless there is empathy in the *Humanism of the Other* (1972), a title of a book – actually three essays – by Emmanuel Levinas (1906-1995). Unlike Marx, Russell, even Berlin, Levinas is not a name well-known in the English world, a philosopher working in Jewish philosophy, existentialism, ethics, phenomenology and ontology. Until the last quarter century and into the first decade of the 21st century, much of contemporary French and German philosophy remained largely unknown in English-speaking cultures, but that did dramatically change from the 1970s with the celebration and criticism of postmodernity in Michel Foucault

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

(1926-1984), Jacques Derrida (1930-2004), and foremost Jean-François Lyotard (1924-1998) who heralded the idea of postmodernity. As indicated above, there is not sufficient historical distance to warrant a judgement that we have really gone beyond 'the modern condition'. Nevertheless, the better version, a more moderating 'postmodern' paradigm came from the philosophers who were the leading critics of 'postmodernism' as advocated by Foucault, Derrida, and Lyotard, and here we see Emmanuel Levinas, and along with the German philosopher, Jürgen Habermas (born 1929).

In the English translation of *Humanism of the Other*, the Introduction from Richard A. Cohen frames the work in the context of 'continental philosophy' of the twentieth century, with the linchpin of the famous 1929 debate between Martin Heidegger (1889-1979) and Ernst Cassirer (1874-1945). Levinas attended the debate as a graduate student, and according to Cohen, the debate shape the direction of Levinas' philosophy. Organisationally the event was a neo-Kantian conference, disputing different and new interpretations of the original texts of Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). For Heidegger, coming from his masterpiece of *Time and Being*, published only two years before (1927), 'being', existence, established the universal validity of truths discovered in the phenomenology (from Edmund Husserl 1859-1938), in the 'human being', the experience of being that is peculiar to human beings – *Dasein*. Here, Heidegger comes very close to the basic questions of humanity. *Dasein* is a form of being that is aware of and must confront such issues as personhood, mortality and the dilemma or paradox of living in relationship with other humans, but being is ultimately a *presence* alone with oneself. Here, I suggest, Heidegger's universalising mysticism got him into trouble. For Cassirer, in contrast, Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781) emphasizes human temporality and finitude. Human cognition was situated within a broader conception of humanity. Cassirer challenges Heidegger's mystic relativism in the universal validity of truths discovered by the exact and moral sciences. In *Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* (1923–1929) Cassirer argued that humanity is a 'symbolic animal'. Whereas non-human animals perceive their world by instincts and direct sensory perception, humans create a universe of symbolic meanings. It is symbols which provided a perfect understanding of our humanity, and symbols manufactured by our humanity are what we call 'culture'.

Hence, the 1929 Davos encounter set off the major debate within continental philosophy between Heidegger's philosophy of being and Cassirer's philosophy of culture. It was also a confrontation between humanism and anti-humanism with Heidegger's own take on the concepts of *techne* (art) and *technik* (technology). According to Heidegger's later works, modern technology is a new stage of 'revealing', where the subject-object distinction is overcome, even as the material. The essence of modern technology is the conversion of the whole universe of beings into an undifferentiated 'standing reserve' (*Bestand*) of energy

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

available for any use to which humans choose to put it. Although Heidegger does not say it, his technological romanticism makes humanity a willing conversion into the machine (Heidegger's *Übermensch*?). For Cassirer's part, culture is the quintessential expression of humanity. Machines are artefacts from humanity and not what culture is reduced to. Culture is more than the 'revealing' *technik* (technology); there is still much more of the *techne* (art) of humanity. We can resist, even rage against both the machine and humanity's insidious 'technological agenda' – the deterministic thesis of Jacques Ellul (1912-1994) where he pessimistically warns of the universalising agenda where technology controls the direction of politics and society, such as there is the religiosity of the technological society.

Between Cassirer and Ellul there is the great A.I. debate between optimism and skepticism, however, in recent decades, from a re-evaluation of Heidegger's philosophy, the anti-humanist inferences have come to the fore. In real life, in the human play of the social and political philosophy, there were serious consequences. Cassirer was the Jewish rector of University of Marburg who was dismissed in May 1933 and forced to flee Germany. In the very same month, in his inaugural address as rector of the University of Freiburg, Heidegger declared his support for a German revolution and Adolf Hitler. At the end of World War II, Heidegger's reputation was redeemed in the denazification procedures. In recent decades, however, the history scholarship has uncovered the unsavoury anti-Semitic and Nazi attitudes of Heidegger. In 1929 Levinas had originally sided with Heidegger against Cassirer, but his career would be largely against Heidegger, on the side of Cassirer, but with criticism of Cassirer's preference for symbols and culture rather their human producers. Levinas' personal experience of World War II was ground-breaking for his thinking. Life is not separated from philosophy as Russell had thought. Levinas was most fortunate as a Jew to serve as a French combatant. It meant that when the Germans captured him he would spend the rest of World War II as a prisoner of war in a camp near Hannover (in a special barrack for Jewish POWs) which protected him from the Holocaust's concentration camps.

In the next and final essay of this program I will have a closer look at the three essays that form Levinas' *Humanism of the Other*, however, a few principal thoughts of Levinas brings together the themes of internationalism and cosmopolitanism, the ideas of how we should live together. The ethics of the Other (a phenomenological term from G.W.F. Hegel 1770–1831) or in Levinas's terms, 'ethics as first philosophy' means responsibility toward the Other precedes any 'objective searching after truth'. Juxtaposed to René Descartes (1596-1650), the Other is not knowable and cannot be made into an object of the self. Rather this ethics is derived from the experience of the encounter with the Other. It is the irreducible relation, the epiphany, of the face-to-face, the encounter with another. In this revelation one recognizes the transcendence and heteronomy of the Other. From this phenomenology

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

comes a moral obligation – the moral "authority" of the face of the Other is felt in *my* 'infinite responsibility' for the Other. If this sounds theological, it is, but not in the meaning of any religious orthodoxy. Ideally from Levinas' ethics, the Other's face might well be adequately addressed as 'Thou' (as articulated by Martin Buber 1878-1965) in whose welcoming countenance I might find great comfort, love and communion of souls—but not a moral demand bearing down upon me from a height. This ethic presents utterly asymmetrical obligations: I owe the Other everything, the Other owes me nothing. This is not the orthodoxy of Judaism and Christianity where the obligation is to the community of faith as symbolised in the Divine; rather it is ethics of the historical Jewish Jesus: "If someone strikes you on one cheek, turn to him the other also. And if someone takes your cloak, do not withhold your tunic as well. Give to everyone who asks you, and if anyone takes what is yours, do not demand it back." (Luke 6:29-30).

Although Levinas does require that a 'trace' of the Divine be acknowledged within an ethics of Otherness, Levinas' ethics is a secular faith, often misunderstood as 'theological' since it is also the ethics of religious thinkers such as Leo Tolstoy (1828-1910) and Mahatma Gandhi (1869-1948). If it is theological, it is so in terms of 'modern spirituality', abandoning the in-group orthodoxy with its rule-focused dogma. Rather, I am suggesting, the ethics is philosophic, specifically on the idea of personhood. According to Levinas, Subjectivity is primordially ethical, not theoretical: that is to say, our responsibility for the other is not a derivative feature of our subjectivity, but instead, founds our subjective being-in-the-world by giving it a meaningful direction and orientation. Here the idea of the Divine is quite different to its religious inferences. The idea of the Divine trace appears to speak of the higher worth and valuing of another. The face of the Other comes toward me with its infinite moral demands while emerging out of the trace. Interestingly, it was Derrida who helped to bring Levinas' work to the fore, and who delivered a eulogy at Levinas's funeral, and who later published as *Adieu à Emmanuel Levinas*, an appreciation and exploration of Levinas's moral philosophy.

Concluding Remarks

Understanding how we can live together without violence and poverty is not easy for the modern world, or even a postmodern world. It is not as easy as the various political organisations and theories that have gone into modern internationalism and cosmopolitanism. Marx has shown that things like property, work, and wealth do matter. Russell, however, has shown that a modest rationality and the desire to improve the world

Present Humanism & Understanding from New Internationalism and Cosmopolitanism

in happiness and love are also very important. Berlin has shown that, to those same ends as expressed by Marx and Russell, we need to make hard choices, moment-by-moment, between our many but limited values (and resources). He also warns that in our desire to improve the world that we do not undo that same quality for someone else. Levinas brings the scope of these ideas together in asking what is the Humanism of the Other as an ethical question. It is a question we will continue with next time when we consider the Age of the Multi-Culturalism, Persons, and the Crisis of Humanity (1846-2000).