

The world citizen and cosmopolitanism in the age of Enlightenment

Prof. Mohamed Osman Elkhosht
Faculty of Arts
Cairo University

Introduction:

The eighteenth century is considered a turning point in the path of humanity towards an understanding of a clear and specific concept of citizenship, as reflective of real equality in rights and duties. Besides, it is during this same century that many changes came about this concept, at least in theory, which in turn resulted in the breaking out of the biggest humanitarian revolutions; the two revolutions that broke out with the concept of citizenship, the American Revolution (1776) and the French Revolution of 1789, and moved humanity into a new horizon, albeit incomplete.

The citizen has gained at the end of the eighteenth century, and with the French Revolution, qualities derived from the principles of this revolution. While stressing that with the considerable progress achieved by the French and American Revolutions in rise of the concept of citizenship and pursuing its practical results, it did not rise up to the rank of complete citizenship; as both revolutions deprived many people from their right of citizenship.

In this era, the idea of citizenship was conceptually linked -a few times- with a cosmopolitanism that envisages a unified world in a framework of diversity, a world that develops means to prevent war and where human beings are treated in a framework of genuine equality between all human rights and duties, without encroaching upon the right of the home state and the right of the home world; especially with the arrival of the peak of this era with Kant (1724-1804), the theoretical peak that has never been practically viable so far.

It followed that the concept of citizenship sometimes swayed away from globalization, laying special emphasis on the home state, and some other times met with cosmopolitanism as home of the world. Its finest and most rational

form, however, was that relating citizenship in the state to citizenship in the world. How can that happen? In what sense? And what causes this high estimation to happen?

Despite the fact that the concept of citizenship continued to be alive and moving under the ongoing historical processes, difficulties emerged when it became linked with cosmopolitanism which was manifest in some philosophies, which went beyond the regional horizons to a broader global horizon.

How did cosmopolitanism arise in the era of modernity? How did it crystallize in the Enlightenment particularly? To what extent did this trend lead to the concept of world citizenship? What are the objections and challenges that faced it — and still do — even now?

These are the questions that this research will attempt to find answers to, in the framework of a comparative analytical approach, not without a largely critical view.

*** Cosmopolitanism in early modernity:**

The 15th century is considered the base of the cosmopolitanism in its modern form, though not clearly defined as it was still in the embryonic stage. Ronald Robertson sets out five historical stages for cosmopolitanism that began in the 15th century, these stages are

- a. The embryonic stage.
- b. The evolutionary stage .
- c. The start-up phase .
- d. The struggle for domination stage.
- e. The uncertainty phase⁽¹⁾.

During the era of humanism, that is, the Renaissance, *cosmopolitanism* was simply an exception; as it began appearing slowly, moving forward with the discovery of America and orbiting the earth. The latter was a clear contribution to philosophical thinking, and some such as A. W. Benn believed that it had a revolutionary influence on philosophy, and indeed these discoveries guaranteed a philosophical revolution⁽²⁾.

In addition to geographical discoveries, the increasing rate of revival of many ancient texts had an important role in the re-emergence of the notion of

cosmopolitanism; as its sources have been well known in the Renaissance, especially for the humanists who emphasized the fundamental unification of human nature.

In any case, some authors in the Renaissance took on old cosmopolitanism to defend world peace, particularly Erasmus of Rotterdam '(9/1466- 1536)' who emphasized the unity of the human race and refused to divide it into different states and peoples, by demonstrating that humanity is destined by nature to be unified and to live in peace⁽³⁾. Erasmus has defended national and religious tolerance, and considered rational human beings to be those living within the same home⁽⁴⁾.

It seems that the Natural Law Theory in the early modern era has given way to the production of philosophical cosmopolitanism, as well as citizenship. Besides, the fact that the secularizing tendencies and individualist views that prevailed among the defenders of all humanity have common basic features appeared to confirm the view of the unity of the human race as a whole.

In any case, according to many thinkers, who appeared in the early modern era, all individuals are always in a state of basic struggle for self-preservation, but this struggle has not yet succeeded in creating a link that brings together all the individuals in a world society.

There are still two factors that sometimes pushed the Natural Law Theory towards the cosmopolitanism:

First, some natural law thinkers assume that nature, the tendency to self-preservation and the sense of compassion have all infused in humanity the social tendency that claims that all members of the human race in its original rank are included in a kind of world community. However, the recourse to such common humanitarian link was weak anyway and did not lead in any way to cosmopolitanism.

In fact sometimes a visualization of a natural social tendency versus a perception of legitimate war against some people in the world was used, as it violated this common bond in an unnatural way, and because legitimate war supporters have put those people outside the field of ethical common humanity due to their barbarism.

Second, the theory of natural law in early modern times is often

associated with the social contract theory and despite the fact that most social contract philosophers often presented their visions, if not individually, at the state level and not at the level of international relations, the idea behind the theory of social contract itself proved viable only at the second level, i.e., at the level of international relations⁽⁵⁾.

This is what we find when global minded intellectuals who voiced these underlying meanings and put the foundation for the international law, such as Pufendorf⁽⁶⁾, in addition to Grotius who conceived of a large society of states governed by the law Of Nations which links between all states, and discussed the idea of the international community and the fundamental questions of international relations, and the difference between fair and unfair war in his book 'In the law of war and peace' ...⁽⁷⁾.

*** Factors of the rise of cosmopolitanism in the eighteenth century:**

During the Enlightenment, the historical context of the up rise of philosophical cosmopolitanism was affected by several factors, notably the growing up of Capitalism, and the growth of world trade and its theoretical implications. It was associated with the growth of capitalism and according to Jonathan Friedman, the European businesses which have flourished in the 18th century, the related business systems in the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia, and the major empires are all strong cosmopolitan systems, for a cosmopolitan infrastructure used to exist in the growth of capitalism.

In addition, the renewed interest in the Hellenistic philosophy, with its cosmopolitanism, had a clear impact on some Enlightenment philosophers. This cosmopolitanism of the Hellenistic philosophy came from Alexander the great whose conquests destroyed the independence of "states of the Greek city" and replaced it by the concept of "the world state", and opened the World East to Greek trade more than ever. The new era was colonial in politics, cosmic in scope and global in thinking. With cosmopolitanism came the inevitable challenges of new ideas and the mixing of cultural traditions and the supremacy of Athens shifted to new cultural centers, notably Alexandria⁽⁸⁾.

The Hellenistic era was an era full of new cosmopolitan opportunities⁽⁹⁾ and many philosophies of a cosmopolitan affiliation emerged, notably the Stoic philosophy, through two principles:

The first principle is the natural law, the law of people which does not differentiate between people on grounds of religion or origin or social

background, (this principle strongly prevailed as we saw in the 18th century).

The second principle is cosmopolitan citizenship which is associated with the concept of Cosmopolitanism, and this principle - as Zeno, the founder of the Stoic, sees- stipulates that people should not disperse in cities that have their own laws, because all people are citizens, who live the same life and there is a single system of things, as is the case of the-common-herd-under-a-common-code principle. All people have the same origin and the same fate, and are subject to the same law, citizens of one state, and members of one body⁽¹⁰⁾.

The return of interest in this philosophy in general, and the Hellenistic philosophy in particular has had a noticeable effect on the re-emergence of cosmopolitanism in the age of enlightenment, especially with the creation of large empires in the world, the increase in journeys around the world, the geographical discoveries, the emergence of the idea of human rights, and the emphasis that philosophy laid on the Human Reason.

*** The manifestations of Cosmopolitanism in the Enlightenment :**

In this era, cosmopolitanism was not only reflected in philosophy, but also in literature; it was notable in those days that many intellectuals considered their belonging to "the republic of literature" that go beyond nationalities more sensible than their belonging to the different political states. This was a natural result of the problematical relations with their government because of restrictions on freedom and censorship. These conditions have led them to think in a broader range than that of the states and peoples, adopting a cosmic viewpoint. In the late century, under the influence of the American Revolution, particularly during the early years of the French Revolution, cosmopolitanism has been given a strong push. And in 1789, citizens' rights were declared which highlighted fixed human rights, and later became part of the Constitution of 1791. This concept has grown even more under the influence of cosmopolitan patterns of thinking⁽¹¹⁾.

The terms *cosmopolitanism* and *world citizenship* as a classification for specific philosophical theories were not often used in the eighteenth century, but they were used to refer to the open mental stream and nonalignment. A "world citizen" was the person who was not subordinated to the particular religious or political authority, or loyal to a particular state or culture.

Furthermore, the term was sometimes used to refer to a person who lived

according to the urban or civil lifestyle, or was fond of traveling and interested in the World Wide Web, or felt at home anywhere. In this sense, Denis Diderot and Jean Le Rond d'Alembert state that it was often used to refer to the person who has no permanent residence, or a human being who is no stranger anywhere⁽¹²⁾.

Although philosophers such as Hume, Voltaire, Hume, Diderot, Voltaire Diderot Addison, Jefferson, had considered themselves as "cosmopolitan" with one or more of these meanings, these uses were not given due attention, particularly in the second half of the eighteenth century. In any case, the term was increasingly used to indicate particular philosophical convictions. Some writers revived the Cynic Tradition. Vogiret Fougeret de Montbron in his autobiography "Le Cosmopolite" in 1753 called himself "a world Cosmopolitan", describing how he used to travel everywhere without getting attached to a certain location, stating that "all countries are the same to me" and "I change my stay places as I wish"⁽¹³⁾.

Although there were some writers who were enthusiastic to link themselves to this type of cosmopolitanism, others criticized it. For example, Rousseau argued that "cosmopolitans" brag that they love everyone, or the whole world, and in fact they don't like anyone⁽¹⁴⁾.

According to Johann Georg Schlosser in his critical poem "Der Kosmopolit", to brag about one homeland is better than being global without a home and he wrote "it is better to be proud of one homeland rather than not have a homeland at all"⁽¹⁵⁾.

In the 18th century, most of the defenders of cosmopolitanism did not identify their vision in light of the critical descriptions mentioned above. They have understood cosmopolitanism not as a vision beyond individualism, but as reflecting the Stoic tradition, involving an example of positive morality of a cosmopolitan human society, and they did not consider this example damaging to the inclinations most specific such as patriotism. And thus they have resumed the spirit of Epictetus (50-130 m), the Stoic, in their theory of "Cosmopolis", where duties towards others are apparent in the human being's practice of their human nature, as a member of the state which is part of a world state. He stresses that, a human being is exposed, for the sake of others, to illness sometimes, to traveling and risk sometimes, to deprivation sometimes and to premature death some other times. He sees that the duties

towards God are based on the belief that the whole world is one cosmic city where humans and gods reside together⁽¹⁶⁾.

Some writers, such as the German writer Christophe Martin Wieland, were totally close to the Stoic visions, while others developed a universal moral theory which was completely new from certain aspects, such as Kant, the critical philosopher. For Kant, there were two angles from which it is possible to consider the homeland and the citizen: the angle of the theory of the right, and that of political morality. In the former, the global dimension appeared only in one side, while the latter is universal in form, content and origins.

The right angle is obvious in his book "the theory of right", which defines homeland as the territory in which the residence once born are citizens in one country under its constitutional system, i.e., without the need for a special legal basis. People who do not have the title citizens are outside. If this outside zone comprises part of the overall empire, it is called the province according to the meaning that the Romans gave to the term⁽¹⁷⁾.

Here, the term citizenship appears in the narrow sense at the level of region or province and the citizen in this sense according to the philosophy of the right, is not the property of the state, and has the right to migrate with his mobile property and not his real estate property, but he has of course, the right to sell them and get the price, and move them to any destination outside his homeland.

This is concerning the right of a citizen, as for the ruler, he has other rights including the right of administrative exile to any citizen who commits an offence that is hazardous to the state, and thus he has the right to withdraw his citizenship. It's the right of the ruler because the person represents a danger to the state. But a universal feature appears in the framework of this angle of citizenship, when Kant gives the ruler the right to promote the stability of the foreigners at the regional home, whether approved by the native citizens or not, provided that their ownership of land is untouched⁽¹⁸⁾.

As for the other angle according to Kant, which is the political morality, it seemed cosmopolitan in form, content and origins, considering all *rational beings* as members of the same human society, and that they are comparable to citizens in a political republic sense, to the extent that they are common in features of freedom and equality, and independence. They devote themselves

to these common laws which are the ethical laws that are based on the human mind where a citizen lives in a world of rational beings⁽¹⁹⁾.

In contrast, the benefit-driven philosophers who follow cosmopolitanism such as Jeremy Bentham defended cosmopolitanism with reference to the mutual benefit and equality for all nations⁽²⁰⁾.

It is possible that moral cosmopolitanism be established in the human mind, or in some other features universally shared among humanity, such as pain and pleasure experiences, ethical sense, and aesthetic imagination. Philosophers supporting ethical cosmopolitanism believe that all human beings are brothers (despite clear qualitative bias for men at the expense of women), by analogy with what they were aiming to indicate concerning fundamental equality between all human beings, an equality that keeps away from slavery, colonial exploitation of natural resources, and feudal hierarchy, and various types of custody.

*** The World state in a new political theory:**

On the other hand, some philosophers with a cosmopolitan affiliation developed their visions into a political theory on the world citizen and state and on international relations. The most radical of the intellectuals with this affiliation in the eighteenth century was undoubtedly Baron De Cloots (1755-1794), who defended the removal of all existing states, and called for the establishment of a single world state under which all human beings directly fall.

Several remarks can be registered on his position regarding one world state:

First, all his arguments are taken from the general structure of the social contract theory. If the public interest to each individual is subject to the authority of the implemented laws that guarantee security, then the argument leads us to demand a world state that involves all humanitarian personnel, and implement cosmopolitan laws that provide security for all which means that De Cloots rejects the idea that the world state be composed of several united states, and rather proposes one world state that does not allow the existence of individual states.

Second, It proves that sovereignty must be established by the people, and that the concept of sovereignty itself, being an integral whole, could exist as a sovereign body in the world, that is, mankind as a whole⁽²¹⁾.

Most cosmopolitanism thinkers did not argue for their views as strongly as Cloots' did; Emmanuel Kant argued, in "Perpetual Peace" (1795), though the defense was less powerful, that the international legal system is "the League of Nations", or "Federation of Nations" and not one state, that is, a cosmopolitan body comprising countries of the world⁽²²⁾.

Kant demonstrated that real world peace is only possible when states are organized internally in accordance with the principles of the republic, and when the state is organized externally in a voluntarily league to preserve peace, and when human rights are respected not only with citizens but foreigners as well⁽²³⁾.

He also demonstrated that the League of Nations should not have compulsory military forces because it would violate the internal sovereignty of the states, and is a potential threat to individual liberty in those states. This happens when the federal authority is less respectful of the human rights of some member states, and trims down the opportunities that actually link the states.

Kant also introduced the concept of cosmopolitan law that concerns universal rights, which include the rights of both states and individuals, as individuals have these rights as "citizens of the earth" or as world citizens, more than as citizens of certain states.

There is also next to the cosmopolitan law, the civil law which is concerned with the civil rights of people, and the international law, which is concerned with guaranteeing the rights of nations and states, and regulating their relations⁽²⁴⁾.

According to Kant, citizenship and cosmopolitanism meet through the new international order based on federal civil societies in which peace can be achieved via the World government, which plays the role of the regulator rather than the actor, through a set of final articles that Kant has prescribed to achieve peace among states. These articles are:

1. The Civil Constitution of each state should be republican. The republican constitution is based on the contract between citizens together on the one hand, and between them and the ruler on the other. In a republican constitution, citizens prescribe rules through their representatives in the parliament⁽²⁵⁾.

2. International law must be based on a federation of free states in the scope of the League of Nations or World Government⁽²⁶⁾.
3. The Cosmopolitan law guarantees the right of foreign citizens, and should be limited to the hospitality requirements of the world: freedom of movement, employment, trade...etc⁽²⁷⁾.

These articles, according to Delu as well, reveal that individuals perceive the world through two points of view: first, as members of their own legitimate rights of citizenship, and the other, as citizens of the world who have a moral responsibility for the maintenance of an international system that can continuously strengthen civil societies everywhere. As citizens in their homelands, they have to strengthen the necessary laws and interests of their nations while urging their countries to abide by the principles of a peaceful international system or else it would find itself outside the international community and exposed to condemnation; this sense of being part of the masses of the world would create the basis for a continuous pressure emitted from a cosmopolitan culture to enable the various parties in the world to live in a state of Perpetual Peace⁽²⁸⁾.

Thus, Kant looked forward to the idea that mankind can slowly approach a cosmopolitical constitution⁽²⁹⁾, that consolidates with *world citizenship* and applying the introductory and final articles to achieve a state of cosmopolitan international peace would help reach this stage. We highlighted previously three final articles as it contains clearly the concept of citizenship where Kant's political theory looks as though it is a theory of the citizen who is the basis for the state, and in order to achieve lasting cosmopolitan peace. We put off talking about the introductory articles, though Kant started with them, as they proceeded from the concept of the state on which the concept of citizenship is essentially dependent; they focus more on the rules governing relations between states in the framework of a world government. There is no doubt that both articles, introductory and final, reflect the cosmopolitanism of Kant. The introductory articles for the realization of lasting world peace state the following:

1. *No Treaty of Peace Shall Be Held Valid in Which There Is Tacitly Reserved Matter for a Future War*⁽³⁰⁾.
2. *No Independent States, Large or Small, Shall Come under the Dominion of Another State by Inheritance, Exchange, Purchase, or Donation*⁽³¹⁾.

This article reflects citizenship in its humanistic dimension; as it considers the state human, or a moral person, not just a piece of land as usual; there is no doubt that given the state on that basis cannot be achieved without the concept of citizenship. The moral personal of the state is derived originally from the concept of a full-fledged human personality. Kant believed that No state is a patrimony (e.g., like the land in which you live), but rather a community of people that no one has the right to impose control on but the state itself. It is like a trunk that has its own roots, and incorporating it in another state is like grafting a plant with another and will destroy its existence as a moral person, and turn it into a thing. Such integration is incompatible with the idea of the original contract without which no right of the people can be conceived⁽³²⁾.

The concept of citizenship is manifest in its ethical dimension; a citizen is a man and a man according to Kant's ethical philosophy is an end in himself and not a thing, an instrument or a means to an end⁽³³⁾. Therefore, Kant rejects the idea that some states rent its army to another state in the face of the enemy that is not common to both. Whoever does this is using "persons" as "things" manipulated by a thumb⁽³⁴⁾.

3. Standing Armies (miles perpetuus) Shall in Time Be Totally Abolished⁽³⁵⁾.

4. National Debts Shall Not Be Contracted with a View to the External Friction of States⁽³⁶⁾.

5. No State Shall by Force Interfere with the Constitution or Government of Another State⁽³⁷⁾.

6. No State Shall, during War, Permit Such Acts of Hostility Which Would Make Mutual Confidence in the Subsequent Peace Impossible: Such Are the Employment of Assassins (percussores), Poisoners (venefici), Breach of Capitulation, and Incitement to Treason (perduellio) in the Opposing State⁽³⁸⁾.

Thus, with Kant, the Enlightenment arrived at the rational concept of citizenship; that does not override regional citizenship, and at the same time does not abandon cosmopolitanism through a uniform international regime standard, that is reflected in the cosmopolitan body of free nations and plays the role of the regulator rather than the role of the actor. Individuals move as members in their homeland, and citizens in the world, and the state is considered a community of a moral personality, not just a piece of land. There

is no doubt that given the state on that basis cannot be achieved without the concept of citizenship, because the moral personality of the state originates from the concept of a citizen who has a fully-fledged human personality.

*** Conclusion: Challenges facing world citizenship:**

The question which is still waiting for an answer is: Will cosmopolitanism in its current forms be able to replace state citizenship with a truly cosmopolitan vision of citizenship⁽³⁹⁾?

The concept of world citizenship without a world state is, in fact, a concept made of straw, like cosmopolitanism. This seems a logical objection, because cosmopolitanism would be meaningless without the context of a world state; this is because cosmopolitanism necessarily involves an affiliation to a world state. As long as there is no one universal human pool, it makes no sense to mention the concept of world citizenship; this concept without this context would be incompatible with the origin of citizenship, and that is the national state.

But if the sense of world citizenship is a lifestyle and not literally a political affiliation, according to some thinkers of the Enlightenment in the 18th century, then there is no objection to the concept, even if there is no world state, because this does not conflict with the political affiliation of the national state.

Since that era, the humanists who have tackled this issue were very few. Moreover, their argument for the world state model has been limited, except for Kant, who argued for a world composed of states, saying that there is a big difference between the one world state and one world government that is composed of states with national sovereignty.

And then we find that even those who argue for a world state have switched to support something more complex, and that is an ideal concept for a world sovereign government. This confirms the failure of the "United Nations" that pursues the interests of major states at the expense of smaller states, and in which human rights are operative only at the will of major powers especially the United States at the present time. Therefore, the most serious challenges for the establishing world citizenship and state from a philosophical view come in three main forms:

First, cosmopolitanism is meaningless without the context of the actual

world state; world citizenship is inconsistent in this case with the origin of citizenship, which is the national state. Citizenship involves two things: the rights of the individual to the state and the duties of the state to the individual, i.e., which means commitment. If the world state does not already exist, where else can you exercise this commitment towards the world state?

Second, there are doubts raised about the willingness of all humanity — individuals and states — to the existence of a single world state.

Third, the possibility of achieving world citizenship through a world political model of one state or government faces difficulties, if not an impossibility, given the conflicting interests, religions and ideologies and different minds and thinking. If a state or several states tried to impose this model, it would impose it in a way that serves its special interests, and therefore takes the form of colonialism that is likely to drive mankind into a state of renewed conflict, and that's what we've seen already in all the cases of former empires which tried to impose the world model.

Isn't the idea of turning the world community into a world state and reaching an agreement on norms and values that control all people— a wonderful and beautiful hallucination? In the light

of the prevailing differences between nations, cultures and religions, and the idea that different currents are keen to preserve their cultural nationalism, linguistic chauvinism and religious fundamentalism, is it possible in light of all this, to conceive of any uniform world government, let alone the possibility of its realization under such world dimensions?

However, you can still walk in the opposite direction, especially in light of this suffocating position, thus the necessary question is: Has the need for a world government or a united nations which is fair and capable become inevitable?

We live in a world of serious tensions and polarizations between believers and non-believers. This is no longer a conflict between members of the Church and secularists, or between the priesthood and his opponents, or only restricted to Russia and Poland, but has also extended to France and Algeria, Iraq, Palestine, Lebanon and others. It is no longer confined to a one continent, but rather found in all continents of the world. Some may ask: are we not living in an era of new cultural clashes? This is, of course, an undeniable fact⁽⁴⁰⁾.

Hence, more and more obstacles are facing cosmopolitanism, and the question remains open: What is the solution to this challenge? Does Kant's statement that "the human race can gradually be brought closer and closer to a constitution establishing world citizenship"⁽⁴¹⁾ still hold?

Translated by :

Dr.Amani Badawy

Associate Professor,English Department,Cairo University

Notes :

- 1) Ronald Robertson, Globalization Social Theory and Global Culture, London, Sage Publication, 1996. p. 11.
- 2) A. W .Benn, History of Modern Philosophy, London, Watts &co. 1930. p.5.
- 3) Erasmus, Desiderius. A Complaint of Peace Spurned and Rejected by the Whole World. In: Desiderius Erasmus, Works. translated by Betty Radice. Vol. 27, pp. 289-322. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.
- 4) Blackburn S., The Oxford Dictionary Of Philosophy, Oxford University Press, 1996. p. 124.
- 5) Sabine, a History of Political Theory, , N Y, Henry Holt & company, 1946. p. 429ff.
- 6) Ibid., p. 430-1.
- 7) H. Kung, A global ethics for global politics and economics, translated by John Bowden from German. oxford, oxford University Press, 1997. p. 20.
- 8) Louis L. Orlin, "Hellenistic Age" in: Academic American Encyclopedia, New Jersey, Arete, 1980. vol. 10, p.114.
- 9) ibid.
- 10) E. zeller, Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy. Translated by L.R, Palmer , London, Kegan Paul, 1931 . p. 225.
- 11) Pauline Kleingeld & Eric brown, "Cosmopolitanism", First published Sat Feb 23, 2002; substantive revision Fri Jun 28, 2002. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <http://plato.stanford.edu/>
- 12) Encyclopédie; ou Dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers, par une société des gens de lettres. Ed. Denis Diderot and Jean Le Rond d'Alembert. Vol. IV, p. 297 (Paris: Briasson, et al., 1754). quoted in: Ibid.
- 13) Fougeret de Montbron, Le Cosmopolite ou le Citoyen du Monde. Ducros, Paris: 1970 [London, 1750]. p. 130. quoted in: Ibid.
- 14) Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings. Ed. and translated by Victor Gourevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.p. 158. quoted in: Ibid.
- 15) Ibid.
- 16) E. zeller, Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy. p. 269ff.
L.T. Hobhouse, Morals Evolution, London, Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1908. vol. 2, p. 201-203.
- 17) د. عبد الرحمن بدوي، فلسفة القانون والسياسة، الكويت، وكالة المطبوعات، ١٩٧٩، ص١٦٨.
- 18) المرجع السابق، الموضع نفسه.
- 19) Kant, Perpetual Peace, with an Introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler. NY, Columbia University press, 1939. p. 12.
- 20) Pauline Kleingeld & Eric brown, "Cosmopolitanism", Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. <http://plato.stanford.edu/>
- 21) Ibid.
- 22) Kant, Perpetual Peace, p. 18.
- 23) Ibid., p.p. 23-24.
- 24) Ibid., p. 11.
- 25) Ibid., p. 12f.
- 26) Ibid., p. 18.
- 27) Ibid., p.p. 23-24.

- 28) ستيفن ديبلو، التفكير السياسي والنظرية السياسية والمجتمع المدني، ترجمة ربيع وهبة، مراجعة علا أبو زيد، القاهرة، المجلس الأعلى للثقافة، ٢٠٠٣، ص ٣٦٤.
- 29) Kant, Perpetual Peace, p. 25.
- 30) Ibid., p. 2.
- 31) Ibid., p.3.
- 32) Ibid., p.3.
- 33) M. Thompson, Ethics, Chicago. NTC - publishing Group, 1994, P. 109.
- 34) Kant, Perpetual Peace, p.4.
- 35) Ibid., p. 4-5.
- 36) Ibid., p. 5.
- 37) Ibid., p. 6.
- 38) Ibid., p. 7.
- 39) Jack Barbalet, Citizenship, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988. p. 57ff.
Bryan S. Turner (ed.), Citizenship and Social Theory. London, Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1993. p. 138ff.
- 40) H. Kung, a Global Ethics For Global Politics And Economics, pp. 91-92.
- 41) Kant, Perpetual Peace, p. 25.

Bibliography

- Academic American Louis L. Orlin, "Hellenistic Age" in: Encyclopedia, vol. 10 .
- Arendt, Hannah. The Human Condition. Charles R, Walgreen Foundation Lectures. University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- Barbalet, Jack, Citizenship. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Benn , W . History of Modern Philosophy, London, Watts &co. 1930.
- Blackburn S., The Oxford Dictionary Of Philosophy, Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Brubacker, William Rogers : The French revolution and the invention of citizenship in French politics and society. Volume 7 number 3-Center for European studies –Harvard university, 2004.
- Bryan S. Turner (ed.), Citizenship and Social Theory. London, Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1993.
- Cantor, Norman F., ed., Ideas and Institutions in Western Civilization. 5 vol., 2nd. New York, Macmillan, 1968. vol. 2: The Medieval World, 300-1300.
- Collin, P. H., Harrap's English Dictionary, Edinburgh,Harrap,1993.
- Dahl, Robert A., Democracy and Its Critics . New Haven, CT, Yale University, Press, 1989. p. 164. Ronald Robertson, Globalization Social Theory and Global Culture, London, Sage Publication, 1996.
- David E. Cooper, World Philosophies, Oxford, Blackwell, 1996.
- Dawn Oliver and Derek Hater, The Foundations of Citizenship. New York, Harvester Wheatsheaf,1994.
- Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., vol. 20,15th ed.
- Erasmus, Desiderius. A Complaint of Peace Spurned and Rejected by the Whole World. In: Desiderius Erasmus, Works. Trans. Betty Radice. Vol. 27, pp. 289-322. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986.
- Feiling, Keith Grahame, A History of England from the Coming of the English to 1918. London, Macmillan Press Ltd., 1966.

- Ferguson , An Essay on the History of Civil Society, ed. Duncan Forbes, Edinburgh, 1966.
- Gray, John, Enlightenment's Wake, London, Routledge, 1997.
- Grotius, Hugo. The Law of War and Peace. Trans. Francis W. Kelsey. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1925.
- Haakonssen , "The Structure of Hume's Political Theory", in: David Fate Norton, ed., The Cambridge Companion to Hume Cambridge, Cambridge University press, 1993.
- Hobbes, Thomas. Leviathan, oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1946.
- Hobhouse, L.T., Morals Evolution, London, Chapman and Hall, Ltd., 1908. vol. 2,
- Janoski, Thomas, Citizenship and Civil Society: A framework of Rights and Obligations in Liberal, Traditional and Social Democratic Regimes. Cambridge, Cambridge University press, 1998.
- John Henry ,GOVERNMENT & POLITICS IN BRITAIN, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1991.
- Kant, An Idea for a Universal History. in: Kant, On History. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill ,1963.
- Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, trans. N. Kemp Smith. New York: St. Martin's press, 1929.
- Kant, Immanuel, Perpetual Peace, with an Introduction by Nicholas Murray Butler. NY, Columbia University press, 1939.
- kant, On History. Indianapolis Bobbs-Merrill ,1963.
- Kant, The Metaphysical Elements of The Theory of Rights. In : Kant's Political Writings. ed. By Hans Reiss, Cambridge, Cambridge University press, 1970.
- Kaufman, Michael and Alfonso, Haroldo, eds., Community Power and Grassroots Democracy: The Transformation of Social Life. London, Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Zed Books; Ottawa, on: International Development Research Centre, 1997.
- Kung, H., A global ethics for global politics and economics, translated by

- John Bowden from German. oxford, oxford University Press, 1997.
- Lewis, Bernard, Islam and Liberal Democracy: a Historical Overview", Journal of Democracy, vol. 7, no. 2. 1996.
 - Lister, Ruth, Citizenship: Feminist Perspectives. London, Macmillan Press Ltd., 1997.
 - Locke, john, Social Contract, edit. Sir Ernest Barker, N.Y, Oxford University Press, 1945.
 - Machiavelli, Nicola, the prince, trans. By luigi, N.Y., random house, 1950.
 - Marshall, Thomas Humphrey, Class, Citizenship and Social Development: Essays. With an introduction by Seymour Martin Lipset. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973.
 - Mcnaughton, NEIL, SUCCESS IN POLITICS, John Murray (Publishers) Ltd, Second Edition 2001.
 - Miller , David, ed., The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought. New York , Blackwell, 1995
 - Montesquieu, Charles Louis de Secondat, Persian Letters. Edited by C. J. Betts. London, 1977.
 - Montesquieu, Charles Louis de Secondat, The Spirit of the Laws. Translated by Thomas Nugent, with an introduction by Franz Neumann. Hafner Library of Classics: 9.2vols. New York: Hafner Pub. Co., 1962.
 - Paine, Tomas, Common Sense , ed. Henry Collins, Harmondsworth, 1776.
 - Paine, Tomas, Rights of Man, ed. Henry Collins, Harmondsworth, 1977.
 - Parsons, Talcott, Politics and Social Structure. New York: Free Press, 1969.
 - Randall, Vicky and Waylen, Georgina, eds., Gender, Politics, and State. London; New York, Routledge, 1998.
 - Reilly, Kevin. The west and the world; A topical history of civilization, 2 vols., Harper and row 1980.
 - Rosenthal, M. & Yudin, A dictionary of Philosophy,
 - Rousseau, Jean Jacque .The Social Contract, trans. Maurice Cranston, New York , Penguin Book , 1968.

- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *The Social Contract and Other Later Political Writings*. Ed. and trans. Victor Gourevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Sabine, a *History of Political Theory*, N Y, Henry Holt & company, 1946.
- Sigler, Jay A., "Civil Right" in: *Academic American Encyclopedia*, New Jersey, Arete, 1980 . vol. 5.
- *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.<http://plato.stanford.edu/>
- Thompson, *Ethics*, Chicago. NTC - publishing Group, 1994,
- Walt, Kenneth, “Kant, Liberalism, and War”, *American Political Science Review*, 56, June 1962.
- Wasserman, Jack," *Citizenship*" in: *Academic American Encyclopedia*, New Jersey, Arete, 1980 . vol. 4.
- *World Book Encyclopedia*. London: World Book, Inc., [n. d.], vol. 4.
- Wuthnow, Robert, *Sharing the journey* .New York, Free Press, 1994,
- Zeller, E., *Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy*. Tr. By L.R, Palmer, London, Kegan Paul, 1931 .