

12-4-2006

# Communicating Cosmopolitanism: An Analysis of the Rhetoric of Jimmy Carter, Vaclav Havel, and Edward Said

Rasha I. Ramzy

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication\\_diss](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_diss)



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Ramzy, Rasha I., "Communicating Cosmopolitanism: An Analysis of the Rhetoric of Jimmy Carter, Vaclav Havel, and Edward Said." Dissertation, Georgia State University, 2006.  
[https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication\\_diss/8](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/communication_diss/8)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Communication at ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks @ Georgia State University. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@gsu.edu](mailto:scholarworks@gsu.edu).

COMMUNICATING COSOPOLITANISM:  
AN ANALYSIS OF THE RHETORIC OF JIMMY CARTER, VACLAV HAVEL, AND  
EDWARD SAID

by

RASHA I. RAMZY

Under the Direction of David Cheshier

ABSTRACT

This project explores how cosmopolitan personas rhetorically negotiate the space between local and global, discursively tying people to the national as well as to the global or transnational. It examines the possible co-existence of cosmopolitanism and nationalism while identifying how each is articulated in response to the other. As global networks become increasingly complex, rethinking borders and how they are articulated is essential. Can a quintessential cosmopolitan also be a public nationalist? Are cosmopolitan discourses compromised by their presumed lack of attachment to the local? To what extent and with what success are cosmopolitanism and nationalism simultaneously articulated? In order to study these and other questions, I analyze the public personas crafted by the cosmopolitan figures Vaclav Havel, Jimmy Carter, and Edward Said. By illuminating how they negotiate that ambiguous space between locale and its absence, a project attentive to the rhetorical possibilities of discursive connection in a world increasingly devoid of shared loyalties and

histories enables a fuller understanding of the possibilities of intercultural contact in a globalizing world.

INDEX WORDS:      Cosmopolitanism, Rhetorical Tokens, Vaclav Havel,  
                          Jimmy Carter, Edward Said

COMMUNICATING COSOPOLITANISM:  
AN ANALYSIS OF THE RHETORIC OF JIMMY CARTER, VACLAV HAVEL, AND  
EDWARD SAID

by

RASHA I. RAMZY

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in the College of Arts and Sciences  
Georgia State University

2006

Copyright by  
Rasha I. Ramzy  
2006

COMMUNICATING COSMOPOLITANISM:  
AN ANALYSIS OF THE RHETORIC OF JIMMY CARTER, VACLAV HAVEL, AND  
EDWARD SAID

by

RASHA I. RAMZY

Major Professor:	David Cheshier
Committee:	James Darsey
	Mary Stuckey
	Carol Winkler
	George Pullman

Electronic Version Approved:

Office of Graduate Studies  
College of Arts and Sciences  
Georgia State University  
August 2006

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I believe the cliché “it takes a village” applies to just about everything. A case in point is that I could not have finished this degree without the loving support of my village. Family and friends have encouraged me with friendship and guidance, beginning with Dr. Samir Moghazi who convinced me applying to a Ph.D. program is a good idea. They have helped me by applauding successes, listening to complaints, and providing words of wisdom, and knowing when I’ve needed which.

To begin I would like to express warm gratitude to my committee chair and mentor, David Cheshier, whose suggested readings have broadened my horizons, conversations have inspired me, and compassion has given me strength to finish. His reassuring patience and continued nurturing saw this project through its darkest days. I would especially like to thank him for seeing the potential in the quiet new student in the back of the room and giving me the confidence to fully participate in the program and in academic life.

My dissertation committee, James Darsey, Mary Stuckey, Carol Winkler, and George Pullman has been supportive and encouraging, their contributions strengthening my project and their insights helping me further develop my ideas. I want to express my gratitude to George Pullman for agreeing to take on my project and his commitment to collegiality and the wider GSU community. Carol Winkler’s confidence in me always gave me renewed enthusiasm for both teaching and researching, and her gift for motivating always impressed me. I will always remember James Darsey’s contagious passion for his field and unique way of telling stories filled with insight that always held me captive. I owe special thanks to Mary

Stuckey for her generosity over the years. In addition to always supporting and encouraging my research decisions, her open door and honest advice have proven to be invaluable.

I would be remiss if I did not express my gratitude to the wonderful faculty at GSU that helped me along the way. Donald Reid, a cosmopolitan himself, encouraged me to pursue new avenues and inspired a large part of this project. Leonard Teel introduced me to the world of conferences during my Master's program and has provided me with wonderful opportunities through out my years as a Ph.D. student. My gratitude to Greg Lisby, the chair of my Master's committee, without whose endorsement, I may not have joined the program. Ted Friedman, Jaye Atkinson, Ray Miller and Michael Bruner have not only shown continual interest in my progress but have empowered me with the will to take risks as a researcher and a teacher. Through the years, Jane Bick has always been there for me, on a personal and a professional level. I owe you more than you know.

I am indebted to my GSU community, without you long hours between classes would not have felt quicker, late nights would not have been bearable, and classes would not have been half as much fun. Joe Valenzano, Jason Edwards, Susan McFarlane-Alvarez, Michael Hester, Grace Lager, Woongjae Ryoo, Harper Cossar, my classmates and colleagues, I am honored to call you friends. Sabrina Freeney, especially, thank you for being there always.

I would like to acknowledge my family's devotion to helping me complete this degree. Thank you to my parents Ismail and Nina Ramzy. Their unconditional love and support (moral and financial) helped me through the process. Part of my drive came from my father asking "so how's the work coming? How much longer do you think it will take?" I thank him for his daily questioning and for being so excited about my successes that he still wants to shout them from the highest mountain. I thank my mother for being my role model (no



matter how old I get), for proof reading, tirelessly discussing, and pushing me to do my best. I love how she “gets” what I do. And of course, I thank her being there for my children in every way when I couldn’t be. I appreciate so much how my brother Basil and sister-in-law Nada have been accommodating to my schedule, for Nada’s help with the children during the final stages and both their support and encouragement. And thanks to my niece Noor for providing entertainment when I suffered from writer’s block by just being cute.

Both my children Aya and Youssef have unknowingly contributed to this degree as well. While they were each born during the process of my Master’s degree some years ago, this current process has seen them through most of their elementary years. They have been my inspiration, my guiding light, my everything. I thrive on their love. I thank them for understanding that mommy has homework too and being happy to study along side of me. I thank them for being patient while I finish before we can go play. I thank them for being proud, as I’ve overheard them tell friends and teachers what mom does all day. They make it all worth it. I’m looking forward to motherhood without being a student. It will be new for the three of us! I love them both so much and dedicate this project to them both.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iv
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCING COSMOPOLITANISM: Reviewing the Prospects for Rhetorical Action in a Globalizing World .....	1
Understanding Cosmopolitanism.....	2
Cosmopolitanism Today.....	8
Some Theoretical Problematics .....	14
And In the Other Corner, We Have Nationalism.....	22
Coming Full Circle.....	26
Method .....	30
If It Walks Like a Duck.....	38
2 VACLAV HAVEL: Empowering the Individual through Tokens.....	44
Havel’s Appeal: How He Reaches His Audiences .....	48
Re-writing Meaning, Creating a New Language .....	55
The Wisdoms of the “Power of the Powerless”.....	72
Time will Tell .....	78
3 JIMMY CARTER: Supporting Tokens with Action .....	87
Human Rights .....	92
Environment .....	97
Health and Hunger .....	102
Poverty.....	106
Mediation.....	110

Reconciliation .....	112
Understanding.....	115
Partnership.....	120
Peace.....	122
Carter’s Cosmopolitanism .....	126
4 EDWARD SAID: Tokens to Demystify the Other.....	132
Said’s Purpose and Audience .....	134
Said and Cosmopolitanism .....	137
“Who Cares About the Labels of National Identity Anyway?” .....	143
Tokens and Their Use .....	146
Transcending Time .....	170
Said’s Contribution to the Cosmopolitan Conversation.....	172
5 CONCLUSION.....	175
Combining National and Global.....	175
A Global Cosmopolitan Language.....	180
Articulating a Global Community .....	185
Tokens for Understanding Difference and Resolving Conflict .....	189
Connecting to a Cosmopolitan Audience.....	198
Assessing the Benefits to Communication.....	204
WORKS CITED.....	208

**INTRODUCING COSMOPOLITANISM:  
REVIEWING THE PROSPECTS FOR RHETORICAL ACTION IN A  
GLOBALIZING WORLD**

An increasing amount of scholarly attention has been recently given to the idea of world citizenship or *cosmopolitanism*. Although the notion of cosmopolitanism has received sporadic attention for more than 2000 years, it is currently enjoying a strong resurgence across the humanities and social sciences. Cosmopolitanism is a theoretical framework that focuses on the connections people feel as “citizens of the world,” as opposed to their exclusive attachment to local communities and environments. In contemporary social theory, cosmopolitanism is associated with the increased mobility of global populations. Modern subjectivity, as a result, is the product of a constitutive tension between local and global. This blurring of spaces has created a new contemporary identity type that one might expect would be more open, tolerant, and flexible. This possibility has caught the interest of theorists and practitioners in a range of disciplines including political science, history, philosophy, cultural studies, law, architecture and urban planning, sociology, the fine arts, and communication.

For communication scholars in particular, cosmopolitan discourse is understood as the articulation of the new mechanisms of identification enabled by our interconnected world. This project explores how *cosmopolitan personas* rhetorically negotiate the space between local and global, discursively tying people to the national as well as to the global or transnational. It examines the possible co-existence of cosmopolitanism and nationalism while identifying how each is articulated in response to the other. As global networks become increasingly complex, rethinking borders and how they are articulated is essential. Can a quintessential cosmopolitan also be a public nationalist? Are cosmopolitan discourses compromised by their presumed lack of attachment to the local? To what extent and with what success are cosmopolitanism and nationalism simultaneously articulated?

In order to study these and other questions, I propose to analyze the public personas crafted by three cosmopolitan figures: Jimmy Carter, Vaclav Havel, and Edward Said. By illuminating how they negotiate the ambiguous space between locale and its absence, how they use language to move from one realm to the other, I hope to provide communication scholars with a means to better account for the manifestations of global identification, difference, and conflict.

### **Understanding Cosmopolitanism**

Cosmopolitanism evokes “the thirst for another knowledge, unprejudiced striving, world travel, supple open-mindedness, broad international norms of civic equality, a politics of treaty and understanding rather than conquest.”<sup>1</sup> It is often defined in opposition to *provincialism*, which tends to be described as expressing only local or restricted interests or

---

<sup>1</sup> Timothy Brennan, “Cosmo-Theory,” *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 100:3 (2001), 659.

outlooks and lacking urban polish or refinement. For that reason, cosmopolitanism is as much a stance or style as a philosophy and seems to call to mind a high level of education, a quality of worldliness, and a general aura of sophistication. Cosmopolitan writing is characterized as unobstructed by boundaries, unrestrained by rules, and unlocated by territory.<sup>2</sup> It suggests a freedom of space, thought and affiliation that allows a person an objectivity untainted by the limits of nationalism, partisanship, or patriotism.

This attitude, which can sound elitist or at least dismissive of local habits of mind, makes cosmopolitanism a controversial notion, and is sometimes read as privileging the ideals of world citizenship over attachments rooted in nation. Joshua Cohen asserts that the debate about cosmopolitanism is both theoretical and practical, and cites examples of human rights, immigration, foreign intervention, and development assistance, among others.<sup>3</sup> The belief that cosmopolitanism manifests one's loyalties to humanity *as a whole* emphasizes the commonalities and responsibilities of global citizenship. The counter to this belief is the practical idea that detached loyalty (of the sort one feels for a stranger never encountered) is incapable of providing a sense of community, control or power sufficient to be effective politically, economically, or socially.<sup>4</sup> Ironically, then, the moral high ground that cosmopolitanism reaches for, according to its challengers, can lack the very grounding in specific local connections able to generate binding moral codes in the first place.

---

<sup>2</sup> Sheldon Pollock, "Cosmopolitan and Vernacular in History," *Public Culture*, 12.3, (2000), 599.

<sup>3</sup> Joshua Cohen, Editor's Preface, *For Love of Country?*, eds, Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press), vii-viii.

<sup>4</sup> For further discussion, see David Harvey, "Cosmopolitanism and the Banality of Geographical Evils," *Public Culture*, 12.2 (2000), 529-564.

Characterizing the cosmopolitan project as utopian, the nationalist school considers itself as simply reflecting realism.<sup>5</sup> From the time of Rousseau's social contract and earlier, citizens are seen as bound to the community to which they belong. Universality enacted in this context is not the universalism of natural rights, but rather the concrete universal of people composing a specific political entity. Differences in character are reflected geographically, economically, and socially, and so moral and political rights are constructed relative to community, culture and context.<sup>6</sup> National citizenship suggests that to be a citizen

is to have concrete rights against, and duties to, a specific sovereign state rather than voluntary and inexact duties to the rest of humanity; it is to belong to a bounded political community which enjoys the right of collective self-determination, and which can decide who can enter its ranks and who can be turned away; it is to have a special bond with others who decide together whether to accept onerous moral obligations to outsiders and how to discharge the duties they impose on themselves.<sup>7</sup>

Nationalism thus assumes citizenship is tied to a state, and also that morality, values and rights connect to the polity. Against such a conception, cosmopolitanism can pose a threat, implying a watering down of values, a diminution of rights, and a hindrance to state sovereignty (and accordingly freedom, democracy and self-determination). Many, including Andrew Linklater, Kimberly Hutchings, David Miller, Gertrude Himmelfarb and Craig Calhoun worry that a cosmopolitan project might diminish the ties between citizens and their

---

<sup>5</sup> David Miller, "Bounded Citizenship," *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, eds. Kimberly Hutchings and Roland Dannreuther (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1999), 60.

<sup>6</sup> Kimberly Hutchings, "Political Theory and Cosmopolitan Citizenship," *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, eds. Kimberly Hutchings and Roland Dannreuther (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1999), 8-9.

<sup>7</sup> Andrew Linklater, "Cosmopolitan Citizenship," *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, eds. Kimberly Hutchings and Roland Dannreuther (New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc., 1999), 35.

countries and allow for a weakened sense of nation. With the nation's significance minimized, they worry about how basic ideals like self-determination could remain.

Brett Bowden differentiates between *nationalism* and *patriotism*, suggesting that nationalism belongs “to the realm of ideology, while patriotism is its psychological correlate.”<sup>8</sup> Thus while nationalism subscribes to particular beliefs and principles, patriotism expresses them. As a political doctrine, he agrees, nationalism requires people to be divided into nations. Nations must be self-determining, self-governing entities, and nationalism necessitates that its citizens derive moral worth from their nation.<sup>9</sup>

The presently dominant ideas of cosmopolitanism and nationalism fail to account for important and inherent complexities. Each view tends to describe a static, objectified mode of being in the world. According to Bowden, intellectuals contributing to the debate have typically endorsed either or, with few attempts to reconcile the two positions.<sup>10</sup> The focus on their dialectical opposition leads to predetermined, repetitive claims. R.B.J. Walker agrees that the debate between cosmopolitanism and nationalism should turn on whether a sensible compromise between the two is possible rather than whether one should prevail over the other.<sup>11</sup>

Thoroughly dissecting the intricacies of cosmopolitanism requires an investigation into the complexity of identity. Stuart Hall suggests identity can be addressed in two basic ways. The first assumes a ‘true self’ that exists at the core of an individual, which is to say that essence remaining when artificial cultural surfaces are stripped away. The other posits that

---

<sup>8</sup> Brett Bowden, “Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism: Irreconcilable Differences or Possible Bedfellows?,” *National Identities*, 5:3 (2003), 238.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, 239.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 236.

<sup>11</sup> R.B.J. Walker, “Citizenship after the Modern Subject,” *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, eds. Kimberly Huchings and Roland Dannreuther (New York: St. Martin’s Press, Inc. 1999), 171-172.



identity is "increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiple across different, often intersecting and antagonistic discourses, practices and positions."<sup>12</sup>

A second manner of understanding identity allows for the coexistence of seemingly competing ideas within one person. In addition, it also takes into consideration how outside influences help *construct* identity and how an individual may construct a rhetorical persona. Therefore, with increasing interaction among different people, ideas and cultures, it becomes more common for a single individual to embrace concepts that on the surface may seem to conflict. And in addition, it suggests that apparently conflicting ideas are not in actual tension, depending on how the discourse is presented and received.

Reconciling cosmopolitanism with national interests is facilitated by an increasingly interdependent world. Pico Iyer explains that the existence of a "Global Soul" arises both by will and of necessity. Shifting spaces and affinities result from the accelerating pace of the world and imposing media and technologies that leave people with the potential of not identifying with any of the places they have lived, a "rootless cosmopolitan."<sup>13</sup> Yet Iyer also maintains that

The hope of a Global Soul, always, is that he can make the collection of his selves something greater than the whole; that diversity can leave him not a dissonance but a higher symphony.<sup>14</sup>

The image of a symphony implies, of course, that the experience of cosmopolitans is potentially better, yielding the higher expectations and richer sensibilities of those who attain a god's-eye view. As opposed to a solo performance, a symphony suggests multiple

---

<sup>12</sup> Stuart Hall in Stevenson, Nick, *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Questions* (England: Open University Press, 2003), 25.

<sup>13</sup> Pico Iyer, *The Global Soul: Jet Lag, Shopping Malls, and the Search for Home* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2000), 136.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, 121.

influences creating one cohesive sound. The cosmopolitan becomes an individual composed out of many influences merged together in one fuller, more complete being. It allows for the cosmopolitan to effect and be effected by, to experience, grow attached, and nurture attachments to places, cultures, and ideologies. It also legitimizes the cosmopolitan's inherent need to experience the world without borders and barriers.

Depending on the concept of identity, proponents of cosmopolitanism suggest that it can facilitate the transcendence of fundamental differences. Kwame Appiah describes a coexistence of national interest and cosmopolitan practice:

The cosmopolitan patriot can entertain the possibility of a world in which everyone is a rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of his or her own, with its own cultural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different, places that are home to other, different people... In a world of cosmopolitan patriots, people would accept the citizen's responsibility to nurture the culture and the politics of their homes.<sup>15</sup>

In his description, Appiah sees the two projects as creating a conceptual space where cosmopolitanism and nationalism interact and inform one another. He portrays someone whose identity appreciates and embraces exposure to difference in people and cultures, and which permits one to evolve accordingly.

Cosmopolitan citizenship as an Enlightenment ideal was first fully articulated in Immanuel Kant's essay on the subject. Providing a way for cosmopolitan discourse to help us reach beyond transcending difference and actually deal with conflict, Seyla Benhabib explains that Kant's notion of cosmopolitanism should be viewed as offering an ethical attitude rather than defending a form of political organization:

---

<sup>15</sup> Kwame Anthony Appiah, "Cosmopolitan Patriots," *For Love of Country*, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002), 22.

...the ethical interest in the world that the world citizen must show was possible only against the background of the citizen's attachments to a specific republic. Kant envisaged a world in which all members of the human race would become participants in a civil order and enter into a condition of "lawful association" with one another. Kant's cosmopolitan citizens still need their individual republics to be citizens at all.<sup>16</sup>

Benhabib's explanation of Kant stresses how his original project does not deny nation its significance in the global arena. Her analysis provides a starting point by allowing that even the original cosmopolitan project sought to maintain a sense of grounding in national attachments while broadening its horizons to global interests.

### **Cosmopolitanism Today**

"Cosmopolitanism is back." David Harvey sees this as good news for some, bad for others. Simply stated, for those in favor, cosmopolitanism portrays a "unifying vision for democracy and governance in a world so dominated by globalizing capitalism that it seems there is no viable political-economic alternative for the next millennium."<sup>17</sup> For those skeptical of these claims, cosmopolitans evoke betrayal as traitors to national solidarities.

Iyer's "Global Soul" identifies as cosmopolitan any person who grows up in several different cultures simultaneously, travels frequently, probably both for work and pleasure, and may even have a name that gives "away nothing about her nationality (a name like Kim, say, or Maya, or Tara), and she might have a porous sense of self that changed with her location."<sup>18</sup> Iyer paints a picture of a person so fluid as to be at home everywhere in the world while not being fixed to a particular place. The "Global Soul" is quintessentially

---

<sup>16</sup> Seyla Benhabib, *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), 183.

<sup>17</sup> Harvey, 529.

<sup>18</sup> Iyer, 18.

cosmopolitan as she has benefited from exposure, education, and privilege to a point that comfort zones become a state of mind rather than a particular nation-state. “The world is your oyster” takes on new meaning, no longer just a figure of speech, but for cosmopolitans, the world has literally become a more easily accessible place. With advances in technology and the ease of travel, the comforts of home are the comforts of everywhere, and the comforts of everywhere make anywhere home.

Yet cosmopolitanism is not only a jet-setting lifestyle. It also encompasses a socio-political agenda with broad ideals, a fact easily forgotten when cosmopolitanism is reduced to a sense of detached loyalty. Some accounts, such as Martha Nussbaum’s, suggest a superficial stance. She identifies as cosmopolitan anyone who refuses to give allegiance to any national (or local) government and instead gives that loyalty to the “moral community made up by the humanity of all human beings.”<sup>19</sup>

Nussbaum’s account provoked reactions on both ends of the spectrum (cosmopolitanism's theoretical supporters and opponents) as well as some in between. “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism” implied that any type of nationalism is dangerous because it reduces people to a primitive tribal instinct characterized by territorial obsessions and hierarchical paranoias. Rejecting the “politics of difference” and recommending what she calls “the very old ideal of the cosmopolitan person whose allegiance is to the worldwide community of human beings,”<sup>20</sup> she advocated a cosmopolitan education that teaches

---

<sup>19</sup> Jose-Antonio Orosco, “Cosmopolitan Loyalty and the Great Global Community: Royce’s Globalization,” *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 17.3, (2003), 205.

<sup>20</sup> Martha C. Nussbaum, “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” *For Love of Country?*, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002), 4.

younger generations to see and care beyond their borders and focus on commonality to promote dialogue. The goal is to promote care for those needing it worldwide.<sup>21</sup>

David Harvey (and others) have rejected Nussbaum's idealistic notion of cosmopolitanism as simplistic and impractical because it fails to account for the complexity of today's world or the complexity of cosmopolitan people.<sup>22</sup> This debate influenced, and was influenced by arguments over globalization and the consequent notion that people and ideas easily move worldwide. Since the many aspects of globalization affect different areas and people in varying ways, sweeping generalizations like Nussbaum's easily provoked critical skepticism.

In *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Appadurai stresses the fluidity with which people, machinery, money, images, and ideas move around the globe by identifying five *scapes*, each a framework for exploring dimensions of global cultural flows: *ethnoscapes*, *mediascapes*, *technoscapes*, *financescapes* and *ideoscapes*. He suggests these five scapes interact and move from place to place, from culture to culture. The speed, scale and volume of each of these flows has become so intense as to have created a disconnect in global culture. One of the main forces driving this transformation for Appadurai is *deterritorialization*, because the notion of one main, central force or area has become obsolete in a globalizing world. Now money, commodities, and people move and maneuver easily from place to place, and while economic globalization creates new markets and opportunities, they also have the potential to accentuate the disconnects that Appadurai refers to as *disjunctures*, radical breaks in the global flows that can potentially lead to dissonance or

---

<sup>21</sup> See Nussbaum, 3-17.

<sup>22</sup> Harvey, 520, and Orosco, 207.

chaos.<sup>23</sup> They are important because the apparent seamlessness of trade flows suggests that globalization is a smooth process, when in fact disjunctures mark major fault-lines in the road.

Pertinent to cosmopolitanism, Appadurai complicates issues of identification, group affiliation, and global understanding by stressing how easily people, information, and money move from place to place. As deterritorialization becomes more common, identification is blurred and affiliations increasingly questioned. Cosmopolitanism is thus both inevitable and problematic.

Thomas Friedman has also offered a popular, albeit simplified account of globalization which relates to cosmopolitanism as a force that challenges traditional national separation. In *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* he says “globalization is not simply a trend or a fad, but is, rather, an international system.”<sup>24</sup> Friedman focuses on global economic integration and suggests that through globalization, nations that were previously enemies have now become competitors. Notwithstanding such potential benefits, he acknowledges that some nations feel globalization is forced upon them from the “outside,” and this produces cultural resistance. Yet he insists on the necessity that nation-states yield at least some of their governing control so they may actively and effectively participate in the global system.<sup>25</sup> From a cosmopolitan perspective, the resulting harmonization of both law and society is likely to produce a more cohesive world culture. From a nationalist perspective, government is threatened, but with a potential payoff in peace. In fact, the very title, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*, proposes that in our globalizing world, the ideal person will have the proper

---

<sup>23</sup> Arjun Appadurai, “Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy,” *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 33-38.

<sup>24</sup> Thomas L. Friedman, *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* (New York: Anchor Books, 2000), ix.

<sup>25</sup> See Friedman for further discussion.

balance of acceptance and adaptation of the new differences encountered in life while holding on to some of the older traditions.

The benefit of globalization, according to Anthony Giddens, is that it keeps people in regular contact with others who think and live differently from themselves. He suggests that cosmopolitans embrace this cultural complexity while fundamentalists do not. But Giddens also notes that traditions are not impervious to change, stressing how all traditions are invented and evolve over time. Global cosmopolitan society is thus a path by which modernity can emerge, creating opportunity for global issues like human rights to prevail. Giddens supports decentralization with the hope of creating more global democratic participation and fostering a stronger civic culture.<sup>26</sup>

In “McCitizens: Risk, Coolness, and Irony in Contemporary Politics,” Bryan Turner defends what has been called *McDonaldization* as a useful way to understand the requirements of citizenship as a form of cultural lifestyle in globalized social systems. The social solidarity of eating at McDonalds (to take just one paradigmatic example) requires consumers to be superficial, transient, and simple. Customers participate in *cool* solidarity and *thin* commitment, echoing a model of social interaction conforming to patterns of global citizenship. Turner suggests that global citizenship should be based on high levels of migration, loyalties should assume mobility, fostering “drive-in democracy,” predicated on cool (or modest) levels of political commitment. As he notes, “modern societies probably need cool cosmopolitans with ironic vocabularies if they are to avoid the conflagration of

---

<sup>26</sup> See Anthony Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping our Lives* (New York: New York University Press, 2000).

nationalistic versions of political authenticity and membership.”<sup>27</sup> Here Turner recognizes the importance of the cosmopolitan identification as maintaining a sophisticated aloofness that allows a way to remaining above the inconsequential differences that may potentially create larger problems.

Yet Walter D. Mignolo typologizes notions of cosmopolitanism to help better understand its potential as a complex phenomenon, distinguishing between what he calls *cosmopolitan projects* and *critical cosmopolitanism*. For him, cosmopolitan projects are a way to articulate the sense of global community that both results from and protests globalization. Critical cosmopolitanism, on the other hand, is a term meant to describe “the need to discover other options beyond both benevolent recognition (Taylor 1992) and humanitarian pleas for inclusion (Habermas 1998).”<sup>28</sup> A significant benefit of this articulation is that it allows for an exploration and appreciation of complex personas, as well as their legitimacy in the world arena.

Still, nationalists see political authenticity and membership as the cornerstone of identification and values. In a response to Nussbaum’s now infamous essay, Gertrude Himmelfarb refers to cosmopolitanism as “utopian, not only in its unrealistic assumption of a commonality of ‘aims, aspirations, and values,’ but also in its unwarranted optimism.”<sup>29</sup> She asserts that the state is the sole structure grounding and guiding morals and principles

---

<sup>27</sup> Bryan S. Turner, “McCizens: Risk, Coolness, and Irony in Contemporary Politics,” *McDonaldization: The Reader*, ed. George Ritzer (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press, 2002), 161.

<sup>28</sup> Walter D. Mignolo, “The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism,” *Cosmopolitanism*, eds. Carol Breckenridge, Sheldon Pollock, Homi K. Bhabha, and Dipesh Chakrabarty (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), 157,160.

<sup>29</sup> Gertrude Himmelfarb, “The Illusions of Cosmopolitanism,” *For Love of Country?*, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002), 76.



including education, welfare, and religious liberty, among others. In addition, she insists that cosmopolitanism denies what she calls the givens of life: “parents, ancestors, family, race, religion, heritage, history, culture tradition, community – and nationality.” For Himmelfarb, cosmopolitanism erases identity.<sup>30</sup>

Craig Calhoun agrees and submits that the local and national levels are where morals are produced while cosmopolitanism simply masks inequalities. Calhoun’s concern is that cosmopolitanism will potentially eliminate old sources of solidarity without providing new ones. He suggests that cosmopolitanism cannot foster commitment and responsibility, and insists therefore, that solidarity is necessary for peaceful coexistence and democracy to thrive.<sup>31</sup>

Complicated and conflicting notions of identification and affiliation undermine how cosmopolitanism can help generate a discourse for understanding difference and shaping values. Still, theories such as universality and hegemony help clear the air and provide insight into how complex consciousness can draw from global interaction to produce contemporary ideas of influence, morals, and standards.

### **Some Theoretical Problematics**

One of the major issues relating to cosmopolitanism is the degree to which it presupposes an inherent uniformity of morals and standards. While on the one hand cosmopolitanism celebrates difference, it also seems to minimize it by encouraging a more homogenous global culture. Accordingly, universalism informs cosmopolitanism because

---

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. 77.

<sup>31</sup> Craig Calhoun, “The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travelers: Toward a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism,” *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101:4, (2002), 871, 894.

cosmopolitan theory, if it possesses any coherence at all, must rely on some account of rational norms and international law. As Iyer remarked, a sense of universality provides a grounding “to keep the soul intact” for otherwise “floating” human beings.<sup>32</sup> It is as if cosmopolitanism requires a universal code-book to provide people with a way to keep in check with the rest of the world.

According to Judith Butler, universality is one of the most contested topics in recent social theory. She posits that universality indicates an understanding of culture as “a relation of exchange and a task of translation.”<sup>33</sup> It is often argued that some accounts of universality fail to offer a strong account of what is common to all citizen-subjects within the domain of political representation. Some political theorists still want to be able to know what features of human being are shared by all humans and then base their normative views of what a political order should be according to that universal description.<sup>34</sup> Butler’s response is to advocate a form of universality that is not static, but adjusts as culture adjusts, accommodates challenge, and responds to its own exclusions. Her critique of existing frameworks is that they fail on all counts, since they are not dynamic and leave little or no room for flexibility, change or inclusion. In fact, such views create false universality, privileging some content while repressing or excluding others. Despite this, she remains optimistic, suggesting that universality can be developed to provide a space for renegotiating the limits of inclusions or exclusions as a part of an ongoing debate.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Iyer, 22.

<sup>33</sup> For further discussion see Judith Butler, “Restaging the Universal,” *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, eds. Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Žižek (New York: Verso, 2000).

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, 14-15.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 24-25.

Ernesto Laclau, Slavoj Zizek, and others follow a similar logic and argue that universality postulates a normative culture that prevents society from achieving its fullness. Universality too easily becomes a general norm-maintaining structure that denies difference and thus identity while encouraging certain hegemonic inclusions and exclusions.<sup>36</sup> In “Universality in Culture,” Butler explains that “the problem emerges...when the meaning of ‘the universal’ proves to be culturally variable.”<sup>37</sup> Thus, deciding what should be universal and what need not becomes a simple function of power and really not “universal” at all.

Despite Butler’s cautious optimism, she recognizes a paradox in universality in her essay “Universality in Culture.”

There are cultural conditions for [universality’s] articulation that are not always the same, and that the term gains its meaning for us precisely through these decidedly less than universal conditions. This is a paradox that any injunction to adopt a universal attitude will encounter. For it may be that in one culture a set of rights are considered to be universally endowed, and that in another those very rights mark the limit to universalizability...<sup>38</sup>

Butler’s perspective here stresses the hierarchical aspect of universality. While one culture may deem something universal, another culture may not. Therefore, articulating what is universal becomes problematic if inclusion is to be achieved.

Butler, Laclau, and Zizek agree that universality is easily deployed to extend colonial and racist understandings of what counts as *civilized*, to exclude certain populations from the domain of the human, in the process reproducing itself as a “false and suspect category.” In

---

<sup>36</sup> Ernesto Laclau, “Identity and Hegemony,” *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, eds. Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Zizek (New York: Verso, 2000), 82-83. and Slavoj Zizek, “Class Struggle or Postmodernism?,” *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, eds. Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Zizek (New York: Verso, 2000), 100-101.

<sup>37</sup> Judith Butler, “Universality in Culture,” *For Love of Country?*, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002), 45.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, 49-50.

fact, they agree that the universality problematic perpetuates hegemonic struggle.<sup>39</sup> This belief creates a paradox for universality directly (and for cosmopolitanism indirectly): while difference is seemingly embraced, the risk of creating a dominant culture with exclusive membership persists. Still, there are subtle points of departure among these theorists who create a more complex terrain for universality. Laclau rejects two opposed approaches tending to universalize conditions of society. Unlike Butler who found room in universality to maintain a dialogue for growth, Laclau's focus is on the impossibility of universality, a concept he finds deterministic and which leaves no room for contention, inherently foreclosing the possibility of dialogue.<sup>40</sup>

Zizek's position may be regarded as more radical than Laclau's. For Zizek, society is categorically impossible or meaningless. Simplistic articulations of society leave no room for global social transformation because there are insufficient opportunities for tensions to be productive. Not only is there no room for broad deliberation when norms are universal, no room remains even for local deliberation: "'Ideology' is also the name for the guarantee that the negativity which prevents society from achieving its fullness does actually exist, that it has a positive existence in the guise of a big Other who pulls the strings of social life..."<sup>41</sup> For Zizek, the inclusions/exclusions involved in hegemonic universality participate in a continuous ideologized-political struggle, and he sees the basic operation of ideology as

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., 18.

<sup>40</sup> Laclau, 82-83.

<sup>41</sup> Slavoj Zizek, "Class Struggle or Postmodernism?," *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, eds. Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Zizek (New York: Verso, 2000), 100-101.

transforming an empirical obstacle into an eternal condition, as well as transposing self-evident impossibility into empirical obstacle.<sup>42</sup>

Since universality defines and regulates what is normal and what is not, these concerns are easily transposed onto the cosmopolitan debate because cosmopolitanism tends to assure the creation of a unified amalgamation of a global culture, therefore privileging certain cultural formations over others. Also easily correlated are theories of hegemony because both cosmopolitanism and universality suggest that when merging cultures, priorities, or systems, the stronger will overpower the weaker.

Timothy Brennan explains that while many accounts of cosmopolitanism have historically valued differences, they have also had a tendency to blend or merge toward “a unified polychromatic culture.” Therefore, what ‘ought’ to be is transformed to the more normative, what ‘is.’<sup>43</sup> Gramsci’s theory of hegemony is particularly significant in Brennan’s account because cosmopolitanism runs the risk that one ideology will dominate global norms. Hegemony is of course a familiar concept in politics, referring to one nation exercising political, cultural, or economic influence over others as well as to relationships between groups and differing consciousnesses.

Gramsci’s theory of hegemony suggests that one social class works to control other ‘subaltern’ classes.<sup>44</sup> In order for the dominant class to gain control, it needs to have a broad and coherent worldview that encourages a following by “active assent from allies and passive

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid.

<sup>43</sup> Timothy Brennan, “Cosmopolitanism and Internationalism,” *Debating Cosmopolitanism*, ed. Daniele Archibugi (New York: Verso, 2003), 41.

<sup>44</sup> Harold Entwistle, *Antonio Gramsci Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics* (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1979), 2, 11.

assent from other classes or groups.”<sup>45</sup> The implication is that a dominant class can dictate which global norms or values will be followed in a cosmopolitan world.

Two theorists have modified or adjusted Gramsci’s original theory in an effort to better suit the current day and age. Chantal Mouffe’s account begins in agreement with the assumption that one dominant class can control the rest, but rereads Gramsci’s hegemony by granting more agency to the classes or parties involved. She explains that hegemonic expansion allows for the dominant culture to take into account and adapt to the ideas of marginal cultures without forcing significant change in the dominant culture.<sup>46</sup> In addition, a main element in her modification of hegemony is that subjects are previously interpellated or conditioned in ways that help them consent to certain situations.<sup>47</sup> Cosmopolitanism is applicable to this understanding because once it characterizes the culture of the worldly, educated, and civilized as the norm, the potential of conditioning marginal groups, inducing them to adjust their beliefs and actions into conforming with the global arena is accentuated. For example, environmental issues have been put on the global agenda primarily by organizations based in more privileged, Western societies. Considered worldly, educated, and civilized, these organizations manage to educate, condition, or even "shame" marginal groups into recognizing environmental issues as significant in the global arena. Cosmopolitanism thus becomes the power to grant or refuse legitimacy to alternative worldviews.

---

<sup>45</sup> Celeste Condit, “Hegemony in a Mass-mediated Society: Concordance about Reproductive Technologies,” *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 11.3, Sept. 1994, 206.

<sup>46</sup> Chantal Mouffe, “Hegemony and New Political Subjects: Toward a New Concept of Democracy,” *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988), 89-104.

<sup>47</sup> Chantal Mouffe, “Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci,” Chantal Mouffe, ed., *Gramsci and Marxist Theory* (London: Routledge and Kegan, 1979), 190-193.

Celeste Condit's theory of *concordance* is also applicable to cosmopolitanism because it allows for a multitude of related interests and suggests that a variety of groups are competing and compromising to accommodate each other.<sup>48</sup> Critical to cosmopolitanism is the negotiation process that allows individuals to rethink and realign their personas. Concordance suggests there is a give and take in the exercise of influence, meaning that while a dominant group may affect a more marginal group, the marginal group also influences the dominant. This notion is particularly relevant in post-colonial literature, where both the colonizers and the colonized are affected by their interaction. For cosmopolitanism, concordance provides a way to articulate negotiation processes where the influence of the global culture produces space to absorb elements of local cultures.

The literature on hegemony thus provides a helpful account to explore how personas and difference are negotiated, and globalization literatures do as well. In a global culture, according to its critics, an imbalance exists between the United States (or the west in general) and other cultures. In addition to Appadurai and Friedman, notions of globalization offered by Fredric Jameson focus more on the collective, where globalization is a vehicle for the transmittal of cultural and economic *meanings*. While globalization can present a façade of embracing difference and differentiation, it actually increases self-consciousness<sup>49</sup> and therefore can reinforce and accentuate dissimilarity, artificially creating incompatibility. This argument presents a dichotomy in the cosmopolitan utopian imaginary because it brings to light the idea of superficiality camouflaging a deeper resistance to a global culture and cosmopolitanism.

---

<sup>48</sup> Condit, 206-226.

<sup>49</sup> Fredric Jameson, "Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue," *The Cultures of Globalization*, eds. Fredric Jameson and Masao Miyoshi (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999), 54-77.

Yet some scholars suggest that cosmopolitanism is better deployed as a counter to globalization. For Mignolo, although cosmopolitanism implies a global project, it is not easily aligned to either a pro- or anti- globalization view. He articulates the difference by suggesting that globalization is a strategy of geopolitical management and cosmopolitanism is more a strategy to create global congeniality.<sup>50</sup> In this sense, congeniality can refer to the need or attempt for people to transcend fundamental differences by way of cosmopolitan discourse. Since globalization evokes a sense of possible domination and meets resistance on multiple fronts, cosmopolitanism may be better received when articulated as a discourse rather than a political or economic project.

The deficiency of solid lines separating different aspects of globalization (like politics, economics, or identity) presents a challenge because the nature of society tends to bleed into all aspects. Consequently, globalization becomes an amalgamation of domains and separation becomes unproductive because there is an innate connection and interdependence. Cosmopolitanism is simultaneously the same and different to globalization insofar as it intrinsically involves the meshing of multiple issues while being less entrenched in economics. Therefore, cosmopolitanism becomes more of an expression of a welcoming of cultures and ideas as opposed to a merging of interests or fostering of partnerships. Rhetorically speaking, the articulation of cosmopolitanism is useful because it provides a means for communicating to wide audiences while resisting severe misunderstandings due to the unknown. The potential for a cosmopolitan language is great as it would allow communication to transcend difference and possibly help lessen conflict.

---

<sup>50</sup> Mignolo, 157.



### **And In the Other Corner, We Have Nationalism**

Proponents of cosmopolitanism believe its discourse is a productive way to overcome differences that might be otherwise problematic, in addition to eventually providing the capacity to deal with (otherwise unsolvable) conflict. Yet, the counter-argument made by nationalists suggests that a clear, distinction of cultures and peoples is best.

Seeing the cosmopolitan project as utopian, nationalists agree that the practice of citizenship must be “confined within the boundaries of national political communities.”<sup>51</sup> According to David Miller, citizenship refers to the republican citizen proper with rights, obligations, and the responsibilities commensurate to civic engagement. He contends that those preconditions can only exist in the realm of the nation-state because localization creates a legitimized form of regulation. Cosmopolitan citizenship lacks the means to create a rooted, bounded political community.<sup>52</sup>

According to Umut Ozkirimli, the French Revolution translated the nation into legal and political terms through the idea of “a shared, common, equal citizenship, the unity of the people.”<sup>53</sup> Extending from Rousseau’s idea of citizenship, the idea of the ‘general will’ was articulated to safeguard against individual conflicting wills. To prevent this, there is an exchange of the ‘selfish will’ for the ‘general will’. Where the priority of natural men is to live for themselves (as opposed to for others), citizens depend on the community to which they belong. Therefore, to protect the greater interest, Rousseau submits that natural men

---

<sup>51</sup> Miller, 60.

<sup>52</sup> Ibid., 60-79.

<sup>53</sup> Umut Ozkirimli, *Theories of Nationalism: a critical introduction* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2000), 21.

need to be transformed into citizens to curb the selfish will and promote the general will. He must exchange “independence for dependence and autarky for participation.”<sup>54</sup>

Many scholars agree that the basics of nationalist ideology, including the assertion that the world is divided into nations and that loyalty must be given that nation, began in the eighteenth century. In addition, most classical theorists would suggest that the nation’s occurrence as a mass phenomenon coincides with thinking national community as transcending social divisions.<sup>55</sup> By contrast, modernists associate the nation and nationalism as directly related to modernity and its major socio-economic processes such as industrialization and capitalism, which signal the rise of the modern state. Accordingly, new public cultures are created and reinforced by the state and for the majority of the population these cohere into national culture. Some, however, are excluded from the benefits of modernization because industrialization does not proceed evenly. Despite living within a recognizable common territory, certain groups composing a different culture often feel they belong to the wrong culture or ‘race’. They consequently resist assimilation into the dominant culture and this counter-nationalism becomes a tool of resistance.<sup>56</sup>

Ernest Gellner’s (modernist) theory of nationalism defines nationalism as “a political principle which holds that political and the national unit should be congruent.” He suggests that ideally nationalism should insist on a common culture. Such a culture, Gellner explains, “not only defines the limits of the unit, but it assumes that the unit has an institutional leadership (‘the state’),” and stresses the importance that positions in the institutional power center be filled by members of the ‘national’ culture. “To put it in simple language: no

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>55</sup> Graham Day and Andrew Thompson, *Theorizing Nationalism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 8.

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 9.

foreigners may rule us!”<sup>57</sup> While Gellner ties nationalism to industrialization, he fails to account for nationalism in post-industrial societies. Manifestations of shifting populations and other societal mergings that are characteristics of a globalized world are not embraced. In addition, his conflation of culture and nationalism can easily be read as sanctioning functionalist, supremacist tendencies or a Darwinist approach that can readily slip into primordial accounts of social function.

Slightly less intense when it comes to the articulation of nationalism, Anthony Smith writes:

While attention may legitimately be focused on the constant elements of ‘nationhood’ in the modern world and the universal trends that govern their formation, the variations between nations are equally important, both in themselves and for their political consequences. My belief is that the most important of these variations are determined by specific historical experiences and by the ‘deposit’ left by these collective experiences... The ‘roots’ of these nations are to be found, both in a general way and in many specific cases, in the model of ethnic communities prevalent in much of recorded history across the globe.<sup>58</sup>

Smith’s theory of nationalism is based on ‘ethno-symbolism’ and he argues that nationalism is based on the shared history of the group. Conceding that interpretations of histories may be flawed or inaccurate, he differs from Gellner and suggests that members of a nation need not be alike but they should feel a strong solidarity with their nation and fellow nationals. Still, Smith holds that the tug between “the drive for socio-political emancipation with the need for identification and solidarity to produce a vision and ethnic of collective

---

<sup>57</sup> Ernest Gellner, *Nationalism* (New York: New York University Press, 1997), 6.

<sup>58</sup> Anthony D. Smith, *The Ethnic Origins of Nations* (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1987), ix.

regeneration...” promotes suspicion, hostility, fragmentation and bias, creating an ‘unpredictable’ and ‘explosive’ political environment.<sup>59</sup>

Benedict Anderson’s theory of nationalism and imagined communities suggests that the decline of religion allowed for the nation to be imagined. After the decline of religion, the conception of time changed, as did the use of the shared language of Latin, which was replaced by local vernaculars. Print capitalism provided readers with books, newspapers and novels in vernacular languages and allowed for the consumption of the same cultural products. According to Anderson, these printed cultural products created for their readers a national consciousness in three ways. They created a cohesive exchange of language besides Latin. In addition, they helped cement the language and therefore made the nation permanent. Finally, print culture created ‘languages of power’ that were different from Latin. Accordingly, Anderson argues that that combination of the decline of religion, human diversity, and the growth of capitalism and print technology resulted in nationalism.<sup>60</sup>

Yet this deep-seated nationalism is a source of concern for many scholars. Bowden suggests that those on the side of nationalism “subscribe to the Aristotelian view of man as a ‘political animal’.”<sup>61</sup> Referring to the idea that humans need and want grounding in community for fulfillment, he attributes this line of thinking to the assumption that personal liberty, non-interference, and a plurality of values is more readily attained this way. Understanding the root of the need for nationalism, Bowden grants that politically, nationalism aims for national self-determination and culturally insists that despite identification or affiliations, its citizens draw from the nation for their moral worth. Morally,

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 221.

<sup>60</sup> For further discussion, please see Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New York: Verso, 2003).

<sup>61</sup> Bowden, 236.

“...nationalism is an ethic of heroic sacrifice, justifying the use of violence in the defense of one’s nation against enemies, internal or external.”<sup>62</sup> Furthermore, the nationalist discourse is characterized by a rallying to the nation, its power stemming from common ground, and it is energized by ideographs. In the effort to revive the nationalist sentiment, the discourse used is often one that accentuates difference and in the process creates (sometimes unnecessary) divisions. Still, much of the cosmopolitan literature acknowledges that nations and nationalism are necessary on many fronts including economic, political and social. Yet taming the beast is more the focus of the cosmopolitan project.

### **Coming Full Circle**

Virtues notwithstanding, according to Bowden, inherent in the claim of nationalism is the assertion of superiority. This, he says, is one of its more dangerous implications. Problems arise when breaks in unity appear (and these are of course inevitable) and national unity has to be maintained by force rather than consent. “It is for this reason that nationalist regimes, although they may start out as democratic, rarely remain so, tending to slide down the slippery slope toward authoritarianism.”<sup>63</sup> Both blind following and forced unity threaten democratic principles because they numb citizens’ critical thinking skills. They suggest that right or wrong, the leader of the nation-state will have support and this alleviation of judgment undermines the democratic process.

Echoing Nussbaum’s original sentiment that nationalism is passé, David Held and Anthony McGrew submit that once functional and even essential, nationalism is now at odds

---

<sup>62</sup> Bowden, 239, quoting Michael Ignatieff, *Blood & Belonging: Journeys Into the New the New Nationalism* (London: BBC Books and Chatto & Windus, 1992), 3.

<sup>63</sup> Bowden, 239.

with the world's economic, social and political forces.<sup>64</sup> Held and McGrew shift the focus from the cosmopolitan individual to the possibility of cosmopolitanism to provide a discourse to navigate conflict. According to Held and McGrew, nation-states and thus nationalism limit economic globalization by creating clear winners and losers through international trade and global competition. Political globalization is also limited because of tensions between international organizations and traditional domestic boundaries. They reject the conventional state-centered conception of world-politics and world order because it promotes the interests of the most powerful states and therefore limits the realization of global social justice.<sup>65</sup> As a solution, David Held suggests a cosmopolitan (or democratic) law to address the limitations of national democracies. Cosmopolitan democratic law would establish accountability for trans-border power systems and ideally extend to the entire "universal community." Held's hope is to level the playing field by alleviating the imbalance of power currently favoring a few powerful nations. The evils of nation-states and nationalism can be remedied by creating a powerful inter-state system.<sup>66</sup>

Agreeing with Held, Bohman suggests a cosmopolitan federation of nations as a means for creating the "institutional conditions necessary for a cosmopolitan public sphere and...an international civil society." According to Bohman, world citizenship would resolve the issue

---

<sup>64</sup> David Held and Anthony McGrew, "The Fate of National Culture," *Globalization/Antiglobalization* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc., 2002), 25-37.

<sup>65</sup> See David Held and Anthony McGrew, Introduction to *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc, 2002), 1-23.

<sup>66</sup> See David Held, "Cosmopolitan Democracy and the Global Order: A New Agenda," *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*, eds. James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann (Cambridge: MIT University Press, 1997), 235-252.

of conflict.<sup>67</sup> If on principle the idea of a more balanced global arena is a desirable one, the idea of a homogenous world is not.

Turner's earlier fast-food metaphor suggests that cosmopolitanism is most beneficial when national commitment levels are low. Furthermore, he states that high levels of nationalism can be dangerous:

Hot democratic identities are probably dangerous in such an environment, where...nationalist fervor can fan the coals of ethnic hatred and difference. Bosnia, Cambodia, and Algeria are contemporary examples of the quest for thick homogeneity and hot loyalty in societies which are in fact subject to forces of global diversification.<sup>68</sup>

A prominent concern with nationalism is its tendency to extremism. While he implies that cosmopolitanism can be superficial, his critique is consistent with Bowden's that nationalism can lead to a dangerous blind following.

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri explain that the modern nation-state as we know it today is simply a new form of the European patrimonial monarchic state. A balance between new means of production and the old absolutist administration was maintained by national identity consisting of "a cultural, integrating identity, founded on a biological continuity of blood relations, a spatial continuity of territory, and linguistic commonality."<sup>69</sup> They continue that accordingly, "the nation becomes finally the condition of possibility of all human action and social life."<sup>70</sup> Hardt and Negri's argument suggests that despite democratic efforts, the structure of the nation-state is originally one that allows for one autocratic ruler. Therefore,

---

<sup>67</sup> See James Bohman, "The Public Spheres of the World Citizen," *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*, eds. James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann (Cambridge: MIT University Press, 1997), 179-200.

<sup>68</sup> Turner, 161.

<sup>69</sup> Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, "Passages of Sovereignty," *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 95.

<sup>70</sup> *Ibid.*, 101.

there is an inherent danger in nation-states for slippage to occur and mutate into an oppressive entity.

While nation-states provide protection from external forces, they can also function as a platform for the rise of totalitarian regimes, justification of actions like colonialism, violence, and exploitation.

Whereas within its domain the nation-state and its attendant ideological structures work tirelessly to create and reproduce the purity of the people, on the outside the nation-state is a machine that produces Others, creates racial difference, and raises boundaries that delimit and support the modern subject of sovereignty.<sup>71</sup>

Hardt and Negri (and countless others) denounce the barbarity of ethnic wars, the struggles of oppressed minorities, and the catastrophes of Nazi Germany, positing that these and other historical disasters are the products of nationalism.

Much of the cosmopolitan literature focuses on the project's political potential, with a resulting tendency to marginalize the nation-state and privilege global networks. Held, a major advocate of this view, and others have suggested unions much like the European Union. But resistance is great, and even in the case of the European Union, the perceived importance of sovereignty often outweighs the benefits of compromise. And the other extreme also breeds trouble, as Hardt and Negri's work calls to painful attention. Staunch nationalists, unfortunately, are too often ethnocentric, and evoke images of the KKK and its politics of racial purity and deadly extremism. In an increasingly interconnected world, putting up such walls (much like the one torn down in the 1980s) can be detrimental.

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid., 114.



If then, there is historical proof that nationalism is potentially devastating and cosmopolitanism is too lofty for application, how can the two be tamed into productive projects, or combined into some middle position where projects can thrive? Efforts to force a political or economic compromise to global issues of difference should be set aside and instead, scholars should seek potential discursive solutions first. By identifying a potential cosmopolitan rhetoric, the tensions produced by economic and political stakes are diffused and the focus shifts to how best to communicate within a global society. In addition, with the understanding that reality is rhetorically constructed, then further significance comes from this project. Recognizing a cosmopolitan language used by each of the three figures provides a means to illustrate how language can be used to identify with a wider global audience. Accordingly, identifying a cosmopolitan rhetoric should create the real possibility of complex personas, transcending difference, and conflict resolution.

## **Method**

In order to explore the possibility of cosmopolitanism and nationalism co-existing, I examine the writings of three cosmopolitan-nationalist figures: Edward Said, Vaclav Havel, and Jimmy Carter. My goal is to identify their strategies for articulating space and place, to elaborate more fully how cosmopolitan rhetorics handle location, and to identify how such rhetors enact persuasive strategies that might otherwise be fatally subverted by the fact that in cosmopolitan situations speakers are, by definition, constrained in their efforts to construct personas connected to audiences by shared local history. In laying out the parameters of a cosmopolitan style, one also reveals how cosmopolitanism and nationalism might mutually inform one another, allowing for a more sophisticated conception of each school of thought.

The purpose of a rhetorical analysis is to challenge the view that the two projects need be opposed, by presenting examples of particular speakers who reconciled their frequently contradicting impulses.

It is this characterization that leads to analysis of the three particular figures examined in the following chapters. Edward Said's life embraced both the perspectives of a cosmopolitan and the activism of a nationalist. His interests in the world were theoretical and practical, and his writings expressed cosmopolitan values, yet much of his work focused on the Palestinian issue specifically and to Arabism generally. In Vaclav Havel's writings, issues relating to individual responsibility, the complexity of identity, awareness of global problems, as well as nationalism articulate a world view fusing cosmopolitan and nationalist interests, all contextualized by his advocacy of Czech independence. In similar form, Jimmy Carter's global interests and awareness move him to world activism while his roots are firmly local. This synthesis of what I refer to as *cosmopolitan rhetorical personas*, at once cosmopolitan and nationalist, is manifested in all three public figures and publicly communicated through their writings, which shed light on how each negotiates identification, difference, and conflict. Of particular interest is the issue of how each negotiates the space that exists between the perspectives and rhetorical resources of local and global themes and situations.

It was important to select contemporaries who interacted in similar historical times. Additional significant is that each of the three are originally from different parts of the world: Europe, North Africa, and North America, providing unique backgrounds contributing to their perspectives of the world. Future studies on cosmopolitan rhetoric would benefit from selecting women because the advantages and disadvantages of the particular world

experiences may be dissimilar to those of men. While there is an inherent risk in focusing on three men, I feel that even though it is unfortunate that cosmopolitan rhetoric is more readily available than with women, I also feel that the challenges presented to women grant the potential of a feminist cosmopolitan rhetoric greater depth, although not the subject of this particular endeavor.

Existing accounts of rhetorical effectiveness have not yet fully examined the possibility of a cosmopolitan rhetoric. This project thus aims to position cosmopolitanism as a potential critical language in the rhetorical field, and also to contribute to existing theories of rhetoric by determining how rhetorically constructed personas can be persuasive in a cosmopolitan context where common ground and collective memory are often nonexistent.

According to Kenneth Burke, identification is fundamental to communication and the need to identify emerges from a natural human division or separateness. As a result, humans try to offset that division and fulfill that need with "separation compensation." He explains that people are "both joined and separate, at once a distinct substance and consubstantial with another."<sup>72</sup> Identification is relevant to cosmopolitanism on multiple levels. How Carter, Havel, and Said construct their rhetorical persona is a function of identification because, as their writings show, they experience the combined phenomena of separation and an urgent need to identify, sometimes enacted in physical exile and at other times by concern for those far away. How they relate to their audiences and persuade them suggests that identification occurs on another level of cosmopolitanism, tying each of them to their audiences despite separation. This connection of identification and cosmopolitanism is challenging because by

---

<sup>72</sup> For further discussion, see: Kenneth Burke, *A Rhetoric of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press), 1969.

definition, cosmopolitanism suggests that common ground is less readily available. Lacking access to the resources of collective memory, joined immediate interests, or other specific connections, the need for identification plays a significant role in how cosmopolitan rhetoric functions.

According to McKerrow, critical rhetoric focuses on how public communication fosters domination and freedom in an uncertain world. By highlighting how Said, Havel, and Carter negotiate space, I hope to shed light on how they overcome the physical, geographical barriers and transcend space.

The goals of this project are thus twofold. First, by exploring a selection of texts by Carter, Havel, and Said, I will identify the characteristics that mark them as cosmopolitan and show how each utilizes certain terms in a consistent manner to signal a cosmopolitan persona. Then, I will discuss what cosmopolitanism has to offer the scholarly conversations relating to identification, difference, and conflict. Each of the public intellectuals chosen addresses issues of place and articulates the local and the global to their audiences. Identifying how they achieve a sense of their doubled locale offers insight into the language used to relay a message of cosmopolitan persona. Some subtlety is required in expressing cosmopolitanism so as to avoid the easy pitfalls of a utopian ideology or to be understood as simply offering abstracted euphemisms. Accordingly, the particular artistry of Carter, Havel, and Said stems from their ability to convey an elusive persona that strikes a tactful balance between local and global.

The *ideograph* provides another resource for connecting the material and the symbolic, as a convergence of a condensed form of ideology. The concept suggests reference to an already agreed upon principle, a term already prefigured in positive or negative terms.

Words like 'liberty' or 'equality' evoke positive feelings that are primarily non-negotiable and uncontested. In addition, McGee argues that an ideograph is specific to cultures and evolves gradually. This is an important dimension of ideographic theory since it implies that ideographic terms acquire their persuasive force through the cumulating effects of socialization. Such a view complicates efforts to theorize the persuasive force of cosmopolitanism, since the absence of a shared socialization process characteristic of diffuse and potentially intercultural audiences arguable makes ideographs unavailable to cosmopolitan rhetorics. Accordingly, the markers of place or cosmopolitan identity and sensibilities that Carter, Havel, and Said might use cannot be properly considered ideographs. Each advocates a highly contested vision. The words themselves are not specific to a particular culture, because by definition, cosmopolitanism exists by transcending cultures. Furthermore, in the context of transnational talk there is no cohesive, shared history or collective memory where such linguistic markers might have evolved.

Still, the fundamental impulse driving this analysis rests on the realization, arrived at as I worked through their major texts, that attention to the recurrence of certain major words must account *in some way* for their persuasive influence. This project thus aims to demonstrate how the placement of particular words in their texts evokes a cosmopolitan sensibility attractive to certain members of their audiences. This more concrete impression of how the conscious use of certain terms (which I later refer to as *rhetorical tokens*) walks the tightrope between nationalism and globalism in a manner I argue can benefit communication scholars by identifying the contours of cosmopolitan rhetoric and the mechanisms of rhetorical influence. It does this by providing a language able to more accurately address the increasingly complex issues of identification, to transcend difference,

and potentially better handle conflict. As McKerrow maintains in his often-cited essay, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," the challenge is to uncover or discover the terms addressing place in a way that helps shed predetermined constructs of both the national and global.<sup>73</sup> In essence, I will look for the ways each figure uses language to encourage changed power relationships by de-emphasizing territorial constructs.

Stylistic tokens are more suitable to the purpose of illuminating cosmopolitan rhetoric than the ideographic alternative, or for that matter than simply identifying markers of place and other apparent indicators of cosmopolitan sensibility. Accounting for stylistic tokens is useful in finding the implied meaning of a word and magnifying its possibilities within the constraints of actual usage. Put briefly, I mean the term *token* to refer to words used in a consistent manner by a particular rhetor, to achieve particular persuasive power by their grounding in the unique enactment of the concept in the lived experience of the speaker, an affinity between word and deed that, to persuade, must also resonate with the broader lived experiences of audience members. While such a definition might imply that tokens simply indirectly represent or enact dominant ideologies, in my view, tokens do not conjure the same emotional or socialized reactions evoked by an ideograph, nor do they invariably serve the interests of dominant elites. Pinpointing stylistic tokens allows one to unpack those seemingly benign markers of place and indicators of cosmopolitan concern, and see how they actually unfurl to reveal a connection with the audience. I believe my analysis exposes the implicit understanding created between Carter, Havel, Said, and their audiences, which in

---

<sup>73</sup> For further discussion, see Raymie E. McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism* (second edition), ed. Carl R. Burghardt (Penn., Strata Publishing Inc., 2000), 126-147.

turn allows them to take advantage of stylistic tokens to package their intricate notions into simple markers appreciated by only a limited few.

Leon Mayhew argues that tokens are a symbolic form that compresses more extended and commonly understood arguments. But without opportunity for redemption, the process of persuasion is made ambiguous and therefore jeopardizes the commitment of the advice and argumentation failure.<sup>74</sup> Thus, to ensure the success of a token as a way to influence an audience, the rhetor must provide the audience ample occasion to prove the value of that token. The strength of a token comes from a trust the audience grants the communicator. Accordingly, if the opportunity for redeeming the token is not provided, the audience may easily become apathetic or uninvested in the argument.

In "Joe McCarthy's Fantastic Moment," James Darsey illuminates the word "fantastic" and shows how the word implies more than its dictionary definition. "Fantastic" is used to communicate an 'understood' connotation between the rhetor and certain audience members who both follow the argument and buy into the ideology. Contrary to Carter, Havel, and Said, McCarthy fell short in providing opportunities for his audience to redeem their tokens, and accordingly lost their support of his argument.<sup>75</sup> In the three cases examined here, the rhetors have an interest in providing their audiences with a chance to invest in their arguments. One might say that each allows for rhetorical tokens to be redeemed.

Edwin Black suggests that tokens are usually, although not necessarily, ideologically based.<sup>76</sup> I would argue here that the tokens used by Carter, Havel, and Said are not

---

<sup>74</sup> Leon H. Mayhew, *The New Public* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 48.

<sup>75</sup> James Darsey, "Joe McCarthy's Fantastic Moment," *Communication Monographs*, vol. 62, March 1995.

<sup>76</sup> Edwin Black, "The Second Persona," *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism* (second edition), ed. Carl R. Burghardt (Penn., Strata Publishing Inc., 2000), 193.

connected ideologically, and yet are highly effective despite this absence. The power of tokens emerges from the frequency of their use and their potentially dynamic meanings. While a token may simply suggest the most basic dictionary meaning to some, to the intended audience a token takes on a more complex connotative meaning. In this case, the magic of the token lies in the rhetors' capacity to take a word not commonly laden with implications and undertones and to use it in a way that elevates the word to the level of understanding that creates a bond between audience and speaker. A common transnational ideology fails to exist, challenging cosmopolitan speakers to build solidarity. Each of the three experiences their philosophies one way or the other and my research will show that their writings are an extension of their personas.

Stylistic tokens provide another connection to Burke's process of identification. In his discussion of language as symbolic action, the act of "naming" suggests that human agents have the power to label things, actions or concepts and through that naming, others can decide whether or not they can share or not share in those concepts. In the end, a decision is made to participate in an identification exchange, and a similar process is applied to rhetorical tokens. The rhetor "names" a concept, or rhetorically constructs a token, and the audience if persuaded may decide to associate with the rhetor and the concept or to disassociate with the properties based on the rhetor's explanation. The explanation translates into opportunities for token redemption. Identification results when audiences are persuaded by the rhetor and the token.

To identify stylistic tokens that imply cosmopolitanism, I will look for words that answer the questions: Do certain words create a cosmopolitan vocabulary? Do those words help communication scholars better identify and articulate the complexity of *identity*,



*difference* and *conflict*? Are those words used in a way that is consistent and particular to that rhetor while allowing for a more intricate notion of cosmopolitanism?

The idea of a “space between” often suggests falling through the cracks, a sense of not quite reaching one point or the other, an existence in limbo, or perhaps invisibility or an inability to commit. There is a sense of not mattering, not caring, or simply passing: passing under the radar or passing for one thing or another, without having to make a stand, make an appearance, or make a difference. I argue that the space between nationalism and cosmopolitanism is quite the opposite. In that space, there is the potential to be both at once and to have a voice as well. This project demonstrates how Jimmy Carter, Vaclav Havel, and Edward Said each articulate their rhetorical personas by expressing strong nationalistic ties as well as a definite propensity for cosmopolitanism.

By reviewing writings by each individual, I will show how they use stylistic tokens to create a cosmopolitan rhetoric by which they place themselves both locally and globally. When describing themselves, each of the three manages to fit in as nationalists and cosmopolitans. Most significant though, is how they express a cosmopolitan persona. It is particularly useful from a communications perspective to be able to identify certain tokens that each uses to convey to their audiences their cosmopolitan tendencies. Identifying those tokens is significant because it could provide communication scholars with a potential language to easily identify cosmopolitan rhetoric, particularly a global cosmopolitan rhetoric.

### **If it Walks like a Duck...**

Scholars affirm that within the history of American public discourse, a cosmopolitan rhetoric exists. James Darsey has set out some of the parameters for a cosmopolitan rhetoric

and explains that such rhetoric reflects pluralism, understands multiculturalism, and values difference. To further explain, he says

a cosmopolitan rhetoric would be a rhetoric created by those, . . . Hoffman and Iyer, who have "left home," who have been alienated, sometimes multiply alienated, who have lost, left, or forgotten their place yet who somehow found new transcendent places or struggled toward such places, and from these new places served as compelling moral spokespersons on significant public issues – rhetors who found a way, despite their displacement to take a position.<sup>77</sup>

In his articulation of a cosmopolitan rhetoric, Darsey also helps define who constitutes a cosmopolitan rhetor. While some cosmopolitans have physically left home, others have spiritually left home. How they experience multiple places may vary, yet the fact that they are able to absorb and reflect on multiple places is the same. Perhaps most telling is that cosmopolitans find a voice "on significant public issues" and use that voice and their position in the world to become "moral spokespersons," whether it is despite their displacement or because of their displacement.

Since cosmopolitanism forces an international perspective, and given the increasing likelihood that communication will cross national borders (both because new informational technologies are globalized and because the global economy enables more frequent travel), a project aimed at discovering how a cosmopolitan rhetoric might exist on a global scale is likely to acquire increasing significance. It is therefore fitting that the three figures I have selected are each from very different places of the world. They are, however, contemporaries, meaning that they often (though not always) inhabit a common time frame, and are each fervent nationalists while being enthusiastic cosmopolitans. By surveying their

---

<sup>77</sup> James Darsey, "James Baldwin's *Topoi*," *New Approaches to Rhetoric*, eds Patricia A. Sullivan and Steven R. Goldzwig, (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2004), p.9.

discourses, I hope to show how their similarities and differences through their own discursive markers used to specify and negotiate the space between cosmopolitanism and nationalism.

One approach to identifying a cosmopolitan rhetoric would be to look for markers of place. Darsey, Iyer, and others utilize place as a fundamental indicator in cosmopolitanism. For example, Iyer identifies a cosmopolitan as someone who feels comfortable anywhere in the world. And according to Sheldon Pollock, Homi K. Bhabha, Carol A. Breckenridge, and Dipesh Chakrabarty, "refugees, peoples of the diaspora, and migrants and exiles represent the spirit of the cosmopolitical community." They, too, suggest that cosmopolitanism is identifiable by references to place, characterized by the mobility of the people.<sup>78</sup>

But in addition to place, cosmopolitanism is also identifiable by references to significant public issues that affect more than the rhetor's immediate environment. While "where" in the world the rhetor places him or herself in the writings is significant, so, too, is the scope of his concerns. It is here that the notion of citizen of the world takes on a deeper meaning because it reveals the sense of duty and responsibility each feels to places near and far. Kwame Anthony Appiah speaks of "a great love for mankind and an abiding desire to see mankind... fulfill its highest destiny."<sup>79</sup> This affiliation that goes beyond their own backyards is characteristic of cosmopolitans. Mother Theresa, Princess Diana, Bono, and Bill and Melinda Gates have all immersed themselves in causes and without concern for national borders. It is the sensibility that allows nation to dissolve momentarily for the good of the cause that helps identify a cosmopolitan.

---

<sup>78</sup> Sheldon Pollock, et al., "Cosmopolitanisms," *Cosmopolitanism*, eds. Carol A. Breckenridge, Sheldon Pollock, Homi K. Bhabha, and Dipesh Chakrabarty, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), p. 6.

<sup>79</sup> Kwame Anthony Appiah, 22.

Based on the two major criteria outlined particularly by Darsey, as well as Iyer, Appiah, and Pollock et al., I argue that Carter, Havel, and Said are quintessential cosmopolitans. I propose to analyze the writings of Carter, Havel, and Said to identify their strategies for articulating space and place and to show how they created a language that allows cosmopolitanism and nationalism to mutually inform each other. Each chapter will specify certain tokens used regularly by the rhetor and demonstrate how that token is given distinct meanings that are both particular to the speaker and useful to producing a cosmopolitan language. Every token recognized will help address one of the three overarching questions: *How do the stylistic tokens used help articulate a complex rhetorical persona?*, *Can cosmopolitanism provide a way to transcend fundamental differences?*, and *Can cosmopolitanism give us the capacity to deal with conflict?*.

The first case study chapter explores the rhetoric of Vaclav Havel, the second is devoted to Jimmy Carter, and the third examines the writings of Edward Said. While each cosmopolitan figure creates an individual language to answer the three questions, their goals coincide. Each offers tokens specific to their experiences that facilitate their participation in the broader conversations of cosmopolitanism. Even though the three intellectuals have different tokens imbedded with particularized meanings, they all are better understood in the wider context.

Each writer addressed local and global identification but did so differently because of their very different personal situations. Nonetheless, certain key words are used by each of the three, a fact that implies a cosmopolitan identity that is both created by exposure and burdened with a sense of responsibility for places near and far. Using this question as a starting point allows me to articulate the first level identification as the basis of each chapter,

how each figure rhetorically constructs their personal place in the world, how they qualify their personas.

Assuming that articulating complex personas establishes a foundation for discussing how cosmopolitanism addresses other globalization quandaries, following sections in each chapter help determine if cosmopolitanism provides a way to transcend fundamental differences. Here, by identifying tokens each rhetor regularly utilizes, I examine their writings and identify how each token is used to provide the audiences with an insight to that person's global philosophies. Some markers deterritorialize place while others minimize difference and maximize common ground. These stylistic tokens often function to disarm and ease tensions heightened by the unknown. By highlighting those markers, I suggest that the authors are placing in their audiences the basic notion that difference can in fact be overcome. Overcoming difference in cosmopolitan rhetoric directly connects to the second level of identification, how the audience compensates for the feeling of separateness.

The next logical step in each respective chapter is the identification and exploration of the tokens that potentially articulate how conflict can be more effectively addressed. Attention to the question of whether *cosmopolitanism provides us with the capacity to deal with conflict* is useful to communication because the tokens can provide a means to better articulate both the problems and possible solutions (and this issue is explicitly addressed in the conclusion). Whether ethnic wars and territorial conflicts have increased or are subsiding, theories of clashes of civilizations persist, are contested and reasserted. The increase of wars and conflicts suggests a stalemate in understanding. Addressing this question will explore possible ways to re-energize understanding and discussion by singling out tokens that address conflict resolution. All three men are outspoken on a variety of

conflicts. Accordingly, I hope to identify a common group of words that they use to evoke restraint, negotiation, and peace in cases of discord.

While optimistic scholars have envisioned the possibility of a compatible space between cosmopolitanism and nationalism, Carter, Havel, and Said have long occupied that space and therefore can contribute considerably to the project of a cosmopolitan rhetoric. This project is significant to rhetorical studies because it helps explain how a rhetor can utilize cosmopolitan rhetoric to help communicate more effectively to a wide range of people without needing to rely in ideographs that are not necessarily available, Not only will exploring their writings provide a cosmopolitan rhetoric that shows how complexity is articulated and how identification interacts with cosmopolitan rhetoric on multiple levels to persuade audiences, but it will also provide rhetors with a way to make use of words in a personalized way to more easily relate to audiences with which they have little or nothing in common.

## VACLAV HAVEL: EMPOWERING THE INDIVIDUAL THROUGH TOKENS

A playwright, a dissident, a philosopher and a president, Vaclav Havel has been called "the mouse that roared," with a major political voice, "heard by cultured, politically astute citizens throughout Europe and beyond."<sup>1</sup> What all four of his personas have in common is his fundamental focus on the nature of human responsibility and personal meaning.<sup>2</sup>

I consider it immensely important that we concern ourselves with culture not just as one among many human activities, but in the broadest sense- the "culture of everything", the general level of public manners. By that I mean chiefly the kind of relations that exist among people, between the powerful and the weak, the healthy and the sick, the young and the elderly, adults and children...and so on.<sup>3</sup>

Havel's interest in relationships and points of struggle is apparent in his plays, essays and speeches. Throughout his long career, the human condition and the individual's ability to live with integrity have been center stage.

Although Havel had been politically active for years before its birth, Charter 77 was a springboard for an even more public life. Charter 77 was a political movement composed of many groups of people from very different backgrounds. Originally a reaction to the imprisonment of a rock band for their lyrics, members of the Charter's group included former party members, some were noncommunists, but all agreed on the basic principles of openness, tolerance, and respect for human rights.<sup>4</sup> Charter 77 (written in 1977) is

---

<sup>1</sup> James W. Sire, *Vaclav Havel: The Intellectual Conscience of International Politics*, (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 24.

<sup>2</sup> James F. Pontuso, *Vaclav Havel: Civic Responsibility in the Postmodern Age*, (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2004), 16.

<sup>3</sup> Vaclav Havel, *Summer Meditations*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992), 14.

<sup>4</sup> Paul Wilson, Introduction of Vaclav Havel's *Disturbing the Peace*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990), xiii.

manifesto protesting the suppression of human rights in Czechoslovakia. The team who wrote it was "bound together by the will to devote themselves, individually and collectively, to the respecting of civil and human rights in our country and the world..." Although the Charter did not have a single author, Havel's professor and mentor Jan Patocka and Havel primarily worded the document.<sup>5</sup> As a result, Havel was imprisoned.

Havel's fervent activism to transform his country reflects an intense display of nationalism. While imprisoned he continued to write, though the only form permitted was letters to his wife, Olga. The now famous letters are looked to as crystallizing his philosophies. Once a week, Havel was allowed to write a letter on four pages of standard writing paper. The themes came from things he thought about in prison, like human kind's identity and responsibility.<sup>6</sup>

Close to him and a part of his everyday life was the political situation in Czechoslovakia. The reason for Havel's activism was to bring awareness and possible change to his country. Conscious of the suppression carried out by totalitarian systems, his writing also observes how those systems threaten identity, constrain the truth, and curb responsibility by forbidding individuals from making choices. Despite his devotion to his country, Havel was also always attentive to the common threads connecting the people of the world and wary of intense nationalism. Longing for Czechoslovakia to shed its communist weight, he wrote:

The state is not something unconnected to society, hovering above or outside it, a necessary and anonymous evil. The state is a product of society, an expression of it, an image of it. It is a structure that a society creates for itself as an instrument of its

---

<sup>5</sup> Eda Kriseova, *Vaclav Havel: the Authorized Biography*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1993), 108.

<sup>6</sup> Vaclav Havel, "I Take the Side of Truth," *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), 243-244.



own self-realization. If we wish to create a good and humane society, capable of making a contribution to humanity's "coming to its senses," we must create a good and humane state. That means a state that will no longer suppress, humiliate, and deny the free human being, but will serve all the dimensions of that being. That means a state that will not shift our hearts and minds into a special little niche labeled "superstructure" tolerated and developed for decorative purposes only.<sup>7</sup>

Havel hoped for a state that allowed the basic rights for its citizens. He links the character of society with the character of the state because, for Havel, they can only be as good as the individuals who comprise them. This focus on the quality of the person, on integrity, and on moral fiber is iterated throughout his work. Yet despite his eagerness for a "respectable" state that could be a dignified member of the international community, Havel warned of the dangers of too much national pride. He hoped that his country's policies would never be based on ideology, but rather on ideas such as human rights, freedom of the individual, equality, the universality of civil rights (including the right to private ownership), a democratic political system among others. Specifically regarding foreign policy, he felt that

(i)t should not, in other words, be a selfish, inconsiderate, mindlessly pragmatic foreign policy, to promote the interests of our own country unscrupulously, to the detriment of everyone else. It should rather be a policy that sees our own interests as an essential part of the common interest, one that encourages us at all times to become involved, even when there is no immediate benefit to be had from it. It should be, therefore a policy guided by a "higher responsibility" in which the world and the global dangers that threaten it are seen comprehensively; a humane, educated, sensitive, and decent policy. This higher responsibility is by no means a megalomaniacal feeling that we Czechs and Slovaks are better than all the rest...On the contrary, among the traits of a policy so conceived are modesty and good taste...Tact, a sense of moderation, of reality, an understanding of others....<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Havel, *Summer Meditations*, 121-122.

Hoping that new found freedom would not cloud the minds of his countrymen, Havel called for temperance and reason and warned that natural solidarities, like nation, form a "pack mentality" where masses "of cowardly and immature individuals... hide behind a 'we' that automatically relieves them of any personal liability. Where does patriotism end and nationalism and chauvinism begin? Where is the line between civic solidarity and tribal passion?"<sup>9</sup> Striving to instill calm and reason in his country, Havel also wanted to create a balance between national and global interests and did so by discursively creating a language that allowed him to connect to those audiences effectively.

Caroline Bayard has pointed out that Havel displayed an openness to diversity and an antipathy to closed systems of thought.<sup>10</sup> When the Iron Curtain collapsed, he felt that it was an opportunity for Europe to "evolve into a single large society based on the principle of 'unity in diversity.'" Policies should have unifying aims.<sup>11</sup> Paul Wilson outlined three particular phases of Havel's efforts to lead his country through difficult times. The first dealt with the early period of post-Communism. The second focused on his call for tolerance and high moral ground. The third was characterized by Havel's "distrust of party politics" and his "belief in nonpolitical politics." Wilson particularly addressed one of Havel's more forceful speeches delivered in December 1997 to the Czech Senate and the Chamber of Deputies and characterized it as "a thundering critique of the ideology of the marketplace and a resonant reiteration of Havel's belief in the importance of an open, civil society."<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 99.

<sup>9</sup> Pontuso, 139.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 17.

<sup>11</sup> Havel, *Summer Meditations*, 97.

<sup>12</sup> Paul Wilson, "Vaclav Havel in Word and Deed," *Critical Essays on Vaclav Havel*, ed. Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz and Phyllis Carey (New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1999), 21.

Making use of a true cosmopolitan discourse, Havel continually expresses his concern for "the fundamental questions of our civilization, questions I have tried to answer...more as an inhabitant of this planet than as a representative of my country."<sup>13</sup> His interests explore scientific, religious, and the philosophical roots shared by different cultures and civilizations. His writings and speeches search for what underpins all human experience and advocate a new world order based on those "common minimums" that transcend the immediate, pragmatic needs of politics.<sup>14</sup> While he seems to have moved through several transformations, he has remained consistent in his basic ideas and intellectual makeup.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, his unwavering concern for global issues is a genuine sentiment that proves his own integrity, enacting the idea of "living in truth" and accepting a "higher responsibility."

### **Havel's Appeal: How He Reaches His Audiences**

Havel manages to balance national appeal with global reach in his writings. He consistently weaves the interests of Czechoslovakia with those of the world and never loses sight of the interconnectedness and interdependence of the global community. Despite this, how he manages to relate to those with whom he has little in common is noteworthy.

In his essays, Havel often wrote to the Communist Party with the intent of reprimanding it for its mistreatment of the Czechoslovakian people. Often the articles would be written for underground publications, addressed to the intellectual circles. "The Power of the Powerless," is an example of this. However, Havel knew well that the Party's reach

---

<sup>13</sup> Paul Wilson, Forward of *The Art of the Impossible: Politics as Morality in Practice, Speeches and Writings, 1990-1996* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), xi.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, xiii-xiv.

<sup>15</sup> Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz, Introduction of *Critical Essays on Vaclav Havel*, ed. Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz and Phyllis Carey, (New York: G. K. Hall & Co., 1999), 5.

extended beyond the small circle of dissidents. Words like "'our' system" and "we" suggest that Havel is immediately concerned with his own country's citizens, then those in Eastern Europe who were suffering under a similar system. Aware of the importance of discursively acknowledging a wider audience, he explains that "they allow themselves..." to be taken in by the "system" suggesting that the masses are stifled by the overbearing government. Here another audience is constructed by placing it in opposition to the knowing citizens. The 'they' represent the part of Havel's audience he wishes to expose to itself. In other words, by placing an already politically aware group in the same arena with himself, although directly addressing them, Havel also recognizes that this group is not the target he needs to convince. As the *they*, the second audience for Havel becomes more thought-provoking because they have yet to recognize the group to which they belong. While on the one hand the essay serves to reaffirm and motivate those already mobilized, on the other hand, the essay also addresses those who still need to realize the problem and be made aware of their situation. On a broader scale, Havel's speeches during his presidency follow a similar audience construction: he speaks to his immediate audience with intimacy; he directs the rhetoric to a broader audience to heighten awareness of his issue or goals; and he uses his communication to send a warning or precursor to those "in charge." Consistently, then, Havel constructs three audiences.

Artful in recognizing his distinct audiences, Havel is particularly in his element when addressing the international arena. In his speech to the United States Congress in 1990, he spoke of responsibility, yet while speaking to them directly, he indirectly spoke to then President George H.W. Bush and other world leaders. To be clear, in the beginning of his speech, he acknowledged that not only is he speaking "in front of this famous and powerful

assembly” but also he is being “heard by millions of people who have never heard of me,” as well as “politicians and political scientists [who will] study every word I say.” Relying on his carefully constructed cosmopolitan language and totally up front about his intended audiences, later in the speech he narrows his focus to President Bush and Mr. Gorbachev because they have the power to reduce the number of American and Soviet troops in Europe.<sup>16</sup> Constructing several audiences simultaneously served Havel in allowing him to charm his immediate audience, awaken his “second circle” audience (in this case including millions of people), while alerting those specifically he wishes to hold a future conversation with (Gorbachev and Bush). This same pattern identified in his essays is consistent in his speeches given abroad (that is, outside of Czechoslovakia).

Four speeches in particular clearly illustrate how Havel constructs three separate audiences. In Jerusalem, Oslo, Los Angeles, and Salsburg, Havel speaks on four different topics, but not only relates them back to his most common theme of responsibility but also delineates three separate audiences in each. Furthermore, in these speeches (as well as his speech to the joint session of the U.S. Congress), he offers to his multiple audiences lessons from Czechoslovakia’s experiences under communist rule.

In Oslo, his speech concentrated on clearly articulating the detriments of hatred. He outlined the harms of otherness and spoke to his immediate audience of its dangers. Furthering his reach, Havel progressed to intertwine the belief that the new democracies of central and eastern Europe are grounded in ethnic and national interests and thus unable to

---

<sup>16</sup> Vaclav Havel, “A Joint Session of the U.S. Congress”, Washington, D.C., February 21, 1990, in *The Art of the Impossible: Politics as Morality in Practice, Speeches and Writings, 1990-1996*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), 10, 15.

function in the international arena. Speaking beyond those in attendance of the conference, Havel explained that

“otherness” of different communities can...be accepted with understanding and tolerance as something that enriches life; it can be honored and respected, even enjoyed. But by the same token, it can be a source of misunderstanding and aversion toward others. And therefore-once again-it is fertile ground for future hatred.<sup>17</sup>

His warnings for his second audience, in this case, are multiple as well. They may be intended for the European people who have prejudices against the former Communist states and people. Yet perhaps he is speaking primarily to factions within Czechoslovakia. In this case, he is telling them that in order to be a viable entity in the world, they must set their differences aside. With Europe first and the world second in mind, Havel used the platform of the Oslo Conference on “The Anatomy of Hate” to address his third audience and give notice to the Western European leaders that Czechoslovakia is not burdened by ethnic interests and is ready to be an international player.

In Los Angeles, Havel spoke at the University of California, Los Angeles about responsibility to the environment. Speaking to students and teachers about environmental activism, he also used a comparison with Eastern Europe and other places in the world that need greater awareness on the issue. Then came the third audience to which he administered his usual forewarning and as he puts the point, “it is not my intention to lecture anyone, least of all teachers and students of this esteemed university.” In concluding, he appeals to the

---

<sup>17</sup> Vaclav Havel, “The Oslo Conference on ‘The Anatomy of Hate’”, Oslo, August 28, 1990, in *The Art of the Impossible*, 62.

importance of the obligation to future generations and directly to “cynical business men” and “left-wing saviors” that lack true action.<sup>18</sup>

On the occasion of the Salzburg Festival, Havel’s pattern of audience construction remained the same. A festival held to celebrate music and drama, he was invited to launch it with a brief lecture. Allowing him to return to his routes as a writer, he performed the July 1990 speech as president of Czechoslovakia. Speaking to those in attendance, he spoke of fear. A theme common to people worldwide, appreciation and understanding of it is readily available and accordingly supportive audiences are also easy for Havel to come by. Both the immediate audience and the wider audience of world citizens would gladly sympathize with struggling for true freedom and the accompanying fear of responsibility and fear of freedom itself. Yet his third audience, in the process was sent a poignant message. He mentioned that upon his re-election he “realized that the poetry was over and the prose was beginning; that the county fair had ended and the prose was beginning...”<sup>19</sup> Speaking to his adversaries back home and world leaders everywhere (he specifically mentioned England, France and the United States), Havel explained that he knows the honeymoon period is over and is aware of the challenges ahead, and is ready to undertake them.

In order to communicate his ideas to both a national and a global audience, Havel made use of concepts to which everyone can easily relate. Ideas grounded in broadly understood values like responsibility and truth were central to his philosophy. In addition, Havel's strength is in his ability to use the flip-side of terms used by oppressors to illustrate to the public the irony within them. By doing so, he communicates to his audiences the

---

<sup>18</sup> Vaclav Havel, “University of California, Los Angeles,” Los Angeles, October 25, 1991, in *The Art of the Impossible*, 81.

<sup>19</sup> Vaclav Havel, “The Salzburg Festival,” Salzburg, July 26, 1990, in *The Art of the Impossible*, 49.

intricate layers of meaning while exposing how those words and ideas are used to suppress. Havel takes those words and recreates them for his audience in a way that their new meaning is one particular to Havel, but used to reach masses. In the process, Havel fashions a cosmopolitan language for himself that not only furthers his philosophies globally, but also counters the intentions of his opponents nationally. In the following sections, I review how Vaclav Havel negotiates the space between nationalism and cosmopolitanism and how he constructs a cosmopolitan language specific to himself by using tokens. The first section explores some of those tokens used by Havel. The next section looks at his essay "The Power of the Powerless" as a piece that exemplifies his writing. The final section in this chapter explores how Havel used those tokens identified to relate to a global audience.

### **Re-writing Meaning, Creating a New Language**

Havel's reach is global. From his early writings to his most recent essays, Havel has been an outspoken advocate of human rights worldwide. "We cannot be indifferent to events in other parts of the world. To understand these events we must consider their many dimensions – the moral, the spiritual, the philosophical as well as the thoroughly practical." His clear grasp of the interconnectedness of the world and his concern for its people are echoed in the themes of his writing. James W. Sire declares Vaclav Havel to be "the unexpected intellectual who has become not only president of a country, but has striven to become the intellectual conscience of international politics as well."<sup>20</sup> As that intellectual conscience, Havel discursively constructed tokens to strengthen his cosmopolitan rhetoric.

---

<sup>20</sup> Sire, 16.



*Dissident*

Through his physical exile, having been imprisoned repeatedly for his dissenting views, and through his spiritual exile, having been marginalized in his own country, Havel saw infringements on human rights and self-expression worldwide as his own personal plight. In "The Power of the Powerless," he focuses on the word *dissident*. For Havel, the dissident is a person who expresses "nonconformist positions and critical opinions publicly," enjoys a certain amount of power because of their exposure (at home and abroad), whose "the horizon of their critical attention and their commitment reaches beyond the narrow context of their immediate surroundings or special interests to embrace more general causes", who is intellectual, and better known for their critical views rather than their "real work."<sup>21</sup>

Havel explains that a dissident is not a renegade:

Dissidents do not consider themselves renegades for the simple reason that they are not primarily denying or rejecting anything. On the contrary, they have tried to affirm their own human identity, and if they reject anything at all, then it is merely what was false and alienating in their lives, that aspect of living within a lie... In short, they do not decide to become "dissidents," and even if they were to devote twenty-four hours a day to it, it would still not be a profession, but primarily an existential attitude.<sup>22</sup>

A large part of this interpretation of "dissident" creates an exilic existence for Havel. Much of his analysis challenges the thought that dissent is a form of reckless disregard for society. To the contrary, Havel's "dissident" is a concerned citizen with a higher view of what he believes to be the public good. The dissident represents the voice of reason, a check on governing and totalized power. Closely related is the point he makes about the reach of the dissident's voice. "The horizon of their ...attention" conveys an awareness of the global

---

<sup>21</sup> Vaclav Havel, "The Power of the Powerless," *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), 167-168.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.* 169-170.

reach of the dissident's influence. The dissident becomes a link to the outside, or a means to participate in the wider arena. Havel further explains that the dissident is struggling with alienation, which creates the spiritual exile. That struggle, forged together with a higher purpose, public role, and global attention, helps make the dissident a cosmopolitan.

Havel's articulation of the intellectual (which he considers himself to be) also provides an opportunity for freedom of space and affiliation. He explains:

...the intellectual should constantly disturb, should bear witness to the misery of the world, should be provocative by being independent, should rebel against all hidden and open pressure and manipulations, should be the chief doubter of systems, of power and its incantation, should be a witness to their mendacity. For this very reason, an intellectual cannot fit into any role that might be assigned to him, nor can he ever be made to fit into any of the histories written by the victors. An intellectual essentially doesn't belong anywhere; he stands out as an irritant wherever he is; he does not fit into any pigeonhole completely.<sup>23</sup>

Jean Bethke Elshtain says of Havel that he "provokes the complacent, mocks the smug, tweaks the arrogant and suffers without excusing the weak."<sup>24</sup> As a sort of overseer of those in power and advocate for those without, Havel asserts that the public intellectual is in a position to reach both. Vital to that success is maintaining independence of thought and speech to be able to remain objective and trustworthy. Autonomy becomes imperative.

---

<sup>23</sup> Vaclav Havel, *Disturbing the Peace: A Conversation with Karel Hvizdala*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990), 167.

<sup>24</sup> Jean Bethke Elshtain, "A Performer of Political Thought: Vaclav Havel on Freedom and Responsibility," *Critical Essays on Vaclav Havel*, ed. Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz and Phyllis Carey, (New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1999), 124.

*Interconnectedness: Circles and Layers*

Two consistent themes in Havel's writings are the interconnectedness of the world and responsibility. In justifying the possible co-existence of seemingly contradicting interests,

Havel writes:

The identity of each one of us is composed of several layers. We are members of our family, of our profession, of our community, of our nation, of our state as a whole, of Europe. And if a citizen of California feels like a Californian, it doesn't mean that he can't at the same time, feel like an American. When a lesser entity delegates certain functions to a higher entity, this does not mean that something is cut away from the lesser entity, that is, it is not something negative; it also means positive participation in the higher entity. If you will allow me a comparison: if a professor of biology is proud of the university of which it is a part, there is no contradiction here. It simply mirrors the fact that while his faculty may contribute to the good name of the university, the university at the same time provides the proper environment for the development of the faculty. If we manage to create an analogous situation in our constitutional arrangements, then we can feel a natural pride both in our national identity- as Czechs or Slovaks- and our state identity, as Czechoslovakia.<sup>25</sup>

While the particular context of this passage deals with the only imagined split of Czechoslovakia yet to come, Havel makes a strong case for the coexistence of nationalism and cosmopolitanism. By borrowing from identity theory and postmodernism, he is able to accept that one affiliation does not detract from the other. The same basic belief in the necessary co-existence of interests echoes in *Summer Meditations*. Paul Wilson observes that

---

<sup>25</sup> Vaclav Havel, "Speech to the Federal Assembly," Sept. 17, 1990.

Havel's notion of home illustrates the concept of concentric circles moving from the central room to the whole world.<sup>26</sup>

Every circle, every aspect of the human home, has to be given its due. It makes no sense to deny or forcibly exclude any one stratum for the sake of another, nor should be regarded as less important or inferior. They are a part of our natural world, and a properly organized society has to respect them all and give them all a chance to play their roles. This is the only way that room can be made for people to realize themselves freely as human beings, to exercise their identities. All the circles of our home, indeed our whole natural world, are an inalienable part of us, and an inseparable element of our human identity. Deprived of all the aspects of his home, man would be deprived of himself, of his humanity.<sup>27</sup>

Again here, Havel explains that one's connection to a given stratum should not interfere or hinder connection to another. "Nor should be regarded as less important or inferior" suggests that he views the different circles as equally important. He cements the idea by calling them inalienable and inseparable parts of the human experience. With this assertion, Havel is consistent with Appadurai's argument that the interconnected environment forces deterritorialization and a blurring of identification. Segregating out identities or affiliations therefore is impossible and undesirable.

Besides the meanings conjured by Havel's choice of words, the visual explanation of his ideas on multiple affiliations provides the reader with a simple and clear notion of a complex persona. Havel presents his idea with an image of stratification, once with layers and once with circles. In the passage from the "Speech to the Federal Assembly," he uses "layers" to help illustrate a multi-dimensional identity for his listeners. *Layers* conveys a positive complexity and depth of character and here Havel uses that quality to portray how

---

<sup>26</sup> Wilson, "Vaclav Havel in Word and Deed," 28.

<sup>27</sup> Havel, *Summer Mediations*, 31.

having several affiliations is indeed a positive feature. In the second selection (from *Summer Mediations*), he depended on "circles" to show the expansion and interaction of complex identities and multiple affiliations. Circles are commonly used to demonstrate intimacy with the "self" in the center and each following circle being less and less intimate as they grow and expand and become more distant from the self. But beyond this, Havel emphasizes the need for all the circles to exist and somewhat differs from the usual understanding. He prefers to stress that each circle is equal in importance. In this move, one might interpret nationalism as closer to the center, thus more intimate, yet no more significant or necessary than cosmopolitanism which would inhabit a more distant circle. Here is the complexity: a superficial reading might conclude that the circles are hierarchial, but Havel is quick to diffuse that inclination.

### *Society and Home*

Both nationalist and cosmopolitan, when speaking at the NATO Summit on April 23, 1999 Havel acknowledged the significance of the treaty at hand to the Czech Republic and said "to my country, this is one of the most important moments in its long and dramatic history..."<sup>28</sup> Shortly after, he broadened his horizons and thanked the members for their decision to open the Alliance and said "I do so not only as a representative of my country and as a European, but also as an inhabitant of this planet who desires that there be peace among the people, as well as within their souls..."<sup>29</sup> In a single speech, Havel managed to position himself as leader and representative of his nation as well as citizen of the world. His

---

<sup>28</sup> Vaclav Havel, "Address at NATO Summit," April 23, 1999.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid.

concerns and victory (with the admission to the Alliance) are for the Czech Republic and yet he simultaneously declares it a concern and victory for the world as well.

One dimension does not negate the other. Not only do the two go hand in hand, but according to Havel, nation thrives when "society" thrives. His notion of society is an international civil society:

I favour a political system based on the citizen and recognizing all fundamental civil and human rights in their universal validity, equally applied; that is, no member of a single race, a single nation, a single sex, or a single religion may be endowed with basic rights that are any different from anyone else's. In other words, I favour what is called a civil society.<sup>30</sup>

Here Havel is defining the terms of what he considers a civil society. It is international or global because he specifically states: "no member of ...a single nation..." should be excluded. He extends his explanation and says that a civil society must be based on the universality of human rights, and should apply to all: "not only members of our nation, but members of our family...our region...our supranational communities." He explains that citizenship should be understood "in the broadest and deepest sense of that world."<sup>31</sup>

Therefore, in this move, he has transgressed national boundaries. Placing himself within the cosmopolitan terrain, Havel maintains his place and role as a citizen of the world. While Czechoslovakia or the Czech Republic is always near and in focus, he also manages to move himself beyond the borders of nations and nationalism in general. Consequently, he refuses the notion that cosmopolitanism and nationalism are polar opposites.

...this principle (his notion of civil society) is sometimes presented as if it were opposed to the principle of national affiliation, as if it ignored or suppressed the stratum of our home represented by our

---

<sup>30</sup> Havel, *Summer Meditations*, 31-32.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 32-33.

nationality. This is a crude misunderstanding. On the contrary, the principle of civil society represents the best way for individuals to realizing themselves, to fulfill their identity in all the circles of their home, to enjoy everything that belongs to their natural world, not just some aspects of it. To establish a state on any other basis- on the principle of ideology, or nationality, or religion, for instance- means a single stratum of our home superior to the others, and thus detracting from us as people, and detracting from our natural world. The outcome is almost always bad. Most wars and revolutions, for example, come about precisely because of this one-dimensional concept of the state. A state based on citizenship, on that respects people and all levels of their natural world, will be a basically peaceable and humane state.<sup>32</sup>

This notion of civil society crystallizes the cosmopolitan spirit with its broad views and acceptance of difference. It takes a principled stand of equality and connectedness to the world that acknowledges interdependence. Once again he refers to his center "home" as a grounding mechanism. One of the main critiques of cosmopolitanism is its rootlessness, yet by persistently using the terms "home" and "circle," he is reminding his audience that while considering himself a citizen of the world, he remains grounded and aware of nation.

### *Human and Duty*

Havel takes his crafted meanings of *home*, *circles*, and *society* and builds on them with his audiences. In describing himself, he also draws on the word *human*, *duty*, and *responsibility*. Quite aware of the position he has acquired thanks to his writing, Havel explains how his particular circumstances shape his being.

I am a writer, writing what I want to write and not what others might like me to, and if I get involved in any other way except by my writing, then only because I feel this to be my natural human and civic duty, as well as my duty as a writer. That is, my duty as a public figure on whom it is incumbent, not just because he is more clever or more important than anyone else

---

<sup>32</sup> Havel, *Summer Meditations*, 32.

but simply because he is, whether he likes it or not, in a different position and possessed of a different responsibility...I serve no one...If I serve anything, then only my own conscience...I merely take the side of truth against lies, the side of sense against nonsense, the side of justice against injustice.<sup>33</sup>

In this passage, merges several identities, one of the private man and one of the public writer. He rationalizes that as a human, he has certain civic duties and in his case they manifest themselves in his writing and speaking the Truth. The truth he refers to is national and cosmopolitan at once because he often directed his advocacy to the crimes of the Communist Party controlling his country while using the platform to address humankind worldwide. His concept of civil society is cosmopolitan in nature as are his descriptions of human and civic duty. Human duty, human identity, and human nature also evoke cosmopolitanism because the word "human" indicates a shared goal, experience, and presence with other humans despite national borders. He often uses the word "human" where he might have easily replaced it with "Czech citizen," or "national," or "countryman." Yet he consistently and insistently uses the term human. This move, therefore, suggests his deliberate inclusion and awareness of the entire world.

The two other words he uses often are *duty* and more so *responsibility*. They are closely related by definition and as mentioned above he often couples the word "duty" with "human" which enforces his view that his duty is inevitably to humankind (as opposed to only people of one nation). Here in particular he refers to his duty as a public writer which he feels is particularly significant because it grants him access to a wider audience. Also, it is significant because as a public writer, as he explains, he regularly makes the choice of

---

<sup>33</sup> Havel, "I Take the Side of Truth," 247-8.



writing the truth or perpetuating non-truths. Obviously, he states above, he chooses to write the truth. Feeling that it is his "responsibility," this word takes on a life of its own for Havel as he places in it connotations in addition to its evident denotations. On the surface, the word "responsibility," simply stated, refers to his feeling of accountability and need to be dependable. Yet a second glance reveals that for Havel, "responsibility" suggests a higher calling, one that is not tied to place but rather tied to being. For Havel, in addition to the basic meaning of responsibility, it is used as a referent for a concern for, an obligation toward, and a connection to the people of the world. At the end of the passage, he declares that he serves "no one...only (his) own conscience" which provides additional testimony to his cosmopolitan identity because he has managed to discursively relieve himself from the constraints of place.

### *Responsibility*

Sire asserts that Havel had been true to his convictions and adds that "he will not let go the responsibility he feels- not only toward his country or himself, but also toward 'the order of Being' that encompasses us all."<sup>34</sup> In a 1993 essay written for *Foreign Affairs*, Havel points out that the world has become an increasingly complex place and calls on the economically stronger nations of the West to help the rest of the world. He tries to place the burden on the West much like he placed the burden on himself as a public intellectual:

The traditional values of Western civilization- such as democracy, respect for human rights and for the order of nature, the freedom of the individual and the inviolability of his property, the feeling of co-responsibility for the world, which means the awareness

---

<sup>34</sup> Sire, 21.

that if freedom is threatened anywhere it is threatened everywhere...<sup>35</sup>

In this essay, he articulates much of his understanding and accordingly use of the term responsibility. When he spoke of himself as having an added obligation to the public at large because of his advantage of position, in this essay he distinguishes the West as having that same position. To help impart what he referred to as "co-responsibility" to the West, he assigned the values to it and suggested that since these values originate from the West, it therefore should feel responsible for seeing that they are accomplished globally. He reinforces his point by alluding to the world's interconnectedness. Trying to urge the West to take on that responsibility, he says

Naturally, all of us continue to pay lip service to democracy, human rights,...and responsibility for the world, but apparently only insofar as it does not require any sacrifice...-that is, a willingness to sacrifice for the common interest something of one's own particular interests...<sup>36</sup>

The willingness to sacrifice for the good of the common interests is an added dimension for Havel's "responsibility." He concludes this essay by asserting that "(p)eople today know that they can be saved only by a new type of global responsibility. Just one small detail is missing: that responsibility actually has to be undertaken." While he, on the one hand, makes it perfectly clear what he means by "responsibility," he also is clear that those who should be responsible have yet to do so.

Throughout his writing and speaking, the theme of responsibility is one of the most prominent. Jan Vladislave explained that responsibility as fate is one of the most personal themes of Havel's thinking. Personal responsibility becomes the choices they make to

---

<sup>35</sup> Vaclav Havel, "The Co-responsibility of the West: (an article written for *Foreign Affairs*, Dec. 22, 1993)," *The Art of the Impossible: Politics as Morality in Practice, Speeches and Writings, 1990-1996*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), 137.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid*, 137-8.

determine or fulfill their destiny.<sup>37</sup> In his address to the United States Congress in 1990,

Havel said

Consciousness precedes Being, and not the other way around, as Marxists claim. For this reason, the salvation of this human world lies nowhere else than in the human heart, in the human power to reflect, in human modesty, and in human responsibility.<sup>38</sup>

For Havel, "responsibility" is more than the basic responsibility most feel toward their families, jobs, or themselves. Responsibility extends to the world. His vision is a global one, and by tying in the "human world" and "human power," "human responsibility" too, intentionally means a responsibility to all human kind. He outlines his notion as follows:

There are countless types of responsibility- more or less pressing, depending on who's involved. We feel responsible for our personal welfare, our families, our companies, our communities, our nations. And somewhere in the background there is, in every one of us, a small feeling of responsibility for the planet and its future. It seems to me that this last and deepest responsibility has become a very low priority- dangerously low, considering that the world today is more interlinked than ever before and that we are, for all intents and purposes, living one global destiny.<sup>39</sup>

This cosmopolitan explanation of responsibility confirms Havel's priorities. He explains that while things from personal welfare to nation sometimes demand immediate attention, the truly significant responsibility should be toward the global. This passage echoes his notion of circles, as he begins with personal and shifts outward from there, ending with the global. And here, again, he insists that the "inner circles" are not more important than the "outer circles." While underscoring the importance of responsibility, in the process he highlights

---

<sup>37</sup> Jan Vladislav, "Introduction: Asides to readers of Havel's Essays," *Living In Truth: twenty-two essays published on the occasion of the award of the Erasmus Prize to Vaclav Havel*, ed. Jan Vladislav, (Boston: Faber and Faber, 1986), xix.

<sup>38</sup> Sire, 53.

<sup>39</sup> Vaclav Havel, Introductory Essay in *Creating a World that Works for All*, Sharif Abdullah, (San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc., 1999), viii-ix.

the cosmopolitan theme of an interlinked world and that there is one global destiny. He ties in the future of the world, its interconnectedness, with his notion of responsibility.

A global concept for Havel, responsibility, he says, is too often a "low priority." As a public person, he has taken it upon himself to raise public consciousness and call people to re-prioritize. In addition to the U.S. Congress in 1991, he reiterated his message at Harvard University in 1995:

The main task in the coming era is...a radical renewal of human responsibility...We must develop a new attitude and find respect for what transcends us immensely: for the Universe, for the Earth, ...Our respect for other people, for other nations, and for other cultures, can only grow from a humble reverence of the cosmic order and from an awareness that we are a part of it, that we share in it and that nothing of what we do is lost...It will certainly not be easy to awaken in people a new sense of responsibility for the world... Who knows how many cataclysms humanity may have to go through before such a sense of responsibility is generally accepted. But this does not mean that those who wish to work for it cannot begin at once. It is a great task for teachers, educators, intellectuals... people active in all forms of public life.<sup>40</sup>

More directly here, Havel calls for greater responsibility. He still provides his audience with a reference point of the global, mentioning the vastest of circles: the Universe and moving in from there. He also makes a plea for respect for difference referring to other people, nations, and cultures. In addition, he adds a warning that it should not take a disaster to wake peoples' conscience. Those who already appreciate that responsibility do not have to wait for those lagging behind. Finally he puts the heaviest load on people active in public life as they have a platform from which to affect change. Havel not only defined how he conceptualizes responsibility, but also made a call to action from those who would be most productive and "wish to work for it" before the next cataclysm or global crisis occurs.

---

<sup>40</sup> Vaclav Havel, Address at Harvard University, June 8, 1995.

Building on Havel's reference to difference, Elshtain explains Havel's philosophy on responsibility "flows from the aims of life...which are plurality, diversity, and independent self-constitution as against the conformity, uniformity..." Furthermore, she understands Havel's responsibility as an amalgamation of freedom and identity. Elshtain argues that for Havel, responsibility is the "acceptance of risks of free action (and) forms the very bases of one's identity..." She finds her evidence in *Letters to Olga* that a "crisis in responsibility (the 'intrinsic responsibility that man has to and for the world') is a crisis in human identity and human integrity." She points out that in Letters 142 and 143 Havel writes: "The crisis of today's world, obviously is a crisis of human responsibility (both responsibility for oneself and responsibility 'toward' something else) and thus it is a crisis of human identity as well."<sup>41</sup> By wrapping responsibility with freedom and identity, Havel instills a sense of free will. Allowing agency balances freedom as not only rights but also duties. Moreover, identity becomes an evolving process that is based on the choices freedom presented to people. Consequently, responsibility becomes directly tied to the quality of the human identity and based on the freedoms individuals have.

Respect for the universality of human and civil rights, their inalienability and indivisibility, is of course possible only when one understands...that one is 'responsible for the whole world' and that one must behave the way everyone ought to behave, even though not everyone does.

This sense of responsibility grows out of the experience of certain moral imperatives that compel one to transcend the horizon of one's own personal interests and be prepared at any time to defend the common good, and even to suffer for it...<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> Elshtain, 120-121.

<sup>42</sup> Havel, *Summer Meditations*, 98-99.

Choice and thus agency are repeated here. Havel insists that individuals have the option to take responsibility for the common good ("and even to suffer for it") and implies that their decision will depend on the quality of the person. The idea then becomes that based on the moral character of the human identity, individuals will take responsibility for others in the world.

In *Summer Meditations* (and elsewhere), Havel repeatedly discusses the link between responsibility, morality, and civility. He begins the book by stressing the significance of moral values in all spheres of social life and notes the importance of cultivating "higher responsibility." Later he asserts that genuine politics is serving those around us and its "deepest roots are moral because it is a responsibility...a 'higher' responsibility." To fulfill this, he must "strive for decency, reason, responsibility, sincerity, civility, and tolerance" by behaving "decently, reasonably, responsibly, sincerely, civilly, and tolerantly."<sup>43</sup> Besides connoting a global reach for Havel, responsibility is also saturated in moral implications. The "higher" responsibility becomes a goal for those living decently and sincerely, striving for a world characterized by civility and tolerance.

### *Truth*

One way that Havel advocates reaching this higher moral ground is by "living in truth." Elshtain says "for Havel, free responsibility is an outgrowth of a commitment to live 'in truth.'<sup>44</sup> In the essay "'I Take the Side of Truth' an Interview with Antoine Spire" Havel fully develops this idea. He discusses his prison experience and relates it to his broader

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 1, 7-8.

<sup>44</sup> Elshtain, 117.

political views. Expressing his grasp of the interconnectedness of the world he said of the global support of his position that people understand "that whenever freedom and human dignity are threatened in any one country, they are under threat everywhere, and this signifies an attack on humanity itself and on the future of all of us."<sup>45</sup> Not only does his reach include all of humanity, but also its future. In acknowledging the support of others, he emphasizes that their support was a personal choice, and often under difficult circumstances required personal sacrifice as well. A short yet poignant essay, it served as the basis for subsequent works because of its concluding revelation. In answering a question about his political aspirations, Havel answers:

I am not, have never been, nor have I the slightest intention of becoming a politician, a professional revolutionary...Even though I naturally do have my own opinions on a variety of issues, I don't hold with any particular ideology, doctrine, or, even less, any political party or faction. I serve no one...If I serve anything, then only my own conscience...I am not on the side of any establishment, nor am I a professional campaigner against any establishment- I merely take the side of truth against lies, the side of sense against nonsense, the side of justice against injustice.<sup>46</sup>

Demonstrating complete independence of thought, Havel liberated himself from all possible political entanglements and showed himself accountable to only himself. By doing this, he has simultaneously suggested that those aligning themselves with an ideology or party become tainted and that he answers to a higher moral calling that is not subjected to the possibility of corruption. His siding with truth is a personal choice, much like the personal choice made by his supporters. They too sided with truth, risking political stigmas to do so. Living in truth becomes a choice to accept responsibility while choosing not to live in truth

---

<sup>45</sup> Havel, "I take the Side of Truth," 239.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 247-248.

suggests an easing of the conscience, a lack of willingness to take risk, a sort of cowardice facilitated by hiding behind ideology and establishment. Hence the word "truth" becomes laden with hidden meaning.

Sire explains that truth becomes sincerity or integrity for Havel: truth is ethical.<sup>47</sup>

Havel believes that truth is possible as are responsible moral choices.<sup>48</sup>

Living within the truth, as humanity's revolt again set an enforced position, is on the contrary, an attempt to regain control over one's own sense of responsibility. In other words, it is clearly a moral act, not only because one must pay so dearly for it, but principally because it is not self-serving...it is an all-or-nothing gamble, and it is difficult to imagine a reasonable person embarking on such a course merely because he reckons that sacrifice today will bring rewards tomorrow, be it only in the form of general gratitude...<sup>49</sup>

Here Sire identifies living in truth as a moral act, a choice or opportunity to embrace responsibility, and a risk. Living in truth becomes a means to counter the agreed upon norms, a sort of critical approach to society. For Havel, the word "truth" can accordingly represent resistance or objection. Living in truth suggests questioning the status quo and being willing to be responsible enough to choose to speak or act to better conditions. This implies a critical approach to society with a readiness to disregard expected notions of nationalism with the hope of transforming society.

For a ceremony honoring him with an honorary degree at the University of Michigan, Havel wrote about the importance of standing by one's convictions:

But what is truth?...I believe that truth is also information but, at the same time, it is something greater. Truth- like any other information- is information which has been clearly proved, or affirmed, or verified..., or which is simply convincing. But it is more than that- it is information avouched by a human being with

---

<sup>47</sup> Sire, 68.

<sup>48</sup> Pontuso, 32.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 63-64.



his or her whole existence, with his or her reputation and name,  
with his or her honor.<sup>50</sup>

Truth is directly linked with the moral being of the individual. Truth manifests itself in times of struggle. In fact, when considering the phenomenon of dissidence, Havel reflects that the dissident does not seek power, but rather seeks truth. The dissident's actions "simply articulate his dignity as a citizen, regardless of the cost. The innermost foundation of his 'political' undertaking is moral and existential...something within has simply revolted and left him incapable of continuing to 'live a lie'."<sup>51</sup>

Opportunities for Havel's audiences to redeem their tokens are plentiful in his writings as he often states and restates how his word usage is particular to him. Such is also the case for the token "truth" as he explains as follows:

If what I have called living within the truth is a basic existential (and of course potentially political) starting point for all those "independent citizens' initiatives" and "dissident" or "opposition" movements this does not mean that every attempt to live within the truth automatically belongs in this category. On the contrary, in its most original and broadest sense, living within the truth covers a vast territory full of modest expressions of human volition, the vast majority of which will remain anonymous and whose political impact will probably never be felt or described any more concretely than simply as a part of a social climate or mood. Most of these expressions remain elementary revolts against manipulation: you simply straighten your backbone and live in greater dignity as an individual.<sup>52</sup>

Providing several layers for his use of truth, Havel allows his audience to grasp the concept depending on their experience or objectives. On the simplest level, Havel offers them the chance to live in greater dignity, for the benefit of moral character and integrity. That

---

<sup>50</sup> Vaclav Havel, Acceptance Address for the honorary degree Doctor of Laws, University of Michigan, 2000.

<sup>51</sup> Vaclav Havel, "An Anatomy of Reticence," *Living In Truth: twenty-two essays published on the occasion of the award of the Erasmus Prize to Vaclav Havel*, ed Jan Vladislav, (Boston: Faber and Faber, 1986), 193.

<sup>52</sup> Havel, "the Power of the Powerless," 176.

opportunity grows in the broadest sense to reach political potential by affecting change within socially oppressed societies. Ranging from the limited to the infinite, living in truth promises positive change, affecting each "circle," depending on the reach of the truth. And as with the circles, no one truth is more or less important than another truth. The individual "modest expression" is just as significant as the political movements.

In his work, the recurring theme of conscience and moral fiber ties together his deep concern for identity. By choosing to live in truth and to bear personal responsibility, Havel felt that people could improve the situations of themselves and others. In his landmark essay "the Power of the Powerless" Havel focuses on those two themes: living in truth and the higher responsibility of all individuals. Havel discloses what is universally human in this essay, "about being in general, about people in today's world, and about the crisis of modern day humanity."<sup>53</sup>

The problem of human identity remains at the center of my thinking about human affairs. If I use the word "identity," it is not because I believe it explains anything about the secret of human existence;...because it helped me clarify the ramifications of the theme that most attracted me: "the crisis of human identity." All my plays in fact are variations on this theme, the disintegration of man's oneness with himself and the loss of everything that gives human existence a meaningful order, and continuity and its unique outline.<sup>54</sup>

Using truth and responsibility to address his concerns of the "crisis of human identity", Havel effortlessly parallels the experience of individual moral fiber with governments' political ideologies.

---

<sup>53</sup> Vladislav, xvi.

<sup>54</sup> Vaclav Havel, *Letters to Olga: June 1979-September 1982*, (New York: Knopf, 1988), 145.

### **The Wisdoms of "The Power of the Powerless"**

Originally written as a discussion piece for a Polish-Czechoslovak volume of essays on freedom and power in October 1978, the essay "The Power of the Powerless" had a great impact on Eastern Europe. A Solidarity activist said that reading "The Power of the Powerless" "gave us the theoretical underpinnings for our activity. It maintained our spirits; we did not give up, and a year later – in August 1980 – it became clear that the party apparatus and the factory management were afraid of us. We mattered."<sup>55</sup> Consequently, in May 1979, Havel and some of the other Czechoslovak contributors were arrested.<sup>56</sup> It serves as a prime example of how Havel utilized his own cosmopolitan rhetoric to discursively place himself in the global realm, concerning himself beyond the borders of nation.

In order to explore the potential of the "powerless," Havel begins by questioning who the dissident is (though not answering his questions) and examining the nature of power. While he goes through a check list of how dictatorship maintains its power and the particulars of his country's situation, particularly revealing of his inclinations is the "third particularity" outlining ideology. In it he writes:

Of course, one pays dearly for this low-rent home: the price is abdication of one's own reason, conscience, and responsibility, for an essential aspect of this ideology is the consignment of reason and conscience to a higher authority. The principle involved here is that the center of power is identical with the center of truth.<sup>57</sup>

Here he juxtaposes power with truth at once equating them and contrasting them. On the one hand, he allows that under the circumstances it may be beneficial to accede to the ideology, yet on the other hand, he points out the extreme compromise being made. Giving up one's

---

<sup>55</sup> Paul Wilson, pretext to "The Power of the Powerless," *Open Letters: Selected Writings, 1965-1990*, (New York: Knopf, 1991), 125-126.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 125.

<sup>57</sup> Havel, "The Power of the Powerless," 130.

reason, conscience, and responsibility for convenience, he says is the trade off. Power becomes identical to truth because one is being bartered for the other.

Much of the essay focuses on a simple green grocer who hangs in his shop window a government distributed sign: "Workers of the world, unite!" Questioning the grocer's motivation, Havel embarks on a journey with his readers that analyzes the implications of this action. Does the grocer comply because he is convinced? Is it a matter of fear? Or could it be that the grocer has simply shut off his ability to think, and therefore acts mechanically? The two main issues Havel addresses are: Is the green grocer's complying a lack of living in truth? And is the compliance a matter of the grocer's inability or refusal to take on responsibility? Havel deems the hanging of the sign as an absence of truth and responsibility, and in that, he sees the relinquishing of power.

The profound crisis of human identity brought on by living within a lie, a crisis which in turn makes such a life possible, certainly possesses a moral dimension as well; it appears, among other things, as a deep moral crisis in society. A person who has been seduced by the consumer value system, whose identity is dissolved in an amalgam of the accouterments of mass civilization, and who has no roots in the order of being, no sense of responsibility for anything higher than his own personal survival, is a demoralized person. The system depends on this demoralization deepens it, is in fact a projection of it into society.<sup>58</sup>

As its counterpoint, the word "lie" and its variants serve to further the significance of Havel's concept of truth. In this passage, Havel connects the truth and responsibility to the crisis of human identity. Their deficiency creates the moral crisis. Society, in his writing, has been discussed as global. Although here he may be specifically referring to Czechoslovakia, his point seems to be more of a critique of a situation no matter where it

---

<sup>58</sup> Ibid., 153.

arises. Railing against totalitarian government (or post-totalitarian, as he coined this case), he is demonstrating to his audience how any oppressive situation can spiral into a societal problem. He continues his explanation:

Living within the truth, as humanity's revolt against an enforced position, is, on the contrary, an attempt to regain control over one's own sense of responsibility. In other words, it is clearly a moral act, not only because one must pay so dearly for it, but principally because it is not self-serving...If living within the truth in the post-totalitarian system becomes the chief breeding ground for independent, alternative political ideas, then all considerations about the nature and future prospects of these ideas must necessarily reflect this moral dimension as a political phenomenon.<sup>59</sup>

Here Havel has identified a means and a place of resistance for those suppressed and oppressed. Living within the truth and regaining a sense of responsibility become more than not lying or slacking, but rather a way to provide options for society. Taking on a clearly political agenda, the individual acts of truth and responsibility are now means to resist regimes. In fact, Havel goes on to say that "the representatives of power" are threatened by those living in truth. They try to dissuade those individuals by tempting them with "power or fame or wealth – and thus they try, at least, to implicate them in their own world, the world of general demoralization."<sup>60</sup> By discursively providing a space for resistance, Havel also illuminates a means for that resistance to manifest itself in society at large.

In "Power of the Powerless," Havel also raises the issue of dissent. That section clearly explains his perception of the word "dissident." As previously discussed, this token for Havel is laden with meanings that take a negative connotation and use it to create a positive force. He connects dissidence with living in truth and responsibility by showing his

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 153-154.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid., 153.

audience how a dissident can choose living in truth and responsibility to rise to the occasion and become an influence on society. Closely related in this essay is the concept of "the independent life of society." He explains that this "independent life" encompasses

everything from self-education and thinking about the world, through free creative activity and its communication to others, to the most varied free, civic attitudes, including instances of independent social self-organization. In short, it is an arena in which living within the truth becomes articulate and materializes in a visible way.<sup>61</sup>

Independent life signifies free, unconventional, and individual thinking and acting.

Encouraging people to act based on their own conscious and thinking, Havel reminds them that each of their limited achievements and choices makes a difference to society as a whole. Accordingly the dissident become an agent of change by simply acting independently. Havel considers living in truth to be the "elementary starting point for every attempt...to oppose the alienating pressure of the system." The dissident's goal, therefore, is put in service to the truth and to "make room for the genuine aims of life."<sup>62</sup>

A significant part of life, especially for Havel, is culture. In "the Power of the Powerless," he discusses the concept of a "second culture." *Second culture* reflects a parallel structure, and for Havel is directly linked to the phenomenon of dissent. Originally introduced to Czechoslovakia by Ivan Jirous, it focused on nonconformist rock music and related literature. Broadening the term's horizons, Havel sees the reach of second culture to include underground editions of books and magazines, concerts, seminars, exhibitions, as well as other cultural expressions.<sup>63</sup> Similar to a counterculture, the second culture is a space where dissidents can express, observe, and share ideas and truths that are otherwise

---

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 177.

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 179.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 192-193.

suppressed. Important for Czechoslovakia at the time (1978), Havel felt that the second culture was needed for the independent life of society and the dissident movement to thrive. In addition to his obvious concern for his nation, in this section, Havel also established the importance of a global reach. He explains that the chances of success of dissent and truth are greatly improved by contact with parallel structures in other countries. He reinforces this point by explaining that historically,

any genuinely meaningful point of departure...usually has an element of universality about it. In other words, it is not something partial, accessible only to a restricted community and not transferable to any other. On the contrary, it must be potentially accessible to everyone...it is not just the expression of an introverted, self-contained responsibility that individuals have to and for themselves alone, but responsibility to and for the world.<sup>64</sup>

In this passage, Havel ties the success of dissent in Czechoslovakia to the world. He justifies his point by asserting that historically, indifference to others in the world and concern for the welfare of the actors only risk failure. He drives his point home by saying that it would be "another version of the schizophrenic life within a lie" and a false notion if dissidents were "an exclusive group with exclusive interests, carrying on their own exclusive dialogue with the powers that be."<sup>65</sup> By shifting the focus of the conversation from exclusivity to inclusiveness, Havel is not only notifying the Czechoslovakian public that their interests are incorporated but also assuring the global public that the world's concerns are taken into account as are others worldwide with the same experiences.

The general essence of "The Power of the Powerless" is a call for individuals to live in truth and take responsibility for their actions and the world around them. A political essay

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 194.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 195.

that encourages change, Havel touches on how that change can be made. Identifying the Czechoslovakian condition as post-totalitarian and therefore different from a totalitarian situation, he notes that a violent swooping revolt would be ineffective. Rather than, he places his hope in the people, the powerless, to affect change. Havel does this by demonstrating to his audience how little choices they make can have a big impact. With the greengrocer's potential cowardice to take a stand (or live in truth and take responsibility), Havel begins by showing how everyday little idiosyncrasies reinforce the strength of the post-totalitarian system. Accordingly, he suggests that by living in truth and taking responsibility, people like the greengrocer will eventually defeat determinism and instill freewill.

These movements, therefore, always affect the power structure as such indirectly, as a part of society as a whole, for they are primarily addressing the hidden spheres of society, since it is not a matter of confronting the regime on the level of actual power.<sup>66</sup>

His call to action is less a cry for revolution than an appeal for an awakening of the individual. Havel is not suggesting that there be a confrontation, but rather a stirring of consciences that sparks little expressions of truth and responsibility. His hope is that these expressions become contagious or even infectious, and truth and responsibility become a way of life. Then, the regime would eventually collapse because its lies would be unheard. In this essay, Havel grants power to the (apparently) powerless, which is how individuals can affect change.

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 198.



## Time Will Tell

Cosmopolitanism is most often undertaken in terms of place (or lack thereof). Yet many of the cosmopolitan ideals that Havel is concerned with would also transcend time. In the preview for the series of books "Issues of Our Time," series editor Henry Louis Gates Jr. wrote "law, justice, identity, morality, and freedom" are concepts that are "at once abstract and utterly close to home."<sup>67</sup> *Abstract* juxtapositioned with *home* contrasts the global and the local, again referring to place. Yet the series title directly references time. Issues like law, identity, and morality are timeless. From the beginning of cosmopolitanism to present, they have been discussed and debated. Havel makes arguments that are timeless, too.

Because "cosmopolitan contamination"<sup>68</sup> as coined by Kwame Anthony Appiah is accelerating due to globalization generally and technology and migration specifically, it seems to be more immediate of an issue today. Yet as Havel maneuvers between the general and the specific, he also manipulates the past, the present, and the future. In his essays, he writes in the present tense suggesting a sort of on-going-ness of the conditions he is describing. The greengrocer in "The Power of the Powerless" "*places* in his window...the slogan..." The present tense insisted upon, implies that the action is a common, reoccurring, expected one. He is illustrating to the reader a cycle or a rut that the greengrocer, specifically, and the average citizen, generally are in due to the political situation. Time then, becomes their enemy as they are unaware of the detriments of the effects and therefore do not even realize how long they have been habitually conceding.

---

<sup>67</sup> Henry Louis Gates Jr., Introduction to series "Issues of Our Time," in *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, Kwame Anthony Appiah, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006).

<sup>68</sup> Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, Kwame Anthony Appiah, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2006), 101.

In his interviews, one gets a different sense of Havel's concept of time. He regularly answers questions about his prison periods with a definite past tense. His stories of days gone by are told in the past, yet intertwined with notions of present and future, often to illustrate the suppression of the totalitarian system or hope for its defeat.

In "Second Wind," Havel offers a detailed account of how time and history interact for him. Havel relates the social climate with the progression of time and suggests that while civil society is accepting of ideas, time progresses.

The fortunate way in which my own "bioliterary" time meshed with historical time gave me another tremendous advantage... there was something deeper and essential here: that society was capable of accepting them, that the intellectual and social climate of the time, open to new self-knowledge and hungry for it... actually wanted them... every such act of social self-awareness—that is, every genuine and profound acceptance of a new work, the possibilities of the repressive system were weakened...<sup>69</sup>

Havel links the vibrancy of society to time, and the more open the society is, the more alive it is. He writes "in a society which is really alive, something is always happening... The richer the life society lives, then, the better it perceives the dimension of social time, the dimension of history."<sup>70</sup> He further explains that the period in which Czechoslovakia was under a communist regime, time stood still, there was no history. He describes the situation as uniqueness and disappearing from life as happenings merge into one gray image. He calls it a sort of deadening and concludes that

The deadening of the sense of unfolding time in society inevitable kills it in private life as well. No longer backed by social history or the history of the individual within it, private life declines to a

---

<sup>69</sup> Vaclav Havel, "Second Wind," *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), 6.

<sup>70</sup> Vaclav Havel, "Dear Dr. Husak," *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), 72-73.

prehistoric level...<sup>71</sup>

Linking time to the quality of life in both the public and private spheres, Havel stresses the significance of a society which is living in the sense of interaction, ideas, and free thinking. While these elements are important individually, Havel also makes sure to tie them into collectivity.

In other words, wherever there is room for social activity, room is created for a social memory as well. Any society that is alive is a society with a history.<sup>72</sup>

Therefore, Havel's articulation of time is strongly connected to the quality of society. His use of the word "alive" compels the reader to view society as a living, breathing thing that needs certain basics to thrive. The concept of time is significant as living things occupy not only space but also time in the scope of history or the world. Placing societies as time occupiers allows Havel to make a case for time being a way to judge or measure the quality of a society. Clearly advocating those basics like free thought and expression in Czechoslovakia, Havel's line of reasoning is relevant anywhere in the world, and for any time as well.

Havel's use of tokens allows him to speak to different audiences at once because the slight variations of his intended meanings broaden and stratify his reach. He is therefore able to hold several conversations simultaneously. In his various discussions about dissidents, he is at once addressing the government who consistently forces a negative connotation of the term, the people of Czechoslovakia, as well as other dissidents world wide. By taking the basic dictionary definition and establish new, positive meanings he is able to recharacterize the term for his purposes and address national and global audiences in the process.

---

<sup>71</sup> Ibid, 73.

<sup>72</sup> Ibid.

The same basic process is used when he redefines the words *circle* and *home*. Taking on new meaning, circle and home become signifiers for something more than their original definition. Havel places in his writing opportunities for readers and listeners to deepen their understanding of his intentions. Through repetition and reinterpretation he creates a language specific to himself and to those willing to follow his intellectual journey. Yet what makes Havel interesting to follow is his commitment to the messages his tokens craft.

Paul Wilson, his official translator, said of Havel, "his power as a writer and his power as a politician come from the same source: his capacity to voice the hopes and fears of people around him." Using his platform as a public intellectual, Havel has said that it is the public person's duty to express concerns and draw global attention to those who cannot do it for themselves. Particular to Havel, is how he instills hope. James Pontuso says that Havel's vision of the future is an optimistic one characterized by a celebration of true diversity and people controlling their own destinies by actively participating in civil society.<sup>73</sup> For many, Havel "spoke the open language of the future."<sup>74</sup>

Couple with his optimism, his natural charm. According to Wilson,

He had everything Western politicians seemed to lack: a clear set of political conviction broad enough to cut across the lines of party politics and the courage of those convictions, for he had gone to prison for them. More than that, his charisma, the aura of a funky Camelot set in the fabled splendor of Prague, the fascination he exercised on intellectuals, artists, pop stars and politicians, and his unshakable faith in the force of his ideal had made him a hero. He seemed the platonic ideal of a philosopher-king made flesh.<sup>75</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Pontuso, 147.

<sup>74</sup> Ibid., 8.

<sup>75</sup> Wilson, "Vaclav Havel in Word and Deed," 22.

Havel came to the political arena a writer and a rebel. His art was characterized by its resistance to the system and its pushing the envelope. Known for underground publications and jail sentences, Havel became the anti-politics politician.

I favour 'anti-political politics', that is, politics not as the technology of power and manipulation, of cybernetic rule over humans or as the art of the useful, but politics as one of the ways of seeking and achieving meaningful lives, of protecting them and serving them. I favour politics as practical morality, as service to the truth, as essentially human and humanly measured care for our fellow humans.<sup>76</sup>

Very much a product of his long suffering under totalitarian rule, Havel outlines his political philosophy. The first issue he chooses to address is power and how it can be used to manipulate masses. Havel wishes to distance politics from power as a means of manipulation. The totalitarian rule (or post-totalitarian) used power to manipulate people and truths according to him. Accordingly, he explained that one of his advantages is that he does not have "a longing or a love for power." In this move, Havel's political astuteness and ambition may be perceived. As he discursively positions himself as freer than those who ground themselves in politics and party, he suggests he is able to act his conscience rather than in a way to maintain his position.<sup>77</sup>

Politics as morality and service to the truth evokes Havel's common themes of living in truth and responsibility. For him, the significance of the truth and responsibility lies in their ability to transform society. By bringing them into the realm of politics, Havel is suggesting that politicians' true power to benefit their people will come from truth and responsibility.

---

<sup>76</sup> Vaclav Havel, "Politics and Conscience," *Living in Truth: twenty one essays published on the occasion of the award of the Erasmus Prize to Vaclav Havel*, ed. Jan Vladislav, (Boston: Faber and Vaber, 1989), 155.

<sup>77</sup> Havel, *Summer Meditations*, 8.

He felt that the political use of power demoralized society and left individuals with an identity crisis or void. With low levels of decency from the government affecting the people, Havel made it his priority to introduce a new political philosophy. According to Sire, "Havel has lived his philosophy," remaining true to his deepest convictions.<sup>78</sup> Insisting on steering clear of traditional politics to maintain his freedom to live in truth, Havel wrote

I refuse to classify myself as left or right. I stand between these two political and ideological front-lines, independent of them. Some of my opinions may seem left-wing, no doubt, and some right-wing, and I can even imagine that a single opinion may seem left-wing to some and right-wing to others- and to tell you the truth, I couldn't care less.<sup>79</sup>

Placing his affiliation with the truth, he maintains that he is responsible to that truth. Havel asserts his independence from traditional molds and finally declares that what others think of his choice makes no difference to him. The articulated persona here is one of unattached objectivity that equally criticizes the political landscape. This public construction of his political self serves to separate himself from other politicians and preserve his image as untainted by politics in general. While here he uses the terms left and right, in other writings he specifically attacks ideologies.

For Havel, ideologies are "closed, ready-made systems of presuppositions about the world." He relates them to "small-mindedness, defeatism, nostalgia, baseness, provincialism, and isolationism" and blames them for the "many expressions of racial or nationalist intolerance, anti-semitism, political extremism, repression of minority rights, xenophobia,

---

<sup>78</sup> Sire, 21.

<sup>79</sup> Vaclav Havel quoted by Elshtain, "A Performer of Political Thought: Vaclav Havel on Freedom and Responsibility," 116.

and even fascism."<sup>80</sup> Havel's rejection of ideologies is multi-tiered. One question he addresses is the "closed" thought, related to provincialism and isolationism. Quite the opposite of cosmopolitanism, he asserts that ideologies prevent a global interest for the better good by focusing only on the local, suggesting a strong sense of nationalism.

Havel makes it a point to mention nostalgia. Very much a part of nationalism, nostalgia suggests the longing for the days when nations and people were easier to identify. Interests were not conflicted and therefore allegiances were simple. As a reaction to globalization, there is a nostalgic move to strengthen nationalism. Havel's incorporating nostalgia in his description of ideologies is poignant because it counters that move by surrounding it with more direct terms that expose the detriments of nationalism.

The rest of his depiction of ideologies is more direct. Stating that they are baseless and promote evils like xenophobia, racial and national intolerance, and fascism among other things, Havel is making a direct claim that nationalism and ideologies are directly related and destructive to society. Accordingly, there is a correlation between nationalist discourses and conflict. He feels that ideologies are contradictory to his notion of human action and thought. Rather, for Havel "life, in its essence, moves toward plurality, diversity, independent self-constitution, and self-organization." Through its dogma and assumptions, ideological thinking become "an attempt against life itself." His refusal to be pigeonholed, to systematize life and constant effort to "think independently, using my own powers of reason" as allowed him to remain "open to everything interesting or persuasive."<sup>81</sup> Dean C. Hammer states that life for Havel is "more plural, nuanced, contingent, and open-ended than can

---

<sup>80</sup> Vaclav Havel quoted by Dean C. Hammer, "Vaclav Havel's Construction of a Democratic Discourse: Politics in a Postmodern Age," *Critical Essays on Vaclav Havel*, ed. Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz and Phyllis Carey, (New York: G.K. Hall & Co., 1999), 145.

<sup>81</sup> *Ibid.*

possibly be grasped by an ideological system."<sup>82</sup> Havel's openness in thought is expressed in his propensity to create his own global cosmopolitan rhetoric that is at once all-encompassing and responsive to audiences beyond nation.

For a global audience, a public intellectual or a politician who is politics-free is curious. Audiences worldwide as well as in Czechoslovakia would be drawn to his potential to maintain objectivity, as per his carefully constructed persona. Havel's critiques of ideologies and politics provide him with the opportunity to take a stance globally that becomes one of the advocate of the people en masse. Telling it like it is despite drawbacks makes Havel more trustworthy to his audiences. Living his philosophy of truth and responsibility, he hoped to help transform how politics operated.

I can try to create around me, in the world of so-called high politics, a positive climate, a climate of generosity, tolerance, openness, broadmindedness, and a kind of elementary companionship and mutual trust. In this sphere I am far from being the decisive factor. But I can have a psychological influence.<sup>83</sup>

Principles of cosmopolitanism like openness, tolerance, and mutual trust are continually incorporated in Havel's agenda. His attention to the big picture, the common good, positions him as a likely and likeable spokesperson for the disenfranchised. In addition, he is also able to serve as a watchdog of politicians. The above passage also demonstrates his modesty which many audience members may find endearing. He has said of himself that he is not "more clever or more ambitious than the rest, but because I seem to get along with people, to be able to reconcile and unite them, to act as a sort of unifying agent."<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> Hammer, 146.

<sup>83</sup> Havel, *Summer Meditations*, 9.

<sup>84</sup> Vaclav Havel quoted by Wilson, "Vaclav Havel in Word and Deed," 22.



Positioning himself as a humble moral conscience, Havel's appeal to global audiences becomes inevitable. By using tokens to articulate his personal understanding of how the world should be, he redefines common words to give them a distinctness to be understood through his lens. This construction of a global cosmopolitan rhetoric coincides with his goal of uniting human kind by holding himself and other public people accountable for their actions is a cosmopolitan goal that defies national borders. As described by Sire, "Vaclav Havel is indeed the unexpected intellectual who has become not only president of his country, but has striven to become the intellectual conscience of international politics as well."<sup>85</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> Sire, 16.

## JIMMY CARTER: SUPPORTING TOKENS WITH ACTION

Jimmy Carter's post-presidential work reflects compassion and commitment to faraway places that extend well beyond his national boundaries, quite unusual for a politician whose exemplary connections to the American South marked his political ascendance. As Douglas Brinkley puts it, "Carter has become a true citizen of the world." This is not a recent rhetorical change for Carter, and in fact one might see a foreshadowing of his broader commitments in his presidential farewell address in which he traded the particular powers of the presidency for the greater abstractions of community and civic responsibility; as Carter said in a passage that sounds more wistful than perhaps even he intended: "In a few days I will lay down my official duties in this office, to take up once more the only title in our democracy superior to that of President, the title of citizen."<sup>1</sup> Since then Carter has helped build homes for the homeless with his own hands, worked to eradicate guinea worm disease through his now well-established Carter Center, extended democracy in country after country by personally promoting free elections and exposing rigged ones, and made peace possible by bringing hostile parties together. His roles and accomplishments have demonstrated how superior the title of citizen can be and have also made him a citizen of the world, a fact recognized when he received the most cosmopolitan recognition of all, the Nobel Peace Prize.

Rod Troester sees Carter as unique, in that he has managed to break the mold of other contemporary former U.S. presidents who have in turn mainly followed the traditional public

---

<sup>1</sup> Excerpted from an essay by Hendrick Hertzberg, *Character Above All: James Carter Essay*, <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/character/essays/carter.html>.

roles of their predecessors. Carter is the only one who "has systematically set out to pursue a particular agenda during his retirement. None has made the kind of contribution to world peace and humanitarian causes that Jimmy Carter has made during his post-presidency."<sup>2</sup> Although this judgment may have to be revised as President Clinton settles into his own post-presidency, Carter's experience is proof that substantial political capital and credibility can remain even after a president leaves office, and can be, as Carter shows, invested in the advancement of humanitarian efforts "at home and abroad" as well as in the development of democracy and diplomacy within and among nations.<sup>3</sup>

The thirty-ninth president of the United States, James Earl Carter, Jr. was born and raised in Plains, GA. The son of a peanut farmer, Carter attended the Naval Academy, served seven years in the Navy, and was Governor of Georgia. While governor, Carter focused on efficient government, ecology, and racial barriers. Raised a Baptist, his religious background permeated all parts of his life. In fact, to this day he still occasionally teaches Sunday School in Plains.<sup>4</sup>

In his speeches and writings, Carter's devotion to global causes and citizens of the world is expressed through story-telling and supported by transcendent references to religious (for Carter, these are almost always specifically Christian) citations. Revered as an elder statesman, his once questionable potential as a political player is now well established as he has emerged into worldwide influence. Perhaps one of the most significant features of Carter's rhetoric is its specific connection of word and deed. In so doing, Carter reveals his

---

<sup>2</sup> Rod Troester, *Jimmy Carter as Peacemaker: A Post-Presidential Biography*, (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1996), 17.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 3.

<sup>4</sup> For further discussion, see Douglas Brinkley *The Unfinished Presidency*, Jimmy Carter, *Our Endangered Values*, and Jimmy Carter's online bio at [www.whitehouse.gov/history/presidents/jc39.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/history/presidents/jc39.html).

own longstanding skepticism about the power of rhetoric and a predisposition likely acquired through his early scientific and military career against talk for the sake of talking. But by closely allying speech and activity (promotional speeches with home building, press conferences with actual election monitoring, etc) he also significantly strengthens his own credibility and by extension the credibility of his causes. His presence serves as an enacted validation of his message, and whether in Africa or in Appalachia, his willingness to show up makes him stand-in as a reliable Everyman and witness to the possibilities of individual action. His writings and speeches thus affirm, to the extent such an affirmation is possible in the lifework of any single person, that his visions for making the world a better place are not only utopian pipe-dreams, but are possible when citizens take on one goal or one challenge at a time.

In his post-presidential writings, Carter's main concern is the well being of the people of the world. Like the cosmopolitan language he utilizes, his efforts are broadly international, positioning the Carter Center as a not-for-profit organization with global reach and capability. While his global efforts alone position him as a cosmopolitan, he also continues to ground himself in the local, with projects in the U.S., and of specific local significance for him in Atlanta. The resulting often delicate balance of global and local interests verifies the symbiotic relationship of cosmopolitanism and nationalism by illustrating how one can at once sustain both personas, and moreover, draw on the symbolic force of both to extend his credibility for multiple audiences. Furthermore, Carter exemplifies how the two roles one might consider wholly at odds may not only co-exist, but also can be enhanced when they are produced and sustained in dialectical tandem.

In addition to the many substantial and award-winning books, Carter's post-presidential writings are also often op-ed pieces in U.S. newspapers deeming the chief target audience American. Still, even when writing for a primarily American audience, Carter keeps his potential international readers in mind. The subjects of his writings usually are international concerns and therefore keeping a broader international audience is beneficial to achieving his goals. For example, a 1997 op-ed piece originally published in the *Washington Times* addressing biotechnology is essentially a call to change U.S. policy on the issue. Yet, Carter simultaneously uses the opportunity to assure the international audience that his concern is for the underdeveloped areas of the world. Additionally, he addresses other "affluent nations" as stalling the process in hopes of nudging them in the right direction as well.<sup>5</sup>

When the forum is international, Carter grounds himself in nation, yet I have observed does not always specifically address an American audience. At the World Health Assembly in Geneva in 2004, he specifically addressed world health leaders, political leaders and the general public. Carter alluded to his presidency and Rosalynn Carter's efforts for mental health "both in the United States and in other nations"<sup>6</sup> which discursively reminds his audience that he is American. Yet an American audience is not directly addressed.

Note worthy is Carter's insistence on incorporating international messages within national texts. Carter's speech in the 2004 Democratic National Convention is a testimony to his national identity complete with references to his military duty, his presidency, and

---

<sup>5</sup> Jimmy Carter, "Forestalling Famine with Biotechnology," *The Washington Times*, July 11, 1997.

<sup>6</sup> Jimmy Carter, "Remarks of Jimmy Carter, former President of the United States of America, at the World Health Assembly," May 9, 2004.

rallying of Americans, particularly Democrats. When speaking about the country's dominant international challenge, he said:

Today, our dominant international challenge is to restore the greatness of America, based on telling the truth, a commitment to peace, and respect for civil liberties at home and basic human rights around the world.<sup>7</sup>

By tagging on the concept of “human rights around the world” Carter is confirming his commitment to global issues, not as an American, but as a citizen of the world. If he had said “civil liberties at home and abroad” the point would have been less poignant because it could be viewed as the traditional nod to the international community. Yet the term *human rights* connotes a global perspective, and its physical separation from “civil liberties” in the passage discursively signifies a separation of thought on Carter's part.

The tokens of cosmopolitanism evident in Carter's writings are broad rather than specific and refer to sweeping categories for action. Words like *human rights*, *mediation*, and *environment* acquire discursive power as Carter overlays them with political implications and religious references. Hinting at what he feels is morally correct, the tokens Carter often uses become tools to explain for audiences what must be done to improve the world. Listeners or readers are offered ample opportunity to redeem these tokens in two ways: the first is in stories of Carter's experience of putting words into action; the second is through his heavy use of internationally accessible examples from the Bible.

In the following, I draw on Carter's post-presidential writings, primarily selections of articles intended for mass audiences, to illustrate how he uses tokens to communicate global principles to his many audiences by reviewing his use of certain words and demonstrating

---

<sup>7</sup> Jimmy Carter, Former President Jimmy Carter's Remarks to the Democratic National Convention, July 26, 2004.

how he fills those words with intense meaning to convey the importance of the issue. In using particular tokens, Carter achieves an otherwise difficult to organize affective response and a sense of immediacy in his writings to garner support for global causes. In order to see how this happens, each of the following sections examines one token, discusses the multiple meanings Carter invests in it, and then explores how he uses the token to negotiate the space between cosmopolitanism and nationalism. I begin with a series of tokens that are also causes: *human rights, environment, health and hunger, and poverty*. The second group of tokens includes words used by Carter to encourage global cooperation. The final section brings these tokens together to review Carter's particular cosmopolitan language, as how he creates a total picture of his global vision for the world.

### **Human Rights**

Scholars like Brinkley and Troester agree that Jimmy Carter was the first to put human rights on the global and national agenda. In *Living Faith*, Carter explains that "as president, I tried to make human rights a core value of my administration".<sup>8</sup> When articulating what he means by "human rights," Carter often starts by naming the principles on which the United States was built. In this move Carter localizes American experience but also, by suggesting for other international audiences the distance yet to be traveled so that idealist goals can be fully achieved, provides a reference point for debating values in a way that does not often seem jingoistic.

As Carter often puts it, "human rights invented America." Referring to the U.S. Constitution, Carter argues that equal freedom (or equal rights and liberty for all) are not

---

<sup>8</sup> Jimmy Carter, *Living Faith*, p. 123.

invented anew in the Constitution but, instead, following on the plain Enlightenment language of the document, the Constitution simply expresses and gives legal codification to universal human entitlements. Still, realizing that this may imply a narrowly nationalistic understanding, Carter supplements this perspective of human rights with one that incorporates a broader perspective. He writes that

...the driving force behind our identity as a society was a hunger for liberty – a hunger that is leading us step-by-step toward equality of opportunity for all citizens. Many other countries around the world are struggling to make the same kind of progress, and they deserve our support. It is surprising to most Americans that people in other nations often define human rights almost exclusively as those that sustain life—the right to adequate food, medical care, a home, education and a job... Yet individual freedoms are the most precious possessions of all in a democracy. Americans are justifiably proud of our Bill of Rights, which guarantees a free press and prevents the government from interfering with our freedoms of expression, assembly, and worship. We cherish our rights to travel freely, to vote, to obtain a free trial, and even to emigrate... There is also protection against discrimination based on sex, age, race, or ethnic origin. These are what we define as human rights.<sup>9</sup>

In this passage, Carter takes into account his international audience as well as a national audience. By parsing the possible meanings of human rights and explaining that where they may differ may depend on varying interpretive perspective, he exposes his reader to the potential of other cultural frames and also grants them legitimacy. Still, to avoid confusion, he clearly states which understanding he is referencing at a given moment. This allows potentially any audience to redeem the token based on his or her own experiences, while the implications of Carter's uses for the token *human rights* remain fairly clear.

In addition to articulating specifically the connotations he applies to the term, Carter also identifies it within a matrix of meaning that preserves a particular hierarchy of value. He

---

<sup>9</sup> Jimmy Carter, "Human Rights: What Rights Do We Share?", *Talking Peace: A Vision for the Next Generation*, (New York: Dutton Children's Books, 1993), 100-101.



explains that those individual freedoms are “the most precious possessions.” In this move, Carter offers his readers an idea of the priorities that should set the stage for his actions as well.

Cosmopolitan rhetors will invariably allow the interests of the global to emerge as well as a component of their persuasive strategies. It might be possible to argue that this will inevitably subvert (if only by a tactic of rhetorical diversion from the scene of local to one of universalism) the interests of any given nation, but Carter’s discourse reveals that in fact, the opposite is true. Consider, for example, Jimmy Carter’s recent and vigorous activism relating to allegations of American human rights violations arising out of the war in Iraq and Afghanistan. In Carter’s distinctive parlance, a continuing interest in America’s shortcomings only lends credence to his commitment to global human rights; in his speeches international human rights protection emerge as a natural progression of his commitment to the cause even when the commitment is activated by a particular disappointment in the performance of his own government. By criticizing the U.S. along with other nations, Carter implicitly establishes a degree of objectivity and impartiality in the global arena, thereby increasing his own worldwide credibility.

In his desire to better his homeland, Carter maintains this balance by negotiating the space between global and local. In his remarks at the conference “Human Rights Defenders on the Frontlines of Freedom” in November 2003 in Atlanta, Georgia, Carter pointed out that the United States had recently made “in my opinion, some very serious mistakes” working “against the spirit of human rights.”<sup>10</sup> He adds that despite this, the U.S. should not be

---

<sup>10</sup> Jimmy Carter, remarks at the conference “Human Rights Defenders on the Frontlines of Freedom,” Nov. 11-12, 2003, Atlanta, GA.

singled out since it is far from the worst violator.<sup>11</sup> In moving back and forth to highlight recent American breaches of human rights, Carter discursively bridges the gap between cosmopolitanism and nationalism. On the one hand, he expresses an opinion unlikely from one wholly attached to and loyal to his attachment to the country. His language is broadly inclusive, with an emphasis on *we* and *us* as opposed to *I* or *me*: “We have continued our efforts, along with many of you, in trying to promote human rights.” The recurring “we” throughout his remarks reassures his audience that Carter is one of them, and only one of many. In fact, in the beginning, he notes that “nobody directly representing any government is here, so we can speak very freely about governments without fear...” Joining the ranks in a common global effort, here Carter enlists himself among the “defenders”<sup>12</sup> as another outsider working to invigorate tired institutions and corrosive state practices.

Carter steps out of ranks temporarily by noting that the recent actions of the U.S. are not a defensible norm. He explains that “we’ve never done that before...I say these things to point out that this is a violation of the basic character of my country, and is very disturbing to me.”<sup>13</sup> Carter at once condemns the actions while also naming them as exceptions to the rule, out of the norm for the United States. His frustration is thus two-fold, one based in an understanding that violations are occurring, and second, because they are being promulgated by his country and with the support of its government. From his comments, one can conclude that he holds the U.S. to a different and higher standard than other countries, and in articulating such a view he stands comfortably in the space between cosmopolitanism and nationalism.

---

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid.

Accordingly, for Carter, *human rights* suggests a necessarily detached sentiment that must apply to all people worldwide. Because “detachment” is relative and Carter’s rhetoric can address the national as well as the international, for clarity he adds another layer of connotation, that of collaborative international effort. In an op-ed piece on needed changes in the U.N. Human Rights Commission, he simply states: “Most serious has been the lack of effective action on emerging human-rights crises that might have been averted with concerted international action.”<sup>14</sup> The prominence he gives international cooperation provides a rhetorical safety net to partly inoculate him against the charge of national or nativist biases. Through the Carter Center, Carter hoped to “promote the concept of the International Criminal Court” that would be authorized to address human rights abuses of people often by their own governments.<sup>15</sup> In addition, that emphasis creates a disposition toward acknowledging multiple interests, valued by the cosmopolitan character. In a question and answer session marking the twentieth anniversary of the Carter Center, Carter reflected on how his vision of human rights has changed over that period. He explained that originally he focused on the rights of occupied peoples, political prisoners, and oppressed populations. Yet he has admittedly broadened that view to include “the right of people to live in peace, to have adequate food and health care, and to have strong voices in choosing their political leaders.” He stresses that “there is no way to separate these crucial rights.”<sup>16</sup>

The third layer that Carter assigns to the meaning of *human rights*, is its direct connection to democracy. An interesting move in the use of a token (here *human rights*) is how Carter uses the ideographic power of the term *democracy* to help strengthen the word’s

---

<sup>14</sup> Jimmy Carter, “Human Rights Commission Must Change,” *San Francisco Chronicle*, Jan. 16, 2006.

<sup>15</sup> Carter “Human Rights Defenders on the Frontlines of Freedom” remarks.

<sup>16</sup> Jimmy Carter, A 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Q&A with President Carter, President Carter Reflects on the Center’s 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary, [www.cartercenter.com/doc105.htm](http://www.cartercenter.com/doc105.htm).

significance. In his discussions, Carter often positions human rights as a basis of or marker for democracy. By linking human rights to the basic principles of democratic life, Carter creates an opportunity for at least part of his audience to redeem the token by tapping into the deeper symbolic significance of the ideograph. In his Nobel Lecture he explains that “democracy ultimately prevailed because of commitments to freedom and human rights...”<sup>17</sup> And in the Twentieth Anniversary Question and Answer, Carter includes the right “to have strong voices in choosing...political leaders” as a crucial right inseparable from the principle of human rights.<sup>18</sup> The meanings broadly associated with democracy, like progressive and tolerant politics, fairness, transparency, and legitimacy, are imported to help the listener achieve an even more detailed sense of what Carter means by “human rights.” His specific inclusions of “choosing political leaders,” “right to live in peace,” and “adequate food and health care” go beyond the generally agreed upon meaning of human rights implying issues of physical abuse to suggest an element of an overall quality of life equally deserved by any human.

## **Environment**

On the environment Carter has written that “all living things are interconnected in a web of cooperation.”<sup>19</sup> According to his understanding, disruption of patterns in the natural world endangers entire species (including humans), and the networks of nature thus are made emblematic of the deeper interconnectivity of human (understood to mean *international*) communities. Referring to the interconnectedness of the world implies that the environment

---

<sup>17</sup> Jimmy Carter, Nobel Lecture, Oslo, Norway, December 10, 2002.

<sup>18</sup> Carter, A 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Q&A with President Carter.

<sup>19</sup> Carter, “Protecting the Environment,” *Talking Peace*, 89.

should be the responsibility of the citizens of the world. Carter rhetorically positions the environment as a global concern and the current problems of pollution, global warming, and general degradation are priorities that evoke the larger shared interests of transnational cooperation: “Until a more cooperative approach can be evolved among all nations, it is unlikely that much progress will be made in improving the world’s environment.”<sup>20</sup> Again, cooperation among all nations becomes the basis and prerequisite for fixing the world’s environmental problems.

*Environment*, when used as a token in his discourse, is redeemable for Carter’s audiences by observance of his own enactment of the principle in the work of the Carter Center. The Environmental Initiative at the Carter Center, for instance, aims to build awareness of the “relationship between the environment and development.” Among its goals, the initiative seeks to prevent and reverse environmental degradation, promote equitable and environmentally sound public policy, and encourage sustainable population policies. A series of public service “advertorials” was launched in 1992, to educate policymakers and raise awareness about the U.N. Earth Summit held that year. Sixteen ads were aired on CNN, U.S. television and radio stations as well as in 140 nations worldwide.<sup>21</sup> The effort to place the ads in 140 nations enforces the point that for Carter, environment focuses on the global while also including the local.

Particularly interesting is his connection of the environment to sustainable development, a move that makes rhetorically obvious the confluence of natural and social networks. Carter argues that in order to achieve the goal of sustainable development in

---

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., 98.

<sup>21</sup> Troester, 46.

developing countries, initiatives must be coordinated by design,<sup>22</sup> which is to say as a product of thoughtful intention and not casual inadvertence. He explains: “You have to make sure that a new democratic government, if it has little experience in governing, is capable; that its long-range plans are comprehensive; and that it works in harmony with other elements within the country.”<sup>23</sup> Carter ties environmental issues to agricultural issues and rationalizes the link with the obvious concerns relating to deforestation and other ecological consequences connected to the degradation of related natural resources (such as clean air and water). His ability to avoid compartmentalizing is also a characteristic of a cosmopolitan. Theories of cosmopolitanism suggest a fluid sense of understanding the world, appreciating its interconnectedness as well as its interdependence. By bringing to light the idea that environmental issues are connected to agricultural issues, which are tied to governmental issues, Carter is displaying his own appreciation of the close relationship of the issues while pointing them out to his audiences. Compartmentalizing issues leans toward over simplifications and shortsightedness while avoidance of compartmentalizing shows a sophisticated understanding and articulation of complex issues and their interaction.

A proponent of genetic engineering, Carter has been endorsing its benefits for years. In a 1998 editorial in the *New York Times*, he argued that none of the products of selective breeding harms the environment or biodiversity. Worth noting is that throughout the article, he draws support for his position from international sources. He cites the Biodiversity Treaty, signed by 168 nations at the 1992 Earth Summit, and experiences apparently showing the successes and safety of genetically engineered crops as in Argentina, Canada, Mexico

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 135.

<sup>23</sup> Jimmy Carter quoted in Troester, 135.

and Australia, as well as introducing the views of experts at the Academy of Science and the World Bank who have been studying the possible risks. Carter ends the article by noting that genetic engineering is particularly important to people in Africa and Southeast Asia, who would otherwise remain “prisoners of outdated technology. Their countries could suffer greatly for years to come.”<sup>24</sup> His use of evidence regarding this issue is cosmopolitan, which is to say that he not only relies on international sources for his information therefore implying that valuable information is found worldwide, legitimizing the varying sources and eliminating possible privileging of national sources. Furthermore, he publicizes the point that developing nations can benefit from these advances to better feed their own people and reduce their national dependence on international assistance. In addition, he clearly positions himself apart from his own national interest because he mentions that the U.S. is not among the nations that have ratified the treaty.<sup>25</sup> Thus he is working as a free agent.

Having established cosmopolitan credentials on the subject, the connection Carter draws between the environment and genetic engineering is also telling. Sometimes pitting the two ideas against each other, he argues for a conceptual reconciliation (by insisting that reliance on both genetic engineering and environmental protection yield win-win politics) and specifically organized cooperation to bring the total benefits of such a strategy to the masses. After an op-ed opening that features global numbers on starvation and malnutrition, he adds,

This is tragic, but it is equally grievous that we have within our power the ability to prevent starvation, but fail to act on it. Existing technologies can increase farmland productivity, but efforts must be made to share these relatively simple techniques...In addition,

---

<sup>24</sup> Jimmy Carter, “Who’s Afraid of Genetic Engineering?”, *The New York Times*, Aug. 26. 1998.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

emerging agricultural biotechnology can play a pivotal role in improving health and nutrition. But now extremist groups in affluent nations have begun to mount attacks against plant biotechnology. They are also concerned that fertilizer and pesticides will ‘poison’ the earth’s farmland, even when used in moderate amounts. This thinking is dangerously misguided. Of course, we must be environmentally responsible in growing food....The world’s farmers will not meet this (population expansion) challenge unless they have access to current planting methods and to continuing breakthroughs in agricultural science and technology.<sup>26</sup>

Positioning biotechnology or genetic engineering as threatened by environmentalists, Carter initially seems to be bracing to undermine the arguments in support of environmental protection. Wrapping the debate in the context of world hunger and nutrition also makes available for his audience another priority. In this case and at this stage of the argument, for Carter, feeding the world trumps saving the environment, a move that rhetorically (and provisionally) prioritizes the immediate and the local over and against the long term and planetary.

But Carter works his way back to a reconciliation of two seemingly conflicting positions. Acknowledging that the heated debate has confused or paralyzed international donors, he explains that, properly used, biotechnology can be beneficial to the environment. As it turns out, at least in his rendition of it, the genetically improved plants actually require fewer chemicals and fertilizers to thrive and fewer areas will have to be slashed and burned to plant new crops. Accordingly, land like forests and wetlands can remain protected, erosion can be reduced, and less chemical pollution will harm the land.<sup>27</sup> No longer is one position or the other demonized, both environment and biotechnology can work together. I would

---

<sup>26</sup> Jimmy Carter, “Forestalling Famine with Biotechnology,” *The Washington Times*, July 11, 1997.

<sup>27</sup> Jimmy Carter, “Advances in Biotechnology Will Save Lives,” *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, Aug. 2, 1998.



like to suggest that generally, cosmopolitan rhetoric is less likely to demonize because in an effort to create a dialectical space where diverse opinions are embraced, demonizing becomes unnecessary.

### **Health and Hunger**

Clearly related to the environmental and agricultural issues are those of health and hunger. As Carter points out when speaking about biotechnology, the importance of producing more and greater quality food, especially for developing nations is immeasurable.<sup>28</sup> In the same way that Carter enveloped environment and agriculture into the larger concerns of world hunger and nutrition, he repeats the same pattern here. In *Talking Peace*, he explains that food, shelter, and health care are “the three basic building blocks of peace”<sup>29</sup> suggesting that in a world where basic human needs are met, war becomes unnecessary. Although potentially overly simple, the goal of conveying the significance of caring for the people of the world is communicated to a wide audience by discursively constructing the tokens of health and hunger.

Initiating Global 2000 with the Sasakawa Association in 1985, Carter proclaims the importance of proper agricultural practices to protect the environment and increase crop yields. Global 2000, Inc. was created to target health problems and agricultural services in developing countries and focused on disease control and crop demonstration projects. Established in 1985, the initiative works with individual countries, improving healthcare conditions and promoting self-sufficiency in food production.<sup>30</sup> The program works by

---

<sup>28</sup> See Carter, “Advances in Biotechnology Will Save Lives” and “Forestalling Famine with Biotechnology.”

<sup>29</sup> Carter, *Talking Peace*, 70.

<sup>30</sup> Troester, 45.

physically going into villages, and teaching farmers techniques like side-by-side farming (where different but mutually beneficial crops are planted next to each other as a way to reduce pest infestation and the need for petrochemical fertilizers and pesticides) and crop storage methods (so that the extraordinarily high amount of crop spoilage can be reduced). In addition, the program helps farm families buy less expensive fertilizer and higher quality seed. Tried on a pilot basis with test farmers and experimental plots, word spread and the program grew. Beginning in 1986, Global 2000 and the Sasakawa Africa Association, a Japanese philanthropic group, partnered and was guided by agricultural specialist Dr. Norman Borlaug, the founder of the so-called Green Revolution that achieved exponential yield gains, especially in Asia in the 1960s and 70s. The first countries were Tanzania, Ghana, Zambia, and Sudan.<sup>31</sup>

In its transnational commitments to intercultural understanding, the project deploys the classic strategies of cosmopolitanism. The effort is not under the exclusive proprietary control of any single country, but rather is a shared international effort. While not all international efforts are cosmopolitan, this can be considered cosmopolitan because it seeks to address transnational problems without looking to benefit the helping nations and the actors are not working as representatives of their countries. Global 2000 is a project designed to alleviate hunger worldwide, not by providing aid with conditions attached but by teaching individuals farming techniques that will generate increased foodstuffs so that families and communities are more fully sustained and healthy. In order to communicate the magnitude of the issue and help secure a place for it on the global agenda, Carter uses tokens like *hunger* and *famine* to remind his audiences of the problems at hand.

---

<sup>31</sup> Carter, "Food, Shelter, and Health Care," *Talking Peace*, 72-73.

Making available cropland as productive as possible is key to reducing hunger and environmental destruction, by sparing other areas for forests and other uses. Responsible biotechnology is not the enemy; starvation is. Without adequate food supplies at affordable prices, we cannot expect world health or peace.<sup>32</sup>

By juxtapositioning the tokens so that a contrastive effect is enacted, the audience is reminded of the priorities at the same time the dangerous and frightening alternatives are called to mind. In the same passage Carter, at once, warns against the danger that interests will come into mortal conflict and also disarms the dichotomy he has suggested by showing how a coordinated, cooperative effort might help solve multiple and apparently intactable problems. And here Carter also uses the tokens evocative of modern-day horror to form a solid foundation that discursively builds priorities, layer upon layer. Building his case from the specific to the general, Carter uses tokens to articulate a cosmopolitan rhetoric that shows his audience how the limited idea of cropland is an essential part of the vast concepts of world health or peace. By layering his concerns, he is able to show how essential intricate pieces are to the big picture. In this case, he expresses concern and solutions for environmental issues, but he also insists that biotechnology is not a demon but will help both the environment and more importantly, feed the hungry. The audience is pulled further along by his suggestion that in order to achieve a healthy world and peace, the hunger issue must be dealt with first. Carter uses this step-by-step process of placing tokens in tiers to build a consensus for the international causes of a cosmopolitan world. That way, the audience agreement is gradual.

Two other health causes Carter has adopted are the eradication of guinea worm disease and polio. Both were targeted by the Carter Center through its Task Force on Disease

---

<sup>32</sup> Carter, "Forestalling Famine with Biotechnology."

Eradication. Guinea worm disease and polio are preventable, the former by avoiding contaminated waters and providing means to purify water, the latter through immunization.<sup>33</sup>

Discussing the successes of the multiple efforts for eradicating these diseases and others and introducing the challenges for humanity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century for *National Geographic*, Carter said

the successes of these efforts reaffirms my faith that this is a time not for despair but for a global commitment to make the most of our scientific knowledge to address the problems of our age...the global fight to control disease, to make our food safe and our water clean,...The problems may seem insurmountable, but they are not. We have the tools; we have brilliant, dedicated people to find answers. All we need is a sense of sharing and the will to change. The will can grow from understanding. Once we understand, we can care, and once we care, we can change.<sup>34</sup>

Disease control and water and food safety are prioritized by Carter as top challenges for our future. He emphasizes the importance of a global team effort in working toward a tangible goal. With words like “we” and “sharing” he places the responsibility on the larger polity. And Carter emphasizes the prerequisite of care and understanding of others to successfully work for changing the world for the better. Again Carter utilizes the strategy of placing tokens in stratum to give his audiences the opportunity to gradually accede to his points. He presents his audience with both the big picture and the little steps taken to improve that picture. By balancing the vast with the specific, Carter is able to offer an argument that articulates both the forest and the trees while expressing how best to approach each.

To be sure, one of the striking requirements for marshaling involvement is the need of specific goals. When adopting a cause and garnering support, Carter insists it

---

<sup>33</sup> Carter, “Food, Shelter, and Health Care,” *Talking Peace*, 83-86.

<sup>34</sup> Jimmy Carter, “Challenges for Humanity: A Beginning,” *National Geographic Magazine*, introduction, Feb. 2002.

...must be based on clear and quantifiable information about individual nations. These should include specific goals to be reached, periodic and accurate measurements of progress (or lack of progress)...the number of public announcements- as blatantly frank as possible. Political leaders and the general public must know...about goals that have been met, achievements realized, and be able to share in the credit and celebrations of victory...At the Carter Center...We select projects based on the potential for significant impact, their relative neglect, where we believe interventions are doable, and which are amenable to a data-driven approach...<sup>35</sup>

Explaining method and tactic at once, Carter offers two overarching pieces of advice. To begin, he stresses the significance of setting specific goals. Read alongside the preceding statement, this is particularly important because it provides a way to overcome the potentially paralyzing and overwhelming nature of the world's problems. Specific goals provide a step-by-step method for reaching the larger broad goal of health: the second piece of advice is also echoed throughout Carter's writings, and relates to the power of sharing: knowledge, responsibility, and successes. Tying himself to the rest of the world, relating to a wider audience, and thereby expanding the universe of available best practices, Carter constantly reinforces the idea that the problems, goals, and benefits of the world belong to all its citizens.

## **Poverty**

Carter balances his time among many humanitarian efforts, but he has repeatedly suggested that the biggest problem the world faces is poverty and the growing income distribution gap. "The greatest challenge facing the world is the growing chasm between the

---

<sup>35</sup> Jimmy Carter, "Remarks of Mr. Jimmy Carter, former President of the United States of America, at the World Health Assembly," World Health Organization, May 19, 2004.

rich and the poor, both between nations and people within nations.”<sup>36</sup> Besides being a key risk factor for illness, Carter also makes note of other global social problems that

this disparity in wealth is growing in parallel with vast improvements in communications, so that the poor are increasingly aware of their relative poverty and of the world’s apparent indifference to their plight. This arouses among them a sense of neglect, hopelessness, and understandable resentment against the powerful and wealthy who are indifferent.<sup>37</sup>

Drawing attention to the plight of the poor worldwide, Carter steps into the realm of the cosmopolitan and becomes their spokesperson, representing their point of view. Because those with the advantage of access to public forums also have the advantage of privilege and the right to speak from a perspective of access to audiences, Carter’s gesture here not only exposes the subject position of the disadvantaged, but also holds the wealthy responsible for their indifference. Using the issue of poverty as a token, Carter therefore overlays it with a sense of moral obligation. When Carter addresses the issue of poverty, it no longer simply means lacking wealth or money, it also encompasses health, wealth, disparity, neglect and resentment as well as the eviscerating indifference of the powerful and wealthy, a fact that only added to the broader indignity and violence done by poverty and disease.

The Carters have made Habitat for Humanity, a program that supplements housing activity already underwritten to some extent private and governmental organizations, a recognizable charitable symbol around the world. Its purpose is to work with indigent people to build or renovate homes. A non-profit organization founded by Millard and Linda Fuller, Habitat for Humanity began in the U.S. and then broadened its horizons to elsewhere in the

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid.

world.<sup>38</sup> Formally beginning in 1976, by the early 1990s, five hundred Habitat affiliates in thirty nations had built 5000 homes. Experiencing an explosion of activity, by 1994, the 30,000<sup>th</sup> house was completed and dedicated and by mid-1995, more than 1,100 affiliates were operating in thirty-five countries.<sup>39</sup>

On the twentieth anniversary celebration of its founding, Carter said, “I get a lot more recognition for building homes in partnership with poor people in need than I ever got for the Camp David Accords or for SALT II...”<sup>40</sup> Explaining his and wife Rosalynn’s participation in Habitat, Carter wrote that

one of the most natural ways to reach out to needy people has been through Habitat for Humanity, with its international headquarters just ten miles from our home. This has become a surprisingly well-known aspect of our post-White House years, although we just send out some fund-raising letters and lead a group of volunteers for one week each year to build homes somewhere in the world. We have done this for more than twenty years... We work side by side with poor families who will be able to own the houses... This has been an enjoyable and heartwarming opportunity for us... and it demonstrates vividly the importance and difficulty of reaching out to needy people.<sup>41</sup>

In discussing their participation in Habitat for Humanity, Carter highlights the personal benefits of limited participation in a worthy cause. He explains that even though “reaching out to needy people” can be difficult, it is both important and personally enjoyable and heartwarming. The work of building is presented not as an experience or a chore, but rather as an opportunity, something one normally strives to attain. Positioning direct assistance for the poor as more a privilege than a burden, Carter offers his audience an expanded meaning for poverty, one that entails a chance for self-betterment consistent with his customary

---

<sup>38</sup> Carter, “Food, Shelter, and Health Care,” *Talking Peace*, 77.

<sup>39</sup> Troester, 153.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 155.

<sup>41</sup> Jimmy Carter, *Our Endangered Values*, (New York: Simon & Shuster, 2005), 185.

discourse of cooperation. Working side by side with those who will benefit financially from the project produces benefits for all, and so Carter focuses on Habitat's global reach and its collaborative methods.

Regardless of the cause, one of the most prominent features of the discourse is Carter's persistent attention to interdependency. Consistently folding one cause in another in a hierarchical base-building approach, Carter utilizes the interconnection of his goals to garner support.

We believe good health is a basic human right, especially among poor people afflicted with disease who are isolated, forgotten, ignored, and often without hope. Just to know that someone cares about them can not only ease their physical pain but also remove an element of alienation and anger that can lead to hatred and violence.<sup>42</sup>

By exposing how each global issue is contingent on the other, Carter benefits from the support another concern may already have garnered, and he reveals the necessary reciprocity in global citizenship. Here Carter articulates how hatred and violence can be contained if care for basic needs is provided early enough. And finally, his approach also expresses the domino effect of global issues and intentionally highlights how each issue needs to be dealt with in conjunction with other issues. While maintaining the need to have limited attainable goals to measure success, Carter stresses the inseparability of issues, and the inseparability of people as well. This passage illustrates how Carter discursively presents separate goals in conjunction with one another to engage a wide audience in hopes of finding several ways to connect with different groups. It also helps to demonstrate how he perceives the world and its issues: as one interconnected whole. Combining interests allows Carter to unify his audiences that may be separated by different histories, experiences, and nations.

---

<sup>42</sup> Jimmy Carter, Introduction, *Health: A Global Goal*, Donald R. Hopkins, (National Geographic Books, 2003).



The second group of tokens used by Carter to relate to a wide audience derive from the prominence of cooperation in his global activism. This cooperation is evident in his actions as well as his articulation of goals and issues. Known for his peace efforts, especially in the Middle East, and the Camp David accords specifically, Carter has trusted in the power of the many, reinforcing his idea that global issues are better solved by group rather than individual efforts. Believing that challenges and accomplishments must be shared, he uses several tokens repeatedly to communicate this message to his audiences, including *mediation*, *reconciliation*, *understanding*, *diplomacy*, and *partnership*.

### **Mediation**

It is possible to understand mediation simply as the process of third party negotiation. But in Carter's usage of the concept, the definition is expanded to include connotations that make it operate as a persuasive token. A part of this persuasive effectivity derives from the fact that the term is a form of specific embodiment, where Carter is transformed into a peacemaker by the very fact of his presence, as in this example: hailed for his efforts and accomplishments by the Nobel Prize committee, upon the announcement of his award, Gunnar Berge of the Committee said of Carter, "he was, and continues to be, the mediator who seeks peaceful solutions to international conflicts."<sup>43</sup>

In a 1996 interview for the "Preventive Diplomacy in Action Video," Carter articulated more fully his meanings of mediation. As a process, Carter says the first step is to "explore the situation." He makes a public statement that he is "not mediating, I'm on a pre-mediating

---

<sup>43</sup> Gunnar Berge, Presentation Speech by Gunnar Berge of the Norwegian Nobel Committee, Oslo, Dec. 10, 2002.

mission.”<sup>44</sup> The purpose is to meet with as wide a range of people as possible, let his meetings be known, and build up an element of trust. Additionally, this allows him to be viewed as an outsider, someone objective and impartial.<sup>45</sup>

Carter has also said that in mediation, “every time any side makes a concession, that the benefits exceed what they give up...It has to be a win-win situation.” To illustrate this point to his audience, Carter points to a case where he mediated a first step agreement between two regional leaders. He stresses the importance of having “a carrot or a promise” that if constructive steps toward an agreement are made, there will be clear, tangible benefits in return. This conception of mutual benefits makes trust and its establishment a key requisite for successful mediation:

One of the key elements is being trusted by the people who are there. We have massive programs in agriculture, in health care, things of that kind, which lets the leaders of—a country, either the ruling party or opposition forces, develop an awareness of what we do and a trust in me personally and in what the Carter Center can do. So, I think the trust of the participants or the disputants in the mediator is a prerequisite.<sup>46</sup>

Explaining in detail the implications of his use of the word and thereby providing an opportunity for his audience to redeem the token, he explains that often he gains trust as the earned aftermath of his actions, both personally and through the Center. Trust is, therefore, a significant element to his notion of mediation. His is a personal enactment of trust formation expressed in how he conducts himself is further proof that action can serve as token redemption opportunities by giving his audience opportunity to witness his commitment to what he says.

---

<sup>44</sup> Jimmy Carter, Interviewed by Glenn Baker for ADM’s “Preventive Diplomacy in Action Video,” Oct. 17, 1996.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid.

Carter's accomplishments are thus deployed as opportunities for redemption while illustrating additional layers to the meaning of the token. To explain to the audience the importance of having one single document for all parties, he spoke of Camp David.

I had a single document, they both know, and they know that I wouldn't lie to them, and eventually we got down to the point where they could both agree on the same text. And that's basically the approach that I've taken in every place I go.<sup>47</sup>

Stressing fairness and transparency, Carter packs the token *mediation* with more layers of meaning. Creating ample opportunity for his audiences to fully understand what the word implies to him, he is able to use it to relate more than just the dictionary definition.

*Mediation* develops greater impact as a rhetorical token because Carter infuses it with more meanings. For Carter, mediation also means objectivity, transparency, trust, fairness, encouragement, and benefits for all involved. Because he uses the word in contexts that are transnational and for purposes of welcoming inclusion and embracing diversity, the token assumes a cosmopolitan discursive power.

## **Reconciliation**

Carter "seeks to find the common ground that can lead to trust, understanding, reconciliation, and ultimately, the resolution of the conflict."<sup>48</sup> An element in conflict resolution, reconciliation is a cornerstone of Carter Center programs. Hoping to encourage others to appreciate different points of view, Carter wrote

We at the Carter Center have adopted a number of principles for making and keeping peace within and between nations. One of the most basic is that in political, military, moral, and spiritual

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid.

<sup>48</sup> Troester, 171.

confrontations, there should be an honest attempt at reconciliation of differences before resorting to combat. The fact is that in most cases...there is enough common ground between adversaries to avoid violence and to permit people to live as neighbors, even if their differences are not resolved...there must be a basic desire for peace, enough respect for opponents to communicate with them, a willingness to reexamine one's own beliefs, and the personal and political courage to employ the principles of dispute resolution.<sup>49</sup>

Making sure to fully develop his notion of reconciliation, Carter begins with the most fundamental level of its understanding, which is the willingness to make and keep peace. He maintains that combat is the last resort and all efforts must be made to avoid it. Hence, Carter discursively constructs the term reconciliation to suggest that involved parties should forego the possibility of war (at least for the time being) and focus all their efforts on peace.

Part of Carter's understanding of reconciliation is the assumption that even adversaries have common ground and common values. A cosmopolitan understanding, this assumption adds to his connotation of the token that basically people are enough alike to be able to manage peaceful solutions. His comment on the avoidance of violence is a move toward demilitarization, encouraging nations to restrain and lessen the possibility of combat. Acknowledging that agreements are not easily produced, the implicit idea that people can live side by side while still disagreeing, is nonetheless sustained.

The final point Carter makes in his articulation of reconciliation is his valorization of dialogue. For him, open, honest dialogue is an indispensable element of reconciliation. Following the requirement for the "basic desire for peace," Carter immediately defends the requirement of "enough respect for opponents to communicate with them." Making mutual respect a precondition of dialogue imposes a de facto sense of equality on the reconciliation

---

<sup>49</sup> Jimmy Carter, "Searching for Peace," *Essays on Leadership*, Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict, (New York: Carnegie Corporation of New York, Dec. 1998), 27.

process. Communication forces interaction. Equality sustained through interaction provides Carter's definition of the token with an obligatory congeniality and diplomacy. He continues by defending the importance of self-reflection (the "willingness to re-examine one's own beliefs"), which adds the acceptance of the humbling possibility that one's position may be wrong, or require adjustment. And finally, Carter's token of *reconciliation* includes having the "courage" to follow the previous guidelines. Clearly an incentive to accept his notion of reconciliation, those able to recognize his implied meanings will not only be rewarded with peace, but also a badge of honor and courage.

In a 2001 House Dedication Ceremony in South Korea, the evening's theme was reconciliation. More than twenty nations were gathered at the "Village of Reconciliation" designed to culminate in national reconciliation and lasting peace. On the occasion, Carter said

I look on Habitat for Humanity as a movement for reconciliation,  
a breaking down of barriers between those who might be different...  
Reconciliation is a matter of binding those who are different...<sup>50</sup>

Adding yet another layer to his token reconciliation, here he emphasizes the purpose of bridging differences while recognizing them, a cornerstone in his cosmopolitan rhetoric. Maintaining healthy diversity does not weaken the possibility of coexistence, bonding, and peace.

---

<sup>50</sup> Jimmy Carter quoted in Habitat for Humanity International, Jimmy Carter Work Project 2001, JCWP2001 Closing Ceremonies, <http://www.habitat.org/jcwp/2001/aug10c.html>.

## Understanding

According to Erwin Hargrove, historian and Carter presidential biographer, Carter “did not see the world as inherently evil and sought peace through understanding rather than confrontation.”<sup>51</sup> Honored on numerous occasions, including the 1999 Delta Prize for Global Understanding and the 1994 J. William Fulbright Prize for International Understanding, Carter’s perception of *understanding* manifests itself through his actions as well as his use of the word. For Carter *understanding* as a rhetorical token is constructed to include compassion, compromise, and being (well) informed and knowledgeable about a subject. *Understanding* contributes to a cosmopolitan rhetoric because when used in a global sense it evokes cosmopolitan sensibilities like the appreciation of difference and diversity and the tendency to acknowledge other viewpoints.

When discussing the necessary qualities of mediators, Carter said, “they must be patient, understanding, and neutral enough to be trusted by both sides.”<sup>52</sup> This use of understanding suggests compassion in order for the mediator to work out an amicable, “win-win” situation for the parties involved. With respect to patience and neutrality, understanding does not compromise objectivity, but it does ensure a humaneness that may be overlooked when neutrality alone becomes the only priority. Carter explains that *understanding* is not necessarily an official matter: “to work for better understanding among people, one does not have to be a former president... Peace can be made in the neighborhoods, the living rooms, the playing fields...”<sup>53</sup> Stressing the importance of

---

<sup>51</sup> Erwin Hargrove quoted in Troester, 171.

<sup>52</sup> Carter, “Human Rights,” *Talking Peace*, 117.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 176.

understanding as compassion, Carter uses the term to show that anyone can participate in making peace. He explains:

God's world is very large, a world we should always explore, to comprehend the problems of troubled people who may be hungry for what we could offer...As we expand our lives and do things that are challenging, innovative, and unpredictable, we can know what it means to be filled with joy and the peace that passes understanding.<sup>54</sup>

In order to reach understanding, Carter outlines steps that include comprehending problems and then organizing action toward solving those problems. *Understanding* in this context comes from the joy and peace to be found in helping others. Furthermore, Carter points out the vastness of the world and the need to incorporate as much of it as possible into one's life by developing an appreciation for it. By describing the world as one, large entity, Carter deterritorializes place and offers a cosmopolitan view.

Another side of *understanding* that Carter defends in his writings is the idea of compromise. When discussing his Ethiopia experience he reflected: "yet we still helped to achieve a cease-fire in the country for over a year- and let the different groups begin to understand and acknowledge one another, a crucial step for the eventual democratization of the country."<sup>55</sup> In the process of fostering a peaceful solution to Ethiopia's problems, Carter noted the achievement of the groups "understanding and acknowledging one another." On the one hand, it is customary for Carter to mark the smaller steps that lead to the major goals, as here he specifically states that it is a "crucial step" in the right direction. Yet specific to the token *understanding*, it is used to suggest a compromise as the different groups began to communicate, acknowledge, and work together for a peaceful solution. In reaching an

---

<sup>54</sup> Jimmy Carter, *Living Faith*, (New York: Random House, Inc. 1996), 255-256.

<sup>55</sup> Carter, *Talking Peace*, 124.

agreement for a cease-fire, each side must not only gain something, but relinquish something as well, and therefore, in *understanding* Carter has instilled the added connotation of compromise.

Nestling the token within a broader context also allows Carter to use the power of the other terms to add significance to the word *understanding*. The intensity of understanding as becoming informed or knowledgeable is conveyed when he explains that “people in many nations have come to understand what freedom and democracy mean and to demand better lives for themselves.”<sup>56</sup> The imposing words of freedom and democracy reinforce the discursive power of the token “understand” by lending it intensity and significance and most importantly, historical and inculcated associations likely to resonate with local audiences. Genuine understanding for Carter is not a superficial familiarity of a subject, issue, or situation, but rather a deeply informed knowledge that is given weight by the collection of different types of information and coupled with a want to fully appreciate a total situation. To “understand what freedom and democracy mean” entails more than a dictionary definition of freedom and democracy. It requires an in depth appreciation that may be acquired globally by the general flow of information and experiences as noted by Appadurai or by the local struggles withstood by different peoples worldwide. Though different experiences and different avenues of obtaining an appreciation for the words freedom and democracy, for example, a cosmopolitan rhetoric functions to overcome those differences and find common ground in the broader sense, creating a familiarity that diminishes those gaps. Accordingly, while ideographs alone lose their intensity and persuasive power in a cosmopolitan arena, with tokens they can function to lend the tokens reinforcement.

---

<sup>56</sup> Ibid., 104.



Carter suggested a similar implication of understanding in his Nobel Prize lecture: “But tragically, in the industrialized world there is a terrible absence of understanding or concern about those who are enduring lives of despair and hopelessness.”<sup>57</sup> Negating the token with “absence of” does not alleviate the depth of the meaning of understanding. In this particular passage, Carter’s use of understanding conjures the three previous meanings. It suggests compromise because in commenting about the poverty gap, he encourages the wealthy to concede some (minimal) amount of that wealth for the betterment of the global population. Compassion is evoked because he reminds his listeners of the despair and hopelessness by use of an explicitly emotional appeal. He also instills the meaning of being informed and knowledgeable in his use of understanding by stating that the industrialized world is all but ignorant of this global problem.

Crystallizing his personal and cosmopolitan meaning of understanding, Carter wrote:

...challenges for humanity in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (include): the global fight to control disease, to make our food safe and our water clean, to live together fruitfully in megacities. The problems may seem insurmountable, but they are not. We have the tools; we have brilliant, dedicated people to find answers. All we need is a sense of sharing and the will to change. The will can grow from understanding. Once we understand, we can care, and once we care, we can change.<sup>58</sup>

Carter outlines what he sees as the challenges for the 21<sup>st</sup> century in the global context, for all humanity as a unifying mechanism. Creating a sense of togetherness and drawing upon the global cosmopolitan persona constructed through his tokens, he illustrates how understanding is a prerequisite for meeting those challenges. The nuanced articulation of understanding thus also encompasses all three meanings.

---

<sup>57</sup> Carter, Nobel Prize Lecture, 2002.

<sup>58</sup> Carter, “Challenges for Humanity: A Beginning.”

Therefore, within the token understanding, Carter places being informed and knowledgeable, compromise, and compassion. His use of the word can vary, but typically audiences are offered ample opportunity to redeem the token within the text because he surrounds it with weighty words like care, freedom, disparity, and peace that lend *understanding* its depth and multidimensionality. In 1999 he, with Rosalyn Carter and the Carter Center were awarded the Delta Prize for Peace and Global Understanding. In his acceptance speech he remarked “peace and global understanding are two subjects that don’t get enough attention.” Further, he insisted that his hope “is that those words – peace and global understanding – can be more widely and prevalently absorbed as part of our consciousness.”<sup>59</sup> The significance of this award is two fold. First, the fact that Carter was honored for his efforts in global understanding makes the token particularly persuasive because it confirms his commitment to understanding based on his accomplishments. Second, his comments upon receiving the award are poignant because he chose speak as a cosmopolitan and use the opportunity to stress that the worlds problems are caused by people’s inability to communicate respectfully<sup>60</sup> and to reinforce his wish that global understanding become a more integral part of our being. By focusing on global issues and encouraging global action, he uses the token in cosmopolitan efforts to join the world and address it as a single entity.

---

<sup>59</sup> “President Carter honored for ‘waging peace,’ Mrs. Carter, Carter Center also share inaugural Delta Prize for Global Understanding,” [www.uga.edu/news/deltaprize/1999Carter/99award.html/](http://www.uga.edu/news/deltaprize/1999Carter/99award.html/).

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

## Partnership

Partnerships, collaborative efforts, and teamwork are cornerstones in Carter's global work. With his wife Rosalynn, Carter established the Carter Partnership Award, which aims to build and strengthen healthy, caring communities in the U.S. and throughout the world.<sup>61</sup> Hoping to foster civil society, Carter uses partnership as a way to encourage involvement, ownership, and community. Often referring to Begin and Sadat as his partners in peace, Carter constructs partnership as an essential part of mediation, reconciliation and the overall success of the global projects.

The Carter Center itself is necessarily based on partnerships that leverage greater resources than it can alone raise, on non-partisan efforts with Democrats and Republicans that leverage expanded political power, and joint projects including representation from many international entities. Reinforcing the notion that global challenges are solvable by cooperation, Carter's partnership helps him emphasize the importance of collaboration.

By using the word *partnership*, Carter illustrates how global efforts require an international team for success. One of Carter's most prominent partners is Japanese philanthropist Ryoichi Sasakawa. A strong supporter of the Carter Center, together Sasakawa and Carter publicized their partnership goals to wage peace and wipe out world famine.<sup>62</sup> With regard to biotechnology and its potential to help alleviate famine and malnutrition, Carter and Sasakawa's partnership was involved in a grassroots agricultural effort in twelve African countries. Carter stated

we work with heads of state, ministries of agriculture, international development agencies and more than 600,000 small-scale farm

---

<sup>61</sup> Michigan Campus Compact, "Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter's Partnership Award for Campus Community Collaboration," 2005.

<sup>62</sup> Brinkley, 187-188.

families. Through this collaboration, we have proved it is possible to double, triple and even quadruple crop yields, using existing technology.<sup>63</sup>

In this passage, Carter explained the involvement of the many countries involved as well as the different tiers of involvement from heads of state to farm families. By elaborating on the scope of participation, he is expressing how the success of the project, in large part, is due to the extent of the “collaboration.”

Further credit to the benefits of partnerships, when asked about the institutional impact of the Carter Center and what difference it has made to conventional understanding of the nature of nongovernmental institutions, he replied

...The Carter Center has established a new paradigm for non-governmental organizations (NGOs)...We offered our services globally, in the realms of peace, freedom, democracy, human rights, environmental quality and alleviation of human suffering. We have formed partnerships with dozens of other governmental and private organizations in the pursuit of these goals...<sup>64</sup>

The new paradigm Carter refers to includes partnerships which strengthen the Center’s clout, help grant it legitimacy in the areas they are working, and provide them with opportunity to work successfully with the different groups involved. There are two separate dimensions to this statement. First of all, by “new paradigm” Carter suggests that besides being a transnational NGO, the Carter Center established the blending of research institution or think-tank with a center with on the ground capabilities. While perhaps other NGOs have followed suit, this statement indicates that the Carter Center was a pioneer in this move. One of the benefits highlighted by Carter is the Center’s capability to produce “in-depth analyses

---

<sup>63</sup> Carter, “Forestalling Famine With Biotechnology.”

<sup>64</sup> Carter, “A 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Q&A with President Carter.”

of complicated issues.’<sup>65</sup> The second dimension is in effect not stated but inherent: that a great part of the success of the Center comes from Carter himself. By borrowing from his clout and legitimacy as a former leader of the free world and his worldwide accomplishments since (both his cosmopolitan persona and his national persona), Carter’s successes in collaborative efforts are used as social capital to the benefit of the Center. By organizing a collaborative effort, Carter is able to achieve goals more easily and perhaps more often.

Continuing his discussion he concludes

We have learned how important nongovernmental organizations can be in peace-making or other crucial roles when they are the only ones permitted or willing to intercede in sensitive matters. We have learned the value of active partners, including foreign governments, private foundations, the CDC, and major pharmaceutical corporations ... We’ve learned to involve the top national leaders in troubled countries, and to emphasize positive results based on these partnerships...<sup>66</sup>

Marking the value of partners and partnership in lessons learned, Carter uses the token to express how they can help ensure success. His partnerships consistently include international representation from multiple arenas and multiple levels of involvement. Moreover, by sharing the credit of success, he encourages future involvement by multiple entities. Carter uses partnership as a place for cosmopolitan entities to be mutually involved and invested in global issues.

## **Peace**

As a token, *peace* takes on new meaning internationally, since the stakes are enormously raised by the prospects that international conflict can produce apocalypse.

---

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

Carter's quest for global peace allows him to use the word in numerous places, and in various ways. Winning the 2002 Nobel Peace Prize, in his lecture, he explained that his goal is to "seek an end to violence and suffering throughout the world."<sup>67</sup> His discussions on peace consistently refer to the world and to the global. His concern for peace is thus a cosmopolitan concern. Later in the lecture he said

I am not here as a public official, but as a citizen of a troubled world who finds hope in a growing consensus that the generally accepted goals of society are peace, freedom, human rights, environmental quality, the alleviation of suffering, and the rule of law.<sup>68</sup>

Carter has positioned himself as a citizen of the world and peace as a global concern. Accordingly he can effectively represent issues of peace from multiple points of view. Locating peace among the goals of society suggests that it is an agreed-upon fact that citizens of the world are working for global peace.

Regularly coupling peace with human rights, Carter crafts the token in contrast to war, that "the existence of war is incompatible with our basic needs as human beings: a stable home, food, and healthcare, a life free from fear and persecution."<sup>69</sup> Thus, the center was designed to

address the issues of education, health, the environment, human rights, and, of course, global conflict. Most of all, I wanted the Carter Center to be a place where people from all walks of life and religious and ethnic backgrounds could come to seek peaceful resolutions to troubling and complicated problems.<sup>70</sup>

Simply stating the complexity of his ideas, Carter articulates peace as the conceptual apparatus at the heart of his Center. Moving from an interest in education all the way to

---

<sup>67</sup> Carter, Nobel Lecture, Dec. 10, 2002.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> Carter, "Waging Peace," *Talking Peace*, 27.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid., 28.

concerns about global conflict, he provides the reader with a step-by-step articulation of ever more serious threats, all the while implicitly stressing their commonality in a politics of cynicism and greed. Incorporating the concept of diversity in religion, nationality, and ethnicity, he seeks to find a particular niche for the Center and its distinctive place in the global arena as a research and outreach operation competing with many others for attention and resources. And finally, by reinforcing the main goal of peace, the Carter Center positions itself as able to help global citizens meet the challenges of increasingly complicated issues in peaceful ways. The token peace, as used by Carter, takes on the meaning of the ultimate challenge, the ultimate goal and in using the term that way, Carter himself takes on the persona of a cosmopolitan.

According to Troester, Carter's personal commitment to peace and the Carter Center have provided a forum to further the cause. Carter's post-presidential credibility and the stature of his good offices as a mediator have proven invaluable, significant tools in the peacemaking work of the Carter Center.<sup>71</sup> The Carter Center's mission, as envisioned by Carter himself,

...is founded on the principle that everyone on earth should be able to live in peace. In pursuit of this goal, the center has earned an international reputation for bringing people and resources together to resolve conflict, foster democracy and development, and fight hunger, disease, and human rights abuses...<sup>72</sup>

According to this statement, Carter's vision for accomplishing peace is a multiple step process, possible through the activities and programs of the center. Peace is only possible when a person's basic needs are met. Carter sees "the three basic building blocks of peace

---

<sup>71</sup> Troester, 39.

<sup>72</sup> Carter, *Talking Peace*, 29.

[as] food, shelter, and health care.”<sup>73</sup> Not only are the priorities discursively placed in a stratified manner, but the Center’s strategy for achieving those goals are also layered, beginning with basic, specific needs and then expanding to the broader more ambitious goal. Therefore, his rhetorical strategy matches his plans of action and reinforces the idea that his accomplishments serve as proof of his commitment to his statements.

The token *peace* is used by Carter as an ultimate goal that can be more easily reached by global efforts to ensure citizens of the world their basic needs. Therefore, the word, when used by him, evokes a consideration that without food, shelter, and proper health care, people cannot be expected to live peacefully. His use of this token reminds his audiences that a global effort must be made to alleviate the physical suffering to be able to restore peace and order to the world. The emphasis, then, becomes cosmopolitan because the goals are global, without regard to any particular national benefits and those who can take action are citizens of the world.

The next stage of meaning that *peace* takes on for Carter is its contrast to *war*. He explains the difference early in his presidency:

Peace is not the mere absence of war. Peace is action to stamp out international terrorism. Peace is the unceasing effort to preserve human rights. And peace is a combined demonstration of strength and goodwill. We will pray for peace and we will work for peace.<sup>74</sup>

While peace is the opposite of war, for Carter, it is an ongoing process that requires constant conscious effort, action, demonstration and work.<sup>75</sup> Not assuming a constant or stable form, peace is fluid and ever-changing.

War and peace were also juxtaposed in the Nobel Lecture:

---

<sup>73</sup> Carter, “Food, Shelter, and Health Care,” *Talking Peace*, 70.

<sup>74</sup> Jimmy Carter, *A Government as Good as Its People*, (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1977), 205.

<sup>75</sup> Troester, 28-29.



War may sometimes be a necessary evil. But no matter how necessary, it is always an evil, never a good. We will not learn how to live together in peace by killing each other's children. The bond of our common humanity is stronger than the divisiveness of our fears and prejudices. God gives us the capacity for choice. We can choose to alleviate suffering. We can choose to work together for peace. We can make these changes- and we must.<sup>76</sup>

Combining both tiers of meaning, Carter evokes his use of peace that contains the basic human condition as well as his notion of peace that changes it to a verb from a noun. In this passage, the intensity of the token is nuanced by the description of war as always an evil, the image of killing each other's children, and the comparison to the bond of common humanity. He combines all the elements he previously used separately to create a compact, forceful notion of his peace. The explanation provides ample opportunity for his audiences to redeem and fully comprehend Carter's use of the token *peace*.

### **Carter's Cosmopolitanism**

With regard to Carter's 1994 "peripatetic peace missions" to Sudan, Haiti, North Korea and Bosnia, Douglas Brinkley wrote that never before Jimmy Carter has an ex-president been in so many international headlines. Brinkley noted that "the dark-horse presidential aspirant journalists had dubbed 'Jimmy Who?' early in 1976 had become 'Jimmy Everywhere'."<sup>77</sup> Maintaining a balance between nationalist and cosmopolitan, Carter negotiates that space by addressing the two aspects of his identity in tandem. His feet clearly planted on the ground in the United States and in Georgia specifically, his concern for his nation is exemplified in his latest book *Our Endangered Values*.

---

<sup>76</sup> Carter, Nobel Lecture.

<sup>77</sup> Brinkley, xii.

*Our Endangered Values* is a critique of American politics and Carter's indictment of the current leadership's mistakes. In it he discusses national polarization, the policy changes of the Bush administration, and the social trends that he feels are threatening the qualities that made his nation great.<sup>78</sup> In the "Introduction" he writes

Our people have been justifiably proud to see America's power and influence used to preserve peace for ourselves and others, to promote economic and social justice, to raise high the banner of freedom and human rights, to protect the quality of our environment, to alleviate human suffering, to enhance the rule of law, and to cooperate with other peoples to reach these common goals.<sup>79</sup>

Clearly rallying the American people around the notions of national pride, freedom, and justice, the passage also serves as a reminder that there is a world beyond our national borders. The rhetorical tokens of *human rights* and *peace* suggest an international arena. The use of America's power and influence force his audience to think globally. Finally, cooperation and common goals serve as a reminder that there are ties that bind the nation to the world. Though capable of negotiating the space between the local and the global, this book privileges the national. Firmly planting his feet in the U.S., Carter presents the public with a text that asserts himself as all-American. Reverting to nation, I argue, does not diminish his cosmopolitan stature. In fact, I submit that shift is both due to and informed by his cosmopolitanism. It is informed by his cosmopolitan sensibilities because as a critique of America's direction, he is opposing the nationalistic tendencies that threaten the country's morals. Because of his global awareness and cosmopolitan understanding, he is able to accurately assess the potential damage of the general direction of the nation, which he feels is

---

<sup>78</sup> For further discussion see Carter, *Our Endangered Values*.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, 1.

led by the current administration. While on the one hand this book is a testament to the value of nations and its significance to identification, on the other hand, it could not have been possible without Carter's awareness of and responsiveness to the necessary cosmopolitan ideals. In addition to being a way to demonstrate his high regard for nation, *Our Endangered Values* also verifies Carter's vision of the world and his place as a cosmopolitan.

Carter's remarks at the funeral of Coretta Scott King follow suit. As national heroes, Martin Luther King Jr. and Coretta Scott King's legacy is primarily an American one. But Carter opens up the frame, noting how "they exemplified the finest aspects of American values and brought upon our nation the admiration of the entire world."<sup>80</sup> In one move, Carter transposes American values to a place of esteem and also connects them to the significance of being worth of global respect. Marking their significance globally, he observes "the essence of human ambitions that bind us all together in those countries in the world that admired the King family and what they meant."<sup>81</sup> Placing them in the international arena helps him to establish the connection between global and local. A balance between local and global continues throughout his brief remarks. Particularly interesting is his translation of the (national) Civil Rights movement. To accentuate the King legacy he says

They led a successful battle to alleviate the suffering of blacks and other minorities and, in promoting civil rights in our country, they enhanced human rights in all nations...<sup>82</sup>

Civil rights *nationally* becomes human rights *globally*. Discursively shifting attention from the U.S. experience to the world, Carter considers the traumatic experiences of other nations

---

<sup>80</sup> Jimmy Carter, "Remarks by Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter at the Coretta Scott King Funeral," Feb. 10, 2006.

<sup>81</sup> Ibid.

<sup>82</sup> Ibid.

as legitimate as those of his own nation. Where nationalism would tend to perceive a nation's own history and experiences as more or greater than those of other nations, Carter bridges the gap by equating the suffering of others with the suffering of the American blacks. With this translation, Carter expands his audience as well as the audience for the King legacy and shows the world more common ground and greater understanding.

While broadening the national to the global arena, Carter also holds the national to a higher standard. In *Our Endangered Values*, he asserts that the US is losing its influence globally because of

special favors for the powerful at the expense of others, abandonment of social justice, denigration of those who differ, failure to protect the environment, attempts to exclude those who refuse to conform, a tendency toward unilateral diplomatic action and away from international agreements, an excessive inclination toward conflict, and reliance on fear as a means of persuasion.<sup>83</sup>

Including many of the causes he works for like the environment, international agreements and peace, Carter fills this list with his tokens that represent his concerns. In addition to being policies, plans of action, or global issues they are tokens that help him express a detailed cosmopolitan vision. For him, they are the key to a better world, not just for the US, but for every nation. Yet his added personal discomfort is inflamed by the Bush administration's hostility to cosmopolitan politics and ideals and comes from the fact that his own nation is neglecting those values. To remedy the situation he writes

I am convinced that our great nation could realize all reasonable dreams of global influence if we properly utilized the advantageous values of our religious faith and historic ideals of peace, economic and political freedom, democracy, and human rights.<sup>84</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Carter, *Our Endangered Values*, 43-44.

<sup>84</sup> *Ibid.*, 101.

Again laden with the tokens he uses to present his global vision, Carter compresses his cosmopolitan ideals into a single sentence. He assures his local audience that America has the power to be great, to be influential and powerful if it uses its values properly. In the process, he is also assuring his global audience that the interests like peace, human rights, and democracy will be better preserved by the United States. Giving his national audience its place and glory allows him to criticize as he is criticizing himself. “Our great nation” is his.

Still, the larger global canvas is never entirely ignored or forgotten. Besides being firmly planted in nation, he is also firmly planted in the world. After leaving office, he consciously took on the role of global citizen. On his farewell address he noted in retrospect

As a global citizen it seemed important to act on these reports, not just stick them in a drawer and wish the problems away. My farewell address was an attempt to issue a warning about the insanity of the nuclear arms race, the horror of international human rights violations, and the need for tougher worldwide environmental cleanup and preservation efforts.<sup>85</sup>

His use of his farewell address to offer advice about global issues provides another example of how Carter utilizes the national to address the global, while also forcing his nation to keep the global arena on the agenda. Primarily significant in this statement, though, is that while discussing his farewell address, he labels himself as a global citizen (as opposed to a private, national citizen). This illustrates his cosmopolitan identity.

Dancing on the line between nationalism and cosmopolitanism, as some political figures do, can suggest that one is almost afraid to be steadfastly committed to either vision. Yet Carter exemplifies how one can be resolute in both identities, without compromising either. His sense of pride and sense of concern about the history and future of America

---

<sup>85</sup> Carter quoted in Brinkley, 33.

clearly show that he is a proud nationalist who values his country. The way in which he uses every opportunity given him to address global issues, to force the U.S. into the global arena, and to live as a citizen of the world expresses his cosmopolitan identity in an unquestionable way. The tokens that he has developed to articulate his ideas are based on specific issues and values that bond the human experience and stress its commonality while celebrating its diversity. Carter's close friend Ted Turner summed it up when he said

He is extremely competent, a fabulous fly fisherman, a crack shot, possessed with an uncanny intelligence, well versed in international affairs, and like any good self-made man built the Carter Center from nothing into a first-class institution- a real asset to Atlanta, America, and the world.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Ted Turner quoted in Brinkley, 97.

## EDWARD SAID: TOKENS USED TO DEMYSTIFY THE OTHER

Fellow philosopher, political expert, friend and colleague Noam Chomsky has said of Edward Said that

His scholarly work has been devoted to unraveling mythologies about ourselves and our interpretation of others, reshaping our perceptions of what the rest of the world is and what we are. The second is the harder ask; nothing is harder than looking into the mirror.<sup>1</sup>

Known for being “incorrigibly independent...answering to no one,” a public intellectual who is committed to a public world and a public language, Edward Said, arguably, is more the subject of discussion and criticism in a vast range of disciplines than any other twentieth century public intellectual.<sup>2</sup> According to Silvia Nagy-Zekmi, his work “provoked passionate reactions” from his critics, “but his supporters also manifested no less passionate arguments in his favor.”<sup>3</sup> Edward Said has left a legacy of publications on a wide range of topics including classical music, art, literature, culture, and politics. He fathered the field of post-colonialism and impacted society with respect to the English language: “the other” and “otherization” were never the same after *Orientalism*. In addition, his public persona represented a different type of citizenship. Often portrayed as a citizen of the world, Said’s expertise and outspokenness left him in a position of authority. About his position as an academic, Said said:

I think the major choice faced by the intellectual is whether to be allied with the stability of the victors and rulers or- the more difficult path- to consider that stability as a state of emergency

---

<sup>1</sup> Noam Chomsky quoted in “Guardian Profile: Edward Said,” *The Guardian*, September 11, 1999.

<sup>2</sup> Andrew Rubin, “Techniques of Trouble: Edward Said and the Dialectics of Cultural Philology,” *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 102:4, Fall 2003, 861.

<sup>3</sup> Silvia Nagy-Zekmi, “Preface: Ultimate Coherence,” *Paradoxical Citizenship: Edward Said*, ed Silvia Nagy-Zekmi, (New York: Lexington Books, 2006), xiii.

threatening the less fortunate with the danger of complete extinction.<sup>4</sup>

Said's position in intellectual life was one of realism and candor. He believed in the honesty of discussion and elected to "tell the truth and unmask lies." He was uncomfortable with those whose behavior would be considered "...proper, professional...not rocking the boat, not straying outside the accepted paradigms or limits, making (themselves) marketable and above all presentable, hence uncontroversial and unpolitical and 'objective.'"<sup>5</sup> Said felt that intellectuals should be outsiders without ties to the circles of power, committed to ideas, values, and public exchange, not institutions, governments, or corporations.<sup>6</sup>

His insider/outsider positions strategically placed him simultaneously in the realms of both "his professional exigencies and his public involvement, his transnational theoretical framework and his status as a representative of the marginalized Palestinian exile. These tensions and contradictions permeate his writings."<sup>7</sup>

With the life of a cosmopolitan and the activism of a nationalist, Edward Said seems to have been plagued with the tension of the pull of each. Through review of his writings, I provide evidence of Said locating himself within a cosmopolitan realm. Yet as the further review will show, he comfortably fit within the nationalist arena as well. In the end, I hope to illustrate how Edward Said was both a nationalist and a cosmopolitan at once. Pinpointing several tokens used by Said and exploring their use will reveal how he positions himself in both arenas and how he communicates that position to his audiences. To begin, I reveal Said's universal purpose and discuss how he constructs his audience. Then I will show how

---

<sup>4</sup> Edward Said, *Representations of the Intellectual*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1996), 35.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Mostapha Marrouchi, *Edward Said at the Limits*, (Albany, NY: State University Press of New York, 2004), 221.

<sup>7</sup> Ernest Gellner, "The Mightier Pen," *Times Literary Supplement*, (February 19, 1993), 3.



Said projected himself as a cosmopolitan. The following section will discuss how he maintains a national appeal. Subsequently, I will explore several tokens like *exile*, *other*, *power*, and *Orientalism* and demonstrate how he uses them to articulate how he negotiates the space between cosmopolitanism and nationalism.

### **Said's Purpose and Audience**

In his attempt to inform his audiences to question truths and re-evaluate representations, Said hoped to “integrate rather than separate”<sup>8</sup> peoples of the world. His tokens create a language by which he can easily communicate his ideas to his readers. They provide a sort of code by which deeper, more complete arguments are sustained. Highlighting prejudices, noting misrepresentations, and explaining relationships, Said's goal was to expose a “better understanding of the way cultural domination has operated.”<sup>9</sup> By encouraging a critical look at cultures and societies, the hope is that future generations can try to avoid injustices by taking into consideration the perspectives of all.

As a cosmopolitan intellectual, Said's audience was a vast array of publics, publishing academic to popular books and articles, and everything in between. Additionally, because of his varied subject matter, his audience was further increased. A regular contributor to newspapers in the Middle East, Europe and the United States, Said was also often interviewed in Asia, the Middle East, Europe and the U.S. Thus, not only did his work reach several segments of a population, but massive numbers of populations worldwide.

---

<sup>8</sup> Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), xxvi.

<sup>9</sup> Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1997), 28.

The significance of audience for a cosmopolitan is complicated because it requires the writer to intimately relate to many separate audience segments. That process is not haphazard for Said, and he addresses it directly. In fact, in *Orientalism* he writes:

...I have written this study with several audiences in mind. For students of literature and criticism, *Orientalism* offers a marvelous instance of the interrelations between society, history, and textuality; moreover, the cultural role played by the Orient in the West connects Orientalism with ideology, politics, and the logic of power...For contemporary students of the Orient, from university scholars to policy makers, I have written with two ends in mind: one, to present their intellectual genealogy to them in a way that has not been done; two to criticize- with the hope of stirring discussion- the often unquestioned assumptions on which their work for the most part depends. For the general reader, this study deals with matters that always compel attention, all of them connected not only with Western conceptions and treatments of the Other but also with the singularly important role played by Western culture in...nations. Lastly, for readers in the so-called Third World, this study proposes itself as a step towards and understanding not so much of Western politics and of the non-Western world in those politics as of the *strength* too often mistaken as merely decorative or "superstructural." My hope is to illustrate the formidable structure of cultural domination and, specifically for formerly colonized peoples, the dangers and temptations of employing this structure upon themselves or upon others.<sup>10</sup>

Mapping out his purpose and his audience, in this passage, Said outlines the reach of his writings. The audience description involves both breadth and depth. Reaching across the globe, Said has managed to include a wide range of peoples, from the West to the East. He refers to different political arenas as well as economic arenas, mentioning Third World nations. Within the different geographical locations, he identifies several layers of audiences as well. The depth of his reach slices societies and involves students of literature, society, politics, economics as well as other fields. He mentions policy makers and university scholars, and this marks his territory from the theoretical to the practical. Said even

---

<sup>10</sup> Said, *Orientalism*, 24-25.

specifically includes the general reader, positioning his contributions as valuable to everyone. The value varies, of course, and the purpose his work may be used for will vary as well.

Outlining how each group may benefit from his work, Said sets clear intentions for himself and his audiences. He provides a detailed account of how his work is valuable and useful globally, while still mindful that within each group there are sub-groups. For example, he points out the benefits for literature and criticism students are plentiful and include “interrelations between society, history, and textuality” as well as issues of power and politics. He also emphasizes the importance of his work to academics as a way to question the status quo and start discussions. Articulating how each group benefits is significant in a number of ways. To begin, it is important because it shows how focused and clear Said is in reaching his audiences and assuring they get the messages he hopes to send them. On another level, it is interesting how throughout his work, he does not leave to chance the possibility of being “misread” by providing an incredibly tireless amount of description, repetition, and detail to carefully guide his audiences to where he wants them to go. Also noteworthy is that Said extends the reach of each group, meaning that he suggests that students of literature should know something about politics, policy makers should be concerned with other accounts of their “intellectual genealogy,” and the general reader should be forced to be connected to other parts of the world.

The last thing he mentions in this passage is his comprehensive purpose of illuminating the dangers of cultural domination and how structures set in place permit and perpetuate that domination. Hoping to strengthen the weak and curb the strong, Said’s goal of communicating to his audiences how to question the taken-for-granted and the benefits of doing so also aims to understand the *other*, creating a more cooperative world. Each of his

specific goals and his universal goal serve to bond the human experience, grant legitimacy to the experiences of the weak, and show how when differences are objectified, artificial gaps and barriers are created. His campaign against objectification and the reduction of differences is a cosmopolitan cause because it hopes to bridge those gaps by deconstructing truths, giving opportunities for alternative histories, and understanding differences rather than using them to take advantage of one another. Not specific to time or place, he explains

But what I should like also to have contributed here is a better understanding of the way cultural domination has operated. If this stimulates a new kind of dealing with the Orient, indeed if it eliminates the “Orient” and “Occident” altogether, then we shall have advanced a little in the process of what Raymond Williams has called the “unlearning” of “the inherent dominative mode.”<sup>11</sup>

Advocating critical thinking, accepting cultural diversity, and denouncing stereotyping, Said’s texts are tools for re-evaluating cultures, broadening our understanding of them, and realizing the unifying struggles of human experience. Said’s consistency in his general theme of re-teaching his audiences how to think about power and cultural domination provides a coherent message throughout his body of work. His unswerving devotion to his purpose provides his audiences with a reliable source for critical thinking.

### **Said and Cosmopolitanism**

Edward Said’s interests in the world were theoretical and practical, and through his writings he expressed what I interpret to be cosmopolitan values. Even when talking about himself he exuded a groundless being. The title of his autobiography is *Out of Place* and

---

<sup>11</sup> Said, *Orientalism*, 28.

suggests not being at home anywhere in the world, yet his descriptions convey quite the opposite:

I have never known what language I spoke first, Arabic or English, or which one was really mine beyond any doubt. What I do know, however, is that the two have always been together in my life, one resonating in the other...<sup>12</sup>

Besides Arabic and English, Said was also fluent in French. Slipping in and out of languages and the states of mind that go along with them was easy for him. Said says that both English and Arabic are “together in my life” affirming that they are on par. Not being sure which came first not only suggested the obvious, that he always knew them, but also suggested that they were equally important in his life.

Said grew up in Palestine, Egypt, Lebanon, and the United States. He attended private English/American schools all his life and attended both Princeton and Harvard. Until his passing in 2003, Said was a University Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University. His upbringing was privileged, complete with piano lessons, country clubs, European vacations, and social connections.<sup>13</sup> His complex grasp of subtleties reflected his comfort in both the East and the West in language, culture, and politics.

In terms of pin-pointing a home, Said was reluctant:

I’ve never felt that I belonged exclusively to one country, nor have I been able to identify “patriotically” with any... Thinking affectionately about home is all I’ll go along with...<sup>14</sup>

Not belonging “exclusively” to a country suggests that he may have felt belonging to multiple countries, rather than to no country at all. The affection as opposed to patriotism implies that Said was more willing to be attached culturally rather than politically. Mustapha

---

<sup>12</sup> Edward Said, *Out of Place, a memoir*, (New York: First Vintage Books, 2002), 4.

<sup>13</sup> See Said, *Out of Place, a memoir*.

<sup>14</sup> Edward Said, “Which Country?” *The Nation*, July 1991, 15-22.

Marrouchi explained that Said traveled frequently, originally assuming the role of an observer, and more so the role of a “shrewd witness.” He observed that as Said grew older, Said expressed a greater sense of moral urgency and undertook the cause of embattled peoples everywhere through commentary on literature, politics, music, theory, and culture.<sup>15</sup>

Part of the definition of a cosmopolitan relates to the privileged, internationally exposed lifestyle that Said led. Another dimension of cosmopolitanism focuses more on the concerns of humanity. Said was a cosmopolitan in this respect as well.

...for me...the intellectual is an individual endowed with a faculty for representing, embodying, articulating a message, a view, an attitude, philosophy or opinion to, as well as for a public...this role ... (should) be someone who cannot easily be co-opted by governments or corporations, and whose *raison d'être* is to represent all those people and issues that are routinely forgotten or swept under the rug.<sup>16</sup>

For Said, being an intellectual was an empowerment with which came the responsibility of being an advocate for those in need of a voice. Accordingly, association, affiliation, or compliance to corporations or governments became unfeasible because that would potentially quiet the intellectual’s voice. This need to remain independent is characteristic of cosmopolitanism. Intellectualism and cosmopolitanism can converge, yet an intellectual is not necessarily a cosmopolitan. Since cosmopolitan theory involves an international perspective with affinities tied to causes rather than places, Said’s description of the intellectual is more inclined to be a cosmopolitan as well. While Said’s vision of an intellectual includes breaking down stereotypes and “question[ing] patriotic nationalism,

---

<sup>15</sup> Marrouchi, 33.

<sup>16</sup> Said, *Representations...*, 11.

corporate thinking, and a sense of class, racial or gender privilege”<sup>17</sup> is strikingly cosmopolitan, an intellectual who privileges traditional nationalist ideals is possible.

Said furthered his discussion and used American sociologist C. Wright Mills as an exemplary of a “fiercely independent intellectual with an impassioned social vision and a remarkable capacity for communicating his ideas in a straightforward and compelling prose.”<sup>18</sup> Said provided an excerpt from Mills in the first of his 1993 Reith Lectures:

The independent artist and intellectual are among the few remaining personalities equipped to resist and to fight the stereotyping and consequent death of genuinely living things. Fresh perception now involves the capacity to continually unmask and to smash the stereotypes of vision and intellect with which modern communications {i.e. modern systems of representation} swamp us. These words of mass-art and mass-thought are increasingly geared to the demands of politics. That is why it is in politics that intellectual solidarity and effort must be centered...<sup>19</sup>

While the passage itself supports notions of cosmopolitanism because it advocates solidarity of the intellectual to preserve their untainted assessment of the world around them, its significance is particular to Said as his choice to illustrate the idealism of the intellectual. In his exploration of the passage, Said stressed that the intellectual should remain detached to be able to “unmask” and “tell the truth.” He extended the idea and compared the intellectual to Robin Hood.

There is no question in my mind that the intellectual belongs on the same side with the weak and underrepresented. Robin Hood, some are likely to say. Yet it’s not that simple a role and therefore cannot be easily dismissed as just so much romantic idealism... This is not always a matter of being a critic of government policy, but rather of thinking of the intellectual vocation as maintaining a state of constant alertness, of a perpetual willingness not to let half-truths or received ideas steer one along.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid. xiii.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 20.

<sup>19</sup> C. Wright Mills in Said’s *Representations*..., 22-23.

Though the discussion centers on the role of the intellectual, Said's repeated principles are those of cosmopolitanism: the need to be distant yet involved, the awareness of the world around him, and the role of authority. Moreover, in his description of the duties of the intellectual he condemns the opposite by warning of being led by half-truths. He insists that it is not a matter of simply disagreeing with or being suspicious of the government policy for the sake of it, but rather a need to keep one's mind sharp. In line with his general purpose, in highlighting the need to remain in a "state of constant alertness," Said also maintains the coherency in his message of critical thinking, questioning power and structures. When stating that the intellectual's place is by the weak and underrepresented, Said makes no mention of national affiliation. This absence connotes a deterritorialization on Said's part. By not addressing place, the implication is that the intellectual should not be limited to nation, and therefore is ideally a cosmopolitan.

Politically, Said continued the notion of cosmopolitanism. In "Opponents, Audiences, Constituencies, and Community," originally published in *Critical Inquiry* in 1982, he addressed the cultural moment of "Reaganism" or the "Age of Ronald Reagan." In it he took a critical approach to the idea of humanism represented at that time. He felt that the politics of the time restricted scope of vision by presenting polar choices:

In a world of increasing interdependence and political consciousness, it seems both violent and wasteful to accept the notion, for example, that countries ought to be classified simply as pro-Soviet or pro-American. Yet this classification...dominates thinking about foreign policy. There is little in humanistic culture that is an effective antidote to it...Our political discourse is now choked with enormous, thought-stopping abstractions...<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> Said, *Representations...*, 23.

<sup>21</sup> Edward Said, "Opponents, Audiences, Constituencies, and Community," *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 119-120.



Said saw forced affiliations as stifling to social progress. For him, this limited discourse that was intended to promote civil society and also control critics, both of which were disservices to world citizens. Reducing the interests of parties to one dimension provided what Said considered an over-simplified notion of the world. This oversimplification spills to other domains and perpetuates to misrepresent and distance groups from each other. Forcing mindsets and fostering destructive tendencies, the simplistic dichotomy, was something Said actively fought against. More intently, when asked about the idea of the resurgence of national identities, and even the narrower communal or religious identities, Said responded with “I am uniformly opposed to this” and explained that “we belong to much larger identities, ones that are more healing, and more generously defined.”<sup>22</sup> Considering narrow identities as dangerous and a threat to humanity and being opposed to a limited, partitioned concept, Said prefers a more complete notion of identity. In contrast to the polarizing dichotomy offered in the pro-Soviet/pro-American example, with his resistance, Said also offers the idea of healing. Allowing for a means to incorporate rather than alienate, “healing” replaces the damaging, destructive, and divisive tendencies of polar choices.

Said embraced cosmopolitanism, in his drive to be an advocate, as a way to overcome the limitations of attachment. His reverence for being a cosmopolitan is even evident when he reviewed a novel by an Arab (female) writer about an Egyptian woman who struggles with her life. Said describes it as an exploration of the limitations of the young woman’s life as an Arab woman, her sadistic and repressed husband, her affair with her English (nationality) professor abroad and at the same time the heroine’s acceptance of living both

---

<sup>22</sup> Edward Said, “The Road Less Traveled,” interviewed by Nirmala Lakshman, *Power, Politics, and Culture: interviews with Edward Said*, ed Gauri Viswanthan (New York: Pantheon Books, 2001), 417.

halves (Arabic and English) of her life.<sup>23</sup> At the end of the essay, Said noted that one of the most interesting aspects of the novel is that

...what has become almost formulaic to the Arab (as well as Western) discourse of the Other need not always be the case. In fact, there can be generosity, and vision, and overcoming barriers, and finally, human existential integrity. Who cares about the labels of national identity anyway?<sup>24</sup>

Not only did Said praise the novel on its merits as a story, he also pointed out that the heroine can float seamlessly from one culture to another, much like a cosmopolitan. In addition, he chose to share with his audience the concept that overcoming barriers is a two-way street and stress the possibility of merging interests and mutual benefits by demystifying the unknown or unfamiliar. What was truly cosmopolitan yet still extremely surprising, was his final statement: “who cares about the labels of national identity anyway?”

### **“Who Cares About the Labels of National Identity Anyway?”**

Edward Said and his family left their homeland, Palestine, officially in December 1947. Much of his work focused on the Palestinian issue, specifically, and on Arabism, generally. From books, to articles, to interviews, to documentaries, Edward Said was considered the most visible spokesperson for the Palestinian cause in the West. Marrouchi remarks that Said always “nurtured his time to Palestine, returning to his people and land as often and for as long as possible.” He wrote regularly in Arabic to reach his Arabic-speaking

---

<sup>23</sup> Edward Said, “The Anglo-Arab Encounter,” *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 408-409.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 410.

audience. Said was an active member of the Palestinian National Council and despite death threats, he never stopped speaking for his cause.<sup>25</sup>

As a writer, Said inhabits a complicated, multiple world. An exile who is attached by all his roots to an Arab people and culture, Said has selected the essay form, a swift and well-aimed strike...to express the pain of exile.<sup>26</sup>

In this passage, Marrouchi justifies Said's identification to the national and explains that his writings are a reflection of that identification and his individual experiences. Beginning with *Orientalism*, Said's goal was to provide his predominantly Western audience with an alternative view of the East. In addition, his writings on exile directly spoke to the Palestinian situation.

In *Orientalism* and *Culture and Imperialism*, Said illustrated how Western perceptions of the East (primarily Arabs and the Arab world) are tainted by inaccurate representations based on power and political motivation. He presented evidence in both pieces that for centuries the West has effectively characterized the East as barbaric, inferior, and worthy of control by the West. Said introduced the concept of orientalism, illustrated it, highlighted it, and introduced tangential themes like cultural imperialism and insider/outsider history. This was revolutionary for the time and provided a language to articulate the motives and manifestations of power as expressed through the production of different forms of communication.

Reviewing official works in *Orientalism* and cultural classics in *Culture and Imperialism*, he also explored the portrayal of Arabs in the Western media in *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. The

---

<sup>25</sup> Marrouchi, 10.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 111.

Introduction to the Vintage Edition speaks to the purpose of the text and although written in 1996, has an ironic resonance in our post 9/11 era.

...there has been an intense focus on Muslims and Islam in the American and Western media, most of it characterized by a more highly exaggerated stereotyping and belligerent hostility... There also seems to have been a strange revival of canonical, though previously discredited, Orientalist ideas about Muslim, generally non-white people...<sup>27</sup>

In this short excerpt, it is clear that his focus is on deconstructing and reconstructing the institutionalized characterizations commonly held in the West. Part of what this passage draws attention to is the general stereotyping of “non-white people,” implying anyone different. The hostility or concern even with difference is characteristic of nationalism, where there is an inherent sense of superiority to those who are unlike. Even though Said’s purpose comes from his care for his own national identification, his message is a cosmopolitan one that ironically warns of the detrimental side effects of nationalism. While this particular book is dealing with Islam and Iran, it is also related to Arab characterizations. Throughout the book he refers to the Middle East, Palestinians, and Arabs, and links them through the common portrayals in the press. According to Said, terrorism and religious hysteria have become somewhat synonymous with Islam and Arabs (and Iranians and Muslims). In his book, he reveals the hidden assumptions and distortions that lie within the seemingly “objective” Western coverage of the Middle East.<sup>28</sup>

If one part of Said’s self-proclaimed purpose was to correct the Western impression of Arabs in general, another was to be an advocate for the Palestinian cause. Besides his political activism through associations and articles directly criticizing policy, Said’s

---

<sup>27</sup> Edward Said, *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*, (New York: Vintage books, 1981), xi.

<sup>28</sup> See Said, *Covering Islam*.

connection to Palestine was evident in his attention to exile. "...the Palestinians, ...for forty-six years have been painfully reassembling a national identity in exile." In the same essay he wrote "nationalism is an assertion of belonging in and to a place, a people, a heritage. It affirms the home created by a community of language, culture, and customs..."<sup>29</sup> In his description of nationalism, he evoked emotions by use of words like "belonging" and "home." Drawing attention to location early in the description implies its importance to him.

Marrouchi provided some insight to Said's ties to Palestine. He explained that while Said was critical of Palestine, Israel, America, and the Arab world in general, "no one...is spared," Said felt a great sense of responsibility to issues of national place, roots, and belonging.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, Edward Said "cares about the labels of national identity." His lifelong project of advocating and supporting the rights and voice of the Palestinian people specifically and Arabs generally would suggest that he cared. His placing himself at the center of the issues would suggest that he cared. And his passionate essays, books, articles, and documentaries would suggest that he cared. He managed to be entrenched in place while being a cosmopolitan.

### **Tokens and Their Use**

Said creates a language for himself by use of tokens that are packed with meaning to sustain greater arguments. Throughout his long career and in his massive body of work, his main objective was to show how polarization causes alienation among people. Particularly

---

<sup>29</sup> Edward Said, "Reflections on Exile," *Reflections on Exile and other Essays*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 176.

<sup>30</sup> Marrouchi, 108.

evident in his canonical texts, Said provides extensive examples (most often historical) for his audience to clarify his use of words and prove his points.

Historiography and representation are vital to Said's writings. Because of his methodology of deconstruction of texts to suggest alternatives to commonly accepted truths, he is able to combine an older Marxist tradition with current critical practice in discourse analysis. The result is the understanding of the relationship between imperialism and culture. He not only relies on Michel Foucault, but also on Antonio Gramsci and Noam Chomsky to help project his view on culture and histories, deeply influenced by the dominant ideology and the political essentials of the society in question. While the basics of Foucault's power and knowledge dynamic are evident in Said's work, Chomsky's critical interventions may have provided Said with the ability to speak about critical issues on the political activity of a community. Said differs from Chomsky in that Chomsky's focus is writing directly about political affairs while Said's focus is more theoretical on concerns of his and his world. Accordingly, in this respect, Foucault's influence on Said is greater than Chomsky's, albeit Chomsky's political commitment eclipses Foucault's cynicism of direct political involvement.<sup>31</sup>

Also facilitating Said's aptitude for political and social commentary is his field. Specializing in comparative literature, Said recognizes that his training and interests are in comparative work. He explains that he is "much more interested in traveling across boundaries- in other words, traveling horizontally rather than hierarchically inside one

---

<sup>31</sup> Shelley Walia, *Edward Said and the Writing of History*, series ed. Rachard Appignanesi, (Cambridge: Icon Books LTD, 2001), 23, 24.

culture.”<sup>32</sup> His propensity to appreciate the intertwinings of cultures and disciplines are accentuated in his efforts to translate to his audiences the dynamics and benefits of different “kinds of crossings-over, as well as anti-specialization and anti-territoriality.”<sup>33</sup> Defying the confines of territories even academically, Said demonstrates the benefits of traveling horizontally, of exploring the scope of issues, and of dissolving boundaries to enhance a fuller understanding. His discussion of disciplines applies well to cultures, and in fact, as a cosmopolitan Said follows the same principles to society.

In order to illustrate to his audiences the alienation that polarization causes, Said invests in certain tokens. Particular to Said’s method is his use of extensive examples to legitimize his argument to the reader. Furthermore, his articulation and repetition convey that argument in an insistent manner. In fact, certain works focus on developing particular tokens that are then used throughout that project and subsequent ones. For example, in *Orientalism*, Said shows how Western knowledge is tainted by power and political motivation. These conclusions are carried forward into *Culture and Imperialism* which illustrates how the creative writer’s consciousness is shaped by the imperialist tendencies prevailing in that time. For Said, his intervention is both intellectual and critically responsible, as well as necessary to draw the attention of Western readers to non-Western cultures and recognize their significant role in the ongoing processes of history.<sup>34</sup> The tokens, therefore, serve as extended symbols or representations of previously rationalized arguments. Said provides specific and detailed descriptions of what a token means, how he

---

<sup>32</sup> Edward Said, “Overlapping Territories” interviewed by Gary Hentzi and Anne McClintock, *Power, Politics, and Culture: interviews with Edward Said*, ed Gauri Viswanathan, (New York: Panthon Books, 2001), 55.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid.

<sup>34</sup> Leela Gandhi, *Postcolonial Theory, a Critical Introduction*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998), 69.

intends to use it, and the broader implications accordingly. Then, he proceeds to use that token throughout that piece and other essays or articles, and the expectation is that his audience will carry that knowledge of the layers of meaning of the tokens with them. This produces a full language, particular to Said and his readers, which allows for a building and strengthening of case and point as well as a deep understanding of his overarching, greater purpose. In “Between Worlds,” originally published in *London Review of Books* in 1998, he writes:

The net result in terms of my writing has been to attempt a greater transparency, to free myself from academic jargon, and not to hide behind euphemism and circumlocution where difficult issues have been concerned. I have given the name “worldliness” to this voice, by which I do not mean the jaded savoir-faire of the man about town, but rather a knowing and unafraid attitude toward exploring the world we live in.<sup>35</sup>

His purpose of understanding the world by unjaded exploration is one of a cosmopolitan. By forcing an independence for his voice and refusing to be co-opted, he functions as a free agent able to criticize and praise beyond borders. Explaining that he favors a direct, truthful approach to cushioning his thoughts, Said chooses to treat the entire world as his rightful domain. In addition, he makes a noteworthy distinction of the word “worldliness.” He asserts that for him worldliness is not the superficial meaning suggesting being able to order a suitable bottle of wine, but rather a more substantial understanding that is able to grasp the subtle nuances of the world. While nation is evidently significant to Said, on identity he insists:

Identity as such is about as boring a subject as one can imagine. Nothing seems less interesting than the narcissistic self-study that today passes

---

<sup>35</sup> Edward Said, “Between Worlds,” *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 565.



in many places for identity politics, or ethnic studies, or affirmations of roots, cultural pride, drum-beating nationalism and so on. We have to defend peoples and identities threatened with extinction or subordinated because they are considered inferior...<sup>36</sup>

Capsulizing his rationale, this passage illuminates the motivation for his writings. In it he likens particularity: ethnicity, nationalism, and other issues that separate peoples, with something basic and simple that does not need as much intellectual energy. Calling that level of particularity narcissistic likens it to vanity while his phrase “drum-beating nationalism” equates nationalism with primitive, unsophisticated behavior. He does, however, stress the importance of aiding those identities victimized by circumstance of the imbalance of power.

In criticizing Bernard Lewis and Samuel Huntington for their “prejudice” and “argument in favor of conflict,” Said countered that there should be an effort for “true understanding and the kind of cooperation between peoples that our planet needs.”<sup>37</sup> By privileging greater understanding and hoping to educate his audiences about perpetuated injustices, Said hoped to encourage greater cooperation worldwide. This cosmopolitan effort of embracing and welcoming rather than alienating and distancing is accentuated by the tokens he utilizes throughout his work. I argue that each token in and of itself serves to further the cosmopolitan effort in that each functions to express an aspect of cosmopolitanism or correct a wrong done because of the lack of a cosmopolitan ethic. Following are discussions on particular tokens used by Said to further his main objective: to create an awareness and understanding of “other” cultures and prove that alternative perspectives are valid and legitimate, and accordingly spreading the prospects of a cosmopolitan understanding of the world.

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 567.

<sup>37</sup> Edward Said, “The Clash of Definitions,” *Reflections on Exile and other essays*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002). 572.

*Exile*

In order to express that dual identity, to articulate that space in between, Said made use of several tokens. Perhaps the most directly related to nationalism and cosmopolitanism is exile. His insider/outsider positions placed him strategically in the realms of both “his professional exigencies and his public involvement, his transnational theoretical framework and his status as a representative of the marginalized Palestinian exile.”<sup>38</sup> Webster defines exile as “the state or a period of forced (or voluntary) absence from one’s country or home” and “a person who is in exile.”<sup>39</sup> Throughout much of his work, Said resisted this minimal notion and presented readers and listeners with a more nuanced and sophisticated understanding of what he believed the token encompassed.

Yet Said seemed reluctant to stress the literal state of exile to maintain the force of its metaphorical use. For Said, exile becomes a means of testing, an exercise to acquaint oneself with the possible interactions of different outlooks, mindsets, and experiences. Therefore, I argue that Said’s use of the term *exile* is used as a means of forging bonds of connection and solidarity between the familiar and the previously overlooked. He rejected the notion of exile as its own reward, therefore necessitating the term to be more complex, as a total experience and rejecting exile as a rhetorical token which may simplify this complexity.

Although Said’s career was intricately entangled with the concept of exile, he viewed his personal exile through a universal lens. Crossing over cultures, a common theme in his work is well illustrated here: (Said once said)

---

<sup>38</sup> Gellner, *The Mightier Pen*.

<sup>39</sup> Merriam-Webster online dictionary.

The fact of migration is extraordinarily impressive to me: that movement from the precision and concreteness of one form of life transmuted or imported into the other...and then of course the whole problematic of exile and immigration enters into it, the people who simply don't belong in any culture; that is the great modern or, if you like, postmodern fact, the standing outside of cultures.<sup>40</sup>

In this as in many other of Said's work, he creates a position of advantage for the exile.

Since one cannot always become an exile, a traveler is presented as an option, one desirable for critical thinkers as they, to, move from life to life. This passage reflects the migratory nature of the world as conveyed by Appadurai. The notion of joining privileged status with marginal, exilic consciousness transforms his use of the term exile from the specific dictionary meaning to a token redeemable for a multifaceted, complex understanding.

In *Representations of the Intellectual*, Said suggests that exile exists in a "median state" explaining it is "neither completely at one with the new setting not fully disencumbered of the old..."<sup>41</sup> Said creates a space for the exile between the previous place and the more recent one, not quite leaving the former and not quite arriving to the latter. This concept of both and neither recurs in many of his essays. Said references exile in a way that both uses the term in reference to his (and many others') situation as well as treats the term as a text in and of itself. The way he expands on the word suggests he deemed it worthy of further exploration, necessary to consistently link to a bigger picture, and significant to maintain throughout his career.

Complicating the term in the same essay, Said enhances his idea by implying that exiles are capable of adjusting. Using the examples of Henry Kissinger and Zbigniew

---

<sup>40</sup> From Stephen Howe, "Edward Said: the traveler and the exile," *openDemocracy*, October 2, 2003, [www.opendemocracy.net](http://www.opendemocracy.net).

<sup>41</sup> Edward Said, "Intellectual Exile: Expatriates and Marginals," *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*, (New York: Random House, 1996), 49.

Brzezinski he explains that each are exiles (one from Nazi Germany and the other from Communist Poland) and have “contributed their talents entirely to their adopted country.”<sup>42</sup> According to Said, both the exile and the adopted country benefit. Also complicating *exile* is Said’s discursive move to qualify the term not solely on its merits of place. Cosmopolitan rhetoric in the American tradition has previously looked for markers of place, and exile can function to that effect signaling the physical removal from one place and the relocation to another. Yet in this essay, Said emphasizes that besides the physical exile, for the intellectual, a metaphorical condition also exists. He explains that intellectuals within their original society can

Be divided into insiders and outsiders: those on the one hand who belong fully to the society as it is, who flourish in it without an overwhelming sense of dissonance or dissent, those who can be called yea-sayers; and on the other hand, the nay-sayers, the individuals at odds with their society and therefore outsiders and exiles so far as privileges, power, and honors are concerned...the intellectual as outsider is best exemplified by the condition of exile, the state of never being fully adjusted, always feeling outside...<sup>43</sup>

In this move, Said has expanded the understanding of a cosmopolitan marker of place to include a broader exile, one of condition. Substantiating his idea with examples and further discussion, Said presents a sound argument that condition is also a requisite for determining and exile. By connecting place and condition to the sentiments of not fully belonging to society, being marginalized, or never being fully adjusted, Said offers a fuller characterization of *exile* which adds significantly to the richness of his own token while contributing significantly to cosmopolitan rhetoric by pushing us to include markers of condition as well as markers of place.

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 51.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 52-3.

The most involved exploration of exile is in “Reflections on Exile,” first publication in *Granta*, 1984. In this essay, Said provides an extensive opportunity for readers to redeem their token on exile. He rejects the heroic, romantic notions of exile which he feel objectify the experience which is most often not experienced first hand. He then embarks on a journey which both complicates and intensifies *exile* to his readers. In this essay, exile is transformed from an object (which may easily be fetishized), to a lived, ongoing, undivorceable experience.<sup>44</sup>

He compares nationalism to exile and suggests an essential connection between the two. Said explains that because nationalism requires belonging to a place, a people and a heritage, it therefore guards against exile and “fights to prevent its ravages.”<sup>45</sup> Said characterizes *exile* as discontinuities, a loss of solidarity and contact, and a feeling of always being out of place. In this essay, he differentiates exiles from expats and émigrés, suggesting that their agency relieves the suffering and rigidity of an exile’s experience.<sup>46</sup>

While Said gave *exile* a depth of pain and element of fate, he further complicates the term and thus the concept by re-granting a certain agency to the exiles:

I speak of exile not as a privilege, but as an alternative to the mass institutions that dominate modern life. Exile is not, after all, a matter of choice: you are born into it, or it happens to you. But, provided that the exile refuses to sit on the sidelines nursing a wound, there are things to be learned: he or she must cultivate a scrupulous (not indulgent or sulky) subjectivity.<sup>47</sup>

This section serves to resist a deterministic or essentialist position on exile. While Said clearly illustrates the differences between expatriates and émigrés as opposed to exiles, he

---

<sup>44</sup> Said, “Reflections on Exile,” 173-186.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 176.

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, 184.

refuses the defeatist, victim that is glorified and objectified. Instead, he establishes elements of exiles' strength and will. This passage is followed by a discussion on Adorno's thoughts on the home as fragile and vulnerable. Adorno says "it is part of morality not to be at home in one's home."<sup>48</sup> Said draws from this notion and uses it to empower the exile because the exile does not take the home for granted. Rather,

The exile knows that in a secular and contingent world, homes are always provisional. Borders and barriers, which enclose us within the safety of familiar territory, can also become prisons, and are often defended beyond reason or necessity. Exiles cross borders, break barriers of thought and experience.<sup>49</sup>

Taking a cosmopolitan turn, Said aligns the *exile* with the global and defines them as a citizen of the world, both in physical space and mental thought. *Exile* not only becomes a living state but also is further developed into a source of strength and the advantage in a postmodern, global, cosmopolitan world. Later in the essay, Said advances this idea when he explains the ability to act at home anywhere provides a sense of achievement for the exile. Exiles, like cosmopolitans, are at home everywhere in the world. He notes that exiles were often novelists, chess players, political activists and intellectuals, accounting this to mobility and skill. He prefers to view *exile* as a collective rather than an individual experience as this enables the exile to reconnect and form a sense of solidarity.<sup>50</sup> He concludes the essay by emphasizing that exile is never a satisfied or secure state. "Exile is life led outside habitual order. It is nomadic, decentered, contrapuntal; but no sooner does one get accustomed to it that its unsettling force erupts anew."<sup>51</sup> Here he has renewed his commitment to the complexity of *exile*. His resistance to exile's simple definition and his recurring efforts to

---

<sup>48</sup> Ibid.

<sup>49</sup> Ibid., 185.

<sup>50</sup> Ibid.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid., 186.

complicate the term suggest that he viewed the token worthy of analysis. Redemption opportunity of that token is particularly available in “Reflections on Exile.” He avoids objectification and prefers a multifaceted, nuanced understanding of the experience that exposes both a nationalistic yearning and a cosmopolitan know-how.

Reinforcing the idea that exilic position is an advantaged one, Said characterizes the exile as an exemplary intellectual. Drawing from Matthew Arnold’s description of the critic as alien, Said suggests that the exile’s homelessness as Lukacs’ “transcendental homelessness” allows for an intellectual mission that he relates to criticism. Said also associated the exilic condition to secularism, distinct from time and history.<sup>52</sup> These additional facets of *exile* help Said construct an increasing sophistication of his use of the term because it features the benefits for criticism. As indicated by Said, the token *exile* also incorporates the potential for an ideal intellectual who is not burdened or tainted by confines but is instead, a worldly individual.

### *The Other (Us and Them)*

In order to fully appreciate the implications otherization and of Said’s body of work, understanding orientalism is essential. Coining the term and providing an entire text of over 350 pages to argue the point, Said spent a great deal of his career articulating orientalism. While ample examples abound the text, one need not look further than the introduction for an in depth, detailed understanding of what Said meant when he said “orientalism.”

Part of orientalism is a geographic location. Acknowledging that, Said explains the additional connotations that come from geographic location.

---

<sup>52</sup> Said, “Overlapping Territories,” 56.

...I shall be calling Orientalism, a way of coming to terms with the Orient that is based on the Orient's special place in European Western experience. The Orient is not only adjacent to Europe; it is also the place of Europe's greatest and richest and oldest colonies, the source of its civilizations and languages, its cultural contestant, and one of its deepest and most recurring images of the Other...the Orient has helped to define Europe (or the West) as its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience...<sup>53</sup>

Besides where the Orient may lie on the map, Said bluntly tells the audience that when he uses the term Orientalism, he is referring to more than just place. He is also referring to the fact that those places are rich in resources and culture, the oldest and earliest sources of civilizations and languages, as well as the descriptions by the West that help it define itself.

Further deconstructing the term for his audience, he pulls apart several layers of meaning. To begin, he mentions the academic definition of the Orient that refers to area studies which connotes European colonialism. Following this line, he notes the meaning of *Orientalism* as a style of thought, "the basic distinction between East and West" for theory building, novel writing, social descriptions, political accounts, etc. The third layer of meaning for orientalism outlined by Said is a "Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient. Through the discussion and analysis of the Orient, the West makes statements about it, authorizes views of it, describes it, and so on."<sup>54</sup> He assures his reader that these layers of meaning will be proven and illustrated in the text, offering opportunity for token redemption.

In *Orientalism*, Said shows how Western Knowledge is tainted by power and political motivation. He presents evidence to the reader that for centuries the West has effectively characterized the East as barbaric, inferior, and worthy of control by the West. This

---

<sup>53</sup> Said, *Orientalism*, 1-2.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, 2-3.



controversial piece serves to introduce the concept of orientalism, illustrate it, and highlight some tangential themes including cultural imperialism and insider and outsider history. His use of extensive historical examples legitimizes his argument to the reader while his articulation and repetition convey that argument in an insistent manner.

His main purpose for writing *Orientalism* is to spotlight the theme of otherization and in turn create an awareness of the alienation that occurs due to that polarization. In doing so, Said builds the term orientalism and discursively positions it as a cornerstone in relating his overall message, understandable to a wide audience. The historical texts he utilizes to illustrate his points are “official” communications excerpts from speeches, published works, and correspondences. While some may criticize the use of “top-down” history, it serves Said well in this case to use that type of artifact because it institutionalizes the Western characterization of the East and provides a sense of validity to that characterization.

Reviewing *Modern Egypt* (a two volume text) by Lord Cromer (England’s representative in Egypt in the early 1900s), the works of scholar William Robertson Smith from the late 1800s, and Haskell Lectures at the University of Chicago in 1945 delivered by H.A.R. Gibb, Said exposed his meaning of orientalism to his audiences.<sup>55</sup> By taking quotes from these and other official writings, Said explained how their use of the word actually created a discourse and showed how his own understanding of orientalism applies. For example, to expose the implications of how Lord Cromer uses the word, Said wrote

Orientals or Arabs are thereafter shown to be gullible, “devoid of energy and initiative,” much given to “fulsome flattery”...Orientals cannot walk on either a road or a pavement (their disordered minds

---

<sup>55</sup> See Said, *Orientalism* for further discussion.

fail to understand whatever the clever European grasps immediately...<sup>56</sup>

Said's deconstruction of official passages helps to both explain and emphasize the characterization that took place. He removes all doubt and places the burden on himself to take what the text suggests and say it bluntly for his audience, leaving no chance of misunderstanding his use of the token. Here, the first use of the word orientals is meant to refer to a certain people, while the second use is more general, giving in to greater layers of meaning. While seemingly sarcastic, his critical rhetorical analysis of the texts illustrates how Western characterizations of the East are caricatures in great part by utilizing his token to articulate that characterization.

Discrediting orientalism as a school of thought, or a way of dominating a culture is accomplished by Said's dealing with orientalism as a discourse as well as a myth. He writes:

In everything I have been discussing, the language of Orientalism plays the dominant role. It brings opposites together as "natural," it presents human types in scholarly idioms and methodologies, it ascribes reality and reference to objects (other words) of its own making. Mythic language is discourse...always the institutions of an advanced society dealing with a less advanced society, a strong culture encountering a weak one. The principal feature of mythic discourse is that it conceals its own origins as well as those of what it describes...<sup>57</sup>

Explaining the detriments of orientalism, Said stresses his notion that it is a systematic discourse that needs to be systematically deconstructed to expose the myths or falsities.

Accordingly, orientalism takes on the grand function of control, suppression, and stereotyping that Said is exposing. While a nationalistic concern because his examples focus

---

<sup>56</sup> Said, *Orientalism*, 38.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 321.

on Arabs, it is also a cosmopolitan concern because the issue is used to understand power relations between any strong/weak or advanced/less advanced societies.

Extending from orientalism is the concept of otherization. The seemingly simple concept of the *us* and *them* dichotomy provides devices for stereotyping and misunderstanding for some and sources for defensiveness for others. This theme is just one of several that is pivotal for a global society and a cosmopolitan world.

As a means for identifying oneself, otherization serves to articulate the self by way of negation. In other words, otherization identifies what one is not. By a process of comparison, otherization uses an *us* and *them* dichotomy to create a sense of self. Said explains that

within each civilizational camp, we will notice, there are official representatives of that culture or civilization who make themselves into its mouthpiece, who assign themselves the role of articulating “our” (or for that matter “their”) essence. This always necessitates a fair amount of compression, reduction, and exaggeration. So on the first and most immediate level, then, statements about what “our” culture or civilization is, or ought to be, necessarily involve a contest over the definition.<sup>58</sup>

While this particular passage was addressing Huntington and his essay “The Clash of Civilizations,” it also serves to better articulate the essence of the *us* and *them* dichotomy. Said stresses the fact that this dichotomy is often an over-simplification and exaggeration, meaning that cultures are reduced and objectified in the process. This obviously prohibits and inhibits a sincere understanding and perpetuates stereotypes in the process. Tangential to appreciating Said’s profound meaning of *us* and *them* and the *other*, this passage also points

---

<sup>58</sup> Said, “The Clash of Definitions,” 577.

out that certain people within a civilization position themselves as “official” spokespersons, and their documentation is often accepted as truths, which is problematic.

Said honed in on the negative effects this may have on societies when analyzing a passage from the work of scholar William Robertson Smith. Some of Said’s commentary is between brackets within the text.

The Arabian traveler is quite different from ourselves. The labour of moving from place to place is a mere nuisance to him, he has no enjoyment in effort {as “we” do}, and grumbles at hunger or fatigue with all his might {as “we” do not}...Moreover, the Arab is little impressed by scenery {but “we” are}.<sup>59</sup>

According to Said, in his essays Smith tried to present a radical demythologizing of the Semites. Yet Said’s treatment of this passage immediately points out the key issues to the reader, without any lapse in time. The instant correction adds to the intensity of the deconstruction. In the paragraph that follows, Said points out his main focus: “The crucial point is that everything one can know or learn about ‘Semites’ and ‘Orientals’ receives immediate corroboration, not merely in the archives, but directly on the ground.”<sup>60</sup> Providing immediate ways for his audience to redeem the tokens, Said does not chance a misunderstanding, but rather prefers instant gratification. The bracketed comments repeatedly use “we” as a way to focus the reader’s attention to the implied comparison by Smith. We, then, takes on a new meaning involving a sense of righteousness and superiority.

Said considers the *us* and *them* dichotomy to be “principles of identity and noncontradiction” that suggest “‘we’ are this, ‘they’ are that.”<sup>61</sup> As an “executive power of

---

<sup>59</sup> Ibid., 237.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid., 236-7.

such a system of reference,<sup>62</sup> it serves to create an objectified representation of an *other*, whatever is different from and not “us”. The way Said utilizes *we*, *us*, *other*, *they*, and *them* helps him to articulate a broader connotation in the relationship between the West and the Rest. In his discussion on identity, he suggests that “the Orient took on a discursive identity that made it unequal with the West.”<sup>63</sup> Accentuating the discursive power of language and noting the inequality stemming from a “comparative attitude is (either) a scholarly necessity or...disguised ethnocentric race prejudice, we cannot say with absolute certainty,<sup>64</sup> the word *other* takes on greater meaning as well.

From page one, the word *other* is capitalized: “...and one of its deepest and most recurring images of the Other...” Capitalized or marked by quotations, this token for Said is powerful in that he uses it to connote that comparative inequality illustrated by the use of *us* and *them*. Furthermore, as suggested above, *other* also implies for Said, ethnocentricity, prejudice, and Western domination. He writes: “...more advanced cultures, have rarely offered the individual anything but imperialism, racism, and ethnocentrism for dealing with ‘other’ cultures.”<sup>65</sup> As a token, *other* becomes an indicator for stereotyping, racial supremacy, ethnocentrism, and imperialism. It suggests a worthiness or neediness of being controlled because of its inferiority represented in the *us* and *them* dichotomy.

Clearly expanding his tokens to reach globally, in *Culture and Imperialism*, Said explicitly states that

What are striking in these discourses are the rhetorical figures one keeps encountering in their descriptions of “the mysterious East,” as well as the stereotypes about “the African {or Indian or Irish or

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 234.

<sup>63</sup> Ibid., 156.

<sup>64</sup> Ibid., 149.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid., 204.

Jamaican or Chinese} mind,” the notions about bringing civilization to primitive or barbaric peoples, the disturbingly familiar ideas about flogging or death or extended punishment being required when “they” misbehaved or became rebellious, because “they” mainly understood force or violence best; “they” were not like “us,” and for that reason deserved to be ruled.<sup>66</sup>

*They* and *us* are tokens used to communicate the harmfulness of systematic stereotyping that come from the discourses of otherization and orientalism. While Said originally uses the Arab and Muslim world to illustrate his point and provide opportunities for the audience to redeem the tokens, here he expands the reach to more varied examples, showing how the problem is global, and not confined by national borders. *Culture and Imperialism* illustrates the parasitic aspect of art and its crucial function as an instrument for maintaining imperial regimes. In order to maintain power over an *other*, the comparison and reference system are used.

### *Empire and Imperialism*

While the terms empire and imperialism generally refer to times in history when European nations actively had colonies world-wide, Said argues that they are still valid. He argues “in our time, direct colonialism has largely ended; imperialism, as we shall see, lingers where it has always been, in a kind of general cultural sphere as well as in specific political, ideological, economic, and social practices.” Using cultural texts to illustrate how this *imperialism* penetrates society he explains the terms as he wishes to use them:

As I shall be using the term, “imperialism” means the practice, the theory and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan center ruling a distant territory...

---

<sup>66</sup> Said, *Culture and Imperialism*, xi.

and to explain *empire*, he quotes Michael Doyle:

Empire is a relationship, formal or informal, in which one state controls the effective political sovereignty of another political society. It can be achieved by force, by political collaboration, by economic, social, or cultural dependence. Imperialism is simply the process or policy of establishing or maintaining an empire.<sup>67</sup>

By clarifying what he means by the terms and determining how he plans to use them, Said is constructing a cosmopolitan rhetoric particular to himself and letting his audience follow his thought process and argument more fully. As tokens serve as condensed arguments, this allows Said to expand on examples while being sure that his audience can grasp what he is relating to them through his repetition and consistent use of those words.

Tying the tokens of *us* and *them* to *imperialism*, he explains to his audience the broader picture:

Domination and inequities of power and wealth are perennial facts of human society. But in today's global setting they are also interpretable as having to do with imperialism, its history, its new forms. The nations of contemporary Asia, Latin America, and Africa are politically independent but in many ways are as dominated and dependent as they were when ruled directly by European powers. On the one hand, this is the consequence of self-inflicted wounds... (some) say: *they*...are to blame for what "they" are... What we need to do is to look at these matters as a network of interdependent histories that it would be inaccurate and senseless to repress, useful and interesting to understand.<sup>68</sup>

This passage is significant on several levels. To begin, it connects the *us/they* dichotomy of the *other* to that of imperialism by suggesting that some justify the dominating of societies as the fault of the "weaker" civilization. It falls into his larger argument of power struggles on another level, and he asserts that domination is an unfortunate fact of human society

---

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., 9.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., 19.

encouraged or based on the inequities of power. Also in this passage, he touches on the fact that imperialism today takes on new forms as those power inequities are manifested in different ways, perhaps culturally or economically. Besides explicitly showing how imperialism is still an issue today, Said also firmly affixes his token to the global arena by providing examples across the globe of areas that are affected by this issue adding it to his cosmopolitan rhetoric.

His focus on the global and the overarching concern with suppressed or dominated societies positions Said as a cosmopolitan. Moreover, his tokens are carefully crafted to hold global meanings as well. When discussing the term empire, he wrote “empire was a universal concern.”<sup>69</sup> Said’s use of the token *empire* was rich with connotations of inequality, prejudice, suppression, and exploitation. By reviewing novels, operas, and plays, Said showed how

the facts of empire are associated with sustained possession, with far-flung and sometimes unknown spaces, with eccentric or unacceptable human beings, with fortune-enhancing or fantasized activities like emigration, money-making, and sexual adventure.<sup>70</sup>

*Empire* becomes a code word for an objectified look at the other, laden with images of exoticism, barbarism, and inferiorism. Said’s choice of the term, usually used to refer to previous centuries, allows him to relate to his audience that the limited understanding of those previous centuries still exist today.

To provide a stronger tie to the present, in “The Clash of Definitions” Said writes

I would begin to survey the world situation by commenting on how prevalent it has become for people to speak now in the name of large, and in my opinion undesirable vague and manipulable, abstractions....

---

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., 64.

<sup>70</sup> Ibid.



labels that collapse religions, races, and ethnicities into ideologies that are considerable more unpleasant and provocative...these examples of group psychology run rampant are not new, and they are certainly not edifying at all. They occur in times of deep insecurity, that is, when peoples seem particularly close to and thrust upon one another, as either the result of expansion, war, imperialism, and migration, or the effect of sudden, unprecedented change.<sup>71</sup>

*Imperialism* becomes less of a historic symptom and more of a constant possibility. Creating a group mentality that results in the dangers of large abstractions, *imperialism* and *other* “sudden” changes in populations are potential situations for any day and age. By re-aligning and carefully crafting the tokens *empire* and *imperialism*, Said shows his audience how cultures systematically rationalize and excuse domination and exploitation of other societies.

### *Knowledge and Power*

In his writings, Said focuses on the relationships between cultures. Attributing power to much of societies’ injustices, the term becomes pivotal to his argument. His autobiography, *Out of Place* serves as testimony to the incredible amount of weight Said places on the influence of power and how it can manifest itself in relationships, whether interpersonal or intercultural. For him as a child, power was exhibited in the way of Western teachers trying to force assimilation on the non-Western student. As he grew, power also meant being included among peers, Eastern and Western alike. And finally, power was always linked to the production of knowledge, the teachers, the “cool” classmates, those who knew the system.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup> Said, “The Clash of Definitions,” 574.

<sup>72</sup> See Said, *Out of Place* for further discussion.

Too often, the interpretation of knowledge comes from those in a position of power, and therefore, the representation of that knowledge is tainted. Such tainted representation, Said asserts, are not facts. In “Orientalism Reconsidered,” originally appearing in *Race and Class* in 1985 he states

Now this, I submit, is neither science, nor knowledge, nor understanding: it is a statement of power and a claim for absolute authority. It is constituted out of racism, and it is made comparatively acceptable to an audience prepared in advance to listen to its muscular truths.<sup>73</sup>

The link between power and knowledge here is clearly made by Said. He asserts that those with an advantage often produce knowledge in a way that misrepresents people and issues and that those misrepresentations are taken as fact because of the power advantage. In other words, when an authority makes a claim, it is accepted. The term *power* for Said is specifically constructed to become a token laden with connotations of absolute authority and racism. The term *knowledge* is crafted to present a signal for questioning. Said expects his audience to approach the tokens of *power* and *knowledge* with a healthy suspicion and a critical eye and presents them discursively to encourage thinking in that direction.

The other implication in this passage is that authority will have a tendency to produce knowledge that reinforces or maintains their position of power. Said asserts that “competing powers invent their own theory of cultural or civilizational destiny in order to justify their actions abroad”<sup>74</sup> which helps them map out not only future actions, but past ones as well. This point is also evident in *Representations of the Intellectual*. When Said was discussing how public intellectuals use their power to create knowledge or “truths”, he said

The problem for the intellectual is not so much, as Carey discusses,

---

<sup>73</sup> Edward Said, “Orientalism Reconsidered,” *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, 206.

<sup>74</sup> Said, “The Clash of Definitions,” 574.

mass society as a whole, but rather insiders, experts, coteries, professionals who in the modes defined earlier this century by pundit Walter Lippmann mold public opinion, make it conformist, encourage a reliance on a superior little band of all-knowing men in power. Insiders promote special interests, but intellectuals should be the ones to question patriotic nationalism, corporate thinking, and a sense of class, racial, or gender privilege.<sup>75</sup>

*Knowledge* then is produced by a small group of people (“all-knowing men”) in power.

Furthermore, that particular knowledge they produce supports their position, perpetuating their *power*. Said suggests that traditionally agreed upon truths should be approached critically, and intellectuals should lead that effort. Besides providing insight into his *power*, this passage also emphasizes the dangers of certain types of knowledge: patriotic nationalism and corporate thinking. His mentioning them underscores that they sustain “class, racial, (and) gender privilege.” With this assertion, Said takes the opposite position, a cosmopolitan one, which promotes equality and embracing of difference.

Warning against the hazards of group pride and what he calls self-aggrandizement, in reaction to Samuel Huntington’s “The Clash of Civilizations,” Said writes

These redeeming ideas dignify the practice of competition and clash, whose real purpose, as Conrad quite accurately saw, was self-aggrandizement, power, conquest, treasure, and unrestrained self-pride. I would go so far as to say that what we today call the rhetoric of identity, by which a member of one ethnic or religious or national or cultural group puts that group at the center of the world, derives from that period of imperial competition at the end of the nineteenth century. And this in turn provokes the concept of “worlds at war” that quite obviously is at the heart of Huntington’s article.<sup>76</sup>

In this passage, power is identified as a motivation for people in positions as well as civilizations. Said explains how it is glorified at the expense of the peaceful co-existence of

---

<sup>75</sup> Said, *Representations of the Intellectual*, xiii.

<sup>76</sup> Said, “The Clash of Definitions,” 575.

cultures. In fact, it becomes the driving force for wars. Criticizing Huntington for pitting societies against each other positions Said more firmly as a cosmopolitan who can appreciate difference and embrace it rather than find difference a problem that needs to be overcome. The other statement made here is that of inequality. Commenting on how a group member puts that group “at the center of the world,” Said is suggesting that group considers themselves to be superior to other groups. This superiority complex helps rationalize injustices done to other groups and produces truths and knowledge with the same rationalizations.

The connection between *power* and *knowledge* as well as the sense of inequality and misrepresentation in knowledge creation is a recurring theme in Said’s writings.

In any case the politics of knowledge that is based principally on the affirmation of identity is very similar, is indeed directly related to, the unreconstructed nationalism that has guided so many postcolonial states today. It asserts a sort of separatism that wishes only to draw attention to itself, consequently it neglects the integration of that earned and achieved consciousness of self within “the rendez-vous of victory.” On the national and on the intellectual level the problems are very similar.<sup>77</sup>

The direct relationship that Said creates between power and knowledge is possible because of how he uses the terms as tokens. His particular construction of the terms force a distinct reading which gives the audience insight to Said’s concerns as a cosmopolitan citizen. In the passage above, his discussion on knowledge conveys that the creation of knowledge is based on identity, individual or national. The broader implication, national and international, is that while knowledge serves to help create identity, it also causes separatism which is problematic in international relations. Later in the same essay, he explains that it is not simply the

---

<sup>77</sup> Edward Said, “The Politics of Knowledge,” *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*, 379-380.

information itself, but also how knowledge is produced and how it is interpreted<sup>78</sup> that make a difference in the representation of peoples and events.

### **Transcending Time**

In reviewing a book for *The Nation*, Said once wrote that while questions of the past were clearly answered, he asked “what of the future?” Clarifying his point, Said said that a further step is needed, connecting, in this case, aesthetic with action.<sup>79</sup> Referring to issues of time, Said’s assessment is not solely based on the descriptive competence of a piece, but also on its effectiveness to address possibilities. Accordingly, when reading Said, it is useful to note how he approaches time and its functionality for him.

Admitting to his interests in history, society, and literature, Said’s intertwining of history throughout his work presents a glimpse into his understanding of time. In an interview for *Critical Text* in 1986 he explained that his concept of history

is essentially geographical and territorial, a history made up of several overlapping terrains, so that society is viewed as a territory in which a number of movements are occurring. The vision of overlapping and contested terrains is to me a more interesting view of history than the temporal one... Given that, it becomes possible to see engagement in the historical process as in fact a collective struggle... in which various interests interact over particular sites of intensity and contested domains.<sup>80</sup>

By discursively shifting the focus from the temporal to the geographical, Said creates a sense of time that is not linear, but rather that tries to incorporate a complete picture with multiple perspectives. Interest in the past, for Said, stems from present experiences and concern for the future. Therefore, he explores history in a way that allows him to explore what events or

---

<sup>78</sup> Ibid., 385.

<sup>79</sup> Edward Said, “Bursts of Meaning,” *Reflections on Exile and other essays*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 152.

<sup>80</sup> Said, “Overlapping Territories,” 58.

texts “were connected to that enabled them?”<sup>81</sup> By avoiding the standard temporal approach to history, Said offers a concept that transcends both time and place because it accounts for the historical interactions from a geographical perspective as well.

The notion of transcending time and place is also addressed in “Traveling Theory” and “Traveling Theory Reconsidered.” Exploring how ideas and theories move from place to place and what happens to them in the process Said originally argues in “Traveling Theory” that theories develop in response to specific historical situation or social reasons. Therefore, when they move from their original place, the power attached to them fades away as they become assimilated or domesticated in their new location (temporal or geographical).<sup>82</sup> About a decade later, he re-evaluated his position in “Traveling Theory Reconsidered” and concluded that it is in fact possible that a theory could be reinterpreted in a new time and place and accordingly be re-energized by a new political situation or social dynamic.<sup>83</sup>

With reference to a cosmopolitan rhetoric, Said’s perception of time suggests that arguments travel through time and place. Because one of the challenges of cosmopolitan rhetoric is its lack of connection to a particular history or an exact place, the idea of transcendence becomes essential for the persuasive power to persist. Said contends with this issue in two separate ways. To begin, in “Overlapping Territories” Said links time and place, discursively creating a bond between the two, allowing for ideas to travel through both. By viewing history geographically, a more complete picture is presented by incorporating place in the articulation of time. To additionally confirm this point, in “Traveling Theory

---

<sup>81</sup> Ibid., 59.

<sup>82</sup> For further discussion see Edward Said, “Traveling Theory,” *The World, the Text, and the Critic*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1983), 226-247.

<sup>83</sup> For further discussion see Edward Said, “Traveling Theory Reconsidered,” *Reflections on Exile and other essays*, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 436-452.

Reconsidered,” Said asserts that ideas can maintain their persuasiveness as it is translated to the new time or place and can thus become reinvigorated in the new situation. Again, the duality of time and place suggested by Said strengthens the potential for concepts and purposely constructed cosmopolitan tokens to maintain their persuasiveness and therefore can overcome cosmopolitan rhetoric’s challenge.

### **Said’s Contribution to the Cosmopolitan Conversation**

Said’s resistance to the simple definitions of exile, power, knowledge, orientalism, and other, coupled with his recurring efforts to complicate his terms suggest that he viewed them as tokens, worthy of analysis. Each token furthers the cosmopolitan notion of viewing the world as a unified place. Exile functions as a connector of similar experiences by stressing the vulnerability of the situation with the strength of the human will. Said does not treat it as a symptom of a single people, but more as a human condition that takes on many forms and is actually a dynamic process. Power and Knowledge serve to heighten awareness of hegemonic structures and how they function, indiscriminately among people and cultures. The point he makes is not to divide but rather to understand how power and knowledge interact with each other and together with society, so hopefully people will be less susceptible to their manipulations. Using tokens encourages people to look beyond superficial bits of information and search for more meaningful representations. As in journalism, the hope is that people realize there may be more than just two sides of a story, which cedes differing perspectives justification. Finally, the tokens of orientalism and other also benefit the cosmopolitan perspective because they demonstrate how stereotypes create

tensions and divide based on misrepresentations. With these tokens, Said brings these issues to the forefront and compels his audiences to consider their world in its all-inclusive entirety.

His arguments benefited by providing his audiences opportunity for redemption by careful articulation of how he sees the implications of the words in a broader scope. His in depth explorations reiterate how different he considered the words to be from the dictionary definition as he provides a multifaceted, nuanced understanding of his particular use.

His focus on the global positions him as a cosmopolitan, and the language he has created with his tokens as a cosmopolitan rhetoric because they are understandable to a mass audience and are not grounded in place. He considered his place in the world particularly in the closing paragraph of his autobiography.

I occasionally experience myself as a cluster of flowing currents. I prefer this to the idea of a solid self, the identity to which so many attach so much significance. These currents, like the themes of one's life, flowing along during the waking hours, and at their best, they require no reconciling, no harmonizing. They are "off" and may be out of place, but at least they are always in motion, in time, in place, in the form of all kinds of strange combinations moving about, not necessarily forward, sometimes against each other, contrapuntally, yet without one central theme. A form of freedom, I'd like to think, even if I am far from being totally convinced that it is. That skepticism too is one of the themes I particularly want to hold on to. With so many dissonances in my life I have learned actually to prefer being not quite right and out of place.<sup>84</sup>

Edward Said's final articulation of his place in the world allows for a greater sophistication of identity by legitimizing the right to be both cosmopolitan and nationalist at once. His self-imposed liberation from the forces that bind allowed him to freely criticize the dangers of conformity of thought and communicate a language for critically approaching the world to

---

<sup>84</sup> Said, *Out of Place*, 295.



allow for diverse contribution, involvement and representation in an effort to legitimize the experiences of the entire world.

## CONCLUSION

Theories of cosmopolitanism and nationalism are traditionally conveyed as irreconcilable in nature. Yet based on careful review of the rhetoric of Edward Said, Jimmy Carter, and Vaclav Havel, it is clear that cosmopolitanism and nationalism can in fact coexist. Each figure is originally from a very different part of the world, and while their backgrounds may seem different, their focus on humankind is quite the same. Not only do they share a certain level of fame, but they also share similar causes in the global arena. Their identification as cosmopolitans develops from how they view the world and how they view themselves in the world. Each considers himself a citizen of the world. Keeping nation close to the heart, Carter, Havel, and Said maintain a global presence, global interests, and a global language of their own.

### **Combining National and Global**

As a testimony to their devotion and grounding in nation, each of the three actively represented their country in the global arena. In fact, their cosmopolitan interests are informed by their national experiences.

Carter's national experiences, which inform his world citizenship, stem from what some consider his "unfinished presidency." Uncompleted goals became the goals of the Carter Center and translated well into a cosmopolitan rhetoric particular to Carter himself. Inspired by the Camp David Accords and hoping for the possibility of more of the same, Brinkley explains that at a pre-Center conference, the consensus was

the Carter Center's primary goals should be to promote international

human rights and to make peace among warring factions, wherever they may be, using the Camp David accords as a model of successful negotiation. “The center would stand on the humanitarian principle that everyone on earth should be able to live in peace,” Carter proclaimed to his brain trust, harking back to his farewell address. He intended nothing less than to create an institute broad enough in scope to carry on his unfinished presidency.<sup>1</sup>

Building a future based on the successes of the past, Carter used his national experience to create a global center, and a cosmopolitan identity for himself. Transforming himself from national leader to citizen of the world, his new life aimed to project the micro of nation into the macro of global by consistently utilizing a set of tokens constructed to help him project a cosmopolitan persona. By containing a broad scope, Carter is able to incorporate more than peace efforts and expanded to global health issues, economic concerns, and environmental issues as well. Taking his national experiences and propelling them into the international arena, Carter has helped foster interdependency typical of a cosmopolitan.

For Havel, his national experiences informed his international concerns because he brought with him the first-hand struggles of balancing national pride with international acceptance. Czechoslovakia’s emergence onto the international arena was both a victory for nationalism as it came out from under the influences of the Iron Curtain, and for cosmopolitanism, as it found strength in legitimacy in the wider world. By recognizing the value of international acceptance, Havel transcended the national and embraced the cosmopolitan to benefit his own country as well as oppressed people everywhere by discursively constructing a language that allowed him to express both his national and cosmopolitan persona to his audiences. His cause may have begun locally, but it grew to the global.

---

<sup>1</sup> Brinkley, p. 91.

Also speaking from his local experience, Said's cosmopolitan interests are greatly informed by his national situation. The harshness of forced exile allowed him to appreciate the struggles of other suffering peoples as well as the advantages of being in a comfortable position to advocate for them. Turning the exilic condition into a position of advantage, he writes

The fact of migration is extraordinarily impressive to me: that movement from the precision and concreteness of one form of life transmuted or imported into the other...and then of course the whole problematic of exile and immigration enters into it, the people who simply don't belong in any culture; that is the great modern, or, if you like, postmodern fact, the standing outside cultures.<sup>2</sup>

Said's career was intricately entangled with the concept of exile. He viewed his own exile through a universal lens. Crossing over cultures nimbly, the title of his autobiography *Out of Place* seems almost quaint, or at least obsolete, as Said seemed to be at home in the entire world. In fact, Said uses "we" to include different constituents depending on his audience, sometimes the Arab world, and sometimes the academic world (internationally as well), more often the United States. Benefiting from maintaining flexibility as a social, cultural and political critic, his use of his language to bridge the national and global interests, his analytical advantage comes from his personal, national experiences.

Reliance on the national as grounding strengthens the cosmopolitan project because it resolves the criticism that cosmopolitanism lacks any foundations. While some notions of cosmopolitanism and nationalism maintain monolithic ideas of identity and identification and thereby restrict individuals and limit the possibilities of either concept reaching full potential, Havel, Carter, and Said seem to have been able to strike a balance. To recognize that

---

<sup>2</sup> From Stephen Howe, "Edward Said: the traveler and the exile," *openDemocracy*, October 2, 2003, [www.opendemocracy.net](http://www.opendemocracy.net).

Czechoslovakia will benefit by participating fully in the global arena, to see if values of democracy and individual rights can benefit world citizens, or to acknowledge mutual struggles globally rather than just focusing on one's own national struggles is how each of these leaders provided a multidimensionality to both projects. By mutually informing cosmopolitanism and nationalism, they provide a greater chance of their ultimate goals being fulfilled.

The co-existence of cosmopolitanism and nationalism therefore does not simply imply being affiliated to both, but rather a deeper understanding that each needs the other. The three public personas not only negotiate the ambiguous space between the local and the global, but they also use each to better articulate the other. In fact, the cosmopolitan language they rely on to communicate their ideas to wide audiences allows them to step into their cosmopolitan personas effectively. For Havel, tokens like home, circle, and society are used to acknowledge and distinguish space. Carter navigates space by investing in the token of partnership. Other and exile are used by Said to closely examine how the local and global interact.

Havel's depiction of space is rather visual as he provides his audiences with a mental image of his conception. The token "circle" illustrates the physicality of being surrounded by different worlds, from the innermost or intimate to the outermost or global. He shows how each circle is dependent on the other and all are interconnected while holding the individual in place. His explanation of home also helps him negotiate the space between cosmopolitanism and nationalism because he uses the token as an avenue to reach all the different circles. Home becomes dependent on the circle involved, an intimate home or a less intimate home, each is essential for the wholeness of a person. Finally, society also

works to negotiate the space in between because his notion of civil society, while traditionally used in the context of nation, is by Havel to evoke the universality of human rights. Thus, to negotiate the space between cosmopolitanism and nationalism, Havel's use of circle, home, and society work together to help him articulate the expanse of "home," by way of circles that progress to a global dimension, remaining grounded in "home" while maintaining the significance of society as a universal concept.

Carter negotiates that space in his notion of "partnership." For him, partnerships are the joining of different entities and interests to create a cooperative effort. Partnership can be inter- or intra-national. It might refer to groups, nations, people, or places. Regardless, for Carter, partnerships function to help foster mutual interests and joint efforts. The other way that Carter balances between cosmopolitanism and nationalism is in his projects. As tokens, his global interests reflect how he smoothly maneuvers back and forth between the two. This is especially evident in projects that are both national and international like the Habitat for Humanity which builds homes for the underprivileged in the U.S. and abroad. Accordingly, "poverty" for Carter is both a local and a global issue and as a token serves to illustrate how cosmopolitanism and nationalism can co-exist.

Said extensively explained to his audiences through the token "exile" how the two might co-exist. Furthermore, his discussion on the other also addresses this point. Exile confirms that the two projects can co-exist and inform each other because as articulated by Said, it is a process of going back and forth itself. Between the "homeland" and the new land or the entire world, exile exemplifies a migratory process by which people become rootless and rooted at once. Said's expression of exile as a process rather than an object creates a more fluid account of the exilic identity. The encompassing of here and everywhere

underscores the mutual possibility and interdependence of both schools of thought. His use of the token “other” also supports that notion because it serves to highlight how alienation and separation are counterproductive. The critical approach of focusing on the detriments of the opposite of a cohesiveness of the projects provides historical and current proof of the point he is making. Becoming a token of great magnitude, now “the other” has taken on such intensity that it is understood from Said’s perspective automatically.

### **A Global Cosmopolitan Language**

Not only does cosmopolitan rhetoric produce a certain distinguishable style but it also has a substance that evokes a particularized way of arguing and using evidence different from other rhetoric. Because it is inclusive in nature, its persuasiveness depends on two main factors. The first is the commonality of the issues, meaning that the topics are unifying, universal concerns that are to a great extent uncontested. The other factor, and perhaps the more important one, is the ethos of the rhetor. More fully addressed in the section addressing the audience, I argue that the success of the cosmopolitan language greatly depends on the moral quality and good will of the rhetor. Particular to cosmopolitan rhetoric is its use of place to contextualize the discussion. Deterritorializing as a means to lessen the emphasis on nation, American cosmopolitan rhetoric has traditionally used markers of place as a strategy to identify and articulate cosmopolitanism. While useful, especially for a cosmopolitan language intended for and from one nation, I submit that other markers are important to note for a global cosmopolitan language, and the tokens identified in this project reflect that idea. While most rhetorical situations prescribe to codified ways of thinking, cosmopolitan rhetoric

tends to resist, demystify, or revise the traditional. To begin, I review how to identify a cosmopolitan rhetoric through the examples of Havel, Carter, and Said.

Identifying a cosmopolitan rhetoric entails two main qualifications. The first is that the rhetor should be a cosmopolitan, and the second is finding the common denominators that unify the language created by them. To begin I will reinforce their positions as cosmopolitan rhetors, then I will demonstrate how their tokens work in concert to provide a global cosmopolitan rhetoric.

Since a cosmopolitan rhetoric should come from a cosmopolitan, reiterating how each of the three public intellectuals is a cosmopolitan is particularly significant. As previously mentioned, Darsey suggests that a cosmopolitan is someone who has left home spiritually or physically, can absorb and reflect on multiple places, and finds a voice “on significant public issues” becoming “moral spokespersons.”

Havel fits this criteria because he has considered himself to be intellectually exiled by his prison sentences. In his work, he connects himself and his topics to the world by maintaining a wide view of universal consequences and the interconnections of place. Lastly, Havel feels that it is his personal responsibility as a public intellectual to use his position as a platform to voice views on issues like human rights.

Said is also considered a cosmopolitan because of his physical exile from Palestine, his intercultural upbringing and life, and his ability to be at home in multiple countries. Furthermore, his writings not only express an appreciation for the interconnectedness of place, but for the interconnectedness of time. He uses historical examples to show how different places and different times interact and affect each other. Said, too, uses his position



as an internationally known scholar to project a cosmopolitan persona, able to advocate for global causes.

Even though he has always lived in the U.S., Carter's focus and work abroad qualifies him as a cosmopolitan. Labeled a Washington "outsider" while president and calling himself a citizen of the world as a post-president, he projects a cosmopolitan persona by becoming known more for his international efforts and accomplishments than for his national ones. In fact, some say he is appreciated globally more than locally, typical of a cosmopolitan. His work and his writings convey his understanding of not only how the world is interdependent, but also how different global issues are interrelated. Using his political capital to gain access to the world, Carter selects global issues to adopt and becomes an active spokesperson, hands on concerned citizen.

It is generally agreed upon by scholars that a cosmopolitan rhetoric should reflect pluralism, have an understanding of multiculturalism, and promote valuing difference on a global scale. Each of the three figures reflects pluralism in their work by allowing differing points of view legitimacy. They all understand multiculturalism partly because of their exposure to different cultures, but also because of their expressed understanding of how the world is interdependent and interconnected. Said, Carter, and Havel also express that they value difference, through encouraging cooperation between different groups, and their willingness to be spokespersons for different people and causes. Following is a review of how their tokens function to articulate these three basic cosmopolitan principles.

Havel, Said, and Carter reflect pluralism by utilizing tokens constructed to discursively relate cosmopolitan concerns and communicate a cosmopolitan persona. Upon reading their work, one can see that diverse groups are represented coincidentally, as part of a normal

process. Havel's focus on the human condition, insisting on "openness" and "tolerance" emerge in his cosmopolitan rhetoric. Seeing himself as an "inhabitant of the planet," pluralism is reflected in his tokens home, circles, and society because they incorporate notions of inclusion and representation of different groups. Said's work also reflects inclusion, especially in the tokens of other, us, and them where he insists on legitimizing diverse groups and points of view. Pluralism becomes matter of fact for Said as his examples span the globe from the Middle East to the Far East to the Near East, to Europe and the Americas. Having founded postcolonialism and as something of a master of Cultural Studies, more cultures are apparently represented in Said's body of work than not. Also a strong proponent of pluralism, Carter uses partnership in particular to promote diversity. Through this token, he is able to insist on the visibility of diverse groups to help him represent and solve global issues. Therefore, the cooperation that is part of his partnership, not only includes those he is trying to aid, but those helping him do the aiding. Collectively, their tokens effectively reflect pluralism because they have instilled in them notions of inclusiveness and diversity. By recognizing different groups and embracing the global population within their tokens, they utilize and provide a language that is more representative of a world population than most.

In order to communicate an understanding of multiculturalism, the three public intellectuals developed tokens including human, orientalism, empire and imperialism, and understanding, and peace. Each figure separately uses terms to reflect his own profound understanding of and appreciation for multiculturalism. Yet together, their tokens suggest that cultures cannot be compartmentalized. Rather, Said, Carter, and Havel assert that no culture is self-contained or impermeable. In fact, cultures are enriched by interaction and

“contamination.” The three also agree that there are what Havel refers to as “common minimums” that serve as a starting point to help the understanding and appreciating process. Their advantage in appreciating how cultures interact helps them to deterritorialize, to see and deal with the world as a whole, and in turn provides their audiences with a cosmopolitan language articulating that view.

Not only are they able to see the world as a cohesive place, but they are also able to value the things that make it different. One of the main criticisms of cosmopolitanism mentioned earlier is that its universality encourages a hegemonic co-opting. Yet the cosmopolitan rhetoric provided by Havel, Said, and Carter actually embraces differences. By valuing and promoting diverse perspectives through tokens like “dissident” and “truth,” “exile,” “knowledge” and “power,” and “reconciliation,” they allow and protect the right to differ, to be different, and to resist conformity. Providing platforms for difference to emerge and be heard, they are resisting the bland, hegemonic, conformity and championing the voice of diversity.

Havel, Said, and Carter offer a global cosmopolitan rhetoric because they enact the sensibilities named by the tokens they emphasize in their lives. Unlike a distinctively American cosmopolitan rhetoric, their rhetoric exists on a global scale because their discourse extends to the world and is not grounded solely in the American experience. Furthermore, the language they provide is also a cosmopolitan rhetoric because the public issues they adopt are global. While markers of place are necessary and significant (like Havel’s home and Said’s exile) they are not the only sources of identification. The common thread in the tokens identified is their inclusiveness of the people of the world. Havel, Said, and Carter consciously articulated their tokens to include multifaceted, profound meanings

that reflect the fluidity of existence, reflexivity of action, and interdependence of entities in today's globalizing world. Accordingly, their collective tokens help create a recognizable language, a cosmopolitan rhetoric, able to communicate those values and realities to a wide, global audience.

### **Articulating a Global Community**

David Hollinger identifies the problem of solidarity as “one of the central challenges of the twenty-first century.”<sup>3</sup> Defining solidarity as a state of social existence, entailing a degree of conscious commitment, he recognizes that it cannot be restricted by borders that are continuously altered. Suggesting solidarity to be more performative than community, he attaches to it “a special claim that individuals have on each other's energies and compassion.”<sup>4</sup> By “more performative than community,” Hollinger implies that solidarity becomes more dynamic, more fluid, more able to adapt to different situations presented by a globalizing world. Solidarity would conventionally refer to the nationalist ideals, yet its interpretation here provides for a wider, more complex meaning. Therefore, as a state of social existence, forging solidarity by means of cosmopolitan ideals and projects becomes a way to unify different peoples.

Broadening our scope to echo David Harvey's “unifying vision,” each of the three public intellectuals applied different tokens to communicate the need for a global solidarity. Different from the space in between the two projects, Hollinger's solidarity refers to an expansive sense of community. Projecting that notion into their cosmopolitan rhetoric, Said,

---

<sup>3</sup> David A. Hollinger, *Cosmopolitanism and Solidarity: Studies in Ethnoracial, Religious, and Professional Affiliation in the United States*, (Madison Wi.: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2006), p.ix.

<sup>4</sup> For further discussion, see Hollinger, (preface).

Carter, and Havel expressed a need for a wider regard for others in the world. Hence, extending the community is integrated in their language.

Havel's primary token for reinforcing that notion of an extended community and forcing solidarity is through the token *responsibility*. Taking it upon himself to call for greater responsibility, Havel's speeches and writings stress the idea of "one global destiny" and "co-responsibility." Explaining that "people today know that they can be saved only by a new type of global responsibility," Havel reinforces the idea of a "human world," "human power," and "human responsibility." By tying the word responsibility to notions of global destiny, he supports Hollinger's cosmopolitan notion of solidarity. Havel uses the token *responsibility* to construct a global society, cast a wide net on human kind, and remind people that the current world order requires a new sense of obligation to this wider community.<sup>5</sup> Packed with connotation, *responsibility* for Havel contains layers of meaning that encourage global awareness for a broad public, reiterated in his token *society*. Investing in the token *society*, Havel instills in it an international appeal. Specifically related to solidarity, Havel's token society emphasizes a broad community as transgresses national boundaries and suggests that society includes "not only members of our nation, but members of our family...our region...our supranational communities."<sup>6</sup> Providing his audience with a continual sense of purpose, Havel's tokens support the extended notion of solidarity because they entail strong elements of a global community, a global society that has an obligation to others beyond immediate borders. In so doing, these tokens underscore certain values that accompany community, but in the wider sense.

---

<sup>5</sup> For further discussion, see Vaclav Havel, "The Co-responsibility of the West."

<sup>6</sup> For further discussion, see Vaclav Havel, "Summer Meditations."

Carter's sense of community is also articulated in broad terms. For the most part it is evident in his tokens that represent global causes. Emphasizing interdependency and interconnectedness, Carter's tokens of human rights, environment, health and hunger, and poverty illustrate the reach of his notion of community. Providing his audiences ample opportunity to redeem the tokens through explanations, stories, and actual action, Carter also encourages an awareness of an expansive world. When developing the concept for the Carter Center, despite its potential idealism, he wanted to create a place where everyone on earth was represented. In fact, he recognized that this meant that not always would the Center be dealing with legitimate governments, but sometimes with groups of people that might otherwise not have a platform to be heard.<sup>7</sup> Carter expands the notion of community and promotes a global sense of solidarity by his conscious effort to reach out to and create awareness of lesser publicized causes. Whether they are Guinea Worm disease, new farming methods, or environmental issues that are not yet fashionable, his discussions on global issues support a cosmopolitan solidarity by promoting inclusiveness. This pattern was followed in the Global 2000 initiatives: the pilot agriculture project in Sudan was selected because of its potential to help a wider area around the country, not just the small community; and a project helping physically disabled in China was noted because "rather than provide individual solutions to individual problems..." it developed "systems, knowledge, and tools to address these problems for years to come."<sup>8</sup> Carter's project characteristically provides the means for communities to help themselves and maintain better standards while serving as "the best evidence of a successful model for international

---

<sup>7</sup> For further discussion see Jimmy Carter, "Waging Peace."

<sup>8</sup> Troester, 134.

collaboration.”<sup>9</sup> Besides that each of the issues serves as a token in its own right, addressing the matter of community is the way that Carter presents them. Layering tokens in a hierarchical base-building method also helps illustrate their relationship and the basic reciprocity necessary in global citizenship. He places great importance on articulating their contingency and interconnectedness, by providing and utilizing a cosmopolitan language that reflects an interdependency of both issues and peoples.

In order to address the wider solidarity that should be a part of cosmopolitanism, Said relies on the tokens of empire and imperialism. Used in the critical sense, these tokens prove how vast the world is, how important alternative accounts and impressions are, and how people’s affect on one another is reciprocal. Hollinger’s description of a performative solidarity is confirmed in Said’s rhetoric because Said’s treatment of identity and identity formation, empire and imperialism is as a process. As on going, fluid concepts, empire and imperialism are utilized to express that despite inequalities, people of the world affect each other. Particularly addressing Hollinger’s idea of individuals’ claim on each other’s energies and compassion, Said’s work meticulously pinpoints how the actions of societies on opposite ends of the world affect each other for generations. Warning of the dangers of exploitation and domination, Said uses the tokens empire and imperialism to articulate that one culture influences another. Yet often overlooked in standard historical accounts is the idea that the “dominated” culture equally affects the imperial power. He draws from historical colonial situations to base his idea that the same problems can arise with newer “imperial” conditions as well. Said asserts that it is not just that the imperial power becomes a part of the dominated culture, but that inadvertently, the dominated culture penetrates and becomes a

---

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

part of the imperial culture as well.<sup>10</sup> This verifies that Said appreciated the significance of a wider sense of solidarity because with the contamination of all cultures that occurs with his interpretations of empire and imperialism, the result is a wider community of shared experiences. Performative solidarity is encouraged in Said's rhetoric because he intently re-teaches his audiences how to decrease the negative exploits and increase the positive interactions by being more fully aware of how to regard, articulate, and address the wider community.

### **Tokens for Understanding Difference and Resolving Conflict**

In addition to creating a greater understanding of a broad globalizing world, the cosmopolitan rhetoric used by the three intellectuals also helps foster a greater understanding of difference by offering a language with which to articulate it. A cosmopolitan language's potential for increasing the appreciation of differences lies in its ability to communicate the humanity of people. Each one of the three articulate this point by using different tokens, yet each communicates a very similar message, that all people deserve the same legitimacy in the world.

For Havel, the tokens he uses to prompt understanding of difference are human, identity, duty and truth. While seemingly separate, these four tokens work together to project Havel's vision of the sameness of the human experience. He often couples the word "human" with identity, duty and truth to express a more expansive meaning. Havel's use of human becomes a demonstration of how to discursively present an understanding and means to overcome difference. As a token, human implies an ability to influence situations by

---

<sup>10</sup> For further discussion, see Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism*.



making choices. Human comprises an autonomy on the individual level as well as on the societal level. His goal seems to be to spark a will to use that autonomy to benefit the world. Havel pairs human with duty and identity to emphasize and expand their reach. The token duty accordingly goes beyond duty to one's next-door neighbor and now reaches to civic duties (and as previously mentioned Havel's civic society is one with global reach). Human duties are duties to human kind. Human identity, along the same lines, is an evolving process based on the choices freedom presents to people. The humanity in identity takes the course of human kind awakening and making more responsible choices. He speaks of the crisis of human identity as one that is brought about by people forfeiting their right to choose to take responsibility for society, for their actions, for the actions of their governments. Human identity, as Havel's token, needs to be re-owned and revived. By "living in truth" or choosing to live by one's conscience, Havel affirms his hopes that society will restore its dignity and be proud of its human identity. The token truth also speaks to the understanding of difference because it hopes to debunk the hegemonic powers by not accepting the forced way of life or way of thinking. Truth for Havel functions as a tool that currently is not utilized enough and needs to be used much more often to resist the structures that keep people oppressed by separating them from the rest of the world. Truth, tied to his token responsibility, is used to articulate a manner to improve the human condition, address the crisis of human identity, become a human duty, and be apart of what is universally human. Duty, truth, identity and human as tokens foster understanding of difference by encouraging a wider view of humanity as a whole while resisting forced views of difference at the same time.

Carter's approach to communicating a better understanding of difference is similar in that he, too, encourages the aspects of humankind. The tokens Carter develops in his cosmopolitan rhetoric that help him articulate this are understanding and peace. Perhaps of the three, Carter crafts the most elaborate tokens directly addressing the issue of understanding difference. The layers of meaning infused in the token understanding prove the complexity of the concept for Carter. To begin, he asserts that understanding is a prerequisite for solving global issues and individuals need to strive for understanding to help make the world a better place. For him, understanding is a combination of compassion, compromise, and knowledge. Compassion toward fellow humans involves a genuine concern for other people. Compromise suggests that understanding requires a give and take because for true understanding, each group needs to accept that they are not the center of the universe. Knowledge, for Carter, is a deep, informed education on a people, place, or subject. It involves an acknowledgement of other people and positions and entails more than a superficial familiarity with a situation. Also an element in Carter's understanding is a neutrality that creates an objective view of difference. Yet his neutrality remains compassionate as he focuses understanding through the lens of the humane. Carter explains that "we can grow from understanding" suggesting that it is a reciprocal process. Understanding and appreciating difference unifies humanity and is a useful tool in cosmopolitan rhetoric because it helps the rhetors articulate an insightful astuteness needed in appreciating diversity.

The other token that Carter shapes is peace. Articulating peace as action, Carter charges the token with cosmopolitan perspective. When speaking about peace, he refers to himself as a citizen of the world which allows him to represent issues of peace from multiple

points of view. By taking different points of view, he is forced to understand difference and communicate that to his audiences. One of the main functions of the Carter Center is to provide a place for people (from everywhere and anywhere) to come to for peaceful solutions. In this move, Carter is acknowledging diversity of religion, nationality and ethnicity. Acknowledging global diversity and legitimizing it by representing different groups provides ample opportunity for understanding. Peace becomes consistent with understanding difference, because for Carter, for peace to be achieved, there should be an acknowledgment, legitimization, and understanding of different people and points of view.

Said's tokens also encourage understanding difference by legitimizing the experiences of others. Much of Said's work functions to help expand his audience's understanding of cultural difference. Because he leans toward the critical, he strives to expose how the status quo shelters the masses from alternative histories, ways of life, or understanding. Said also tends to use his work to illuminate different points of view, show their legitimacy, and provide an opportunity for difference to be celebrated rather than feared. Since understanding difference is a major motivation for his work, his tokens often serve, in one way or another, to expose how difference is often feared, shunned, or vilified. Yet specifically, the token orientalism works to this end.

Drawing from his personal position of living a multicultural life, Said is able to proficiently articulate difference. Orientalism informs the understanding of difference because as a token, Said positions it to encompass multiple layers of meaning particular to him. Used as a referent, this token expresses what difference is and explains how it functions by method of comparison. So, by showing the juxtapositioning of one understanding to another, Said exposes the challenge of understanding difference without alternative points of

view. To overcome that challenge, Said tirelessly tries to realign generally agreed upon truths to show that questioning those truths can lead to better understanding of different cultures. Because orientalism connotes distant geographic locations, political and economic colonialism (including decolonization, post and neocolonialism), and cultural colonialism, it becomes a token to critically show how difference is traditionally demonized, vilified, and opponents thus treated accordingly. Said exposes this rhetorical move to demonize anything different, and counters it with the token orientalism, which is used to highlight the differences and accordingly demystify those differences, bringing about a greater understanding and appreciation.

Besides providing a better understanding of difference, which is significant in an increasingly interconnected world, a cosmopolitan rhetoric is important for understanding and negotiating conflicts. Encouraging cooperation among disagreeing parties is growingly important as we see a rise in violent conflicts worldwide. Tokens outlined by Carter, Havel, and Said are used to discursively help bridge those gaps and encourage dialogue to reduce conflict.

Even though Havel's tokens have more obvious assets to a cosmopolitan rhetoric, they do lend a helping hand in conflict resolution by recognizing the value of duty and responsibility to the world. Since his tokens of duty, truth, and responsibility incorporate confronting problems, they are useful to conflict resolution in so far as they encourage people to try to better situations globally for the oppressed. A human rights activist, Havel's tokens revolve around the notion that misconducts should be corrected and a sense of universality should guide how conflict is resolved. The token "dissident," however, demonstrates how Havel uses a token to deal with conflict. Deconstructing "dissident" and "dissent," it

becomes clear that Havel actively justifies opposing points of view and suggests that the dissident is a citizen concerned with a higher purpose. This is useful to resolving conflict because it is a viable term that can be used to disarm the “opposition” by implying that an opposing position is more of a shift in priorities rather than one against the other. The dissident is no longer a rebel, but rather a long term planner. The dissident can be removed from direct conflict and placed in a position of an alternative choice. In this move, the success of the token dissident to resolve conflict is determined by Havel’s articulation of the dissident as a legitimate public intellectual with the universal good of humankind in mind.

Said’s tokens can also be useful in conflict resolution insofar as they provide groups with a way to understand how power and knowledge interact and consequently affect the world. Centering his attention on the relationships between cultures, Said shows how power can manifest itself and play a role in conflict resolution. Knowledge production, which is dependent on power, tends to misrepresent issues, people, and cultures and are too often taken for face value. As tokens, knowledge and power are directly related to conflict resolution because the misinformed facts are used in solving disputes. Thus, the solutions are often unfair to the misrepresented parties. In “The Clash of Definitions,” he specifically said that “competing powers invent their own theory of cultural or civilizational destiny in order to justify their actions abroad.”<sup>11</sup> Knowledge is used by groups to perpetuate and maintain power. Accordingly, together they are used to take advantage of groups or can become the grounds for conflict. Misrepresentations create unfair advantages for the powerful and unjust disadvantages for the vulnerable. By providing tokens to expose and explain those

---

<sup>11</sup> Edward Said, “The Clash of Definitions,” p. 574.

discrepancies, Said helps provide a global language to improve the fairness of conflict resolution.

Perhaps the ultimate master of conflict resolution is Jimmy Carter. Having established a world-renowned conflict resolution center, Carter's post presidency has been characterized by its triumphs in resolving previously irresolvable disputes. The tokens he empowered with the ability to articulate his intense and involved meanings to aid in conflict resolution efforts are mediation and reconciliation. Both terms are interrelated and at times may seem to overlap, yet the subtle differences show how insightful Carter is in delicate situations.

Mediation as a token is important to facilitating conflict resolution because for Carter in his meaning he insists upon a "win-win" situation. With the predetermined notion that everyone will benefit, mediation becomes more enticing. Also in the meaning, Carter incorporates trust. A dual meaning of trust is implied: one is trust of Carter as a leading proponent of objectivity, compassion, and statesmanship; the other is trust of the Carter Center as an established, successful, respected entity in the world. The significance of these connotations of trust is that a major part of the success of rhetorical tokens is dependent on the ethos of the rhetor. Further encouraging conflict resolution, Carter's mediation includes fairness and transparency. Carter has earned a reputation for objectivity in conflict resolution situations, saying that an important element in mediation is fairness to all parties, listening and taking into account as many points of view as necessary. Along the same lines, he also makes a point to integrate transparency, letting all parties know what is happening with every other group involved. According to Carter, this enhances trust and objectivity.

The other significant contribution to conflict resolution rhetoric is Carter's token reconciliation. The cornerstone of this token is the willingness to make and keep peace.

Carter insists that a basis of reconciliation is the understanding that combat is to be avoided, therefore the groups involved must forgo the possibility of war. Putting all their efforts on peace, reconciliation is therefore better equipped to succeed. This token also encompasses the view that even adversaries have common ground and common values that can serve to bring them together. Reconciliation for Carter suggests that there must be an honest attempt at dialogue, maintaining that opponents must respect each other enough to communicate. Therefore, to facilitate conflict resolution, Carter's token reconciliation is used to discursively encourage restraint, prioritize peace, and maintain respectful dialogue to bring parties together.

One major contribution to a global cosmopolitan rhetoric that emerges from this study is that there is a constant need to avoid demonizing the other. In "The Rhetoric of Hitler's 'Battle,'" Burke illustrates how the "international devil materialized."<sup>12</sup> The devil functions to unite with an either-or choice with the hope that the audience will choose the side against the constructed devil. Another rhetorical strategy used to motivate an audience is the metaphor of light and dark, clarified by Michael Osborn in "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: the Light-Dark Family." In his essay, he explains that the metaphors associating light with good and dark with bad are not only accessible, but also persuasive.<sup>13</sup> While these metaphors are used in different cultures and in different times, I argue that they, like the devil function, are less useful to a cosmopolitan rhetoric because it is intended for a wider audience. On a national level, rhetorically constructing a devil figure to align opinion can serve to unite. Yet on an international level, the same evil enemy will more than likely

---

<sup>12</sup> Kenneth Burke, "The Rhetoric of Hitler's 'Battle,'" *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism*, 2nd ed, Carl R. Burghardt, (State College, PA: Strata Publishing, Inc., 2000), 210.

<sup>13</sup> For further discussion see, Michael Osborn, "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family," *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism*, 2nd ed, Carl R. Burghardt, (State College, PA: Strata Publishing, Inc., 2000).

include part of the audience. Based on my observations, rhetorically constructing an evil enemy would be counter productive for cosmopolitan rhetoric because the goal the global cosmopolitan rhetoric is to identify and articulate possible places or opportunities for unification and deterritorialization rather than promote or intensify a divisive element often used to mark territory. Tokens used by Havel, Said, and Carter in their cosmopolitan rhetoric resist creating an other as well as avoid aligning arguments as right or wrong, or good or bad. In an effort to be inclusive, systematic linguistic choices they make function to lessen differences that may otherwise divide. Havel accomplishes this by closing the gap between the dissident and the citizen by explaining that the intellectual dissident is by no means an immoral creature. By challenging traditionally demarcated boundaries separating the dissident from society, Havel is defying the imposed “devil” construction and its alignment with good and light. Said contests both the light-dark metaphor and the construction of the evil enemy by exposing it by constructing tokens like other and us and them, and using them to discursively demystify the idea persistently throughout his career. Said’s entire purpose is to show how constructing an other, a devil figure and restricting that enemy to the dark, wrong, bad side of the metaphor is limiting, misrepresenting, and incorrect. Breaking that mold becomes essential. Carter, too, resists categorizing others as evil. Often using his Baptist background to inspire his writings and speeches, Carter may seem the perfect public figure to rely on prophetic rhetoric, yet in his efforts to embrace and include everyone, his rhetoric is cosmopolitan in that it avoids constructing an enemy as well as labeling good or bad, right or wrong. Carter’s rhetoric is profoundly cosmopolitan because of this resistance and because of his devotion to maintain an equal playing field, refusing the common tendency to speak from a place of religious superiority.



### **Connecting to a Cosmopolitan Audience**

Making use of their tokens becomes easier as each of the public intellectuals' audiences accept their arguments. Cosmopolitan rhetoric's power comes in the rhetors ability to connect with a global audience. Because cosmopolitanism deterritorializes space, its connection with people needs to be based on other universal, unifying factors. Carter, Havel, and Said depend on similar factors to at once remove themselves from specificity that might limit their reach while simultaneously connecting themselves in a particular way to audiences worldwide.

Connecting to a global audience is a challenge when common histories and shared experiences are not readily available. Clearly, the conditions of exilic relocation are different from those occurring when the dissident is jailed, and different from an ex-president's resurgence in world politics. While each figure's different experiences helped create their public personas, they all found paths that led them to connect with a global audience.

Kwame Anthony Appiah explains that there are two strands in cosmopolitanism.

One is the idea that we have obligations to others, obligations that stretch beyond those to whom we are related by the ties of kith and kind, or even the more formal ties of shared citizenship. The other is that we take seriously the value not just of human life but of particular human lives, which means taking an interest in the practices and beliefs that lend them significance.<sup>14</sup>

The first component suggests that responsibility for others should go beyond nation and beyond the local in reach. The second component asserts that universal understanding and the implementation of certain basic values should hold for all persons, regardless of their

---

<sup>14</sup> Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, (New York: W.W. Norton & Co, 2006), p.xv.

experiences. Together, the two strands indicate that certain basic rights should be extended to all, and that it is the responsibility of world citizens to help ensure the enforcement of those rights. Using both the sense of obligation and the value of human life as guides, it becomes more apparent that Said, Havel, and Carter are cosmopolitans and have found a way to articulate that commitment to a global audience.

Certain universal goals unite groups and become known as cosmopolitan causes because they apply regardless of nation. Among those are human rights issues, environmental issues, and health and poverty issues. To differing degrees and with various interests, all three figures are involved in these global issues. While their participation is part of how they relate to people globally, how they articulate their involvement is significant. The tokens crafted and the opportunities provided to their audiences for token redemption also play a role.

Globally, Said, Havel, and Carter are human rights advocates. As a mutual interest, human rights becomes a familiar cosmopolitan issue able to rally masses and the phrase incorporates numerous problems under its umbrella. Sometimes absorbing health, political, and economic concerns at times, the phrase *human rights* risks becoming a cliché for all global issues. Despite this, each of the three figures devotes ample time to this cause, and because each has a direct and personal connection to the concept, the use of the phrase takes on greater persuasive force as each enacts for audiences a particular and especially influential connection.

Sparked by his personal oppression under a totalitarian regime, Havel addresses human rights from the perspective of the importance of free speech and expression. In reference to Appiah's second strand, Havel stresses the significance of each individual suggesting that

one person at a time can make a difference. His token *truth* and his notion of “living in truth” speaks to this point as it reminds people that living according to one’s conscience and speaking the truth is central to challenging oppression. Valuing each human contribution is a cornerstone of Havel’s approach to human rights. This presents Havel with a way to articulate a global connection to his audience because he puts emphasis on how the individual can make a difference, and no matter how small, that difference is necessary for the bigger issue. The individual is not of a particular race, nation, or religion. The only requirement is to be human.

The second strand for Appiah is the sense of global responsibility, which is directly related to Havel’s cosmopolitan rhetoric. Tokens of duty and responsibility dominate his work and the fundamental notion behind his work is the necessity of world citizens to feel an obligation toward other world citizens and act or (speak) accordingly. This is essential for human rights, and Havel tackles this issue by combining both strands. He uses his tokens to inspire individuals to feel responsible for others (no matter where they are) and speak truth, their conscience, to voice their concerns for the oppressed in the world. By shifting focus from nation to the individual, Havel is able to associate with audiences in a personal way and therefore induces a direct form of rhetorical identification.

Said’s approach is less individualistic and more historical. Rather than appealing to the personal, Said connects with a global audience in the way a teacher might relate to students in a large class. He establishes common ground with the audience by beginning with commonly believed truths. From that point, he systematically takes them through history and shows them how those truths may be flawed. With his step by step method of presenting agreed upon facts and exposing their weaknesses, he allows the audience to

gradually accept that other points of view are as relevant, important, and legitimate as the dominant ones. Said develops a rapport with audiences worldwide by finding common ground in dominant histories then compelling them to see issues through the eyes of the underdog. No matter where anyone is from, people around the globe will empathize with the underdog.

With specific reference to human rights issues, Said uses his method to enlighten his audiences about human rights violations globally. He creates awareness by showing them how violations are easily overlooked or swept under the carpet. Tokens like *imperialism*, *power*, and *knowledge* help him poignantly reveal abuses by strengthening his publics' critical thinking skills. Because he provides ample proof through history, his global audiences are able to readily redeem his tokens and understand his argument.

To relate to global audiences, Carter appeals to their sense of compassion and charity. A major proponent of human rights, Carter travels the world both to speak about and directly work to alleviate suffering from human rights violations. As one of his tokens, the term "human rights" is laden with meaning that evokes emotional responses on multiple levels. But, in terms of connecting with global audiences, Carter's appeal comes from his celebrity as a world citizen. Devoting his post presidency to fostering peace and helping the underprivileged, Carter and the Carter Center's accomplishments speak louder than words. His willingness to take on previously unsolvable issues and speak for previously unsaveable people forces audiences to appreciate his sincerity and power in coming to the aid of those who need it most. By developing effective tokens that reflect his views on the world, audiences relate to and respect his commitment to global issues.

Both of Appiah's strands are represented in Carter's cosmopolitan rhetoric. The first, an obligation to others is evident in his tokens representing his global concerns including poverty, hunger, and health along with the multiple others. Carter's need to alleviate suffering and his establishing his center to do that reflects his feeling of obligation. The second strand of valuing the significance of human life is also clear by the same tokens. It is particularly evident in his selection of causes, usually the ones that are the least publicized, with the least chance of getting public sympathy otherwise. In both, Carter uses his tokens to communicate his compassion and concern for all people.

Carter, Said, and Havel are able to create a tie between themselves and their global audiences by means of tapping into universally human experiences. Carter relies on the reputation of his accomplishments, his political capital, and being able to communicate his genuineness. Said depends more on finding common ground through generally agreed upon historical facts. Havel creates ties by converting his audience from a group to individuals and relating to them on an individual level. Each of the three methods let the intellectuals reach their audiences in a way that allows the audience to relate to and often accept the rhetors' arguments.

While each of them is able to find common ground to their audience, they also each come to the global arena with a build in audience based on their public personas. I argue that while the cosmopolitan project offers the world benefits in areas like the environment, human rights, and conflict resolution among many others, communicating cosmopolitanism is better achieved when done by figures who already have a captive audience. In the early eighties, especially, Vaclav Havel emerged on the international circuit because of the political situation in Czechoslovakia. While having previously produced essays and plays, his

worldwide fame from the Velvet Revolution made him an international player with a captive international audience. Edward Said's move to the forefront of the global arena was less glamorous and more controversial. After the 1978 publication of *Orientalism* and his coinciding increased involvement in the Palestinian cause, Said became the center of political and social discussion. Targeted by enemies and watched by all, Said's rise to prominence created an international audience because his writings he created theories that applied to countless situations globally. Jimmy Carter's international audience began with his prominence as President of the United States, and then was cemented by his post-presidential activities as he personally set out to monitor elections, conduct mediations, and help the needy provide for themselves. While Havel, Said, and Carter were thrust into the spotlight for different reasons, each used the opportunity to propel themselves to achieve cosmopolitan goals. The trick, then, was not how to acquire an audience, but rather how to maintain the interest of the audience they already had. In order to keep those already interested captive and expand their audience they utilized cosmopolitan rhetoric to communicate a sense of inclusion, responsibility, and global awareness that appeals to the values that Appiah refers to as "empirically universal."<sup>15</sup> The advantage that cosmopolitan rhetors have in retaining their audience and possibly expanding it is that many of the values and issues they address are ones which are of concern, but not dealt with on the national level. In other words, cosmopolitan rhetoric is particularly useful and persuasive on issues that are often neglected on a national level. Accordingly, the cosmopolitan audience is composed of original followers of the cosmopolitan rhetors and maintained by their willingness to address global

---

<sup>15</sup> Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, 22.

issues that are marginalized on the national level, from an inclusive, cosmopolitan perspective.

### **Assessing the Benefits to Communication**

Tokens function to provide a compact way of communicating extended arguments. They are beneficial because they allow rhetors to develop a language using simple markers that pack more than the obvious meaning to their audience. To be of real value, the rhetors must use the tokens consistently and provide ample opportunity for their audience to redeem those tokens, a way to find the intricate meanings that the speaker is implying. The power of tokens lies in the rhetors' ability to fill a term with all the layers of meaning they hope to convey, offer audiences enough occasions to explain those meanings, and then use the term frequently enough that it becomes an understood, symbolic form of the extended argument. The tokens used by Havel, Said and Carter outlined earlier fulfill this criteria as I discovered how the terms are laden with meaning, are carefully defined to avoid misunderstandings, and used consistently throughout their work.

Communications scholars have previously explored the power of tokens, and this study reinforces the potential benefits of tokens to the field of communications. As a tool to rhetors, tokens are advantageous because they grant both independence and autonomy to their user. Not bound by agreed upon meanings and emotions evoked by ideographs, tokens allow the speaker the freedom to develop a term to incorporate the scope of meaning he or she chooses. Accordingly, the rhetor is able to articulate a personal stance more accurately because it is custom-made.

This can potentially strengthen the speaker-audience connection because the individualization of the terms suggests a more genuine interaction. A speaker names a concept, rhetorically constructs it, and the audience identifies with it. Providing opportunities for identification, audiences are inclined to be persuaded by sincerity. It also strengthens the speaker-audience connection because tokens develop an understood aside between the audience and the rhetor. In order for the tokens to be fully appreciated, the audience makes an effort to know the work of the rhetor, as a body of work. This investment pays off in token redemption and a closer relationship with the speaker, fostering more power to the tokens.

A very personal expression, Havel, Said, and Carter's use of tokens is beneficial to communication scholarship because they have demonstrated how tokens can be used to articulate the complexity of cosmopolitanism. As McKerrow pointed out, the challenge is to uncover or discover the terms addressing place in a way that helps shed predetermined constructs of both the national and global.<sup>16</sup> I found that each used tokens to encourage a change in power relationships by de-emphasizing territorial constructs. They established ways to articulate a devotion to nation and an obligation to world. Furthermore, they confirmed that tokens are a viable way to customize a language to account for new ways of being in the world.

Part of what the global cosmopolitan rhetoric provides for the communications field is a language to better articulate the sophistication of identity. A more intertwined world forces a veering from simple, straightforward identities. Traditional categories no longer contain

---

<sup>16</sup> For further discussion, see Raymie E. McKerrow, "Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis," *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism* (second edition), ed. Carl R. Burghardt (Penn., Strata Publishing Inc., 2000), 126-147.



people well, and therefore there is a need to develop a more sophisticated way of expressing identity. The deep descriptions of the tokens dissident, us and them, among others, suggest ways to represent the newer cosmopolitan identities.

Communications scholars can also benefit from how these public figures communicate a better understanding of difference. Their ability to both connect groups based on the common human experience with terms like partnership and human while at the same time embracing diversity and varied perspectives with tokens like other and truth show us that it is possible to strike a balance. The actual theme of striking a balance is a recurring one as the three also strike a balance between nationalism and cosmopolitanism. The ability to express and embrace two seemingly conflicting notions is important to cosmopolitanism and communications scholars because it indicates the perceptiveness that our globalizing world requires us to not only recognize that embracing diversity is a way to resist hegemony and keep power in check, but also to discursively construct that possibility.

When an improved understanding of difference is achieved, communications scholars can look to these tokens to help convey ways to help conflict resolution. Unfortunately increasingly necessary, a language to aid in conflict resolution efforts is useful for scholars and practitioners alike. A cosmopolitan rhetoric that legitimizes differing points of view and strives to make peace and justice a priority with tokens like orientalism, mediation, reconciliation, and responsibility gives us a head start in gaining acceptance, trust, and good faith worldwide.

Havel, Said, and Carter have rhetorically constructed a cosmopolitan language by naming concepts, providing layers of meaning and using those terms frequently enough for them to be recognizable in their bodies of work. By identifying the tokens, communication

scholars become equipped with a new potential way to better articulate cosmopolitanism. This is particularly beneficial in our increasingly intertwined world, to assert more sophisticated identities, represent and embrace diversity, and help resolve growing conflicts. The cosmopolitan rhetoric they provide is a critical one that helps shed predetermined constructs of both national and global projects. It encourages us to question power relationships to find better solutions to global concerns. Their deemphasizing of territorial constructs aids in the effort to address issues in a complete way. Most importantly, Havel, Said, and Carter have proven a cosmopolitan rhetoric can articulate the complexity of identity, promote understanding, and evoke restraint, negotiation and peace in cases of discord by rhetorically constructing tokens.

## WORKS CITED

- Anderson, Benedict. 2003. *Imagined Communities: Reflection on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. In *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2002. Cosmopolitan Patriots. In *For Love of Country?*, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2006. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 2002. *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Black, Edwin. 2000. The Second Persona. In *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism* (second edition), ed. Carl R. Burgchardt. Penn: Strata Publishing Inc.
- Bohman, James. 1997. The Public Spheres of the World Citizen. In *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*, eds. James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann. Cambridge: MIT University Press.
- Bowden, Brett. 2003. Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism: Irreconcilable Differences or Possible Bedfellows? *National Identities* 5:3.
- Brennan, Timothy. 2003. Cosmopolitanism and Internationalism. In *Debating Cosmopolitics*, ed. Daniele Archibugi. New York: Verso.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. Cosmo-Theory. *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 100:3.
- Burke, Kenneth. 1969. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Butler, Judith. 2000. Restaging the Universal. In *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, eds. Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Zizek. New York: Verso.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. Universality in Culture. In *For Love of Country*, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Calhoun, Craig. 2002. The Class Consciousness of Frequent Travelers: Toward a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism. *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 101:4.

- Carter, Jimmy. 2002. A 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Q & A with President Carter. President Carter Reflects on the Center's 20<sup>th</sup> Anniversary. [www.cartercenter.com/doc105.htm](http://www.cartercenter.com/doc105.htm).
- Carter, Jimmy. 1998. Advances in Biotechnology Will Save Lives. In *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2002. Challenges for Humanity: A Beginning. In introduction of *National Geographic Magazine*.
- Carter, Jimmy. 1993. Food Shelter and Health Care. In *Talking Peace: A Vision for the Next Generation*. New York: Dutton Children's Books.
- Carter, Jimmy. 1997. Forestalling Famine with Biotechnology. In *The Washington Times*.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2004. Former President Jimmy Carter's Remarks to the Democratic National Convention.
- Carter, Jimmy. 1977. *A Government as Good as Its People*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2001. Habitat for Humanity International, Jimmy Carter Work Project 2001. JCWO2001 Closing Ceremonies. <http://www.habitat.org/jcwp/2001/aug10c.html>.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2006. Human Rights Commission Must Change. In *San Francisco Chronicle*.
- Carter, Jimmy. 1993. Human Rights: What Rights Do We Share? In *Talking Peace: A Vision for the Next Generation*. New York: Dutton Children's Books.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2003. Introduction to Health: A Global Goal, by Donald R. Hopkins. New York: National Geographic Books.
- Carter, Jimmy. 1996. *Living Faith*. New York: Random House, Inc.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2005. *Our Endangered Values*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Carter, Jimmy. 1996. Preventative Diplomacy in Action Video. Interviewed by Glen Baker for ADM.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2002. Nobel Prize Lecture.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2003. Remarks at conference: Human Rights Defenders on the Frontlines of Freedom. Atlanta, GA.
- Carter, Jimmy. 2006. Remarks by Former U.S. President Jimmy Carter at the Coretta Scott King Funeral.

Carter, Jimmy. 2004. Remarks of Mr. Jimmy Carter, former President of the United States of America, at the World Health Organization.

Carter, Jimmy. 1993. *Waging Peace*. In *Talking Peace: A Vision for the Next Generation*. New York: Dutton Children's Books.

Carter, Jimmy. 1998. Who's Afraid of Genetic Engineering? In *The New York Times*.

Cohen, Joshua. 2002. Editor's Preface. In *For Love of Country?*, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen. Boston: Beacon Press.

Condit, Celeste. 1994. Hegemony in a Mass-mediated Society: Concordance about Reproductive Technologies. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 11.3.

Daresy, James. 2004. James Baldwin's Topoi. *New Approaches to Rhetoric*, eds Patricia A. Sullivan and Steven R. Goldzwig. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Darsey, James. 1995. Joe McCarthy's Fantastic Moment. *Communication Monographs* March, vol. 62.

Day, Graham and Andrew Thompson. 2004. *Theorizing Nationalism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. 1990. A Performer of Political Thought: Vaclav Havel on Freedom and Responsibility. In *Critical Essays on Vaclav Havel*, ed. Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz and Phyllis Carey. New York: G.K. Hall & Co.

Entwistle, Harold. 1979. *Antonio Gramsci: Conservative Schooling for Radical Politics*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Friedman, Thomas L. 2000. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree*. New York: Anchor Books.

Gandhi, Leela. 1998. *Postcolonial Theory, a Critical Introduction*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gates, Henry Louis Jr. 2006. Introduction to series: Issues of Our Time. In *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, Kwame Anthony Appiah. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Gellner, Ernest. 1993. The Mightier Pen. In *Times Literary Supplement*.

Gellner, Ernest. 1997. *Nationalism*. New York: New York University Press.

Giddens, Anthony. 2000. *Runaway World: How Globalization is Reshaping our Lives*. New York: New York University Press.

Goetz-Stankiewicz, Marketa. 1991. Introduction of *Critical Essays on Vaclav Havel*, ed. Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz and Phyllis Carey. New York: G.K. Hall & Co.

*The Guardian*. Sept. 11, 1999. Noam Chomsky quote in “Guardian Profile: Edward Said.”

Gunnar Berge. 2002. Presentation Speech of the Norwegian Nobel Committee. Oslo.

Hall, Stuart, (in Nick Stevenson). 2003. *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Questions*. England: Open University Press.

Hammer, Dean C. 1999. Vaclav Havel’s Construction of a Democratic Discourse: Politics in a Postmodern Age. In *Critical Essays on Vaclav Havel*, ed. Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz and Phyllis Carey. New York: G.K. Hall & Co.

Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2001. Passages of Sovereignty. In *Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, David. 2000. Cosmopolitanism and the Banality of Geographical Evils. *Public Culture*, 12.2.

Havel, Vaclav. 2000. Acceptance Address for the honorary degree Doctor of Laws, University of Michigan.

Havel, Vaclav. 1995. Address at Harvard University.

Havel, Vaclav. 1999. Address at NATO Summit.

Havel, Vaclav. 1986. An Anatomy of Reticence. In *Living In Truth: twenty-two essays published on the occasion of the award of the Erasmus Prize to Vaclav Havel*, ed. Jan Vladislav. Boston: Faber and Faber.

Havel, Vaclav. 1997. The Co-responsibility of the West (written for *Foreign Affairs*). In *The Art of the Impossible: Politics as Morality in Practice, Speeches and Writings, 1990-1996*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Havel, Vaclav. 1991. Dear Dr. Husak. In *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Havel, Vaclav. 1990. *Disturbing the Peace: A Conversation with Karel Hvizdala*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Havel, Vaclav. 1991. I take the Side of Truth: an interview with Antoine Spire. In *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

- Havel, Vaclav. 1999. Introductory Essay. In *Creating a World that Works for All*, Sharif Abdullah. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1997. A Joint Session of the U.S. Congress. In *The Art of the Impossible: Politics as Morality in Practice, Speeches and Writings, 1990-1996*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1988. *Letters to Olga: June 1979-September 1982*. New York: Knopf.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1997. The Oslo Conference on 'The Anatomy of Hate'. In *The Art of the Impossible: Politics as Morality in Practice, Speeches and Writings, 1990-1996*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1989. Politics and Conscience. *Living in Truth: twenty one essays published on the occasion of the award of the Erasmus Prize to Vaclav Havel*, ed. Jan Vladislav. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1989.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1991. The Power of the Powerless. In *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1997. The Salzburg Festival. In *The Art of the Impossible: Politics as Morality in Practice, Speeches and Writings, 1990-1996*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1991. Second Wind. In *Open Letters: Selected Writings 1965-1990*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1990. Speech to the Federal Assembly.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1992. *Summer Meditations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Havel, Vaclav. 1997. University of California, Los Angeles. In *The Art of the Impossible: Politics as Morality in Practice, Speeches and Writings, 1990-1996*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Held, David. 1997. Cosmopolitan Democracy and the Global Order: A New Agenda. In *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*, eds. James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachmann. Cambridge: MIT University Press.
- Held, David and Anthony McGrew. 2002. *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. The Fate of National Culture. In *Globalization/Antiglobalization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Hertzberg, Hendrick. Character Above All: James Carter Essay.  
<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/character/essays/carter.html>.

Himmelfarb, Gertrude. 2002. The Illusions of cosmopolitanism. In *For Love of Country?*, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen. Boston: Beacon Press.

Howe, Stephen. 2003. Edward Said: the traveler and the exile. In openDemocracy at [www.opendemocracy.net](http://www.opendemocracy.net).

Hutchings, Kimberly. 1999. Political Theory and Cosmopolitan Citizenship. In *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, eds. Kimberly Hutchings and Roland Dannreuther. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Iyer, Pico. 2000. *The Global Soul: Jet Lag, Shopping Malls, and the Search for Home*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Jameson, Fredric. 1999. Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue. In *The Cultures of Globalization*, eds. Fredric Jameson and Masao Miyoshi. Durham: Duke University Press.

Kriseova, Eda. 1993. *Vaclav Havel: the Authorized Biography*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Laclau, Ernesto. 2000. Identity and Hegemony. In *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, eds. Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Zizek. New York: Verso.

Linklater, Andrew. 1999. Cosmopolitan Citizenship. In *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, eds. Kimberly Hutchings and Roland Dannreuther. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

Marrouchi, Mostapha. 2004. *Edward Said at the Limits*. New York: State University Press of New York.

Mayhew, Leon H. 1997. *The New Public*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

McKerrow, Raymie E. 2000. Critical Rhetoric: Theory and Praxis. In *Readings in Rhetorical Criticism* (second edition), ed. Carl R. Burgchardt. Penn: Strata Publishing Inc.

Michigan Campus Compact. 2005. Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter's Partnership Award for Campus Community Collaboration.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2002. The Many faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism. In *Cosmopolitanism*, eds. Carol Breckenridge, Sheldon Pollock, Homi K. Bhabha, and Dipesh Chakrabarty. Durham: Duke University Press.



- Miller, David. 1999. Bounded Citizenship. In *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, eds. Kimberly Hutchings and Roland Dannreuther. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- Mouffe, Chantal. 1979. Hegemony and Ideology in Gramsci. In *Gramsci and Marxist Theory*, ed. Chantal Mouffe. London: Routledge and Kegan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. Hegemony and New Political Subjects: Toward a New Concept of Democracy. In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, eds. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Nagy-Zekmi, Silvia. 2006. "Preface: Ultimate Coherence." In *Paradoxical Citizenship: Edward Said*, ed. Silvia Nagy-Zekmi. New York: Lexington Books.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 2002. Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. In *For Love of Country?*, eds. Martha C. Nussbaum and Joshua Cohen. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Orosco, Jose-Antonio. 2003. Cosmopolitan Loyalty and the Great Global Community: Royce's Globalization. *Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, 17.3.
- Ozkirimli, Umut. 2000. *Theories of Nationalism: a critical introduction*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Pollock, Sheldon. 2000. Cosmopolitan and Vernacular in History. *Public Culture* 12.3.
- Pontuso, James F. 2004. *Vaclav Havel: Civic Responsibility in the Postmodern Age*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Rubin, Andrew. 2003. "Techniques of Trouble: Edward Said and the Dialectics of Cultural Philology." *The South Atlantic Quarterly*. 102:4.
- Said, Edward. 2002. The Anglo-Arab Encounter. In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward. 2002. Between Worlds. In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward. 2002. Bursts of Meaning. In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward. 2002. The Clash of Definitions. In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward. 1981. *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York. Vintage Books.

- Said, Edward. 1994. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, Edward. 1996. Intellectual Exile: Expatriates and Marginals. In *Representations of the Intellectual: The 1993 Reith Lectures*. New York: Random House.
- Said, Edward. 2002. Opponents, Audiences, Constituencies, and Community. In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward. 1997. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, Edward. 2002. Orientalism Reconsidered. In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward. 2002. *Out of Place, a memoir*. New York: First Vintage Books.
- Said, Edward. 2001. Overlapping Territories (interviewed by Gary Hentzi and Anne McClintock). In *Power, Politics, and Culture: interviews with Edward Said*, ed. Gauri Viswanthan. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Said, Edward. 2002. The Politics of Knowledge. In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward. 2002. Reflections on Exile. In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward. 1996. *Representations of the Intellectual*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Said, Edward. 2001. The Road Less Traveled (interviewed by Nirala Lakshman). In *Power, Politics, and Culture: interviews with Edward Said*, ed. Gauri Viswanthan. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Said, Edward. 1983. Traveling Theory. In *The World, the Text, and the Critic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward. 2002. Traveling Theory Reconsidered. In *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Said, Edward. 1991. Which Country? In *The Nation*.
- Sire, James W. 2001. *Vaclav Havel: The Intellectual Conscience of International Politics*. Downers Grove, Il: InterVarsity Press.
- Smith, Anthony D. 1987. *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. New York: Basil Blackwell.

- Troester, Rod. 1996. *Jimmy Carter as Peacemaker: A Post-Presidential Biography*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Turner, Bryan S. 2002. McCitizens: Risk, Coolness, and Irony in Contemporary Politics. In *McDonaldization: The Reader*, ed. George Ritzer. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Vladislav, Jan. 1986. Introduction: Asides to readers of Havel's Essays. In *Living In Truth: twenty one essays published on the occasion of the award of the Erasmus Prize to Vaclav Havel*, ed. Jan Vladislav. Boston: Faber and Faber.
- Walia, Shelley. 2001. *Edward Said and the Writing of History*. Series ed. Richard Appignanesi. Cambridge: Icon Books LTD.
- Walker, R.B.J. 1998. Citizenship after the Modern Subject. In *Cosmopolitan Citizenship*, eds. Kimberly Hutchings and Roland Dannreuther. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.
- Wilson, Paul. 1997. Forward of *The Art of the Impossible: Politics as Morality in Practice, Speeches and Writings, 1990-1996*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Wilson, Paul. 1990. Introduction of Vaclav Havel's *Disturbing the Peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Wilson, Paul. 1999. Vaclav Havel in Word and Deed. In *Critical Essays on Vaclav Havel*, ed. Marketa Goetz-Stankiewicz and Phyllis Carey. New York: G.K. Hall & Co.
- Zizek, Slavoj. 2000. Class Struggle or Postmodernism? In *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality: Contemporary Dialogues on the Left*, eds. Judith Butler, Ernesto Laclau, and Slavoj Zizek. New York: Verso.