

ISSN: 2456-9550
JMC
November 2019

**THE SUBJECTIVE BASE OF OBJECTIVE
INTEREST IN COSMOPOLITICS: A
PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS**

CHINWEUBA GREGORY EMEKA

.Email: gregory.chinweuba@esut.edu.ng; gregorychinweuba@yahoo.com

General Studies Division

Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT)

Volume 3, 2019

THE JMC REVIEW

*An Interdisciplinary Social Science Journal of Criticism,
Practice and Theory*

JESUS AND MARY COLLEGE
UNIVERSITY OF DELHI
NEW DELHI-110021

THE SUBJECTIVE BASE OF OBJECTIVE INTEREST IN COSMOPOLITICS: A PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS

CHINWEUBA GREGORY EMEKA*

Abstract

In cosmopolitics, economic power blocs uphold their interests as objective. This raises the question of the sources of these objective interests. Whether objective interests are natural with global economic power blocs, and therefore independent of human subjective reasoning, or whether some individuals posited these interests which the capitalist power blocs incorporate as objective. The question of objective interests brings back the philosophical issue of generated and real interests which revolve on whether human subjective stances give rise to interests at the international level, or whether cosmopolitical interests naturally exist. Then, individual nations or their diplomats, in agreement, incorporate and project them as objective and universal. This paper analytically determines the cradle, base, essence, justification and consequences of objective interests in global politics, as well as its philosophical foundation. The research finds that the objective interests or goals of global economic power blocs are once subjective interests, incorporated and proposed by economic power blocs through diplomatic influences, global politics and exercise of power. This is so because a critical investigation shows that no objective interest is devoid of subjective supposition or presupposition which serves as its generating ground. For, subjective reflections and contributions are the ground of meaning and being of international interests, claims, goals and praxis. Besides, the being of objective interests in global politics and the possibility of its definition denote the necessary existence of the subjective ground from, ground on, and ground of its existence. In other words, the being of every objective interest and goal is necessarily underscored by subjective consciousness, which reflects in human cognition, reasoning, postulations and justifications. As such, this paper concludes that international politics is a dialectics of interests in which those of the superpowers dominate those of other nations through global institutions that have tremendous influence on various countries of the world.

* PhD, Philosophy Unit, General Studies Division, Enugu State University of Science and Technology, (ESUT), P.M.B. 01660 Enugu. Email: gregory.chinweuba@esut.edu.ng; gregorychinweuba@yahoo.com.

Key words: subjective; objective interest; cosmopolitics; economic power blocs; philosophical analysis

I. Introduction

Cosmopolitics is defined as dialectics of interests among nations and global economic power blocs. But sources of these interests bring us back to the philosophical issue of generated and real interests which revolve on whether human subjective stances give rise to interests at the international level, or whether cosmopolitical interests naturally exist. Then, individual nations or their diplomats, in agreement, incorporate and project them as objective and universal. A critical investigation however shows that no objective interest is devoid of subjective supposition or presupposition which serves as its generating ground. For, subjective reflections and contributions are the ground of meaning and being of international interests, claims, goals and praxis. Besides, the being of objective interests in global politics and the possibility of its definition denote the necessary existence of the subjective ground from, ground on, and ground of its existence (Odimegwu, 2008). In other words, the being of every objective interest and goal is necessarily underscored by subjective consciousness, which reflects in human cognition, reasoning, postulations and justifications.

Based on these, cosmopolitical analysts often point to subjective opinions as constitutive parts of public opinion which is central in politics (Ofoegbu, 1999). For cosmopolitics is a reflection of the kinds of everyday interests, decisions and choices made by ordinary people leading ordinary lives. Thus, international politics mainly proceeds in down-top fashion, and to understand it, one has to start with the most basic fundamental unit of the state which is the individual. This is so because the state is not strictly described by its mere constituent location or land mass, but by the human beings or the citizenry that make it up. And as the combination of these individuals makes the state, their subjective interests culminate in national interests that prevail in global politics. Hence, Plato considers the state, and by extension the international community, as individual writ-large (Stumpf, 1994). As such, various governments largely represent the subjective perceptions, views, interests and expectations of their citizenry which are variables in global politics. Concurring with this

reality, Thomas M. Frank, in his work, *The Empowered Self*, holds that subjective ideas are central in international law and politics, and a combination of these diverse interests of the individuals are what the diplomats (though inadequately) represent.

If objective interest in geopolitics is viewed from the perspective of meaning, what comes to mind also is the subjective platform or ground on which this meaning is cognized, interpreted and established. This again points to the fact that the existence of objective interests, decisions or goals corroborates the subjective background that supplies its meaning and justification. It therefore stands that even the interests of economic power blocs in cosmopolitics stem from generated interest made real through powerful diplomatic and often conflicting influences (Böhme, et al., 2012). As such, survival of global interest depends on the strength of a nation, and how much this strength bears on other nations. Hence, global politics is a game of interests depending on ‘might is right’, and a situation in which justice, morality and truth mainly depend on the interests of the strong and powerful capitalist states (Stumpf, 1994). In this context, it is mainly nations which are to a large extent equals in power that have the right. Thus, the superpowers do what they can for their benefits, and that of nations within their blocs, and the weak nations suffer what they must (Magstadt, 2009). Consequently, the world has been visibly polarized in endless cultural, religious, socio-political and nuclear conflicts, resulting in environmental degradation, the crisis of immigration, refugees, asylum, migration and the magnitude of death of human beings. Therefore, this discourse is compelled to unravel the fulcrum of geopolitical interests in cosmopolitics; its essence and justifications.

II. Conceptual Analysis

Unexplained concept is a misnomer that obstructs understanding and knowledge. But defined concept sets the limit and point to meanings inherent in a term (Ezeugwu and Chinweuba, 2018). Since philosophy thrives in distinction, clarity, explicitness and creation of better insight into the meaning of words, there is need to define subjective interest, objective interest, economic power blocs and cosmopolitics, which are all outstanding concepts in this discourse. The word ‘subjective’ came from the root word ‘subject’, which depicts a being with a higher grade of existence capable of thinking, reflecting and willing (Arua, 2007). Thus, the word ‘subjective’ points at an individual or a human being who, as opposed to an object perceives. From an epistemological stance however, ‘subjective’ corroborates the

philosophical doctrine of subjectivism, which holds that knowledge, interest and awareness of realities are created and shaped by the individual human mind.

As a theory, subjectivism suggests that whatever the value or interest there is in the world, it is by virtue of the fact that a subject has a certain attitude for or against the value or interest under certain circumstances. It then stands that subjective or subjectivism points to the fact that human knowledge and interests stem from individual reflections or intuition. And values, moral principles, standards, ideologies, precepts and interests first emanate from individual subjective attitudes, conventions, whim, reasoning or preference. In all, subjectivity has a dual sense: the perceiving subject as a being; and his thought processes visible in opinion, interest and actions.

Objective interest, on the other hand, points at goals that are taken to be independent of human invention. As such, proponents of objective interests, especially the capitalist power blocs in global politics, surround it with naturalistic and phenomenological explanations. Truly, economic power blocs believe that their interests are universally real, natural or phenomenal, and do not result from subjective background, influence, view or practice. In this way, objective interest is viewed as that honest and actual goal or concern not influenced by emotions or prejudices, but based on natural facts. This is why economic power blocs argue that their objective interests stem from universal and phenomenal truth, bound to be beneficial to all nations.

Economic power blocs are alliances or coalitions of countries with similar interest. In the cold war era, the world was divided into two economic power blocs. One, the capitalist western democratic bloc led by the United States of America (USA) which is still powerful and influential in present global politics, with traditional allies like Canada, France, the United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, Australia, Brazil, Argentina, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, Israel, etc. The other is the eastern communist bloc led by the erstwhile Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR), along with some countries in Eastern Europe as well as Cuba and China. But with the collapse of the USSR in 1991, this bloc is today being revitalized by Russia, relying on democratic principles that have triumphed over communism. As such, post cold war international politics is no longer based on ideology, but on economic or capitalist interest along with political advantages. Consequently, a common feature of economic power blocs in the post cold war era is the tendency to control and dominate global trade/market and politics to their advantage. They are also able to dictate to weak and

developing nations on their domestic, and international, economic and political trajectory. Thus, the neocolonialism of contemporary era is championed by global capitalist power blocs, and is mostly felt in poor, weak and developing countries in Africa, and some in Asia and South America.

The power blocs indeed lord it over each other, and countries within each bloc also do the same as they struggle for the supremacy of their own parochial national capitalist interests. However, their means of achieving these interests range from diplomatic actions, economic sanctions, politico-economic pressure and suppression, international exclusion, domination and military actions. A typical instance of this internal struggle within blocs is presently evident in the total blockade of Qatar by four Arab nations under the western bloc: Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Egypt and the United Arab Emirates. The same treatment is being meted out to Venezuela under President Nicolas Maduro by most American and European Union countries under the western bloc. The result has been poverty, hunger, mass migration, brain drain, crisis and conflicts in the annihilated country.

Meanwhile, western dominance visible in the United States' hyper-supremacy at the end of the cold war is waning, and a new liberal world order is emerging with countries like China, India, Iran and Turkey expanding their politico-economic and military interests, influences and assertiveness in diverse countries, consequently fast becoming major global stakeholders. President Donald Trump is aware of this, which is why his campaign slogan, as also the effort and focus of his government is 'America First...Making America Great Again'. Thus, the present escalating tensions between the US and these countries, especially Iran, which is bent on acquiring ballistic missiles is resulting in cosmic instability, uncertainty, complex regional conflicts, trade wars, crippling international sanctions, difficult international politics, relations and cooperation.

Nevertheless, cosmopolitics depicts political affairs at the international level. Broadly, it incorporates all the decision making regarding what nations should do; when, how and why; as well as which nation or who should determine what is done (Elijah and Ette, 2018). Seen in this light, cosmopolitics came to involve the struggle for power at the international assemblies, which gave the one in possession of this power the right to determine what policies a group or state should carry out (Eminue, 2001). As such, cosmopolitics encapsulates the tussle which precedes and surrounds any decision of the international community (Jouvenel, 1957). As such, each state is perceived as a hierarchy, and various

governments represent their citizens and participate in international policy making. This means that cosmopolitics constitutes human activities associated with running the government, organizations or movements of the global community. In these activities, differing interests within a given unit of rule are conciliated by giving people or member states a share in power in proportion to their importance in the welfare and survival of the entire world (Crick, 1964).

Cosmopolitics also refers to how human beings and nations govern and are governed; hence, the activities involve who gets what, when, how, and the authoritative allocation of values at the global level (Magstadt, 2009). Indeed, global politics extends to the analysis of governance at the level of the global community and its workings, which meddles with every region of different countries of the world (Appadorai, 2004). The modern philosopher Kant describes it as the political struggle of nations, who, despite their differences, recognize themselves as occupying a common world. Within this struggle, nations, according to Kant, stand in mutual influential relations (Ulrich, 2004). Here, Kant seems to equate cosmopolitics with cosmopolitanism, which has to do with meddling of people and their diverse cultures and experiences. Yet his description of cosmopolitics contextually refers to the tussles which precede and determine global decisions, as well as the trend of cosmopolitanism.

At the centre of cosmopolitics, however, are superpowers such as the United States, Russia, China, and countries of the European Union like France, Britain, among others. These are capitalist state actors behind the international policies, trends and regulations that govern the activities of other nations. As such, they have permanent seats in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), as well as veto power privilege in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). These positions are made possible by their sustainable large economy, stable internal socio-political organization and efficient military capacity. As such, these nations have tremendous influences on United Nations Organisation (UNO), World Trade Organisation (WTO), United Nations Human Rights Commission (UNHRC), International Monetary Fund (INF), World Bank (WB), International Court of Justice (ICJ), Amnesty International (AI), among others, which they use to control member states and chastise dissident individuals and nations.

However, contemporary international politics is no longer exclusively state centric. The interests and enormous contributions of international organisations as well as other non-state actors like; migrants, refugees, minority groups, even species of plants and animals,

atmospheric conditions, natural disasters, among others, are now globally felt. But of all the influential nations and power actors in cosmopolitics, the USA holds a special position and has a leading role based on enormous military, political, economic and diplomatic capacity in every region of the world. In addition, the US is also a leading knowledge society as its institutions of learning rank among the best in the world.

III. Cradle of Objective Interest in Global Politics

After the First World War in 1919, there was an emergent need for mutual relationship among nations. There was also the need for an assembly that would foster global peace and harmony by promoting the general principles of human rights and freedom. This led to the formation of the League of Nations in 1919, which later metamorphosed into United Nations Organisation (UNO) after the Second World War in 1945. But within the United Nations Assembly are human beings with human nature. So, Plato's idea of human natural state and modes of existence began to play out (Nwoko, 1988).

In one of his famous dialogues *Phaedo*, Plato describes the human natural tripartite mode of existence: reason, as the catalyst behind human awareness of an interest, goal or value: spirit, or *thymos*, as that which propels human drive towards achieving an interest; and appetite, as that which underlies human desires. These natural modes of existence point out the innate human capacity for metaphysical or mental abstraction. In other words, the human mind is naturally capable of interactive, dialectical or dialogical thoughts. Thus, amidst present realities, human beings naturally exercise their mental faculties which have the capacity for psychic abstraction of the ideal. Hence, amidst subjective interest resulting from human thought processes influenced by his experiences, the human mind also thinks of the possibility of its ideal. This conjectured ideal the world calls objective interest, which, in actual sense, is synthesised and promoted subjective interest. As such, subjective thought and its resultant interest enhances the abstraction of objective interest. This means that the idea of objective interest in cosmopolitics is a psychic conjecture arising from the real, actual, truthful or factual subjective interest, made possible through the innate activities of individual human intellect. Because objective interest is a tangible ideal extracted from existent subjective interest through mental abstraction, it has been employed in cosmopolitics by capitalist power actors to describe their interest.

Meanwhile, the natural tripartite human operative elements as described by Plato also propel mankind's desire for honour and respect (Stumpf, 1994). Fukuyama (1992), however, argues that the human natural desire for respect and honour develops to *isothymia*, which is the desire to be recognized as the equal of other people, and eventually to *megalothymia*, that is geared towards dominating, dictating to others and asserting self superiority. These natural tendencies as described by Plato and elaborated by Fukuyama are therefore the propelling forces behind proposing objective interest in cosmopolitics. For the act of positing an interest as objective connotes the idea of assertiveness as the aim is to make others accept it. This acceptance amounts to recognition of equality, superiority or dominance of the concerned nation with or above others. General acceptance again guarantees the equal or superior nation to go ahead in achieving such interest. Countries therefore assert their interest as objective to acquire importance, prestige and authority from others. Therefore, representatives of such nations believe that asserting their interest would enhance their national power, give them an edge, and ensure their accommodation and survival in competitive global relations (Magstadt, 2009). However, it is deductible from this discourse that subjective interest and its evolution into objective interest is a reality that first has an individual as its fulcrum. In other words, the individual is the inventor of liberal and cosmopolitic thought.

IV. Subjective Base of Objective Interest in Cosmopolitics

The link between subjective and objective interests is a necessary one, because there can be no objective interest without a subjective source, and, furthermore, the objective interest of nations is constituted by subjective attitudes and thought processes of individuals. In other words, human subjective faculties of perception, thinking or rational reasoning give rise to data or information that is tagged as objective. And through referendum or other viable means possible, greater subjective interests are then synthesized to form what the world calls national objective interest. It is with this in mind that Plato reasons that the state is man writ-large, implying that objective interest of political states which emanates from individual thought processes is also subjective writ-large. This position debunks the views of a few contemporary sceptics and cynics that some political states are totally detached from the individual citizens. As such, it is absurd to think that objective interest is natural and independent of the individual or immune to human subjective influences (McComas, et al., 2002).

Thus, objective interest of nations predicates on everyday personal decisions and choices of individuals which define it. This is why Millar and Driver (1987) consider objective interest or goal as personally and socially constructed rather than objectively revealed. Similarly, Lederman and Abd-El-Khalick, (2002) aver that it is the individual contribution behind an interest that makes it subjective, and this subjectivism accounts for the existence of every objective interest or goal in global politics. As such, there is hardly any objective interest, conclusion or goal without subjective dimension. In line with this, Ulrich (2004) asserts that even when the United Nations or its security arm passes a resolution, it is seen as speaking objectively of humanity's interest, but the guiding intellectual forces of this objective interest include the greater subjective reflections and postulations of individual classical thinkers like Adam Smith, Alexis de Tocqueville, John Dewey, Kant, Goethe, Herder, Humboldt, Nietzsche, Marx, Simmel, etc. As such, objective interest premises on individual perception, cognition, definition and communication. And public acceptance of interest as objective is still underscored by subjective transformative criticisms in the determination of its factualness. This is again followed by intersubjective agreement among member states to ensure the legitimate pursuit of the acclaimed objective interest.

Based on these thoughts, objective interest does not have existence outside the subjective individuals that evolve, interpret or accept them. And they can never be known or have a meaning except when such meaning is given from subjective human reasoning. For objective interest is greatly controlled by personal influences, beliefs and previous knowledge, and will always require personal or subjective clarifications (Lederman, 2007). Thus, subjective contributions give objective interests in cosmopolitics its substance; form, richness, meaning and dynamism (Wenger, 1998). This is why Gergen (2001) reiterates Berkeley and Hume's assertion that there is no means of declaring objective interest except when it is done subjectively. This again supports the fact that objective interest has a necessary connection with individuals who serve as its source. Thus, the interests held or promulgated by economic power blocs in global politics emanate from the greater subjective thought and attitude of some individuals under certain circumstances.

Even when the people's representatives choose to project their own personal interest in cosmopolitics, subjective interest is still playing out. Similarly, moral principles, standards, ideologies, precepts and justice are also products of human subjective thought processes. And subjectivism is also central in scientific processes and its objective products. This is because

these processes of observation, investigation and experimentation are unavoidably influenced by personal attitudes, styles, hypothesis and prior subjective works or paradigm. Coupled with these, individual subjective stances are also used to challenge, promote or enhance the objectivity of scientific findings. Indeed, subjective reasoning and its resultant objective interest is not monolithic. They are constantly shaped by ever changing realities in the human environment. These changing realities range from socio-political and economic order; conflict; natural disasters like, famine, drought, floods; atmospheric conditions like, unfavourable weather/climate; environmental and ecological hazards like, earthquake and landslide. And in many ways, objective interest in turn shapes the individual and his thoughts, interests or actions; objective interest dialectically meddles with individual thought processes, and provokes new subjective thoughts or interest. In other words, objective interests serve as thought materials of the subjective individuals as these individuals imbibe and abide by them.

V. Essence of Objective Interest in Global Politics

The substance of objective interest lies in the fact that it is a conglomeration of greater subjective interests. Its essence also includes the fact that it is artificial, subjectively articulated, stage managed and then packaged into a complex whole. However, objective interest is packaged in a manner that will guarantee its acceptability by a greater number of people. To enhance this general acceptance, it is package in a way that will be seen to be beneficial to many people and nations; interests proposed by nations in cosmopolitics gains the support of other people and nations who hope to benefit from such interests in one way or the other. Since objective interest emanated from greater subjective interests of the citizenry, it is a clue to the fact that its evolution was shaped by human subjective experiences in different environments.

However, geopolitical objective interests are logically and carefully presented by smart and intelligent ambassadors or diplomats with great eloquence and conviction. At times, the superpowers threaten other nations and force them to support their objective interest, as was the case with President Donald Trump when the US voted Jerusalem as the capital of Israel in 2017 and moved the Embassy from Tel Aviv in 2018.

Indeed, objective interest in global politics reflects the greater collective interest, goals and expectations of the citizenry of the concerned nation. This is the rationale behind the support

it gains at the domestic level. Often, objective interest is also part of the foreign policy contained in the political manifestoes or agendas of various governments. Indeed, such interest becomes objective and universal when it is shared by many other nations of the world. Interests that gain objective and universal status are economic in nature and they often come from superpowers like USA, Russia, China, France and the United Kingdom. Thus, global politics revolves around projection, analysis, control and protection of capitalist interests. These interests are always about generation and control of the global economy, international trade or market. In this situation, political and economic processes and strategies are put in place by concerned nations to ensure their global control of production, and exchange of goods and services. This is why cosmopolitics is all about individual nation's assessment of what to get or gain, whom to trade with, whom not to trade with, what to trade, price control, and the consequent individual nation's relevance in the global economic scenario.

VI. Justification of Objective Interest in Cosmopolitics

State actors believe that their foreign policies are in the interest of the world, and argue that they are guided by global liberty, equality, fraternity, stability and respect for human rights. It is on this basis that they forge ahead in pursuit of these interests. Besides, global superpowers have justified their interest by citing their roles during the diverse vicissitudes that pose some challenges to the universe. For instance, the US has on many occasions cited its consistent and irreplaceable role in the stability of Europe and the world since the Second World War. Thus, they have justified their dominant objective interest on the more liberal and democratic international order they hope it will bring. This justification also alludes to their stable democratic ideological preference, readiness to assume a subsequent leading role based on collective arrangements, provision of cosmic security, monetary stability, free market/trade, as well as multilateralism and an international liberal order.

State actors often refer to the economic/national well-being of their country as the reason behind their objective interest. For instance, Donald Trump told CNN and Al Jazeera news on 10th and 12th February, 2019, respectively, that he did not appear before the US Congress to unveil any sanction plan against Saudi Arabia, with regard to their involvement in the murder of Saudi dissident journalist Jamal Kashoggi in Istanbul because of the economic welfare of the US. This welfare rests on a US-Saudi relationship with deals worth billions of dollars that will benefit the US and which Trump will not lose to China or Russia.

In addition, state actors also cite defense as the rationale behind their objective interests or goals. For instance, the US under President George Bush Jr alludes to defense of the nation as the reason behind the objective interest of the invasion of Iraq on 19th March, 2003 by the allied forces. He posited that Iraq is home to Palestinian and Al Qaeda terrorists, weapons of mass destruction, and funding for terrorism that will destroy the US and her allies (Ota, 2005). This interest became credible after the horrifying experience of the bombing of the World Trade Center and the Pentagon in September 11, 2001. Similarly, Israel has also defended its objective interest in the Middle East based on the defense argument. This rationale has also become credible as they are surrounded by Arab nations who consider them as intruders and infidels who should be wiped out.

For these reasons, powerful nations often posit the defense of a nation's natural right behind their objective interests. Hobbes (1985) explains this as the right of an individual to do anything to preserve his own life and property, and that of others. The exercise of natural right as argued in the international assembly by state actors extends to establishing world peace and security, protecting the weak and vulnerable, and sovereignty of nations from despots. As such, defenders of objective interests resonate Kant's (1983) assertion that a transgression of rights in one place in the world is felt everywhere. This has led to the fight against extremism and tyranny by the US and her allies in many countries of the world.

It is worth noting, however, that behind most of these claims of objectivity in global interests are ulterior motives. These motives range from vendetta, political and economic control, or domination of nations (Ota, 2005). For instance, the rationale behind the invasion and occupation of Iraq by the United States was later discovered to be predicated on lies and ulterior motives. No weapons of mass destruction were found, which was the main reason for the invasion in the first place. Also part of these ulterior motives are lies and conscious war on citizens who are perceived as internal enemies, antagonists or dissidents. Saddam Hussein's Iraqi objective deceived the international community as his real aim was to exterminate his own citizens and antagonists, especially the Kurds whom he considered his internal enemies in the 1980s. The Nigerian genocide between 1967 and 1970 against the Biafrans by General Yakubu Gowon's administration was instigated by Britain, who forcefully united several tribes with conflicting cultures in one country, and then favoured only the Hausa and Fulani tribes; the 1991 Odi massacre by President Olusegun Obasanjo; the persecution of Shiite Muslims; killings of Christians; and the on-going killings of

Indigenous People of Biafra (IPOB) have been portrayed to the international community as Nigerian objective interests by President Muhammadu Buhari's government and his predecessors. Similarly, Myanmar is following the same path since 2016, killing *en masse* the Rohingya people in Rakhine. The Anglophone Cameroonians have also been suffering since 2018. These state atrocities are shrouded in lies and have resulted in the destruction of these countries.

VII. Consequences of Cosmopolitical Objective Interests

In global politics, the individual state is concerned not only with maximising its power, but stabilising its relative capacities and position in the system through propagation of its interests. But cosmopolitics is largely under the monopoly and control of state actors (superpowers), who, through conscious strategies or policies, prevent the capacity enlargement of other states, and ensure global imbalance to enhance their superiority. Thus, the superpowers and other strong capitalist states engage in neocolonial activities where their interests strategically take precedence. And resistance to their interests has often resulted in crippling sanctions on the dissident states and even military invasion. The US has clashes with Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, Libya, Somalia and Grenada. Russia has clashes with Ukraine, among others. Britain has reduced Nigeria and most Anglophone nations to poor and helpless states despite their rich human and mineral resources.

Similarly, France has clashes with Sudan and Central African Republic; continues to control the leadership, printing and currency operations of Senegal; and up to 13 other African countries to her advantage. At times, some of these capitalist states even instigate conflict in developing countries to achieve their economic interests through sales of arms and ammunition. For instance, the 1994 civil war and genocide in Rwanda was instigated by Belgium which persuaded the Hutus to fight their tribal brothers, the Tutsis, they claimed, were enslaving and depriving the Hutus of their rights (Nnamani, 2012). All these are examples of how these nations and their economic resources can be controlled, and how they can be made to serve their objective interests and imbibe their ideals (Omazu, 2010; Ota, 2005).

As reported by Al Jazeera on 10th February 2019, Italian Prime Minister Giuseppe Conte blamed France for the incessant African migration through the Mediterranean Sea to their shores, stating that its grip on African states had led to such hardship that they were forced to

leave. Since the idea of objective interest in cosmopolitics is geared towards what to get, state actors do not leave any stone unturned in getting their interests recognised and served by other nations. Consequently, clash of interests and the fight for freedom have characterised international relations, which affects global stability. This is more so as the superpowers at the long run veto their interests and force it on others thereby creating controversial hegemonic trend in the universe.

Indeed, unhealthy relationships among great powers also have some influence on international stability. The more these great powers are involved in unhealthy relationships, the more the international organisations of which they are members are unable to deal with the destabilising factors. As such, cosmopolitics polarises the world, creating rivalry among the superpowers that merely co-operate on few selected issues affecting them. This polarity often results in escalating tension, leading to proxy military confrontation. Such indirect confrontation is presently evident in Syria, where the superpowers back conflicting fighting groups and supply them military personnel, intelligence, arms and ammunition. For example, Russia, Iran and Turkey fully back President Bashar Assad's government, while the US Special Forces back the Syrian Democratic Forces (SDF). Given the central economic and security role these superpowers play in global politics, proxy conflict is also likely to exist in other parts of the world in the years ahead.

Nevertheless, cosmopolitics, with its multidimensional processes, has changed the socio-historical nature of the world, as well as the status of individual countries. It has paved the way for tremendous unemployment and poverty in many nations, multiple loyalties of various nations to diverse power blocs, and the spread of transnational lifestyles. It has also led to the rise of non-state political actors, such as Amnesty International and World Trade Organisation, as also intellectuals, artists, minority groups within each nation, all of whom are engaged with global recognition and protection of human rights, workers' rights, state rights, environmental rights, minority cultural practices and poverty eradication. Minority cultural practices and individual voices that are different from those of the nations of the contemporary world vie for greater expression in politics. The hidden presence of other non-state actors, as mentioned earlier, also vie for greater expression as they occasionally overwhelm the calculations of world leaders, diplomats, ambassadors, etc who are propellers of global politics. These non-state actors are indeed the liberal voices central to cosmopolitics, for their existence in many ways shapes the trend of global decisions and

events. Yet, on many occasions, these non-state actors are ignored by state actors as they vie to actualise their objective interests. This is so based on the supersedence nature of most of these state actors over member states and non-state actors. Despite this, the relationship of state actors with non-state actors at the global political level is at times symbiotic and cordial. This is often so because such a relationship largely enhances the actualisation of the likes, wants or objective interests of the state actors. But based on the impact of these non-state actors, there is presently a shift from humanism to post-humanism in the understanding of global politics.

VIII. Implications of the Argument

The subjective base of objective interests in cosmopolitics has significant implications for human societies. It implies that the focus should be on sound training of individual citizens with philosophic education that influences human thought processes and its products. For, philosophic education consists in the development of the human mind with its essential tools of criticality, consistency, logicity, comprehensiveness, profundity, and coherence (Chinweuba, 2018). With this type of education, a large part of the global population will be enabled to acquire the critically penetrating and illuminating qualities needed for the determination of truth and reduction of error in every situation. Philosophic education therefore completes the human person; it stimulates the psychic faculties, and equips humans with coherent and systematic abilities and skills needed for formulating and implementing important subjective and objective interests. This is why the 20th century philosopher John Dewey postulated that nothing is more important than philosophic education for skillful alteration of human thought processes and habits, and in remoulding global society. In congruence with this, the modern philosopher William James (1925) states that philosophic education drives people away from psychic insufficiency, mere verbal solutions and bad *apriori* absolutes, and turns them towards rational abstraction, concreteness, adequacy, action, facts and openness to positive change as against dogma, artificiality and pretense.

Philosophic education therefore, allows individual citizens to reason correctly, and their subjective and eventually objective interests that result from such reasoning will be rational and more valuable to the world. However, the international community needs to produce the type of philosophic education that will largely cut across diverse human environments and bridge the differences in human thought. Such holistic philosophic education will enhance relations within the world of differences, initiate a relation where there is none, and free the

world from parochial western thought that had trapped it for ages. And, such philosophic education will not be confined to human thought, but will also embrace objects and beings of different kinds such as animals, plants, earth, planets, etc., which have a stake in the cosmic realm.

Indeed, philosophic education can be relied on to bridge the differences among humans or between humans and other cosmic realities. This is because it has in the contemporary epoch become a dynamic exercise that relies on reason rather than orthodoxy and instinctive tendencies through which humans largely interpret the world to their advantage. When compared to other disciplines, philosophy alone privileges reason as its sole tool (Asiegbu, 2011). Thus, contemporary philosophic education is equivalent to being rational, and of all the attributes bestowed on humankind, none surpasses rationality (Chinweuba, 2019). Rationality as synonymous with and characterising philosophic education depicts man's ability to think differently and proactively; a positive intent to galvanise available means to desired and approved ends; an intent that is backed by the qualities of efficiency, impersonality, objectivity and neutrality (ibid). This character of philosophic education also fosters a logical movement beyond empirical investigations in the search for answers to cosmic predicament. Empirical investigations as characterising science in fact produce truths which are valid only in the realm of experience. But through the power of reason, philosophic education produces results which are universally valid and sound in the realm of experience and beyond (ibid). In fact, it is based on this mega-character and function that Plato in his *Phaedo* describes philosophy as "the noblest and greatest of art" (Agbanusi, 2011). And this brings into view, Plato's thought that for the world to record harmony and sustainable development, philosophers must be Kings, or Kings and Potentates must be philosophers.

Once more, the philosophic education necessary for sustainable cosmic unity, peace and progress has to incorporate the socio-political ideologies of diverse nations, as well as the mutual overlapping and beneficial similarities inherent in diverse cultures. These should culminate in a central philosophic education curriculum that member states should agree to apply in their respective education systems. Such a curriculum must of course be based on practical human equality, recognition, diverse positive values and practices, truth and goodness. It should also be capable of developing the social, intellectual and psychological nature of future generations through inculcation of right ideas and skills.

IX. The Philosophical Base of the Argument

Subjectivism and objectivism of interests are symbiotic cosmopolitical polarities with a long philosophical tradition. Their symbiotic nature was first formalised in the philosophical teachings of the Sophists who were great spokesmen of Greek enlightenment and politics (Blackburn, 2005). Most influential among them was Protagoras, who was quite outstanding with the philosophical assertion that ‘man is the measure of all things, of the things that are, that they are, and of the things that are not, that they are not’ (Stumpf, 1994). This assertion echoes the subjective bedrock of human interest, including what we term objective in global politics. Adding to this thought, the Sophist Trasymachus reveals that in global politics, justice favours the strong and ‘might is right’, hence the subjective interest of the strong prevails as objective (ibid).

Socrates in his philosophical discourses upholds human subjective contributions to the understanding of that which is objective. Hence, he opines that knowledge has to do with the mental power of the individuals to discover the abiding elements that remain after the accidents have disappeared (ibid). In addition, Plato gives more ground to subjective and objective interests in his theory of knowledge and doctrine of forms or ideas. He taught that subjective interests in the cosmic realm are copious perceptions of the real forms in the ideal world (ibid). Based on this, Plato bequeathed to the world a philosophy with two dependent subjective and objective worlds of human interests. Moreover, Plato teaches that subjective individual interests underscore the discovery of objective interests and their real forms in the ideal world. This, according to him, is possible through sound education which is a process of reminiscence and dialectics that involves mental abstraction of essence of things that leads to the discovery of relations of knowledge. It is possible again through the art of desire which leads people step by step from mere subjective perception to beautiful thought, and eventually to the very essence of objective interests. In these ways, Plato expresses the subjective rational ability of humans to apprehend the transcendental objects of the ideal world (Asiegbu, 2011).

When Kant wrote about categorical imperative in his Critique of Pure Reason, he was referring to objective morality which is a widely debated point in cosmopolitics (Onwubiko, 1991). He includes the causal subjective role of humans in instituting objective interest and

practices, which is an exercise of their moral freedom and sense of moral duty. The objective interests and its morality, according to Kant, dwell on truth and goodness which transcends and judges the actions of all nations. For him, objective interests are necessarily cognised and made meaningful through human subjective exercises. As such, subjective minds transform the raw data given to our senses into a coherent and related set of elements to ensure a human unified grasp of the world and a unity of experience (Stumpf, 1994).

In his celebrated essay, 'To Perpetual Peace', Kant (1983) also introduces the idea of cosmopolitical law which reflects the way men and nations stand in mutually influential relations. He sees moderation of objective interests through cosmopolitical or international law as a way of achieving global peace (Ulrich, 2004) Admitting that objective interests do not exist in a vacuum, Kant again opines that legislative authority and governments of nations need to seek instruction from subjective philosophers concerning the principles on which it should act toward other nations. However, he defines the normative basis for cosmopolitics, stating that it must be transparent and dependent on governments which represent a synthesis of individual interests or public opinion in their nations. In the contemporary period, Longino (1990) champions the nexus between subjectivism and objectivism as it pertains to scientific knowledge. He argues that the possibility of criticism does not totally eliminate subjective preferences, either from an individual or from a community's practice of science. Rather, it provides a means for monitoring and assessing its influence in the formation of scientific knowledge (ibid). In other words, Longino taught that subjective influences underscore objective interests, and that even the objectivity of science derives from intersubjective agreement among the members of the scientific community.

X. Conclusion

Subjective and objective interests are cosmopolitical realities with a dialectical nexus; the synthesis of the subjective interests of individual citizenry results in objective interests which nations propose in cosmopolitics. As the bedrock of objective interests, subjective interests shape national interests and therefore influence cosmopolitical decisions and choices. Even scientific processes involve individual subjective orientations, assumptions, inclinations and life dispositions, tending to decrease impartiality and bias. Hence, Nozick (2001) draws attention to the fact that science will only be objective when no extraneous factors interfere with its processes or divert it from accurately finding the truth. Therefore objective interests fully depend on individual citizens' imagination, intuition, emotion, thought processes,

values, beliefs, experiences, ambitions, interactions and negotiations (Huizing, 2007). Objective interests also influence further subjective interests and their processes. Here then is the symbiosis and connection between the two realities, as well as the active participation of the individual human in shaping and changing the environment.

However, objective interests which have become central in cosmopolitics have brought about a paradigm shift in global understanding of cosmopolitics. This is because the hitherto neglected non-state actors, discussed earlier, now vie for greater expression in politics and are being accommodated. This global accommodation is materialising on the basis of a greater presence, impact or the need for the existence of these non-state actors that are presently overwhelming the calculations of various world leaders, who are the catalysts behind objective interests in global politics. As such, non-state actors now contribute in shaping the trend of objective interests, global decisions and events. Consequently, nation states are now engaging in a redefinition of politics in the contemporary world, accommodating the being of non-state actors and portending a significant shift from humanism to post-humanism.

References

- Agbanusi, Arinze. 2011. "The Great Need for Philosophy in the Quest for Sustainable Development", in A.B.C Chiegboka, T.C. Utoh-Ezeajugh and M.S. Ogene (eds.), *The Humanities and Sustainable Development*. Nimo: Rex Charles & Patrick.
- Appadorai, A. 2004. *The Substance of Politics*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Arua, K. C. 2007. "Man is Free to be Free and not Free not to be Free", *Uche Journal of the Department of Philosophy*, 13: 1-13.
- Asiegbu, Martin. F. 2011. "Philosophy and Sustainable Development", in A.B.C Chiegboka, T.C. Utoh-Ezeajugh and M.S. Ogene (eds.), *The Humanities and Sustainable Development*. Nimo: Rex Charles & Patrick.
- Blackburn, S. 2005. *Oxford Dictionary of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Böhme, Tillmann, Paul, Childerhouse, Erick, Deakins and Denis, Towill. 2012. "A Method for Reconciling Subjectivist and Objectivist Assumptions in Management Research", *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, XX(X):1-9.
- Chinweuba, Gregory E. 2018. "Leadership and Higher Education in Nigeria: The Philosophical Nexus", *Sapientia Journal of Philosophy*, 9: 83-89.
- 2019. "Philosophy and Sustainable Development in Nigeria: A Critical Analysis",

- Nnamdi Azikiwe *Journal of Philosophy*, 11 (1): 41-54.
- Crick, B. 1964. *In Defence of Politics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Elijah, O. J and E. E. Ette. 2018. "Political Education and the Sustainability of Democracy in Nigeria", *Sapientia Journal of Philosophy*, 9: 23-30.
- Eminue, O. 2001. *Introduction to Political Science*. Calabar: Clear Lines Publications.
- Ezeugwu, Evaristus C. and Gregory E. Chinweuba. 2018. "The Supreme Being in Igbo Thought: A Reappraisal", *Philosophia E-Journal for Philosophy and Culture*, 21: 26-47.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Gergen, Kenneth. 2001. "Psychological Science in a Postmodern Context", *American Psychologist*, 56: 803-813.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1985. *Leviathan*. (trans.) C. B. Macpherson. London: Penguin Books.
- Huizinga, A. 2007. "The Value of a Rose: Rising above Objectivism and Subjectivism", *Humanities and Social Sciences Review*, 7(11): 1-11.
- Jouvenel, B. 1957. *Sovereignty: An Inquiry into the Political Good*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1983. *To Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch, in Perpetual Peace and Other Essays on Politics, History and Morals*. (trans.) Ted Humphrey. Indiana: Hekett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Lederman, N. and F. Abd-El-Khalick. 2002. "Avoiding De-Natured Science: Activities that Promote Understandings of the Nature of Science", in William F. McComas (ed.), *The Nature of Science in Science Education: Rationales and Strategies*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Lederman, N. G. 2007. "Nature of Science: Past, Present and Future", in N.G. Lederman and Sandra K. Abell, *Handbook of Research in Science Education*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Longino, H. 1990. *Science as Social Knowledge*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Magstadt, T. M. 2009. *Understanding Politics, Ideas, Institutions, and Issues*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- McComas, W., M. Clough and H. Almazroa, H. 2002. "The Role and Character of the Nature of Science in Science Education", in William F. McComas (ed.), *The Nature of Science in Science Education: Rationales and Strategies*. Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publisher.
- Millar, R. and R. Driver. 1987. "Beyond Processes", *Studies in Science Education*, 14: 33-62.
- Nnamani, O. 2012. "Conflicts in Africa", in C. Nnadi and E. C. Ezeugwu (eds.), *Conflict*

- Prevention & Management Strategies*. Enugu: His Glory Publications.
- Nozick, R. 2001. *Invariances: The Structure of the Objective World*. London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Nwoko, M. I. 1988. *Basic World Political Theories*. Owerri: Claretian Institute of Philosophy.
- Odimegwu, Ike. 2008. *Philosophic Foundation of Politics*. Awka: Lumos Nigeria Limited.
- Ofoegbu, G. A. I. 1999. *Modern Government for Senior Secondary Schools in West Africa*. Onitsha: Mas Founders Publications.
- Omazu, E. 2010. "Africa in the Politics of Dominant Civilization", *Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 11(2): 85-103.
- Onwubiko, O. A. 1991. *African Thought and Culture*. Enugu: Snaap Press.
- Ota, E. N. 2005. "United States Adventurism in the Gulf: What Peace? Whose Security?" *Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 7: 171-195.
- Stumpf, Samuel E. 1994. *Philosophy History & Problems*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Ulrich, B. 2004. "Cosmopolitical Realism: On the Distinction between Cosmopolitanism in Philosophy and the Social Sciences", *Global Networks*, 4 (2): 131–156.
- Wenger, Etienne. 1998. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- William, James. 1925. *Pragmatism*. New York: Longman's Green and Co.