



## Arendt and cosmopolitanism: the human conditions of cosmopolitan teacher education

MatthewJ. Hayden

To cite this article: MatthewJ. Hayden (2013) Arendt and cosmopolitanism: the human conditions of cosmopolitan teacher education, *Ethics & Global Politics*, 5:4, 239-258, DOI: [10.3402/egp.v5i4.20271](https://doi.org/10.3402/egp.v5i4.20271)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.3402/egp.v5i4.20271>



© 2013 M.J. Hayden



Published online: 16 Jan 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1394



View related articles [↗](#)



Citing articles: 6 View citing articles [↗](#)

# Arendt and cosmopolitanism: the human conditions of cosmopolitan teacher education

Matthew J. Hayden\*

*Department of Teaching and Learning, School of Education, Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, USA*

## Abstract

Despite the diversity of cosmopolitan philosophical thought, two constants remain: the significance of shared humanity and the idea that this fact should shape the way people live with each other. I will argue that Hannah Arendt's conceptions of the human conditions of plurality, natality, and action offer cosmopolitan educators an improved grounding for their theoretical foundations and crucial points of emphasis for teacher education in opposition to the educationally destructive effects of standardization in education. Cosmopolitan characteristics such as democratic inclusion, openness, and dynamic engagement emerge as embodiments of morality wherein the preservation of the human condition of natality is vital for the public expression (action) of one's humanity. Arendt's conditions serve as the 'is' to cosmopolitan education's 'ought,' wherein the human conditions of plurality, natality, and action support the creativity, fluidity, and unpredictability of lived lives and frame the context in which cosmopolitan teacher education responds, offering teacher educators a theoretical foundation and language to forestall or reverse the educationally devastating effects of standardization in education.

**Keywords:** *action; humanity; international; morality; natality; plurality; public; standardization*

We live in a time of great uncertainty in education. One reason is the acceleration of globalization and its effects, some of which are the porosity of borders, the diffusion of cultures, and in some cases the weakening of local ways of living as new ways are experienced, assimilated, or adopted. These phenomena put pressure on schools and teachers to effectively understand the constantly evolving global environment and to prepare students for such a world. The accelerated and unmediated introduction of new and different ways of living resulting from technological advances and increasingly accessible global mobility has instigated

---

\*Correspondence to: Matthew J. Hayden, School of Education, Drake University, USA. Email: [matthew.hayden@drake.edu](mailto:matthew.hayden@drake.edu)

©2012 M.J. Hayden. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Citation: Ethics & Global Politics, Vol. 5, No. 4, 2012, pp. 239–258 <http://dx.doi.org/10.3402/egp.v5i4.20271>*

reactionary movements to re-establish traditional systems of authority. A strand of these reactions can be seen in multiple forms of fundamentalist-type movements in religion and cultural preservationist efforts.<sup>1</sup> Less obvious forms, but no less reactionary, are secular strands of ‘reform’ found in standardization movements in educational contexts. Standardization in economic globalization attempts to increase certain efficiencies as well as decrease uncertainty and unpredictability. Educational standardization, for teacher education as well as general education, attempts to achieve the same.<sup>2</sup>

The desire to reduce the inherent uncertainty and unpredictability in education has become a motivating factor in the increased global support for the standardization of teaching and curriculum and the use of testing to verify the various outputs labeled ‘learning,’ with significant implications for teacher education. In recent years, attempts to guarantee the achievement of various aims in education in schooling have grown dominant. These efforts are seen in the attempt to increase educational ‘achievement’ wherein ‘achievement’ has come to mean meeting certain ‘criteria’ and the ‘criteria’ has come to be signified by quantitative products, such as test scores and grades. Content is usually prescribed, teachers are tasked with teaching it, and students are assessed to see if they have learned it. From recent US policies such as No Child Left Behind (NLCB) and Race to the Top (RTTT) to international standardized examinations such as Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) and Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), there is momentum to standardize schooling while within nation-state and regional organizations there are conflicts over whose ‘standards’ are to be utilized. It is this conflict—evident of widespread human diversity and plurality—over what should be standard that illustrates why such standardization is not only suspect for educational processes but potentially counter-productive to schooling in the first place.

In teacher education, such standardization results in reducing teaching to mere production of quantifiably measurable knowledge. As a concurrent reaction to globalization, cosmopolitanism has a role to play in these discussions of ‘improving’ education through teacher education. In her essay, Claudia Schumann discusses how cosmopolitanism embodies a critique of reification, and standardization is a means by which reification occurs. The gesture and support of such a critique can also be found in the writing and thinking of Hannah Arendt. More specifically, I will draw upon the manner in which cosmopolitan education relies on the idea of ‘shared humanity’ as a foundation for its democratic impulse and ethical position. I will then use Arendt’s thinking about the human condition to strengthen the idea of shared humanity and show that efforts to standardize schooling processes inhibit the kind of educational process needed to sustain human creativity and flourishing in intellectual and ethical development. I will further develop Arendt’s human conditions of plurality, action, and natality as vital contexts to guide cosmopolitan education, such that an education is cosmopolitan to the extent that it responds to the human conditions posited by Arendt.

## SHARED HUMANITY AND ITS OBLIGATIONS

Cosmopolitan education starts from the recognition of shared humanity, a perspective wherein one sees oneself as a person in a world full of other persons with whom one is connected and must live *with*, not merely among. Cosmopolitanism is thus oriented toward figuring out how to live with each other and is positioned as an ethical, moral, and political endeavor. The primacy of shared humanity in cosmopolitanism entails that in such an education the processes that erect rules, customs, or structures be grounded via the input of all who will be governed by them. This creates a democratic impulse for cosmopolitan educators, which is not derived from liberal ideology nor from Plato's *Republic*, but rather as a logical consequent of the most fundamental component of cosmopolitanism, shared humanity.

In the cosmopolitan literature, 'shared humanity' has many related meanings without agreement on one specific meaning and is often left to stand alone to represent a complex though ineffable constellation of qualities to be found in human beings. It is said that one should possess 'allegiance to humanity' wherein one does not only develop loyalties to family and countrymen but also to all persons.<sup>3</sup> The Stoics believed that moral allegiance was owed to everyone, and Martha Nussbaum suggests that reason and moral capacity are the 'fundamental ingredients' that can provide the necessary links of humanity.<sup>4</sup> I aver that the only conception cosmopolitanism can use with consistency conceives 'humanity' as containing everything that humans are and can be 'good' and 'bad.'<sup>5</sup> Thus, 'humanity' represents a set of human conditions that, together, represent an overall condition of 'humanity' that is shared. Such a stance is not without consequences and it is for this reason I will summon what Arendt calls the *human condition* that describes conditions of human existence, including, but not limited to, the human conditions of plurality, action, and natality.<sup>6</sup>

In exploring the affinity between Arendt's conditions and cosmopolitanism, I do not propose to define human nature, but will simply repeat Terence's observation that 'I am a man; I deem nothing that is human to be foreign to me,' nor to any other person.<sup>7</sup> To possess the potential for all actions known to be within the capability of a human as well as the potential for all actions not yet known to be possible by a human essentially frames the human condition that serves to represent the domain that 'humanity' encompasses. It is the expression of that humanity that drives cosmopolitan, and Arendtian, education.

## CONDITIONS OF COSMOPOLITANISM

Cosmopolitanism and the idea of shared humanity entail four 'conditions': the recognition of living with other people; the need for dynamic engagement; openness and receptivity to the new; and the acceptance that this orientation and the processes therein are never complete.<sup>8</sup> These conditions combine to suggest that at a fundamental level, cosmopolitanism is a way of engaging the world that recognizes that living is something that is done *with* and not only *among* other people,

something necessary in teacher education as argued by Klas Roth in his essay. While these characteristics are not unique to cosmopolitanism, they are logical extensions of what it means to possess a shared humanity and are derived thus. These and other characteristics often cited in relation to cosmopolitanism are outward manifestations of an ongoing dialectic of an individual's awareness of and interaction with his environment and are behavioral manifestations of ethical dispositions.<sup>9</sup> The individual who cultivates a cosmopolitan disposition is ready, willing, and able to, as John Dewey says, 'modify our organic resources to adapt them to the specific features in which we find ourselves.'<sup>10</sup> When confronted with a 'novel condition' or situation should one attempt to think and reflect on it and understand it, admitting the possibility of including its lessons in one's life? Or, should one disregard it simply because one would rather not be troubled with the effort or fear that one might have to give up some previously held principle? The Stoic Marcus Aurelius would answer that '[i]t is no evil for things to undergo change, and no good for things to subsist in consequence of change.'<sup>11</sup> In cosmopolitan education one acts, and does so in relation to and with others in the context of evolving conditions. To live in the world is to receive an onslaught of new experiences and a constant unfolding of one's relationship to oneself, one's environment, and other people. A cosmopolitan educator encourages students to be receptive to these experiences, thus preparing them to be better practiced at dealing with emerging and changing situations in the world.

The important role that this conception plays in education is that it stresses the impermanence and fallibility of our efforts because humans are human and that means we are both the same and different. Cosmopolitan philosophy harbors no finality in the matters of human experience and actively supports the constant investigation into the ways in which people do and ought to live together, which includes examining past and present ways of living. Philip Kitcher gives the example that in the 20th century 'very few people . . . have retained exactly the constellation of attitudes towards sexual behavior that were originally passed on to us by parents and other ethical teachers.'<sup>12</sup> Whether such changes in individual and societal values are 'good' or 'bad' is a different point. The only fixed truth in ethical, moral, and political systems is that they change over time and this foregrounds the ultimate framing of the human condition, change. The cultivation of a cosmopolitan sensibility in teacher education creates in the individual an acute awareness of the constant diffusion of ways of living and the dynamic nature of multiple forms of ways of living to form a dynamic, growth-oriented disposition to the world. Cosmopolitan philosophy as a way of living and as an educational endeavor in teacher education cannot help but embark on an educational project because it is focused on the individual's relationship to other people from the outset, and human plurality compounds the diversity of these relationships. A cosmopolitan teacher imbues his teaching with the communication of the ethical imperative of openness, receptivity, and engagement to live with others, and that 'lifelong learning' in this respect means that these cosmopolitan conditions constitute a process that is ongoing.

## ARENDT'S HUMAN CONDITIONS

From this base, cosmopolitanism offers a philosophical approach to how one should live in the world, an endeavor that encompasses the ethical, moral, and the political. In moving from cosmopolitan philosophy to cosmopolitan education in teacher education,<sup>13</sup> a political function, this project invites comparisons to political life, processes, and theories. It is for this reason that I will examine Arendt's conceptions, the inescapable 'human conditions' of plurality, action, and natality. The cosmopolitan ethical component compels us to retain the recognition of the collectivity of flourishing and politics must therefore operate to that end. We cannot figure out what the good is without being a 'we,' and this requires an inclusive, collaborative, democratic process which appeals to the core components of shared humanity in cosmopolitanism.<sup>14</sup> To facilitate this understanding, it is useful to examine three 'human conditions' as proposed by Hannah Arendt: plurality, action, and natality. These three human conditions create the context to which the four cosmopolitan conditions—the recognition of living with other people; the need for dynamic engagement; openness and receptivity to the new; and the acceptance that the processes therein are never complete—embody a response that is critical of the prevailing efforts for certainty through standardization in education and in teacher education.

### Plurality

I will begin where Arendt begins, the inescapable plurality of human existence. For Arendt, 'plurality is specifically *the* condition . . . of all political life'<sup>15</sup> and this condition of plurality is fundamentally shared 'because we are all the same, that is, human, in such a way that nobody is ever the same as anyone else who ever lived, lives, or will live.'<sup>16</sup> The existence of others prompts the asking of questions about our actions, questions relative to the domain of morality by virtue of their inevitable impact on others. *Should I do x? Is it right or wrong to do x? What factors should I use in order to determine this?* The existence of others demands that I question my relation to those others and evaluate the interactions that transpire.<sup>17</sup> From the very start, we are thus compelled to acknowledge, think, and act according to this condition of the plurality of human beings. The condition and the compulsion are both shared universally, though what exactly each of us does about the condition as a result of the compulsion is anyone's guess, an unpredictability that results from the Arendtian condition of natality, to be discussed later.

In the classroom, teachers and students are confronted with plurality every day. In some places, such as schools located in communities with high rates of immigration, linguistic, cultural, and ethnic plurality are very evident. Variations in phenotypes, languages, and cultural norms and behaviors are readily apparent and require attention and negotiation. In teacher education as well as elsewhere, we need to develop skills that allow students to both understand and navigate this plurality. But there is more to plurality than these concrete differences. Even when language

and culture are generally homogenous, plurality exists in the minds, thoughts, ideologies, and beliefs of people. Thus, it does not matter if one is in a culturally heterogeneous community or one that appears homogenous; the condition of human plurality is omnipresent.

The recognition of the existence of others and the compulsion to factor their existence into the evaluation of and decisions about ourselves is further compounded, and complicated, by the fact that each of us will have potentially different reactions to each other, which is evidence of our natality. Our actions will be disparate, our choices will differ, and our desires will conflict precisely because of our plurality. The plurality of our individual humanness will manifest in a hyper-plurality of human action. As a result, it becomes even more important that we find ways to negotiate our concurrent existences and make them complementary.<sup>18</sup> In the classroom, the plurality of cultures, languages, beliefs, and even citizenship status will create immediate problems for teachers and students that must be negotiated. For Arendt, the domain into which these negotiations fall publicly is *politics*, and the domain of private thought is *morality*. They are both necessary and demarcate the primary aim of cosmopolitan teacher education: to educate persons to live *in action with* other persons. Thus the Arendtian condition of plurality is the cognate of the cosmopolitan recognition that we live with other persons, a condition that requires more than just knowing that this is the case, but also *being* with and *acting* with others. The compulsion to moral thought finds its actualization through action in public. It is important for teachers to bring the condition of plurality out into the ‘conscious open.’ It is not enough that teachers and students recognize for themselves that this plurality is present, but that they publicly acknowledge it and engage each other about it. This requires that they act in concert with each other and for Arendt this means ‘action.’

## Action

According to Arendt, action can only take place in the presence of others. Thus, the nature of politics is *world-directed* whereas the nature of morality is *self-reflective*. However, even if the intent of our actions might be wholly self-regarding, the outcomes of our actions are not only ours and once unleashed into the world, the world and the other persons in it determine them; our thoughts might be ours alone, but our actions are for everyone. We are conditioned by our conditions ‘because everything [we] come in contact with turns immediately into a condition of [our] existence.’<sup>19</sup> Our morality, then, becomes public by virtue of action, and thus conditions the next set of actions, contributing to expressions of natality, plurality, and subsequent morality.

Sharing in action is not done in the abstract sense of sharing in plurality. There is also a concurrent sharing concretely, in the way that action must occur in public, and thus we share in the world of our actions. Arendt asserts that we can only think when we are alone and that we can only *act* in the presence of others, in public.<sup>20</sup>

For Arendt, the ‘public’ is constituted when ‘individuals come together in a particular way around an issue or object of common concern,’ such as education.<sup>21</sup> Thinking is necessary for morality—there are others in the world and their presence compels us to think about the implications of that fact—but thinking alone is not sufficient. Disclosure of that thinking is necessary for morality to ‘come to life,’ because according to Arendt, without ‘God’ handing down moral laws or demonstrable eternal truths (as opposed to what Arendt identifies as eternal truths that are simply un-provable), we are forced to live our lives ‘without a banister.’<sup>22</sup> In education and in teacher education, if we are not dogmatically handing down ‘truths’ to students, then something else must be required for them to learn.

The fact of plurality forces us to interact with others and thus the need to think about those interactions. Action happens in the world and the inter-actions within it and does not *only* happen in one’s own mind.<sup>23</sup> Moral and political lives exist in the public actions and disclosures of the internal moral self into the external world along with other persons’ insertions of themselves. The Arendtian human condition of action, then, provokes the cosmopolitan recognition of the necessity of dynamic engagement with others. It is through such action that persons reveal and share their humanity.<sup>24</sup> Action itself can only take place in the presence of others and thus we must share a political space with others when we reveal our humanity; we literally share our humanity with them. In this way, the expression of morality and one’s humanity are bound together as a disclosure of the self. It is the development of the self to which a cosmopolitan education is oriented. Thus, cosmopolitan teachers must engage students to share in the construction of publicly shared morality/humanity through the public disclosure of their selves via private thoughts, interactive arguments, and the negotiations that follow the disclosures. It is crucial that students be brought into direct, public, and active contact with the plurality around them as a catalyst to engage others in the examination of it. The fruits of education exist in the habits of public disclosure of internally constructed—and externally influenced through prior experience—judgments that are then tested, debated, negotiated, and sometimes instantiated in public laws or in social behaviors.<sup>25</sup>

We all are subject to the condition that compels us to think morally and we all are subject to the same terms of sharing morality; it must be done in the presence of others and in public. A person who is a thinker and an actor must enact his/her humanity in the public realm. Arendt states ‘[w]ith word and deed we insert ourselves in the human world, and this insertion is like a second birth.’<sup>26</sup> Doing so allows morality to become the public dialog that it must become, and that public realm is constitutive of a political, social, and moral process. The questions one asks oneself arise out of the problems of living in the world with others, which put morality squarely in the public, existing in engagement with others through self-disclosure. The engagement is one of action and reaction, revelation and response, and creates a public dialog in morality. It is also uncertain. By entering the public dialog in morality one does not know what will happen; one throws one’s lot in with others, one’s community, and all of humanity. It is a choice to not force or coerce, and, as Christine Korsgaard puts it, ‘to share, to trust, and generally



speaking to risk your happiness or success on the hope that [others] will turn out to be human,' too.<sup>27</sup> However, to be human is to be the progenitor of the unpredictable, and this is due to what Arendt calls the human condition of natality.

## Natality

One of the appeals of traditional education and teacher education—in which students are compelled to accept and learn predetermined content—is the perceived increased probability that such knowledge will be adopted and manifested by students thusly taught. Traditional education provides a level of comfort and less unease with the future. There is a belief that telling students, specifically, the correct thing to do or know in all given situations will point them in the appropriate direction and make it more likely that they will do or say specific things and thus provide comfort or the illusion of certainty about possible preferred outcomes. This speaks to a broader compulsion in teacher education to attempt to eliminate uncertainty and struggle against the breakdown of comforting and familiar norms and ways of living. Teachers are often caught between the desires of others (e.g. parents, community leaders) to reinforce normative constructions of these elements of culture and educational imperatives (from within or without) to equip students with the knowledge of other possibilities as well as the tools of inquiry to explore them and the skills of judgment to evaluate them. This creates a familiar tension for cosmopolitan educators who must figure out how to balance their roles as a public or community 'servant' and an intrinsically motivated educator and citizen.

To come to grips with this problem and its relationship to cosmopolitan teacher education, Arendt's notion of *natality* in education is useful. Arendt's approach to natality, as well as plurality and action, comes from her belief in the fundamental equality of all humans.<sup>28</sup> Natality, in direct contrast to mortality, is the condition which grounds our ability to insert ourselves in and become part of the world.<sup>29</sup> We are all born into the world; an involuntary act on our part, and for most of the early parts of our lives our natality is dormant or unexercised. Arendt says that at some point we have a 'second birth' as a result of our saying 'yes' or 'no' to something.<sup>30</sup> We begin to understand that we can *act* in the world, and our yes/no decision is a form of communication to the world. It is, in a sense, our first 'speech act' and expression of our self. It is the connection between natality and action that exposes the communicative nature of natality, its place in politics and morality, and thus its place in education. Teachers at various stages (or grade levels) in student development will see this nascent ability to speak and act as students begin to ascertain their autonomy, agency, and powers. The way we react to their first attempts is crucial to the formation of their capacities.

For Arendt, natality is the very essence of education because of 'the fact that human beings are *born* into the world' and each person born represents unknown actions and possibilities, finite in person but infinite across humanity as actions and possibilities stretch into the future.<sup>31</sup> This natality unleashes an incalculable

unpredictability in the world, and in human action it opens up a range of possibilities that cannot be enumerated and outcomes that cannot be prefixed, each one of which can add to the experience of life. In contrast to attempts to curtail the possibility of education through fear of the unknown, Arendt sees education as a fundamental necessity of human society because such society constantly ‘renews itself through birth, through the arrival of new human beings.’<sup>32</sup>

With the creation of man, the principle of beginning came into the world itself, which, of course, is only another way of saying that the principle of freedom was created when man was created but not before. It is in the nature of beginning that something new is started which cannot be expected from whatever may have happened before.<sup>33</sup>

Education is a process in which ‘beginners’ are also ‘beginnings’ and with each unique origination of action brings something new into the world.<sup>34</sup> Such *action as beginning* presents the potential to express the human conditions of natality and plurality—a plurality which cannot be eliminated nor constrained—through the bringing forth (or ‘birthing’) of the new. It is this condition that education is to preserve.

The condition of natality can contribute to cosmopolitan thought and teacher education in a number of ways. First, the preservation of natality suggests that there will always be new possibilities and thus the ‘project’ of living is never finished; there will always be something new on the horizon. Cosmopolitan teacher education’s orientation to the presence of constant change and interest in the means to best negotiate these changes is vitally important in the contemporary world. Teachers who recognize and facilitate these negotiations can better prepare their students to live in the world. Second, preserving natality suggests that each person retains the capacity to *contribute* to the world; the democratic impulse inherent in the concept of shared humanity sees a commensurate impulse in ensuring this potential via natality. In addition, natality serves to further ‘pluralize’ plurality and action, by starting from differentiated beings and promoting a near infinite number of possibilities that might extend from each. Due to this complex layering of natality and plurality in educational processes, we can never be certain that the outcome will match our intentions or desires. Instead, cosmopolitan teachers recognize the importance of helping students to remain open, inquisitive, and engaged with others so that they can participate in the ongoing project of their lives. This includes helping students learn how to make sense of the world and their place in it among others who are attempting to make sense of the world and find their places in it. It is a shared experience of lifelong inquiry, negotiated collaboration, and growth.

### **The human conditions of education**

In ‘The Crisis of Education,’ Arendt asserts that when at home children are under the authority of their parents through the private life of the family. This domestic protection is necessary but cannot suffice to adequately instruct the child in and

about the world since this protection lacks the necessary freedom to learn and to 'act' and is supplanted instead by the compulsion to learn from the unquestioned authority of the parents. Without 'world' contact, the child will know nothing of the world she will inherit, and therefore have no understanding or capacity to engage it intelligently.<sup>35</sup> For Arendt, teachers are responsible for the continuance of the child and the continuance of the world. They must occupy both of these worlds at once and serve as the bridge between them; the world that is and the preparation of the persons for the world that will become. This is the position of the cosmopolitan teacher: between the world the students know and the one they are in a position to discover/create. Arendt laments that people in the Western world have continued to retreat from politics and their attendant obligations.<sup>36</sup> A cosmopolitan teacher is obligated to the continuation of the world and must therefore be in it and of it to both practice action and to teach for it. It is at this juncture that Arendt's unique 'conservatism' plays a role.

For Arendt, education is a conservative venture; its task is to protect 'the child against the world, the world against the child, the new against the old, the old against the new.'<sup>37</sup> Far from being only a backward looking conservatism, the most important function requires the protection of the natality inherent in human life, in the capacity for unique persons to disclose unique selves in an old, existing world in which the very action of disclosure changes the world and brings forth something new. In education, if the world is to survive, humans must endeavor to alter or create what is new, not only preserve what is old. The conservation that education involves is to *preserve* natality, the capacity for human creativity in forms of life; to preserve the capacity, not what the capacity has already produced. Education means introducing students to the adult world they will some day be in a position to alter. It involves protecting them from that world and concurrently preventing the students from hiding or burying their creative capacities that will allow them to act in it. As teachers who simultaneously live and act in the world, we educate students to be beginners and conservators in their own right to reflect their own natality.

Arendt writes that we 'are always educating for a world that is or is becoming out of joint, for this is the basic human situation.'<sup>38</sup> Our current world of rapid 'globalization' is very much a world that is constantly coming out of joint. Everything is temporary, from our governing institutions to our own personal understandings and beliefs. Education's goal is to ensure the conditions under which the world might be 'set aright' without guaranteeing that such 'aright-ing' will occur. 'It is the task of the educator to mediate between the old and the new,'<sup>39</sup> and a challenge of a cosmopolitan educator is to maintain authority in education while moving through a world without structural authority or binding tradition. It is an odd place and no small challenge for the teacher-adult, 'to prepare them [students] in advance for the task of renewing a common world,'<sup>40</sup> a world that will quite likely not be lived in by the one who has educated someone else for it. Each of our 'beginnings' or actions bumps up against the 'beginnings' and actions of others so that 'our efforts to initiate the new take place always in the midst of other acting beings whose very presence mitigates against our actions coming to fruition.'<sup>41</sup> It is this constant

conflict—constituted by the human conditions of plurality, action, and natality—to which cosmopolitan education must be educationally oriented to accept as part of the conditions of life, while subsequently focusing on ways to facilitate meaningful and peacefully inclusive ways of mediation and negotiation.

## **THE HUMAN CONDITIONS OF COSMOPOLITANISM**

### **The condition of education**

The milieu of natality is constitutive of Arendt's condition of plurality because of its incessant nature to 'birth' the new, though it does not exclusively determine the actuality of pluralism. Natality is a precondition of action, but action may or may not take place. Cosmopolitan teachers must foster and promote the conditions of natality, but in doing so they also foster frustration; the inevitable recognition that one's actions may be mitigated by the actions of others.<sup>42</sup> Arendt identified this frustration as a cause of the tendency for humans to inaction, to relieve themselves of the frustrating effects of other actions and actors, and the disappointment of the unpredictability of the results of action. This frustration is evident in the widespread efforts to standardize curriculum and use testing to confirm the results. There is an assurance or comfort that can be found in knowing beforehand what the students will learn and what might be expected of them as they become adults. The 'old' adults thereby attempt to preserve *the world* as they prefer it to be rather than to preserve the natality and creative possibilities contained in the 'new' adults.

Here, we see how Arendt's thoughts connect to education in morality and cosmopolitan teacher education. The plurality that obtains from the successful efforts of the teacher to preserve, promote, and foster the condition of natality is the condition that defines the challenge of natality in action and also demands the facilitating processes of morality and politics. By 'mid-wifing' natality into action, the teacher creates conditions of additional plurality under which students must find their way. Doing so puts students into each other's 'beginnings' and forces open questions of morality as they attempt to act and re-act to and with each other. Natality is actualized in an explosion of action and social activity, all of which is unpredictable and unstable, and is particularly dangerous to the status quo. If teachers are successful at this, the 'world' is in danger of revision. Received morals and knowledge are thus under threat of assault or even irrelevance, but the real educational danger arises from total resistance to those potential threats; this danger arises 'out of the desire to find results that would make further thinking unnecessary.'<sup>43</sup> Arendt believes that 'the very humanity of man loses its vitality to the extent that he abstains from thinking and puts his confidence into old verities or even new truths' that have not been critically examined.<sup>44</sup> Dampening the nascent creativity of students and young adults requires the suppression of thought. Controlling and steering outcomes in education result in conducting students down well-worn tracks, preventing them from contributing anything new and learning how to do so. Arendt's conditions demand a response in education that

could be found in an agonistic cosmopolitanism; both our shared sameness in the human condition of natality and our differentiating uniqueness in the shared human condition of plurality combine to compel inquiry, analysis, deliberation, and judgment from us to 'get on' with each other. This process in action is an educational one, and it is this process that cosmopolitan teachers must facilitate.

Arendt's conception of the role of natality and its reconfiguration of education stands alongside cosmopolitan teacher education in attempting to maintain a 'receptivity to the new *and* loyalty to the known.'<sup>45</sup> Arendt's teacher and the cosmopolitan educator must inhabit two worlds, one that is in danger of dying and changing and one that is emerging and unknown; one that has the illusion and comfort of certainty and one that is unpredictable and unsettling. Such an individual must move ahead with the knowledge she knows and be eager to engage with that which is yet to come. Further, she must be prepared to join others 'in assuming the effort of persuasion and running the risk of failure' rather than relying upon 'dictatorial intervention, based on the absolute superiority of the adult, and the attempt to produce the new as a *fait accompli*.'<sup>46</sup> The teacher is essentially a midwife, using the ways from the old and existing world to facilitate the 'birth' of something new and unpredictably indeterminate, while also purging the unexamined opinions and assumptions that prevent new thoughts, new actions, and new becomings, and would otherwise arrest the inherent natality of education.<sup>47</sup> The 'new' here is not only that of unique events or widely influential actions, but may also include the 'quotidian but nonetheless surprising moments in which individuals initiate relationships and thereby attempt to forge new social realities.'<sup>48</sup> In maintaining natality and involving oneself in the development of and participation in a cosmopolitan education, one engages with other people at the cusp of constructing new social relations and realities with them. The combustible aspects of the competing actions play out socially among the actors and the beginners, all of which requires the maintenance of the space to act. Violent reactions to actions have a chilling effect on further action and thus the maintenance of this political space compels governance. Governance of the political space is a result then of an answer to the question *How shall we act together?* For Arendt, acting *is* living, and thus the question invokes morality by asking *How shall we live together?*

### The condition of uncertainty

To properly educate for a 'cosmopolitanizing' world and to show that cosmopolitan education does this, we must understand the processes by and through which this education exists. Humans possess a concept of morality and politics primarily because of other humans. '[M]en, not Man, live on the earth and inhabit the world'<sup>49</sup> and practical requirements of living force us to engage in the considerations and deliberations about what their presence means to and demands of us, individually and collectively. From shared humanity and its gesture toward democratic inclusion, to Arendt's acknowledgement of the necessity for 'assuming the effort of persuasion'<sup>50</sup>

which might fail and the ‘task of renewing a *common* world,’<sup>51</sup> we arrive at a critical juncture in the formation of cosmopolitan education, getting from ‘here to there’ with other people. How can teachers actually teach—through action and preserved natality—amidst such plurality?

Arendt’s natality both exemplifies our shared humanity and provokes the necessity for education to make possible the mediation of infinite ‘beginnings’ and the preservation of the conditions of natality. Cosmopolitan teacher education requires collaboration and participation with other people, which then creates complexity, unpredictability, and compounded uncertainty. You are here, and I am here, so now what? Our utterances of what should be, how things should go, and what each of us should do in relation to each other are moral and political utterances by the very fact that they are intended to govern our behavior and future actions. The sociability of this condition forces us into considering life as social, not isolated, beings. Teachers need to preserve natality while fomenting a community of collaborative action. They must stand on the ground of shared humanity, preserve democratic inclusion, and continue to live with others amidst all of this turmoil. They do this by consistently guiding their students in inquiry, thinking, and action.

In thinking of dominant extremes, neither received tradition nor nonjudgmental relativism requires much thought. In fact, relativism merely conditions one to never think nor make judgments, while accepting received judgments entails not thinking and merely accepting the re-disclosure of judgments already made, and both persist without criticality. Such inertia exists in defiance and opposition to human plurality and requires an almost deliberate artificiality or denial of the human condition.<sup>52</sup> Dialog is a natural consequence of social life; language and communication grew out of social living by necessity. Dialog takes place with interruptions and unpredictable twists and turns, reflecting the plurality of humans involved. However, monolog can exist only with suppression of interruption, sometimes internally regulated, but usually regulated by rules placed upon participants so as to constrain their natural impulse to participate. It is for this reason that ideological values that are presented for acceptance without argument cannot suffice for public consideration; doing so would not be a public action. In contrast, accepting a challenge to one’s disclosure, considering it in examination of life experience, and responding with a new disclosure is an action born of both plurality and natality.

What makes this process difficult is that the consequences of action or the reactions that follow our disclosures are infinitely unpredictable; we can have no way of knowing the consequences of our actions, which Arendt says are boundless, before they are unleashed. Teachers must be prepared to manage this unpredictability of natality and action. This fact does not stop people from attempting to ignore the fact of unpredictability or to rein in the uncertainties of an uncertain world. Most people want some way of determining indeterminate outcomes to soothe their anxieties: thus, the appeal of education based on authority and tradition and the implementation of standardization in curriculum and testing. Tradition provides both a pre-approved guide for action that eliminates the fear of ‘doing the wrong thing’ and the perception of stability and predictability in how our

actions—and the actions of others—will be received and approved. This need for reassurance might also be a sign that we lack confidence in our own capabilities for action.<sup>53</sup> It may result from a direct knowledge of our limitations and thus the desire to protect ourselves from the potential failure of what we do. Alternately, this uncertainty may arouse a fear of using and possessing judgment because doing so implies the admission that if one is capable of judging one might also possess responsibility,<sup>54</sup> and as noted earlier, Arendt sees that we retreat from such responsibility. Human action and genuine natal disclosure will eventually blow apart any preconceived limits or constraints placed upon it and render the received world or knowledge unreliable in the face of both thought and action as new conditions emerge.

### **The condition of shared humanity**

Cosmopolitan humanity consists of all that is human. This sense of humanity and human conditions admits the human-ness that is possessed by all human beings, including good, evil, and the combinations in between. In this case, one would be ‘rolling the dice’ when asking someone to summon his/her ‘humanity’ in his/her interactions with another person because doing so could bring forth any possibility in the entire range of human action. There may be some reliable probability, but we can never be certain with regard to human action resulting from plurality and natality. We share conditions of human existence that are contained in each person’s existence—plurality, action, and natality—but this does not mean that we realize our desires or even manifest all of the same needs. At birth, by virtue of being human, there is a subset of general conditions of human existence that frames our lives, from limitations—such as external limitations on human movement like gravity—to capacities such as the potential for new thought or the development of new concepts. We coinhabit a set of conditions that are necessary extensions of our existences. It is this cohabitation, this ‘sharing,’ of the conditions of human existence that sits at the base of cosmopolitan philosophy and Arendtian human conditions.

If we understand shared humanity to be commensurate with the human conditions of plurality, action, and natality, then it includes the bad as well as the good because nothing is pre-determined by these conditions and natality makes it possible for any human action to occur. When we only think of humanity as consisting of those ‘good’ characteristics that we may possess and express, then those who do not do those things are excluded from humanity, and cosmopolitanism has failed the test of its own inclusiveness. We hear it in common language every time someone suggests something is inhumane or that someone has ‘lost his humanity’ by acting against prevailing norms of conduct.<sup>55</sup> However, if one human is capable of an ‘evil’ act, then it is quite possible that another person is. We can find commonality with others not only in our good, saint-like acts of kindness and compassion but also in our darkest moments, too.

Recognizing that humans are ‘all-things-in-one’ does two things. First, it prevents students in teacher education from denying wrongdoers their humanity as a result of their transgressions. In cosmopolitan shared humanity, we cannot deny them this. If shared humanity is deemed enough when things go well, then it must be enough when they go awry. Allowing wrongdoers to retain their humanity prevents the rest of us from deeming the wrongdoer ‘inhuman’ and not deserving of ‘humane’ treatment. Allowing the wrongdoer to retain his/her humanity compels us to keep him/her in the population of human consideration, and thus not expel him/her from our association or shared obligations. It also means that we all share in the responsibility of mutually beneficial association, providing a reason to work with wrongdoers and to integrate them back into conditions of associated living. Second, it opens a door for teacher education students to see the often-tenuous distinctions that separate ‘us’ from ‘them.’ It humanizes the new or inexplicable practices of others that will emerge from either newly introduced members to the classroom or the natality-inspired actions of existing members. Retaining the humanity of others, however different their actions might be, allows us to engage more openly and benevolently with questions about how we ought to live together, and to what degree various choices of action are deemed allowable. The type and severity of ‘wrong’ behavior matters, especially in a society that metes out punishments and constraints on persons whose behavior offends or threatens. Including both bad and exemplary actions in humanity retains the grounds for a principle of truly shared humanity and protects us from subjection to a tyranny of our own making in which we would lock ourselves in the past and prevent ourselves from moving forward.<sup>56</sup> It requires of us, through a commitment to nonexclusion, to construct something like forgiveness in order for us to let go of the past instead of maintaining old grudges. It allows us to move on from what has happened to instead focus on what is happening or what might happen. It allows us to live human lives in the most humane sense.

## CONCLUSION

Arendt’s conception of natality in education provides a catalyst for growth, discovery, and tradition—challenging newness which acts as a stepping-stone to public action, pluralism, and to the progressivity of the mediating processes of the plurality of natality and action. She finds that ‘life without speech and without action . . . is literally dead to the world; it has ceased to be a human life because it is no longer lived among men.’<sup>57</sup> Living a life in action among others automatically entails uncertain content and outcomes. To live a human life that contains the human conditions of natality, action, and plurality, one must accept the inherent unpredictability contained in each of these conditions. What makes each person unique, what enables action, and what preserves natality is the unavoidable unpredictability, and therefore uncertainty, of human life. I would add this concept to Arendt’s list of human conditions, the human condition of uncertainty, a condition whose inevitable presence logically demands an understanding of life



(as education) as unfinished—or, rather, *never* finished—business. The acceptance of the ineradicability of pluralism and uncertainty encourages thinking and action and disposes one to be prepared to inhabit an agonistic state of being.

Cosmopolitan teacher education is fundamentally oriented to the unpredictable, the uncertain, and the unknown as much as it is to the known and the past, but does not treat these conditions as mere intellectualizations of human existence, but rather as very real, concrete conditions that demand a response. Arendt's human conditions circumscribe the causes of this same uncertainty about the world and they frame the context for the cosmopolitan response, a response that is guided by the constraints of a shared humanity both in the conditions that constitute our humanity and the expressions of it through action. Cosmopolitan education forms an inquiry that seeks not to eradicate pluralism or uncertainty, instead embraces both to be better prepared for them and to find better ways of living with each other. This is done *because* of, not *despite*, pluralism and uncertainty. The ultimate aim of this educational process is the teaching of judgment. The scope of this current article is not adequate to develop an argument for education for judgment completely, nor is it presently necessary. However, it should be clear that students who fail to recognize, accept, and manage the human conditions of plurality, natality, and action will be subject to the actions and judgments of others and ill-equipped to participate in the world and the conditions of their own lives. Further, they will be unprepared to contribute, share, and participate in their own humanity and the humanity of others. Teachers should be prepared to teach not only with this in mind but also with the presence of uncertainty as an educational necessity. It is the very nature of the unknown and unpredictable that precipitates the desire to equip young persons with the ability to live this 'human life.'

Arendt's human conditions can serve as resources for thinking about cosmopolitan education. I aver that our shared humanity *is* the human condition. Arendt's conceptions of thinking, natality, and action offer cosmopolitan educators deep philosophical, political, and conceptual clarity for increasing the strength of their understanding of cosmopolitan education. They also provide another language with which to think and converse about what cosmopolitan education is and could be. While Arendt could not be called a cosmopolitan in the sense that such a person is the adherent of a free-standing cosmopolitan-'ism,' she has articulated conceptions of the purpose of various political and social activities that sound very cosmopolitan.

If the solidarity of mankind is to be based on something more solid than the justified fear of man's demonic capabilities, if the new universal neighborhood of all countries is to result in something more promising than a tremendous increase in mutual hatred and a somewhat universal irritability of everybody against everybody else, then a process of mutual understanding and progressing self-clarification on a gigantic scale must take place.<sup>58</sup>

In Arendt's cold stare at the human condition, we can find additional tools of investigation for cosmopolitan teaching. It seems fitting that a scholar whose work has been so difficult to categorize or situate within dominant ideological and

theoretical perspectives has much to offer a philosophy that avoids dogmatic prescription. It is my recommendation to cosmopolitan educators and theorists alike to engage Arendt's work more fully so that cosmopolitan teacher education and educators can move beyond simply justifying their claims to the crucial step of enacting their methods in classrooms and in the political and policy-related arenas for development of cosmopolitan educational processes.

## NOTES

1. Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* was targeted by religious fundamentalists for challenging the notion of religious purity and evolution. He once stated that his book 'celebrates hybridity, impurity, intermingling, the transformation that comes of new and unexpected combinations of human beings, cultures, ideas, politics, movies, songs . . . a bit of this and a bit of that is *how newness enters the world*.' Salman Rushdie in Jeremy Waldron, 'Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternative', *University of Michigan Journal of Law and Reform* 25 (1992): 751. For an examination of cultural preservation, see Kevin McDonough, 'Cultural Recognition, Cosmopolitanism and Multicultural Education', *Philosophy of Education Society* 28, no. 5 (1997): 127–135; and Sharon Todd, 'Living in a Dissonant World: Toward an Agonistic Cosmopolitics for Education', *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 29, no. 2 (2010): 213–228.
2. This is not to confuse 'standards' with 'standardization.' 'Standards' as general criteria for ascertaining acquisition is different from 'standardization' wherein processes and content are imposed. One might argue that standardization in education, particularly regarding credentials, promotes equity by producing equal outcomes in the educational credential 'market.' This argument does not focus on educational content or procedures but rather on the certification that such processes have reached a level of competency recognized as valid for certification. For a variation of this argument, see Don Weenink, 'Cosmopolitan and Established Resources of Power in the Education Arena', *International Sociology* 22, no. 4 (July 2007): 492–516. My present focus is on the constitutive substance of education in schooling and not on certification processes.
3. Pauline Kleingeld and Eric Brown, 'Cosmopolitanism', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (May 2006). Accessed July 15, 2011, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/>, 10.1177/026327640602300290
4. See Sandrine Berges, 'Loneliness and Belonging: Is Stoic Cosmopolitanism Still Defensible?' *Res Publica* 11 (2005): 7; and Martha Nussbaum, 'Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism,' *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 5 (1997): 1–25.
5. There are enough commonplace uses of 'humanity' to require more clarification. For instance, consider the conception of 'humanity' that indicates a positive trait. I take seriously Sharon Todd's critical analysis of the concept of 'humanity' and its typical adjectival use to denote something good or to represent 'goodness' in opposition to 'inhumanity,' which is something bad and 'evil,' and thus allow for a conception of humanity that is separate from the adjective-form of 'humane.' See Sharon Todd, *Toward an Imperfect Education: Facing Humanity, Rethinking Cosmopolitanism* (London: Paradigm, 2009).
6. See Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1958).
7. Terence, in David Hansen, 'Cosmopolitanism and Education: A View From the Ground', *Teachers College Record* 112 (2008): 16.
8. See Matthew Hayden, 'Cosmopolitan Education and Moral Education: Forging Moral Beings Under Conditions of Global Uncertainty' (Ph.D. diss., Teachers College, Columbia

- University, 2012). See also David Hansen, *The Teacher and the World: A Study of Cosmopolitanism and Education* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2011).
9. A disposition is a power that finds itself in active properties such as capacities and tendencies. See Luke Robinson, 'Moral Principles as Moral Dispositions', *Philosophical Studies* 156, no. 2 (2010): 3.
  10. John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The Free Press, 1916): 'Hence, normally, there is an accentuation of personal consciousness whenever our instincts and ready-formed habits find themselves blocked by novel conditions . . . Unless we try to drive our way through by sheer brute force, we must modify our organic resources to adapt them to the specific features of the situation in which we find ourselves. The conscious deliberating and desiring which precede overt action are, then, the methodic personal readjustment implied in activity in uncertain situations' (p. 348).
  11. Marcus Aurelius, *Meditations*, trans. George Long, vol. 12, 29th ed. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, 1987), 267.
  12. Phillip Kitcher, *The Ethical Project* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 330.
  13. I recognize that education can and does occur independent from and outside of formal schooling. Throughout this article, I will typically contextualize education as formal and most of the examples given will be the same, but this is done for the clarity of writing rather than to make a distinction that does not exist. Further, moral education does not necessarily occur in nor imply only schooling, but since state-supported or public schooling is educational, it becomes political. See John Dewey, *Moral Principles in Education* (Cambridge, MA: The Riverside Press, 1909): 'Education is a public business with us, in a sense that the protection and restoration of personal health or legal rights are not.' (p. 1).
  14. This does not commit me to the advocacy of democratic governments or institutions. It is possible to conceive of structures that would allow for the processes of ethical and political participation that I describe without the existence of liberal democratic governments or republican democracies.
  15. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 7.
  16. *Ibid.*, 8.
  17. The existence of plants, animals, our environment, the physical world, and even future persons compel us to consider them, too, though without the same force. The general prioritization of human considerations over other life forms seems to indicate that we can more easily understand our 'shared humanity' with other persons than we can with other life forms. This is not to say that we should not consider those other life forms more than we do, only that for this project the focus is on the sharing of 'humanity.'
  18. We compete for the primacy of certain ends, but our individuality and our agency are premised on our differentiation and are thus complementary.
  19. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 9.
  20. Hannah Arendt, 'Some Questions of Moral Philosophy', in *Responsibility and Judgment*, ed. Jerome Kohn (New York: Schocken Books, 2003), 99.
  21. Aaron Schutz, 'Contesting Utopianism: Hanna Arendt and the Tensions of Democratic Education', in *Hannah Arendt on Education: Renewing our Common World*, ed. Mordechai Gordon, 93–126, (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001), 99.
  22. Aaron Schutz, 'Creating Local "Public Spaces" in Schools: Insights from Hannah Arendt and Maxine Greene', *Curriculum Inquiry* 29, no. 1 (1999): 90.
  23. Arendt does allow for 'anticipated communication' with others that does not require actual interaction with them, but it does involve an active engagement with their ideas or actions. This 'anticipated communication' is a form of judgment that finds its culmination in public action; in concert with others. See Stacy Smith, 'Education for Judgment: An Arendtian Oxymoron?' in *Hannah Arendt on Education: Renewing our Common World*, ed. Mordechai Gordon, 67–82, (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001): 69–74.

24. See Smith, 'Education for Judgment', 73. See also Richard Bernstein, 'Judging: The Actor and the Spectator', *Philosophical Profiles* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1986).
25. The scope of this current article is not adequate to develop this argument (education for judgment) completely, nor is it presently necessary. However, it should be clear that students who fail to recognize, accept, and manage the human conditions of plurality, natality, and action will be subject to the actions and judgments of others and ill-equipped to participate in the world and the conditions of their own lives.
26. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 176.
27. Christine M. Korsgaard, 'Creating the Kingdom of Ends: Reciprocity and Responsibility in Personal Relations', *Philosophical Perspectives* 6, *Ethics* (1992): 306.
28. Dana R. Villa, *The Cambridge Companion to Hanna Arendt* (London: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 80–1.
29. Hannah Arendt, "'What Remains? The Language Remains": A Conversation with Günther Gaus' in *The Portable Hannah Arendt*, trans. Peter Baehr (New York: Penguin Books, 2000), 19. Arendt's conception of the 'world' underwent a transformation after she wrote *The Human Condition*, in which she conceived of the world primarily as the space of politics. As she stated in the interview in 1964 with Gaus, 'I comprehend it now in a much larger sense, as the space in which things become public, as the space in which one lives and which must look presentable.'
30. Villa, *The Cambridge Companion to Hannah Arendt*, 189.
31. Hannah Arendt, 'The Crisis in Education', in *Between the Past and Future*, 173–96, (New York: The Penguin Group, 1961), 174 (emphasis in original).
32. Arendt, 'The Crisis in Education,' 187.
33. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 177–8.
34. *Ibid.*, 177.
35. I admit that it may be possible, to an extent, to indoctrinate so completely that the indoctrinated might be 'inoculated' adequately enough to prevent an 'intrusion' or corruption of the child by the world, but this would require an almost permanent removal from the world, not only physically, but politically as well. One so inoculated would never engage in a true interaction with another, and so never really 'be' in the world.
36. See Hannah Arendt, 'On Humanity in Dark Times: Thoughts About Lessing', in *Men In Dark Times*, ed. Mary McCarthy West (Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1970), 3–31.
37. Arendt, 'The Crisis in Education', 192. Many authors have written about Arendt's educational 'conservatism' but have fallen prey to an equivocation with the political notions of conservation. In addition, there is a common misreading or perhaps selectivity that omits the clear intention of Arendt in 'conservation' that aims to protect all of the inherent qualities extant in the students (their natality and uniqueness), the teachers (their own natality and desire to convey an understanding of an old world to new inhabitants that will alter that world and make it their own), and the world (apprising children of the 'old world' without allowing the old to subjugate the natality of the 'new' in the students/children).
38. *Ibid.*
39. *Ibid.*, 194.
40. *Ibid.*, 196.
41. Natasha Levinson, 'The Paradox of Natality', in *Hannah Arendt on Education: Renewing our Common World*, ed. Mordechai Gordon, 11–36 (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001), 13–14.
42. For more about this frustration, see Levinson, 'The Paradox of Natality.'
43. Arendt, *The Life of the Mind* (New York: Harcourt, 1978), 176.
44. Arendt, *On Humanity in Dark Times*, 11.
45. Hansen, *View from the Ground*, 23 (emphasis in original).

46. Arendt, *The Crisis in Education*, 176. In such cases, the new is not new but rather prefigured.
47. Hannah Arendt, 'Tradition and the Modern Age', in *Between Past and Future: Six Exercises in Political Thought* (New York: The Viking Press, 1961), 17–40; and Hannah Arendt, 'Thinking and Moral Considerations: A Lecture', *Social Research* 38, no. 3 (July 15, 1971): 417–446. The 'midwife' metaphor is another recurring theme in Arendt's exploration of Greek life and of the Socratic dialogs.
48. Levinson, *The Paradox of Natality*, 17.
49. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 7.
50. Arendt, *The Crisis in Education*, 176. In such cases, the new is not new but rather prefigured.
51. *Ibid.*, 196. Emphasis mine
52. For more on these comments about dialog and monolog, see Lev Petrovich Yakubinsky and Michael Eskin, 'On Dialogic Speech', *PMLA* 112, no. 2 (1997): 243–256.
53. See Bonnie Honig, *Political Theory and the Displacement of Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993). Honig suggests that such reassurances were sought by the revolutionaries of the American Revolution through their resurrection of ideas, processes, and thoughts from ancient thinkers to support their wholly radical project.
54. Korsgaard, *Creating the Kingdom of Ends*, 323–4.
55. See Todd, *Toward an Imperfect Education*.
56. The redemptive potential found in this conception lies at the root of forgiveness, a significant component of social, political, and moral goods as identified by Arendt in a number of her works. See Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 236–42. See also Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (New York: The Viking Press, 1964), particularly the postscript. The concept in Arendt is intriguing but not necessary for this project. It is used here only to show one benefit of a more comprehensive conception of 'humanity' and the implications therein.
57. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 178.
58. Arendt, 'Karl Jaspers: Citizen of the World', in *Men In Dark Times*, ed. Mary McCarthy West, 81–94 (Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1970), 84.