

Peirce's Response to Skepticism:

Offsetting Skepticism's Influence on Global Transactions

“Philosophy, like all other studies, aims primarily at knowledge. The knowledge it aims at is the kind of knowledge which gives unity and system to the body of the sciences, and the kind which results from a critical examination of the grounds of our convictions, prejudices, and beliefs.”
(Bertrand Russell)

This article was written in the spring of 2009
And revised for publication consideration in the fall of 2011

Leon Miller is a lecturer at Tallinn University of Technology in Ethics, Comparative Religion, Intercultural Communications and International Relations. He has a number of peer reviewed publications in the areas of The Philosophy of Religion, International Relations and Business Ethics in a Globalized World.

Peirce's Response to Skepticism:

Offsetting Skepticism's Influence on Global Transactions

“Philosophy, like all other studies, aims primarily at knowledge. The knowledge it aims at is the kind of knowledge which gives unity and system to the body of the sciences, and the kind which results from a critical examination of the grounds of our convictions, prejudices, and beliefs.” (Bertrand Russell)

Abstract

Hilary Putnam, in pointing out what is common to philosophical outlooks described as ‘Pragmatist’, once suggested that from its inception Pragmatism addresses the persistent problem of skepticism in the history of Western philosophy. Appearing in Western philosophy’s earliest stages as Sophism skepticism continued to be an influential force in the history of philosophy well into the twentieth century in spite of the Kantian attempt to settle the issue of skepticism. Thus, formulating a response to skepticism has proven to be an arduous challenge even for philosophers as prestigious as Aristotle and Kant.

In spite of some of the most prestigious philosophers of the West attempting to address and settle the issue of skepticism it has continued to have an impact on philosophy and human interactions right up to today. C. S. Peirce recognized that there was a set of philosophical themes that were the dominant philosophical issues of his time that he was obliged to address. Foremost amongst these was the issue of skepticism plus its impact on human interactions, international transactions and the nature-human relationship. Peirce addressed and resolved these dominant philosophical issues of his time in a way that helps us deal with the most pressing issues of our time.

Introduction

As is true to the aphorism, “The optimist is an idealist and the pessimist is a realist,” skeptics have been proverbial pessimist in their understanding of what shapes interpersonal and international relations. In this respect skepticism has throughout history influenced a Realist perspective on human relations which allows for expediency overriding ethical considerations. Furthermore the influence of skepticism on Western philosophical thought has hampered progressing the hoped for Enlightenment aim of effectively managing humanity’s social and economic problems. This has caused many scholars to realize that the desired global stability we are seeking demands addressing and resolving the impact of skepticism on philosophy, international relations and its current impact on the global arena. C. S. Peirce recognized the challenge of skepticism and responded with a philosophical perspective that addresses some of the most pressing issues of Western philosophy. His insights also play a role in contributing to realizing the hoped for stabilization of the global arena, improved human interactions and an improved nature-human relationship.

Hilary Putnam, in pointing out what is common to philosophical outlooks described as ‘Pragmatist’, once suggested that from its inception Pragmatism addresses the persistent problem of skepticism in the history of Western philosophy. Appearing in the earliest stages of Western philosophy as Sophism skepticism continued to be an influential force in the history of philosophy well into the twentieth century in spite of the Kantian attempt to settle the issue of skepticism. Thus, formulating a response to skepticism has proven to be an arduous challenge even for philosophers as prestigious as Aristotle and Kant.

In spite of some of the most prestigious philosophers of the West attempting to address and settle the issue of skepticism it has continued to have an impact on philosophy and human interactions right up to today. C. S. Peirce recognized that there was a set of philosophical themes that were the dominant philosophical issues of his time that he was obliged to address. Foremost amongst these was the issue of skepticism plus its impact on human interactions, international transactions and the nature-human relationship. Peirce addressed and resolved these dominant philosophical issues of his time in a way that helps us deal with the most pressing issues of our time.

The article points out the role of skepticism in the Western intellectual tradition with a special emphasis on how it influences notions of human interactions and international relations. Historically skepticism has been aligned with Realism (with its particular epistemology and ontology) as an approach to political economy (which is now referred to as global political economy). Peirce presents an alternative view of human interactions with a unique Pragmatist view of epistemology, ontology and teleology. Peirce’s views contributed to new perspectives on discourse ethics and the teleological significance of the human relationship with the environment.

The first section of the article emphasizes how global interdependence creates the necessity of expanding Modernity’s notion of atomistic autonomous agents by means of an inclusiveness of a global discourse ethic that will contribute to promoting the *global common good*. This section highlights Peirce’s claim that preferred interactions facilitate shaping transactions into mutually beneficial outcomes. Peirce’s approach to interactions stresses that interlocutors enter into deliberation with the understanding that reliable knowledge is socially constructed. This section of the article describes Peirce’s contribution to this new perspective in his attempt to address the philosophical challenges of his day.

The second section of the article goes into detail on the background of the philosophical issues that Peirce was challenged to address. This section of the article introduces the role of skepticism in shaping the history of philosophy. It explains why, according to Critical Theorists, skepticism had become so deep and so profound that some prominent scholars believe that Modernity's entire notion of human interactions (intercultural and toward the environment) along with much of its infrastructure must be deconstructed. Peirce addresses the problem of constructing reality in a way that enhances the human experience by redefining Kantian insights (especially concerning mutuality and discourse). This section concludes by explaining how Peirce's introduction of semiotics offers a unique, interactional approach to perceiving reality thus, resolving the problem of subject-other dualism.

The third section explores Peirce's understanding of how an interactional approach is the key to obtaining reliable knowledge thus knowledge more beneficial to the human experience. Peirce's interactive basis for epistemology reflects a commitment to an open ended and open minded sharing of viewpoints in an attempt to synthesize them into a more comprehensive basis of understanding reality. Peirce believed that inquiry is a process that produces empirically verifiable knowledge that is more likely to provide more beneficial results, provide results that promote more widespread agreement and reduces the annoyance of experiencing error. Through inquiry we gain the most accurate grasp of reality and as a result we understand the best response to its possibilities and challenges. Thus Peirce believed that reliable knowledge is socially constructed and with such reliable knowledge we are able to enhance human interactions (intersubjectively, institutionally, and with nature).

The fourth section of the article explores Peirce's claim that enhancement of the human experience and improving human interactions is a matter of accurately perceiving and responding to environmental signals. Peirce believed that the environment signals opportunities for increasing the scope of cooperative or more beneficial interactions which allows humans to be better-integrated beings. The founding of semiotics was an anticipation of the need to address the challenge of interdependence (or mutuality). This section of the article explains how Peirce contributes insights into mutuality with his notion of *confluence*. A confluence results from the interaction of something 'out there' (in the environment) that stimulates an urge for interaction-by means of triggering an impression-that is sensed by something 'in here' (sensations and cognition). For Peirce the human impression of what is out there is mirrored by or reflected by something in here (humans apply the semiotic trilogy to processing phenomena: first is the projection of a signal, second the signal or sign makes an impression, and third the impression shapes a conceptual interpretation).¹

The final section of the article provides a summary of how Peirce contributes to effectively managing the challenge of globalization. A special emphasis will be placed on explaining how Peirce's views contribute to new perspectives on communication theory and global discourse ethics. Of course any explanation of Peirce's contribution to communication theory must be thought of in terms of Peirce's vision of communication taking place on the basis of rational discourse. In addition mention must be made of the fact that Peirce's views on human interactions have developed into unique insights on the factors contributing to effective intercultural communications and how these factors contribute to improved human relations (improved IR). Thus the final section explains the connection between Peirce's interactive

¹ Merrell, Floyd. (1997) *Peirce, Signs and Meaning*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 65.

semiotics and human interactions on a global scale.

Globalization as an Outgrowth of Modernity (Enlightenment Philosophical Assumptions)

Globalization advanced as one of the outgrowths of Enlightenment views and assumptions about Modernity. These foundational principles of Western Civilization have had tremendous impact on most of the world. In one way or another every nation, culture and tribal clan have found it necessary to make adjustments to the demands of Modernity. These basic assumptions are under scrutiny by many world cultures and are also being reconsidered by Europeans themselves. As a matter of fact, after surveying our 'Fin-de-siecle' peak-the debris of the 20th century, philosophies which do not engage in questioning the fundamental concept of Modernity (rational autonomy) are considered marginal in regards to being relevant to our current most pressing issues.² A critical view of Modernity from the perspective of Peirce's Pragmatism is especially important if our theoretical views about international relations and globalization are to be able to include concerns about culture and values.

Globalization has heightened awareness of how much the motivation behind human interactions has economic, political, environmental and cultural repercussions that affect us all. We saw this dramatically in the recent financial crisis where we realized how much the ethical motivation behind financial decisions (made by key individuals in certain powerful positions) effect all of us individually, socially and nationally. Whether one identifies globalization as primarily driven by economics or as a new era phenomenon occurring in the context of information technology (that puts people around the globe in immediate contact) it is now clear that contemporary scholarship faces the challenge of putting globalization into a theoretical perspective that addresses the role of global political economy for safeguarding the global public interest, addresses the need for global justice and offers more theoretical insight on the newly emerging global discourse ethics.

Human discourse (as a founding element in human culture) has been intended throughout history to advance three primary concerns: the first is interactional (or enhancing how we relate), the second is material (enhancing human labor efforts thus enhancing the economy), and the third increasing our ability to effectively manage our relationship to the environment. I argue that human discourse still plays the same role it always has but now on a global scale. Thus the global scale of human discourse demands inclusiveness of a dialogic approach to international relations. "Since our aim is to make discourse (or communication) more effective (or more intelligent), it seems reasonable to start with communication as it occurs in processes of *inquiry*, where the function of the norms of critical control is to make inquiry more successful in the sort of results it specifically aims at."³

Indeed the world system is in need of a communication ethic that will contribute to moving scholarship in international relations past its theoretical impasse or "Great Debates" (regarding whether or not international relations theory should be inclusive of Realism,

² Gutting, Gary. (1999) *Pragmatic Liberalism and the Critique of Modernity*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 1.

³ Ransdell, Joseph. (2002) The Relevance of Peircean Semiotic To Computational Intelligence Augmentation. *Workshop on Computational Intelligence and Semiotics II*, 5:2.

Liberalism and Constructivism). The problem of the impasse in international relations scholarship is partially due to what is regarded as an incompatibility between the well calculated, quantitative methodology of positivism and the descriptive, interpretive, qualitative methodology of the social sciences. The Western approach to international relations has been shaped by the way that Enlightenment concepts of ontology have influenced political philosophy. By investigating the ontological assumptions that are embedded within the dominant systems driving Western globalization we better understand the roots of the differences that influence the theoretical debates in international relations.

A preferred approach to interactions stresses that interlocutors enter into deliberation with the intention of shaping transactions into mutually beneficial outcomes. Such an approach to interactions stresses that the nature of relationships is determined in the process of dialogue. A dialogic approach to interaction is based on the premise that reliable knowledge allows agents to accurately appraise the factors affecting the encounter so that actions can be directed toward what is best for enhancing the relationship, increasing mutual benefits, increasing understanding and increasing cooperation. With the stress on the social construction of knowledge, and knowledge as power, relationships are not seen as contests of power. With this perspective the notion of competing interests is transformed by means of a process that calls for constructing mutually preferred outcomes. This approach shifts the focus of intercultural transactions away from conflicts due to power and conflicts due to apparent interest clashes. With this approach to intercultural relations the global arena will not be anarchic, nor only interest driven but also value driven.

Norbert Wiley argues that Peirce contributes to resolving contemporary controversies because he tempers “A dog eat dog view of evolution with a reformed culturally or socially based view of evolution.”⁴ Wiley believes that Peirce’s appeal to contemporary Critical Theorists is due to the fact that “His logic is strongly anti-foundational, and his epistemology is thoroughly social.”⁵ In fact Peirce suggests that “Cultures differ from each other depending on the specific details of how their dialogical and semiotic processes have proceeded. This influenced such thinkers as Estonian scholar Juri Lotman (amongst other international scholars) to define culture in semiotic terms.”⁶ “Peirce’s perspective provides an explanation of how societies can differ from each other without any of them necessarily being better or more valid than others.”⁷ Thus Peirce’s ideas encouraged a relativistic approach to viewing other cultures (or a non hierarchical way of regarding *others*). It is in this sense that Peirce anticipates a Constructivist approach to intercultural relations.

Initially globalization and Modernity’s notion of development were spurred on by Enlightenment convictions regarding expanding markets, progress and development. Market Liberalism views relationships as occurring between agents who are engaged in an endeavor to make rational choices that will maximize utility. However Liberalism adds that

⁴ Wiley, Norbert. (2005) Peirce and the founding of American sociology. *Journal of Classical Sociology*. Vol. 6: No. 1, 24.

⁵ Ibid., 28.

⁶ Ibid., 30.

⁷ Ibid., 31.

transnational agents value the utility of cooperation (especially in terms of regional or global cooperation in such areas as human rights, world health in response to virus threats, environmental protection, space exploration, telecommunications and free trade). Pragmatism contributes to making Liberalism more attractive (as an alternative to Realism) by providing a perspective that is inclusive of a *Theory of Communicative Action*. By applying “Communicative Action political actors do not simply bargain based on fixed preferences and relative power; they may also argue questioning their own beliefs and preferences; remaining open to persuasion and to the power of the better argument.”⁸

C. S. Peirce’s critical analysis of Enlightenment assumptions contributed significant insights that have practical value for helping humanity today experience more desirable outcomes (in regards to human interactions in our domestic societies, in global interactions, and environmentally). Peirce does this while in the process of founding Pragmatism. Blasco José Sobrinho (in his book describing how Peirce’s ideas contribute to managing the challenge of globalization and global interdependence) defines Pragmatism as the study of how communicative cooperation constructs conceptions of synergistic socialization.⁹

To fully grasp the significance Peirce’s philosophy holds for addressing issues of globalization one must appreciate what a reconciliation of classical, Enlightenment and a Critical Theorist approach to philosophy would mean for better managing the challenges of globalization (especially if such a reconciled philosophical position was also blended into a perspective that is highly compatible with Eastern philosophical views). Pragmatism offers such reconciliation by transcending the communication, epistemological, teleological and ontological barriers that have hindered cooperating to realize more satisfactory results. The claim of its relevance is grounded on the fact that its insights are applied to “Industry, business, technology, intelligence organizations, and the military; plus it has resulted in the establishment of a substantial number of agencies, institutes, businesses, and laboratories in which ongoing research into and development of Peircean concepts are being vigorously undertaken.”¹⁰

The turn of the century (from the 19th to the 20th) is marked by a paradigm shift that we are now experiencing the full impact of. Peirce contributed to that shift with his founding of Pragmatism and its focus on a type of dialogical approach to knowledge. Peirce believed that the pursuit of trustworthy knowledge (that he called “inquiry”) is an ongoing process, relational, and that participants enter the process with no predrawn conclusions. In spite of Peirce’s enormous contribution (founding Pragmatism and contributing to the founding of semiotics) some contemporary scholars criticize Peirce for not having gone far enough in endorsing relativism. However one must keep in mind that Peirce was obliged to address issues from the perspective of the concerns that were dominant in relationship to the established paradigm during his time. His writing demonstrated a depth of understanding of

⁸ Pollack, Mark. (2005) Theorizing the European Union: International Organization, Domestic Polity, or Experiment in New Governance? *The Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 8, 387.

⁹ Sobrinho, Blasco, Jose. (2001) *Signs, Solidarities, and Sociology*. Oxford, England, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 30.

¹⁰ Burch, Robert, (2010) Charles Sanders Peirce. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. (Zalta, Edward N. Ed.).15:1.

issues related to the established paradigm that needed to be resolved. Peirce's insight into these vital issues enabled him to contribute to and progress philosophy in a way that helps us today deal with some of our most pressing concerns.

Thus to get a clearer picture of the wealth of insight that Peirce contributes to advancing our understanding of epistemology, logic, semiotics, ethics, communication, perception, and aesthetics one must consider the historical context he was writing in and the dominant paradigm of that historical period. By tracing the philosophical developments leading up to Peirce's position one can see how Pragmatism grows out of his effort to address the dominant and crucial issues of his time in ways that resolve some of the controversies connected with the established paradigm. At the time of Peirce's writing the philosophical perspectives that determined the established trend in philosophical discourse were French Rationalism with insistence on reason, British materialism (insisting on empiricism) and German Idealism (including a reaction by Kant and his *Critique of Pure Reason*). By understanding the philosophical backdrop that Peirce was obliged to grapple with we can see more clearly how Peirce contributes to insights that are valuable from the viewpoint of our day and time.

The Historical Background of the Philosophical Issues Peirce was Challenged to Address

Aristotle (a proponent of the study of existence by means of observation thus more empirically minded than Socrates and Plato) continues to be a towering figure in philosophy because of the continuing significance of his insights into what produces human well-being and flourishing. He did this by exploring both the individual and the individual in social relations. He promoted the development of a certain type of character by means of what is called "Virtue Ethics." He believed that the development of such a character affords the experience of "eudaimonia" (eudaimonia is one aspect of Aristotle's insight into what promotes happiness, integrity, improved social relations, human well-being, human flourishing and an understanding of the teleological significance of natural processes). He thought of the manifestation of these qualities in relational terms, "The individual then is not self-sufficing; and therefore the individual is like a part in relation to the whole."¹¹ In other words (similar to what Confucius conceived) Aristotle thought that *Virtue* would be manifested in the individual character but such an individual character would lay the foundation for household relationships and social interactions.

"Aristotle's central concern was to address the issue of skepticism that he was faced with in his day (especially from the arguments of the Sophists who claimed that those in positions of power attempt to create systems that justify their using power to enhance self-interest)."¹² Aristotle recognized the possibility that self-interest (instrumental desires) could be a primary motivational factor for individual pursuits. He warned that this is accompanied with a tendency toward tyranny, a debilitated society and ineffective economic strategies. Thus, Aristotle believed that a thriving polis could not be achieved with leadership inclined to the pursuit of instrumental desires. This is why he proclaims that of all the possible political

¹¹ Aristotle, (1996) *The Politics and The Constitution of Athens*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 14.

¹² Johnston, Ian. (1997) Lecture on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethic. *Liberal Studies Lecture 301*. B:1.

arrangements he prefers “rule of law” and he believed that “The pursuit of trade merely for sake of amassing wealth is justly censured.”¹³ He was certain that self-interest as the basis of economic exchange could not lead to happiness because “It never finds a point of satisfaction since the means of gratifying them are without limit.”¹⁴

Because Aristotle establishes a connection between economics and politics an argument can be made that the study of political economy began with him. Aristotle's comparison of economic relations with the household implies that although economics (for both the household and the polis) involves the material activities of production, consumption and exchange which are economic, its fundamental connections are relational. Because his economics are based on the household model one could argue that Aristotle stresses a connection between economics, solidarity, social responsibility and interdependence. In other words although Aristotle saw economics as a means of maximizing utility he thought of utility more in value terms rather than in material terms. It should also be noted that Aristotle makes numerous references to what is natural as a means for determining the value of an action (in Book I, chapters 8-10 of Politics he is referring to political economy however this section also reflects his thoughts concerning *Natural Law* in addition to politics and economics).

Aristotle viewed nature as definitely expressing teleological intention. His teleological view held that natural phenomena are determined not only by mechanical causes but by an overall intentionality that is manifest in the fact that nature's interactions occur with telos or purpose. Aristotle believed that all things (especially all organic things) exist with the ontological necessity of maintaining integrity without which they will begin to deteriorate (this includes both individuals and societies). On the basis of this claim one could argue that realizing one's full potential (*entelechy*) for happiness, flourishing and well-being are based on understanding the teleological significance of human interactions (intersubjective and with nature). Aristotle's naturalism prompted him to claim that knowledge is intended to increase our understanding of the teleological significance of natural processes plus to enhance our participation in natural processes.¹⁵

Aristotle proposed that philosophy (*Philo* meaning love for and *Sophia* meaning wisdom or reliable knowledge) is the pursuit of understanding causes (*aitia*) and principles (*archai*). For Aristotle we learn about “Being (*ousia*) qua Being (*ousia*).” It is in this respect that the initial phases of Western science and philosophy (in alignment with classical Aristotelian Scholastic Realism) was an inquiry into the world's own fundamental structural categories.

The Age of Reason was born out of a resurgence of “The First Philosophy” which sparked new ways of thinking about the nature of the universe and new ways of understanding the role

¹³ Aristotle, (1996) *The Politics and The Constitution of Athens*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 25.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 24.

¹⁵ Falcon, Andrea. (2005) *Aristotle and the Science of Nature: Unity Without Uniformity*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press, 16.

of authority in relationship to the individual and communities. Inspired by recent translations of Aristotle the former views on authority and dogmatic views of existence were transformed by Medieval Philosophers who increasingly adopted “metaphysical realism” as an alternative to religious transcendentalism. The revival of Aristotle’s works allowed scholars to draw insights from his ideas on the relationship between politics, economics and what is natural. As a result of this Aristotle is credited with establishing the fundamental ideas behind natural law.

To fully grasp the legacy we today are obliged to grapple with and advance in a progressive way one must understand the significance of the challenge to Aristotle’s Scholastic Realism that was imposed by René Descartes’ claim “Cogito ergo sum.” Descartes (also recognizing a need to address skepticism) aided the transition from religious authority to freedom of conscious by offering the world a philosophy he thought was compatible with rationalism, the emerging world of science and also the traditional Christian faith. This attempted reconciliation resulted from the elevated position he gave to human reasoning. However as a mathematician he emphasized reason over Hume’s approach to eliminating doubt by means of materialism. Descartes gave his readers the impression that mind (in dualistic dichotomy with the body) is that part of the human being that provides a link with transcendental being, the ideal level of being, or Divine being.

Descartes doubted that evidence from the senses provides a reliable source of information about reality. His doubt in regards to sense perception, accompanied with his certainty that Rationalism is the key to the desired Enlightenment of the European individual and society, were the impetus behind his intention to establish a solid basis for epistemology. However what Descartes initiated was more than the suggestion of the connection between elevated human consciousness and Enlightenment. He ushered in the Western conception of an individual that is self liberated from the restrictions of Medieval social structures. “Descartes’ refusal of tradition is connected therefore to the emergence of the individual subject. Cartesian thought establishes the centrality of the subject, thus subjectivism. Cartesianism not only marks the emergence of the subject as central to epistemology but as well the subject is central in terms of one’s own sentiments.”¹⁶ Ultimately Descartes’ solitary individual becomes an ethereal mind cut off from physical grounding (from the biological aspects of the self and from fully appreciating the essential human connection with nature).

Thus Modernity initiates a grounding of assurance on the autonomous individual who is able to apply “rational choice” to what was best for development. In this respect Descartes has to be credited with influencing what becomes the hallmark of Western civilization-individualism. The emancipated Western individual becomes an *autonomous self-reference* who subsequently is empowered to the extent of possessing political sovereignty. Descartes lived at a time when the political and economic prospects of globalization were just being envisioned. His emancipated individual began shaping a global reality (under the influence of Hobbes’ ontology where one has to be skeptical of the real intentions of others) with the view that global development proceeds as inevitable progress. The new world order would be built on scientific, political and economic principles adhering to mechanistic determinism, man over nature (advanced cultures over cultures lacking development) and mind over body (or

¹⁶ Benjamin, Andrew. (1977) Eisenman and the Housing of Tradition. *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. (Leach, Neil. Ed.) New York, Routledge, 288.

reason over intuition). These concepts have subsequently been noted to result in a fragmentation of the individual who is not firmly grounded by the senses (due to the body-mind split) and as well leads to a nature-human dichotomy. Due to these tendencies Critical Theorists believe Cartesian dualism contributes significantly to the entire global community currently being challenged with *The Global Triple Threat*.

Immanuel Kant attempts to address Cartesianism by means of reforming metaphysics and by proposing an inclusiveness of empiricism. Kant's endeavors are also partially sparked by the need to address the problem of skepticism. "The types of skepticism which really originated and motivated Kant's critical philosophy are types of skepticism that mainly threaten metaphysics; and conversely, what originated and motivated critical philosophy's reform of metaphysics is above all the aspiration to enable metaphysics to withstand skepticism."¹⁷ Kant believed that empiricism and critical analysis could provide the rational mind reliable knowledge concerning phenomena. However he also claimed that there is a level of existence (the essence or true nature of things that he called *noumena*) that we can only intuit with non cognitive perception. The end product of cognition (concepts) results in a barrier between conceptualization and noumena. Thus, noumena is a domain where metaphysics cannot offer reliable knowledge.

However Kant's familiarity with Hobbe's ontology and his observation of how European expansionism was progressing (with its tendency toward mercantilism) made his concerns about skepticism closer to those addressed by critics of classical Moral Skepticism. He realized that unbridled self-interest is not good for intersubjective relations and not good for interstate relations. Kant attempts to reform Cartesian subjectivity by transforming autonomous individuality with his ethical demand for attempting to achieve mutuality (by means of his universalized categorical imperatives). Kant conceived of ethics as universalized meaning that he believed that all people have basic human rights. Kant's categorical imperatives describe an ethic where the Confucian *Golden Rule* is the basis of intersubjective encounters. Thus, he espoused a viewpoint of relations where others should be treated no differently than one would want to be treated (or one must treat others in the same way you would want the other person to treat you). Certainly one must never use someone else as a means to accomplish his or her goals. Reversibility demands asking yourself, "If I were this person would I want to be treated this way?" In this sense Kant's philosophy offers a perspective on the freedom of the individual, the duty to recognize the other's rights and on Liberalism (the foundational principles of Liberalism that are referred to as Kantian *Cosmopolitanism*).

German Critical Theory engages a spectacular scope of concerns that include human rights, social relations, European-wide peace and cooperation, economics and politics. Some Critical Theorists have even engaged the vision of *The End of History* where Enlightenment would give way to a *New World Order*. *Critique of Pure Reason* can be said to initiate a long line of German Critical Theories. This progressive-in some aspects revolutionary-form of Liberalism has a legacy that can be traced back to Immanuel Kant. That is to say that in his essay *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* Kant describes his vision of peace and collective security. He proposed a league of nations where states are organized externally in a voluntary league for the sake of keeping peace, and for the promotion of global human rights

¹⁷ Foster, Michael. (2008) *Kant and Skepticism*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 3.

(upholding the rights not only of citizens but also of other nationalities outside of domestic borders).

“Kant's practical philosophy and the categorical imperative that governs it were intended to form the basis not only of what is thought today to be ethics proper but also with everything that broadly speaking had to do with deliberative human behavior.”¹⁸ Thus for Kant the freedom of the individual is depended upon social structures that allow public deliberation. In his essay *Theory and Practice* he claims that this is best realized in political systems that are built by social contract. Kant envisioned that this principle offered potential for improving human interactions domestically, improving relationships between states and globally. Jürgen Habermas believes that just as public discourse is intended to determine a democracy's constitutionally established policies, norms and behaviors, Kant's approach to Cosmopolitan Liberalism can achieve the same thing at the international level-if deliberative democracy is extended to the global community. John Rawls believed that Kant's ideas can be applied to managing globalization more effectively (in terms of deliberative processes to determine what normative policies apply between particular cultures).

The realization of Kantian Cosmopolitanism as the basis of international relations has always been hampered by the fact that Liberalism historically has been overshadowed by Realism. From the standpoint of Realism expediency always overrides moral considerations. The domination of Realism as the basis of Western political and economic transactions creates a dichotomy between Western rhetoric and practice. The idealistic rhetoric articulated by the West emphasizes an interest in spreading democracy, peace, freedom and prosperity. But the practical reality-in accordance with globalization based on Realism-is that “the other” is a threat that needs to be contained or dominated. The self-other tension underlying Realism culminated in the last century with nationalism, attempts at ethnic cleansing plus hatred and violence on ever larger scales. This has caused scholars to realize that managing the challenge of globalization requires a new way of thinking about the motivation behind human interactions.

As Modernity and European expansionism progressed skepticism developed an even broader base (as pointed out by Hegel in *On the Relationship of Skepticism to Philosophy, Expositions of its Different Modifications and Comparison of the Latest Form with Ancient One*). Added to the perspective of classical skepticism is modern skepticism. In its classical form there was an aspect that emphasized the use of power to gain or protect ones interests. Thus classical skepticism, throughout history has always influenced the position of Realism (the belief that values and norms matter less than material capabilities-military and economic power). Skepticism's influence on Realism is rooted in the argument of the pre-Socrates philosopher Thucydides. He claimed that “Imperialism is based on certain traits inherent in human nature, which are believed to be universal. Egoistic individuals pursuing wealth and security are seen to be behind all political struggles. Thus power politics is ultimately rooted in an egoistic human nature.”¹⁹

¹⁸ Rauscher, Frederick, (2008) Kant's Social and Political Philosophy. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. (Zalta, Edward, N. Ed.), 1:3.

¹⁹ Freyberg-Inan, Annette. (2004) *What Moves Man: The Realist Theory of International Relations and its Judgment of Human Nature*. Albany, The State University of New York Press, 26.

Classical skepticism not only has “Doubts regarding the human intellect’s self-sufficiency but even doubts humanity’s aptitude toward moral improvement. Such doubts have justified attitudes toward international relations characterized as ‘self help’ and power politics.”²⁰ William James (a renown pragmatist) has characterized skeptics as plagued with fear (of various types) which causes them to maintain a focus on protecting themselves from their fears rather than embracing greater virtues, principles and values. This is not to say that suspension of belief, withholding judgment, the rejection of dogmatism, and the rejection of dogmatic authority have no merit. A value for open-mindedness is reflected in Socrates’ skepticism and the suspension of bias is the basis of Peirce’s principles of inquiry. What is in question is classical Sophistry which exerted influence with the primary intention to increase power, status and wealth and taught their students how to use their influence in the same way (which Socrates opposed by implying that it is philosophy for hire).

Because of the persistence of skepticism modern philosophers including: Erasmus, George Berkeley, David Hume, Søren Kierkegaard, Bertrand Russell, G.E. Moore, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Michel Foucault (plus some of his French compatriots and some of his fellow Postmodernists) have all found it necessary to formulate some response to aspects of its claims. In its modern form skepticism has played a significant role in influencing the response of Critical Theorists to skepticism’s instigation of a challenge to the established views on ethics, economics, politics, our understanding of the nature-human connection and the role of power in human relations. One of the areas where Critical Theory has launched its most relevant response to modern skepticism is in reaction to its claim that any attempt to plan foreign policy on the basis of democratic principles (a global socially contracted agreement on what is best for achieving the common good) will end in moral skepticism.²¹ The statesman Michel Eyquem de Montaigne, for example, did not believe that there was any evidence in nature to support a claim for natural law or natural rights (not to mention a global order based on universalized declaration of human rights as a natural right).

Modern skepticism is distinct from ancient skepticism because it not only doubts rationalism but as well has doubts about the nature of the external world. This doubt has had an impact on globalization because it engenders a view that the international arena exists in an anarchical state. International Relations theorists argue that those burdened with such skepticism will not accept the Constructivist claim that democratic, rational deliberation can be applied to the international arena. Without the reconsideration of the traditional approach to international relations there will be no acceptance of the role of culture and values plus without inclusiveness of a more pragmatic perspective there is reduced consideration given to the significance of norms and principles in IR theory. Thus without properly addressing skepticism approaches to effectively shaping global stability will be inadequate.

It is therefore no wonder that C. S. Peirce devotes a significant segment of his philosophy to addressing doubt and establishing a basis for gaining reliable knowledge. Peirce envisages

²⁰ Monoson, Sara. and Loriaux, Michael. (2007) Pericles, Realism and the Normative Conditions for Deliberative Action. *Classical Theory in International Relations* (Jahn, Beate. Ed). UK, Cambridge University Press, 49-50.

²¹ Viona-Motoc, Iulia. (1999) Moral Rule and Rule of Law in International Relations: Common Sense, Political Realism, Skepticism, in a Decade of Transformation. *IWM Junior Visiting Fellows Conference, Vienna*, Vol. 8, 16.

doubt as the motivational factor stimulating the process of inquiry and the factor that gives it purpose. The goal of inquiry is the increase of knowledge, the knowledge necessary for obtaining desired results. Inquiry (the effort to gain a state of belief) forces the consideration of new possibilities. Skepticism, “The instigator of inquiry, is an uneasy and dissatisfied state from which we attempt to free ourselves.”²² Peirce claimed that when a former standpoint is found to be inadequate doubt begins. He proposed inquiry as the best means for resolving the inadequacy and eliminating doubt.

Pragmatists believe that human culture is socially constructed and the knowledge of how to enhance our interactions is also socially constructed. For Peirce, the passage from doubt to experiencing more desirable results is a social action. “Peirce’s method is built upon the assumption that humans are and will continue to be part of a transactional social and rational order. Peirce assumes that the members of the community would want and be able to subordinate their self-interest (i.e., private gain) for the sake of pursuing a common goal that would create mutual benefit.”²³ Thus he thought that the same evolutionary impulse that initiated culture would eventually subordinate humanity’s irrational and egotistical desires to the nonpartisan promotion of inquiry for sake of obtaining reliable knowledge. If we now think of our social scale as involving global interactions then, in Peirce’s terms, “The forum for fixing belief is shifted from the individual to the larger social sphere.”²⁴

Peirce believed that we each have our own viewpoint which is called into question when our knowledge fails to produce desired or anticipated results (which causes doubt). Or as Peirce put it we each have our own viewpoints but we must take our theories and try them in the real world if there is any hope of achieving our desired results. When our theories are not producing the anticipated results there is doubt; this problem can only be fixed by openness to a more effective point of view.²⁵ For Peirce the collaborative interaction between people with diverse perspectives is essential for obtaining better results. To gain our desired outcomes we enter into inquiry with a willingness to continually test hypothesis with the anticipation that inquiry will contribute to less disputable results. Thus, inquiry (or the process of public deliberation) is a more viable way of accurately discerning what is best for enhancing the human experience.

For example many members of the European public are left with doubts regarding EU’s ability to successfully manage its financial crisis and establish European-wide governance based on the approach to international relations that prevailed in Europe during the last century. This doubt is resulting from the probability that EU cannot work on the basis of traditional perspectives of international relations and macro economics. There is also doubt about our ability to effectively manage the *global triple threat* and shape global stability on the basis of the established view of international relations. “Doubt is the situation which

²² Peirce, Charles, Sanders. (CP 5:372)

²³ Hildebrand, David, L. (1996) Genuine Doubt and the Community in Peirce’s Theory of Inquiry. *Southwest Philosophy Review* 12:1, 33

²⁴ Peirce Charles, Sanders. (1955) *Philosophical Writings of Peirce* (Buchler, Justus. Ed.). New York, Dover Publications, 13.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 12.

results when one is confronted with a situation to which prior habits of action—that is, prior beliefs—are unfit to respond.”²⁶ In other words Europhiles doubt Realism’s adequacy for bonding Europe by means of norms, shared values and common principles. From the perspective of Peirce this doubt prompts interstate agents to engage in Constructive deliberation. It is in this respect that Peirce believed that the knowledge needed to gain more desired results is constructed in social interactions (scientific analysis).

There is an absolutely aesthetic aspect to Peirce’s logic in that he bases his semiotic ideas on harmonious interactions. As a result his epistemology (his approach to gaining reliable knowledge), his ontology (his understanding of the nature of existence) and his teleology (his view of the meaning of existence) are all based on his notion of semiotic interactions. Throughout Peirce’s writings there is the claim (based on his semiotic theories) that life is enhanced when organic organisms generate cooperative structures and participate in structures of cooperative interactions. In his view inquiry is an activity of the community of science that serves the purpose of generating larger units of cooperative interactions. “Thus, the very origin of the conception of reality shows that the conception of inquiry essentially involves the notion of community, without limit and capable of a definite increase in knowledge.”²⁷

Epistemology: Trustworthy, Valid and Reliable Information

“A theory of knowledge is expected both to take advantage of skeptical questions in order to uproot itself from intellectual dullness, and to acquire, in so doing, all the conceptual resources necessary to avoid being taken astray by nonsensical doubts.”²⁸ Peirce recognized Descartes attempt to establish certainty but he was concerned about the tendency for Cartesian philosophy to result in a dualism where the rational mind is so cut off from external reality that it becomes skeptical about it. The doubts and reservations about engagement with external reality have had devastating effects on human interactions (interpersonally and with the environment). Peirce’s semiotics supports Western individualism and individual creativity (he opposes determinism). However he asserts that in experience the individual forms symbolic or representational impressions of reality thus, becomes an “interpretant” of “signals” that have triggered an impression. In short his epistemology is interactive.

To understand and appreciate Peirce’s epistemological response to skepticism one must recognize that he viewed existence as dominated by patterns of harmonic expression. Peirce claimed that although there are outbursts of some unexpected phenomenon most of what we appreciate about reality is its harmonic patterns (in other words he sees freedom as a necessary aspect of reality and vehemently opposes a mechanistic view of existence). In biological terms these harmonic patterns are expressive of efforts to structure units of

²⁶ Peirce, Charles, Sanders. (1974) *The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce Volume 4* (edited by Hartshorne and Weiss). Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 186-187.

²⁷ Peirce Charles, Sanders. (Peirce 1868, CP 5.311).

²⁸ Floridi, Luciano. *The Importance of Being Earnest: Skepticism and the Limits of Fallibilism in Peirce. C.S. Peirce: Categories to Constantinople : Proceedings of the International Symposium on Peirce.* (Brakel, Jaap. and Van Heerden, Michael. Edts.). Leuven, Belgium, University of Leuven Press: 1998, 47.

cooperative interactions. His naturalized epistemology was the basis for his claim that since humanity's biological nature (both body and its counterpart mind) are components of nature's biological evolution humanity is naturally inclined toward shaping larger structures of cooperative interaction. Peirce's ideas-about the process of inquiry as a means of shaping information that enhances interactions between people and with nature-is based on a type of logic that he viewed as aesthetic (that which enriches and elevates the human experience).

Inquiry is a type of discourse ethic that demands "Real discourses with all affected persons in order to take into account all interests (including value preferences) of the affected persons thus, it is obviously dependent on the cooperation of those persons (or, in the case of those who cannot speak for themselves, their advocates)."²⁹ Because, for Peirce, rational discourse involves logic as an application of ethics and ethics is tied to aesthetics inquiry is a means for increasing those things that are worthwhile within themselves. It is in this respect that logic (right thinking) leads to an understanding of how to shape interactions (with all other aspects of existence) into more mutually beneficial outcomes. Peirce believed that the monological approach to knowledge as proposed in Cartesian philosophy failed to recognize the historical fact that social engagement is the basis of constructing reliable knowledge. For Peirce, reliable belief results from an intersubjective process. "We individually cannot hope to attain the ultimate philosophy, which we pursue; we can only seek it for the community of philosophers."³⁰ Cooperative interaction between people with diverse perspectives of reality is essential for formulating diverse positions into more accurate information.

The Pragmatist perspective on discourse ethics calls for responding to challenges in a way that produces practical and ameliorative results. Pragmatist discourse ethics presumes that in the process of critical communication a body of inquirers will formulate a consensus on key issues. The ethics are based on the presumption that the participants will attempt to establish a common ground by means of communication and negotiation. Peirce believed that this approach to reliable knowledge is a way of reconciling conflicting points of view. Different minds may set out with the most antagonistic views, but the nature of the process carries them to agreement.³¹ Resolution occurs with a willingness to continually test hypothesis in the hope that testing increases the accuracy of the results by indicating the most consistently reliable outcomes. This can only be achieved by cooperative interaction, which allows for sincere consideration of all available insight.

We realize that there is too much at stake (for all of us) to risk leading entire economies and social systems into error based on mere bias. Effectively managing the impending water crisis, the imminent energy crisis, the current environmental challenges, safeguarding global stability, and establishing a normative basis for global financial transactions cannot be done

²⁹ Apel, Karl- Otto. (2007) Discourse Ethics, Democracy, and International Law: Toward a Globalization of Practical Reason. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology Details*, VOL 66; Number 1, 51.

³⁰ Peirce, Charles S. (1958) Some Consequences of Four Incapacities. *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 2, 140-157, 1868. (1958) *Selected Writings* (ed. by Philip Wiener). New York: Dover Publications, 40.

³¹ Peirce, C. S. (1878) How to Make our Ideas Clear."from *Writings of Charles S Peirce*, Volume 3. Indiana University Press, 11.

unilaterally, it takes real concerted effort. The necessity of reconciling differences while avoiding conflict calls for skills in discourse ethics.

Peirce's ideas resonate with Wendt's claim that *Anarchy is What States Make of It* meaning that inquiry is a method that diverse intercultural groups can use to define the meaning of what they are confronted with in their relationships. Inquiry is also the means for generating the knowledge necessary for shaping the phenomena intercultural groups are confronted with into mutually beneficial outcomes. Positivism has been Realism's means of measuring global relationships in terms of the material capabilities of the various states. From the perspective IR's traditional epistemology knowledge is intended to anticipate the potential power states might employ in relationship to other states. On the other hand, deliberation or inquiry, as Kant pointed out, is the means of adding significant socio-historical concerns: values, principles, operating norms and culture to international relations. Peirce, in agreement with Kant, proposed what he called the architectonics of knowledge (systematically structuring information so as to optimize the ability to take advantage of its interdisciplinary complementary nature).

Semiotic pragmatism (that quintessential Peircean response to Kantian metaphysics) expands the utility of knowledge by making inquiry the basis by which international agents can break Realist power patterns caused by a materialistic, deterministic and mechanistic view of existence. Inquiry is clearly a democratic approach to establishing what is increasingly called a "global social contract." "The idea of basing justification and legitimacy on public deliberation is an attractive one for democrats. For, the view of legitimation which centers around the notion of public reasoning is just a restatement of the principle that everyone has the right to participate in discussions that shape the social contract."³² In this respect inquiry is a type of open and free debate where the participants come to an agreement on how to reduce our common threats and how to achieve a more cooperative relationship.

"Pragmatism provides a solid and healthy epistemological grounding for a theory of international relations (which is still struggling to move beyond the confrontation between those endorsing and those criticizing the Enlightenment project)."³³ The Pragmatist influence on international relations contributes to creating international structures and shaping relationships so that they can be constructed based on the values of the actors. This means a move toward a transnational civil society where "The will of the people" shape the norms and values that determine their relationship."³⁴ Jürgen Habermas believes that public discourse-the basis of deliberative democracy-applied in the form of a Constructivist approach to IR would facilitate various cultures and states negotiating to achieve mutually desirable outcomes. This would mean that Kantian Neoliberal Cosmopolitanism would achieve a global common good in the same way that social contract works to constitute a domestic

³²Misak, Cheryl. (2000) *Truth, Politics, Morality: Pragmatism and Deliberation*. London, Routledge, 5.

³³ Bauer, Harry and Brighi, Elisabetta. (2009) *Introducing Pragmatism to International Relations.* *Pragmatism in International Relations* (Bauer & Brighi-editors). New York, Routledge, 6.

³⁴ Habermas, Jürgen. (2006) Religion in the Public Sphere.(translated by Gaines). *European Journal of Philosophy*. 14, 5.

social contract and the domestic common good. The global common good would be achieved by social agents-empowered by deliberative democratic procedures-intersubjectively constituting the social structures that determine their relational activity.

Interaction is more than the basis of inquiry and more than the key to understanding Peirce's epistemology. Interaction is fundamental to Peirce's semiotic view of existence. Peirce offered inquiry as a means of accurately appraising the phenomena we are confronted with and planning the most appropriate response. To a large extent this involves appraising the best approach to human interactions. The right understanding of the relational aspects of how humanity can more effectively manage phenomena is addressed in Peirce's ontology. His explanation of semiotics offers a perspective on existence that provides insight into how to have more beneficial exchanges in the various areas of human encounters. Peirce insisted that to gain the knowledge needed to make our exchanges and interactions more beneficial we must understand how triadic interactions reveal something of the true nature of reality.

Semiotic Ontology: Interdependence and the Fundamental Essence of Reality

The term "semeion" had already been in use during the rise of Greek classical thought (and since on occasion by several philosophers). Peirce adopted the term and applied it to his understanding of how human experience is shaped by means of semiotic interactions and how human experience is communicated. He asserted that a better comprehension of triadic exchanges would enable humanity to perceive the nature of encounters in a way that enables experiencing more of what we value. Peirce believed that if we want to experience more enhanced interactions we must understand the integral nature of interactions.

Pragmatists assert that in an effort to maintain integrity complex structures must achieve an integral connection with other aspects of existence. Because of this the nature of interactions is one of the most essential and meaningful aspects of existence. Peirce realized that reality is filled with opportunities for experiencing life-enhancing interactions and he also acknowledged that not all encounters have the desired outcome. However he was certain that attempts to avoid the disturbance of undesired outcomes are more successful as a result of cooperative interchange (the very basis of life is the ability to form structures of cooperative interchange). Thus, by accurately discerning the nature of existence we are more cognizant of how to shape interactions into more beneficial and cooperative outcomes. Being able to flourish is related to being able to discern how to have more cooperative and beneficial interactions.

Peirce acknowledged the problem of ambiguity connected with various encounters in nature. However he also asserted that experiences formed by perception are contingent on the perspective of the *experiencer*. Peirce argues that inquiry (the process of obtaining reliable knowledge) reduces the disturbance of nature's ambiguity by increasing the probability of anticipation becoming experience. Reliable knowledge (a conceptualized understanding of how to achieve more of what we value) promotes an understanding of the connection between human values, teleology, human integrity and human intentionality. Knowledge provides understanding of how diversity can be shaped into cooperative unity.

He believed that knowledge-proven effective for managing encounters-is considered to be epistemologically reliable knowledge. He held that reliable knowledge guides the individual

to becoming better integrated internally and externally. Knowledge is considered reliable if it helps the individual to achieve beneficial outcomes while more successfully engaging other aspects of the environment that are needed for flourishing. It is such knowledge that is a preferable basis for the cultural belief systems regulating human interactions. Peirce asserted that knowledge of what extends units of cooperative interactions thus, increasing life enhancement is discerned by accurately appraising the true nature of semiotic interactions.

Peirce explained that the sense of being well-integrated is reduced by a view on existence that isolates parts by segmenting them, reducing them and turning them into objects. He recognized that to improve the quality of our existence we must learn to view the parts in such a way that we perceive them as *Holistically* integrated thus, the particular quality of the total increases in aesthetic value.³⁵ The world is not made up of atomistic entities all potentially juxtaposed to each other. “Pragmatism emphasizes the world’s interdependence, its interrelations, and its entanglements as constitutive of reality. This emphasis (highlighting the aesthetic dimension of logic and ethics) calls for a theory of interactions that mediates conflicts by laying the groundwork for a social and political philosophy that places democratic and humanitarian concerns at the center of social arrangements.”³⁶

An extended range of cooperative interchange is necessary because the life principle is built on organic elements participating in beneficial interchanges. Human culture was spurred on by the realization that cooperative interaction is not only basic to maintaining individual integrity it is essential for the integrity of all structured units. Thus there is a human value preference “For achieving unity as a self, to have a unique center and to find common ground and relation or unity with others. In other words, human beings strive for unique individuality or fulfillment of capacities with a unique angle of vision and, at the same time, to improve the quality of their associations and to establish new common ground in friendship and communication.”³⁷

The nature of semiotic triads for Peirce meant that there is a correlated interaction between what Peirce called *the first*, the way in which the interaction is constructed (what Peirce called *the second*), and together these shape the way encounters are interpreted (in Peirce’s terms *the third* or the interpretant). I put it in these terms because of the implications that it has (as proposed by Pragmatism’s foundational proponents) for social structures and our relationship to the environment.

Pragmatists continued to develop Peirce’s insight into a philosophy emphasizing the ethical obligations of cultures to align their mega organic structures with humanity’s natural ethical (aesthetic) predisposition. This means that flourishing cultures require increasing the range of internal and external cooperative interactions. Increasing the range of cooperation helps a culture to flourish in ways that are beneficial in spite of the challenges it faces. Thus, flourishing cultures attempt to shape their overall worldview into a systematic system for

³⁵ Peirce, Charles, S. (1974) *Ethical and Esthetical Goodness. Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce* (edited by Hartshorne and Weiss). Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 84.

³⁶ Parker, Kelly. (1996) *Pragmatism and Environmental Thought. Environmental Pragmatism* (edited by Light, Andrew and Katz, Eric). London, Routledge, 25.

³⁷ Ziniewicz, Gordon. (2006) *Essays on the Philosophy of John Dewey. Adventures in Philosophy*, 4.

regulating successful cooperative interactions. Such a perspective on the nature of existence takes us beyond a sense of dualistic contention into improved relationships. It takes us beyond a subject-object split into cooperative union. This is clearly an approach where we view the “other” in relational terms rather than in dualistic subject-object terms. This approach presumes that global interdependence can be more effectively managed with rational discourse plus this approach to encounters enhances nature-human interconnection with its semiotic view of interactions.

We can apply Peirce’s ontology to the global arena by keeping in mind his claim that perception is influenced by the perspective of the experienter. Let us use the terms that have sparked the IR *Great Debates*-Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism-as options for defining the nature of international relations. Given these terms as a generalized way of perceiving the reality of the global arena *The First* would be the nature of the global arena (not as perceived by individual agents from their theoretical perspective but the total scope of what shapes social interactions). Keep in mind that which theoretical position one uses as a starting point influences the perceptual perspective from which one views the international arena and acts as an international agent (this applies also to how one views the environment). The international agent believes that his or her perspective of the true nature of the global arena is shaped by the real conditions of the world. But as it turns out one’s theoretic perspective is actually also shaping perspectives, impressions, experiences and actions.

The *Second* would be the means international agents believe are best for shaping international relations thus, their expectation of what motivates the behavior of interstate agents (power capabilities-Realism; normative structures-Liberalism; cultural values, shared values, and normative structures-Constructivism). The *Third* would then be the interpretant’s conceptual anticipation of how international relations indeed should be approached. It is easy to see how Pragmatism contributes to resolving the impasse in international relations with inquiry as a means of gaining an inclusive perspective (an epistemologically more reliable perspective) on what has meaning to various international agents and how that meaning shapes encounters.

It is apparent that Peirce contributed to the paradigm shift that upset the established foundations of “Absolutism” by initiating a greater respect for the roles of culture, dialogue and the social sciences. Thus Peirce’s Pragmatism lays the foundation for expanding the theoretical perspective of IR by viewing it as part of “A discursive web that, in the potentiality of its connections, is global, although any actual piece of knowledge or point of view is always only local.”³⁸ Peirce’s Pragmatism challenges the often taken for granted Realist (or Hobbesian) conception of the human condition and international relations which proclaims that humans are driven by self-interest, and that power manifested in material terms is the basis of assuring an agent the ability to obtain self-interest. **Peirce viewed interactions as necessarily involving a reciprocal exchange between the interlocutors who accept that the process of Constructivist dialogue is the best approach to satisfying their intention to benefit from the transaction.**

From the Western perspective a utilitarian pursuit of instrumental desires might have

³⁸ Rytövuori-Apunen, Helena. (2005) Forget ‘Post-Positivist’ IR!: The Legacy of IR Theory as the Locus for a Pragmatist Turn.” *Cooperation and Conflict: Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*, Vol. 40:2, 150.

traditionally been the prescribed path to prosperity, progress and development. However values and meaning are as well important factors in intercultural exchanges and these are shaped by cultures or social behavior. Thus the deeper values of life are derived from cultural meaning more than by individual efforts for gain. Given a decline in the emphasis on the atomistic individual (who had continued to be skeptical of the Eastern view of necessary social harmony and harmony with nature) Peirce's more Holistic view offers a new and important ontological paradigm change. I mention this in these terms because the foundations of Pragmatism are not without consideration of the relevance of development and progress. Pragmatism anticipates modern communication technologies and the need for communication ethics. In part Peirce's communication ethics are expressed in terms of his interactive teleology. The relevance of Peirce's vision for dealing with contemporary global communications is revealed by the fact that he was one of the first to use the term "virtual" in the sense that it is used today in connection with information communication technology. The virtual for Peirce is a marriage of rationality, aesthetics and technology.

Conclusion- Peirce's Teleology and Global Interdependence

The fact of global interdependence makes apparent the need for cooperative structures: to promote global stability, to establish a regulatory system for stabilizing the global economy, to establish an effective normative basis for financial transactions that will safeguard public interests, plus for spearheading a concerted effort to facilitate sustainable approaches to development and the use of natural resources. The well calculated, quantitative, analytical and abstract approaches to gaining reliable knowledge (one branch of what grew out of Enlightenment philosophy) must be expanded to allow inclusiveness of a Pragmatic perspective. Pragmatism because it has a well established track record for promoting improved human interactions (improving interpersonal interactions, social interactions, attempts to establish liberal democracy and Pragmatism offers an outlook that helps to resolve the nature-human dichotomy).

Globalization has modified the way we think about culture, identity, space, time, distance, who we are in significant relationship with and the motivational factors behind relationships. The speed at which globalization has engulfed the world has also outpaced the ability of states to effectively manage the new means through which interactions, transactions and telecommunications permeate their borders. Thus, making way for this new era has demanded new perspectives on power, communication, global discourse ethics, and a new understanding of the nature of the international arena. This is all amounting to the necessity of new ways of thinking about intercultural communications and international relations.

Coupled with the realization of the extent to which the global community is becoming interdependent is the understanding that the way we think of the individual is transforming from atomistic to interdependent (in terms of self-other and nature-human relationships). It is clear that the traditional notion of an atomistic individual (operating primarily on the basis of self-interest and viewing interactions from a standpoint of the utility value they have for fulfilling self-interests) is altered by the "enlightened view of self-interests" which stipulates that utility value is increased by attempting mutual benefits. This is increasingly resulting in an understanding that the risks that are necessarily faced because of the nature of the global reality are shared or mutual. This also means that what is at stake is of equal significance for all international agents (at multi-levels). "Interdependence implies that the parts of the system

rely on one another and that events occurring at particular times and places may have impacts elsewhere at the same time or in future times.”³⁹

The speed at which globalization is engulfing the world has resulted in enormous challenges to cultures that must expand their perspectives and conceptual focus from that of the *polis* to that of the *Cosmo-polis*. States, still adhering to the Westphalian model of international relations, are not ready to turn over their sovereignty to some international governance body. However due to the fact that the highly complex global environment is increasingly characterized as containing incalculable risk, there is a strong interest in a discourse ethic that will facilitate stabilizing global social and economic interests. Because of the risk (or because of what is at stake for all of us) there is also now a need of reconsidering basic assumptions regarding the motivation for political and economic transactions. The new networks of interaction require new models (and norms) that will help states transcend the materialist emphasis that caused so much division, hatred, violence and destruction in the last century.

“If the mission of philosophy is to bring wisdom into action, and if there is any wisdom in philosophy at all, this wisdom will be active and it will teach us how to live and how to act. If philosophy does not move us toward ameliorative action it ends up as a luxurious ‘language game’ or ‘intellectual gymnastics.’”⁴⁰ If philosophy is to help us to more effectively manage the challenge of globalization the philosophical assertions must have clear pragmatic value. Richard Shusterman believes Pragmatism (as its name implies) has such value because “Pragmatism is sensitive to the possibilities for the change that constructive interactions afford. Pragmatism refuses to confine itself to the traditional scholastic problems of philosophy but addresses the most pressing issues that preoccupy our experience in today’s world with its diverse peoples and publics.”⁴¹

The extent of the challenges we are faced with in an effort to stabilize the global society (especially in terms of the environment, energy and financial transactions) raises concerns about the compatibility between the strategies for interaction that exclusively take Realism as an approach to global economics and politics and those that are inclusive of deliberative approaches to global stability. One must also take into consideration the role that the continuous rapid development of technology plays in this compatibility comparison? Peirce anticipated a future where reconciliation of what is demanded by *natural law* and what is intended by rational choice would be achieved by what he called the normative sciences—the logic of investigation, ethics and aesthetics.⁴² Peirce envisioned that in the biological struggle for survival one is more likely to turn strife into harmonious order by a discursive approach to

³⁹ Abler, Ronald. (1991) *Global Interdependence and its Consequences. Collapsing Space and Time: Geographic Aspects of Communications and Information.* (Brunn, Stanley and Leinbach, Thomas. Edts.). London, Harper Collins, 49.

⁴⁰ Višňovský, Emil. (2009) Introductory: The Global Potential of Pragmatism. *Human Affairs*, Volume 19, Number ,11.

⁴¹ Shusterman, Richard. (2004) *The Range of Pragmatism; and the Limits of Philosophy.* Oxford, UK. Blackwell Publishing, 2.

⁴² Apel, Karl-Otto. (1981) *Charles Peirce: From Pragmatism to Pragmaticism.* Amherst, Mass., University of Massachusetts Press,

gaining his or her interests. Peirce pointed out that what is most admirable (worth achieving) is connected with what is most reasonable. In this sense deliberative action can be thought of in aesthetic terms (the aspect of logic and ethics that creates that which enhances, enriches, enlivens, and ennobles the human experience). Peirce (in accord with Schiller) understood aesthetics as a perfect reconciliation of the sensory (sensual, feeling and experiential aspects of the human experience) and the logical aspects of human nature. He believed that rational discourse aligns with the inherent human value preference for beneficial interactions and beneficial outcomes. Thus rational discourse is a reasonable approach to intercultural communications and international relations because it helps to create what is beneficial in terms of contributing to the global common good. Peirce thought of logic (rational discourse) in normative terms, that is as an *ought* in the sense that Aristotle thought of ethics, because it contributes to creating the good life. But at this stage of history we are thinking in terms of expanding Aristotle's understanding of social relations (*polis*) to the global scale (the *Cosmopolis*). This would mean a concern for what creates the global good, global well-being and global flourishing.

Peirce would say that what is worth achieving is determined by agreements that can bring about desirable changes in social interactions without changing the fundamental values and cultural convictions of the participants. Moreover, in spite of the different viewpoints and various cultural convictions participants would agree that inquiry enhances the prospects that the communication process will result in improved intercultural communications and improved international relations. Put in relationship to Aristotle's ethics, Peirce's notion of *Communicative Action* provides a process by which international agents can come to an agreement on the normative procedures that will contribute to obtaining *the global good life* (protecting the global public interest).

In line with Aristotelian teleology Peirce viewed nature as reflecting intentionality thus purposefulness. It was apparent to Peirce that inherent in existence is an intention that prompts structured units to attempt beneficial interactions. He believed that organisms do not (indeed cannot) survive independently. Because of the fact of interdependence the naturally preferred purpose, goal, outcome, or function (*telos*) of human encounters is enhanced interactions. Thus for Peirce the very nature of interactions (and increasing the range of beneficial interactions) is connected with what he understood as Normativity. It was this perspective that led Peirce to draw the conclusion that aesthetics, ethics and logic are connected with what he thought of as a trichotomy of normative sciences.

Peirce implied that human interactions are enhanced with: the autonomy that individuality and freedom promotes, rational discourse, and the understanding that what is best for self-interest is based on considering the standpoint of every other person (Kantian mutuality).⁴³ Peirce contributes to ideas on global discourse ethics by offering a process for enhancing international relations in ways aligned with the principles of existing democracies. However his Constructivist leanings envisioned the possibility of beneficial discourse between democracies and communal cultures plus between democracies, communal cultures and other types of well-organized societies (all exercising their sovereign freedom by participating in deliberative attempts to promote the global common good). Rational discourse (a

⁴³ Smyth, Richard. (1994) What Logic Can Learn from Ethics. *Peirce and Value Theory*. (Herman, Parret. Edt.), Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company, 53 & 54.

significant variation of rational choice) is what Peirce defined as the scientific method. In other words, as Habermas proclaims, the Pragmatist perspective on global interactions supports the Kantian proposal that adhering to the principle of mutuality enhances the ability to obtain utility based on the *rational choice* approach. “The Enlightenment project-as expressed in Kantian terms-aims for a globally free and just social conditions and can be constructed by means of the Pragmatic orientations to rationality of social actors in daily intersubjective communication.”⁴⁴

Thus, agents at multi-levels would participate in a deliberative process of determining, on the basis of certain principles, how to increase the extent of humanity’s inherent value preference for cooperative and beneficial interactions. This increases international cooperation while reducing clashes over conflicting interests. From the semiotic point of view contemporary human interactions can be characterized as a vast multidisciplinary, multi-agent communication network that increases the impact that individuals, human networks, civil society, and NGO’s play in the global arena.

⁴⁴ Habermas, Jürgen. (1998) *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. (Lawrence. Frederick. Trans.). Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 312-342.

References

- Abler, Ronald. (1991) Global Interdependence and its Consequences. *Collapsing Space and Time: Geographic Aspects of Communications and Information*. (Brunn, Stanley and Leinbach, Thomas. Edts.). London, Harper Collins.
- Apel, Karl- Otto. (2007) Discourse Ethics, Democracy, and International Law: Toward a Globalization of Practical Reason. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology Details*, VOL 66; Number 1.
- Aritotle, (1996) *The Politics and The Constitution of Athens*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Bauer, Harry and Brighi, Elisabetta. (2009) Introducing Pragmatism to International Relations.” *Pragmatism in International Relations* (Bauer & Brighi-editors). New York, Routledge.
- Benjamin, Andrew. (1977) Eisenman and the Housing of Tradition. *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. (Leach, Neil. Ed.) New York, Routledge.
- Burch, Robert, (2010) Charles Sanders Peirce. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. (Zalta, Edward N. Ed.).
- Falcon, Andrea. (2005) *Aristotle and the Science of Nature: Unity Without Uniformity*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Floridi, Luciano. The Importance of Being Earnest: Skepticism and the Limits of Fallibilism in Peirce. *C.S. Peirce: Categories to Constantinople : Proceedings of the International Symposium on Peirce*. (Brakel, Jaap. and Van Heerden, Michael. Edts.). Leuven, Belgium, University of Leuven Press: 1998.
- Foster, Michael. (2008) *Kant and Skepticism*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- Freyberg-Inan, Annette. (2004) *What Moves Man: The Realist Theory of International Relations and its Judgment of Human Nature*. Albany, The State University of New York Press.
- Gutting, Gary. (1999) *Pragmatic Liberalism and the Critique of Modernity*. Cambridge, UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. (2006) Religion in the Public Sphere.(translated by Gaines). *European Journal of Philosophy*. 14.
- Habermas, Jürgen. (1998) **The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity. (Lawrence. Frederick. Trans.). Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.**
- Hildebrand, David, L. (1996) Genuine Doubt and the Community in Peirce’s Theory of Inquiry. *Southwest Philosophy Review* 12:1.
- Johnston, Ian. (1997) Lecture on Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethic. *Liberal Studies Lecture 301*.
- Merrell, Floyd. (1997) *Peirce, Signs and Meaning*. Toronto, University of Toronto Press.
- Misak, Cheryl. (2000) *Truth, Politics, Morality: Pragmatism and Deliberation*. London, Routledge.

- Monoson, Sara. and Loriaux, Michael. (2007) Pericles, Realism and the Normative Conditions for Deliberative Action. *Classical Theory in International Relations* (Jahn, Beate. Ed). UK, Cambridge University Press.
- Parker, Kelly. (1996) Pragmatism and Environmental Thought. *Environmental Pragmatism* (edited by Light, Andrew and Katz, Eric). London, Routledge
- Peirce, Charles, Sanders. (1974) The Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce Volume 4 (edited by Hartshorne and Weiss). Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Peirce, Charles, S. (1974) Ethical and Esthetical Goodness. *Collected Papers of Charles Sanders Peirce* (edited by Hartshorne and Weiss). Cambridge, Harvard University Press.
- Peirce, C. S. (1878) How to Make our Ideas Clear. from *Writings of Charles S Peirce*, Volume 3. Indiana University Press.
- Peirce Charles, Sanders. (1955) *Philosophical Writings of Peirce* (Buchler, Justus. Ed.). New York, Dover Publications.
- Peirce Charles, Sanders. (1958) *Selected Writings* (ed. by Philip Wiener). New York: Dover Publications.
- Peirce, Charles S. (1958) Some Consequences of Four Incapacities. *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* **2**.
- Pollack, Mark. (2005) Theorizing the European Union: International Organization, Domestic Polity, or Experiment in New Governance? *The Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 8.
- Ransdell, Joseph. (2002) The Relevance of Peircean Semiotic To Computational Intelligence Augmentation. *Workshop on Computational Intelligence and Semiotics II*.
- Rauscher, Frederick, (2008) Kant's Social and Political Philosophy. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. (Zalta, Edward, N. Ed.). [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-social-political/>]
- Rytövuori-Apunen, Helena. (2005) Forget 'Post-Positivist' IR!: The Legacy of IR Theory as the Locus for a Pragmatist Turn." *Cooperation and Conflict: Journal of the Nordic International Studies Association*, Vol. 40:2.
- Shusterman, Richard. (2004) *The Range of Pragmatism; and the Limits of Philosophy*. Oxford, UK. Blackwell Publishing.
- Sobrinho, Blasco, Jose. (2001) *Signs, Solidarities, and Sociology*. Oxford, England, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Smyth, Richard. (1994) What Logic Can Learn from Ethics. *Peirce and Value Theory*. (Herman, Parret. Ed.), Amsterdam, John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Viona-Motoc, Iulia. (1999) Moral Rule and Rule of Law in International Relations: Common Sense, Political Realism, Skepticism, in a Decade of Transformation. *IWM Junior Visiting Fellows Conference, Vienna*, Vol. 8.
- Višňovský, Emil. (2009) Introductory: The Global Potential of Pragmatism. *Human Affairs*. Volume 19, Number 1.

Wiley, Norbert. (2005) Peirce and the founding of American sociology. *Journal of Classical Sociology*. Vol. 6: No. 1. [<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/peirce/>]

Ziniewicz, Gordon. (2006) Essays on the Philosophy of John Dewey. *Adventures in Philosophy*.