

Cosmopolitanism as a Concept of European Integration

Assoc. Prof. Kire Sharlamanov, International Balkan University
Assoc. Prof. Bejtula Demiri, International Balkan University

Abstract— Cosmopolitanism as a concept is one of the most commonly used concepts in the analysis of the postulates of international relations and the building of international organizations. In this paper is analyzed the place and role of cosmopolitanism as a basic principle of European integration. We analyze two different views of cosmopolitanism, the one proposed by Jurgen Habermas and the latter proposed by Ulrich Beck. At the same time, the focus of our analysis is the model of cosmopolitanism that is developed in the process of European integration, the ways in which it seeks to deal with nationalism and the type of democracy it produces.

Index Terms — Cosmopolitanism, Democracy, European Integration, European Union, Jurgen Habermas, Nationalism, Ulrich Beck.

1 WHAT IS COSMOPOLITISM?

ONE of the most significant debates after the Cold War took place on the axis of cosmopolitanism - nationalism.

Since the 1980s, to this day we have witnessed numerous inter-ethnic conflicts, with both sides using ethnic arguments. On the other hand, in Europe and the United States, the narrative of cosmopolitanism prevailed. In the United States, the narrative suffered a serious blow after September 11, 2001, when the arguments for national interests and national security were gaining in importance. In Europe, political cosmopolitanism does not always go hand in hand with cultural cosmopolitanism [6]. Two serious projects that had their most important supporters in the United States and Europe were based on cosmopolitanism, that is globalization on the one hand and the European integration and creation of the European Union on the other. In this text, we will first refer to the European Union, but before we begin our analysis of the cosmopolitan foundation of European integration, we will first define what exactly cosmopolitanism means.

The term cosmopolitanism comes from the Greek *cosmos*, which means universe, world. Accordingly, the literal meaning of the word cosmopolitan is a citizen of the world (Van Diesen 2013: 9). Diogenes was the first to call himself a citizen of the world. Stoics developed the idea of concentric identities, according to which individuals initially associate their identity with their own personality, and then with family, relatives, friends, fellow citizens, the nation they belong to, the state in which they live and ultimately humanity as a whole [13]. Kant is the first author to systematically address the issue of cosmopolitanism and defines it as an aspiration to create a world community. As a term, cosmopolitanism is one of the most prominent in the contemporary social sciences and is often associated with transnationalism, multiculturalism, and pan-nationalism. The basic principles of cosmopolitanism are that all people are members of a universal but heterogeneous community. As such, they have duties that go beyond ethnic, religious and territorial differences and undertake political activities through which they transform the society to deal effectively with global problems [1]. According to Van Diesen [5] cosmopolitanism is an ideology that implies that every person has

an obligation to help each other, because of the humanity that carries within him. Cosmopolitanism as a philosophy suggests that people, apart from their particularities, are citizens of the world and as such create a world moral community, and humanity has an obligation to respect universal moral values [14]. Because cosmopolitans are moral universalists, they believe that all people, and not just their fellow citizens, should respect universal moral principles. Hence, national, state, cultural, social boundaries are irrelevant, viewed from the perspective of universal moral principles. Over the last few decades, two very relevant sociologists, Jurgen Habermas and Ulrich Beck, have been dealing with cosmopolitanism as a topic and especially in the context of European integration. Below we will look at their concepts of cosmopolitanism.

2 THE HABERMAS VIEW OF COSMOPOLITISM

Habermas perceived cosmopolitanism through the prism of constitutionalism. Habermas, perceived that the history of a liberal-democratic nation-state is characterized by tensions between republicanism and nationalism, in particular between the idea of international citizenship and the idea of the historical and cultural context in which those ideas are developed. The fate of democracy depends on whether republican or nationalist ideas prevail. In doing so, Habermas advocates constitutional rights and principles to serve as a supportive point of constitutional patriotism, which should encompass people with different worldviews. Citizenship should guarantee universal equality before the laws, fundamental rights and principles that are independent of the identity of any individual group in society. Considering cosmopolitanism as a serious political project, in a European context, Habermas points to the concept of regionalism. Regionalism as a post-national policy should overcome linguistic and ethnically divided European societies. In general, there is no reason why constitutional patriotism could not be applied on a regional or continental level [15].

Trying to give cosmopolitanism a normative dimension, Habermas advocated the creation of a cosmopolitan law that would surpass the borders of sovereign

states, which will be implemented by several states, thus guaranteeing the peace and security of the international community. Having in mind Kant's vision of a peace federation, Habermas looked at the League of Nations as the first step in the formation of international law and the realization of Kant's vision. Habermas was aware that the experience of the two world wars teaches us that, in order to fulfill Kant's vision and to pacify international peace, it is not enough to establish only an international legal order, but also an additional level of integration of the international community [2].

Regarding the European Union as a cosmopolitan project, Habermas, proposed its democratization. His vision was the EU as a post-national federation that would be integrated through a policy of regionalism. It is a way to show how democratic politicians reconfigure the space occupied by traditional economic and political actors. Regionalism is a normative project that is the articulation of the new global order. It is a post-national policy that should overcome linguistic and ethnic divisions in European societies [15]. Accordingly, Habermas proposed that the EU be built from bottom to top, from regionalism to cosmopolitanism, and not from top to bottom, from co-operation between national states towards regional co-operation [16].

Regional political integration depends not only on the shared value obligations of liberal democracy, but also on shared historical experiences and the interpretation of basic constitutional principles and shared ways of life. Matching the practices of liberal democracy is not the same as sharing the specific ways of life. In that sense, even if the European and American ethos respects the values of liberal democracy, they are significantly different in their ways of life. According to Habermas, the European nations share a certain historical horizon associated with modernism and violence-based conflicts, after which the tendency toward respect for tolerance is slowly crystallized [15]. Hence, the European Union, in particular its regional policy, rely not only on sharing its obligations to liberal democracy, but also on the historical experience and the specific way of life. Regional integration policy requires a strengthening of civil solidarity, which will go beyond that of the national states. The basis for such solidarity should be the shared political culture, created in conditions of open common horizons [15].

According to Habermas, European political integration takes place in territorially entrenched political identities. In order to carry out the integration process, they are trying to find a common historical experience. This common experience is identified at the regional level, where people from different ethnic groups live together, where they revive postnational identities. It can be said that post-national identities are at the same time extended nationalisms or regional citizens nationalisms. Habermas himself identifies nationalism with ethno-nationalism, and puts himself on the side of constitutional patriotism, which is another name for civic nationalism inspired by the principles of liberal democracy and multicultural politics. According to civic nationalism, membership in a particular political organization, such as the state through citizenship, is inextricably linked to

the political rights and institutions that those rights provide, guarantee and implement. The affiliation to the state through citizenship means equality before the law, irrespective of ethnic, cultural or religious affiliation. The European Union should be inspired by the spirit of extended nationalism.

3 THE BECK'S VIEW OF COSMOPOLITISM

Beck's understanding of cosmopolitanism is the cosmopolitanism of European integration. Ulrich Beck is aware that the European Union can not be a state or a nation in the near future, but that does not mean that it should not strive for it. He notes the sociology is using the categorical apparatus developed in the nineteenth century to analyze national states, so the European Union is considered through categories of territoriality, sovereignty, jurisdiction and democracy. Beck strongly objects to sociology methodological nationalism, that is, to the use of the term European society, instead of his plural, European societies. European societies should not be understood as a simple sum of European national societies. This methodological nationalism practiced by the social sciences leads to erroneous analyzes, since it simplifies, otherwise complicated European realities [9]. It seems that Beck's cosmopolitanism goes from the borders between national states within the union, but further insists on the borders between the European Union and the rest of the world. In addition, national states are the starting point for European integration, while horizontal integration that ignores national sovereignty is a perspective, especially in the field of public opinion creation. Ulrich Beck insists that while the public is fixed to the nation-state, it should be opened up for cosmopolitan understanding of realities and monitoring the dynamics of the transgressive forms of a European public sphere that is developing.

According to Beck, the perception of global threats between Europe and the United States is significantly different to the extent that Europeans and North Americans actually live in different worlds. According to Americans, Europeans have a hysterical fear of environmental pollution and global warming, while according to Europeans, Americans are paralyzed by overstating the fear of terrorism. The trend shows that transatlantic cultures of fear are moving away from one another and at one point there will be a break. As Beck concludes, the choice of fear leads to choice for two visions of the world [9].

Despite making the difference between cosmopolitan Europe and others, Ulrich Beck is aware that methodological nationalism should not be replaced by methodological Europeanism, and here he approaches the position of Habermas and suggests replacing the endogenous approach, with exogenous, in terms of openness of European societies to others, but still separates European societies as a single entity and sees them against the world, ie, others in the world, whose boundaries can not be anywhere [9].

It seems that between the concepts of Habermas and Beck, for cosmopolitan Europe, there can be found points that are common, but also those that differ. Thus the two authors insist on cosmopolitanism, but for Habermas he is from regionalism, while for Beck it is crucial to form a common

European public sphere. Also, the two authors have noted a tendency to distinguish cosmopolitan Europe from the United States, with Habermas insisting on the only European historical experience and way of life, while Beck insists on the differences in the fears that produced differences in the worldview.

4 COSMOPOLITAN MODEL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

The primary goal of the founding of the European Union was overcoming national egoisms. In this sense, ethnic, regional and national particularities should have gone one step backwards to give way to the growing convergence of the member states of the union in all segments of social life. Hence, some authors like Ulrich Beck consider that European identity should be based on cosmopolitanism [9], [12]. Moreover, Beck and Grande [12] believe that the cosmopolitan Europe project should be enforced, as opposed to European cosmopolitanism that leads to dual loyalty to national states and Europe. A cosmopolitan Europe, as a project must rely on the integration and the harmonization of policies in individual countries. It is a process that, through the elimination of the differences, should lead to the unification of a transnational territory of the future European Federation.

The European Union is based on several cosmopolitan principles such as freedom, democracy and human rights. The very idea of a European Union i.e. politically united Europe is a cosmopolitan idea and it has existed in Europe for a long time. Why such an idea could have been realized in the 20th century, after the Second Wartime War, and not earlier, is one of the questions that many authors try to answer. According to Kaufman [6], the reasons are: a) refining, perfecting the cosmopolitan ideology, b) the growth of cosmopolitan organizations across Europe, c) the growth of a new educated class that has helped the cosmopolitan ideas to institutionalize both nationally and at international level.

It seems that the concept behind the European Union follows the suggestions of Jurgen Habermas and Ulrich Beck. More precisely, the interior borders seem to be blurred, but they still exist, but they are more emphasized in times of crisis, but more borders are set on the outside, especially in relation to Russia, Turkey and the United States, as serious international players. Schlenker realizing that the European Union encourages the free movement of goods, services and people within its own boundaries, but there are dilemmas and limitations for the same movement between the EU and the rest of the world, rightly raises the dilemma of whether the European Union as a political project is cosmopolitan or fortress against the others [13]. More than that, the dilemma arises whether European identity is one step towards a universalist identity, whether it is an inclusive cosmopolitan identity or an exclusive identity with regard to others.

Analyzing the principles on which the EU is set, Ferry [7] identifies several elements of European cosmopolitanism as a community of citizens:

- European citizens recognize each other's fundamental rights

- European citizens build a multinational society together
- The European Union creates a good basis for creating transnational power
- Europeans create horizontal, not just vertical political integration, that is integration at the level of the non-governmental sector, and not between the member states
- Horizontal solidarity increases solidarity and takes place in the transnational community space
- The Cosmopolitan Union, however, is not a global democracy, because the national states retain their sovereignty, and the citizens have a dual identity, one connected with the national state, and another with the cosmopolitan Union. This means that member states respect both national and civil rights

In this concept, there is a place for national states, but also for horizontal political integration, which in the long run blurs the boundaries between them. Starting from the fact that there is no European nation, this concept insists on the creation of a European public discourse. Within this European public discourse, European public spheres are interconnected, allowing for the interaction between European societies and the creation of cosmopolitan consciousness [1]. Hence, Ulrich Beck talks about opening up the public sphere and transforming it from national to cosmopolitan. Horizontal Europeanization creates new forms of multilingualism, multinational networks, mixed marriages, multiresidential educational mobility, transnational careers, links between science and the economy [9].

However, the process of European integration set on the basis of cosmopolitanism according to Ferry [7] opens up a few dilemmas:

- Between citizenship and nationality. This opens up the idea of post-national citizenship
- Between people and nations. This opens up the idea of pluralizing citizens' identities
- Between the negative sovereignty (sovereignty of states) and positive sovereignty (the sovereignty of the union). This opens up the idea of mutual sovereignty
- Between international and transnational (cosmopolitan) law

Between the sovereignty of the member states and the authority of the bodies of the European Union.

5 COSMOPOLITISM AND NATIONALISM

The dichotomy between cosmopolitanism on the one hand and the nation, the nation state and nationalism on the other is obvious. The authors of the cosmopolitan concept like Ulrich Beck, for example, point to the negative influence of national states in the production of the two world wars, the

Holocaust, the development of nuclear weapons, etc. [16]. But he also points out that national states in Europe will better protect their national interests as part of the EU, rather than separately from one another. Cosmopolitanism as transnationalism, post-nationalism insists on trans-territorialism, ie. post territoriality. It is a field that confronts a nation-state based on national identity, national and state territory, national sovereignty and jurisdiction of managing public affairs [4].

Cosmopolitanism raises the question of the difference between the nation and the citizenry. It is clear that a nation of Europeans does not exist, but cosmopolitanism as they understand both Habermas and Beck should not insist on that, but on citizenship and the building of plural identities. At the same time, the fact that there is no nation of Europeans does not mean that EU citizens can not perceive themselves as Europeans as supra-national identities and at the same time be compatible with their national or regional identity. Studies by Schlenker show exactly this. There are two thirds of the respondents feel at the same time Europeans and citizens of the world, without losing their national identity. Plural identities is widespread in Europe in now days [13].

European cosmopolitanism is closely linked to the civil state and the transformation and reconstruction of European national identities into plural and multicultural identities. In a European context, it goes hand-in-hand with the recognition of minority rights and by raising the rights of those who have not yet acquired the citizenship of a given country. In response to such policies, the far right, both in Western and Eastern Europe, is growing. Even the most liberal European societies such as Germany have difficulty separating national identity from its rootedness in ethnic-historical roots [6]. This is best seen in the attitude towards migrants. The Schlenker survey results indicate that the general attitude towards migrants is negative, but particularly negative towards those with a different cultural identity from the European. In that sense, although the dominant attitude towards migrants from any region is negative, a migrant from Eastern Europe is more acceptable than from Africa. This puts doubt the declared cosmopolitanism, which among other things requires the acceptance of differences between individual cultures [13].

The competition between the perception of the EU from the perspective of cosmopolitanism on the one hand and the side of the national state and its sovereigns on the other is one of the central issues of the EU [1]. In that sense, in European societies there is a potential that opposes the cosmopolitan project. Thus, the unsuccessful referenda on the adoption of the European constitution in 2005 in the Netherlands and Denmark, and somewhat later in Ireland in 2008, Brexit from 2017 clearly indicates that the dominant public opinion has serious reservations over the European cosmopolitan project. In the Netherlands and Denmark by the supporters of cosmopolitan Europe, there were allegations that the non-acceptance of the European constitution was a result of the nationalist and xenophobic atmosphere created by anti-immigrant sentiments [16].

6 COSMOPOLITISM AND DEMOCRACY IN THE EU

The issue of cosmopolitan democracy in the scientific circles was opened in the 1990s. Thus, according to Archibugi (1995), the question of the democratization of transnational policies should be at the top of the agenda of the political issues to be addressed. Cosmopolitanism and democracy can go together. At the same time, cosmopolitan democracy is trying to implement cosmopolitan moral principles. Many issues of democratic governance are shifted from the national to the supranational level. There are different variants of institutional cosmopolitanism. One is proposed by Otfried Hoffe who is the advocate of the idea of forming a world federal state [2]. Another is proposal of Jurgen Habermas [3], which extends the perspective of cooperation between different power structures (regimes and government organizations), but not the world government [1].

Daniele Archibugi advocates the institutionalization of cosmopolitan rights, based on the global civil society and the global regulation of the economy [18]. Under this approach, cosmopolitan democracy studies the application of democratic norms and values at different levels: at local, national and global levels. Cosmopolitan democracy is trying to democratize the decision-making process that is traditionally reduced to national states and the workforce and employers. In that sense, the cosmopolitan democracy insists on the involvement of the civil sector and the public sphere in the decision-making process [1].

According to Held, cosmopolitan democracy should be based on the "cosmopolitan democratic right", which in turn takes into account the best legal traditions in the West [19]. According to Scheuerman, Held goes against the traditional concept of the rule of law [17]. Held on the one hand points out that cosmopolitan democracy will not be a hypercentralized planetary leviathan but also forgets that in that case it will not be able to bring justice for diversified culturally, religious and ethnic backgrounds. According to Held, the model of cosmopolitan democratic law, in addition to making decisions on a global scale, will have to leave room for decision-making at both local and national levels. Many in the EU see such a supranational, post-national institution that seeks to establish democratic legitimacy and an integrated rule of transnational space. However, it is precisely the institutions of the EU that are noted that they are characterized by a democratic deficit [4].

REFERENCES

- [1] Angelopoulou Maria (2012) A Cosmopolitan Approach to European Crisis; International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanity Studies; Vol. 4, No 2
- [2] Hoffe Otfried (2007) Democracy in the Age of Globalization, Berlin: Springer
- [3] Habermas Jurgen (2001) The postnational constellation, Political Essays, Cambridge: Polity Press
- [4] Parker Owen (2009) "Cosmopolitan Europe" and the EU-Turkey question: the politics of a "common destiny"; Journal of European Public Policy, 16:7, 1085-1101
- [5] Van Diesen Suzanne (2013) Cosmopolitanism and European

Identity; Master Thesis, Utrecht University

- [6] Kaufman Eric (2003) The Rise of the Cosmopolitanism in the 20th century West: a comparative historical on the United States and European Union; *Global Society*, 17 (4) 359-83
- [7] Ferry Jean-Mark (2011) Understanding the European Union in a cosmopolitan sense. What is Civic Participation?; European Conference: Closing the Empowerment gap through citizenship education. How to address educationally disadvantaged groups?; Warsaw, Poland
- [8] Parker Owen (2009) "Cosmopolitan Europe" and the EU Turkey Question: the politics of a "common destiny"; *Journal of European Public Policy* 16:7, 1085-1101
- [9] Beck Ulrich (2005 A) Re-Inventing Europe: A Cosmopolitan Vision, Talk given at The Centre de CulturaContemporania de Barcelona on 27th October 2005
- [10] Beck Ulrich (2005 B) Power and the Global Age; Cambridge/Oxford: Polity Press/Blackwell
- [11] Beck Ulrich (2006) *Cosmopolitan Europe*; Cambridge: Polity Press
- [12] Beck Ulrich and Grande Edgar (2007) Cosmopolitanism, Europe's Wey Out of Crisis; *European Journal of Social Theory*; Vol. 10, No. 1, pp 67-85
- [13] Schlenker Andrea (2011) Cosmopolitan Europeans of Partisans of Fortress Europe? Supra-National Identity Patterns in EU; Paper Presented at the ECPR Conference, University of Reykjavik, 26th August 2011
- [14] Nussbaum Marta (1997) Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism; *Journal of Political Philosophy*; Vol. 5, No. 1, pp 1-25
- [15] Lupel Adam (2005) Tasks of a Global Civil Society: Held, Habermas and Democratic Legitimacy beyond the National State; *Globalizations*; Vol.2, No. 1
- [16] Hansen Peo (2009) Post- National Europe - without cosmopolitan guarantees; *Race and Class*, Vol. 50, No. 4, pp 22-37
- [17] Scheuerman E. William (2002) Cosmopolitan Democracy and the Rule of Law; *Ration Joris*, Vol. 15, No.4
- [18] Archibugi Daniele (1995) From the United Nations to Cosmopolitan Democracy In Daniele Archingugi and David Held, *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order*; Cambridge: Polity
- [19] Held David (2000) The Changing Contours of Political Community: Rethinking Democracy in the Context of Globalization; In *Democracies Edges*, Ed Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cordon; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [20] Parker Owens (2010) The Limits of Deliberative Cosmopolitanism: The Case of "New Governance" in the EU; Centre of Study of Globalization and Regionalization, University of Warwick
- [21] Gaspere M. Genna, Haakerson O. Thomas and Wilson W. Ian (2000) Jurgen Habermas and European Economic Crisis: Cosmopolitanism Reconsideres