

# Rethinking International Relations in Times of Global Crisis

## — The Cosmopolitan Approach

Vera Spyrakou

*(Panteion University of Social and Political Studies, Athens, Greece)*

**Abstract:** This article examines the role of cosmopolitan international theory as a factor to formulate International Relations in a demanding globalized co-existence; this article focuses on the case of European institutional and political identity within the features of cosmopolitanism regarding its values and an updated political interpretation. Furthermore, the article examines whether a transformation of “state sovereignty” is possible and in which framework, European “demos” within the revolution of global citizenship, narratives as basic components of the post-national era in international politics, thus aims to bring in the fore a recent discussion which implicates both European and International politics and the crucial role of citizens in times of crisis, as an opportunity of a changing point in the political order.

**Key words:** cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitan international theory, European identity, global citizenship

### 1. Introduction

The challenge of cosmopolitanism in International Relations as well as an updated international theory based on European studies and political science, is in combination with the theory of neo-republicanism and the neo-institutional approach, a theoretical turning point, which approaches and confirms this evolutionary phenomenon; despite the difficulty overcoming mental and practical limitations that prejudices the impossibility of its implementation, at least with the currently available institutional and legal framework. Based on the above description of modern reality, Kant’s writings and the inherently cosmopolitan nature of the EU brings in the fore rethinking the appropriate way to confront the pre-constitutional quality values on which a similar multiculturalism, such as that of the EU, can be built, or, as Chryssochoou points, an “organized synergy” in an ongoing process between states and citizens.

The rediscovery of cosmopolitan international theory, then, emerges as of a critical dual importance: as a tool in itself for understanding the complex theoretical connections — in the context of international theory and supranational relations — of the prospective political developments of the modern form of the EU, as well as by trying to predict the required practical applications and revisions have to be held in order to operate more effectively in an institutional and socio-economic global context, as Chryssochoou argues “even today, Kant’s cosmopolitan design invites research to exploit the perspective of a “transcendental” ethical philosophy of

---

Vera Spyrakou, Ph.D. in International, European and Regional Studies, Panteion University of Social and Political Studies; research areas: European identity, European politics, constitutional patriotism, cosmopolitan international theory. E-mail: [vera.spyrakou@gmail.com](mailto:vera.spyrakou@gmail.com).

international relations, proposing a peaceful system of sovereign relations” (Chryssochoou, 2010, p. 66) and that Kantian thought mainly contributed to cosmopolitanism of its latent historically and sociologically value, remaking it one of the most fertile fields of critical thinking regarding the international regulatory discourse in terms of political science and philosophy.

The discussion is also linked to the notion of “moral interest” in conjunction with ethics, of which interest is the position of Habermas, who has argued that ethics is a “constituent science”. Moreover, when he had been asked about ethical theory as it is perceived from the scientific fields and about how it works in relation to other theories regarding its practical application to the behavior of actors and its dynamics in contrast to social theories, he answered as follows:

“Morality certainly has to do with justice and the well-being of others, even with the promotion of general well-being. [...] Ethical theory proceeds reconstructively, in other words after a celebration. Aristotle was right when he said that the moral insights explained by the theory must have been acquired elsewhere. Nevertheless, I would like to see a critical theory that would make enlightening interpretations of situations that affect our self-understanding and guide us to action” (Habermas, 1987, pp. 125-127).

In the academic debate, the search for a critical space, in the logic of an evolving familiar political will, the formation of a “European state’ unity in relation to the pre-existence of a European “Demos” is observed profoundly and as a result it brings to the forefront of the political theory and European epistemology the possible transformations of the classical “state sovereignty” into a participatory perception of a common sharing of political power at the supranational level, even in terms of global governance. The discussion takes on the dimensions of an undoubtedly interesting theoretical research framework, which is called upon to answer the question *quo vadis Europa*, thus to discover those methods which will successively endure such theoretical approaches that are questioned even rejected by the globalized whole and the evolution of the international co-existence, consequently alongside offering a fairly wide field of theoretical and epistemological discourse in times of global crises.

## **2. The EU Interrelations’ Case as a Paradigm to Be Extended — The Impact of Cosmopolitanism**

Reconnecting European integration and its supranational impact with cosmopolitanism is crucial quest to clarify the hitherto drawbacks and prejudices about the EU’s institutional power, thus an indicative approach regarding the ongoing procedure its citizens to be highly included; in other words to be closer and open to the citizens, therefore in Politics, containing examples from the past, as well as an symbolic paradigm within values and institutional legitimacy on the field of identity politics. However, on the basis of which we are called to cover this constitutional cosmopolitan perspective logically, so that its continuation does not seek the declared existence of a restrictive political systemic continuity, this phenomenon has to be perceived as a condition which even couldn’t be transformed into a state, executes and cooperates with a post-national view to the prevalence of a horizontal and heterogeneous cooperation between member-states, and indicates its evolution as a democratic legal identity Furthermore, its supranational features within the cosmopolitan impact do not regret against the difficulty of its formation, but recognizes it, with the same ease as Human and Individual Rights, International Law and the individual and cosmopolitan values co-exist independently of national, multinational, socio-economical and geographical diversities; otherwise a conjoint law, which regulates important spheres of

everyday life and thus creates a common perspective about peoples' interaction (Preuß, in Van der Walt et al., 2015, p. 22).

The hitherto analysis of cosmopolitanism regarding to the distinction of international theory into a revolutionary philosophical formation, according to Wight, was one of the reasons that an upcoming "cosmopolitan democracy" in practice, appears likewise a precarious and utopian expectation without substance (Wight, 2011, pp. 90–91). However, it should be considered the nature of the organizational framework of the EU's operation is characteristic of the cosmopolitan Kantian view, with a common direction in the conduct of legal acts, which is due to "moral liberalism" as well as "economic liberalism" with a transnational foreign policy resonance. As Lavdas notes,

"[...] the global multicultural dimension of liberalism offers substantial opportunities to shape the building blocks of new, supranational state models, if possible, as the factors influencing the proposed institutional arrangements reflect complex democratic and not just technological or economical parameters" (Lavdas, 2015, p. 335).

The continuing search for a universal interpretive thesis through the plethora of theoretical approaches that take place at the academic level and beyond, in contrast to the expectation of clarification of an internally multifaceted phenomenon, leads the discussion to questionable outcomes as well to nullifying positions. Besides the fact, the cosmopolitan approach could be seen in the historical turning points of European integration, which shaped its political identity as it is perceived in modern times could also become the political shift in the international relations during critical times.

### **3. Values, Citizenship and Crisis – The Cosmopolitanism's Regulatory Framework**

The view of the European participatory status of the citizen remains a question, as a springboard for the acquisition of rights in the wider ecumenical context in question. European identity, as the delimited diagnosis of rights and obligations within the EU, holds a strong position in the field of international relations; either as a state or as an inherently political form that the European example can take. Nevertheless, the dimension of a pluralistic notion is only a pre-procedural method of the subsequent development of the institutional factors that, to date, such a political dynamic underlies. The debate on "transnational identity", therefore a transcendental or otherwise, evolved-expanded national identity, within a supranational community, inevitably confirms that European identity is not the answer, but certainly the preparation of the framework which response could prevail regarding the evolution of the social progress as a multicultural whole, but also of the evolution of the concept of citizenship and the delimitation of the rights and obligations of its bearers. It is appropriate to clarify at this point the 'post-democracy' narrative in the field, thus the use of the term here is made with the margin of philosophical reflection on the evolution of the democratic institution that the interpretation of the concept itself predisposes and allows, when there is a set of factors with institutional and value background, as in the concept of European politics and state identity.

Social discontinuity is reflected in political weakness. Cultures, as innumerable and at the same time as the variables of common humanity, are not the non-common battlefield for the consolidation of a state or a city, or in this case the EU. economic and - according to the national sovereign model of cooperation — political power. Consequently, a common "language", transnational and attached to the promotion of values and the bearers of these values. A set of processes quite convincing in the emergence of European identity on the basis of a universal

common sense, the identification of the value and institutional framework, beyond the distributive contradictions, in terms of social and economic power, as the dominant structures for the creation of any transnational community.

Habermas describes as a “transnational constellation” the framework for the formation of new political forms whose purpose, through their discovery and development, is to be coordinated in an ever-evolving international environment in parallel with the also constantly evolving European modernization urging the need for this new post-democratic metamorphosis. It states that “in order to respond rationally to the challenges of globalization, we must develop new forms of democratic self-government in the transnational constellation”, taking into account the arguments of pro- and anti-EU approaches, “the European Union as the first form of transnational democracy” (Habermas, 2003).

According to Delanty, the transnational citizenship cannot be understood as an acquired constitutional right alone. In particular, it states that the concept of transnational identity must “include in the important dimension of the possibility of citizen participation in the democratic state [...] must be the most important basis for legitimacy for the construction of new institutions and not be identified with some vague cultural identities” (Delanty, 2010, p. 247).

On the other hand, but equally reflective on the course of a democratic Europe, as well as democracy as a field of revisionist skepticism, the term also responds to Crouch, who speaks of a “decline” of the representative democratic institution, highlighting the shortcomings and misunderstandings, intentional or not, in the context of the reproduction of different political ideologies and results, that is a negative approach that does not affect the transnational identity, which does not expose the national element but can rearrange it, in a context of multiple identities and identities. Tsatsos, for Crouch’s “post-democracy”, as a negative description of the relationship between citizens and institutional actors, states that Crouch uses the intention “after...” to refer to the decline of democracy, the detachment of the procedures followed and the implementation of the system, that is the great economic and social choices (Tsatsos, 2010, p. 217, as cited in Chryssochoou, 2017, p. 223). In this conception, is through politics, institutions and citizens that the self-establishment of society is the first step to its emancipation and maturation as the main feature of democracy, recognizing that the problems posed by the vulnerability democratic procedures; however democracy is only a dynamic impetus for reformative forms of “institutionalizing democracy” at the state in national level and consequently at supranational framework confronted as we are with multiple EU and global crises.

#### **4. Cosmopolitanism — The Absence of Constitutional Identity**

Constitutional patriotism and cosmopolitan theory are two theoretical shapes that reflect each other and seem to intersect in statehood and legal culture. In other words, where constitutional patriotism does not conclude its features according to Habermas approach, a cosmopolitan state universality emerges and evolves by bringing in the discussion Kant's third definitive article. The Habermas critical thought, distinct from the Kantian cosmopolitan model, develops a dynamic of revision of international law and its transformation into a constitutional cosmopolitan principle, outlining the need to meet the challenges facing the Europe during an increasingly need to go further in cooperation with United States. The crucial point to find out the theoretical and functional way out of the two correlations, shouldn't be the international social and political participation of citizens in issues of global importance and the simultaneous settlement of any legal deficiencies that arise in an

undeniably wide public sphere? This is a question that arises and refers as well in the lack of enrollment of the citizens and civil societies' participation in global matters, likewise climate change, pandemics (Demertzis & Eyerman, 2020) poverty, discrimination and violation of human dignity, terrorism among others (Beck, 2016). In the same point of thinking, Nussbaum argues of a "wider patriotism with global sensibilities" giving rise to a cosmopolitan consciousness with state characteristics equally conscious and secured in a national, supranational and consequently multinational space. A patriotism of empathy and international law in security and peace, the joint treatment of poverty regardless of origin, if not with the same ending as the form of a quite "personified" patriotism which reminds but is not similar that of Gandhi, then certainly with the same strategy of persuasive solidarity, which is based on constitutional values rather on exemplification through sacrifice. The reasonable question that appears necessary for the debate to continue is not solely to discover new forms of governance methods and legitimacy channels, either with a view to reviving past forms or by promoting them, but mostly within the specific institutional framework; given the fact of examples like the European co-existence within drawbacks and policies to be reviewed, could bridge the gap between citizens representing democratic authorities and their representation in a global level.

#### **4.1 Why Europe and the World Need Cosmopolitanism — The Transnational Normative Based on Law and Ethics**

A crucial hypotheses: given the fact that law, in this case European law, is seen as the evolution of the already existing legal identity of Western civilization-polycentric constitutional system, establishing state and national status of participation in transnational politics, perhaps in the same sphere should be sought forms of safe evolution of organizations like the EU, thus covering the gaps of conceptual and semantic-symbolic origin, which, although they can be answered according to the sociological theoretical point of view, composing a more comprehensive picture of the thorough and progressive treatment of phenomena concerning the world community, have not yet been identified. From this point of view, the EU meets and functions only as the "political laboratory" of evolving forms of review compositions at political and legal level, according to which the "point of convergence" corresponds to the ethical-international rule of coexistence of the parties and the acceptance of a collective identity having an impact on the world community, regardless of differences in the field of sociological symbolism, while given the western type of political philosophical identity as the predominant, but also as the one that recognizes Law as an inherent and integral element for the future of human nature and not only, values as an integral institutional tool of rational coexistence by Western standards and the judiciary as the highest peace dynamic, the EU in particular is the preparatory of universal Treaties. Within which, the experimental stage of an inter-state type of transnational agreement is carried out, the main feature of which is multilateralism and the emergence of new norms of governance.

A cosmopolitan Europe, in the context of the universal promotion of human values and rights, is a symbolically and practically dynamic regulatory framework on the basis of which international relations can be organized and seek better and closer cooperation within a pluralistic policy with a universal sign. But this raises questions as to whether and to what extent belief in an international human rights statute is sufficient to secure the union's cosmopolitan policy, even if cosmopolitanism as the critical theory embodying these values can to confront the opposing "echoes" in the context of an alignment that, if it does not replace the nation-state, it certainly revises.

Beck and Grande describe this as the "universal dilemma", referring to the braking of an EU's increasingly

cosmopolitan nature with respect for basic human rights, which here, however, do not seem to be enough, despite the facts, and they distinguish in addition, the “integration dilemma” as an inherent feature of the EU’s historical and political nature in responding to the process of balancing “unity with diversity”, the “insecurity dilemma” in the global cooperation in dealing with external attacks and consequently the boundary dilemma of European territory, but also the dilemma of achieving peace and self-limitation in the perception of avoiding the repetition of horrific historical memories as well as the modern perception of achieve it (Beck & Grande, 2007).

The peoples of Europe play an important role in the very course of parallel patriotism and their European perspective, in the sense of a bilateral synthesis of cooperation and common pursuit of an organization whose main concern is universal values that do not at all arise in one and all more precarious world landscape. The EU political leap presupposes widespread acceptance as a patriotic element of belief in a common constitutional identity — as opposed to the trick of unconditional solidarity which presupposes the understanding and continuing education of citizens in a multinational European education policy framework with universal value background — and yet the EU’s national political and institutional bases are not decisive enough for such an achievement, but they certainly do not have a deterrent effect either. As a two-way relationship that requires two parties in parallel coordination, action and response, in this case legitimization and control takes significant time - practically and institutionally in order to mature the new structures of international cooperation that are activated either through crises or as a coordinated special development of states, while the concept of reaction is contained and constitutes the psychological framework of citizens’ perception and response to their demands from the EU as a whole. Leonard writes about the importance of Europe in the modern world, especially for those outside the EU, as “more convinced than ever of its necessity”, noting moments of the world (Leonard, 2006) and this an undoubtable factor for the international framework.

## 5. Summarizing

This theoretical composition thus rethinking cosmopolitanism’s values within the international sphere of a complex synthesis of transnational policies to be taken in order to deal with global crises which seeks a thorough understanding of the appropriate structure; that is gradually evolving into new sociological and political forms, while the problem of lacking common dynamic sense and influence as the institutional and legal, strengthens the mechanisms of an unstable conquest as a political consequence of an integrated political society.

An important reason for consolidating integration according to the (neo) republican model of cooperation is the values and beliefs, direct or indirect, that is the political culture of all European citizens, mainly on the basis of the right to vote which is not exercised and is not formalized in its core as a common act of participatory democratic behavior, but as a voluntary or secondary dynamic-participation in the consolidated democratic representation of national political interests. They also emerge directly dependency as choices as a consequence of the political behavior of one nation towards another that similarly emerges as either undemocratic or Eurosceptic, again due to a comparative perception of European identity in place of a prerequisite understanding of the sphere of a multifaceted attribute. connecting rather than separatist, according to modern social demands and problems. This critical element of European identity emerges as the lack of emotions likewise the national identity verifies that could repair institutional gaps in the union, as well the functional asymmetries, such as non-district united electoral compatibility between Member States, thus as regulatory shortcomings of state in the case of citizens outside European territory; these are features of democracy which, in the course of European integration are

overshadowed by the possibility of multilevel co-operation at supranational and international level, nevertheless the most efficient example for international relationships and global politics.

Nussbaum starting point of this perspective is the moral courage, as a recognition that is the basic energy of “universal citizenship” another “broader patriotism”, which, as it seems, only European communities could perform, as the evolution and completion of governance at another level. That is a universal identity of the transnational citizenship and of the legal and institutional character of the EU itself. Structural dependencies and issues with disproportionate treatment of the dynamic identity, hitherto devalued or limited according to the Western model, in contrast to its instrumental and empirical dimension that corresponds to the value and legal facts so it prepares the “global citizenship”. However, the necessity for a theoretical conception of the appropriate example of supranational status and governance as well for the rationalization of democratic processes through a participatory conscience, within a common starting point of human values; through the exercise of political will on the structures of this global community but with inherent elements of state structure and legal cosmopolitan reference. At the same time, it has a common past of values, but in which either the effect of citizen’s participation is insufficient because of the institutional gaps which are communicated at different levels of EU policy, resulting in the absence of a participatory and stable interaction between institutions and citizens, in other words overcome the “syndrome of civic privatism” that is encouraging citizens to meet the demands of citizenship and acquire the virtues beyond its national introversion (Kymlicka, 2005, pp. 412–413).

Consequently, it refers to the creation of structures of social-political-interaction, as a sequence of the construction and the co-existence of the European identities. As a result of this dialectical relationship, theoretical issues arise regarding institutional boundaries, the evolution of the EU’s relationship of parallel patriots, the broader functional framework of the legitimation of transnational citizenship according to the constitutional and cosmopolitan value system, but possible an evolution of forms of multilevel governance on progress. These political co-formations at institutional and value level are cultivated in the European political project of self-determination as a instrument of legal argument in the form of the inherent consequence of the construction of identity over the whole of a pluralistic multi-identity conciliation; appears more than ever that lacking of this perception in the international politics a changing and overcoming multiple crisis’ point endures the misunderstanding between nations-states on the global community (Harris, 2009) thus remains a consisting problem to be solved regarding how to deal with problems that in final analysis concerns the whole human community: European citizens and nor, national and transnational governance and its effective cooperation in front of common problematic areas.

## References

- Beck U. and Grande E. (2007). *Cosmopolitan Europe*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Beck U. (2016). *The Metamorphosis of the World: How Climate Change Is Transforming Our Concept of the World*, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Delanty G. (2005). “The idea of a cosmopolitan Europe: On the cultural significance of Europeanization”, *International Review of Sociology — Revue Internationale de Sociologie*, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 405–421.
- Delanty G. (2010). *Inventing Europe: Idea, Identity, Reality*, London: Springer, translated in Greek as *Epinowntas tin Europi: Idea, Tautotita, Pragmatikotita*, Athens: Ekdoseis Asini.
- Demertzis N. and Eyerman R. (2020). “Covid-19 as cultural trauma”, *American Journal of Cultural Sociology*, Vol. 8, No. 36, pp. 1–23.
- Habermas J. (1986). *Autonomy and Solidarity: Interviews With Jürgen Habermas*, Verso, translated in Greek as *Autonomia kai allilegui*, Athens: Ekdoseis Ypsilon.

- Habermas J. (1996). "The European nation-state: Its achievements and its limitations — On the past and future of sovereignty and citizenship", *Ratio Juris*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 125–137.
- Habermas J. (2003). "Making sense of the EU: Toward a cosmopolitan Europe", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 14, No. 4, pp. 86–100.
- Harris P. G. (2009). *World Ethics and Climate Change: From International to Global Justice*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kymlicka W. (2005). *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, translated in Greek as *H Politiki Philosophia tis epochis mas*, Athens: Polis.
- Λάβδας Κ. Α. (2015). *Liberalism of the Citizens: Evolutionary Quest With Republican Compass*, Athens: Papazisis.
- Leonard M. (2006). *Why Europe Will Run the 21st Century*, London: Fourth Estate, translated in Greek as *21os: O Aiwnas Tis Europis*. Athens: Kritiki.
- Nicolaïdis K. (2004). "The new constitution as European 'demoi-cracy'?", *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp. 76–93.
- Nussbaum M. C. (2008). "Toward a globally sensitive patriotism", *Daedalus*, Vol. 137, No. 3, pp. 78–93.
- Preuß U. K. (2015). "Revisiting the rationale behind the European Union — The basis of European narratives today and tomorrow", in: Van der Walt J. & Ellsworth J. (Eds.), *Constitutional Sovereignty and Social Solidarity in Europe*, Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG., pp. 193–220.
- Τσάτσος Δ. Θ. (2010). *Polity*. Athens: Ekdoseis Gavriilidis, translated in Greek as *Πολιτεία*, Αθήνα: Εκδόσεις Γαβριηλίδης.
- Φραγκονικολόπουλος, Χ. Α. και Προέδρου, Φ. (2010). *The Democratization of Global Governance: An Introduction in Cosmopolitan Democracy*, Athens: I. Sideris, translated in Greek as *Ο Εκδημοκρατισμός της Παγκόσμιας Διακυβέρνησης: Μία Εισαγωγή στην Κοσμοπολιτική Δημοκρατία*, Αθήνα: Ι. Σιδέρης.
- Weiler J. H. (1995). "Does Europe need a constitution? Demos, telos and the German Maastricht decision", *European Law Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 251–253.
- Wight M. (2011). *International Theory: The Three Traditions*, translated in Greek as *Diethnis Theoria: ta tria reumata skepsis*. Athens: Poiotita.
- Χρυσόχου Δ. Ν. (2007). "Europe as Synarchy", *Greek Review of Political Science*, Vol. 30, pp. 43–74, translated in Greek as "Η Ευρώπη ως συναρχία", *Ελληνική Επιθεώρηση Πολιτικής Επιστήμης*.
- Χρυσόχου Δ. Ν. (2017). *Politics: A Conceptualization*, Athens: I. Sideris, translated in Greek as *Πολιτική: Μία εννοιολογία*, Αθήνα: Ι. Σιδέρης.