



Notes and News

“Cosmopolitan Democracy / Kosmopolitische Demokratie”

10th International Course *Philosophy and Democracy / Philosophie und Demokratie*

Dubrovnik, 30 August – 4 September 2015

Democracy and philosophy have always been interconnected by appearing at the same time on the territory of ancient Greece and trying to resolve the issues of freedom, justice, equality and the organization of political life of citizens along the centuries. Their relationship, of course, has not always been idyllic since they were in constant mutual reconsideration and criticism (in terms of Greek *kritein*). Ever since Solon had set up the principles of democracy and had opened the principal assembly (Greek *ἐκκλησία*) to all male citizens (with the only condition of having two years of military service), Plato criticized democracy (in *Politeia*) for being an inferior form of rules due to its tendency to undermine expertise necessary to properly govern on behalf of experts in manipulation and mass appeal. Democracy is seen as a system of government that can hardly focus on the common good and is even not likely to fulfil basic conditions for its realization (e.g. to allow all the citizens to have their voices heard). Even today, when we can no longer talk about the type of democracy that existed in ancient Athens, this productive criticism is still ongoing: philosophers question possibilities of further development of modern democracy (realist analysis), question its principles (normative aspect) and its current reality. One of the places suitable for these types of discussions was the international course *Philosophy and Democracy / Philosophie und Demokratie* organized by the Inter-University Centre in Dubrovnik for the last 10 years.

In that period, this project focused directly on reflecting democracy from the perspective of philosophy as the only possible line of sight for monitoring the development of the entirety of knowledge. In so doing, a series of narrow topics was elaborated: from consideration of the freedom–justice relationship, over deliberative democracy and questions of positioning Europe in the theory of democracy, to cosmopolitan democracy which was the topic of the last conference. In this way, with 47 philosophers and political scientists from 16 countries cooperating, an entirety of current debates on democracy was completed. Therewith the organizers, academician prof. Henning Ottmann and prof. Pavo Barišić tried to show both the relevance of philosophical reflection in the world today and critically evaluate the potential and reality of modern democracy. The structure of the course provided by the Inter-University Centre enabled focused dealing with certain aspects of the annual topics without getting lost in their broadness and without strictly limited time intervals, as it

is unfortunately the case, for practical reasons, with most other conferences. In addition, by means of realization of the program in English and German the highest possible level of joint discussions among local and foreign participants has been achieved.

In the opening lecture of the last course, titled "Kosmopolitische Demokratie", Henning Ottmann pointed out how the idea of the cosmopolitan democracy was developed by David Held and Ulrich Beck in the 1990s. This idea was the result of a search for the third route between the right and the left solutions for social democracy. This third route was also, as considered in the theories of globalization, tantamount to the notion of the global democracy, which is in the focus of contemporary discussions in the field of theories of democracy and history. As the Course Director, Henning Ottmann also presented a wide range of topics, which were supposed to be the focus of this course: from ideas of global governance and world state to ideas of world republic, experience with cosmopolitanism and dangers of the imperial rule in the new political constellation.

Pavo Barišić, also the Course Director, highlighted that our idea of cosmopolitan democracy arose under completely different historical and political circumstances than the very first notions of democracy and cosmopolitanism born in the ancient Greece. Our idea, even though etymologically grounded in the ancient Greek and associated to those notions, originated from our contemporary experience: omnipresent globalization and predominant concept of liberal democracy. To clarify its meaning, Barišić focused on its two major points: democratization of global politics and globalization of democracy. Positioning cosmopolitan democracy (with a special focus on its soft variant), in relation to the aforementioned, shed light on its role and place in the spectrum of international political relations. Barišić also took into consideration objections and controversies, as well as the limits of possible implementation of the present theories of cosmopolitan democracy, world government and global governance.

In addition to these differences in the political world organization, Mislav Kukoč stressed the difference in the ideological naming of what we see as global unification and/or linkage. On the one hand, we have globalization which is understood as objective reality with all its positive and negative aspects. On the other hand, we have globalism as a doctrine and ideology of unity and interdependence of the whole world (in opposition to particular identities presented in the idea of modern nation state) and as a code for neo-liberal policies directed from the world power centres. Unlike a similar notion of cosmopolitanism that points out cultural identity of the pre-national "citizen of the world" and the notion of internationalism as ideological concept of the revolutionary brotherhood of nations, globalism is based on economic, informational and intellectual connection and dependence at the global level in the imaginary post-state constellation. The idea of globalism, Kukoč warns, (ideologically) can be based both on western hegemony (either cultural or of any other kind), or on ideas of socialist internationalism that, as history has proved, were used as a fig leaf for the Russian hegemony. In any case, it is about opening the place for hegemony, because of what cosmopolitanism, besides differing to patriotism, can also successfully be positioned opposed to both internationalism and globalism in general.

Although cosmopolitanism thus appears as a way to address political problems that elude the limitations of national states in situations where international economic and political reality have a significant role, the question

arises not only of its position within the framework of modern international political theory, but also with regards to the consequences that it brings to the carriers of political rights. Christo Todorov, who has dealt with the question of the carriers and the meaning of responsibility in cosmopolitan democracy, has pointed this out. Olga Simova has carried on in his wake, who, in the wake of David Held, one of the central carriers of the modern idea of cosmopolitan democracy, problematizes the relationship between constitutionalism and democracy, as well as the trends of spreading democracy: on the one hand, horizontally beyond the national boundaries of a modern democratic state, and on the other hand, vertically, through the deepening of democracy in an individual political community through the introduction of its principles throughout society. This discussion, conceived as a questioning of Held's arguments and a dialogue with the current authors, is a hypothesis of the evaluation of the normative field of the project of cosmopolitan democracy.

Stjepan Radić also began from the normative content of the concept of cosmopolitan democracy that made him confront reality: while on the one hand the idea of cosmopolitanism romantically asserts the importance of openness, tolerance and empathy, Radić noticed that in practice they are often used as a justification for cultural and moral relativism. The question that then preoccupies him is in what way, departing from the position of communitarianism, can we connect particular communities of a concrete political community and the universal canonical value system. Are they necessarily in conflict, as per moral relativists, or can they exist in a conditioned relationship seeing as universal values must be set in concrete societal values, and basic values must have a universal nature? In his problematization, Radić relies on Charles Taylor, whose theory is analysed in more detail by Hasnije Ilazi.

Ilazi discussed modernity as a secular age and phenomena of religious expansion within the modern secular societies. Starting points for this discussion were the understanding of the relationship between secularism and self-identity on the one hand, and relationship between individual and collective identity in the scope of new reaffirmation of the religion as a way of life on the other. More closely, Ilazi discussed impacts of globalization on contemporary identities, including the aforementioned phenomena of popularization of religious life.

Examination of possibilities of the theoretical concept within the new context of globalization is what Marita Brčić Kuljiš also focused on in her paper titled "Cosmopolitan Distributive Justice: Globalizing Rawls". Brčić Kuljiš examined Rawls' principles of distributive justice applicable in the context of the cosmopolitan democracy. Even though Rawls himself related distributive justice to a specific and limited political community (within the state borders), Brčić Kuljiš argues that in the current age of globalization our responsibility towards foreigners (the term covering all those who are not part of our political community) should not include only the need for humanitarian assistance, but the new idea of a global distributive justice as well.

On the other hand, Sulejman Bosto discussed Ulrich Beck's concept of cosmopolitan realism. More precisely, Bosto's contribution dealt with conceptual and empirical tensions between cosmopolitisation of a living environment and life practices on the one hand, and grounding of the political within ethnocentrism and state borders on the other. By questioning both the myth of communitarianism and self-misunderstanding of the methodological nationalism, Beck's idea is seen as an alternative to old political paradigms of nationalism, socialism, communism, and neoliberalism, as well as of utopian

cosmopolitanism. As such, it can be taken into consideration as a reference framework or a possible new paradigm for resolving the issue of the conditions of possibility of a new world politics.

Klaus-Gerd Giesen kept the same direction discussing different approaches to extrapolation of democratic decision-making at the global level. With specific focus on the relationship between democracy and legitimacy and rights, Giesen noted that not only so-called globalists and followers of the idea of cosmopolitan democracy, but also the Tübingen School, are critical of the idea of the world republic. More closely, the position and change of the political role of the concept of rights was in the centre of Hans-Otto Muhleisen's lecture. Focusing on human rights specifically, Muhleisen analyzed their role in the context of discursive theory of global democracy.

Karl-Heinz Nusser went even further discussing ideas of world state and world governance. While Kant rejected the notion of a global state as tyrannical, new context (including new ecological, economic, and other dangers for the humanity as a whole) requires reactualisation of this idea. Nusser, however, argued that the notion of a world state, as the only way to solve the current supranational problems, is not true. Quite the opposite, he sees the current existence of individual states as an insurance against possible world state tyranny. A possibility to monitor each other as a nation state in a reciprocal fashion is what, in Nusser's opinion, really assures democratic relations. As an argument in his favour, Nusser pointed out concrete consequences of nation states' agreements and cooperation, e.g. that the UN Security Council prevented several military confrontations among the world's greatest powers. Therefore, rather than thinking about supranational political organs, maybe we should focus on benefits that the current kind of political organization has to offer. Hrvoje Jurić continued the discussion about the global democracy and global rule finding ideas of the American poet and thinker Walt Whitman to be interestingly instructive in this debate. Jurić presented Whitman's notion of *concrete humanism* and pointed out his opinion that the United States are supposed to be the crucial subject in implementing goals of the global democracy. Despite his advocacy of Americanity, which of course must take into consideration conditions of developing his thought, Jurić showed that Whitman was highly influenced by the concept of cosmopolitan patriotism as well.

Understanding the implications of the cosmopolitan idea on the legal nature of political communities' organization was in the focus of Anita Lunić's paper as well. Confronting Dummett's and Gibney's understanding of the right to citizenship, as well as the difference between the notion of the first class and second class citizen, Lunić presented current discussions on the right to citizenship with reference to the current migration crisis.

Anita Lunić