A Cosmopolitan Perspective of Multi-level Governance in Europe

Léonce Bekemans*

«I would like to live in this kind of cosmopolitan Europe, one in which people have roots and wings». (Ulrich Beck)

Premises

The European integration process is to date the world's most advanced post-national constellation of states. As such it has become a laboratory for scholars and philosophers of political theory and international relations interested in studying and developing workable models of supranational and/or global and multi-level governance. Prominent among these scholars are those who view the European Union from a cosmopolitan perspective, analysing integration for its potential to realise a cosmopolitan Europe in which the concept of citizenship is crucial.

The new postmodern conceptualisation of governance, citizenship and dialogue in international/global relations requires a multiplicity of citizenship (i.e. post-nationalism), a recognition of diverse and multiple identities (i.e. multiculturalism and interculturalism) and a citizens' participation on all levels of sovereignty (i.e. transnationalism). On the other hand, the growing awareness of the need for global knowledge and global management to realise global goods and the recognition of a shared future favour the interest in universal values and the institutional expression of global norms.

The current multidimensional process of globalisation has a paradoxical impact on external and internal relations of states. The dominant spatial paradigm of territoriality and identity building is being undermined by globalising forces. This paradigm has placed boundaries around some of the most fundamental characteristics of the modern world, notably

* Jean Monnet Chair «Globalisation, Intercultural Dialogue and Inclusiveness in the EU» and academic coordinator of the Jean Monnet European Centre of Excellence «Intercultural Dialogue, Human Rights and Multi-level Governance» at the University of Padua.

community, nationality, identity and citizenship. Still the power of the territorial narrative remains strong through the re-emergence of communal, nationalist and ethnic identities, the misconceived interpretation of sovereignty and the exclusive focus of locally-based communities for sustaining social solidarity. In sum, the globalising world is characterised by some asymmetry between the growing extra-territorial nature of power and the continuing territoriality of the ways in which people live their everyday lives. Its seemingly contradictory nature reveals new opportunities for institutional structures along with new forms of politics and civility and, as a consequence, offers a reading of the process of European integration from a cosmopolitan perspective.

The history of the European integration process shows a development from a (neo) functional, utilitarian and largely economic project to a more complex and mixed political undertaking, set in a globalising context and today based on the institutional structure of the Treaty of Lisbon. The first decades of the European integration process functioned on the political paradigm of the Westphalian system. A democratic approach to international life outside of the national borders was not at all required. There was equality between nationality, identity and citizenship. The Treaty of Maastricht (1992) brakes down that linear perspective and establishes a political framework for a broader and deeper integration of European states and regions. In addition to consolidating the single market and opening the way for greater cooperation on internal and external affairs, it introduced the concept of «European citizenship», i.e. a «common citizenship» applied to «many nationalities» and covering a multiplicity of identities.

Such a broadly defined European citizenship does, however, not replace national citizenship but rather complements it. Moreover, it enhances the legitimacy of the process and promotes a stronger European identity. It is claimed that European citizenship provides equal access to the individual-based legal status of union citizenship to all nationals, and universal civic protection to all nationals and residents, and this is to translate into a transcendent European identity. It also means that an active citizenship can develop within a new framework, not that of a closed state on a limited territory, but open beyond national borders and respecting diversities.

Europe is therefore evolving towards a social and political body in which one will be able to distinguish a common European citizenship, multiple state and regional citizenships and governance structures, within which there exists a growing awareness of multiple and different cultural identities.

Europe is indeed involved in favouring the development of a «trans-national democracy». The process of European integration strongly contributes to changing the mentality and conception of the state system. The role of the state becomes less essential in many sectors of economic life through the «supranational» transfer of decision-making powers to common authorities; similar developments affect its role regionally through the need to adapt to multiple demands of autonomy, identity recognition, and decentralisation. In short, it seems obvious that with the process of globalisation the demands for the recognition of particular identities and minority rights will strongly develop within national and regional structures, while at the same time requests for more citizens' participation at the supranational or trans-national levels will become more evident, in the name of new European citizens' rights.

This article argues that a cosmopolitan shaping of the European Union using a complexity of multi-level governance structures is conducive to its underlying objective of legitimating the emerging European polity. The major working hypothesis is that the concept of cosmopolitanism can contribute to our understanding of the transformation of modern societies and of Europeanisation, in particular, by creating an integrated European public and European space. A cosmopolitan reading of Europeanisation and, in particular, of the process of European integration is proposed to understand and assess the viability of a «cosmopolite» Europe and its policy implications as an idea and reality within a European and global context.

1. Cosmopolitanism and Post Modernity in the Context of Globalisation

By globalisation we mean the phenomenon and process of growing concrete interdependence of economic, political,

social and cultural relations and of greater consciousness of the world. Globalising processes involve variable, but usually significant shifts in the spatial ordering of personal and social relationships as well as in the organisational political forms and functions. It is an enacted process, one in which the transformative capacity of globalisation reshapes the contours of social action and redefines the political and the identity spaces of individuals and collective actors. In the extensive literature on globalisation studies[1] three conceptual stages can be distinguished. In a first stage the impact of globalisation on national economies was investigated with a conclusion that a neo-liberal world economy government and homogenous world society were on the rise and the national state was in demise. In a second stage the cultural aspects of globalisation were studied with criticism on the convergence thesis and arguments for a fragmented and multidimensional world view. National communities were seen as one of the multiple places of human organisation. The current third phase brings together a multidisciplinary and multidimensional analysis of globalisation, with particular focus on its political manifestation. It concludes that globality and globalism represent the dual character of globalisation, in that they simultaneously generate the conditions of universalism and particularism.

In the following we first briefly identify the major characteristics and developments of contemporary cosmopolitanism; next we focus on an analysis of a major contribution to the universalist interpretation of cosmopolitanism, i.e. cosmopolite democracy and, finally we conclude with an assessment of the critique presented by constitutional patriotism.

1.1. Multi-faced Cosmopolitanism

In the first place we want to clarify the concept of cosmopolitanism, which is often used as synonym for globalisation, globality, glocalism, globalism, universalism, multiculturalism, pluralism and imperialism. The term goes back to the Cynics and Stoics of antiquity, it acquired central importance in the philosophy of the Enlightenment and has regained conceptual strength in the current debates on globalisation against the

[1] See amongst others U. Beck, *What is Globalization?*, Malden (Mass.), Polity Press, 2000; J. Brodie, *Introduction: Globalization and Citizenship Beyond the National State*, in «Citizenship Studies», vol. 8, no. 4, 2004; J. Stiglitz, *Making Globalization Work*, London, Penguin, 2006; A. Giddens, *Runaway World: How Globalization Is Reshaping Our Lives*, New York, Routledge, 2000; Z. Bauman, *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1998; D. Held, *Governare la Globalizzazione*, Bologna, il Mulino, 2005.

organising power of the market and the nation-state. In sum, the concept of cosmopolitanism has a very old meaning that points to the future; it is both pre-national and post national.

Its core premises are the recognition and appreciation of difference of thought, social life and practice, both internally and towards other societies. It rests on the «both/and» principle of regarding others as both equal and different and, consequently calls for new concepts of integration and identity that affirm coexistence across borders without requiring that difference be sacrificed by supposed national equality. It therefore relies on a framework of uniting and universally binding norms that should prevent deviation into postmodern particularism.

Ulrich Beck uses the concept as a social scientific concept to deal socially with cultural differences, distinguished from hierarchical subordination, universalistic and nationalistic sameness and postmodern particularism[2]. It is important to recognise that cosmopolitanism aims to overcome the dualities of the global and the local, the national and the international. It is not specified in spatial terms and can therefore be applied to regional geographical units such as Europe. Viewed in this way, cosmopolitanism should not only integrate different national traditions and norms, it should at the same time balance various ways of dealing with cultural differences, determined by the «both/and» principle. As such it is both a theoretical and empirical concept.

1.2. Contemporary Cosmopolitanism

From the above definition it is clear that contemporary cosmopolitanism provides a suitable ideological framework to respond to the conditions developed in the third phase of globalisation[3]. It represents a way of dealing with difference and similarity within changing societies of a globalised world. Scholars concerned with the impact of globalisation have come to a common understanding that the modernist premises of the national state have been eroded. The Westphalian state is no longer the singular unit of political power with absolute sovereignty. There is the emergence of regional and local democratic entities and communities. Moreover, in multicultural Europe the nation is neither culturally homogenous

[2] U. Beck, E. Grande, *Cosmopolitan Europe*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2007, p. 12.

[3] D. Archibugi, D. Held, M. Kohler (eds), *Re-imaging Political Community-Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1998; B. Axford, *Globalization and the Prospects for Cosmopolitan Society*, in V. Gennaro Lerda (ed.), *Which «Global Village»? Societies, Cultures and Political-Economic Systems in a Euro-Atlantic Perspective*, Westport, Praeger, 2002, Ch. 18; D. Archibugi, *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens: Toward Cosmopolitan Democracy*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2009.

nor the primary expression of collective identity; national and regional communities are diverse and identities are multiple.

The contemporary expressions of cosmopolitanism seem to represent a logical accommodation of the postmodern challenges to citizenship and dialogue. They represent post-national, multi- and inter-cultural models of political community that preserve identities and facilitate global, regional, local and municipal loci of legal status and political membership. Moreover, they are transnationalist, in that they promote an active citizenry that is empowered within an emerging global civil society and enabled to shape political, social and cultural developments.

A common reference point for contemporary cosmopolitan theory is Immanuel Kant's cosmopolitan theorem build around the vision of world peace and a global ethical regime[4]. In his 1795 essay *Perpetual Peace* Kant puts forward a *ius cosmopoliticum* as a universal guiding principle to protect people from war. It is evident that Kant's theorem was grounded in the modernist understanding of citizenship. In the absence of inter- and supra-national legal and institutional frameworks for citizenship, it falls short of post-nationalism. As it is focused on the universal awareness it does not recognise the notion of cultural diversity.

In the current globalised context cosmopolitan thought has flowed into several directions, one of which is universalism. The universalist position promotes the expression of global morality in the form of supranational legal systems and political institutions, implying an extension of the modern national state-based theory of citizenship. In the Kantian tradition of universal, trans-cultural authority Martha Nussbaum[5] pleads for a humanistic cosmopolitanism, insisting that rights, obligations and commitments do not stop at national borders. She suggests a primary allegiance to the worldwide community of human beings, in which educative processes gradually narrow the gap between particular and broader loyalties, and between the local and humanity as a whole.

1.3. Cosmopolitan Democracy

A major contribution to the universalist stream is the theory of cosmopolitan democracy centred on David Held's idea of

4 I. Kant, *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, in M. Forsyth, M. Keens-Soper, P. Savigaer (eds), *The Theory of International Relations*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1970; I. Kant, *Idea for a Universal History with Cosmopolitan Purpose*, in H. Reiss (ed.), *Kant's Political Writings*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

5 M. Nussbaum, *Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism*, in «Boston Review», October-November 1994.

global governance[6]. Held argues that the realisation of the cosmopolitan vision, that of lasting world peace and universal equality of individuals, cannot rely on the states' democratic capacity only. As a result of globalisation, the idea of a political community can no longer be exclusively located within the boundaries of the territorial nation-state and secondly, the locus of effective political power has shifted from national governments to international regimes and forums, international and regional organisations, and a variety of transnational corporations. Consequently, it is argued that democracy must be strengthened within and beyond borders and effective democratic law internationalised. An institutionalisation of cosmopolitan principles based on cosmopolitan democratic law is therefore more than welcome. Moreover, in resolving conflict situations between national sovereignty and international law, he very much advocates a democratisation of the intergovernmental international organisations, in particular granting operational power to the UN. In his version of a cosmopolitan democracy, in addition to the existence of overlapping and spatially variable sovereignties, there exists a multitude of political communities with multiple citizenships and different agenda.

Daniele Archibugi[7] elaborates on Held's new democratic condition and examines the prospects for cosmopolitan democracy as a viable and humane response to the challenges of globalisation. He argues that democracy has to function simultaneously on domestic, international and global levels of political authority in order to generate a lasting normative framework. He therefore proposes a renewed model for global citizenship, i.e. institutional cosmopolitanism. He argues that democracy can be extended to the global political arena by strengthening and reforming existing international organisations and creating new ones. Furthermore he calls for dramatic changes in the foreign policies of nations to make them compatible with global public interests and, consequently, advocates giving voice to new global players such as social movements, cultural communities, and minorities. Finally, he proposes building institutional channels across borders to address common problems and encourages democratic governance at the local, national, regional, and global levels.

[6] D. Held, *Democracy and Globalization*, in «Global Governance», vol. 3, no. 3, 1997.

[7] D. Archibugi, D. Held, M. Kohler (eds), *Re-imaging Political Community*, cit.

In short, Archibugi's vision of the cosmopolitan world order is one of a multi-level system of democratic governance, i.e. cosmopolitan democracy in which democratic participation by citizens is not constrained by national borders and where democracy spreads through dialogue and incentives[8]. He applies the cosmopolitan logic to concrete issues such as humanitarian intervention, institutional reform at the UN and democratic transitions.

For both scholars the linkage of democratic institutions outside the boundaries of the state is indeed necessary in order to complement the inadequate democratic capacities of the post-modern state and to monitor the internal state affairs[9]. Andrew Linklater talks about the necessity to create a post-Westphalian community in which citizens have the right to participate in the decision-making processes of international organisations[10]. The cosmopolitan argument for a federative development of the global landscape and a global legislative institution should therefore be conceived above all as a framework-setting institution[11].

Such a cosmopolitan approach to democracy has of course policy consequences[12]. Firstly, it implies an active membership of individuals in the global community. Global issues, such as human rights, the environment and poverty have a universal impact on all individuals and as such transcend regional, national and international frameworks of cooperation. If global challenges are to be addressed in line with basic democratic principles, citizens should therefore have political represen-tation at various levels of decision-making from the local neighbourhood up to the international level. Secondly, it involves the institutionalisation of a universal and global citizenship status which contains a mandatory core of rights, laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Finally, the expression of cosmopolitan citizenship as the empowerment of a nascent global civil society denotes the transnational dimension of the cosmopolitan democracy theory. All these policy consequences require the management of global public goods[13] and the establishment of global bodies that are designed to manage global issues and individual interests in multi-level and multi-actor governance structures.

In short, global citizenship means the transfer of specific elements of national citizenship into the global domain so that

[8] D. Archibugi, *Principles of Cosmopolitan Democracy*, in Id. et al., *Re-imaging Political Community*, cit., pp. 207-209; Id., *Cosmopolitan Democracy and Its Critics: A Review*, in «European Journal of International Relations», vol. 10, no. 3, 2004.

[9] D. Archibugi, D. Held (eds), *Cosmopolitan Democracy: An Agenda for a New World Order*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1995.

[10] A. Linklater, *The Transformation of Political Community*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1998; Id., *Citizenship and Sovereignty in the Post-Westphalian European State*, in D. Archibugi, D. Held, M. Kohler (eds), *Re-imaging Political Community*, cit., pp. 113-137.

[11] D. Held, *Democracy and the Global Order: From Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1995.

[12] D. Archibugi, *Cosmopolitan Democracy and Its Critics*, cit., p. 456; Id., *Principles of Cosmopolitan Democracy*, cit., pp. 216-217. See also N. Dower, J. Williams (eds), *Global Citizenship - A Critical Introduction*, New York, Routledge, 2002; D. Held, *Democracy and the Global Order*, cit.

[13] For the literature on global public goods see I. Kaul, I. Grunberg, M.A. Stern, *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century*, New York, Oxford University Press, 1999 and I. Kaul, P. Conceicao, K. Le Goulven, R.U. Mendoza (eds), *Providing Global Public Goods: Managing Globalization*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2003.

specific global issues can be tackled. The cosmopolitan democracy thesis focuses on the institutional establishment of the cosmopolitan ideal and on the multi-level nature of the emerging system of governance by subscribing to the condition of multiple post-nationalism. The introduction of a global cosmopolitan citizenship status complements national as well as regional and local loci of citizenship and complies with the multiple de-national and de-territorial conditions of citizenship.

A pertinent and interesting account of the impact of globalisation upon democracy is offered by Richard Falk[14]. He argues that the growing importance of transnational relations is weakening national citizenship and reducing the importance of social capital at the level of the nation-state. Because of the fact that the logic of market opportunity no longer coincides with the logic of territorial loyalty the tendency is likely to create links and solidarities across borders rather than within them. Falk proposes a polity of a globalisation from below for offsetting the tendency for national governments to be shaped by market-oriented forces pressing globalisation from above. In his human governance approach[15] Falk therefore focuses on the realisation of a system of human government, based on a globalisation from below and beyond national borders which is rooted in civil society and developed in a practice of trans-national democracy. He believes in the creation of a normative global democratic structure, but constructed from below and rooted in the global civil society. As a consequence, the task of transnational social movements is to disseminate a global ethics which surpasses the identity of state sovereignty. Marco Mascia shows that the growing importance of civil society in Europe exemplifies the integration from below and supports the hypothesis that this participative dimension provides a new democratic horizon for the EU[16]. This is very important for understanding the practice of multi-level governance of intercultural dialogue and the role of civil society.

1.4. Constitutional Patriotism

A comprehensive critique of the cosmopolitan democracy thesis is provided by Jürgen Habermas[17]. He endorses the requirement of supranational democratic institutions and

[14] R. Falk, *The Decline of Citizenship in an Era of Globalization*, in «Citizenship Studies», vol. 4, no. 1, 2000.

[15] Id., *On Human Governance*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1995. See also UNDP, *Human Development Report 1999. Globalization with a Human Face*, at http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global.

[16] M. Mascia, *La società civile nell'Unione Europea*, Venezia, Marsilio Editori, 2004.

[17] J. Habermas, *The Postnational Constellation: Political Essays*, in T. McCarthy (ed.), *Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2001.

transnational civic activity but criticises the premises of the theory. First, Habermas rejects the prospects of a world state, away from a multilayered post-national system of governance. Instead he envisions a dynamic picture of interferences and interactions between political processes at national, inter-national and global levels.

Second, he claims that cosmopolitan democracy ignores the multicultural dimension and favours an all-inclusive and *a priori* sameness at the cost of multicultural particularism[18]. In short, he asserts that cosmopolitan democracy cannot reconcile universalism and particularism[19] and therefore re-establishes the competitive relationship between the national and cosmopolitan domains of collective belonging. Habermas stresses the importance of a new community-building logic in national and global domains. He argues that the cohesiveness of a community cannot be guaranteed by fostering an exclusionary ethno-cultural identity. Instead, he pleads for the building of a civic form of identity, i.e. «constitutional patriotism». He reasons that rationally chosen commitments to a common set of constitutional principles, fundamental rights and democratic institutions can provide a common normative framework that is culturally neutral and therefore sufficiently inclusive for binding a multicultural society together.

Habermas' third critique regards the democratic character of the cosmopolitan democracy thesis[20]. He criticises the so-called pre-existing global morality that holds humans together in a global community. In this context cosmopolitan rights are understood as predefined and universal. Democracy, according to Habermas, is the self-defined and self-legislated power of the public. That is, identity, rights and their institutional expressions are organic and negotiated categories. In order to overcome the democratic deficiency of the cosmopolitan democracy theory, Habermas suggests moving away from representative towards a deliberative notion of democracy internally and externally, domestically and globally. In particular, he asserts that deliberative democracy promotes channels of interactive and discourse-based civic activity in addition to the formalised institutional representation and participation of the citizen[21]. Such a deliberative democracy further facilitates a comprehensive notion of the public sphere as a space where individuals can engage in rational critical

[18] Id., *Struggles for Recognition in the Democratic Constitutional State*, in A. Guttman (ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1994.

[19] While universalism refers to the individuals' commitment to abstract principles and rights, particularism refers to the context of a historically specific political culture.

[20] J. Habermas, *The Postnational Constellation*, cit.

[21] Id., *The European Nation State - Its Achievements and Its Limits. On the Past and Future of Sovereignty and Citizenship*, in G. Balakrishnan (ed.), *Mapping the Nation*, London, Verso, 1996; Id., *The Postnational Constellation*, cit., p. 76.

discourse about common political interests. This might create a socially constructed collective identity that is constantly reproduced and generates legitimacy from below.

Habermas's final criticism of the cosmopolitan democracy thesis refers to its empirical foundations. According to Habermas, it is mistaken to base a cosmopolitan view on the developments of the international domain, the evolution of an international human rights regime and the UN system. He posits the European Union as a viable model of democracy beyond the nation-state[22]. Despite this positive outlook Habermas admits that the European Union is not yet adequately equipped to deliver this promise. He insists that the integration must incorporate the vehicles of constitutional patriotism and deliberative democracy so that the EU's democratic capacity can be strengthened while the multi-layered nature of the European polity maintained. Producing a common ethical framework of shared political values, moral norms and legal rights should only transcend but not erode national and cultural particularism in order to provide a viable and meaningful basis of solidarity for the public[23]. In this perspective the Treaty of Lisbon offers a modest step forwards to create a «European public space» in advancing deliberative capacity of the supranational institutions of democracy, simplifying decision-making and favouring active citizenship[24].

2. A Cosmopolitan Perspective of Europeanisation

In the second part of the paper we first present Ulrich Beck's interpretation on cosmopolitanism, as it was developed in his trilogy on «Cosmopolitan Realism»; in the next section we analyse and assess the application of his cosmopolite vision to the process of Europeanisation, in particular to the content, policy implications and global setting of «Cosmopolitan Europe».

2.1. Beck's Political and Sociological Cosmopolitanism

Understanding Europe in cosmopolitan terms means defining the European concept of society as a regionally and historically particular case of global interdependence, i.e. a Europe of

[22] Id., *Making Sense of the EU: Toward a Cosmopolitan Europe*, in «Journal of Democracy», vol. 14, no. 4, 2003, p. 94.

[23] Id., *Citizenship and National Identity: Some Reflections on the Future of Europe*, in R. Beiner (ed.), *Theorizing Citizenship*, Albany, University of New York Press, 1995.

[24] See the declaration by J. Habermas, J. Derrida, *After the War: The Rebirth of Europe*, in «Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung», 31 May 2003.

accepted, recognised and regulated difference in a new era of border transcending and border effacing cooperation. This historically unique and distinctive mixed form of inter-governmental, supranational and inter-societal community escapes the traditional categories and concepts. The development of the EU exemplifies particularly how political and theoretical concepts of the social sciences have become trapped in what Beck calls the conceptual straight jacket of methodological nationalism[25]. Societies cannot any longer be conceived in exclusive territorial terms in which cosmopolite relations are reduced to mere international relations while the reality develops beyond borders in a framework of plural belongings.

In *Power in the Global Age*[26] Beck explores the legitimacy of political authority under conditions of global interdependence. The major answer to a redefinition of concepts such as power, dominance and authority from a cosmopolitan perspective is to include globalisation in the analysis of politics, society and identity-building. Nationalism is about exclusive distinctions and loyalties; cosmopolitanism is about inclusive distinctions and loyalties, being citizens of the cosmos and the polis. It is therefore possible to develop meaningful affiliations without renouncing one's origins.

As was said earlier, globalisation processes signal a rupture with past developments with profound internal and external consequences. In *Cosmopolitan Vision*[27] Beck recognises the need to gear national (and regional) objectives to global ends and acknowledges the global civil society as an advocatory movement that generates global values and norms with a self-legitimating power. He proposes a critical democratic cosmopolitanism achieved through reforms that include new transnational organisations and normative frameworks as well as remodelled multilateral institutions, democratisation of human rights and enforcing of citizens' rights in the globalising context. According to Beck the cosmopolitan state is a political answer and useful instrument in managing political identities and ethnic fragmentation in the era of globalisation and pluralism. Applied to the European context, Europe is then seen as a new kind of transnational, cosmopolitan, quasi-state structure, which draws its political strength precisely from the affirmation and managing of diversities. In other words, he conceives Europe as a cosmopolitan state that cooperatively

[25] U. Beck, E. Grande, *Cosmopolitan Europe*, cit., p. 17.
[26] U. Beck, *Power in the Global Age*, Malden (Mass.), Polity Press, 2005.
[27] U. Beck, *The Cosmopolitan Vision*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2006.

domesticates economic globalisation and guarantees the otherness of the others. In reality, this requires a political Europe which seeks to reconstitute its power at the intersection of global, national, regional and local systems of governance.

His new concept of cosmopolitan critical theory is placed in direct opposition to traditional nation-state politics. His political and sociological cosmopolitanism acknowledges the otherness of those who are culturally different, the otherness of the future and the otherness of nature. In that sense cosmopolitanism shares some aspects of universalism, namely the globally acceptable notion of human dignity that must be protected and enshrined in international law. Thus, if we are to understand cosmopolitan Europe we must radically rethink the conventional categories of social and political analysis.

2.2. Cosmopolite Europe

2.2.1. Content

In *Cosmopolitan Europe*[28] Ulrich Beck and Edgar Grande further elaborate the cosmopolitan vision in a global age, as it was presented in Beck's two previous books. They propose an analytical and political vision for rethinking Europe, based on the narrative of Europeanisation, defined as a permanent process of transformation which goes beyond the conceptual horizon of national societies and states. Beck calls Europe the last politically effective utopia[29], i.e. an idea and a reality. Europe is neither a state nor a nation; hence it cannot be thought of in terms of the nation-state. Beck criticises the methodological nationalism practiced by social sciences in the usual national conceptual horizon which neglects Europe's complex realities. As a consequence a sociological cosmopolitanism[30] is proposed with a positive definition of Europe based on the «both/and» principle: expansion of power at the supranational level is not equated with loss of power at the lower level; rather the opposite holds, namely power as a whole increases and, as a consequence, nationality, transnationality and supranationality reinforce and complement each other.

A cosmopolitan Europe means simultaneously both difference and integration. It offers an alternative to the existing concepts of European integration which either locate Europe above the states and combat national particularities as obstacles to

28 U. Beck, E. Grande, *Cosmopolitan Europe*, cit.

29 *Ibidem*, p. 2.

30 *Ibidem*, pp. 17-21.

European integration, or want to subordinate Europe to the nation-states and national interests. This also calls for expanding the concept of the public beyond its national borders and opening it up to an emerging European space. However, such cosmopolitanism also needs political mechanisms for institutionally producing and stabilising collective difference within given spaces. The novel concept of multi-level governance offers a support to this cosmopolitan perspective.

The concept of multi-level governance, introduced by Gary Marks[31] more than a decade ago, refers to «the existence of overlapping competencies among multiple levels of governments and the interaction of political actors across those levels». Its application to the practice of European governance suggests that the EU is considered a multilayered system of decision-making in dealing with complex societal problems where the institutional redistribution of competences is not based on a territorial dimension but on functional and issue-related criteria[32].

Following this line of thought, the idea of a cosmopolitan Europe is at once radically new and yet forms part of the continuity of European thought and politics. Beck defines Europe both as a social construct and open political project, guided by vision and political principles as well as by the logic of side effects[33]. The principle of cosmopolitanism offers a new perspective for understanding Europe and opens up new possibilities of social organisation and political participation, though not based on a homogeneous and uniform model of European demos or European polis, but characterised by an institutionalised process of permanent change.

This does not imply that Europe has to be completely reinvented. On the contrary, the European process of integration involved a cosmopolitan momentum from its beginning, in that it transcends the idea of the nation and transforms national sovereignty. Cosmopolitanism has been formalised in Europe by a step by step approach through the simultaneous institutionalisation of seemingly two competing and conflicting principles, i.e. supra-nationalism and inter-governmentalism. This process has proceeded in two directions: inwards, through constant extensions of the power of the EU and the resulting structural adaptations in the

[31] G. Marks, *Structural Policy and Multi-level Governance in the EC*, in A. Cafruny, G. Rosenthal (eds), The *State of the European Community: The Maastricht Debate and Beyond*, Boulder (Co.), Lynne Rienner, 1993, pp. 391-410.

[32] A short analysis of the concept is given by F. Delmartino, *The Paradigm of Multi-level Governance*, in Committee of the Regions, *Towards a Multi-level Governance in Europe?*, «Cahiers of the CoR», vol. 1, 2009, pp. 33-36.

[33] U. Beck, E. Grande, *Cosmopolitan Europe*, cit., p. 30.

member states; and outwards, through the constant enlarge-ments and the export of its norms and rules in the exercise of mainly soft power politics.

We agree with Beck's thesis that the process of Europeanisation has reached a critical threshold[34]. Internally the EU has been confronted with intensifying criticism from its citizens for its lack of transparency, credibility and accountability. Externally there is much talk of the Balkanisation of Europe within the international political landscape. The real European crisis, as Beck argues, may be the inability to see the contradictory events as part of a common European undertaking. Both the internal and external contexts of European politics and governance are being fundamentally shaped by the opportun-ities and threats of globalisation. Under these conditions, the institutional reforms in the Treaty of Lisbon alone do not go far enough. Much more is called for to rethink Europe.

2.2.2. Policy Implications of a Cosmopolite Europe

What is European can be termed by forms of identity, ways of life, means of production and types of interaction that go beyond national or regional frontiers. It is about continuous border-crossing. Horizontal Europeanisation has taken place in all sectors of human life. Science, polity and economy are becoming globalised and Europeanised at the same time. This intertwining has various policy consequences and produce different lines of thought and action.

– The dismantling of national borders in Europe has an impact on the European dynamic of socio-economic inequalities. One thing is sure, the nation-based limits to people's perceptions of social inequality have slowly begun to dissolve as Euro-peanisation moves forward. The recognition of the importance of the social dimension for the European integration process has policy implications within and beyond European borders, in particular in relation to internal and external solidarity and a sense of belongingness.

– The Europeanisation is initiating a historically new positive sum game: joint solutions serve the national interest. In some occasions and policies the EU is better placed to solve problems than nations or regions could possibly do acting alone. In other words, the EU is an arena where formal sovereignty can be exchanged for real power, cultures nurtured

---

[34] *Ibidem*, p. 4.

and economic success improved. A cosmopolitan Europe is first and foremost the Europe of difference of recognised particularity. From a cosmopolitan perspective, this diversity (whether languages, economic systems, political cultures, or forms of democracy) appears primarily as an inexhaustible source of Europe's cosmopolitan self-concept and not as an obstacle to integration. If we understand Europe's actual distress mainly as an inability to grasp and understand the historically new kind of reality that Europeanisation represents, different «both/and» policy alternatives may be envisaged.

– A third line of thought and action is that Europeanisation requires a collective memory culture that spans borders. Beck calls it a Europeanisation of perspective. A cosmopolitan approach to the opening up of communication, the acceptance of interdependence through inclusion of «the other» for the sake of common interests and, to the management of cultural diversity goes beyond tolerance or multiculturalism. It may lead to genuine intercultural dialogue and mutual learning, conceived as an enrichment of one's own integral human development. Such cosmopolitanism is intended to rest upon cohesive and reciprocally binding norms away from postmodern particularism and close to Europe's true identity of an open, dynamic, diversified, multicultural and democratic entity.

– The fourth line is the understanding of European society as a regional world risk society[35]. To avoid the danger caused by a European replica of methodological nationalism, Europeanisation should not be defined and analysed purely in endogenous terms, but in exogenous terms in relation to the frame of reference determined by world society. In this context Becks refers to the theory of reflexive modernisation[36] in which the experience and dynamics of modernity bears risks in the sense that along with its success modernity also contains negative consequences. This requires policy coordination and rule setting of both obstacles and opportunities in European and global context.

– The fifth concluding line concerns the understanding and shaping of new forms of political authority that have emerged in Europe beyond the nation-state. The management of the globalisation effects, specifically the problems related to the flows and crises of global finance and the neglected European

[35] U. Beck, *World at Risk*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2008.

[36] U. Beck, A. Giddens, L. Scott, *Reflexive Modernization: Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 1994.

dimension of current socio-political developments, requires a more courageous approach, in respect of the various levels and actors involved in the process.

2.2.3. Cosmopolite Europe in a World Risk Society

In the development of modern societies Beck distinguishes a first and a second modernity and applies this distinction to the process of Europeanisation: the «either/or» model of society and politics of the first modernity is being replaced by the «both/and» model of society and politics of the second modernity. The relation between the two is conceived in inclusive, rather than in exclusive terms. Beck defines Europe as a society of societies, an «empire» composed of states and finally as a product of the secondary modernisation[37]. The transition from first to second modernity is then perceived as a self-transformative meta-change. As such, Europeanisation is understood and analysed as part of a comprehensive process of reflexive social modernisation, a structural and epochal break in the development of modern societies, often as the result of the success of primary modernisation and internal dynamics.

In agreement with this line of argument cosmopolite Europe cannot be reduced to a territorial expression of a «fortress» Europe, but is a component of the second modernity that is embedded in the world risk society[38]. The conceptual link is clarified by the theory of reflexive modernisation[39] which is characterised by three constitutive elements, namely, the theorem of risk society, the theorem of forced individualisation and the theorem of multidimensional globalisation.

It is argued that the dynamics of reflexive modernisation poses numerous challenges for the nation-state. The nation-state as one of the basic institutions of the first modernity is being transformed by the emergence of a plurality of diverse new forms of transnational governance beyond the nation-state, but remains an integral component of the creation of post-national Europe. In other words, states become integrated in a variety of ways into new international regimes and organisations, new supranational institutions, new forms of regionalism, etc. The result of this development are new complex systems of (global) governance and policy networks. In addition there is the increasing role of private actors in solving collective problems and providing public goods[40]. The new basic institutions of the

---

37 U. Beck, E. Grande, *Cosmopolitan Europe*, cit., p. 53.

38 *Ibidem*, pp. 197-218.

39 *Ibidem*, pp. 28-49.

40 J. Baudot, *Building a World Community, Globalisation and the Common Good*, Seattle-London, Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs Copenhagen and University of Washington Press, 2001; A. Héritier, *Common Goods: Reinventing European Integration Governance*, Lanham (MD), Rowman & Littlefield, 2002.

second modernity manifest themselves in these emerging transnational political regimes, of which Europe is at once the result and the driving force of this process. The theory highlights the facts that the different regions in the world are affected unequally not only by the consequences of failed processes of modernisation, but also by the consequences of successful processes of modernisation.

In this context Beck refers to the interesting notion of a regime of side effects[41]. He argues that an inner globalisation of European societies has gradually and largely been taking hold through side effects independently of the political agenda, in the form of a self propelling meta-change in European social, cultural and individual life worlds. Although the process of Europeanisation, i.e. «the realisation of an ever closer union of peoples of Europe» was intended and the result of political decisions of the founding fathers, its institutional and material consequences were often unintended. This is well explained by the thesis of institutionalised cosmopolitanism[42].

2.3. Cosmopolitan Perspective of the European Integration Process: A European «Empire»

Reality is becoming cosmopolitan. As was said earlier *de facto* Europeanisation has already developed over the past fifty years. The real process of becoming cosmopolitan is taking place through secondary effects often undesired, unseen and usually occurs by default. Scholarly literature agrees that the EU is not a «state», neither a «superstate» that has assimilated the sovereignty rights of the member states nor a federal state with a clear division of powers, but neither is the EU a confederation, an international organisation or an international regime. In the context of recent research on Europe in political science the EU has been defined a network, set of networks, network form of governance, a multi-level system, a multi-level system of governance or as a multi-level state[43].

Ulrich Beck and Edgar Grande have proposed a redefinition of the term empire for an appropriate analysis of the political rule in Europe[44]. It is argued that the cosmopolitisation of the state in Europe has created a new political system; they call it a post-imperial empire. This European empire is not based on national demarcation and conquest, but on overcoming

[41] U. Beck, E. Grande, *Cosmopolitan Europe*, cit., pp. 35-40.

[42] *Ibidem*, pp. 19-20.

[43] *Ibidem*, pp. 50-52 and pp. 69-70.

[44] *Ibidem*, pp. 50-92.

national borders, voluntarism, consensus, transnational interdependence and on the political added value accruing from cooperation. The cosmopolitan empire of Europe is notable for its open and cooperative character at home and abroad. Its real power lies in the socio-economic model of a cooperative future and in its special form of soft world power. It is characterised by the following constitutive features[45]: an asymmetrical political order subdivided in power zones according to the intensity of cooperation and the number of countries involved; an open variable spatial structure; a multinational societal structure; an integration through law; a consensus and cooperation behaviour; a welfare vs. security objective; a horizontal and vertical institutional multi-level system of governance; a network power marked by non-hierarchical forms of decision-making and participation of a large number of societal actors in integrated negotiating systems and political decision-making processes; a complex cosmopolitan (internal and external) sovereignty; an ambivalence of delimitation and limitation; and finally an emancipatory vs. repressive cosmopolitanism.

The impact of a cosmopolitan perspective on European integration should be clear by now. For a long time the key concept of integration process consisted primarily of the abolition of national and local differences. This policy confused unity with uniformity or assumed that uniformity is required for unity. In this sense uniformity became the supreme regulatory principle of modern Europe. By contrast, cosmopolitan integration is based on a paradigm shift in which diversity is not the problem but rather the solution. Europe's further integration should therefore not be oriented to the traditional notions of uniformity inherent in a European federal state. On the contrary, integration should instead take Europe's inherent diversity as its starting point in order to link the call for recognition of difference with the call for the integration of divergences. Understood as a historically tested political model for a post-imperial empire of consensus and law Jeremy Rifkin's *European Dream*[46] of a soft world power is a fascinating alternative of a forward-looking vision of a state structure firmly based on recognition of the culturally different other.

In this context, nationalist and regionalist ideas are unsuitable

[45] *Ibidem*, pp. 62-72.

[46] J. Rifkin, *The European Dream*, Cambridge, Polity Press, 2004.

for unifying Europe. A large European super-state frightens people. Beck's cosmopolitan Europe offers an idea of uniting European citizens today because it quietens Europeans' fear of losing identity, makes tolerant interaction, dialogue and mutual learning among the many European nations, regions and peoples enshrined in the treaties and opens up new political spaces and options for action in a globalised world. However, the persistence of nations and regions remains an important condition of a cosmopolitan Europe. The more secure and confirmed Europeans feel in their national, regional and local dignity, the less they will shut themselves off in their territories and the more they will stand up for European values and take responsibility in the world.

Conclusion

By proposing multi-level governance structures and applying dialogue's frameworks and mutual learning for managing differences, a cosmopolitan perspective outlines a new post-national model of democracy for Europe that no longer marginalises citizens but give them an active role in European decision-making processes[47]. Europe can be understood through the concept of cosmopolitanism because it fully reflects its nature, history and future possibilities. A cosmopolitan Europe guarantees the coexistence of different ethnic, religious and political forms of life across borders based on the principle of cosmopolitan tolerance and dialogue. Throughout different eras of European history this concept has been transformed from an ethical-normative ideal of community and open mindedness into the hybrid patterns of integration. In sum, cosmopolitanism is evolving from a categorical imperative and a rational project into a new modality of practice-oriented awareness. In this way it acquires an empirical and analytical value inside a reality that seems to become structurally cosmopolitan. This allows a broad applied thinking about the democratic transformation of the EU and its role in view of the present and future challenges.

The cosmopolitan perspective also implies a fading of physical, mental and disciplinary borders. It is shaped by fluxes of capital, information and persons and by processes of spatial-

[47] M. Mascia, *La società civile nell'Unione Europea*, cit.

temporal compression, de-territorialisation and de-national-isation. The new fluxes go beyond traditional borders and refer to the concept of a network of interconnections. Cosmo-politanism becomes the possibility to recognise diversity as a constitutional element of multiple identities. At the practical level this new consciousness determines the creation of a civilised confrontation sphere where identities are build in dialogue, in relation to a reality of (global) risks that requires collective solutions.

For many sociologists the EU represents the result and the challenge of social transformation. It is said to be characterised by a flexible spatial structure, composed of vertical and horizontal links between models of sovereignty in a trans-formative interdependence. It presents an asymmetrical integrative order based on a mixture of intergovernmental and supranational forms of cooperation in which civil society is becoming a shaping actor and meeting place of social and political aggregations. This might lead to a new model of supranational and transcend democracy which, of course, poses the problem of searching for new forms of management of politics and dialogue at various levels of the globalising landscape.

To think and act Europe along a cosmopolitan perspective means recognising the EU as a laboratory of plural democratic forms and analysing the European integration process as a dimension of cosmopolitisation and transformative cooperation. It is therefore necessary, at the one hand, to consider nation-states in relation to the transnationalisation of their interests and, at the other hand, to understand various forms of governance and dialogue within a context of risk-interdependence[48]. EU is then conceived as a new space in which federalism, intergovernmentalism and neofunctionalism are interconnected through a multi-level governance structure which opens up to a participative process and plurality of decision centres. Apparently, the paradigm of multi-level governance contributes to the understanding of the complex political reality in the European and global context[49].

Following this policy line, Europeanisation as cosmo-politisation is analysed in the discursive interaction between segmented publics which favours integrative dynamics and transformative efficient solutions. In a transnational

[48] U. Beck, *Power in the Global Age*, cit.

[49] Examples of European multi-level governance are offered by European Commission, *White Paper on European Governance,* 25 July 2001, COM (2001), 428 (final); Committee of the Regions, *Whiter Paper on Multi-level Governance*, 17-18 June 2009, CoR 89/2009, final and Committee of the Regions, *Towards Multi-level Governance in Europe?*, cit.

deliberative democracy the form of multi-level governance merges with the realisation of a public sphere that is open to the discursive process and diverging expressions. The legitimacy of subsequent political decisions comes then from the inclusion of knowledge, interests and actors at the various levels of the participative process.

This is not an easy discourse[50]. The multiplicity of links and cultural perceptions stresses the premises of a valorial community. Europe should not only find its democratic form through the principle of responsibility in managing (global) risks but should also apply the principle of reflexivity to the dynamics it put at work. Important is that the recognition of universal rights remain the point of departure of democratic politics in multi-level and multi-actor governance[51].

Next to a societal reflection also a meta-reflexive person is therefore needed to valorise the transformation of society in a European and global context. The capacity of transformation and realisation depends on the historical experience of the society as well as the level of social practices of persons. The reflexivity of persons applies to memory, knowledge and action, and links the individual's prospects with that of the society. Therefore it is necessary to re-conquer a space of recognised and accepted difference which is not limited to cultural relativism but favours a community of cultures and makes intercultural dialogue possible. The fundamental question relates to the objective of integral human development of a person who is conscious of his/her universal rights. Europe should therefore present itself as an open public space where institutional and non institutional actors, formal and informal ones, meet recognising their proper rights and obligations. Such a European perspective transforms demands and identity in a constructive way, but requires a respect of personal and collective identities and memories.

Cosmopolitanism is thus not an external credo or an ideological slogan of a normative and political universalism, but more an internal dimension of reflexive action which stretches beyond a nostalgic defence of territorial sovereignty as well as beyond a utopia of universalistic centralism. Cosmopolitanism is mirrored in the diversified and similar history of Europe, a permanently changing multi-faced Europe, situated at the crossroad between past, present and future. A cosmopolitan

[50] A. Taglioli, *Il volto cosmopolitca dell'Europa*, in «Società Mutamento Politica», vol. 1, no. 1, 2010, pp. 189–201.

[51] *Ibidem*.

vision of the process of European integration may contribute to identify and clarify the conceptual and empirical characteristics of a multi-level governance of intercultural dialogue, bridging between past and present contradictions in international democratic politics and strengthening the process of Europeanisation.