

---

# EUROPIA

AN ANALYSIS OF THE 'DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE MOVEMENT 2025'

BY JESPER LADEKÆR GRÄS (STUDENT ID: 51666) & ANDERS COLSTRUP HVASS  
(STUDENT ID: 52407)

BACHELOR PROJECT, ROSKILDE UNIVERSITY, MAY 18<sup>TH</sup>, 2016

SUPERVISOR: SØREN BLAK HJORTSHØJ

NUMBER OF CHARACTERS: 65043

SUBJECT: HISTORY

LANGUAGE: ENGLISH

---

## ABSTRACT

---

The motivation for this project was based on the newly founded movement DiEM25 (Democracy in Europe Movement 2025) and their manifesto. The movement's ideas and visions are based on the critique of the European Union's handling of the economic, refugee and migration crisis', that has been debated throughout Europe in recent years. With their manifesto, DiEM25 has formulated an idealistic alternative vision for the future Europe. This assignment seeks to find answers to what kind of alternative this is. More specifically; which kind of cosmopolitanism is expressed in the manifesto, and which European concept historical traditions this cosmopolitanism builds upon. The analysis conducted in this project will be a comparative concept historian analysis of the cosmopolitan vision formulated in the DiEM25 Manifesto.

The assignment concludes that the manifesto entails a potential utopian cosmopolitan vision of re-democratising Europe, and more specifically the EU in our present modern and globalised world.

Furthermore, it concludes that the the cosmopolitanism in the DiEM25 Manifesto builds on a long tradition of cosmopolitan ideas, leading back to Immanuel Kant initial ideas of cosmopolitanism, through post world war and the thoughts of Ulrich Beck up until the 21st century and the notion of New Cosmopolitanism.

**KEYWORDS:** Cosmopolitanism, European Union, DiEM25, Utopia, European history, Immanuel Kant, Reinhart Koselleck, Ulrich Beck, Victor Roudometof, Robert Fine, Mary Helen McMurrin

# STRUCTURE OF THE PROJECT

<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>DIEM25 – A REINVENTION OF EUROPE?</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>EUROPEAN UNION HISTORY - SHORT SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>6</b>
FROM UNION TO UNION.....	8
EU’S STRUGGLE FOR LEGITIMACY AND AUTHORITY .....	9
<b>METHODOLOGY: CONCEPT HISTORY IN THE SCOPE OF REINHART KOSELLECK</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>THE COSMOPOLITAN IDEA</b> .....	<b>12</b>
IMMANUEL KANT AND HIS SEARCH FOR UTOPIA ON EARTH.....	13
FÆDUS AMPHICTYONUM – THE GREAT FEDERATION .....	15
ULRICH BECK – THE WORLD HAS BECOME COSMOPOLITAN, OUR MINDS HAVE NOT .....	16
FROM NATIONAL OUTLOOK TO COSMOPOLITAN OUTLOOK .....	17
NEW COSMOPOLITANISM .....	19
<b>ANALYSIS OF THE DIEM25 MANIFESTO</b> .....	<b>21</b>
DEMOCRACY .....	22
MIND-SET .....	23
TRANSPARENCY .....	23
SOLIDARITY VS. NATIONALISM, EXTREMISM AND RACISM .....	24
RE-DEMOCRATISATION OR DISINTEGRATION.....	25
<b>DISCUSSION</b> .....	<b>27</b>
DEMOCRACY .....	27
CAN A UNIVERSAL, COSMOPOLITAN SHIELD INCLUDE EVERYONE? .....	28
UNIVERSALISM VS. EUROCENTRISM .....	29
A COSMOPOLITAN MIND-SET .....	31
<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>32</b>
<b>LITTERATURE</b> .....	<b>34</b>

## INTRODUCTION

In the beginning of 2016 a newly formed European organisation held its initial press conference. The 'Democracy in Europe Movement' (DiEM25), was presented by one of its makers, Yannis Varoufakis. Being the former minister of Finance in Greece, Varoufakis represented the exact demography of the organisation. Bright thinkers and creative minds of Europe, had formed an organisation with one clear goal in mind: Re-democratising Europe. Many would argue that Europe, via the European Union, is to be considered a democratic continent, but DiEM25 argues that this is not the case. They argue that EU has fallen into the shadows of bureaucracy, and has left behind its initial ideals of a democratic union, build on the backbone of the European soul.

The idea of re-democratising Europe and bring about change is not a newly constituted idea within the continent. For several hundreds of years, many bright minds such as Immanuel Kant, Karl Marx and Thomas Moore to name a few, has talked about an ideal Europe. What these ideas had in common was the utopian ideal or idea. The idea that Europe could become a place of equality, freedom and liberty. Though their ideas varied in the way they were formed and sometimes also what the end goal was, the idea and aspiration still remains as common denominator to this very day. In this day and age, we refer to this aspiration with a different concept and word: Cosmopolitanism. The word has been around for centuries, but it has undergone changes and has evolved. It is a word that has the utopian concept underlined at its very core, and is somewhat elusive in its definition. Though a very fact remains; cosmopolitanism points towards world citizenship. We see a world becoming more and more globalised, distances being shortened, bringing all corners of the world closer together in a tightly knitted web. In this web, DiEM25 places itself as a saviour for the European citizen of 2016. They see that despite this globalised world, we as people move away from each other – away from the cosmopolitan ideal of happy coexistence. In light of this we find it interesting to ask the following question:

*Which kind of cosmopolitanism is expressed in the DiEM 25 Manifesto?*

With this question we want to investigate how the cosmopolitan concept is defined in the DiEM25 Manifesto, and how it has evolved (or not evolved) since Immanuel Kant wrote his

essay *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose* in 1784. We will be looking into the different paradox' of the concept of cosmopolitanism, presented by different scholars such as Ulrich Beck and Victor Roudometof, in an attempt to establish why the concept of cosmopolitanism is still viewed as being somewhat of a utopian idea. The focus of this project will be a comparative concept analysis of the DiEM25 Manifesto. By finding the different concepts highlighted within the manifesto, we aim to outline the cosmopolitan vision within the DiEM25 organisation. Furthermore, we wish to discuss this very vision within the frame of previously formulated ideas of cosmopolitanism, in order to see how this concept has evolved alongside human history.

## DIEM25 – A REINVENTION OF EUROPE?

DiEM25 is a newly formed movement (early 2016) that has the core project of re-democratize/democratizing the European Union and Europe as a whole. The organisation is established by the former Greek minister of finances, Yanis Varoufakis and is being supported by several highly profiled Europeans from a vast range of professions.

So far the movement has made appearances in public debates and has, even more interesting, formed an extensive manifesto. The manifesto is divided into a section showing, and arguing against the infrastructure of the current European Union and a section regarding the focus of DiEM25 and how they intend to “fix” Europe and EU.

The organisation consists of 17.000 members from 56 different countries (Web 1), and are operating across Europe by creating meetings and debates.

The organisation's overall objective is by their own words to re-democratise Europe. In addition to this, they have formulated a manifest with specific objectives, that has to be reached by 2025:

*“Our medium-term goal is to convene a constitutional assembly where Europeans will deliberate on how to bring forth, by 2025, a full-fledged European democracy, featuring a sovereign parliament that respects national self-determination and shares power with national parliaments, regional assemblies and municipal councils” (Article 1, Feb. 10th 2016)*

Despite DiEM25's short lifespan, it has already accumulated a lot of interest and media attention, and the list of members and supporters consists of famous people such as, Brian Eno (musician), Slavoj Žižek (philosopher) and many others.

The case of DiEM25 is an ambitious and interesting attempt of creating a better Europe. The manifest itself speaks extensively about how the EU has failed and neglected the core values of a collective Europe, in the sense that it has distanced itself from the democratic core value: "if Europe's autocratic powers succeed in stifling democratisation, then the EU will crumble under its hubris" (DiEM25, 2016: 3). It is believed in the manifest that the core value of a common Europe must be a completely transparent EU where the decision processes are accessible for the people of Europe: "All documents pertinent to crucial negotiations (e.g. trade-TTIP, 'bailout' loans, Britain's status) affecting every facet of European citizens' future to be uploaded on the web" (DiEM25, 2016: 6). These notions speak volumes about the intent and ideology behind DiEM25, in the way that it portrays an organisation that believes in a free, democratic and peaceful Europe that embraces each and every single citizen in this region of the world:

*"Our pledge*

*To fight together, against a European establishment deeply contemptuous of democracy, to democratise the European Union*

*To end the reduction of all political relations into relations of power masquerading as merely technical decisions*

*To subject the EU's bureaucracy to the will of sovereign European peoples  
To dismantle the habitual domination of corporate power over the will of citizens*

*To re-politicise the rules that govern our single market and common currency" (DiEM 25 Manifesto, 2016: 8).*

Throughout centuries intellectuals have thought of a more united Europe. After the Second World War there were no other option than to start the process of necessary negotiations towards a more interdependent and collective Europe, in order to gain a peaceful future. The frightening experience of the two world wars, showed that the European countries had failed to respect each other once again, and the debilitated Europe was now in the middle of a conflict with great risks: The Cold War.

In order to re-establish security - both internally and externally - and to gain economic growth, there was a need for a *comprehensive continental community* in Europe, and a *protective shield* for the Western European countries to protect them against the threat in the east (Cini & Borragán, 2010). This led to the establishing of a common defence agreement in Brussels 1948 and the creation of NATO in 1949. These actions gave Western Europe security against the threatening Soviet Union and laid the foundation to what would turn out to be one of the most important turnarounds in European history. One that would lead us to the Europe we know today.

The thoughts concerning a future federal Europe became highly relevant after the Second World War. The Italian federalist Altiero Spinelli talked about a 'United States of Europe', and this view represented one pole in the discussions in the late 1940's (Cini & Borragán, 2010). What did the concept of *union* mean? Should it be an intergovernmental or supranational collaboration, and were there a balance to be found between the two? A balance that is still debated today.

In the beginning, all collaboration was intergovernmental. This changed in 1951. The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) was established (consisting of Western Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, The Netherlands and Luxembourg), and Europe now saw the first international organisation which involved a degree of sovereignty, which was previously exclusive to nation states (Cini & Borragán, 2010). The supranational authority was now a reality, and this would later be the foundation for the creation of the European Union. As Jean Monnet - the drafter of the plan for the European Coal and Steel Community - said; this was "the first expression of the Europe that is being born" (Cini & Borragán, 2010: 21). The collaboration got even closer when the Treaty of Rome came to light in 1957 and made way for a common market. It was now implicated that one nation's problem would be all nations problem.

## FROM UNION TO UNION

Economy and trade were the tools to peace between especially France and Western Germany in the 1940's and 1950's. In 1969, The Hague Summit made way for the admission of new member states which led to the accession of The United Kingdom, Ireland and Denmark in 1973, Greece in 1981 and Spain and Portugal in 1986. In 1974, the political summits were institutionalized by the establishment of the European Council which led to the agreement of a major revision (Single European Act) of the Treaty of Rome that would eventually lead to the single internal market and the Treaty on European Union which were agreed at Maastricht in December 1991, signed in 1992 and saw the European Union established in 1993. This came as a result of the fall of Communism in Europe, where the German unification, led to intergovernmental conferences out of which the Treaty of European Union emerged.

*"It is in part the desire to ensure that the EU behaves and acts as a union that has been behind the various reform attempts - successful or otherwise - that have dominated the EU's agenda ever since its creation" (Cini & Borragán, 2010: 33).*

In 2000 the big intergovernmental consultation searched for a deeper and wider debate about the future of the European Union including:

- *How to establish and monitor a more precise delimitation of powers between the EU and its member states.*
- *The status of the Charter of Fundamental Rights (proclaimed at the Nice European Council)*
- *A simplification of the Treaties with a view to making them clearer and better understood*
- *The role of national parliaments in the European architecture*
- *In addition: ways of improving and monitoring the democratic legitimacy and transparency of the EU and its institutions (to bring them closer to its citizens) (Cini & Borragán, 2010: 43-44)*

The Treaty of Nice (2001) paved the way for addition of Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia and Cyprus in 2004. In 2007, Romania and Bulgaria followed, and the latest to join the EU was Croatia in 2013, making EU a union of 28 countries.

This led to the the Treaty of Lisbon which entered into force December 1st 2009.

#### EU'S STRUGGLE FOR LEGITIMACY AND AUTHORITY

One of the key issues the EU is facing right now, is the struggle of keeping their legitimacy and authority. Within political science, two different types of legitimacy are important when an institution such as the EU wants to uphold and sustain authority, namely: *output-* and *input* legitimacy. *Input* legitimacy is defined in the way that common people in a state, or here a supranational organisation, are directly part of the decision process (Cini & Borragán, 2012). The results of the process do not have to correlate with the desire of the public, as long as they feel as they are part of the process itself. At the other end of the spectrum we have *output* legitimacy. Here the legitimacy is supported and upheld, by a public that finds the outcome produced by the organisation satisfactory (Cini & Borragán, 2012). Hence, being a part of the process is not a necessity compared to the importance of the actual results.

This exact spectrum is where we find the problems that are facing the EU right now. Previously it had been enough establishing authority and legitimacy through the *output* alone, but the period from 1991 and up until now, the EU has struggled to involve both ends of the legitimacy spectrum, in order for the European people to believe and trust in the EU (Cini & Borragán, 2012).

When the European Economic Committee (EEC) was created in 1957, it had a limited number of specific tasks and functions. Its legitimacy was based solely on *output*, which became a problem for the organisation, since large parts of the European people did not believe in what they thought to be a technocratic institution (Cini & Borragán, 2012).

This created what is called a 'democratic deficit'. The solution for this problem of lack of legitimacy, ended being the parliamentary system that are in place in the EU today.

Despite this attempt at a solution, the parliamentary system comes with its own set of

issues. Problems regarding the parliamentary structure within the EU is, that it lacks a public sphere and demos<sup>1</sup> (Cini & Borragán, 2012). There is no public sphere where the European people can take part in discussions and be informed on what is being decided in the union, as well as the lack of a collective political unity.

An attempt at creating a common public sphere and demos throughout Europe, was the introduction of European citizenship enveloped in the Maastricht Treaty of 1991. Despite this attempt at creating a common Europe, and thereby strengthening the legitimacy of the EU, the efforts proved somewhat unsuccessful:

*“Despite all previous efforts to strengthen European democracy on the basis of the parliamentary model, the European Union was still not perceived as more legitimate by European citizens”* (Cini & Borragán, 2012: 346)

The debate regarding *input* legitimacy continued throughout the 1990's, and intensified after the turn of the century (Cini & Borragán, 2012). The struggle for legitimacy has become the core issue for the European Union, based on several different factors. First of all, the introduction of European citizenship and the attempt of enhancing the possibility for the European citizens to become involved in the decision processes of the EU, was still a complicated thing to achieve. Some scholars suggested that the parliamentary process should be strengthened, making it possible for the European citizens to: “Elect their ‘executive’ on the basis of a European-wide public debate about policy choices” (Cini & Borragán, 2012: 346). Political leaders have so far been rather reluctant to do so, and has in turn supported the argument EU being a bureaucratic and non-democratic institution.

Secondly, legitimacy cannot be stabilised and achieved by the opportunity for participation in an electoral process alone. Keywords such as ‘civil society’ and ‘transparency’ are just as important in keeping up the legitimacy of the democratic processes in the EU (Cini & Borragán, 2012). ‘Civil society’ coins the idea of encouraging common citizens to participate in the different organs within the EU. Though the idea was to make easy access for the citizens, it has actually created an unequal state, in the way that lobbyists with potentially a lot of money, will eventually have an easier time forcing their political

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘Demos’ is defined as the people of a particular nation as a political unit - a politically defined public community

agendas into the decision making in the EU than the average citizen (Cini & Borragán, 2012). 'Transparency' is a key issue and something that the EU tried to implement in order to avoid the democratic deficit. It deals with the fact that the European citizens experience and feel that they are informed about what is going on behind the closed doors of the parliament. However, the EU governance system is too complex and remote to serve other than a certain elite (Cini & Borragán, 2012).

The issues raised here, show some of the key problems related to the legitimacy of the European Union democracy. Along with the economic crisis that began in 2007, the trust in the EU has never before been at such a low point. The EU has not only trouble sustaining the legitimacy of the democratic process towards the public. The trust regarding its strength as an international organisation, took a massive hit during an economic crisis that took down former superpowers of Europe such as Spain, Greece and Italy. As a consequence of all this, we find the DiEM25 organisation and their initiative to create a stronger, improved and most importantly completely democratic European organisation.

## METHODOLOGY: CONCEPT HISTORY IN THE SCOPE OF REINHART KOSELLECK

The methodological approach applied in this project will be a comparative concept analysis of the DiEM25 manifesto. The manifesto will serve as primary source material in this project and will therefore be the focus of this analysis. Through the application of the comparative concept analysis, we seek to outline the concept *cosmopolitanism* and see how the concept has continuously been present in the discussion surrounding a united Europe. By outlining the history of the concept of *cosmopolitanism*, we wish to see to what extent the DiEM25 manifesto builds on the same cosmopolitan idea, that goes centuries back, and how it has evolved and adapted to the changes of our time.

The background of this application of method is based on Reinhart Koselleck's approach to understanding and analysing concepts over time. Koselleck's focus on concepts, is based on the argument that concepts via the changes in meaning that they undergo, outline important parts in our history, that are not found elsewhere. Concepts tell a unique

story, through their application in a specific period of time. We build upon this tradition, but unlike Koselleck who argued that concepts adapt different meanings fitting to the changes that we, as a civilisation goes through, we wish to focus on how a specific concept has been present and is a continuously and non-redundant part of the understanding of a united Europe. Via the comparative concept analysis, we seek to understand the importance of the concept of *cosmopolitanism*, and see how the complexities of these concepts might prove to be problematic in a unification across different cultures.

## THE COSMOPOLITAN IDEA

This chapter seeks to outline a historical map of the cosmopolitan idea. Our understanding of conceptual history, is initiated around the period of Enlightenment. It is to be understood as the change in how humans perceived their position in history and how history's possibilities changed.

German concept historian Reinhart Koselleck presents his thesis on this change in his text "*Space of Experience' and 'Horizon of Expectation': Two Historical Categories*". Here he argues, that a historical change in the classification of the concepts of experience and expectation has occurred in the aftermath of the European Renaissance. In what he calls *Neuzeit* "(...) expectations have distanced themselves evermore from all previous experience" (Koselleck, 2004: 263). Before the *Neuzeit*, harshly put, the expectations which were cultivated "(...) subsisted entirely on the experiences of their predecessors, experiences which in turn became those of their successors" (Koselleck, 2004: 264). Also, man was placed in an external frame consisting of nature and religion. It was nature and religion that dictated man's position on earth and thus making the future bound to the past, which man was unable to change. Expectations reaching beyond this structure – the objective of completeness – were referred to as a *Hereafter* - an eschatological thought.

This changed when the concept of *progress* opened a new horizon of expectation for man. Expectations became worldly and gave man the idea that one could change and improve the world. This opened up the idea of the future, and history could now "(...) be regarded as a long-term process of growing fulfillment which, despite setbacks and deviations, was

ultimately planned and carried out by men themselves” (Koselleck, 2004: 266). Via this, a world in constant progress was passed on to the next generations. The present now held an expectation of a *changing* future, towards a better world, through *progress*. (Koselleck, 2004). This meant that progress was no longer an otherworldly idea, far from the common man’s everyday life.

This is similar to the way Immanuel Kant viewed history. As Koselleck writes: “Kant strenuously opposed the thesis that, as he once summarized it, ‘things would always remain as they were’ and that, consequently, one could not forecast anything which was historically new” (Koselleck, 2004: 267) which he claims in the essay “Idea For a Universal History” written in 1784. This is the basis for the understanding of history as a singular history. In this lies, that the future is unique and distinct from the past so that the expectation can no longer be deduced from previous experience. This creates a rupture in continuity and it all happens because of one word; *progress*. This word – which Koselleck makes Kant the author of – is the first historical concept that brings together the difference of experience and expectation into one word. And in this word, the singularity, the breach between past and future, and the rupture in continuity is at the core. It is in this breach in the perception of history and historical time that Kant writes his essay *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose*.

## IMMANUEL KANT AND HIS SEARCH FOR UTOPIA ON EARTH

In his essay *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose* written in 1784, Immanuel Kant wishes to discover:

*“(...) a purpose in nature behind this senseless course of human events, and decide whether it is after all possible to formulate in terms of a definite plan of nature a history of creatures who act without a plan of their own”*  
(Kant, 1784: 2).

If there is a definite plan, it pertains the *guiding principle* for when man enters the collective matter. Here man must adopt a cosmopolitan purpose. If we do not find this purpose, Kant says, the capacities of nature will be of no purpose to man. Every single

individual will be left alone without aspirations in his own time frame, without any real connection to that which goes beyond the individual's life span. This will lead to absence of progress.

At his starting point the individual is on his own. He must create everything that gives his life a purpose and meaning within a mechanical frame of life and death. *But*, Kant says that there seems to be a connection which runs through this mechanical frame order: "The earlier generations seem to perform their laborious tasks only for the sake of the later ones, so as to prepare for them a further stage from which they can raise still higher the structure intended by nature" (Kant, 1784: 4). What Kant see, is that man's contribution to history, is an accumulating, ongoing process which continuously place man in an improved world, compared to his forefather(s). The laborious efforts of our forefathers give way for the present living man to enjoy an increased happiness. In order for man to reach this happiness, we must all enter into a shared society. This is one of the biggest challenges men face according to Kant: "The highest purpose in nature – i.e. the development of all natural capacities – can be fulfilled for mankind only in society, and nature intends that man should accomplish this, and indeed all his appointed ends, by his own efforts" (Kant, 1784: 5). Nature has given a purpose for us to reach; the development of all natural capacities. It is a purpose for all of mankind and can only be reached in a societal context. This contains a state of antagonism: "The means which nature employs to bring about the development of innate capacities is that of antagonism within society (...)" (Kant, 1784: 4). This antagonism makes the task for attaining a civil society, which can administer justice universally, very difficult as Kant mentions in proposition five and six. But as mentioned earlier, it is only in society the highest purpose of nature can be fulfilled. This is the case because only society can create a freedom which can include continual antagonism among its members, "(...) and the most precise specification and preservation of the limits of this freedom [the greatest freedom, red.] in order that it can co-exist with the freedom of others" (Kant, 1784: 5). Therefore, Kant argues that nature's purpose, sets a task for mankind to be that of establishing "(...) a society in which *freedom under external laws* would be combined to the greatest possible extent with irresistible force, in other words of establishing a perfectly *just civil constitution*" (Kant, 1784: 5-6).

To build such a society, is only possible if the people of the society are gradually developing through education (*Bildung*). To accomplish this development of insight the individual must practice and get instructions. This is every man's responsibility. But, the society also have a responsibility towards its citizens. It must go through a long internal process; its political body has to prioritize the education of its citizens to make a morally mature population. Kant only finds this possible if the resources are reorganized. Instead of a continually chaotic international world in preparation for war, or in actual war, the world must develop into a place where the resources are spent on increasing the level of insight and moral from generation to generation. This leads us towards the cosmopolitan prospect.

#### FÆDUS AMPHICTYONUM – THE GREAT FEDERATION

Though the internal society of a state has these tensions between man and its society, this aspect is subordinate to the interrelationship between states. With this priority, Kant plants the cosmopolitan horizon as the primary focus point. If the single states are to achieve a universal just society, within itself, it must have a peaceful and just external relationship with other states. Here we see that Kant finds the same antagonism between states as he first saw the antagonism between the individual and its attachment to society. To reach such a goal Kant sets up a number of factors which the states need to be able to take part in the federal relationship between one another:

- 1) Every state need a high level of commonwealth
- 2) Every state need to be cultivated (art and science) and civilized to the point of excess in all kinds of social courtesies and proprieties
- 3) Every state need to be morally mature

Kant sees war as one of the main preconditions to create (but also to destroy) the process of these factors is war:

*“Wars, tense and unremitting military preparations, and the resultant distress which every state must eventually feel within itself, even in the midst of peace – these are the means by which nature drives to make initially imperfect attempts, but finally, after many devastations, upheavals and even*

*complete inner exhaustion of their powers, to take the step which reason could not have suggested to them even without so many sad experiences – that of abandoning a lawless state of savagery and entering a federation of peoples in which every state, even the smallest, could expect to derive its security and rights not from its own power or its own legal judgment, but solely from this great federation (Fædus Amphictyonum), from a united power and the law-governed decisions of a united will” (Kant, 1784: 7).*

It is of great importance that the states withdraw from their starting point of brutish freedom to enter the great federation’s law-governed constitution. This is what Kant foresaw. That the interdependence between states would increase, wars would be less and the human race would realize nature's purpose by progress towards more peace in a universal cosmopolitan existence. Kant’s philosophy sees that nature has a plan and this plan is rooted in the human mind as an idea which works as a force:

*“For such a plan opens up the comforting prospect of a future in which we are shown from afar how the human race eventually works its way upward to a situation in which all the germs implanted by nature can be developed fully, and in which man’s destiny can be fulfilled here on earth” (Kant, 1784: 12-13).*

According to Kant this is the natural goal that is set for us. If we do not progress towards full development it will be in direct contradiction with the teleological theory of nature he presents in his essay, and the alternative will be a world which consists of random processes without any aim resulting in uncivilized chaos. Kant wished to underline this. In doing his essay, he gave his present time an ideal to follow that indicated the necessity of progress on an individual, national and international level.

#### ULRICH BECK – THE WORLD HAS BECOME COSMOPOLITAN, OUR MINDS HAVE NOT

Since Immanuel Kant outlined his vision more than two hundred years ago, many significant events have occurred in world history. Two world wars made the European states get together at the negotiation table, to make way for a future of peace between the states. As Kant foresaw, war would eventually lead to interdependence between states in the wish for peace.

According to the German sociologist Ulrich Beck the idea of cosmopolitanism has become the world reality. In his work "The Cosmopolitan Vision" (Der kosmopolitische Blick oder: Krieg ist Frieden) from 2004, he outlines how the human condition itself is now cosmopolitan. What Ulrich Beck means is, that today's world society deals with global issues such as threats of terrorism, international politics, global scale communication etc. while man itself does not necessarily see the world as such. Although there might be a big amount of nationalism and patriotism, Beck sees this as pettiness and as a result of the difficulty and complexity that are attached to the cosmopolitan life form. For Beck, it takes courage to live as a cosmopolitan. It demands that man embraces multiple identities and see the equality and difference of humans living under the same global risks. This new cosmopolitan reality demands a new mind-set.

The change Beck sees as a necessity in our minds, is a transition from a national, territorially defined outlook to the cosmopolitan outlook. We must follow the evolving world. A world Beck compare to Robert Musil's `Babylonian Madhouse`:

*"(...) when the world has mutated into a `Babylonian madhouse` (...), when the historical fetishes of the state and the nation can no longer order and control the lives and interactions of human beings, they must themselves find a way to redefine their interests and interrelations among the ruins of former certainties in whatever way makes continued coexistence possible"*  
(Beck, 2006: 7).

This is the reality of today according to Beck. Differences, contrasts and boundaries can no longer be seen as territorially, gorge-creating defined entities because the boundaries are crumbling. We do not live in a national ontological life frame anymore. Separation has transformed into transparency: "The world of the cosmopolitan outlook is in a certain sense a glass world" (Beck, 2006: 7).

#### FROM NATIONAL OUTLOOK TO COSMOPOLITAN OUTLOOK

Kant saw the existence of an antagonism in man between living as an individual and living in society. This antagonism is still present today but in a different way. When Beck talks about the cosmopolitan outlook as being a glass world, it means that the world is fragile. Humans are fragile. It takes a lot to have this outlook and to balance between the

provincialism, of his home place and culture, and the cosmopolitanism of being a part of the multifaceted world. This is in many ways the struggle of today's world according to Beck. How do we find balance in ambivalence?

"Differences, contrasts and boundaries must be fixed and defined in an awareness of the sameness in the principle of others" (Beck, 2006: 7). This is the inclusive differentiation which we must adapt in our mind-set, because "The cosmopolitan outlook is both the presupposition and the result of a conceptual reconfiguration of our modes of perception" (Beck, 2006: 2). This reconfiguration of our mind-set includes the awareness of the following principles:

- *“first, the principle of the experience of crisis in world society: the awareness of interdependence and the resulting ‘civilizational community of fate’ induced by global risks and crises, which overcomes the boundaries between internal and external, us and them, the national and the international;*
- *second, the principle of recognition of cosmopolitan differences and the resulting cosmopolitan conflict character, and the (limited) curiosity concerning differences of culture and identity;*
- *third, the principle of cosmopolitan empathy and of perspective-taking and the virtual interchangeability of situations (as both an opportunity and a threat);*
- *fourth, the principle of the impossibility of living in a world society without borders and the resulting compulsion to redraw old boundaries and rebuild old walls;*
- *fifth, the m elange principle: the principle that local, national, ethnic, religious and cosmopolitan cultures and traditions interpenetrate, interconnect and intermingle – cosmopolitanism without provincialism is empty, provincialism without cosmopolitanism is blind” (Beck, 2006: 7).*

If we are aware of these principles, we can live our everyday life with reflexive awareness. This is a necessity in a world of global risk and in the end a necessity for human survival.

We must find ourselves as being a part of the same as the other. This does not mean that the local or provincial identity must decline. It must be a part of a new perspective. Because of our civilization's creation of global crises and dangers we must become aware and take part in the cosmopolitan realism to survive. According to Beck this is the only way for us to avoid disaster. Kant saw the possibility of war changing our minds towards a future of peace. Beck sees the global risk frame as the possibility for us to change our minds towards a cosmopolitan outlook searching for a world where the differences are included in the irreversible sameness. The real enemy is still inside every individual. Beck places the obstacle as to whether one can leave his or her narrowmindedness to become boundarylessness. It is in this struggle the antagonism flourish:

*"(...) This irreversible sameness opens up a space of both empathy and aggression which it is difficult to contain. This is a consequence both of pity and of hatred – pity, because the (no longer heterogeneous) other becomes present in one's feelings and experience, and observing oneself and observing others are no longer mutually exclusive activities; hatred, because the walls of institutionalized ignorance and hostility that protected my world are collapsing. Both of these sentiments, pity and hatred – the sense of boundarylessness and the longing for the re-establishment of the old boundary-lines – prove that the cosmopolitan outlook is a politically ambivalent, reflexive outlook." (Beck, 2006: 8). No matter which side you choose the reality is the same. In this world we should strive for "(...) an everyday, historically alert, reflexive awareness of ambivalences in a milieu of blurring possibility and cultural contradictions" (Beck, 2006: 3).*

## NEW COSMOPOLITANISM

Some of the critique that has been formulated against Beck's definition and idea of cosmopolitanism, is the emerging relationship between transnationalism on the one hand and cosmopolitanism on the other.

When Ulrich Beck speaks about the human condition itself becoming cosmopolitan, sociologist Victor Roudometof argues that this is not the case. Roudometof argues that we

do indeed live in a globalised world that might foster a higher degree of cosmopolitanism of some sort, but the unavoidable condition as of now, has more to do with the concept of transnationalism rather than cosmopolitanism (Roudometof, 2005). The argument is that the higher degree of mobility across all spaces does not necessarily pertain the condition of cosmopolitanism.

Roudometof divides cosmopolitanism into two groups: *values* and *attitudes*. Attitudes should be a measurable phenomenon, whereas the cosmopolitan values are an ethical or moral goal (Roudometof, 2005). The point being here, that moving across borders and acknowledging that we live in a globalised world does not mean that we live in a cosmopolitan world: “other groups that move across national borders – such as refugees, transmigrants, illegal immigrants or international students are not necessarily cosmopolitan in orientation” (Roudometof, 2005: 117). The differentiation away from Ulrich Beck’s perspective on cosmopolitanism, lies in the fact that, according to Roudometof, Beck sees cosmopolitanism as both an outcome and process. Furthermore, he intertwines cosmopolitanism and transnationalism, which according to Roudometof, has distinct differences (Roudometof, 2005). Beck sees cosmopolitanism in late modernity, as the opening of both physical and metaphorical borders, at the same time as being describing the resulting society of this process as being cosmopolitan.

This critique of Beck’s cosmopolitanism is directly linked to the concept *new cosmopolitanism*. According to professor of English, Mary Helen McMurrin, the concept of new cosmopolitanism emerged around 1994 when scholar Martha Nussbaum, wrote the article “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism”. Whereas Beck’s definition of cosmopolitanism is somewhat singular, there is no specific and singular definition of the concept of new cosmopolitanism:

*“There is no clear agreement on a new meaning for cosmopolitanism, as any survey of the literature demonstrates: some use it to emphasize global interconnectedness, while some understand it as a consciousness of the human situation or an ethics of inclusiveness akin to multiculturalism; others link cosmopolitanism to political agendas regarding human rights, or international law, and specifically laws of asylum (hospitality), while another group understands cosmopolitanism within the domain of international*

*relations and uses it to name a set of principles for global democratic order or global civil society.” (McMurrin, 2013: 20).*

Just as Victor Roudometof, McMurrin coins one of the key issues in new cosmopolitanism to be the division of consciousness (or in Roudometof's description, values) and the actual global interconnectedness. This exact notion also relates to the critique of cosmopolitanism as being too Eurocentric in its core. Stemming from the era of Eighteenth century, through the definition coined by Immanuel Kant, cosmopolitanism as a concept have been somewhat rooted in a European perspective. But in the modern world which we inhabit now, it is important to ask oneself what a universal cosmopolitan concept would be described as. First of all, the clear division of the globalised world as being transnationalistic as opposed to cosmopolitanism as a set of values. According to Roudometof, transnationalism makes way for new social spaces, that in turn involves multiple actors and transnational communities are created by both migrants as well as the employees of transnational companies that operates across the world (Roudometof, 2005).

The notion of New Cosmopolitanism, is a notion without a clear cut normative. The idea in itself, as portrayed in this section, points in different directions. The main argument and discussion is though, that scholars of today, are pointing to the division between a set of values and a 'newly' globalised world society.

## ANALYSIS OF THE DIEM25 MANIFESTO

In the following chapter we will be analysing the manifesto created by DiEM25 in the beginning of 2016.

The main purpose of this analysis will be to establish how a map of concepts is presented throughout the manifesto. This will be leading to the discussion of the problem formulation:

*Which kind of cosmopolitanism is expressed in the DiEM 25 manifesto?*

The essence of these concepts described as both part of the current problems and future solution in Europe, give clues to what the cosmopolitan profile in the manifesto consists of.

Though the concepts outlined and presented in this chapter, represent different aspects of cosmopolitanism, they also intertwine and overlap. Some of the concepts represent the same meaning as others, but will still be deemed relevant because of its other features, and vice versa.

## DEMOCRACY

The main concept in this manifesto, and the concept which is being mentioned most times, is *democracy*. It is by far the most utilized and described concept in this manifesto. Already in the headline of the document we find the quote: “The European Union will be democratized. Or it will disintegrate!” (DiEM25, 2016:1) The point being made here is, that democracy becomes a non-redundant part of how DiEM25 views the future of Europe. Europe cannot exist without a democratic core.

In the introduction of the manifesto, EU is criticised for evading the core principles of democracy despite speaking in the name of democracy: “They seek to co-opt, evade, corrupt, mystify, usurp and manipulate democracy in order to break its energy and arrest its possibilities“ (DiEM25, 2016:2). Another main argument made by DiEM25, relating to the concept of democracy, is that democracy is for the common European citizen and not the people, companies, institutions, banks and government, that works with EU politics on a daily basis. The concept is portrayed and presented as anti-elitist and something raised on a pedestal and treated like an ideal for mankind, rather than a practical guideline for international institutions and governments: ”There must be another course. And there is! It is the one official ‘Europe’ resists with every sinew of its authoritarian mind-set: A surge of democracy!” (DiEM25, 2016:3).

A lot of effort is put into establishing that the democratic values has been evaded and forgotten in the EU, but when looking at the exact plan for re-democratising EU, we see the framework of what is embedded in the concept of democracy.

A key feature embedded in democracy is transparency. The feature entails that EU citizens has the opportunity to view all meetings via live-stream and summaries from various meetings in the EU. Another important and embedded feature of the concept of democracy

is freedom: “No European people can be free as long as another’s democracy is violated”. This quote also entails another important feature, that of people being equal within the European society. DiEM25’s idea of democracy is further defined through bottom-up democracy, meaning that focus on democracy must come from “local, regional or national levels” (DiEM25, 2016:8) and at the same time this is “intertwined with an ambition to promote self-government (...) to throw open the corridors of power to the public; to embrace social and civic movements; and to emancipate all levels of government from bureaucratic and corporate power” (DiEM, 2016:8).

The concept of democracy has various different features that points towards the individual European citizen being free, equal to his neighbour and should be in power opposed to the situation right now, where the EU is being viewed as being elitist and technocratic in nature, rather than democratic.

#### MIND-SET

An unavoidable concept within the manifesto that relates back to the overarching concept of cosmopolitanism is the concept of having a specific *mind-set*. Throughout the manifesto the notion of changing the mind-set of the European people, empowering them to take back their institution, i.e. the EU: “Now, today, Europeans are feeling let down by EU institutions everywhere (...) We must resolve to unite to ensure that Europe makes the obvious choice: Authentic democracy!” (DiEM25, 2016:6). Once again, the argument embedded in this concept becomes that of a set of values. The importance here is to embrace the open, free and democratised Europe, and adopt the mind-set of a cosmopolitan. The idea of cosmopolitanism must be a set of values engraved in the European cornerstone, in order for the DiEM25 plan to come true. A basic pillar of the cosmopolitan vision of DiEM25, is the very idea that it has to be believable in order to be successful.

#### TRANSPARENCY

The concept of *transparency* is another key factor in this manifesto. The word itself is mentioned several times. The concept is both represented as the way forward as well as pointing out the difficulties within the EU now: “cloaking all policy-making in a pervasive pseudo-technocratic fatalism” (DiEM25, 2016:4).

The importance of transparency within the manifesto and for DiEM25, is based on the fact that transparency represents a new way forward for EU: “When asked what we want, and when we want it, we reply: IMMEDIATELY: Full transparency in decision-making.”

(DiEM25, 2016:6). Other than being referred to as a demand for the way forward for EU, the notion of transparency within the EU also points to one of the main problems.

Continuously throughout the manifesto, DiEM25 points to the EU with words such as ‘evade’, ‘mystify’, ‘cloaked’ etc. Thereby underlining the fact that the EU we see today is all but transparent in nature. As with the concept of mind-set, we see that DiEM25 also points towards transparency as a certain type of value. A value that is closely related to that of equality, liberty, freedom and more. A value that is embedded in other values that DiEM25 sees a crucial for the EU, in order to move towards a re-democratized Europe, better capable of satisfying its inhabitants needs.

## SOLIDARITY VS. NATIONALISM, EXTREMISM AND RACISM

According to the DiEM25 manifesto, one of the main problems in Europe today is the reawakening of *nationalism*, *extremism* and *racism*. This reawakening is seen as a direct result of the common bureaucracy and common currency that “(...) divide European peoples that were beginning to unite despite our different languages and cultures” (DiEM25, 2016: 2). The Europe as it is today is disintegrating and the option to retreat into “the cocoon of the nation states” is seen being taken all around Europe. This tendency is among other things exemplified by the founding member and former Greek finance minister Yanis Varoufakis when he describes the European countries actions doing the refugee situation (Web 2). But this is also exemplified in the manifesto with examples such as Europe's response to the challenges of financial debts, migration and anti-terrorist policies.

The DiEM25 manifesto points to a dark spiral that will result in a disintegrated Europe. The de-politicised institutions are losing their legitimacy more and more as they claim their authoritarianism further and further. The result being that “(...) the enemies of democracy gather renewed power while losing legitimacy and confining hope and prosperity to the very few” (DiEM25, 2016: 4). This negative, dark spiral will result in people turning inwards. And here the jingoism and xenophobia thrive. This is the problems that will occur when a solidary mind-set is replaced with a nationalistic inward mind-set. The refugee crisis and the reactions to the Paris attack aftermath are some the main issues. Here the DiEM25 finds the response to be a:

*“(...) ‘not in our backyard’ attitude (...) which is (...) illustrating how a broken European governance model yields ethical decline and political paralysis, as well as evidence that xenophobia towards non-Europeans follows the demise of intra-European solidarity” (DiEM25, 2016: 4).*

The response - DiEM25 argues - has been to re-erect borders instead of finding common solutions on a European level, on common European problems. These responses are a sign of the declining solidarity that - according to DiEM25 - is happening all over Europe and the missing solidarity is part of the problem with the disintegrating Europe they see today. This total solidarity principle is seen everywhere in the manifesto. Their economic view, their view on the refugee crisis, their view on the political system is just some of the aspects where a total solidarity principle is legible.

## RE-DEMOCRATISATION OR DISINTEGRATION

The DiEM25 manifesto outlines how the *disintegration* is already happening all around Europe. But also how Europe can achieve a *re-democratisation*. This democratic solution to the disintegration problem is set to happen in five different realms, that will eventually lead to a fully democratic, functional Europe in 2025.

Behind these five realms lies a wish for a fundamental change in the European political system. When outlining the current European crisis as consisting of the following five realms, they wish to show the importance of Europeanising the political solutions

concerning: “Public debt, Banking, Inadequate investment and Migration, Rising Poverty” (DiEM25, 2016: 5).

The manifesto argues that the nationalistic, political turn has left the nations powerless to act upon these issues. Here we are presented to the DiEM25’s view on how the political system of Europe must change. To Europeanise the political system the manifesto argues that there must be a limiting of Brussel institution’s power. As of today, Europe is - as described earlier - elitist. It is not for the European people. To get the power moved from Brussels to the regional and local people of Europe, it must be ready for implementing “(...) a full-fledged democracy with a sovereign Parliament respecting national self-determination and sharing power with national Parliaments, regional assemblies and municipal councils” (Diem25, 2016: 5). It is the right and duty of the European people to transform Europe in this direction. This future Constitutional Assembly is then “(...) empowered to decide on a future democratic constitution that will replace all existing European Treaties (...)” (DiEM25, 2016: 6) which will be enacted by 2025. In short, the DiEM25 wants to revolutionize the political system in the European Union. They want to replace the elitist and de-politicised Brussels institutions with institutions where the people of Europe has the power and control. These, the people of Europe, are all people from different “(...) cultures, languages, accents, political party affiliations, ideologies, skin colours, gender identities, faiths and conceptions of the good society” (DiEM25, 2016: 6). Here we see the principle of total tolerance. The political system must provide space for everyone to be part of it. This total tolerance principle serves the ideal of the inflexibility of the single man's rights as seen in the DiEM25 Manifesto’s four principles:

*“No European people can be free as long as another’s democracy is violated*

*No European people can live in dignity as long as another is denied it*

*No European people can hope for prosperity if another is pushed into permanent insolvency and depression*

*No European people can grow without basic goods for its weakest citizens, human development, ecological balance and a determination to become*

*fossil-fuel free in a world that changes its ways - not the planet's climate*  
(DiEM25, 2016: 6).

To achieve a Europe that builds on these principles, the existing institutions must be re-deployed through a bottom-up movement where the local communities, city halls, regional councils and national parliaments is heard all the way into the heart of political power in Europe. Only then the bureaucracy of the EU will be replaced by the “(...) will of the sovereign European peoples” (DiEM25, 2016: 7).

DiEM25 imagines that European democrats will get together, forge a common agenda and then finally bring the power in connection with the local, regional and national levels. This last connection to the smaller levels are of the biggest importance to the manifesto. The end goal is to “(...) throw open the corridors of power to the public; to embrace social and civic movements; and to emancipate all levels of government from bureaucratic and corporate power” (DiEM25, 2016: 7). This is what DiEM25 wants Europe to be. A reasonable Europe that protects everyone's liberty through tolerance, transparency, solidarity, imagination and authentic democracy.

## DISCUSSION

Through our analysis, we have established some main concepts relating to the overarching concept of cosmopolitanism, that are present in the DiEM25 Manifesto. These concepts, and the way they have been portrayed, explains to some extent, how the concept of cosmopolitanism is understood and presented via DiEM25. In this following chapter we will discuss these concepts and the cosmopolitanism portrayed in the Manifesto by DiEM25 in relation to how the concept of cosmopolitanism has been outline previously by different scholars.

## DEMOCRACY

First of, there is the whole notion of *democracy* as being a key feature within the cosmopolitan thought of DiEM25. The democracy idea, is to be understood as the ideal of

every single person within the European continent, should be regarded as equal to one another. In relation to this, there is a need for *solidarity* against the uprising nationalistic movement that are occurring across Europe, according to DiEM25. The cosmopolitan thought has to be accompanied by both *transparency* and a certain *mind-set*. This shows that, DiEM25 acknowledge that for their cosmopolitan ideal to manifest itself, there is a need for a certain set of values that includes openness, respect, freedom etc. In other words, cosmopolitanism is not something that can be forced upon people, but rather the mind-set has to be adopted by every single individual, in order for it to establish itself as a normative in society. The utopian aspect of DiEM25's cosmopolitan idea, lies in the fact that they demand a *re-democratisation* of Europe. This becomes another necessity of their cosmopolitan ideal - the ideal is not present at this very moment, but should be in the future. They aspire towards a better Europe in their minds. This aspiration can be viewed as somewhat of a utopian ideal - a common trade within the general cosmopolitan paradox.

The cosmopolitan ideal, as defined by the DiEM25 Manifesto, is an (perhaps utopian) aspiration towards a better Europe. A Europe of transparency, equality, liberty, openness, freedom etc. A Europe where the individual inhabitant of the continent is at the centre of attention. By decentralising Europe, they wish to use the central power "(...) to maximise democracy in workplaces, towns, cities, regions and states" (DiEM25, 2016: 7). In the words of Robert Fine, DiEM25's idea of cosmopolitanism can be described as such:

*It is a way of thinking that declares its opposition to all forms of ethnic nationalism and religious fundamentalism as well as to the economic imperatives of global capitalism. It perceives the integrity of contemporary political life as threatened both by the globalization of markets and by regressive forms of revolt against globalization, and aims to reconstruct political life on the basis of an enlightened vision of peaceful relations between nation states, human rights shared by all world citizens, and a global legal order buttressed by a global civil society (Robert Fine, 2003: 2).*

CAN A UNIVERSAL, COSMOPOLITAN SHIELD INCLUDE EVERYONE?

The cosmopolitanism in the DiEM25 Manifesto has a *protective and including character*. Meaning that DiEM25 wishes to create a cosmopolitan shield that can protect the rights and democratic voice of every single person in Europe.

DiEM25 wants Europe to be for everyone, no matter their faith or view on how a good society is or should be. This is exactly one of the biggest problems when creating a cosmopolitan reality with a wide diversity of cultural ties. As Kant wrote in his essay it is of the utmost importance for a cosmopolitan society to have a just civil constitution which is universal. In this sense, the nation states enter

*“(...) a federation of peoples in which every state, even the smallest, could expect to derive its security and rights not from its own power or its own legal judgment, but solely from this great federation (Fædus Amphictyonum), from a united power and the law-governed decisions of a united will” (Kant, 1784: 7).*

This is one of the core elements of the DiEM25 cosmopolitanism. That no one can be free if another is not and therefore a universal order is necessary. The Europe of 2025 needs to be “A Pluralist Europe of regions, ethnicities, faiths, nations, languages and cultures” (DiEM25, 2016: 7) which builds on an egalitarian ethical basis that hinders discrimination and worships difference. By this, DiEM25 seeks to create a frame where people freely has the best possible conditions to develop their full potential. They wish to aspire to: “A Liberated Europe where privilege, prejudice, deprivation and the threat of violence wither, allowing Europeans to be born into fewer stereotypical roles, to enjoy even chances to develop their potential (...)” (DiEM, 2016: 8). But here, there might lie a contradiction.

## UNIVERSALISM VS. EUROCENTRISM

As argued by different scholars, cosmopolitanism deals with the paradox of wanting to be universal at the same time that many argues that it is indeed not Universal, but rather Eurocentric in nature. This is in some extent also the paradox which the DiEM25 is faced with. How can DiEM25 stand for a widely European tradition and claim to offer space and freedom to people with an opposite opinion on how the good society should be? Although

the majority of critique regarding eurocentrism within cosmopolitanism is related to the older definitions “The new cosmopolitanism may misconstrue its Enlightenment past, but old cosmopolitanism can look misleadingly contemporary” (McMurrin, 2013: 21), we see very clearly that DiEM25’s Manifesto is built upon the same foundation: “The embrace of cosmopolitanism’s possibilities for a post-hegemonic future fell in line with another trend in the new theories: the idea that cosmopolitanism is “a fundamentally ambivalent phenomenon,” (McMurrin, 2013: 27). DiEM25 acknowledges that the EU was, at least in thought, a glorious idea, but has now had its downfall. They buy into the notion of a collective Europe with a common set of values as their basis. At the same time, they argue, that the borders should stay open - both culturally (to have a pluralist, differentiated Europe) and physically: “An Open Europe that is alive to ideas, people and inspiration from all over the world, recognising fences and borders as signs of weakness spreading insecurity in the name of security” (DiEM25, 2016:9).

In light of this, one might argue that the cosmopolitan vision of DiEM25 is inherently Eurocentric, based on the fact that they believe in EU and a collective Europe: “Pagden argued that cosmopolitanism is “a distinctively European concept, however we define it, whose fortunes have been linked, for far longer than has generally been supposed, with the history of European universalism.” (McMurrin, 2013: 24)

Ulrich Beck on the other hand would argue that the cosmopolitan vision should be global, an idea that involves every person from across the world, rather than just European citizens. The Manifesto speaks about opening the borders and letting people in, but it is still inherently European, in the sense that it is the main focus of the manifesto. A way to imagine a stronger and more united Europe first of all.

The inherent paradox can be expanded to not only the gap between universalism versus eurocentrism, but also transnationalism as a concept underlines one of the main paradox’ within DiEM25’s vision of cosmopolitanism. Roudometof argues that:

*“Transnational experience should be conceived as involving several layers ranging from the construction of transnational social spaces to the formation of transnational communities. Hence, transnationalism’s relationship to*

*cosmopolitanism is less straightforward than what it might seem at first glance.” (Roudometof, 2015: 113)*

Within this argument lies the basic notion that transnationalism as a concept, has to be taken into account when discussing cosmopolitanism in the 21st century. He further argues that the notion of a higher degree of transnationalism, does not necessarily feed of into a higher degree of cosmopolitanism: “other groups that move across national borders – such as refugees, trans migrants, illegal immigrants or international students – are not necessarily cosmopolitan in orientation.” (Roudometof, 2015: 117). Within lies a paradox that also relates to DiEM25 and their manifesto. They see a global future of Europe, and expects and believe that the common European citizen will adopt the cosmopolitan mind-set of their manifesto. But as pointed out by Victor Roudometof, this might not be the case. With the amount of different cultures that lies within the borders of EU, it takes a lot to alter and unify the basic ideas of what collective Europe should look like. In some sense, the paradox of universalism versus eurocentrism can be expanded to be a paradox that entails also the internal struggle for unity.

#### A COSMOPOLITAN MIND-SET

To be a part of The European Union, as presented by DiEM25, demands a complex mind-set. When Ulrich Beck writes about a cosmopolitan reality it is - as mentioned above - a reality which we are all part of on earth. It is a reality created by the interdependence that has evolved as a result of global risks and crises as Beck writes (Beck, 2006). When McMurrin writes that cosmopolitanism is an ambivalent phenomenon it illuminates the dialectical relationship between the universal, cosmopolitan level and the pluralistic level. This is inherent in the *mélange principle* presented by Beck: “(...) *the principle that local, national, ethnic, religious and cosmopolitan cultures and traditions interpenetrate, interconnect and intermingle (...)*” (Beck, 2006: 7). There can be no cosmopolitan reality without a provincialistic reality and vice versa. For both realities to interact in a peaceful and just manner the people of the realities must be able to deal with the complexity that exists in these. Beck talks about the awareness of the sameness of otherness. It is this perception of the world - that we are all on board the same boat - DiEM25 wish for. They

aspire to: “A United Europe whose citizens have as much in common across nations as within them”. How people interact is not determined by borders.

When Kant wrote his essay “Idea for a Universal history with a Cosmopolitan Purpose”, he pointed out that the cosmopolitan reality would be impossible to reach if education and a high moral standard were not part of the people. Since Kant's time the complexity of the world has increased, and this demands more of the educational ideal of today's people. According to Beck, the complexity interacts in a frame with two poles: Either you turn into hatred and build walls to protect yourself or you build your mind-set on boundarylessness. In the DiEM25 Manifesto there is specific indicators of which mind-set that is compatible with their future hopes for Europe. Within Europe - as mentioned above - people will (and do) interact across borders. Externally Europe must have an internationalist profile that “(...) treat non-Europeans as ends-in-themselves” (DiEM25, 2016: 8) and a Europe do not hide behind walls but instead strive to be open towards incoming people and cultures. This is a cosmopolitan mind-set which builds on many of the facets Beck presents in his idea of the cosmopolitan outlook.

It is of high importance to the DiEM25 manifest that the idealistic world it presents cannot become reality without a cosmopolitan mind-set among the sovereign, European people.

## CONCLUSION

The Manifesto by DiEM25 entails a cosmopolitan vision of re-democratising Europe, and more specifically the EU. It builds on a long tradition of cosmopolitan ideas, leading back to Immanuel Kant, through Ulrich Beck up until the 21st century where a newly cosmopolitan idea is being discussed. Despite building on top of the tradition relating to the concept of cosmopolitanism, DiEM25 has attempted to enrol their vision into a modern globalised world, as they see it. They have focused their cosmopolitan vision of re-erecting Europe and the EU, and can therefore be viewed as somewhat Eurocentric in their cosmopolitan vision. This notion points to the paradox' that are rooted in their

cosmopolitan idea - the gap between universalism and particularism. To close this gap is more than difficult.

Furthermore, DiEM25's visions regarding the future of Europe, is to some extent utopian. As scholars within International Relations such as Cini & Borragán has argued, there are several practical problems regarding the institution of the EU. This along with the huge diversity embedded across Europe, makes this manifesto a potential utopian vision of a future collective and unified Europe.

## LITERATURE

**Beck, Ulrich:** “Cosmopolitan Vision” (Translated by Ciaran Cronin). Polity Press, Cambridge, 2006. ISBN: 0-7456-3398-6.

**Cini, Michelle & Borragán, Nieves Pérez-Solórzano:** “European Union Politics”. *The Historical Context* chapter by Urwin, Derek W.; Phinnemore, David & Church, Clive. Oxford University Press, New York, 2010 (Third edition). ISBN 978-0-19-9548637

**Cini, Michelle & Borragán, Nieves Pérez-Solórzano:** “European Union Politics”. *Issues and Debates* chapter by Smismans, Stijn; McLaren, Lauren M.; Guerra, Simona; Hodson, Dermot & Puetter, Uwe. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2012 (Fourth edition). ISBN 978-0-19-969475-4

**DiEM25 Manifesto:** “DiEM 25 - Democracy in Europe Movement 2025”. Downloaded at <https://diem25.org/manifesto-long/> 10th of February 2016.

**Fine, Robert:** “Taking the ‘ism’ out of Cosmopolitanism - an Essay in Reconstruction” in *European Journal of Social Theory: 451-470*. Sage Publications: London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi. 2003. 1368-4310[200311]6:4;451–470;036945.

**Kant, Immanuel:** “Idea for a Universal history with a Cosmopolitan Purpose”. Published in the series *History of Political Thought, Kant - Political Writings*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991. ISBN 9780521398374

**Koselleck, Reinhart:** “Futures Past - on semantics of historical time” (translated by Keith Tribe). Columbia University Press, New York, 2004. ISBN 0-231-12770-7

**Roudometof, Victor:** “Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Glocalization” in *Current Sociology*, January 2005, Vol. 53(1): Page 113-135. SAGE Publications (London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi). DOI: 10.1177/0011392105048291

**McMurrin, Mary Helen:** “The New Cosmopolitanism and the Eighteenth Century” in *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, Volume 47, No. 1. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Fall 2013. Page 19-38. DOI: 10.1353/ecs.2013.0053

**Web 1:** [diem25.org](http://diem25.org) (Checked: May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016)

**Web 2:** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9ddtWSWR6FQ>. (Checked: May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2016)

**Article 1:** “Yanis Varoufakis launches Pan-European leftwing movement DiEM25” in *The Guardian*, Feb. 10, 2016. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/feb/10/yanis-varoufakis-launches-pan-european-leftwing-movement-diem25> (last visited May 18th, 2016)