

# **INSTITUTE FOR CULTURAL DIPLOMACY**

## **The 2012 Cultural Bridges in Germany Conference**

*Multiculturalism, the 2012 Global Debate: Strengthening Intercultural Relations through the  
Arts, Sports, Politics and the Economy*

**(Berlin, November 7<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – Held parallel to 23<sup>rd</sup> Anniversary to the fall of the Berlin  
Wall)**

## **PRAGMATIC APPROACH AND COSMOPOLITAN SOLUTIONS FOR MULTICULTURAL REALITY OF EUROPE**

**Narcisa Šabić**

**MA student of political science – political theory**

**(Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana)**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

As we are witnesses of current global crisis that calls for the rise of the so called 99 percent against exploitation by small number of elites ruling over the world, there is a question that arises. Namely, if we really do live in the end of history, which was stopped by neoliberal revolution, as Fukuyama (Fukuyama in Lukšič and Pikalo 2007, 22) stated – how come we still do not see any positive changes of liberal democracy? How come that the conception of human rights just does not work? How come that any approach did not succeed in its attempts to achieve the democratic ideal? Humanity reached the point when it is both intellectually very distinguished and still extremely frustrated by the current state. Thus, where did democracy go?

At this point, it seems even more difficult to find the answer to our question about multiculturalism in Europe and European Union (EU). How to achieve goals such as peace, democracy and prosperity in combination with keeping the identity, participation and inclusion of EU multicultural citizens on highest level possible?

We live in the world of interconnected, fluid and hybrid identities, where citizenship is not bound only to national state. Multiculturality of contemporary time demands completely new reflections about who we are, how we are, and how to teach next generations how to use competences to get along with new conditions and live fully in them. Besides learning intercultural dialogue with others and different ones, we must also learn how to involve into dialogue with ourselves while we enter such kind of world. In last decade, a serious (academic and political) discussion asks questions and looks for answers, how to connect different identity levels and avoid conflicts in and between the societies. Indicators of success of such dialogue and successful implementation of multicultural practices are multilingual education, demarginalization of marginalized groups, good practices of governing the diversity, strengthening the human rights and transcultural competencies, cultural sensitivity, cherishing and keeping the plural society. In case that such practices disappear, it is not possible to avoid the rise of ethnic, religious and other discrimination, assimilation of minorities and emigrant groups, stereotypes and evolution of other factors of intolerant society (Mandelc 2010, 46–47).

As Pikalo stated, in nineties there was optimism expressed in every field of human life: from economic integration to political cooperation. On every field of human life there was a great move forward. And just for one moment we thought that attacks on WTC in New York on September 11, 2001 represent the symbolical end of optimism of human connections in nineties. But that was the case just in some fields. Economic cooperation and connecting in the world remained undamaged and got new forms. However, attack on WTC changed former political optimism regarding global governance and cosmopolitan democracy. Politicians did not talk about one interconnected world any more. They did not talk about the world of compromise and negotiation, nor did they talk about global citizenship and new consciousness. They rather began talking about new world danger, and threats to, so called, our way of life. There were almost no academic articles about cosmopolitan or global democracy and citizenship. The short period of political optimism of new global world was irrevocably ended by financial and economic crisis 2008–2010, when states tried to save themselves from the crisis, on their more or less own ways. Although crisis was not just economic and financial, but first of all – crisis of way of life or civilizational crisis, the states were trying to save everything they could. In this kind of struggle, there is no space for thinking about others (Pikalo 2010, 4).

In this short theoretical contribution, we would like to stress the importance of pragmatic approach, creativity of cosmopolitan principle, and suggest some theoretical postulates for achieving peace, justice and prosperity, in order not to deny or oppress different individuals and diverse political communities of multicultural society of EU. We agree with Pikalo that national liberal democracy relies too much on territory to be the right basis for global democracy and governance in twenty-first century. It was conceptualized for some another (past) time, for time when the world of national states and liberal individuals was still emerging and developing. Today, we have the chance to seriously rethink new possibilities for establishing the contemporary world, when it comes to individuals, sovereignty, and consequent social and international relations (Pikalo 2010, 25).

According to topic and our question, the development of thought will be based on double hermeneutics. According to Giddens, it is very important to explore how the results of social sciences constitutively enter the world, defined by them. Thus, we consider that concepts of social sciences are not being produced independent (Giddens 1987, 20). Double hermeneutics

give us the way to use the potential subjectivity as creative potential – as something positive and even necessary, as a condition for research and knowledge (Lukšič and Pikalo 2007).

## **2. SHIFTING THE POINT OF VIEW**

First of all, if we would like to spread our thinking beyond the borders of national states in order to get closer to broader (and even globally applicable) solutions in multicultural Europe, we should also change our point of view when it comes to EU and the process of europeization. Regarding this, Vink and Graziano insisted that instead of top-down, the research agenda of europeization should be in bottom-up-down direction, starting on domestic level, analyzing the formation of institutions and policies on EU-level, and finally, defining the effects of challenges and pressures of European integration on domestic level. For understanding multiculturalism as one of the greatest sources of democracy and participation of citizens of united Europe, it is necessary to include divergence and differentiation into our research, not only convergence and harmonization. We should consider both direct and indirect effects of europeization – both the effects of implementation of European legislative and horizontal effects of European integration. Our research (of policy and polity in EU) should not ignore the politics of EU – broader research structures, discourses, identities (Vink and Graziano 2006), which are essential for completing the mosaic of plural, multicultural Europe.

It is clear that if we ignore the difference and force the frames of past, we can obviously expect conflicts and clashes. The colorfulness of multicultural society in Europe has a creative potential for achieving sustainable peace and justice that remains exactly in these differences. According to Negri – if the difference is productive, there is no subordination, nor is it necessary to take over the control, because the potential of difference is already affirmed. This strongly influences the collective dimension of life (Negri 2007).

Foucault and Deleuze (2008) share the understanding of the contemporary society as a strategic one, and not contradictory in itself. Namely, contradiction is totally inappropriate word, since society flees and power relations are deterritorialized. There is absolutely no space for marginalization of difference. Problem is – how to combine unification of Europe with these complex conditions of contemporary, globalized world?

### 3. PRAGMATISM AND PLURAL SOCIETY

To answer to this kind of question, we could also look for good theoretical postulates in the heritage of pragmatic thought, which could be applied to both EU- and global democratic issues. For example, as Mujkić stated, topics of contemporary discussions about ethnicity and all those serious questions about the possibility of imagining political community without the domination of the ethnical, are simply variations of the question: can we think the modern state without its king and dominant religion? Those are some of the questions about contemporary political community, to which pragmatism gives a clear answer: yes, with a little luck, people can govern themselves. State without its king and dominant religion is not only possible, but also something that humanity strives for. Namely, reduction of freedom and dignity of citizen as human being cannot be legitimized by anything. Thus, European and global political community can be understood without the political domination of the ethnical principle (Mujkić 2010, 4).

When it comes to American radical democratic heritage, it is the time we live in which makes us more and more attracted by its remarkable, pragmatist thought. William James referred to pragmatism as a new name for some old ways of thinking (James, 2007). According to Robertson, the use of the word pragmatic in political argument is usually characterized as an equivalent of common sense. It is considered as lack of ideas or muddling through. It is the conservatives that usually refer to themselves as pragmatic, wanting to draw a distinction between ‘ideologues’, which stick to a particular social theory at any cost, and them as ones with common-sense or ‘practical’ approach, which will consider each problem separately. There is a serious point of rival political theory underlying it. It is also considered that pragmatism easily slips into opportunism. It is believed that it is a synonym for mindless short-term expediency. Thus, the distinction between ideology and pragmatism could be considered as false. Namely, pragmatism dogmatically insists on impossibility of far-seeing deliberate reform, and thus it represents a deliberate ‘ideological’ standpoint of human nature (Robertson 2004, 400–401).

However, it seems that pragmatic thinking could lead us to some core (theoretical) solutions in our plural world, since James’ pragmatic method, for example, promises us that we can overcome the clashes of different views and observe the differences between their practical consequences (James 2007, 36).

Thus, according to pragmatism, it is possible to go beyond those clashes of different views, and just observe the practical consequences instead (James 2007, 36). This could lead us to solutions for multicultural society of EU. On the way to these democratic solutions, power should be derived from the consciousness about justice, which could block the extreme forces in their attempts of impact and violence on society (Paine in Foner 1945). When it comes to achieving the democratic goals, Dewey stressed the importance of means for achieving democratic ends. Namely, if our tendencies are towards greater changes in EU – which could be considered as radical ones – we are forced to use means, which are as radical as our goals. Thus, since the democracy was not adequately realized in institutional, legal, cultural and economic sense, as an end, it is a radical one. In fact, insisting upon democratic methods as means is radical. We cannot talk about democratic changes without paying full respect to our common human nature and voluntary action of public collective intelligence (Dewey 1937).

Since democracy indeed remains the huge task before us, we might find it very useful to consider Dewey's reminding on the events of shaping the nation of the United States, which was committed to the creation of democracy. At that time, after they were in pioneer position, with the help of wise, politically inventive men, who knew how to use physical circumstances and material resources, they tried to readapt ideas and institutions in accordance to new situation. Today, since there are no boundless, free lands any more, these circumstances became moral, and resources are rather human than material, which makes our situation more complex and critical. That is why we need to stop acting like democracy is something that was once established, and it will be re-establish by itself over and over again. Even if we say that it is a way of life, we can be more precise. Although it does not involve anything fundamentally new, democracy is a personal way of individual life. Only the creation of personal attitudes of individuals gives us the chance to meet the powerful present enemies of democracy. Its defense should not be based on external (civil or military) means. Dewey's radicalism does not include revolution. The most important is human nature of individual, no matter what sex, race, and color he or she is. This should be applied both in theory and in practice, on paper and in daily life. Everybody should have the equal opportunity for development of any gift he has. Besides faith in human nature in general, the democracy is controlled by the belief that human beings are capable to intelligently judge and act, and by personal faith in personal day-by-day working together with others. Competition and rivalry are considered as enrichment in life, and are

inherent in the democratic personal way of life. Experience as free interaction of individual human beings with (especially human) surrounding conditions, which satisfies and develops desire and need by increasing knowledge of things as they are, is more important than any special result. In democracy, process of experience is both mean and the end. It is continuous – after experience, a more humane and free one will come (Dewey 1939).

#### **4. OUR GOAL: COSMOPOLITAN CITIZEN**

Cosmopolitanism is based on individualism, universality and generality – the emphasis is put on persons (not tribes, communities and so on), equality and inclusion of all people. When it comes to compatibility of cosmopolitan justice and cultural diversity, Caney noticed three obstacles: cultural relativism (cosmopolitanism does not depend on transcultural truths), cultural respect (it oversees the common concerns, distribution of resources, dealing with conflicts and so on), diverse cultural values (it is not possible to identify sources of common values) (Caney 2000, 525–551). Also Dobson warns us about motivational vacuum of cosmopolitanism due to thin or weak connection between members of common humanity, which acknowledges similarities of common humanity, but skips the aspect of political action. He offers different, alternative (to communitarian) approach, which strengthens these ties – this is called thick cosmopolitanism, including causal responsibility in order to react on time in case of suffering and weakness of others, instead of plain ethical appeals of higher level. It is not important just to believe in cosmopolitanism – it must also be exercised (Dobson 2006).

Multicultural, cosmopolitan citizen of EU does not need – as Turner stated – the strong scenario of otherness, for identity is not formed in conflict with others. He rather speaks about cosmopolitan value, which represents forward evolution in the process of civilization. Cosmopolitan value accepts pacifist values and a priori excludes violence as model of action. Care or concern for others and protection of their rights, which rest on the heart of legislative about human rights, represent civilizational transformation of international relations. If we want cosmopolitan value to become an active principal, we need irony: ability for respecting culture of other demands a certain amount of ironical distance from own culture. According to Turner, this irony does not stand against patriot attitude towards home country, in contrary – it represents its

condition. Irony works only if we develop emotional relationship with space, and it represents a creative, (re)formulating vision of our own culture and an antipode to nationalism. Author also warns about the analytical deficit of theory, which tends to separate patriotism and cosmopolitanism. If we would like to understand the possibilities for their synergy, we need different definition of patriotism. If we insist on ironical distance towards our own culture, than we gain possibility of certain freedom in (self)determination, which is constantly open and infinite process. Besides, distance towards our own tradition, cultural values and norms, is also a form of obligation to recognize the vulnerability of others. Since the modern society is complex and hybrid, there is no appropriate place for real and extreme feelings. Intercultural sensitivities and the need for constant interaction with strangers promote irony as mostly valued norm of social interaction. Irony is sensitive to simulation, which is necessary for interaction in multicultural societies. Ironical distance becomes compatible with globalized hybrid world, for we all became urban strangers (Turner, 50–57).

Since we want freedom, justice and democracy, Waldron's Kantian definition of cosmopolitan right seems interesting and applicable to our multicultural concerns in EU. Namely, people share the land with those, who live differently. Those people move on the same, closed space. They do not know, who will discover someone as his/her neighbor, under which conditions someone will cooperate, adapt and so on. Humans are both social and asocial beings – on one hand, they surrender their beliefs due to others, and on the other hand, they want to control everything according to their own ideas. That means that cosmopolitan right has very interesting implications for particular states, which are far away from the business of international law, federations of states and cosmopolitan commonwealths. Such cosmopolitan approach could bring discipline in politics, so it could consider others, reflect its readiness to accept and act in accordance with the principle saying that people share the limited world with others. According to Waldron, it is not true that someone who lives in a particular culture overwhelms that culture in whole. Nobody can say that he/she follows the practices of his/her own community. It is neither true that someone who lives a life of cosmopolitan experiences wears a coat of many different colors. All cultures already have some cosmopolitan aspects, for human beings are like curious animals – they travel, migrate, fight and so on, but they also report about the explored ways of life of others. Author stresses the importance of distinctiveness and advertising or



announcing, but most important is to live in the world and not to consider any man as foreigner (Waldron 2000).

Vidmar Horvat suggested new kind of citizenship as a result of forming a new ethics of political cooperation, based on concerns for freedom and equality of all members of particular territorialized community. We should provide conditions for stranger to speak up and cooperate in formulating the local, already globalized society, and create collective memory about love for home country, which is based on diverse contribution to responsible treatment of earth and Earth (Vidmar Horvat 2011, 23).

## 5. CONCLUSION

Finally, in this paper we explored that an ideal citizen in multicultural and globalized EU and world is a cosmopolitan citizen, whose identity begins with negation of existence of the great Other. This closes all doors to discrimination and potential conflicts, and opens them to tolerance and solidarity. Cosmopolitan citizen not only pays attention to someone's difference, but also gives to diversity the main, essential role. Principally, he acknowledges the similarities and connection with the rest of humankind. Morally, he is aware of his responsibility for consequences regarding others. Cosmopolitan citizen also shifts his thinking about his own cultural identity and leaves space for both continuous self-reflection and reflection on understanding of other, ever-changing globalized political communities.

Also pragmatic thought is widely practically applicable in our society lacking of egalitarianism and freedom. Inspired by Dewey's idea of pragmatism as the 'philosophy of democracy' (Dewey in Rorty 1999, 24), we could say that pragmatist thinkers left not just a map, but many maps, which we could use to be our guide in global, pluralist world, which (nowadays even loudly) exclusively demands – democracy. Not a try for democracy, but a high concentration of it with a quick shot. However, these maps do not have red lines that represent directions leading us to exact destination, or remind us on front lines that limit our imagination. For it has always been – although unfairly – marginalized as humanity's both power force and navigation.

## REFERENCES

- Buchanan, Ian and Nicholas Thoburn. 2008. *Deleuze and Politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Caney, Simon. 2000. Cosmopolitan Justice and Cultural Diversity. *Global Society* 14 (4): 526 – 551.
- Dobson, Andrew. 2006. Thick Cosmopolitanism. *Political Studies* 54: 165–184.
- Foner, S. Philip. 1945. *The Complete Writings of Thomas Paine*. New York: The Citadel Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1987. *Social Theory and Modern Sociology*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Hickman, A. Larry and Thomas M. Alexander. 1998. *The Essential Dewey. Pragmatism, Education, Democracy*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- James, William. 2002. *Pragmatizem in volja do verovanja*. Ljubljana: Krtina.
- Lukšič, Igor and Jernej Pikalo. 2007. *Uvod v zgodovino političnih idej*. Ljubljana: Založba Sophia.
- Maarten P. Vink and Paolo Graziano. 2006. Challenges of a New Research Agenda. In *Europeization: New Research Agendas*, ed. Maarten P. Vink and Paolo Graziano, 3–20. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Mandelc, Damjan. 2010. Multikulturalizem, multikulturni dialog. In *Nova državljanstva v dobi globalizacije*, ed. Jernej Pikalo. 31–56. Ljubljana: Sophia.
- Mujkić, Asim. 2010. *Pravda i etnonacionalizam*. Sarajevo: Centar za ljudska prava Univerziteta u Sarajevu. Fondacija Heinrich Böll, Ured u Sarajevu.
- Negri, Antonio. 2007. *The porcelain Workshop. For a New Grammar of Politics*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).
- Pikalo, Jernej. 2010. Od etničnega do kozmopolitskega državljanstva. In *Nova državljanstva v dobi globalizacije*, ed. Jernej Pikalo, 1–25. Ljubljana: Sophia.
- Robertson, David. 2004. *The Routledge Dictionary of Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Rorty, Richard. 1999. *Philosophy and Social Hope*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Turner, Brian S. 2002. Cosmopolitan Virtue, Globalization and Patriotism. *Theory, Culture and Society* 19: 45–63.

- Vidmar Horvat, Ksenija. 2011. Novo državljanstvo, patriotizem in kozmopolitstvo. In *Nov(o) državljan(stvo)*, ed. Cirila Toplak and Žiga Vodovnik, 1–25. Ljubljana: Sophia.
- Waldron, Jeremy. 2000. What is Cosmopolitan? *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 8 (2): 227–243.