



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

„Nation-States and Democracy in a Globalized Europe “

Verfasser

Lárus Heiðar Ásgeirsson

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magister der Philosophie (Mag.Phil)

Wien, 2011

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: A -300

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt: Politikwissenschaft

Betreuerin / Betreuer: Prof. Dr. Peter Gerlich

Summary	4
Abstrakt	4
1. Prologue	6
2. Introduction.....	8
3. What is democracy – not a law it is an Idea	13
History of democracy	13
What problems do democracies face.....	15
The democratic heritage of Europe.....	17
4. What is a Nation and a Nation-State.....	19
The difference between nation and nation-state	19
The origin of nations.....	20
What makes a nation?.....	22
The state	24
Globalizations effects on the nation-state	26
The role of capital.....	26
The future of the nation-state?.....	28
5. Sovereignty.....	31
6. What is the European Union	34
Why is there an European Union?	34
The unfinished project	40
Empire – old and new.....	43
8. Globalization and its affects on the European Union.....	47
The incalculability of the global.....	51
The democratic revolutions in rise of the globalization.....	52
The quest for the “finalité”	53
9. Democracy within the EU	57
Hopelessly lost in its search for some truth?	57
The democratic deficit.....	58
10. Conclusion	62
The Change.....	63
Why Europe?	64
The world of a Cosmological Europe and newly found Empires.....	65
11. References	68
Lebenslauf	72

Summary

Studies on the European Union have alongside the Union been rising in the past decades. This study is intended to explore the European Union from the perspective of theories about nation-states, democracy and globalization. That exploration confronts both the problems and limits of the European Union as well as its chances for the future. In this study many terms and ideas are reviewed that are often seen as self-evident, the best examples here are both nations and states.

This study mainly focuses on politics as human interactions and that the power of these interactions are human ideas. In an attempt to find out what role nations and nation-states have in the future of the European Union the author starts by reviewing ideas of democracy and nation-states, from those stepping stones the study can reach its core with the chapter about the European Union and from there the influences of globalization on both the EU as well as its nation-states can be evaluated.

The result of this study is that even when it is facing many problems, is controversial and imperfect the European Union still is the best possible weapon in the common European arsenal, when facing both of financial and social crisis. It has problems, but these problems are manmade and can therefore be fixed.

Abstrakt

Untersuchungen über die Europäische Union haben beiseite der Union gewachsen in den vergangen Jahrzenten. Diese Untersuchung soll die Europäische Union aus der Sicht der Theorien über Nationalstaaten, Demokratie und Globalisierung erkunden. In die Arbeit werden die Probleme und Einschränkungen der Union sowie die Chancen für die Zukunft konfrontiert. Hier werden viele begriffe und Ideen die häufig als „selbstevident“ gesehen werden geprüft, die besten Beispiele sind Nationen und Staaten.

Dieser Untersuchung fokussiert hauptsächlich auf die Politik als menschliche Interaktionen und das der macht von die Interaktionen Ideen sind. In ein versuch zu herauszufinden welche rolle Nationen und Nationalstaaten haben in die Zukunft der Europäischen Union der Autor fängt an mit einer kritischer Handlung der Begriffe

Demokratie und Nationalstaaten. Von dort kann die Untersuchung den Kernstück der Arbeit, den Kapitel über den EU erreichen und dann weiter zu den beeinflussen der Globalisierung auf die Union und die Nationalstaaten.

Das Ergebnis der Untersuchung ist das, auch wenn es mit vielen Problemen konfrontiert wird und kontroversiell und unvollkommen ist dann ist der Europäische Union trotzdem Europas beste Waffe gegen ökonomischen und finanziellen Krisen. Es ist defekt aber die defekt sind von Menschenhand gemacht und können deshalb korrigiert werden.

1. Prologue

Sitting down at the desk, enjoying it in the summers breeze in the park or reading this work going from place A to B in the public transportation, there is the possibility that to some readers this work might seem unusual, as an attempt to preemptively handle that problem this short prologue is an explanation of its nature.

The idea behind this work lies on two levels. First of all an desire to take active part in the search for Europe the true Europe or even the future of it. Secondly, after the economic collapse of my country of origin, Iceland, I started to question more the “truths” which were presented in society, the ones which previously or even still today I agree with. I started reading different books, which gave new perspectives. If nothing in the financial market of Iceland, which is mainly just as the financial market everywhere else only smaller scale, is as it was said to be, what about everything else? Perhaps this is an pessimistic view of the world politics and power – but being an optimist, allowing some degree pessimism to enter the mind, should only have the outcome of more balanced views and logic.

There are multiple motives for each action. The world which is presented has sometimes only two, left/right or good/bad as only possibilities. In the real world this helps us only in limited way, for the real world is more complex. Anywhere one looks at the world, the statement can easily be made that it is at crossroads. It is easy to identify occasions in the past that mark a transformation, however it is hard to see them when they are about to take place or already happening. At this present time there is not only a economic crisis, there seems to be a system-crisis, in a wide understanding of the term. The post Word war era is passing us by, the globalization is pushing it away and simultaneously filling the void. This globalization seems both irrelevant to territory, time and an has not certain center, neither a center of power nor of a beginning. The globalization seems free from traditional forms of governing. This globalization stands beyond traditional definitions of politics and hegemony. To fully understand it, the world not only needs new answers, it needs new questions, new concepts and new terms. In times like these, it is hard to see in which direction to go and it becomes even more difficult when the situation is put in context with Bertrand Russell’s saying that: “The whole problem with the world is that fools and fanatics are always so certain of

themselves, but wiser people so full of doubts.” Even the people that might seem the right candidates to lead, have hesitated. Others who claim they know what to do, point to the past. In order to understand the present, it is useful to take an abstract view of the situation. After this experiment the distance from the answer is perhaps equally far, but hopefully the understanding of the problem has grown.

The enlightenment gave us tools to take on such quests. The encouragement to be active, not passive – have courage to speak our mind and not let old books guide or old ideas control us – we should make new ones using our logic and based on the wisdom of our forefathers. One might say that the society still are facing similar challenges, our society is not an enlightened one in every understanding of that word. It seems as persons are still being controlled and like Kant stated our problem lies in the *“Selbstverschuldeten Unmündigkeit”*; people are being guided instead of trusting their own minds in reasoning and the cause lies not with in the human being not being able to act, more in the lack of courage to act. Sapere Aude! Have courage to live by and trust your own “understanding”. (Hrsg: Bahr, 1996)

One has to allow oneself to think outside the box, or even erase the box entirely. Majority of the definitions used in 20th century politics were filled with presumptions of self-evident truths, mixed with memories, feelings and often connected the most brutal parts of common history. Can there be an rational discussion about any topic, when the discussants carry such heavy baggage to every discussion. New situations call for new explanations, the present situation is truly new. Instead of the divided past, there seems to be forming a world community, the boundaries between the macro and micro are dissolving, while both are facing crisis, both political and economic, perhaps even cultural to some extent. Perhaps we are moving closer to the words allegedly said by Socrates, one is not from Athens, in his case, from Akureyri in this authors or Austria in the case of most of the readers, but the world.

2. Introduction

My interest lies in finding out more regarding the importance and relationship between three major concepts of politics and the public life of people in the beginning of the 21st Century. These concepts are Democracy, Nation state and the European Union. As a guiding light on this way I will ask myself the following question:

Are the Nation States standing in the way of a democratic European Union?

This question works as an almost automatic trigger for further questions, such as what do these terms really mean: What is a Nation, what is a State, what is democracy and what is the European Union? In order to answer the main question it needs to be deconstructed and connected with the problems and reality facing the European Nation States and the EU. In democratic politics, power is used to implement the will of the public, or at least the majority of the public. In multistate cooperation, such as the EU, the main goal of the participating states is therefore to protect the interests of that state. A logical question to follow the main question is consequently. How can the Nation states within the EU increase the democratic powers and democratic interest of the Union without losing their rights and powers? How come are the European nations facing this problem, since it only seems logical that a Union of democratic nations would be a democratic union.

What might seem as a paradox is, that by protecting the traditional interests of their nation-states and holding on to traditional rights and powers, the members states of the EU might, in regards to the current situation of a globalized world, might actually losing power and becoming less democratic instead of vice versa. Why is democracy so important, why is this idea held so high both in society and amongst the authors writing about the subject. Could it be because they see democracy as the key to the solution of Europe's problems? True democracy stands for freedom, equality, liberty and justice, which could just as well be defined as the goal of the European Union.

The well know discussions about the legitimacy and democratic problems of the European Union, must also be answered in order to answer the main question. Statements regarding increased influence of an privileged elite at the cost of the majority of the population are frequent in European debates. These debates do focus on different

and most often very interesting and important factors concerning the true condition of the nation-states and their interesting cooperation. To thoroughly understand this new situation one needs to take a look at the bigger picture, while when the focus is just on the EU, individual nation-states or specific problems regarding the Union, one can very well find some truths, however the core of the problem, which needs to be resolved is not within the borders of individual nation-states or regional organization, but is completely global and lies over them as a whole and not piece by piece. Therefore in order to understand what the European project is really all about and how or if it can be used to bring more peace, prosperity and democracy into the world one must seek answers else where than just in literature directly connected to the EU. As was shown in the prologue, the world community is transforming, it is not in the same place as it was, the politics, the nation-states and its powers are becoming more distant from the real power, making the development in the world harder to predict. For that reason it is important to understand the EU, for it is the most highly developed regional collaboration today and many see it as a future example of international partnership. Another aspect of international politics which has changed is actually in the core of the EU cooperation the EU is not going to, or has any plan of a domination of the world, in imperialistic Empire style. Mark Leonard does point out that Europe will not, and has no intention to rule the World, but he believes that the European way of doing things will. The keyword for the EU is cooperation, rules, regulations and respect for the differences and the common heritage the region it exists in. (Leonard, 2007) The future of democracy seems to lie with how the citizens deal with questions of citizenship, lack of sovereignty and how they react to the influence of an irreversible globalization. Throughout the history Nations and States have presented themselves as natural and somewhat unchangeable, any changes to the states are important because of the dilemma the changes logically turn on the citizens and their rights and methods of having influence on their societies. Nations seem a bit selfish, hardly ever a nation declares itself equal to all other nations, they are complex, based on common heritage, myths and some sort of spirituality.

When faced with this new situation, many who have faced the complexity of the EU have described it as “*sui generis*”, to some extent it is a sign of laziness to declare something, in an crucial time as “*sui generis*” and find that a satisfactory explanation of something as big and important as the EU. However to be fair, when the EU has not yet

reached its state of finality and might not for some time to be, nevertheless in uncertain times it is hard to wait for some finality on an unfinished project. The development of the EU is not only for Europe but other continents as well highly interesting, for the search for new hegemony in the world is ongoing and the solutions are not always clear. For Anthony Giddens, although he feels as the world is a runaway one, it is clear that what the world needs not less government, but more and that can only be provided with democratic institutions. (Giddens, 2002) For some the EU can be described as a house of mirrors, that makes any debate over Europe complex, the participants might be comparing totally different parts of the Union. Because of this complexity it might be easy to dismiss the benefits of the EU, some even claim that they are not connected to the EU, just taken for granted. Is the European Union only an answer to a more complex world, were depowered nation-states and post-democratic democracies try to find solutions to different problems both old and new.

If one thing is certain it is that this globalization, has made the globe seem smaller but simultaneously no less complex. The old days of a bipolar west vs. east or good vs. bad are gone and one might claim that finally we understand that, we know that we know nothing. Never has so much information been at the reach of each and every individual, but at the same time we know that we don't know much, for the incalculability of the world seem endless. This situation is best described by Ulrich Beck in his work *World at Risk*, where he describes that the irony of risk is that rationality – which means past experience – misleads us into measuring risks against completely inappropriate standards and into treating them as calculable and controllable. We cannot eliminate risks without damaging our societies, by e.g. damaging the plurality of the community, the task of the community “is to organize and regulate the cultural coexistence of people who encounter each other as equals.” (Beck, *World at Risk*, 2009, S. 49). Freedom means that complete strangers are can trust each other and therefore act in unity, freedom is based on this capability to make new beginnings. In order to be permanently ready for the unexpected one cannot trust the society as persons do, with this example the trust which is key factor in this definition of freedom would vanish and the society lose much of its core. For in the modern culture, were risks are omnipresent, citizens live in denial of the risks, they are in a almost nihilistic way ignorant of it and according to Beck must realize in the that they are trapped on this globe to gather. (Beck, *World at Risk*, 2009)

This globalization as will be comprehensively shown in this work both delocalized and incalculable, hence new political solutions are needed to resolve its problems. According to Beck, “neither science, nor the politics, nor the mass media, nor business, nor the legal system, nor even the military, is in a position to define or control risks in a rational way. The individual is forced to mistrust the promises of rationality of these institutions.” (Beck, *World at Risk*, 2009, S. 54) The citizens are supposed to stand on their own in this new complex situation, at the same time the capital seeks to dissolve the state or at least merge the capital with the state and using its legitimacy forming a neoliberal state. Often this modern society is seen as some sort of “finality”, this modern capitalistic representative democracy is described as at the end of time. It must be dangerous for any society, to believe it is the “perfect one”, that no change is to come and no except risks and fears are ahead. That is more like the description of stagnation than perfection, the quest and belief in a better future is a driving force of change. Political science must have interties in not only describing what was but searching for the possibilities of what might come.

This semi-peaceful globalization, the regional modern Empire EU and modern notion of a democratic society are therefore at the core of this work. It describes a society where it is utterly important, while the citizens depend *de facto* only on their own sense, that both legislation, treaties and actually all implementation of regulations in this society should be understandable for every person that it effects, it however is not the case, it is at times presented in a way that only “specialists” understand it and can actively take part in debates about it.

In the literature which have guided the author in making this work the term Empire is frequently used to describe the globalized world, however it is never used in the same way. The authors only seem to agree that it is not like the earlier empires, for the more it shows its powers, the less power it has to implement its goals on a global scale. “Along with the global market and global circuits of production has emerged a global order, a new logic and structure of rule —in short, a new form of sovereignty.” (Hardt & Negri, *Empire*, S. 11) And the goal of the authors answering the Empire, such as Hardt and Negri, is not an utopia, comprehensive a solution to all problems of life, the goal is resistance against this Empire which seems so hard to describe.

As this introduction shows this work, which is more theoretical than practical, tries to use many connections as are logically possible in this attempt to explain the problems and complexities facing the nation-states of the 21st Century and how or if they can use the European Union in solving these issues. It would be highly interesting to do further research in this field, such as a follow up analyses on the national lines going in and out from Brussels, however one would need to be in Brussels for some time and interview the persons in Brussels as well as looking at data from both European Union as well as the Member States in order to do that properly.

Many of the terms which will in this work be questioned and sought to be explained are perhaps most commonly seen as self-evident. To use political theory and philosophy in order to answer the questions instead of cold hard and calculable data might seem as an undoable, because in the field of real international politics and international relations there might seem little space would be left for ideas and theories and for it is hard to explain what goes on inside the heads of political leaders and policymakers. It is however equally hard to use only data for this project, for it leaves out one of the main causes of problems facing the society, human feelings, emotions and the teaching learned from history.

3. What is democracy – not a law it is an Idea

History of democracy

One could never point at a single individual person and state “he or she” invented democracy, however the word comes from Greece and is formed from two words, “kratos” which means Rule and “demos” which has several meanings one of them being village. In Athens this form of governing has its origin and today this idea is still used, it has been revised, lost and found several times until the modernized way it is used today was developed. But what does it mean? Can one understand the dilemma that the European Union allegedly is in without a clear definition of democracy? First of all one needs to understand the term and furthermore in this era of democracy, does anything challenge it? Finally than one can continue on the quest of understanding if and how the idea of democracy can improve the European Union.

At the core of modern political societies and lives there is the seemingly well known idea of democracy, often held high by politicians, used as motivation for the citizens and even as an justification to fight wars. However enabling any decent explanation of the many complexities of modern societies, the term democracy must be clarified. Finding a simple quote from almost any politician or philosopher over the past two centuries at least would be an easy task, they might even be reasonably good explanations for what this idea stands for. It is famously the rule of the people, who rule in consensus with one another, either through elected representatives or by a referendums. In a democratic society the citizens are equal before the law and furthermore they are protected by the law. At its heart democracy stands for freedom, equality, liberty and justice for all members of the community. Democracy cannot survive without these four components and it could be argued that the other four; freedom, equality, liberty and justice, would likewise lose their importance with democracy gone. Nevertheless, democracy is not only locked within the macro-community or political sphere, it can just as well be used in everyday life; families can use it, organizations that strive for profit as well as non-profit ones can also benefit from this old idea of consensus and fairness.

In the past and even present time there are several different ideas about the degree of participation in democracy. Tom Christiano shows at least two examples of that, both Joseph Schumpeter and Plato have criticized the understanding that everybody is equally rightful in being elected. Schumpeter claims that it is desirable to elect competing elites but too inclusive definitions of equality is dangerous. Plato on the other hand argues that democracies tend to weaken the importance of expertise which is needed for a properly governed society. Others such as Amartya Sen argue that no considerable famine has occurred in any independent country with a democratic form of government, because the democratic state protects the rights even of the poor and powerless. (Christiano, 2008) What tools does the society have when an democratic majority, be it elected and represented or through referendum is wrong, morally unjust and not reasonable. This concept that seems clear and easy to understand has like any other many sides.

Democracy can also be defined in a more narrow manner, Anthony Giddens defines democracy, from this short of a perspective when he describes it as a:

“system involving effective competition between political parties for positions of power. In a democracy, there are regular and fair elections, in which all members of the population may take part. These rights of democratic participation go along with civil liberties – freedom of expression and discussion, together with the freedom to form and join political groups or associations”. (Giddens, 2002, S. 68).

Here Giddens involves political parties and not simply individual citizens or human beings in this definition. What is clearly shown in this definition is that, in his sense, persons should act collectively in their quest to fulfill their political goals.

However, this modern society has produced several paradoxes, as it seems frequent in human societies. One of these paradoxes is the paradox of democracy, at the same time the idea spreads across the globe and more states become democratic, there are a widespread disillusion of democratic processes. Some go as far as claiming that we live in a period of Post-Democracy (Crouch, 2008), others point out that in old and stabilized democracies fewer people turn out to vote, people are disinterested in politics and seek answers elsewhere. (Giddens, 2002) Further go authors such as Hardt and Negri, who try to explain the situation with, what they claim to be new terms that fit this

new situation. They claim that an “Empire is materializing before our eyes”, a new form of sovereignty and hegemony. (Hardt & Negri, Empire)

At the moment both societal and economic dynamics are claimed to be beyond control of the democratic authority, therefore it is evident that some change is likely to take place. One of the most common claims is that what needs to be done is “democratizing the democracy”, but according to the many authors that debate over the matter, the change needs to be done at a transnational level and not the traditional national one. To further democratize individual, small states should not be too hard, the past teaches us that people tend to trust their nation and are willing to give their loyalty to the state while it gives them voice, when the citizens become speechless, the speechlessness produces disloyalty to the state. (Berazin, 1999) Therefore it is hard to see what will happen, the democratic entities that once gave individuals collective voice do not withhold the same power as they used to, they do not give the citizens the same voice as they did, which could lead to distrust, disloyalty and even disbelief in the functionality of the nation-states. The power that they once held has with the rise globalization in the economic field and the transformation of political borders gone to some extent to both conglomerates and to international organizations. The influence of the majority is ever less and an privileged elite has most of the power at its hand. (Crouch, 2008). It must however be made clear that the conglomerates and international organizations are not represented by non-nationals or non-citizens, as it sometimes might seem in the discussions, the previous power of the democracies and therefore democratic powers the citizens are diminished. In the past democracy and nation-state were coextensive and with the recent changes both democracy and the nation-state now stop at national borders, when the new influential multinationals have the whole globe as their playing field. Democratic politics did presume a national society of a self-governing nation. But after the impact of globalization, national sovereignty itself has become a fuzzy idea. (Giddens, 2002)

What problems do democracies face

One of the main complications about the current situation is, what Crouch describes as a strong tendency towards a post-democratic community, instead of focusing on the

typical activities of the state it focuses on a neoliberal “*free market equals free society*” ideology. (Crouch, 2008) The global community has been changed through a irreversible globalization of the economy as well as the culture. This situation is either praised or condemned, people celebrate the increased freedom in the world and others fear that the tools once used by the citizens to have influence are now gone. (Hardt & Negri, Empire) This situation could be connected with some sort of dualism, and this duality is very clear with Giddens, who claims that “Corporations can threaten the democratic legitimacy of states, in the industrial as well as the developing countries.” (Giddens, 2002, S. xxv) They can do it by buying votes or dominate the funding of political parties, with intense lobbyism or by choosing their location based on the local taxation. Nevertheless, it can be exaggerated how influential the corporations are says Giddens, specially he criticizes those who claim that corporations now “run the world”. Furthermore, Giddens states that especially if nations act in cooperation they have far more power than corporations. Nations make laws, control territory and control military powers, but corporations have none of these functions. (Giddens, 2002) There are of course some truths to these claims from Giddens, yet, if one states that “corporations threaten the democratic legitimacy of states”, mainly by the power of money, it is hard to understand how the same person can state on the same page that it does not matter. Who is really in control of the nation-states, corporations that pay the salary of the natives, that pay the highest taxes that fund the state and can though their influence the political system. Perhaps that is an vast overstatement, but recent incidents show how real that threat that corporations present to the democratic rule of nations really is. These examples which here follow did all quite recently come into light. The first one shows the influence of a corporation on diplomatic relations, the embassy of the USA in Paris suggested to Washington it should start a “military style trade war” with the EU over genetically modified crops. The reason for the outburst of the diplomat was the discussion for the ban of the controversial Monsanto Corn in France. (Vidal, 2011) For an diplomat to suggest such drastic actions against an ally, because of a disagreement over corn produced by only one company raises serious questions of the interest that lie behind. The next example shows how a Oil conglomerate claims to have direct influence in ministries of a oil rich but legislatively and socially poor country, as the Oil company Shell states it has informants in every important ministry in the State of Nigeria. (Smith, 2010) And finally in regards with the statement that nations have militaries and

corporations do not, it is best to have a look at private military companies such as Blackwater (now called Xe) and others which have played a crucial role in the war in Iraq and they have been taking over ever more of the assignments that once were only done by national militaries or national police force. (Denselow, 2010)

The objective of these few examples is not by any mean to show how bad the Western states behave in the innocent poorer countries. For many of the problems that are facing many developing countries do not solely lie with the “evil empires” of the West, in many of them corrupt local government do not allow their countries to grow. (Syal, 2010) The intention was simply to show how complex and actual the situation is, rarely there is only one truth, if there is even such a thing as a truth in difficult situations like these. So whatever the truth there might be, it is only clear that this is a major transformation and puts the nation-state in a new position. And what is clear if it is the intention to hold on to democratic powers it cannot be locked within closed national borders.

The democratic heritage of Europe

The political heritage of Europe lies according to Peter Wager in the four principles; liberty, statehood, democracy and revolution. One might be tempted to call them four principles of modernity, at least they all play a role its creation. Liberty is presented first through the Magna Charta, then Habeas Corpus Act and after a leap forwards it appears in the French constitution. Wagner calls it a leap because of several points, the declaration applies to a large polity and it has universal learning's, it refers to the singular human being. (Wagner, 2005) The idea still needed, after centuries of development and two world wars and the trauma of totalitarianism, an further chapter to it, the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. Statehood is presented through two points, in intellectual history with the elaboration of the concept of sovereignty by Bodin and then Hobbes which launches the idea that states have full control over its territory and residents, and in political history with the Treaty of Westphalia, which as an idea ends religious wars in Europe. (Wagner, 2005) Wagner states that democracy has the longest roots of these ideas and transforms from time to time until it is what modern Europe knows it to be, after the idea of sovereignty was

presented. Democracy therefore is a child of modernity, it would not have reached its place in the history of mankind without the help of other ideas. It found support as an supreme idea after the founding revolutions of modernity, in both the declaration of human rights in France and the Bill of Rights in the United States of America the idea of democracy is held high. This “democratic revolution marks the entry of ‘the people’ into legitimate political debate and, thus, changes the terms of political struggle.” (Wagner, 2005, S. 61) One can therefore easily state that modernity has its roots equally in the ideas of liberalism, democracy as well as the idea of revolution, amongst others. Still the ideas of democracy and liberty seem to be held higher than the one of revolution, the idea of revolution seems sometimes to be disconnected from the story and it is even presented as some sort of antithesis to other aspects of Modernity. That is perhaps because “this modernity destroys its relations with the past and declares the immanence of the new paradigm of the world and life.” (Hardt & Negri, *Empire*, S. 74) When this new situation becomes “new truth”, according to this theory, counter-revolution should take shape. Modernity is therefore to some extent characterized by permanent crisis, it creates, constructs and deconstructs and this conflict is the key to modernity. (Hardt & Negri, *Empire*)

If we accept this claim, that is, that a constant transformation takes place, which should not be too hard to comprehend in regards with the rapid changes of forms of government of the 20th century. It is reasonably plausible that the crisis of democracy in the beginning of the 21st are not just mere illusions of few scientist who wish to be well known and sell more books, but real changes, at least, no matter what one might think of these theories, it is interesting enough to give it a thorough look. In regards with the idea of democracy it has to some extent been described but because it is at the core of many other ideas, it needs to be placed in connection with other aspects to describe its problems that cause its difficulties and philosophize about its future. The future of democracy lies with how the citizens deal with questions of citizenship, lack of sovereignty and the irreversible globalization. In order to understand both citizenship and sovereignty, the concept and idea behind “Nation” must be defined and discussed.

4. What is a Nation and a Nation-State

The difference between nation and nation-state

According to Cohen for many the nation-state is now considered obsolete. The dilemma logically places not only the nation-state itself in question but also the citizens and their rights and methods of having influence on their societies. (Cohen, 1999, S. 246) Whether they are obsolete or not, it only makes it more important to understand the meaning of these two concepts that either play or have played such a major role in. First of all, there is a clear difference between nation and state, it will be articulated later on in this chapter, however their journey begins together.

From early on in most of the tribes and cities of antiquity, these two entities were basically extensions of the family. But in the Roman Empire the situation changed completely, provinces and cultures, which were different from each other were joined under one ruler. What helped the Roman Empire in the late stages, was Christianity, it worked even more effectively in universal and absolute character. (Renan) In the times of the Roman Empire, tribes still ruled the barbarian world, research shows that the barbarian were however closer to the Romans than one might think. After the fall of the Roman Empire, Western Europe can be divided into four major territories: Germania, Gallia, Italia and Britannia. (Llorbera, 2003) To start at that period of time would lead this work away from its goal, Lansford rightly starts his overview of the development of the nation-states with the treaty of Westphalia in 1648. With the centralization and institutionalization of the public authority. (Landsford, 2003) The main powers of that period, that is those in position to create something so large as a nation and a state, were the European Dynasties and the Church. Using simple logic it becomes clear that anyone with power would never release such an idea, without expecting something in return. Peasants and Merchants of that time did not have the chance to believe in modern day liberties and democracy, so one can hardly connect them at that time in history. That is why many state that nations are designed or invented. Others such as Llorbera are very critical of those who claim that the nations are mere inventions of humans, he states that they were nor created out of nothing (*ex nihilo*) and claims that there is a need for roots and tradition in a community. Whether one accepts that nations were not created out of

nothing or that they are some sort of a natural development in human communities, the nations they were ruled and controlled by someone and for some reason.

It is frequently stated by historians that in France the state proceeded the nation but in England it was reversed with the state following the nation. But to Llobera, the key point is that the state and nation reinforce each other. For others such as Münkler the nation as a concept began not with the rise of nationalism with the French Revolution but with the beginning of national differentiation within the universal institution of Christianity. (Münkler, 1999) It was therefore already there at the time of the French Revolution and the nation survived the fall of the state. Tom Lansford points out that before the nation-state was founded, the landscape of political authority was complex, national boundaries were of little use as rulers governed different territories with different methods, some as vassals of other rulers. This complexity made it hard to develop significant military power and loyalty was only secure with a fraction of the population of the old Empire's. Later on, developments in the military made it impossible for a small feudal system to last long without the help of others. The European states which then formed were strong enough to survive and managed to raise sufficient level of common identity for loyal subjects. What is special for Europe is that the diverse geography of the continent led to cultivation of diverse products, and these products and other goods from other regions could quite easily be transported to and around Europe. This exchange of goods led to development in the field of credit and banking practices and the merchants as well as the bankers were left mainly unrestrained by government, those who tried to exploit the merchants found themselves left out of the trade routes. (Landsford, 2003)

The origin of nations

Herfried Münkler deals with the origins of nations in the text "Nation as a Model of Political Order and the Growth of National Identity in Europe". There he presents nations as a symbolic expression of the political world, that is of the reality. Nations need the symbols and stories for their collective memory, to reinvent themselves. These stories focus on the founding of the nations, myths of ancestry or motifs of nativeness, self-labeling and the stigmatization of outsiders with which the neighboring

communities of the rising nation seek to secure their own identity. (Münkler, 1999, S. 288). The term "*natio*" was polysemic at first, that is it meant many things, depending to who was using the term at the time. After the invention of Gutenberg's book-printing the term began a transition to becoming monosemic. The "helpless subjects" became actors in the development of the term "*natio*", the development lead to the possibility that people could characterize for themselves what belong to the nation and what was foreign. Münkler states that this is of tremendous importance for the solution of present political problems. (Münkler, 1999) A formed nation does not tolerate *polysemia*, and clearly distinguishes between "the Nation" and other nations. In at least some way nations can be linked to xenophobia, if it is not clear dislike of foreigners, it is at least clear that they their nation more important. Hardly ever do nations declare themselves equal to all other nations, in a humble manner and accepts that every human being has the same rights – the rights of a native citizens are normally at least a bit higher. In this extent the boundaries between nations have been naturalized, the political borders which seem as human inventions became sacred, untouchable and carved into the collective self-understanding of different nations.

With the definitions of state and nation from Landsford and Münkler combined the outcome is that the state has centralized authority, has monopoly over legitimate use of force in the community and it was formed by high officials, diplomats and lawyers. That is those who execute power of the state. The nation within the state has complex class structure, an élite and workers/peasants, which all identify themselves as the citizens. Nation is formed by writers and intellectuals, those who are the creators of stories focusing on how and why it belongs to gather. (Landsford, 2003) (Münkler, 1999) According to Hardt and Negri in their work "Empire" the very concept of the nation was developed in the patrimonial and absolutist state. And during the transition from the absolutist state to the modern one the core of the concept survived and only took over the "patrimonial body of the monarchic state and reinvented it in a new form" (Hardt & Negri, Empire, S. 95) Therefore there was only a transformation, no new invention, power of the king became the power of the sovereign nation, with some reinventions and later on changes, but the idea was the same.

What makes a nation?

More than before now in the globalized world this old idea becomes relevant again, as the weaknesses become clear, the idea of the nation as the basis of international order and the foundation of political self-determination, is particularly relevant. That is why it is interesting to find out what makes a nation, why do specific groups of people form nations and others not? In an globalized world with intense cultural interactions and influences one might also wonder is this old concept of any use today.

European states were formed from fusion, the cultures mixed, and they learned from each other. Ernst Renan wrote this over a hundred years ago and handles here one of the most noted difference between the nations, the race, he points out that while the European states, although in competition, they formed alliances and learned from each other. Race had nothing to do with the formation of modern nations, all of the large European Nations derive from mixed origins. France, Germany and Britain all have both Germanic and Celtic roots, and the truth is that there is no pure race. (Renan) Individuals seek a role in the community and want to be part of something, belonging is important for the idea of nation and it seems as the notion of race has contributed to that factor for the idea of nation. As Hardt and Negri point out the trilogy of nation, people and race are never distance from another, even when it is clear that European communities and nations were never pure and homogenous.

A second important factor in the formation of the nation is language, but just as race does not define a nation, it is similar with language. Today the usage of English, Spanish or German are used different Nation-States and even on different continents. Nevertheless, language is an important factor to consider. Llobera states that according to the medieval philosopher Thomas Aquinas it determinates the essence of the nation. (Llorbera, 2003) In the creation of myths and stories which hold the nation together, language is an important tool, it can clearly separate the nation or at least the origin of the nation from other nations. It is particularly interesting to place the language into the discussion, while it is perhaps the most important tool in International Relations. Can words evoke the same understandings, the same thoughts and feelings with different languages? The fact that people separate themselves from others with the language can for this matter lead to complications and misunderstandings. Language is a tool of unification and inclusions as well as exclusion. Whatever might thought of such

reflections, languages have historical backgrounds, they are natural to mankind and yet they are made and remade and they influence each other. They are natural but not neutral, words and ideas have a role in the collective memory and those roles can be revised. They are part of what forms culture and connect societies to the past and the future, through the language we can understand ideas from the past and form new to affect the future. Therefore the language is not neutral, it is filled with emotions and historical notions, memories and desires.

The third factor to take into consideration when one tries to understand the origins of nations is culture. This complex term contains both human inventions, arts and knowledge. Renan indicates that human culture exists before national cultures, there is first a common human culture which can then be divided into different groups according to its origin. To support his argument Renan mentions the Renaissance and that the men which there rediscovered old teachings of human culture, presented themselves not as divided into different nations but as mere humans. Traditional cultures which have supported the nation in its existence can be in the form of manners, habits, customs and laws which have helped to identify nations. Berazin calls this national culture constructed and sees it as the glue of the 19th century European state projects as "peasants" became "Frenchmen" and ideas and habits became traditions. (Berazin, 1999) Therefore it is important to behave according to the set traditions in terms of principles, symbols and manners to make clear where one belongs.

Fourth and final factor which is fundamental in the discussion of what a nation is, is territory. It might be a paradox to call it fundamental, however it is fundamental in the connection between the nation and the state. Nations can exist without territory, as in early forms of human societies humans lived from herding and collecting, but as agriculture developed and humans began to live on a fixed locality it can be stated that some form of group territory must have formed, although this was not in form of a traditional modern state. However Renan deals with the territory in this work when he declares that just as race does not make a nation, so does soil not.

"A nation is a spiritual principle, the outcome of the profound complications of history; it is a spiritual family not a group determined by the shape of the earth. We have now seen what things are not adequate for

the creation of such a spiritual principle, namely, race, language, material interest, religious affinities, geography, and military necessity.” (Renan)

The state

Now it is clear to the extent as it can be, what a nation is, attention cannot be drawn to the nation alone, because as it cannot be disconnected from politics as well as other aspects of social life, explanation can perhaps never clarify how nations came into existence, without understanding more about its connection to the state. Nations are a complex melt of belonging and participating, they cannot simply be explained through rational clarifications. Just as it can be proposed that the nation, although natural in some form, it has also been made and remade, imagined and influenced over the centuries, the same goes for the state it is imagined and manmade.

States have two important functions, first of all the state is in the business of governing, as well as the business of creating emotional attachment to the state in its attempt to secure its existence for the future and therefore keep its purpose. Llobera claims that, although the ruling elite formed states on similar grounds in which the nation states now are placed, they did not all materialize until the second half of the 19th century. (Llorbera, 2003) Over that time the idea of a nation changed and gained importance with the rise of modernization. It rose with the development of capitalist production processes and national identity was stabilized. (Hardt & Negri, Empire) The ruling elites controlled the construction of this process, culture was divided into what can be called elite and popular culture, and there was an clear distinction between the noble and poor within the nation. Because of this difference Hardt and Negri identify a difference between nation and people, they call the link between the two a powerful innovation. What seems to revolutionize and liberate is in their mind simply an extension of suppression. To understand what Hardt and Negri mean with this connection between nation and people the idea must look at more detailed. The claim is that “people” is as the original basis of the nation, but it is to them really vice versa and that the people only exist in this ideological context. Furthermore they criticize that many studies of nations and nationalisms rely on the naturalness of the concept of people without questioning this. The nation has in many aspects betrayed

the people, first of all Hardt and Negri look towards the abandonment of the international union of workers and people adaptation of an idea of separate nations locked within borders of the state, which, as said by them was just what was best for ruling elite and the capital, another betrayal was the support to the great European wars. This sort of a community is not an collective creation of an republic, which benefits all, but an creation of “re-total’, the total thing, that is, the totalitarian overcoding of social life.” (Hardt & Negri, *Empire*, S. 113)

It is very clear in the text from Hardt and Negri, that they honestly believe that the concept of nation is no longer, or perhaps never has been, capable of controlling the essence of the nation or the state. Even when the nations have defended their states in wars, and thereby themselves and their own existence Hardt and Negri claim the people was being betrayed, for there is no gain for them to fight. They claim that the identity of the People has been replaced by a mobile, flexible and permanently isolated multitude. This multitude is controlled and can only by controlled within the rules of production, exchanges and culture, put differently, in the biopolitical context of its existence. (Hardt & Negri, *Empire*)

This understanding of nation and people demystifies and destroys the older definition. Whatever one makes of the radical theories of Hardt and Negri, others state claims in similar directions. As Berazin does, when he indicates that the globalization has placed the nation-state, identity, citizenship and civil society in crisis, which for him frame the debate on globalization, democracy and political culture. And in this context the political identity, the question of how one defines and categorizes the self in political space, is relevant in view of a destabilized nation-state. (Berazin, 1999) In situation like these it is rational of people to look for the known in this unknown situation, and hold on the past. However, there is no going back to the nostalgic era of supposed better past, and as Giddens describes it.

“There are good, objective reasons to believe that we are living though a major period of historical transition. Moreover, the changes affecting us aren’t confined to any one area of the globe, but stretch almost everywhere.” (Giddens, 2002, S. 1)

Globalizations effects on the nation-state

To understand what Hardt and Negri, Berazín as well as others state of the connection between capitalism, nationalism and the nation a quick look backwards has to be made before the journey can be continued. As it has been made clear, modern human society was made, although it can be stated that to some extent it is natural; traditions, culture and both state and nation were created, it has been reinterpreted and recreated, therefore it can be its current form can be replaced. Much can be said about the nation and state, however one thing cannot be disconcerted from the equation, the individual person, with its desires and its needs. Quoting Renan again, who so elegantly said:

“Man is a slave neither of his race nor his language, nor of his religion, nor of the course of rivers nor of the direction taken by mountain chains. A large aggregate of men, healthy in mind and warm of heart, creates the kind of moral conscience which we call a nation.” (Renan)

When as has been shown that the nation-state stands before, or is in the middle of a transition, this idea that people, healthy in mind and warm in heart can change things is important. Nevertheless, it is not enough simply to state that there are crisis, these crisis must be defined and to define it one must go back in history and understand the origin of the circumstances.

The role of capital

The transition to capitalism developed slowly until the Industrial Revolution and with the technological innovations connected with the use of iron, coal and railways. At this time nationalism was used by capitalist to keep control of the domestic market, both in the sense of economic control as well as to exclude non-national capitalists. Simultaneously there was an increased class domination over the working class from the Bourgeoisie, who used culture as a diversion to hide the exploitation. (Llorbera, 2003) But, Llorbera also states that the rise of the industrial society did only reinforce an existing phenomena. As an example he does not agree with authors such as Hobsbawm or Gellner, that nationalism was invented. Llorbera argues that these modern nationalism were recreations of medieval realities, for they can only be used as reinforcements of traditions if they are based upon the past. (Llorbera, 2003) One could state that with this

development the true essence of democracy, if there is such a thing, is taken away. The development of national sovereignty had reach its final stand at the beginning of the 19th century and the nation became the answer to the bourgeois hegemonic question of sovereignty. (Hardt & Negri, Empire) The logic of this development is that in an economic sense, the truth is simply “the bigger the better”, therefore the nations although they were big they were supposed to by alike. Unfortunately in the political sense it is the opposite and there the logic calls for “the smaller the better”. (Hix, 2008)

What this development shows, is that it did not benefit the majority of the citizens in a democratic way. By taking a big step over the chaotic, dark decades of the 20th century, the beginning of the end of the Westphalian sovereignty is in motion. The goal of European politics is no longer territorial growth, the goal is simply more wealth and it can be made through other means than geographical expansion. More wealth means in an modern welfare state, more opportunities and should lead to a better life, the citizens should be able to produce more, work less, know more and live enriched life in a well ruled society. This change in the economic sphere lead to more cooperation instead of aggression, cooperation among trading states is, according to Tom Lansford, the result of three main factors: First, the change of goals lead to more open and free trade systems, where capital moves freely inside and across borders. Second, collective acts in regards of security, when the states no longer threaten or feel threaten from each other. The third factor is that the rulers recognize that they are not in a position to withdraw from International organizations and regimes without serious political and economic damage. (Landsford, 2003) This short of arrangement changes, for example the notion that anarchy and egoism are at the core of the international order, states are acting in opposite of what Political realism would suppose of international politics. Where it is presupposed that scarcity of goods makes men enemies. (Donnelly, 2005) Continuing in trying to explain this development with the theories of international relations, one could argue that the idea which lead this transformation was some short of global liberalism. It is clearly an powerful idea for it advocated political freedom, democracy and constitutional rights and with the increased number of democracies in the last decades it is clearly influential. (Burchill, 2005)

When one goes even further into the development of the transformation of the nation states, Ulrich Brand points out in “The Internationalization of the State as the

Reconstruction of Hegemony” that the core of the obvious transformation of the past decades is economic, such as the crisis of Fordism, however the new internationalization became a hegemonic strategy and therefore it is “not only an economic process, but also closely tied to political institutional developments.” (Brand, 2007, S. 5) Therefore it is clear that a link exists between the depowered state and the globalization of capitalism. Not only has the state been influenced by the transformation and the powers of the workers unions diminished, but the power of the transnational capital increased, and social relations have changed with the emergence of “transnational managers and bourgeoisie”. What is left on the “national” level are the workers, their wages, their diminished rights and powers. Social relations, both cultural and political as well as economic have become internationalized. (Brand, 2007) The internationalization and globalization has affected not only the economic sphere, but the whole society. Although this development already had begun, its pace increased rapidly after the fall of the Soviet Union, perhaps with the Cold War gone, there was room for another topic on the discussion field and the globalization finally came to the mainstream surface. When people noticed it, itself is not the most important issue, but the impact it has on the society. The majority of the entities of hegemony in the world have shifted their focus from the national level to the global or international one. Therefore Hardt and Negri draw the conclusion that it would be a grave mistake to hold on to any nostalgic powers that are connected with the nation-state or attempt the impossible work to breathe life into national politics again, for the nation was not simply an structure of culture and shared traditions, but primarily a structure of juridical and economical kind. This structure grew ever more ineffective and the nation-states formed intergovernmental organizations such as the World Bank, Interpol, IMF and the WTO to name a few. It would be false for the people to try to go back and not forward for the system of nation-states was abandoned for a reason. (Hardt & Negri, Empire)

The future of the nation-state?

As mentioned earlier to many the nation-state could be considered as obsolete, or could become obsolete. To completely abandon that idea is for Cohen not an option. In the modern nation-state, citizenships are based upon the principles of the political principal

of democracy (participation in deliberating and decision-making), juridical status of legal personhood (legally specified rights) and as a form of membership (exclusive category). (Cohen, 1999) One can philosophize about many outcomes in individual solitude and even out in public, however it would be hard to see in a logical manner, a nation coming to the democratic solution of abandoning the state. Cohen suggest that instead of imagine that in the future the system will either be made out of completely new systems of sovereign federal mega-states, an return to liberal nation-states, one world government, or some kind of Cosmopolitical world order, the solution might as well be an combination of these elements. (Cohen, 1999)

How can there be built, beyond the old Stabilizers, a new way of running a Community and Politics. The task is not a light one, and in the EU, although the project has begun, there is still an long way to be traveled. For the EU can be seen like a house of mirrors, it depends on where you stand whether you seem small, fat, long or thin, it is hard to focus and there is no clear beginning and no clear end. (Beck & Grande, 2007) This makes any debate over the European Union complex, while the participants might be comparing totally different views on the Union. However, for Beck and Grande, the ones who think about Europe in a National way, misjudge both the reality and the future. (Beck & Grande, *Cosmopolitanism: Europe's Way Out of Crisis*, 2007) It is in the Europe, where the development from the national to “new” level has gone the furthest. For Beck and Grande the core problem is that Europe is “sick” from misunderstood national identities, this leads to political blockades and the debate over “Nation or EU”, a third way is almost never an option, Beck and Grande call the third way: Cosmopolitical Europe, it will be presented later on in the work (Beck & Grande, *Cosmopolitanism: Europe's Way Out of Crisis*, 2007)

Whatever one might find of the current situation and the possible solution Simon Hix presents in this book “What’s Wrong with the European Union & How to Fix it”, that the nations of Europe seem to be going in the same direction, they can described as post-religious, there is an high degree of social mobility within Europe, which has generated what can be described as an „European Dream“. Europeans have more things in common, however they are taken for granted, Simon Hix connects the EU with high employment, more investment, higher consumption rate, higher level of education, increased travel and an high social mobility and increased lifestyle opportunities they.

(Hix, 2008) With the failure of the nation-state to secure welfare of the domestic communities, as well as some of the above mentioned tasks, the idea of the EU had its first major momentum. (Münkler, 1999) The State lost some of its powers, but the nation remained strong and its symbolism lost little importance. But the central tasks of modern societies such as national unity, secure an democratic society, integrate the whole population within this order and satisfy the demands of various groups for fair participation, became increasingly harder to fulfill.

Ernst Renan was remarkably farsighted, when he over a hundred years ago stated: "The nations are not something eternal. They had their beginnings and they will end. A European confederation will very probably replace them." (Renan) Whatever follows must do even a better job in securing the individual rights of humans. For our reality is unusual, Anthony Giddens called it a runaway world, which is hard to control and the technology which made life in many ways easier simultaneously created new risks and dangers. And these new risks of environmental origin as well as human do not only threaten one state or nation they create an "World Risk Society". (Giddens, 2002) (Beck, World at Risk, 2009)

5. Sovereignty

As was shown in the previous chapters, globalization has lead to a paradoxical situation for democracy and the nation-state. Democracy has expanded and is now the core system of government in the globe, however the paradox is that it shows crucial weaknesses that are in the structures of parliamentary democracy. Most intellectuals both of the 19th and the 20th centuries did directly or indirectly advocated a certain immortalization of sovereign national entities. Only few questioned the belief that the human race is made up of “national islands” and underlined the realities that prove the contrary: border-transcending interrelations, interdependencies, causalities, responsibility, solidarity and communities of fate. (Beck, World at Risk, 2009). Therefore before one goes further into the study of the affects of globalization on the nation-states in Europe and their cooperation. One needs to deepen the understanding of the concept of sovereignty.

In the existing international order, it is a fact that the sovereign states are building blocks or unions, which are becoming the key actors of the system. In the traditional Westphalian order of the international system, the states were individual and autonomic territorial units, with juridical independence. States should not intervene the domestic matters of other states. (Krasner, 2001) These basic ideas were recognized since their foundation and are *de jure* still valid. However, with contemporary changes in the fields of technology, communication and transportation, the ability of states to regulate transborder movements of goods, ideas, working force and capital has at least diminished and even vanished. It is however important to understand that their right to manage their borders has not been challenged, only their ability to do so. (Krasner, 2001) The hegemony behind these actions, that is the control of the flow of ideas, people and capital, is now in the hands of those who control the capital, need the workforce and can buy the best ideas. As early as in the beginning of the 20th century, there was hardly a village which was not influenced by products of foreign market or financed in any way by foreign capital. (Krasner, 2001) As this glimpse at concept of sovereignty shows, the problems of the 21st century do not respect national borders, problems such as ecological risks, diseases, economic crises or the rapid change in technology do in many ways escape democratic processes. (Giddens, 2002)

The changes which have been made on the world community, are of the same origin as the modernity which made the world community: "Modernity itself dissolved the seemingly natural, hence divine ordained, connections between sovereignty, the right of self-determination, the nation and isolationism." (Beck, *World at Risk*, 2009, S. 233) After the trauma of the second World War, this change of international order was encouraged in Europe. Inspired by the belief that with common interests in the economic sphere the possibility of wars would be decreased. Germany and France which had traditionally resolved their disputes in armed conflict, were now encouraged to cooperate and therefore the states had a joint stake in each other's peace and prosperity, other states in the geographical region which were affected by the constant conflicts took part in the collaboration. (Burchill, 2005) The changes do, as the problems, not stop at national or European borders and there are other explanations to the hastiness of the transformation. The world's financial system changed considerably with the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in the early 70's, which changed the regulation and flow of capital in the international markets. Nations tried to answer the loss of sovereignty with cooperation, entities such as IMF and the World Bank as well as the EU, NAFTA, GATT and later on the WTO were strengthened as an attempt to hold on to the regulating powers. Globalization is because of the importance of trade, most often cited in relation to the world economy but it is equally significant in stimulating discussions on human rights and global moral responsibilities. (Entrikin, 1999) Since the creation of the concept of self-government in particular place it was carried out by citizens loyal to that place and the way of life it embodies.

Today, self-government however takes place in a multiplicity of settings, from neighborhood to the world as a whole. In the view of Hardt and Negri, sovereignty as it is "has taken a new form, composed of a series of national and supranational organisms united under a single logic of rule. This new global form of sovereignty is what we call Empire." (Hardt & Negri, *Empire*, S. xii) This change means that no nation is or will be "world leader", those days are gone. The fixed borders remain in place on a global scale, social functions are maintained and according to Hardt and Negri, the capital relies on these networks and functions. As they describe it, the capital operated on "a plane of *immanence*,[...] , without reliance on a transcendent center of power. (Hardt & Negri, *Empire*, S. 326) And as the capital brings value to a common place, it links all value through the power of money, being a "subject" is becoming ever more complex, identity

is not clear and the boundaries are foggy. As in the previous chapters and will be in the ones to come as well, the ideas of Hardt and Negri, might seem radical, still they are describing the same situation as the other authors do and for one to understand the state of affairs it is important to take a wide range of possibilities into consideration.

The conclusion which can be drawn from change of form in regards of sovereignty, is that the communities are no longer simply bound to a national level, they are regional and global. The only actors which seem excluded from this change are the nations and their nation-states, they are of course a part of what has changed, but their powers have presumed an national community of a self-governing nation. Giddens claims that:

“we need to further democratize existing institutions, and to do so in ways that respond to the demands of the global age. We shall never be able to become masters of our own history, but we can and must find ways of bringing our runaway world to heel.” (Giddens, 2002, S. 5).

Furthermore he indicates that this democratization cannot stop on the national level. And as the European Union is perhaps the best example or the best know example to an answer of a call for economic integration, it fits very well that we now take a closer look on that regional quasi indescribable *sui generis* “thing”.

6. What is the European Union

Why is there an European Union?

First of all it is important to emphasize that this overview of the European Union is not an historical or a praxis one but rather of a theoretical or an philosophical kind. The goal is to understand why there is an European Union as well as understanding what it is and understanding its functions. What knowledge can the EU draw from the past on its journey to the future, in a text, which has already been mention several times, Ernst Renan states that it would be close to impossible for anyone to create a “new Roman Empire” or finish where Napoleon failed. In the story which the history shows us lies at least one major, identical mistake. The mistake is that no one ruler, be it individual or one nation, can rule over everybody else, neither Germany or French, Cesar’s or Napoleon’s, nor anybody else for that matter, can though violence implement rules and laws over other beings. That would only lead to chaos as the history teaches, however cooperation among the nations is a healthy way to settle disputes and use the magnitude to benefit the entire population.

As in has already been shown, in many of their core responsibilities the nation-states have failed, e.g. to secure welfare of the domestic communities, this is not exclusively their fault, but as this fault came into light in the 1980’s the European Cooperation had an momentum of support and understanding. Although the State lost some of its powers, the nation remained strong and its symbolism lost little importance. (Münkler, 1999) Unlike in other parts of the world, the continent of Europe consisted of a number of small states, who were more or less of equal power, the result of this was increased competition, which can be seen as one of Europe’s greatest assets as well as flaws. This competition lead to wars, powerful rulers, increasing taxes, improving communications, centralizing the nation by suppressing the regional identities, monopolizing violence, new technologies, stronger armies, nurturing the local trading class so the wealth could be taxed or borrowed. (Llobera, 1996) With these facts we are also closing in on the true nature of nation-states, they have goals which they hope to achieve. This competition lead to conflicts over goods which were of insufficient quantities, and after centuries of such conflicts and wars, the European cooperation began. This cooperation is however not undisputed, although many claim that its

institution building in the EU is more advanced than any other regional entity (Landsford, 2003), that fact is not held high within the Europe, and the discussion regarding the Union is more often focused on its flaws.

It is of course important to be openly critical about matters that could be executed in a better way. Simon Hix however points out, that the Europeans take the EU for granted and that the benefits such as our freedom of travel, increased chances of investment, open employment market and the internal market are not connect to the EU. (Hix, 2008) In 'World at Risk' Ulrich Beck, notes that the multibillion-Euro EU budget gives boost to innovations and is therefore highly positive for the world. (Beck, World at Risk, 2009) That is another example of positive out comings that can directly be connected to the EU, it is interesting to find out more about the criticisms towards the EU, what claims are made and on what grounds.

The European cooperation, was founded up on the principle of mutual understanding, therefore it has had an surface of neutrality. Yet, beneath the surface neutrality and consensus are ferocious political battles" (Hix, 2008, S. 1) Would the EU be possible if the citizens would get "the real deal" like in national politics, would it still have support it if an large number of politicians on the European level were unhappy, constantly battling and perhaps openly aggressive and critical of each other. The logical answer to these speculations, is another question, do the Member state citizens support the EU?

Europe is not a unchangeable condition (Beck), for that matter nothing in an human society is or should be. It is flexible and should be able to reform in order to give answers to new questions, that is one reason why European politicians have tried to solve problems which the nations cannot resolve on that level. There are numerous problems facing the European Union, Simon Hix points out three challenges facing the EU: the first he calls the "policy gridlock", that is the solution to increasing the amount of jobs and increasing growth, while simultaneously protecting the European way of life. The second faces the legitimacy dilemma, only about 50% of the EU citizens believe that their countries membership is a good thing. The third is the well known claim of democratic deficit of the European Union. Although these matters will be handled thoroughly later on, what Simon Hix suggests is that what the European Union needs is

more politics, they should be embraced rather than feared, he calls the solution “limited democratic politics” (Hix, 2008, S. 4)

Beck and Grande in their work *“Das kosmopolitische Europa”* also identify several problems facing the European Union, they see the situation from a different perspective and call the problems “European life lies”. First of all there is the National lie, a common claim from this view is that *“the EU is a faceless bureaucracy”*, and that deepening of European cooperation is consequently followed with less democracy and that “without a nation there is no democracy”, the answer therefore is to go back to the good-old nation-state. Beck and Grande on the other hand claim that there is nothing to go back to and that that option is therefore not realistic. Secondly is the Neoliberal lie, here the claim is that it is enough to simply integrate Europe in an economic manner, some sort of minimal Europe. Beck and Grande however state that what follows, is not only less Europe but also less market. The third lie is the technocratic one, which is a form of constant reaction but no action, going from one crisis to the next. For Beck and Grande this sort of Europe is a formal EU that does not change and is not flexible. Finally they see an Eurocentric lie, where Europe should grow from within, a sort of top-down structure. Beck and Grande point out that the EU must be self-critical, with a national view of Europe, there are only two possible outcomes a confederation of States (Staatenbund) or a federal state (Bundesstaat). Both are according to Beck and Grande wrong: first of all Europe neither of those things, it is something else. They claim that the EU cannot be described with common definitions of state, state-federation, a federal-state, the EU is not a international organization and no international government either. The simple solution to this dilemma is to call the EU ‘Sui generis’ and leave it there – “don’t worry about it, it’s special”. Their vision for Europe is an Cosmopolitical one. (Beck & Grande, *Das kosmopolitische Europa - Gesellschaft und Politik in der Zeiten Moderne*, 2007)

The Cosmopolitical Europe of Beck and Grande will be thoroughly handled later on. Going back to Simon Hix and his ideas of “limited democratic politics” he claims that the EU is ready for controlled political debate resting on the existing checks and balances, with a broad coalition in support of policy changes which is the result of an open and hard political debate. (Hix, 2008) Hix states that resting on the existing system, the EU can perform much better, the wheel therefore does not have to be invented, just

made more effective. It is no secret by now, Simon Hix seems supportive of the European Union, he goes so far in calling the political design of the EU „pure genius!“ (Hix, 2008, S. 18) The fact that he is excited about the cooperation should however not blind the reader, Hix notes both the pros and cons of the Union, he simply seems passionate about the solutions of its problems.

The multiple checks-and-balances within the Union are a result of a broad consensus, each fundamental change in the EU has to be unanimously agreed between the governments of the EU members-states, when these changes call for ratification this must also be unanimously agreed. At the EU level, there are three separate institutions which have a say in how the legislation is made, these are the European Commission which has its members appointed by the national governments, the Council which is composed of ministers for the governments and the directly elected European Parliament. Finally both the European court of Justice and the National courts have to review the legislation. Hix notices the similarities between this system and the one of the USA, it prevents a narrow political majority to dominate the policy-making and calls for broad consensus.

If we compare the ideas from Hix to the ones from Beck and Grande, it could be stated that Policy making gridlock has the same origins as the neoliberal lie, technocratic lie of Beck and Grande. Depending on the neoliberal lie one believes that it is enough to stop here, with the policy-making, in order to resolve whatever problems are facing the market and the EU has fulfilled its reason of existence, with an functioning inner market it has reached its goal. In the same way, in regards with the technocratic lie, with an functioning policy-making institutions the EU could react to every crisis and without deepening the cooperation resolve the problems its facing. However, like every man made system this one has its pros and cons, it protects the interests of the majority, that is no radical change comes through, it takes a long time and therefore the policy-making is rather. To make it clear, the goal of policy-making is to replace the existing agenda, each and every actor has an interest preference about the possible outcome. The policy gridlock is according to Hix the reason why the EU is unable to perform its duties is because it has changed, on the program is no longer, e.g. to make the internal market but to regulate it. An open politicization on the EU policy process will be feared by Europe's Elites they don't want to show the public that they lose any key battle. (Hix,

2008) This is also connected to the founding principle of the integration that historic rivalries of the European nation-states and also ideological conflicts were the origin of disasters of the 20th century. To avoid this the focus was on consensus which lead to a EU that nobody loves, people don't actually despise it either.

To end this endless procrastination and paralysis, Hix calls of open political competition. There are several reasons why he makes this claim, competition is interesting, the media are willing to report about things that can be made clear quickly and that promotes innovations and in the spotlight the politicians bloom. Although this statement may have something to it, I find it hard to understand that all the politicians need is a bit of coverage from the BBC or ZDF and then they come up with good solutions. Nevertheless, Hix has stronger arguments, such as with the results in the winners of the "open political competition" would form cross-institutional coalitions, which lead to higher degree of coordination. Importantly it would encourage EU citizens to form opinions on the policies and the competition produces "winners and losers" which produce a political mandate for policy-making, this would also force the European political parties to for EU entities and not extensions from the national ones.

Legitimacy in a political sense means the public acceptance, Simon Hix states that the support for the EU has transformed dramatically in the past decade. Before the citizens trusted their governments to represent their interest in Brussels. People don't blindly accept European-level deals and are not committed to the European project. Why does one support an political idea and why not? Mainly because what one thinks one might gain, the European Elite is in favor of the Union simply because the EU creates are more chances for them than others, the higher the income the higher the approval. (Hix, 2008) If we compare the lack of legitimacy as it is presented by Hix to the Ideas of Beck and Grande, the resemblance is high with the national lie. Which claims that "the EU is a faceless bureaucracy", and that deepening of European cooperation is consequently fallowed with less democracy, that "without a nation there is no democracy" and the answer is to go back to the good-old nation-state. This argument can be strengthened with the fact that the elite gets more chances with the EU, the masses (the nation) seem to get little from this new situation and is therefore in disapproval of the result – the EU, although as shown in an earlier chapter, is simply an

answer to the situation of a powerless nation-state, the ironic situation creates an new aspect to the dilemma.

The best known problem facing the EU is the well-known the democracy deficit. In this paper there is an whole chapter devoted the democratic conditions of the European Union. However, to complete the argumentation of both Hix and Beck/Grande, it is proper to mention their views on the democratic deficit. Hix finds five standard claims regarding this problem, he finds four of them largely wrong. These five claims include: an decrease in national parliamentary control and that the EU parliamentary is too weak, even if it is growing, there is no democratic electoral contest within the EU and it is not transparent, the member-state citizens find it distant and hard to understand and finally the role of well organized lobby groups and “big business”. Hix argues that the accountable politicians are still on the national level, that might very well be true, but as has been show in this paper, their powers even when it still exists are limited to their borders. The European Parliament, says Hix, grows stronger after almost every new development in the EU and its more transparent than most nation-states. Regarding the “lobbyist” claim, Hix states that free marketers are just as unhappy as the far-left, that answer can hardly by satisfactorily, in an democratic sense it does not matter if everybody is as unhappy, if there are flaws on the democratic process those flaws should be fixed regardless of the distribution of happiness and unhappiness. One claim is according to Hix therefore right, the missing ingredient, as has already been mentioned, is the contest for power of the EU, the EU-citizens should be able to vote. This procedure, that is an open vote for EU power might be hard to put into practice, however with increased distribution of technologies and internet access it should be easier than before. People have from the mid 1980s until today, been reluctant to “give away” there powers to the European Union, that might however change with an elected democratically responsible European “government”. Continuing the attempt to connect the ideas of Beck and Grande “European life lies” to the ideas presented by Hix, it gets a little bit more complicated here, although there are to some similarities between the democracy deficit and the Eurocentric lie, that is, the idea that Europe should grow from within as an top-down function principal rather than through democratic elections, which leads to a democratic deficit.

The unfinished project

The power of nation-states is not the same, therefore it is logical to continue in the direction the EU integration is going, it is an unavoidable development. It has been clear for a long time that the EU is special, it is controversial, sometimes hard to understand and therefore it has been the topic for many scientist and thinkers from diverse origins. Beck and Grande state in "*Kosmopolitische Europa*" that the European Union has been "completely researched" and that its reality lies under mountains of Literature. (Beck & Grande, 2007) Europe continuously focuses on itself, even when the world seemingly goes out in flames, some have stated it is debating itself to death (Morgan, Glyn) and others such as Beck and Grande say that the motto of Europe is „You claim I'm dead, therefore I am“ (Beck & Grande, 2007, S. 12)

The core problem that Beck and Grande see with Europe is that it is suffering from misunderstood national identities, which leads to the political blockades ("Policy Gridlock", (Hix, 2008)) and the debate over "Nation or EU", it is either the nation-state or the European Union, an third way is almost never an option and the researcher as well as politicians continue they search using the old tools of the nation-states. However Europe can't be found, it has to be invented. ("*Europa kann nicht gefunden werden, es muß erfunden werden*") (Beck & Grande, 2007, S. 18) As frequently when such a claim is made the authors of political-philosophical texts have found an answer, Beck and Grande call theirs Cosmopolitical Europe. They claim that Europe cannot build its future resting on the old system which is failing, not denying that the task is hugely complex, with historical learning's of colonialism, nationalism, holocaust and also the laws and ideas that condemn and forbid these terrifying deeds in European memory, self-criticism is of huge importance in Europe. In a similar understanding as Hardt and Negri see the contemporary development, Beck and Grande see the EU as both presenting itself as well as understanding itself as "decentralized, territorially complex negotiation system which is dominated by elites. " (Beck & Grande, 2007, S. 85) This new form of hegemony is to them an post-hegemonic Empire, their interpretation of the term "Empire" is, they emphasize, different to the one of Hardt and Negri. The different understandings of the term, as well as why the idea of "Empire" is recently appeared as an explanation to the situation of world community, will be handled later on in this chapter. Because there is first another element of the European complexity that must be handled.

In past decades, when Europe has been focused on their own issues, deeply divided on many of them and attempting to building functioning, democratic institutions of a new kind, Europe has received harsh criticism for the way it has tried to resolve the question of the way to use and build up its power in this new globalized world order. One of the best know criticism towards Europe came from Robert Kagan, his views on the matter of power and weakness in world politics was presented in the article "Power and Weakness". (Kagan, 2002) In very simple terms the world view is, if you don't carry a stick and beat people with it you are doomed to failure. The ideas presented by Kagan, fit almost perfectly to the theories of "World at Risk" by Beck. Where risks and possible disasters in every corner and one should be prepared for the worst, this view focuses on the past, what has happened before is likely to happen again. Kagan for example uses what can only be called the "Hitler argument" against the unprepared Europe, how could Europe react against Hitler today? What Kagan fails to notice is that the world of the 21st Century a different world and the possibilities of "Europe having to react against Hitler" are close to non. The new world is the world of trading-states, welfare-states and global business. The states that do not participate get left behind, not the ones who do not carry sticks. According to this view that if the EU would have a more "sticks", the European Union would be powerful, they could help the United States in their tasks around the world and the EU would use their sticks to beat people. The simple thing is that the past is filled with memories of European "sticks", they did beat on each other for centuries as well as other nations. By many it is a blessing for the world that it finally stopped, and now they should start again? Stated by Kagan it is a matter of increasing their power: "After all, Europeans are not increasing their power. Their tactics, like their goal, are the tactics of the weak." (Kagan, 2002) This view is directly linked to the anarchic world of political realism, the oldest theory of International Relations "Realist emphasize the constrains on politics imposed by human selfishness and the absence of international government." (Donnelly, 2005, S. 30) They claim to be rational, it is nation-state-centered and presumes that anarchy and egoism are the core of international order. Furthermore they are not willing to make greater demands on human nature that it with its imperfection can satisfy. (Donnelly, 2005) This view also presupposed that the EU needs protection, but fails to define from what it needs to be protected from.

In the world described in "World at Risk" there should be a fear of the dark, an constant fear that something could always lurk around there. It seems however that

Europe in an Enlightened manner has turned on the light to see, explore and communicate. Most of the fellow inhabitants of the world are peaceful and if they are treated with respect they will do the same. There is no NATION in the world that is plotting a total war against the EU, there are small groups of fanatic fundamentalists that pose with their hate some level of danger to everyone else, they are inside as well as outside every state and form unions on their own in organized crime, terrorism or oppression to reach their goals, financial or political ones. An increased number of men carrying sticks this danger will however not go away. As Mark Leonard clearly shows in "Why Europe will run the 21st Century", the future of Europe lies not in its military might but it's economic and humanitarian accomplishments. (Leonard, 2007) One argument from Kagan is actually quite interesting, that claim many Europeans don't recognize that "this paradise" is also existing not only because of European acts, but also in gratitude of the United States. Perhaps the Europeans are blissfully ignorant in their paradise, unwilling show their gratitude to the USA and naïve in their view that "the world has yet to accept the rule of 'moral consciousness'" (Kagan, 2002). It is completely clear that Europe should be thankful and acknowledge that without the peoples, products and help of both North- and South-America, Asia, Africa it would not be the same. In an attempt to answer the criticisms of Kagan it can be states that, if some learning can be drawn from war and conflicts, people tend to fight harder for what they truly believe in than for that they do not. If there was an grave danger from fundamentalists or extremists that were capable of revolutionize or destroy the European way of life, like any other societies, Europe would rise up, it is however not the first answer for Europe in the 21st Century, but when it is absolutely necessary Europe would react.

As has been show Europe focuses on securing its own survival not with military strength but by using international law as well as its economic strength. Compared with other regional cooperation's such as the NAFTA in North-America or the APEC in Asia, the EU is by far the most successful entity. (Beck & Grande, *Das kosmopolitische Europa - Gesellschaft und Politik in der Zeiten Moderne*, 2007) From this comparison Europe can however not become arrogant and overconfident, while although it has gone further in regards with regional integration, the EU is still in many ways dysfunctional and to some extent turning into an zero-sum game between the EU and the nation-states where both are bound to lose. In the age of 'world risk society', the solution to this problem cannot lie in a retreat to the nation-state and neither the European project. Beck and Grande

therefore call for not less but more Europe, although a different one is needed, a more cosmopolitan Europe. (Beck & Grande, 2007) When sovereign rights have been transferred to the supranational level in the past, democratically elected national parliaments have been deprived of some of their powers often without ensuring that the new founded institutions have sufficient democratic legitimacy. In this situation everything seems to depend upon alliances, it is equally important for everyone that have something at stake to use their abilities. Although this new situation seems to only help the most powerful, such as “the capital”, who seem to have the strategy, to combine the capital with the nation-state in an attempt to create new type of legitimacy based on the neoliberal state. (Beck, World at Risk, 2009) It is to the benefit of the capital that there is less state, than they can try to do what is in their interest, it is even better when they “are” the state or take over its functions. The risks of a destabilized market, failures in investments and the ecological affects of production, that the community faces do on the other hand also give power to the civic movement and the states as they give them legitimacy in reaction to these risks. (Beck, World at Risk, 2009) Therefore it could be important that the existing state jurisdictions would remain in control in many areas, democratic, constitutional nation-states would remain a level of political identification for the local citizenry. But new identities and new forms of representation would follow for federal and supranational bodies. (Cohen, 1999) Instead of inventing an entire Europe, this way old Europe would get an new and effective function. This suggestion is logical, easy to understand and could be successful, there is however one problem to it, these new identities on the supranational level have not been created and that is what the complications revolve.

Empire – old and new

As mentioned earlier, the term “Empire” frequently comes up in the discussion of the future state of affairs, Beck and Grande call it an Post-hegemonic Empire. Which is not based on borders and conquests but on dissolution of boundaries, freewill, consensus, transnational cooperation and from these strengths there arises additional political value. (Beck & Grande, Das kosmopolitische Europa - Gesellschaft und Politik in der Zeiten Moderne, 2007) Their Empire is not the same description to what Hardt and

Negri identify as an Empire. There are similarities, but Hardt and Negri's Empire is Eurocentric, it is however, on the contrary to earlier imperialistic Empires not tied to one region, the logic of the leadership comes from Europe and the USA, but it is active on the Globe as a whole. Its rule is not a moment in the history, but as a regime with no boundaries concerning time, it is outside of history or at the end of it. Also on the contrary to Imperialism, the *Empire* is decentralized and deterritorialized, it emerged as the modern sovereignty of traditional Nation states weakened. It was in the time when the Bretton Woods system ended and neo-liberalism moved capitalism away from the borders of nation-states to the supranational level and Conglomerates, this new balance of Power within the international system is what they call Empire. (Hardt & Negri, Empire)

Beck and Grande use the term because it opens views on the new forms of political integration and frees the discussion of political power from the being fixed on the nation-states. Empire breaks the fiction of equal sovereign states, it shows that there is an real asymmetry of power. Finally it separates the national from the international in a historical view and challenges the axiomatic way that politics and political science see the nation-states and politics. (Beck & Grande, 2007)

Components of state and Empire: (Beck & Grande, Das kosmopolitische Europa - Gesellschaft und Politik in der Zeiten Moderne, 2007, S. 94)

	State	Empire
Ruling function	guarantee inner and outer security and secure Material wellbeing	guarantee inner and outer security and secure Material wellbeing
Ruling logic	Permanent, secure and closed borders. Inclusion/Exclusion	Flexible and open borders. Expansion
Ruling technique	Modern Sovereignty, formal equality of members, consistency in regards of norms and benefits	Imperial Sovereignty, Asymmetric rights of members, different degree of integration

State and Empire are two completely different forms of rule, states depend upon the stability of their borders and use the logic of Inclusion/Exclusion as they attempt to control the subjects. Empires depend upon expansion and their borders are fluid or flexible. Both states and Empires are however supposed to solve the same functions, guarantee both the inner and outer security and secure the material wellbeing of the subjects. The ruling technique is as seen here above based on totally different procedures, the states are based on symmetry whereas the Empires are asymmetric. Empire combines direct and indirect, formal and informal forms of rule, Empire is not simply a territorially big state, there are other ruling techniques and ruling logics. (Beck & Grande) Europeanization has simultaneously grown more asymmetric, because there are many different degrees of the Integration and cooperation, few states are in the Monetary Union others cooperate at a higher rate in some policy fields and there are variations in terms of the policy areas, protecting the states that are weaker on some levels, such as can be seen in the Nordic Agriculture Aid scheme and fisheries program for Malta. Other states which take part in the integration such as the candidate countries and the EEA (European Economic Area) are under extended rule and do implement EU laws, rules and regulations without any formal participation in the process.

It is interesting that these intellectuals are going back to the term “Empire” and interpreting it and re-thinking it, in their attempt to describe the world today. This could be because the new order has complex territorial and cultural borders which have redesigned the way people sense their position in society, not only on the local, but also on the regional and global levels. The definition of “others”, which could in the past easily be identified and then included or excluded with the tools of nations and nationalism has become uncertain. The complexity lies in the exclusionary style of modern citizenship, it becomes unclear why a nation should be exclusionary. Therefore both the personal and collective identities give people little support in distinguishing between the personal “I” and collective “We” from the “others”. In the years after the Second World War and until this day, increased migration has modified Europe. Millions of people have sought and found new opportunities far from their places of birth and the consequence is what was described here above, it is no longer entirely clear what nation means. (Münkler, 1999) The transformation of Europe has, for that reason resulted that the states are now closely linked in cooperation and are more interdependent than before. The tolerance and knowledge for the needs of others grows and the community

benefits, Europe is maturing in the way that it tolerates and is ready to benefit from its differences. And this could become Europe's specialty and what will make Europe stronger in the 21st century, this integration through law, consensus, cooperation and tolerance for each other.

Europe can be described as an big exception, it is not founded with sword and flame, but with pen and paper, the basic logic of it comes not from militarist power but from consensus and cooperation. (Leonard, 2007) Although it has to made clear that both in the history of the 20th century as well as earlier history of Europe, the conquests in different continents and the foundation of prosperity of the European Nations was made from not only "sword and flame" but sometimes brutal repression, exploitation and exclusion. However the modern EU is not the same as the colonial powers and 20th century nation-states of Europe and it seems, with this interpretation, as in the last decades Europe has matured rapidly. Europe supports the UN Human Rights Conventions, the Convention on the Rights of Children, the Kyoto Protocol on the reduction of pollution as well as the International Crime Tribunal. In this sort of way the EU can have important impact on the globalization. Instead of being only a reaction to the globalization, it can be a core factor in making it positive and leading to way of using it to benefit mankind.

8. Globalization and its affects on the European Union.

To define the term globalization briefly, one could say that “globalization” is the globalizing of the idea, that the prime factor of human societies are common economic growth, consumption and progress, regardless of any other human needs and affects on society, through this globalization the regions of the world are now openly interdependent. Additionally to this short definition, authors such as Cohen, point out that this globalization could not have been possible without major technological inventions, most importantly in the field of communication and transportation. (Cohen, 1999) At the end of the cold war the West notion of democracy, supposedly, lost the ‘other’ which in the 20th century took on the forms of dictatorship, tyranny or totalitarianism with the best know examples of Communism, Nazism and Fascism. (Aradau & Huysmans, 2009) . A short look at the world map of political systems however shows us clearly that this is not completely true, states such as the enormous China and oil-wealthy Saudi-Arabia to name only two are not western democracies, their form of governing can easily be defined as part of the previously described category of ‘others’. However they seem supportive of the system of government that the West has set up for the world or at least their role and chances within that system and are therefore perhaps not seen as ‘others’ or because of their economic strength they are accepted even when they do not act according to western values.

An result of this globalization is, as has already been mentioned, that both the control of society and economy are beyond the hegemony of the nation-states. In Europe as an result to both the divisions of the Cold War, and the fact that the USA took on the burden of a large part of European defense, which was most likely done to prevent an European arms race. Europe started an cooperation on an level which would never have been possible in the past. Finally the European nation-states did not seek territorial expansion. (Landsford, 2003) The changes which have followed are in the view of Jürgen Habermas several. First of all the globalization has changed the economic system of the World, that is why we cannot understand the future or present situation of the EU without involving the concept of Globalization. The most important factor in this change is according to Habermas, that nation-states lost control over their taxation resources and without them there can be no welfare-state. Another aspect is the rebirth of a ruthless hegemonic power politics, which are seen in “the west against Islam” conflict,

the number of failed-states in the world and that the globalization increases the long term effects of the colonial history and the failures made in the decolonization. (Habermas, 2008) In this new order wealth and power was beginning to be measured in economic rather than geopolitical terms, the aim was not territorial conquests and domination, the focus was not on military power. This means for Landsford that “the trading state has arisen” (Landsford, 2003, S. 5) In fact it has not simply arisen, in Europe it has re-risen, for in the past there was an internal market in Europe, no ruler could control the merchants that transferred goods across the continent, as they would only find new ways around the rules, regulations, taxation and oppression by bringing their goods to the market through different gates. This rise of one market in Europe led to a fundamental shift in state authority; organizing and protecting the “self-regulating” market became the function of the state. (Landsford, 2003) Protecting this economy is seen as the key to well being in the world, growth as the main goal and those who hold the power of creating growth are therefore essential. Even big states such as France, UK and Germany would without the EU not be sustainable and could not secure the living standards of their citizens, for they cannot control the market. (Hix, 2008) The big EU states need the small ones just as much as the smaller ones need the bigger ones. Therefore on the contrary to what one might think, the globalization has actually lead to increased regionalization. (Therborn, 2002)

One of the most interesting results of this new transformation in society, is the uncertainty, even the ones which seem to have looked at it most closely, are not sure where in this transformation we are at the present moment. Beck and Grande for example ask if we are on the threshold of an American ‘empire’ at its end, the fact the they do not know if we are at the beginning or the end of this period is at least bizarre. Whatever their answer to that question might be, they seem to be certain that we are forced to accept this change and the easiest way to react is to use the European Union and see human diversity not as a problem but as the solution (Beck & Grande, *Das kosmopolitische Europa - Gesellschaft und Politik in der Zeiten Moderne*, 2007) Mainly because this transformation is so unclear it is important to try to explain it better, especially its connection with the European Union.

One might think that this accountability which is laid upon an unfinished project like the EU and the hopes for the future for the power of a united Europe are too high

and perhaps verging on some sort of perfectionism regarding the Europeanization. These hopes seem to build to some extent at least on a belief that human societies are capable of changing, they may have their foundations in the Enlightenment and therefore expecting more from citizens than the role of a consumer, they should be moral actors and ready to step out of the market role of self-interest and into the role of actor in political community. (Entrikin, 1999) This dream and belief in capability of humans are vital to any society, especially when a society is at the end of History. Which has most notably been shown in present time by Francis Fukuyama. In this vision some key factors in the development of society are missing. The hope of change and a better world at the horizon. Aníbal Quijano shows in the article "Return of the Future" how important these factors are and have been for the progress of society. Modernity, rationality, progress, liberalism, nationalism or socialism have all at sometime been at the horizon as something brilliant, visible to everyone promising far more than mere continuation of the present, they all have promised something new; a dream, a desire and hope. Even when certain ideas were lost or dismissed, the horizon was still there and the future was still undefeated. These promises lead, according to Quijano, to bourgeois democracy, the modern state and its institutional structure. However the situation now, where society is at the end of history, for the first time for at least 500 years dreams seemed dead and buried, hope lost and horizon invisible. The truth has been found and it made no sense to continue the search, when nothing new was coming in the foreseeable future, the world had no use of any historical imaginary ideas. The ideas which Quijano presents in this text might seem as some sort of manifesto of the dreamer, an request for endless troubles, new missions and bigger manifestos. But if this text is given a serious look it becomes clear that the ties between the imaginary and real are obvious in the political development of the 18th and 19th centuries leading to the reality of modernity, rationality, progress and finally to the so far highest expression of modernity - democracy. (Quijano, 2002) Even when much has been achieved the human mind is always capable of forming new dreams and when these visions and imagination continue history can never be at an end point. A society which holds itself for the best possible and fairest of all societies despite numerous clear problems loses the creative powers and courage of a true freedom of thoughts, feelings and hopes.

In a "western" or "European" view of the situation there are two central ways of viewing it, first with celebration that the economic relations have finally become free

from political control and the production, investment and exchange are increasingly autonomous. Then secondly, there is the fear what comes next after the lost of control of the institutional channels through which citizens could influence the capitalist market. Another view which fits not to the reality of European citizens, is that of the “others” the workers in or from the poorer regions of the world, the agricultural labor of immigrants in the EU and USA, the factory workers in Asia or laborers in the Oil fields of the Arab world. (Hardt & Negri, *Empire*) Every feature of this transformation involves movement either the migration of people from the poorer countries of the globe or the relocation of a production plant in the home countries of the workers. This mixture of peoples, cultures and lifestyles which is both directly and indirectly encouraged is essential to the production itself, but it is nevertheless criminalized. The logical movement of individuals seeking the dream of a better life cannot be controlled through traditional methods and therefore like in the nation-state world the globalized one tries to isolate, divide and segregate people, even criminalize the movement of people.

The future of both citizens of the rich countries as well as the poorer ones are interwoven, Hardt and Negri give this group an united name ‘Multitude’. Although the majority of both of these groups, the rich and the poor, isolates itself from the other, Hardt and Negri believe that this multitude must and can act collaboratively in order to gain or regain control. If the observation is narrowed only to Europe, what is the current state of affairs, the citizens are allowed to move freely on equal grounds with the capital, there are still limited boundaries such as immigration from Romania and Bulgaria to few States. Swedes can work in England, Englishmen in Germany and Spaniards in Slovenia, they pay taxes and participate on equal grounds with the locals on most levels, except on the juridical level. Hardt and Negri raise the question of “residency papers for everyone” which means:

“in the first place that all should have the full rights of citizenship in the country where they live and work. This is not a utopian or unrealistic political demand. The demand is simply that the juridical status of the population be reformed in step with the real economic transformations of recent years (Hardt & Negri, *Empire*, S. 400)

Why should this not be done in the EU, all are allowed to participate in the financial market, work freely and educate themselves, but not vote? Is it dangerous to

allow a Italian who works and lives, to vote in municipal or parliamentary elections in Spain? Banks are allowed to be everywhere, Icelandic banks were in England, Austrian banks are in eastern Europe, industry can produce everywhere with positive side effects such as increased job opportunities and higher taxation incomes and with negative effects such as pollution. Why do not Europeans allow each other to be fully active participants in the communities? The increased mobility was an request of the Capital, it now depends on this flexibility of individuals and the laborer must have rights as they create the wealth of the capital. Furthermore this step is important for it is utterly clearly now in these times of financial turmoil the citizens and the capital have very different ideas of fairness – the myth that there is no such thing as a community is nothing more than a myth, a lie. The sooner that the “multitude”, workers, proletariat or whatever label people put on themselves and others realize this the sooner they can come up with solutions.

The incalculability of the global

One part which distances the new globalized world from the previous local and nationalized reality is that it is decentralized and therefore the challenges are becoming ever more incalculable: No matter whether the state, the military or the sciences are called upon to solve this new situation, the problem that it is not only also new to these institutions, they are becoming part of the problem. In *World at Risk*, Ulrich Beck describes the world not as a post-modern one but as a hyper-modern world and in this delocalized and incalculable world we need new solutions to solve the new problems. The old institutions can neither define nor control the risks in a rational way, which leads to mistrust within the community. For Beck this has lead to the realization of a “cosmopolitan moment”, the fact that “we are all trapped in a shared global space of threats – without exit” (Beck, *World at Risk*, 2009, S. 56) The problem with the idea of the “cosmopolitan moment” is that whatever one’s understanding of the term be it possible or negative, there are nowhere feasible conditions for a “cosmopolitan moment”. Even when it seems clear that there is a sort of new global logic, no nation can deal with the problems alone and still there is no practical alternative that works against the power loss of state politics in comparison with the capital. In the vast field of

literature describing this new world order, such as the World at Risk (Beck, World at Risk, 2009), Empire (Hardt & Negri, Empire), The new rulers of the World (Pilger, 2002), Postdemocracy (Crouch, 2008), Post American World (Zakaria, 2008) or Runaway World (Giddens, 2002) the authors show us in very different ways, that the world has changed and that no single actor on the field of international politics can “win” on their own, every outcome depends on alliances. In this period according to Beck the strategy of the capital is “to merge capital with the state in order to open up new sources of legitimacy in the guise of the neoliberal state” (Beck. 65) Beck however points out that the global risks strengthen states and civic movements but weaken the global capital, this might seem as a opposite or even paradox of the traditional notion of Globalization. However the new risks open up new sources of legitimization of actions for the states and civic movements, at the same time as the global capital becomes distrusted. (Beck, World at Risk, 2009) It can therefore be understood that the globalization gives the “victims” or subjects of the powerful globalization weapons to react. The changes in society are nevertheless effecting many different fields, some of them face the cores of the modern nation states, are our societies ready for such a confrontation? For a long time ideas such as nations, nationalism and nation-states were taken as self-asserted and from generation to generation became pre-conceived ideas, most thinkers of the 19th and throughout the 20th century directly or indirectly advocated the immortalization of self-enclosed national sovereignties and only few raised serious questions about these beliefs that humanity is made up of nations. (Beck) Sarcastically the development that formed the modern society is now dissolving it and changing it. In this world of global risks, the possibly most rational road to solutions is through cooperation. The global economic and social change and risks has lead to a development towards more balanced and structured political cooperation and in some cases political integration.

The democratic revolutions in rise of the globalization

According to Crouch the European cooperation began in the blooming era of democracy, it was however from the beginning on formed as technocratic institutions. (Crouch, 2008). This blooming era of democracy has also been described as economic “golden years” from 1945 and until the 1970s there were no serious economic crisis in the

Western world. At this time in Europe the welfare states were being formed and a society took care of its citizens. In the years following, from the late 1970s and beginning of the 1980s and onwards the markets with lobbyism for privatization weakened the nations-states hold on many human interactions, e.g. on health care and education, comparing these to any other human activities and arguing that they too should follow the rules of the market. In this way the states lost power, authority and meaning. In this debate, there is however too common that the mistake is made of taking the presumption that a certain view is right and it is then held high in an almost dogmatic way, this occurs both on the left and right spectrum of the political field. On the left sphere the state should have these powers mainly because that is seen as just and leads to equal chances, almost regardless of the educational outcome or level of healthcare provided. On the right sphere the market should have these powers because that is economically beneficial, the people should have freedom to choose and the state should not be active where it is not needed, on the contrary this is accepted regardless of the outcome on the society. Neither of the two the market nor the state are perfect, the debate is therefore stuck in a two-way street with dead ends on both sides. The same can be said about the either-or debate on nation vs. globalization. Colin Crouch calls for the mobilization of “new identities” and that there constructive and innovative Ideas and Groups must shine through, the negative and destructive forces of the bossy and arrogant free market movement and the violent and backwards looking anti-globalization movement have been in the spotlight for too long. There must be a direction towards new global instead of hyper-global or the no-global, an Alter-globalization instead of anti-globalization. Aradau and Huysmans see regional cooperation as a halfway step for the reason that it strengthens the leverage that political power has on the global socioeconomic situation. At the same time it opens the door for democracy out of the closed territorial borders, however it reproduces and magnifies any flaws of the structures of the community. (Aradau & Huysmans, 2009)

The quest for the “finalité”

As has been shown in several examples the European states have lost substantial democratic powers with not only the unification of Europe, but rather the globalization.

This occurs of course not without representation of the nation-states, more and more decisions are made in Brussels by representatives of the member-states and these are being implemented at home. In "*Ach, Europa*" Jürgen Habermas stated that the question of *finalité* in Europe had to be unresolved in the 2009 European elections, if not then the future of the European Union lies within a neoliberal orthodox. (Habermas, 2008) Today in 2011 the quest for *finalité* of the EU seems to be on an halt. The financial crisis which have shaken member-states of the European Union has lead to a new situation, since the work of Habermas was published in 2008 and most of Europe's power has been directed towards hard recovery work trying to save what can be saved in what can only be described as an economical disaster, the member-states that seem to be in deepest crisis seem to be Greece, Italy, Portugal, Ireland. The neoliberal orthodox which was supposed to dominate the future caused what seems to be one of the deepest crisis the globe as had to react to. Internal institutional and economic problems paralyze Europe at a time when the world is threatened by new forms of hegemonic power and ungovernability. The calculable and controllable risks of the bipolar world order of the Cold War have been replaced by new, incalculable and uncontrollable insecurities. 'Risk society' has turned into 'world risk society' (Beck & Grande, 2007). The strength of the EU is that it can choose what it wants to be. Beck and Grade state that the question can be even bigger: Europe can choose what kind of a world it lives in and consequently what influences it has on it. This statement however seems to be vastly Eurocentric, for authors claiming to be internationalist in a Cosmopolitical way it comes as a surprise. However when this statement is given fair consideration the authors are not requesting for a dominant superpower Europe, only for Europe to have courage to present to the world a EU way of governing, the world has changed and Europe is forced to accept this change. A new world order has begun, a paradigm shift has taken place, in an decentralized and ungoverned manner the world faces risk that possibly are destroying the globe and the easiest way to democratically have influence on this is to use the European Union. In the past decades the EU has developed fast, too fast for conservative minds stuck in the comfortable past of rather small individual self-governing nation-states, the EU seems to be on its way to more active role in world politics, at least when one looks at the "Charter of fundamental rights of the European Union". In its Preamble the European Union states that "Conscious of its spiritual and moral heritage, the Union is founded on the indivisible, universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and

solidarity; it is based on the principles of democracy and the rule of law.” The fact that these rights are held to be universal and not simply European is a first clear sign and that these rights are rights and responsibilities and duties of the human community. (Parliament, Council, & Commission, 2007/C 303/01) What is hugely important here are these universal values of human dignity, freedom, equality and solidarity. It tells us that the Union believes these rules should be respected not only within the EU itself but on a universal, global scale. Here the Europeans that want the European Union to become more active on a humanitarian level have a tool, the policy makers of the EU declare solidarity as an universal value. Therefore the “dreamers”, that some may say the ones are, which hope for an emancipation from domination and discrimination, can quote John Lennon in saying, “you may say I’m a dreamer, but I’m not the only one”. (Lennon, 1971) Quijano notices that for the future the concept of democracy must be expanded and deepened, not only on the traditional nation-state level, but above all as the manifestation of solidarity with each other. (Quijano, 2002) This sort of dreamers-change would be interpreted by Quijano as a return of the future, not everything can be changed at once, we only control ourselves, therefore it is easiest to start in our own backyards, a truly democratic EU would be a beam of hope sending light to every part of the world, like a metaphorical “Statue of Liberty”. Beck calls unilateral national policies backward-looking idealisms and goes even further by claiming that “national isolationism is an illusion, a fiction, a relic – it is counterproductive and condemned to failure.” (Beck, *World at Risk*, 2009, S. 233) This shows clearly how important the task of finding and agreeing on the future of the EU is. The quest for the “*finalité*” is therefore reasonable, for it is not seeking status-quo for the Union but an answer for EU’s role in the world. This quest might however take longer than months or years, if the EU wishes to be flexible and ready for changes in the future, the *finalité* cannot be too permanent. The international community has rapidly become more economically and socially unified, cooperation has grown yearly and the space left for both isolation and exploitation has been minimized. However by not accepting this change and holding back in transforming the EU and thereby national-politics Europe holds on to an ineffectiveness and isolation, the taboo-child of modernity, revolution, is seen in a negative light and is therefore not on the agenda, even if Europe would need indeed a peaceful democratic revolution to change its ways of governing. The nations born in the revolutions seem to have become more afraid of the term than the idea of war. Even when the system of

world governing, in the sense of leadership not hegemony, is imperfect with justification of hunger, greed and inequality in the name of freedom, the word and idea of revolution seems to be blown away because of a negative connection to violent and imperfect revolutions of the past and instead of being connected to the positive changes of European Modernity (e.g. French Revolution or fall of the Soviet-Union), revolution is even noted as almost an antithesis to the other aspects of European Modernity.

Only when debated, continuously revived and looked after freedom and democracy can be hold as self-evident and uncontroversial, to hold the accountability of the regional level in balance, despite many positive sides to it, there must occur and “Democratic Revolution” within the European Union. A revival of the Democratic Revolution could like the earlier ones, which open up the gates for entrance of the People and simultaneously marked the end of “modern/western” revolutions. (Wagner, 2005) A new version of a “Democratic Revolution” could open up an new entrance of citizens as active participants in decision making and end the long period of transformation towards this new world order, thereby giving Europe time to focus on other aspects of our societies which are in need of being at the center of attention.

9. Democracy within the EU

Hopelessly lost in its search for some truth?

Facing the task of handling both the EU and democracy at least one resemblance comes to mind, both of these ideas that is a unified and peaceful Europe and a community run based on rules, acceptance and inclusion must have seemed visionary and almost surreal or naïve in their beginning stages. Both seem to be used in a search for some sort of truth, true power of the people and true Europe. Nevertheless they are not hopelessly lost in their search these truths, for both of these ideas have millions of followers. Another connection is the complaint that the European Union, in its search for true Europe, lacks true democracy. Claims have been made that it grows distant from its disinterested population and has a deep degree of democratic deficit within its governing body and institutions.

In the past reforms within the EU, it has tried to bring an end to the transformation that started in 1986 with the Single European Act. In the same period the Union has taken on the task of enlargements and democratization in its neighboring east. In this development there was an opportunity to deepen the cooperation, therefore the Constitutional and later the Lisbon Treaty were produced, not because of a “constitutional moment” but a political window. What followed were the visualization of crisis, not only at the core of European politics but simultaneously and just as much national politics. (Melchior, 2008) With increased population and diversity the European economy, the large continental market, geographical diversity and different forms of human expertise made the EU economy one of the most profitable and well functioning regions of all. Simon Hix points out that on the economic level the large economies are generally better than small ones, their variety of products and services are followed by higher growth and wealth. On the contrary, small and homogenous societies tend to be more governable and the political elites less distant from the people. The Europe of the past was formed from many small sovereign states, the European Union is therefore an attempt increase economic growth and use the diversity so it benefits all, this positive change came though at some cost. (Hix, 2008)

In Europe today, the citizens of the EU Member-states want the leaders to find solutions to the major problems which the communities are confronted with on the European level, however they distrust the institutions and politicians. (COMMUNITIES, 2001) This could be called the European paradox, the Union is taken for granted, the benefits of it are not connected to it, such the freedoms of travel, investment, work and open market. If it were not for the EU this cooperation would not be as easy as it is today, there is however no reason for denying that the state of affairs could be better. It is only logical that many thinkers wonder why it seems so hard to fully democratize Europe. All of the Member states are democratic and actually they could not be members if they were not, furthermore they defend human rights, the origin of democracy as an idea is European. Most of the new member-states have recently gained democratic rule again and the debate of democracy in Europe is well a live and held high, it should be automatic that the EU would be an prime example of democracy in the world. However the fact is that even in the EU, democracy must be fought for, persevered and kept alive shows that it is more than an idea, more than any law or simple rule. It must be constantly looked after and reinvented, democracy is simply more complex than it might seem.

The democratic deficit

The most well know complaint of lack of democracy in the EU is the so-called democratic deficit. There is no single simple definition of this democratic deficit, Simon Hix gathers five “standard claims” in his work, Hix does then after explaining what those claims are, largely dismisses four of them, as was previously shown. The first one is that European integration has led to an increase in executive power and decrease in national parliamentary control and that the main problem is that the EU level executive actors are largely beyond control of national parliaments. The second is that the European parliament is too weak. The EP is consultant, but can’t block legislation and the governments are the agenda-setters. Third, even when the power of the EP is growing, there is not a democratic electoral contest for EU political office or over the direction of the EU policy agenda resulting that this election has no direct influence on EU, the Europeans which do vote are voting in accordance to the current political situation in

their Nation-State. The fourth common claim is that the EU is too distant from the voters, it is completely different from everything that the citizens are used to. With this lack of understanding for the EU it becomes hard to keep up with the new developments. As a result to these four claims there is a gap between what the citizens want and what they get. Well organized lobby groups are influential and the outcome is neo-liberal market environment, huge subsidies to farmers and restrictive immigration. This claim is that business interest and multinational firms have greater motivation to organize on the EU level than consumer groups and trade unions.

As already mentioned, Simon Hix argues that four out of five from these claims are largely wrong, it is still so that the accountable politicians are on the national level, the national governments are accountable, so it is rather that too few executive politicians are in charge and the national parliaments have for long been under the control of the national governments. This could be changed within the Nation-states, if that is the will of the people and does not need guidance from the EU to do so. On the European level the EP gets a larger role and becomes more important after almost every institutional development. Furthermore Hix claims that the EU is actually more transparent than most national systems of government. The EU is well aware of the democratic criticisms and this has led to what Hix calls paranoia inside the EU institutions, it however needs to become more transparent inside the council, citizens should be able to know what their governments propose inside the Council. On the European level most information is online, but one has to have interest to find it in order to know what is being debated in Brussels. In regards with the 5th claim, Hix notes that radical free marketers are just as unhappy as the far-left wing. (Hix, 2008)

To improve the democracy within the EU Hix finds that the missing ingredient is contest for EU power and policy. He calls for balance on the procedural side and substantive side of democracy. Proceedings are very important, such as free and fair elections, rights of citizens to run for office and freedom of speech, the press and association. However without the substantive side of the content of the political process it is not enough to have free and fair elections if it has no change in political outcomes. Basically it is important to have contest over the executive and policy agenda and thereby enabling citizens to identify winners and losers. (Hix) These winners would have greater powers in setting the agenda and the losers would have interest in making

the citizens and interest groups know of any other more feasible ways of handling things.

Beck and Grande claim that internal institutional and economic problems are paralyzing Europe at a time when the world is threatened by new forms of hegemonic power and ungovernability. They find the majoritarian parliament an insufficient solution in democratizing the EU. This new confrontation should be answered with new model of democracy, a cosmopolitan model, at the core of this model are new strategies of intervention, inclusion and recognition of otherness, as well as control. (Beck and Grande 78) For them earlier democratizations of the EU have had major flaws to them, such as for the Parliament, it has increased its powers, but for Beck and Grande not the legitimacy. In addition, there can be no new implementations from above, Europe must be founded again from below, by its citizens and by movements in civil society. To strengthen their argument, Beck and Grande clarify that in an opinion poll made in spring 2003 by the conducted by the EU Commission, it was revealed that towards the end of the consultations about the constitution more than half (57%) of European citizens were not even aware of the fact that a Convention was working on a draft constitution for Europe. (Beck & Grande, *Das kosmopolitische Europa - Gesellschaft und Politik in der Zeiten Moderne*, 2007) Rightfully they state that this may seem utopian, not only because of the size of this project but also because of the lack of interest in the European Union. Even if the idea of Cosmopolitical Europe is taken out of the out of the equation, the problem remains the same and the answer is also similar, the key factor in securing a future for the EU are its citizens, and vice versa, for because with societal and economic dynamics beyond the grip of democratic decision-making (Aradau & Huysmans, 2009), something similar to the EU is only a logical answer to a new dilemma. In the pursuit to find an answer to this dilemma, European states have lost substantial democratic powers with the unification of Europe, or these powers have been transformed and are now used collectively amongst the member-states. Ever more decisions are thought out in Brussels and they are only implemented at home. By shifting the burden of responsibility onto Brussels in this way, reformers are missing something important. Traditional systems of national accountability have become outdated. The context, the potential and the information required to hold governments accountable have changed radically over the past years. For Mark Leonard Europe's strength is what many other see as its weakness, for in the 21st century power politics

are not the answer, paradoxically in the 21st century the more power one shows, the less power it has to implement its goals on a global scale. Therefore an democratic, open and just European Union is the most logical solution. (Leonard, 2007) In most cases Europe has not had to threaten with invasions or terrifying actions, the worst Europe could do is to leave a state alone, turn its back on them. An simple example is Serbia, were Europe tries to help building a functioning state, at the same time the USA help Columbia and Mexico in the “War on Drugs” solely with founding and equipping the Military and police. Europe stands for hope, and the new European Dream, even when it is flawed when it comes to the traditional definition of “government of the people, for the people, by the people”, there is an ongoing construction of a new form of governing is being made, which should strengthen the position of the governments and citizens of Europe. (Leonard, 2007) Any concept has limits, can at times be fragile and vulnerable, democracy is no exception, it is not simply the power of majority, it is a system of competition that uses the difference of opinions and visions in order by productive. Its strength can most obviously be shown by the fact that “neither wars nor imperialisms, neither chauvinisms nor dictatorships have completely undermined democracy in Europe.” (Llorbera, 2003)

Now in the beginning of the 21st century, at the new dawn for democracy, with the numbers of democratic states at its worldwide peak so far, it might seem strange to see Europe in troubles finding the right ways in implementing it. In this sense it is highly interesting to think of and ask what lies in the future for democracy: should all citizens participate actively and informatively in the policy-making process, does that benefit the society, should the focus be on economical gains and leaving the “boring” politics to the “experts”. Is it enough to have the democracy like it was and is, with regular, fair elections of representatives and the right to run for office? Has relying on expertise backfired at us so crucially, so that it must now be rethought in what way the communities large and small are run? There is at least one thing that the ones debating on the issues agree on, despite the differences between a more majoritarian EU government according to Hix, the freshly recycled ideas of Cosmopolitical politics by Beck and Grande, or the “continue on this road and the EU will do good” view of Mark Leonard, all of these authors and others as well, notice that the EU and the nation-states, are facing legitimacy problems regarding true democracy, therefore it is in their opinion quite clear that a new road must be found.

10. Conclusion

The EU is an historic achievement, the change in Europe in little more than half an century is remarkable. When compared to other regional entities such as NAFTA or APEC, the EU is by far the most successful, it is nevertheless a different form of regional cooperation. The European Union should however not become overconfident or arrogant from the comparison, for it can be far more effective, democratic and legitimate. In the beginning of this work the question was asked whether the nation-states were standing in the way of letting the EU become more democratic, letting it become what it can be. The short answer is that it seems as they might be afraid of letting the EU blossom, the nation-states hold on to the power they have left and therefore not really changing what would be changes. The focus appears to be rather on public relations, moving from crisis to crisis and putting bandages on wounds that are in need of medication.

There is a disbelief in, or fear of, real change and the current circumstances are therefore remade each day, the existing world seen as the best possible world. One is taught that the EU is *sui generis*, which in my opinion leads to, because it is allegedly so large, complex and extremely special, one tends to look at only specific details of the Union e.g. on one policy or on the democratic deficit, instead of the Union as a whole. Political scientist frequently joke about the blindfolded scientists looking at an elephant and each and every one of them is describing something completely different from the others. In reality political scientist seem to do the same, focusing on few big problems but not the EU as a whole, as a concept or as our common future. Within the EU and its system there have been rapid changes, which have lead to a situation where; a significant amount of information is outdated, which leads to a new dilemma where the people debating the EU are constantly comparing apples and oranges or even apples and umbrellas. Still in the EU politicians tend to show only the “soft side” of politics such as the “one happy family” picture at the beginning of summits. Increased cooperation is not equal to decreased disputes, disputes are healthy and a natural fact of human interactions. What is unhealthy is not being able to understand others, and accept that the majority might have an different opinion.

The Change

After the fall of the wall and the Soviet Union, what followed was not as described or hoped by some “end of history”, there was a void waiting to be filled with ideas of true freedom, democracy and human dignity. In that journey the European Union has showed real strength. However, what the literature, so broad and diverse as it is shows. There is something utterly wrong with the way modern societies are run and it can only quiet easily get better, the closest tool to change this is the EU. The EU has, as has been shown, changed rapidly, new treaties which were made as an attempt for fixing other treaties, which previously replaced earlier treaties. The focus is on the wrong issues, by no means are the treaties the problem, the change needs to get the citizens involved, in order to overcome the policy gridlock and make the EU democratically accountable the elites need to change the way the behave within the institutional setup of the EU. The EU is no longer “EU-6-12-15” it is EU-27 and it is growing, additionally the nation-states are in a new political environment. It seems that both societal and economic dynamics are to be beyond control of traditional democratic authority, the democratic entities that once gave individuals collective voice do not withhold the same power as they used to. It can hardly be that what can only be described as crisis of democracy are just mere illusions of few scientist who wish to be well known and sell more books. It is reasonable that these are real changes, and that now in the beginning of the 21st Century and answer to this evolution has to be made. In the opinion of most intellectuals which write about this matter the future of democracy lies with how the citizens deal with questions of citizenship, the lack of sovereignty and this seemingly irreversible globalization. The citizens need to find new instruments which give them the voice which they had, the growing distrust has to be fought and the citizens need to refind the trust they had in their societies. In the case of the European Union, a more openly political and democratic Europe is possibly the best solution.

One factor which is important in this transformation is that pre-conceived ideas of Europe, democracy, nation-states, globalization and the EU influence the discussion field. In every debate it is important to take time for defining the core concepts, it might change the way the problem is handled or not at all. What is of importance is to think and rethink, allow new ideas to challenge old ones, even the ones that are good.

Believing that a society either is “perfect”, at “end of History” or reaching its “Finalité” is dangerous, simply because that describes stagnation, which is a state that few voluntarily seek. It is specially treacherous when it seems clear that the world society in the 21st century has problems such as ecological risks, diseases, economic crises or the rapid change in technology which do make national borders unclear and do in many ways escape democratic processes. Live and open political process on the European level would not only lead to higher degree of coordination. It would lead to increased interest from the public, producing a political mandate for the policy-making field in the EU. The concept of the EU, its core and the solutions of the future are simply a difficult subject. Nevertheless, one thing is a fact, the solution is never going back to the past. Trying to sit it out and be quiet is also not an option, a good silence is golden but there is nothing within them, except unsaid thoughts and ideas that might change the world.

Why Europe?

The quest is not to unite and integrate Europe under one flag, symbol or language. The goal in the European political process cannot be of such a simple material kind the unification must be on a intellectual or a logical level. Different Groups, Languages, Countries, Nations and Cultures will always exist, completely unaffected by the man made borders or fashions on the political sphere which change from time to time.

A spiritual unification of Europe means, a Europe free for the seeds of mistrust or at least freer than today. A Europe which encourages truly free thoughts, has place for hope and foremost a friendly place for Europe’s differences. Even when Europe truly has achieved much in the past decades, a war between the European countries is almost unthinkable, this idea of a perhaps seemingly complex unification shows us that Europe has a long way to go. The only problem with this quest is that as Freud said “the voice of the intellect is quiet” to furthermore add to this idea from Freud, the wiser people seem full of doubts but the ignorant one sure of themselves. (*Bertrand Russell*) Europe can gain so much from working with each other and not against each other, with increased cooperation instead of competition.

As globalization has presented serious faults in the democracy of the World, for almost two decades it has been ongoing and altered the nature of the nation-states, the risks and dangers are different, their ambitions have changed. The political reality however is that boundaries between nations have been naturalized, the political borders which are human inventions became sacred, untouchable and carved into the collective self-understanding of different nations. Even when the globalization has placed the nation-state, identity, citizenship and civil society in crisis, the concept of nation, state, sovereignty and traditional understandings of democracy are almost unchanged. Still today only few question this certainty that the human race is made up of “national islands”, even when the reality proves that interrelations, interdependencies, common responsibility and solidarity amongst the communities rise above the borders and even continents. Promoting democracy is an unfinished journey and will remain so, and for it is an unfinished journey the result should only be that the EU can always do better.

The world of a Cosmological Europe and newly found Empires

The idea behind cosmopolitanism is that it is ok to be different, *we*, that is humans, can be brothers on different grounds and terms. *We* do however have to react to each other views and doings, as long as they do the thing they are supposed to do and do it with respect for others, *we* are responsible for not only our own but each other’s well being. This way the globalization can be used increase respect and to raise living standards of all peoples. The main goal is to find out how to implement these ideas, without understanding any of them it will be an never ending search. Furthermore even if one understands the situation, it must also be made clear that a large part of the population has no idea that world we live in a post-democratic/post-nation-state/democratic deficit hyper-modern globalized society, which has been compared to an Empire and of what some see a cosmopolitical way out as the best possible solution. Most people simply live. For them the world is still the world of sovereign nation-states, they perhaps aware that it has changes and would agree that it is a complicated world. To educate the population about these changes that have without a doubt taken place in the world society would take years and possibly decades. There can be invented an endless amount of –isms, however final decisions are always made in the real world, not the theoretical one, and

always by humans which might have no idea of the trends in theories and -isms. Authors such as Hardt and Negri show, with high complexity, that “traditional struggles” are in most ways completely useless, the world they trying to change has changed. The capital has tried, and somewhat succeeded, in merging the capital with the state, this has given not only the capital new chances but also the states and civic movements and they open up an new level in the fight over power in society.

As was shown earlier in this work, the transformation began in the 1970s and with it the national phase of the industrial modernity came to an end, what is to come is largely unclear. The changes have impacted many levels such as the communication level, with the end of fordism and with the rise of post-fordistic production processes, the way goods are produced changed and the importance of transportation grew. Whether these changes are equally important to the technological revolution at the beginning of the 20th century is unclear. The biggest changes are in the states that are now rapidly closing in on the West, China, India and Brazil are all modernizing in the sense that the people in these states which had until recently not entered the “20th century” are now with remarkable pace flying into the 21st. There the urbanization is now taking place, this also shows duality of this globalization, it has effect on the entire globe but the changes are not everywhere the same.

By using the term Empire, the fiction of the equal sovereign states is broken, it shows that there is an real asymmetry of power. It is also important to show this change now when the states have changed and new powers have risen, it is important for the reason that State and empire are two completely different forms of governing. With it the national is separated from the international in a historical view and challenges the axiomatic way that politics and political science see the nation-states and politics. The transformation of Europe has, resulted that the states are now closely linked in cooperation and are more interdependent than before. The tolerance and knowledge for the needs of others grows and the community benefits, Europe is maturing in the way that it tolerates and is ready to benefit from its differences. Sarcastically the development that formed the modern society is now dissolving it and changing it. In this world of global risks, the possibly most rational road to solutions is through cooperation. Regional cooperation can be seen as a halfway step between the nation-states and a “Super-state”, for it strengthens the leverage that political power has on the

global socioeconomic situation. At the same time it opens the door for democracy out of the closed territorial borders, however it reproduces and magnifies any flaws of the structures of the community. Human society was made, although it can be stated that to some extent it is natural; traditions, culture and both state and nation were created are reinterpreted and will be recreated again it can therefore be replaced.

There is an should be an urge and need to revive democracy on daily bases, the core of it civil liberties, reason, logic and clarity to name a few are not ideas and tools that humans are born with, they need to be learned. It is not an matter of left or right, German or Greece, the idea of democracy is more complex than that and it should be respected as such. The fact that even in the EU, a union of democratic states, democracy must be fought for, persevered and kept alive shows that it is more than an idea, more than any law or simple rule. It must be constantly looked after and reinvented, democracy is simply more complex than it might seem.

There is an entire generation in Europe which has seen the power of democracy, this generation should simply not be able of imagine that fighter aircrafts could again fly over the same waters and mountains that they do on our way to holidays and business. That bomber aircrafts were once used this same route to destroy the homes of other Europeans is simply an bizarre idea, even more bizarre is that young Germans, Frenchman and Britons were sent to the battlefields to kill each other, at it is even more bizarre that they went out and did it, seemingly without much hesitation. The fact that this happened only 60 years ago shows that the "European project" will never reach a finality, it must be constantly looked after. A reward of this work should not only be measured in what Europe gets, but what it becomes.

11. References

- Aradau, C., & Huysmans, J. (37:583 2009). Mobilising (Global) Democracy: A Political Reading of Mobility between Universal Rights and the Mob Millennium. *Journal of International Studies* .
- Beck, U. (2009). *World at Risk*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U., & Grande, E. (10: 67 2007). Cosmopolitanism: Europe's Way Out of Crisis. *European Journal of Social Theory* .
- Beck, U., & Grande, E. (2007). *Das kosmopolitische Europa - Gesellschaft und Politik in der Zeiten Moderne*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Berazin, M. (14: 227 1999). Introduction: Democracy and its Others in a Global Polity. *International Sociology* .
- Brand, U. (No. 1 2007). The Internationalization of the State as the Reconstitution of Hegemony. *IPW Working Paper* .
- Bruter, M. (36: 1148 2003). Winning Hearts and Minds for Europe: The Impact of News and Symbols on Civic and Cultural European Identity. *Comparative Political Studies* .
- Burchill. (2005). Liberalism. In B. e. al., *Theories of International Relations* (S. 55-83). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burchill, S. L. (2005). Introduction. In B. e. al., *Theories of International Relations* (S. 1-23). New York: palgrave Macmillan.
- Christiano, T. (Fall 2008). *Democracy*. Abgerufen am 23. Januar 2011 von The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy:
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/democracy>
- Cohen, J. L. (14: 245 1999). Changing Paradigms of Citizenship and the Exclusiveness of the Demos. *International Sociology* .

- COMMUNITIES, C. O. (2001). *EUROPEAN GOVERNANCE - A White Paper*. Brussels.
- Crouch, C. (2008). *Postdemokratie*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Denselow, J. (7. Januar 2010). *Guardian*. Abgerufen am 15. Februar 2011 von <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/jan/07/security-contractors-iraq-afghanistan>
- Devetak, R. (2005). Postmodernism. In B. e. al., *Theories of International Relations* (S. 161-187). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Donnelly, J. (2005). Realism. In B. e. al., *Theories of International Relations* (S. 29-54). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Enrikin, J. N. (14:269 1999). Political Community, Identity and Cosmopolitan Place. *International Sociology* .
- Giddens, A. (2002). *Runaway World - How Globalisation is Reshaping our Lives*. London: Profile Books.
- Habermas, J. (2008). *Ach, Europa*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Hardt, M. N. (2002). *Empire - Die neue Weltordnung*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (Empire). 2000. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hix, S. (2008). *What's Wrong with the European Union and How to Fix It*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hobsbawm, R. (1995). *The Age of Extremes*. London: Abacus.
- Hrsg: Bahr, E. (1996). *Was ist Aufklärung? Thesen und Definitionen*. Stuttgart: Reclams Universal-Bibliothek.
- Kagan, R. (No. 113. June-July 2002). Power and Weakness. *Policy Review* .
- Krasner, S. D. (22:3 2001). Abiding Sovereignty. *International Political Science Review* .
- Landsford, T. (37:1 2003). Post-Westphalian Europe? Sovereignty and the Modern Nation-State. *International Studies* .

Lennon, J. (Komponist). (1971). Imagine. [J. Lennon, Interpret] Auf *Working Class Hero*.

Leonard, M. (2007). *Warum Europa die Zukunft gehört*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag.

Linklater, A. (2005). Marxism. In B. e. al., *Theories of International Relations* (S. 110-136). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Llobera, J. (1996). *The god of modernity*. Oxford: Berg.

Llorbera, J. (23:155 2003). The concept of Europe as an idea force . *Critique of Anthropology* .

Melchior, J. (No.4 2008). Democratic paradoxes and deficits of EU constitutional politics: the case of the Constitutional and Lisbon Treaties. *IPW Working Paper* .

Min, A. W. (2006 (71)). From Empire to Nation-State. Explaining Wars in the Modern World, 1816-2001. *American Sociological Review* , S. 867-897.

Münkler, H. (14: 283 1999). Nationa as a Model of Political Order and the Growth of National Identity in Europe. *International Sociology* .

Oijano, A. (50: 75 2002). The Return of the Future and Questions about Knowledge. *Current Sociology* .

Parliament, T. E., Council, T., & Commission, T. (2007/C 303/01). *CHARTER OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION* (. Brussels.

Pilger, J. (2002). *The New Rulers of the World*. London: Verso.

Renan, E. (kein Datum). Abgerufen am 1. September 2010 von Sorbonne Lecture, March 11, 1882: (http://www.ellopos.net/politics/eu_renan.html

Smith, D. (8. December 2010). *Guardian*. Abgerufen am 15. Februar 2011 von <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2010/dec/08/wikileaks-cables-shell-nigeria-spying>

Syal, R. (21. December 2010). *Guardian*. Abgerufen am 15. Februar 2011 von <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/dec/21/wikileaks-cables-iraq-security-firms>

Therborn, G. (5: 403 2002). The World's Trader, the World's Lawyer Europe and Global Processes . *European Journal of Social Theory* .

TNS Opinion & Social. (2010). *Eurobarometer 74*. Brussels: European Commission.

Vidal, J. (3. Januar 2011). *Guardian*. Abgerufen am 15. Februar 2011 von <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2011/jan/03/wikileaks-us-eu-gm-crops>

Wagner, P. (80:47 2005). The Political Form of Europe, Europe as a Political Form. *Thesis Eleven* .

Wiedenfeld, W. W. (2007). *Europa von A bis Z*. Berlin: Institut für Europäische Politik.

Zakaria, F. (2008). *The Post-American World*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Lebenslauf

Lárus Heiðar Ásgeirsson ist in Island am 23.07.1983 geboren und auf die Insel aufgewachsen. Nach seinem Maturaabschluss von dem Gymnasium Akureyri (Menntaskólinn á Akureyri) hat Lárus ein Jahr in der University of Akureyri studiert, danach ist er nach Wien gezogen und hat zuerst deutsch am Sprachzentrum der Universität Wien gemacht. In Wien hat Lárus Heiðar Ásgeirsson Politikwissenschaft an der Universität Wien studiert und hat dort versucht einen Fokus auf Internationalisierung, Europäische Politik und Demokratietheorien zu halten.

Lárus Heiðar Ásgeirsson was born in Iceland on 23.07.1983, he grew up on the island. After graduation from Akureyri Junior College (Menntaskólinn á Akureyri) Lárus studied for one year in the University of Akureyri, thereafter he moved to Vienna and first learned German in the University of Vienna Language center. In Vienna Lárus Heiðar Ásgeirsson studied Political science in the University of Vienna, there he focused foremost on Internationalization, European Politics and Democracy studies.

