Reflections of Cosmopolitan Debate in the European Parliament
(Master’s Thesis)

Özer Yördem
Supervisor: Dr. Geoffrey Gooch
Linkoping University, Sweden
Master in International and European Relations, January 2007
ozeyo743@student.liu.se

ABSTRACT:

The problem of world poverty is appalling in human terms. Almost half of all the humankind lives below the poverty line of $2 per day, whereas affluent parts of the world continue to enjoy enormous technological and economical progress. In the light of such discrepancy, the debate in political philosophy regarding “global justice” has renewed significance. The current debate between those who agree global justice is important, is those who think that positive duties towards poor is enough, and those who think that morality requires a re-designation of the ground rules operating at the global level.

The Cosmopolitan view grounds its theoretical framework in this second view. This study aims to analyse if, and how, the normative debate in the European Parliament reflects the assumptions, arguments and considerations of the Cosmopolitan approach. This study identifies central concepts of the Cosmopolitan approach, and then analyses how these concepts are discussed in the European Parliamentary debates. In addition, I identify who discusses what in the parliamentary debates. The analysis reveals how Cosmopolitan ideas are reflected in the discourse within the debates, and the second dimension identifies which party groups discuss and hold which key concepts of Cosmopolitanism.

Key Words: Cosmopolitanism, European Parliament, poverty, Theory of Justice
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

First of all, I would like to thank the Swedish Institute for the financial support it has provided during my studies in Sweden.

Professor Geoffrey Gooch deserves special thanks for his invaluable guidance in helping me transform my academic aspirations into this thesis. Without his support, his supervision and his guidance, this thesis would be less well-oriented, if it existed at all.

My dearest thanks to my family for their love and support, and also to my friends Ahenk Dereli, Mert Koygun and Sara Vanhoyland for their emotional and nutritional support during the final days of writing this thesis.

I owe thanks to my classmates in Sweden. Without Oxana Borta, Harvey HuangHe, Teona Kupunia, Andrea Lucarelli, Eirini Souri, Jari-Pekka Sova, Pierre Vantine and Nathan Wells, our class would not be such a source of academic and social inspirations.

And last, but not least, my warmest thanks to Alice Gibson for her support, belief, assistance, feedback, wisdom and love. As any time-consuming human effort necessitates a true inspiration, she is the real inspiration for this thesis.
# Table of Contents

Abstract ................................................................................................................................. 1

Acknowledgements ............................................................................................................... 2

Abbreviations ..................................................................................................................... 4

Part I Research Outline

1 Definition of the Problem: World Poverty and Normative Debate ............................... 5
2 Aims of the Study & Motivation ..................................................................................... 8
3 Delimitations of the Study ............................................................................................... 11
4 Theoretical Framework ................................................................................................... 12
   4.1 Rawlsian Framework
       4.1.1 Theory of Justice ................................................................................................... 13
       4.1.2 Law of Peoples .................................................................................................... 16
   4.2 Cosmopolitan Framework ......................................................................................... 19
       4.2.1 Cosmopolitanism and Cosmopolitans ................................................................. 20
       4.2.2 Beitz’s Cosmopolitanism: “Political Theory and International Relations” ....22
       4.2.3 Pogge’s Cosmopolitanism: “Realising Rawls” ................................................... 24
   4.3 Cosmopolitan Tools ................................................................................................. 27
       4.3.1 Global Interdependence ..................................................................................... 28
       4.3.2 Global (In)Justice .............................................................................................. 29
       4.3.3 World Poverty ................................................................................................... 30
       4.3.4 Moral Universalism ............................................................................................ 31
       4.3.5 Global Responsibility ......................................................................................... 32
       4.3.6 Institutional Reform & Distributive Justice ......................................................... 33
       4.3.7 Proposals of Redistribution & Satisfaction of Basic Needs ............................... 34
5 Methodological Framework ............................................................................................ 36

Part II Analysis

6 European Parliament as an Institution ............................................................................ 42
7 Debate in the European Parliament
   7.1 Global Interdependence ............................................................................................ 46
   7.2 Global Inequalities .................................................................................................. 50
   7.3 World Poverty ........................................................................................................ 57
   7.4 Moral Universalism ................................................................................................. 61
   7.5 Global Responsibility .............................................................................................. 66
   7.6 Institutional Reform & Distributive Justice .............................................................. 71
   7.7 Proposals of Redistribution & Satisfaction of Basic Needs ................................... 77

Part III Conclusion

8 Cosmopolitan Reflections in the European Parliament ................................................... 86
   8.1 Cosmopolitan Discourse in the European Parliament ............................................ 88
   8.2 Party Affiliation and Degree of Cosmopolitanism .................................................. 88

Bibliography ...................................................................................................................... 94
**ABBREVIATIONS:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALDE</td>
<td>Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Common Agricultural Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDD</td>
<td>Europe of Democracies and Diversities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEC</td>
<td>European Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDR</td>
<td>European Liberal, Democrat and Reform Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNP</td>
<td>Gross National Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens/ALE</td>
<td>European Greens-European Free Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRT</td>
<td>Global Resource Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUE/NGL</td>
<td>European United Left-Nordic Green Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/DEM</td>
<td>Independence and Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEP</td>
<td>Member of the European Parliament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPE-DE</td>
<td>European People’s Party-European Democrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>Party of European Socialists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Single European Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPS</td>
<td>Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>Tobin Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTO</td>
<td>World Trade Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDHR</td>
<td>Universal Declaration of Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEN</td>
<td>Union For Europe of the Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 1: RESEARCH OUTLINE

No need for greed or hunger
A brotherhood of man
Imagine all the people
Sharing all the world
You may say I’m a dreamer
But I am not the only one

“Imagine” by John Lennon

1. Definition of the Problem: World Poverty and Normative Debate

We know that the problem of world poverty is catastrophic. According to a recent report by the World Bank, there has been a rise from 2.4 billion people in 1987 to 2.7 billion in 2001, who live below the US$2 per day poverty line.1 The same report estimates that there has been a decline from 1.1 billion people in 1987 to 1 billion in 2001, for the people living below the US$1 per day poverty line.2 However, the report suggests that this decline is largely attributable to relative progress in China.3 The conditions of poverty have in fact worsened in Sub-Saharan Africa. In Sub-Saharan Africa, there has been an increase from 218 million in 1987 to 312 million people in 2001 living below the US$1 per day poverty line; for the US$2 per day poverty line, there has been an increase from 355 million in 1987 to 516 million in 2001.4

The more recent 2005 report on progress on Millenium Development Goals (MDGs) confirms the same trend. The report laments that, despite relative progress in certain regions, there has been increase in absolute poverty (US$1 per day) in Sub-Saharan Africa, from 44.6% of the population in 1990 to 46.4% in 2001.5 Today, some 2.8 billion, almost 46% of humankind, live below the US$2 per day poverty line, and 1.1

2 Ibid, p.31
3 Ibid, p.1
4 Ibid, p.30
billion of them live below the $1 per day poverty line.\textsuperscript{6} It is estimated that 18 million people die annually of poverty-related causes, in other words 50,000 people daily and 300 million within the last 16 years since the end of the Cold War.\textsuperscript{7}

This is the arithmetics of world poverty. Development aid has been given to developing countries for years. However, given the persistence of severe poverty, the international community has decided to take some further action in 1996. At the World Food Summit in Rome, leaders of the world have declared their aim of “halving the world poverty” by 2015. Four years later, in 2000, the United Nations (UN) Millennium Development Goals were declared. MDGs are comprised of eight main goals: eradicating extreme poverty, achieving universal primary education, promoting gender equality, reducing child mortality, improving maternal health, combating HIV/AIDS and other diseases, ensuring environmental sustainability, and developing a global partnership for development.\textsuperscript{8}

Together with the development aid given and the declaration of MDGs, the fight against poverty has gained a foothold in other domains. Transnational civil society campaigns such as “Make Poverty History”\textsuperscript{9}, and other private initiatives such as Tony Blair’s calling world leaders for more commitment to fight against poverty in 2005 reflect a growing awareness of the global societal implications of poverty.

Academic debate is also influenced by poverty debates. Problems of world poverty and the observation that “we do not live in a just world” have renewed a topic in political philosophy: global justice.\textsuperscript{10} Some even argue that the topic of ‘global’ justice will dominate the academic debate in political philosophy in the 21st century.\textsuperscript{12}

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid, pp. 97-98
\textsuperscript{8} UN (2005), pp. 4-5
\textsuperscript{9} www.makepovertyhistory.org
\textsuperscript{10} Nagel, Thomas “The Problem of Global Justice”, \textit{Philosophy and Public Affairs} 33 (2005), p. 113
\textsuperscript{11} The words ‘global’ and ‘international’ are interchangeably used in many texts. However, they might in fact have different meanings in some contexts. The word ‘global’ does not necessarily accept state borders as given or as relevant, whereas the word ‘inter-national’ implies a world divided into states. So to say,
As regards world poverty, this debate has taken a new direction, and that is “between those who think that we only have humanitarian duties to foreigners, and those who think that we have, in addition to humanitarian duties, duties of distributive justice”.\(^{13}\) In the academic literature, this debate is also called the ‘cosmopolitan versus communitarian debate’, or the debate between “justice beyond borders” and “justice within borders”.\(^{14}\)

The first opinion, which \emph{only} assigns humanitarian duties to the international community, is based on the idea that it is domestic factors (political culture) that determine the prospects of any given society. To support this argument, the example of rapid economic growth of Asian tigers in the last decade is given, with the conclusion that proper domestic policies would and could bring about prosperity.\(^{15}\) Hence, it is only the duties of assistance (such as development aid) that the affluent morally owes to the poor.\(^{16}\) As we will see in the theory part in more detail, this first opinion is championed by John Rawls and his domestic theory of justice, as well as his international theory of ethics.

The second approach disagrees with the belief that it is domestic factors that make the difference. This approach, the ‘cosmopolitan’ approach, argues that it is the ‘global institutional order’ that determines the main dynamics of domestic and global factors.\(^{17}\) Therefore, the existence of world poverty requires a moral reflection, on the

\(^{12}\) Rengger, Nicholas “Introduction: Justice in the World Economy: Global, International or both?” \textit{International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)Vol.75, No.3 (Jul.1999)} p. 471
\(^{14}\) For a detailed discussion, see Cochran, Molly (1999) \textit{Normative Theory in International Relations}, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.6
grounds that we (all of us) might be contributing to the existence of severe poverty.\textsuperscript{18} Moreover, just because they are humans, all humans deserve equal moral concern, whether they are compatriots or foreigners.\textsuperscript{19}

Cosmopolitan approach laments the fact that the moral debate on poverty is dominated by the first opinion, which focuses on how much and which affluent societies and persons have obligations to \textit{help} others in need.\textsuperscript{20} Instead, Cosmopolitan approach sets the goal of its political discourse with an institutional focus:

“A criterion of justice, which assesses the degree to which institutions are treating persons in a morally appropriate, and even-handed way”.\textsuperscript{21}

\section*{2. Aims of the Study, Motivation & Research Questions}

The case of world poverty in human terms has been presented. I have also outlined an introduction to the normative debate of Cosmopolitan approach to world poverty. The aim of this thesis is to analyse how the Cosmopolitan approach, together with its main assumptions, arguments and considerations, is reflected in the debates of the European Parliament (EP). I have been motivated to choose such an aim for three main reasons.

The first reason is derived from the Cosmopolitan argument that in fact citizens’ moral views \textit{dramatically} differ from those officially representing them on their behalf.\textsuperscript{22} The argument here is as morally enlightened human beings, we would not be indifferent to severe poverty but we are, in fact, contributing to world poverty through the outcomes of the global institutional order being shaped by our representatives. Concerning world poverty, Thomas Pogge asks “how can such severe poverty continue despite the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Pogge (2002), p. 13
\item \textsuperscript{19} Ibid, p.169
\item \textsuperscript{20} Ibid, p.117
\item \textsuperscript{21} Ibid, p.31
\end{itemize}
enlightened moral norms and values of our heavily dominant Western civilization?”.23 Here is a reflection how severe poverty might continue: In the World Food Summit in Rome in 1996, the goal was set as “reducing the number of undernourished people to half their present level no later than 2015”.24 Four years later, when the MDGs were set, the goal has been changed to “halve, by the year 2015, the proportion of the world’s people whose income is less than one dollar a day”.25 Pogge argues that this subtle but significant change in words from ‘number’ to ‘proportion’ makes a huge difference of 101.5 million people.26 In other words, as the population is expected to grow from 6 billion in 2000 to 7.2 billion in 2015, halving the ‘number’ of poor would mean a reduction from 1094 million poor to 547 million, whereas halving the ‘proportion’ would mean from 18% to 9% of human population, which is equal to 648.5 million people estimated in 2015.27 A second reflection is that for the MDGs, the baseline (for halving the proportion of poor) was set at the 1990 level. Pogge argues that, the use of 1990 as the baseline has two implications: first, relative poverty reduction in China in the 1990s makes a huge difference to poverty statistics (i.e. a decrease in relative poverty in China, with its huge population, translates into a significant decrease in relative poverty globally, even if in other world regions poverty is getting worse). Secondly, a longer plan period of 25 instead of 15 years, means greater population growth; so essentially they have given themselves 10 more years to lower the 1990 levels, even though in these ten years the absolute number of people in poverty will be growing.28 The result is that with few technical changes in the document and in the measurement, the ‘acceptable’ amount of people living in absolute poverty ($1/day) has been raised from 547 million people to 883 million, which is equal to 336 million people worldwide.29

Pogge calls this situation as a “stunning thoughtlessness in the face of a problem that destroys more lives than problems we pay at least some attention to- the civil

23 Pogge (2002), p.3
27 Ibid
28 Ibid
29 Ibid, p.4
wars”\textsuperscript{30}, and asserts that “our negotiators must know that the better they succeed, the more people will die of poverty”.\textsuperscript{31} Hence, my first motivation has to do with the argument of Pogge that states that our moral views are not reflected by our representatives.

The second motivation for choosing such an aim is because the literature on qualitative research laments that despite the potential of the public records (including the work of parliaments and parliamentary committees), these public records are under-utilised.\textsuperscript{32} My personal observation confirms this statement, as I was unable to find any parallel analysis to mine, whether in the EP debates or other parliamentary debates, in the relevant literature.

The third, and the most, important motivation is the European Parliament itself. Due to direct elections every five years, it is considered as the “true representative of the European peoples”.\textsuperscript{33} Moreover, the Parliament plays the role of a venue where Members of the European Parliament (MEPs), together with some guest speakers, discuss the important issues that people care about.\textsuperscript{34}, I have thought that analysing the reflections of such a normative academic debate in the European Parliament would be a good way to examine to what extent certain moral views are reflected in the European Parliament.

Two specific research questions emerge from these motivations:

- How are the Cosmopolitan assumptions, arguments and considerations reflected in the European Parliament debates? Is it possible to argue that Cosmopolitan approach is reflected in the discourse of the speakers?
- How do the MEPs from different party groups and guest speakers (from the Commission or the Council) discuss the relevant concepts central to

\textsuperscript{30} Ibid, p.17  
\textsuperscript{31} Pogge (2002), p.20  
\textsuperscript{32} Zimmerman, David (1993), Interpreting Qualitative Data, London: Sage Publications, p. 68  
Cosmopolitan thought? Is there a significant correlation between one’s party affiliation and the degree of their ‘cosmopolitan’ discourse?

3. Delimitations of the Study

To begin with, this thesis is definitely not a discussion over the debate between Cosmopolitan approach and Rawlsian approach. Although both approaches have been contrasted in the theoretical framework, the aim has been to provide an explanation of how the Cosmopolitan approach has evolved, and what the key concepts of the approach are. With a different aim, with a larger scope for the theoretical part, it could have been provided a rather more complete picture of Cosmopolitan thought. However, I have tried to keep the focus on the Cosmopolitan concepts, since they guide the analysis.

For the collection of data, I have used key words from the Cosmopolitan concepts to find the relevant debates in the EP, by running ‘key word searches’ in the EP database. The selection of these Cosmopolitan concepts is based on my understanding of what concepts are central to the Cosmopolitan thought. Nevertheless, one could identify other concepts (and thus key words) as being descriptive of Cosmopolitan concepts. However, I do not believe that the selection of the concepts and the findings would constitute a significant change in the findings.

As a result of the method I have used to collect the data, I have analysed 94 debates in total. One could have widened the analysis by using a larger number of debates, by adding more key words while searching in the EP database. One could also have focused on certain issues debated in the Parliament. My personal choice has been towards picking different debates, through search of words, rather than focusing on, say, trade negotiations or agricultural policies.
4. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK:

Introduction:

Considered as one of the most prominent scholars of Cosmopolitan school, Thomas Pogge dedicates his book “Realizing Rawls” to John Rawls who “made it possible and necessary”. Why has John Rawls, who had once been his supervisor while writing his doctoral dissertation in Harvard back in 1983, mattered so much to Thomas Pogge and what was it that John Rawls made possible and necessary. The answers to these two questions, I believe, help understand the evolution and basic building blocks of Cosmopolitan thought, which has been largely developed on Rawls’s philosophical legacy. Coming from Rawls’s legacy, the theoretical framework to be presented in this section and to be utilized in the coming analysis section, aims to explain Cosmopolitan thought, its evolution, its criticisms and eventually, its main arguments and considerations. Though the word ‘cosmopolitan’ and ‘cosmopolitanism’ might be used in different contexts, ‘Cosmopolitanism’ referred here is Cosmopolitan Theory of Justice, which has departed from Rawlsian theory of justice, with the aim of extending, advancing and globalizing it and which is mainly comprised of works of Thomas Pogge and Charles Beitz.

The section starts with John Rawls and his domestic “Theory of Justice”, and continues with his theory of international affairs, which is known as “Law of Peoples”. After introducing the reader to Rawlsian framework, the focus moves towards building of Cosmopolitan thought. Hence, in order to build the Cosmopolitan family of dispersed argument(s), the section chooses to benefit from two main Cosmopolitan thinkers, Pogge and Beitz, and their main works. The motivation for choosing these two authors, rather than others, is that they are the only authors Rawls refers in “Law of Peoples”, when he explains why he disagrees with Cosmopolitan approach. After benefiting from their works, the section aims to provide an overall framework of Cosmopolitan thought, by

---

including the main concepts, considerations and reflections so as to provide the main tools to be used in the analysis section.

Only through understanding the Rawlsian framework can one have a better understanding of Cosmopolitanism, its evolution, its main arguments and its normative considerations. Hence the reason(s) why I choose such a structure and my eventual aim to come up with Cosmopolitan tools to be used in the analysis section.

4.1 Rawlsian Framework

4.1.1 Theory of Justice

Rawls begins with assuming that a society is a “more or less self-sufficient association of persons”, who recognize certain rules of conduct as binding. These rules form a certain type of cooperation, from which the participants aim to benefit. Together with the cooperative nature of the association of the people, conflicts of interests are inevitable as well, since people are not indifferent to the distribution of benefits produced out of cooperation. Therefore, the principles to determine the basic distribution of benefits and burdens of that social cooperation are the principles of social justice. Any society is a just society if the chosen principles of justice on which that particular society consider to be accepted by all are adhered to; and also if basic social institutions are capable of satisfying those principles. So the basic structure of the society is the primary subject of justice. That basic structure of the society can be understood as “the way in which the major social institutions distribute fundamental rights and duties and determine the division of advantages from social cooperation”.

---

36 Rawls (1971), p.4
37 Ibid
38 Ibid
39 Ibid
Having established ‘basic structure’ as the main subject of justice, Rawls aims to find principles of justice that free and rational individuals would agree upon in a condition of equality, that is without any coercion or oppression.\textsuperscript{40} In addition to that, the principles of justice also should correct the social accidents caused by natural and social contingencies, which are natural endowments and social circumstances.\textsuperscript{41} To put it simply, as long as it is a matter of chance of having or not having our natural endowments (e.g. intellectual, artistic or physical capabilities), or starting life with favourable social contingencies (e.g. education, wealth), these particular circumstances seem morally arbitrary and hence, need to be balanced to the benefit of those least advantaged\textsuperscript{42}.

Rawls uses a thought experiment, or hypothetical situation, to illustrate a certain conception of justice, famously known as ‘The Original Position’, or the ‘veil of ignorance’.\textsuperscript{43} In this hypothetical situation, the persons in the experiment do not know anything about their place in society, their class position or social status, their natural talents or other capabilities. From under this ‘veil of ignorance’ they must design the principles of justice they choose to live by. Because people do not know what their social situation will be when they emerge from the ‘veil of ignorance’, they would logically choose principles which would be fair to everyone. Hence, the principles designed at the end are results of a fair agreement or bargain, or “justice as fairness” as Rawls calls it.\textsuperscript{44} As a result of this fair bargaining under the ‘veil of ignorance’, Rawls thinks two principles would emerge, agreed upon by all. Also known as the ‘liberty’ and ‘difference’ principles, the principles are:

1- Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all.

2- Social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both
   (a) to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged, consistent with the just savings principle, and

\textsuperscript{40} Rawls (1971), p.10
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., p.14
\textsuperscript{42} For two various definitions of “least advantaged”, see Rawls (1971), p.84
\textsuperscript{43} Ibid, p.11
\textsuperscript{44} Ibid
For such a conception of justice, Rawls states his aim as presenting a conception of justice which would operate within the familiar tradition of social contract theories as found in Locke, Rousseau and Kant, and also as carrying it (the conception of justice) to “a higher level of abstraction”. Hence, Rawls seems to achieve his aim of forming an original social contract theory which I have simply summarized above.

For Rawls, these two principles are extremely important since they complement each other with the aim of enjoying equal liberty as much as one can. In a society, some might have more wealth and power so it might be easier for those to enjoy their liberties, whereas less fortunate members (“least advantaged” in Rawl’s terms) might have less means to make their liberties “worth”. Liberty is about equal citizenship (first principle), whereas worth of liberty depends on one’s means to achieve it (second principle). Not a nominal liberty, but a worth liberty is what matters to Rawls, hence the inequalities should be compensated for the less fortunate members of the society, so as to “maximize the worth to the least advantaged of the complete scheme of equal liberty shared by all”. This defines the end of social justice, for Rawls.

So far, I have presented the Rawlsian Theory of Justice. For the purposes of my theoretical framework, within which I will describe a complete picture of Cosmopolitan theory, I choose to discuss Cosmopolitan responses to Rawls through the main works of Thomas Pogge (1989) and Charles Beitz (1979). However, prior to that, I believe it is essential to discuss “Law of Peoples” (1999), which is Rawl’s theory of international politics. My aim is to complete the Rawlsian framework before exposing the reader to Cosmopolitan thought. In “Theory of Justice” (1971), Rawls already discusses some of his ideas about international politics, but he does not provide a complete theory. He offers a more complete picture in ‘Law of Peoples’.

---

45 Rawls (1971), p.266
46 Ibid., p.10
47 Ibid., p.179
48 Ibid
4.1.2 Law of Peoples

Rawls’s “Theory of Justice” (1971) provokes several responses from different schools of thought, including liberal thinkers. Two of these liberal thinkers, Pogge and Beitz, take the challenge to extend the scope of Rawlsian framework, and advance it to an international / global level. They believed that a true interpretation of Rawlsian theory of justice requires such an extension. After their responses to Rawls, they become to be called “Cosmopolitans” or “Cosmopolitan liberals”. In “Law of Peoples” (1999), Rawls explicitly rejects some of the central ideas put forward by Cosmopolitan thinkers, mainly Pogge (1989) and Beitz (1979). By presenting the main ideas in Law of Peoples, I believe I will complete the Rawlsian framework.

The main idea motivating Rawls’ “Law of Peoples” is that “The great evils of human history follow from political injustice .... and once, these injustice(s) are eliminated, these great evils will eventually disappear”.49 Hence, Rawls aims to come up with a particular conception of justice, parallel to “justice as fairness” (his domestic idea of justice) to be applied at the international level.50 He calls a “Society of Peoples” those peoples51 who would follow the ideals and principles in their mutual relations.52

With the aim of forming a conception of justice to be applied to international law and practice, Rawls forms a second “Original Position”, where representatives of states would form basic principles. Parallel to the first original position, representatives of states are subject to a ‘veil of ignorance’, that is they do not know the size of their territory, the amount of natural resources, or the relative strength of the peoples they would represent.53 Under such a hypothetical situation, after the fair bargaining of representatives of states, eight principles are formed to constitute the main elements of international law and practice. These are:

50 Ibid, p.3
51 ‘Peoples’ refer to States in Rawlsian terminology, as moral motives could only be attributed to peoples, which wouldn’t be the case for states.
52 Rawls (1999), p.3
53 Ibid., p.32
1. Peoples are free and independent, and their freedom and independence are to be respected by other peoples.
2. Peoples are to observe treaties and undertakings.
3. Peoples are equal and are parties to the agreements that bind them.
4. Peoples are to observe a duty of non-intervention.
5. Peoples have the right to self-defense but no right to instigate war for reasons other than self-defense.
6. Peoples are to honour human rights.
7. Peoples are to observe certain specified restrictions in the conduct of war.
8. Peoples have a duty to assist other peoples living under unfavourable conditions that prevent their having a just or decent political and social regime.\(^\text{54}\)

Five types of domestic societies exist, according to Rawls: *reasonable liberal peoples*, *decent hierarchical societies*, *outlaw states*, *burdened societies* and *benevolent absolutisms*.\(^\text{55}\) Rawls argues that only the “Well-ordered peoples”, in other words *reasonable liberal peoples* and *decent hierarchical societies* would conform to these eight principles stated above.\(^\text{56}\)

‘Duty of assistance’ constitutes an important element in the “Law of Peoples”. Rawls argues that well-ordered people have a *duty* to assist burdened societies and he emphasizes that regulating social and economic inequalities should not be the object of a duty of assistance.\(^\text{57}\) The reason is that Rawls believes that it is the political culture (of any society) that makes the difference and a duty of assistance should only aim to help burdened societies develop the political and social institutions necessary for managing their own affairs.\(^\text{58}\) To highlight his point, Rawls uses the contrast between Japan and Argentina as an example: the former society is resource-poor but well ordered and the latter is resource-rich but still “having difficulties”.\(^\text{59}\)

Rawls’s ‘duty of assistance’ is not found sufficient by some Cosmopolitan thinkers and Cosmopolitans instead highlight the need for an “institutional focus” (in

---

\(^{55}\) For a detailed discussion of Rawlsian typology of states, see Rawls (1999), p.4
\(^{56}\) Ibid., p.63
\(^{57}\) Ibid., p.106
\(^{58}\) For the guidelines of duty of assistance, see Rawls (1999), pp.106-111.
\(^{59}\) Ibid., p.108.
other words, reforming the whole global institutional order). Pogge argues, under the label of “explanatory nationalism”, that what is unjust is not the political culture of the countries, it is the unjust global order that is coercively imposed upon them, and which distorts the development of their political culture and excludes them from the benefits of global cooperation. This therefore sustains the relative and absolute poverty.

As a proponent of the view that duty of assistance is enough to help develop stable political institutions and eliminate political injustices that he considers as the “main evil”, Rawls rejects the Cosmopolitan approach of Pogge and Beitz. The Cosmopolitan approach is rejected on the same grounds that he argues for duty of assistance: political culture is what matters, not the resources. Rawls also argues that any distributive justice principle among nations would be unjust and hence unacceptable, since it would penalize some societies who have taken an industrious and productive path.

By rejecting Cosmopolitanism of Pogge and Beitz on the grounds of being unjust according to his theory and therefore unacceptable, Rawls contrasts with the Cosmopolitan thought and its arguments for reducing international / global inequalities. He describes the contrast between Cosmopolitan approach and “Law of Peoples” as follows:

“The Law of Peoples is indifferent between the two distributions. The cosmopolitan view...is concerned with the well-being of individuals, and hence with whether the well-being of the globally worst-off person can be improved. What is important to the Law of Peoples is the justice and stability for the right reasons of liberal and decent societies, living as members of a Society of well-ordered Peoples”.
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4.2 Cosmopolitan Framework

It seems essential to now proceed to the Cosmopolitan perspective. First, I will discuss Cosmopolitanism in general. I will then outline two important texts of Cosmopolitan thought, with the aim of constructing the Cosmopolitan perspective. There are two reasons for choosing these texts and these authors, rather than the others: first, both Pogge and Beitz are contractarian in the Rawlsian sense. In other words they depart from a Rawlsian framework presented in his “Theory of Justice” and they argue for an extension of it to the global / international level. Second, both authors and their texts are the main texts that Rawls cites in his “Law of Peoples”, under the section where he explains why he disagrees with the Cosmopolitan view.66

The first text is by Beitz (1979), who comes up with two modifications to Rawlsian framework. The first modification accepts Rawls’s assumption that only within a domestic context, can one talk about distributive justice, but Beitz argues for an international resource distribution principle. The second modification denies this Rawlsian assumption and sets the moral need for principles of global distributive justice. The second text is by Pogge (1989), who has a similar aim as Beitz’s, where he argues for a ‘global difference principle’, which can be explained as optimizing the social and economic inequalities in a Rawlsian fashion that it would be to the greatest benefit of the globally least advantaged participants. For this principle, he departs from two central elements of Rawlsian theory and concludes that a true Rawlsian interpretation of Rawls would in fact require a global dimension to Rawls’s distributive justice scheme.

After presenting the two primary texts, I will sort out central concepts of Cosmopolitan thought, such as global interdependence, global inequalities, world poverty, moral universalism, global responsibility, institutional reform, redistribution and satisfaction of basic needs. The motivation for choice of these concepts rather than others will be discussed in detail, both in the coming sub-section ‘Cosmopolitan tools’ and in the analysis section. These concepts are of extreme importance to this thesis, since they

66 Rawls (1999), pp.113-120
will guide the analysis of how Cosmopolitan approach is reflected in the European Parliament debates.

4.2.1 Cosmopolitanism and Cosmopolitans:

Cosmopolitan thinking has its origins from the Greek Stoics, who believed that humankind is bound together morally in a “spaceship of Earth”. In this thesis, “Cosmopolitanism” (or “Cosmopolitan thought / approach”) has been used so far to refer to the same approach, which is contractarian cosmopolitanism, mostly of Pogge and Beitz, built on the legacy of Rawls.

Regarding what Cosmopolitanism is, let us refer to our main authors Beitz and Pogge, on how they define themselves and Cosmopolitanism. Beitz chooses to call Cosmopolitanism, particularly his approach to Rawlsian framework, as “Cosmopolitan liberalism”, which he contrasts with “Social liberalism”, that is a Rawlsian framework presented in “Law of Peoples”. He distinguishes Social Liberalism with a moral “division of labor”, where domestic societies are responsible for well-being of their citizens, while international community is responsible for providing the background conditions in which domestic societies can flourish. Cosmopolitan liberalism, on the other hand, perceives the world as composed of persons, rather than states or communities, and the principles chosen should be based on a consideration of the fundamental interests of persons. However, Beitz distinguishes his Cosmopolitan liberalism from other cosmopolitan approaches, such as institutional or individual. For instance, Institutional Cosmopolitanism requires some sort of a global supra-national
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political authority, while Individual Cosmopolitanism requires humans feel like ‘citizens of the world’. Beitz requires neither.

Pogge states three elements that are shared by all cosmopolitan positions: Individualism, that is our ultimate moral concern is about individual human beings, not communities and not states; Universality, which means all humans have equal moral status; and Generality, which implies that all humans are concerns of everyone, rather than only for their compatriots or countrymen. Pogge makes two distinctions between different cosmopolitan approaches. The first distinction is between a legal and moral cosmopolitanism, in which the former is committed to a global political order under which all persons have equivalent legal rights and duties, while the latter has as the central idea that every human being has a global value as an ultimate unit of moral concern. The second distinction lies within the domain of morality: institutional vs. interactional cosmopolitanism. The former emphasizes ground rules, i.e. the institutions, that are to be assessed in relation to social justice. The latter assigns the responsibility to individual and collective agents, rather than the institutional schemes.

Although moral and institutional cosmopolitanism can be contrasted, it can be argued that Beitz’s and Pogge’s cosmopolitan approaches are both moral and institutional. They are moral in the sense that they consider all humans as the ultimate unit of equal concern; they are institutional in the sense that they put the emphasis on institutions, or the institutional order, for their cosmopolitan considerations to be reflected and realized. Now, we can proceed into a more detailed discussion of Beitz’s and Pogge’s contribution to Cosmopolitan thought.
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4.2.2 Beitz’s Cosmopolitanism: “Political Theory and International Relations”:

On the Cosmopolitan debate over Rawlsian thought, Brown calls Beitz’s work “Political Theory and International Relations” (1979) as a “pioneering study”, as many of the later arguments first “see the day light here”. Beitz underlines the aim of his work as “helping lay the groundwork for a more satisfactory normative political theory of international relations”.

Beitz begins to construct his approach by arguing that international relations can not be understood as a “state-of-nature” in Hobbesian sense anymore. He highlights some newly arising developments in world politics, such as widening gap between rich and poor countries, growth of centers of economic power beyond effective regulation by states, shortages of food and energy caused by irresponsible growth policies of governments, demands of third world countries for more equitable terms of participation in global economics and politics. He associates these developments with increasing impact of international arrangements and transnational interactions on humans. The conclusion he makes is that just as in domestic societies, there are patterns of cooperation and competition in international relations. Here is how, then, he constructs his theory of distributive justice, in which he proposes two arguments to Rawlsian framework:

International relations are increasingly resembling domestic societies. The model of a cooperative scheme was a prerequisite for Rawls for his distributive principles to apply, and nations were those self-sufficient cooperative schemes. However, if nations are that self-contained, why consider international justice at all? Self-sufficiency assumption requires that societies do not have any significant trade or other economic relations, which could easily be refuted, given the level of economic interdependence
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among states. Nevertheless, if Rawls was right about nations being self-sufficient cooperative schemes, parties to the second original position, as described in “Law of Peoples” would still come up with additional principles, other than the eight principles which resemble current norms of international law. To use Rawls’ own argument, distribution of natural resources in the world are just as arbitrary as natural endowments of persons. Therefore, the main additional principle to Rawls’ eight, would be a resource redistribution principle, since parties (to the second original position) would not know about their economic endowments and hence, they would want to have a fair chance of developing just political institutions and economy. A resource distribution principle, thus, is compatible with the Rawlsian assumption that states are self-sufficient cooperative schemes.

On the other hand, if there is a significant interdependence among nations and hence states are therefore not that self-sufficient cooperative schemes, Rawls’s domestic principles (those presented in Theory of Justice) should be applied globally. And there is a certain level of interdependence among nations. For example, the global monetary regime can bring about adverse effects on any economy, beyond its control, through price inflation or financial crisis. Moreover, participation in international trade and investment might very well sustain unjust domestic distributive policies, especially in the countries with corrupt governments. These facts describe a world where state borders do not define the borders of social cooperation anymore. Hence, Rawlsian domestic principles ought to be applied globally, since Rawlsian thinking would require that.

Throughout the entire text, Beitz seeks to come to two conclusions: first, accepting national self-sufficiency, Rawls’s eight principles is incomplete, since distribution of resources, at least, would also matter to parties to the second original position. Second, as long as global economic interdependence is present, there is a
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normative argument for an appropriate global difference principle, which should be a modified version of Rawls’s difference principle.  

Benefiting from Rawlsian framework, and aiming to advance it to the international sphere, Beitz calls this view of his as a “cosmopolitan conception”. In his own words, “it is cosmopolitan in the sense that it is concerned with the moral relations of members of a universal community in which state boundaries have a merely derivative significance”.

4.2.3 Pogge’s Cosmopolitanism: “Realising Rawls”:

As the next pivotal text to Cosmopolitan framework presented in this thesis, Pogge starts by stating that “this book is both a defence and a constructive critique of the work of John Rawls”. Simply put, Pogge focuses on two central ideas of Rawls, and reaches the conclusion that in fact a Rawlsian framework would require a global original position, hence a global interpretation of Rawls’s domestic “theory of justice”. These two ideas, which Pogge deliberately focuses on, are: first, the basic structure and second, the idea that any scheme of social institution should be assessed by how well it does by the least advantaged participants (the “maximin” idea).

In “Theory of Justice”, Rawls argues that his conception of justice is applicable to all self-contained social systems. The justification for that is the fundamental assurance problem, which is about how to make states comply with the requirements of global distributive justice, given the absence of a supra-national authority or a “world government”. Pogge explains this reasoning with the “dogma of absolute sovereignty”, which is the belief that a juridical state requires an authority of last resort. He argues that this is a mistaken belief since law-governed societies are possible without a supreme and
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unlimited authority. Hence, he comes up with the answer that rather than a world
government, what is needed is an “overlapping consensus” for a global conception of
justice.\textsuperscript{92}

The need for an “overlapping consensus” arises from the need for a value-based
world order. Pogge argues that the conventional understanding of international relations
is based on the Hobbesian concept of “modus vivendi”, which relies on states’ mutual
agreements without sharing any common moral values.\textsuperscript{93} However, such an
understanding of world order is unsuitable for achieving peace and justice, due to
constant changes in states’ power, interests and situation.\textsuperscript{94} Describing the present world
order as “the enduring climate of insecurity and hostility”, Pogge sets the target as
“transcending the prevailing modus vivendi and establishing the superior form of
institutional scheme”, which is a value-based world order.\textsuperscript{96}

This discussion takes Pogge towards issues of interdependence and responsibility.
He attributes existing world market systems as responsible for the current global poverty
and related human misery.\textsuperscript{97} Hence, according to Pogge, given the causality between
current world order and world poverty, coupled with the lack of political will and
commitment to eradicate human miseries, we\textsuperscript{98} are not only disregarding our positive
duty of mutual aid, but also we are violating negative duty\textsuperscript{99} of not harming others, which
in fact we do through our unjust global institutional order.\textsuperscript{100} This leads Pogge to ask how
one assesses a global institutional framework from a moral point of view, and the answer
is from a cosmopolitan conception of justice, based on two central Rawlsian ideas.

\textsuperscript{92} Pogge (1989), p.216.
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\textsuperscript{98} In the discourse of Pogge, “we” generally refers to citizens of affluent countries and some local elites of
developing countries, unless otherwise specified. In this text, he refers it as “citizens of powerful and
approximately democratic countries”. See Pogge(1989), p.239
\textsuperscript{99} Pogge rejects the mainstream belief that responsibility towards poor only includes a positive duty of
assistance, in contrast he argues that we are harming the global poor through the institutional order we are
imposing on them, hence this is a violation of our negative duty not to harm anyone.
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It has been mentioned above that Pogge was focusing on two central elements of Rawlsian theory. Pogge argues that the commitment to these elements (focus on basic structure and assessment of the relevant institutional structure through the position of the least advantaged participant it affects) would bring about abandoning the primary emphasis on domestic institutions in favour of globalizing Rawlsian conception of justice.\(^{101}\) Then, according to him, there are grounds for globalizing Rawlsian theory since there is significant global interdependence.\(^{102}\) In other words, as a Cosmopolitan thinker, Pogge considers the world as a global institutional scheme significant enough to assess within the terms of considerations of justice, in opposition to those who would reject the existence of global order, hence considerations of global justice.

Pogge argues for a single global original position, on the grounds that nationality is a contingency just as natural or social ones.\(^{103}\) Against the idea that claims of states should also be taken into account, Pogge argues that this is in fact compatible with a Rawlsian framework, which views only persons as ultimate units of moral concern.\(^{104}\) He supports his argument by mentioning that Rawls’s individualistic perspective (that the individuals are the ultimate units of moral concern) would never let burdens to be imposed upon someone just because of the wrong conduct of her relatives or compatriots.\(^{105}\) Hence, he concludes, the individualistic basis of Rawls requires a global interpretation of justice, where parties to the original position would represent persons, rather than states and hence, the global institutional scheme would be assessed by the least advantaged in the global level.\(^{106}\)

Out of the need of “re-capitulating” the main steps through which he comes up with a constructive critique and extension of Rawls to the global level, Pogge presents six main points, which will lead to two conclusions. The first point is, present widespread human misery requires a moral reflection and if we might be a part of its cause. Second,
true macro explanations of human misery could easily be provided, given the dynamics of international economical and political order. Third, in spite of “just” ground rules among states (such as equal sovereignty), a good case can still be made that the current global order is unjust, regarding the feasible institutional alternatives. Fourth, since we are so affluent and powerful, we have a significant impact upon living conditions on the world elsewhere, hence it is our duty to initiate the theoretical and practical task of institutional reform. Fifth, satisfaction of social and economic needs of all should have priority among other concerns, as they are also prerequisites for a true enjoyment of political and civil rights. Sixth, and finally, a global institutional framework is “up to us” collectively, and hence we have a collective causal responsibility for existing social institutions. By imposing and collaborating in such an unjust institutional order, we are violating our negative duties of not harming others.\textsuperscript{107}

These six main points lead to two main conclusions: Firstly, the current global institutional scheme is unjust, and secondly we share a collective responsibility for this injustice.\textsuperscript{108} This is why a proper Rawlsian interpretation of Rawls would in fact lead us to take a global position on the conception of justice, rather than separating domestic and international domains and building the conception(s) of justice over this “moral division of labour”.

4.3 Cosmopolitan tools

This section on theoretical framework aims to build the Cosmopolitan approach and provide the main concepts to be utilized in the further analysis section. The Rawlsian framework was first presented. Secondly, a Cosmopolitan framework has been outlined, so as to provide the essential framework for my analysis. I will now discuss the main elements of Cosmopolitan theory, in order to complement the entire framework and smooth the path for incorporating the theoretical tools for our practical analysis.

\textsuperscript{107} Pogge (1989), pp. 272-6.
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Prior to that, recalling my initial question of what was *it* that Rawls made *possible* and *necessary*, I argue that *it* was opening the debate in political philosophy for Cosmopolitan framework to come into being and evolve on its own. Rawls has made it *possible* because he was the one who formed a plausible account of justice and a just society, within the tradition of social contract theories. Assigning “basic structure” as the main subject of justice, Rawls’s approach was pioneering, as he underlined the institutional aspect of justice. What was incomplete, hence *necessary* for the Cosmopolitan thinkers, was a consistent interpretation would in fact require a global scope for application of his theory, rather than a domestic scope as originally designed. In a way, Rawls had made Cosmopolitan theory *possible* and *necessary*. In the following, I will highlight the key elements of Cosmopolitan contribution to the normative debate on global justice:

### 4.3.1 Global interdependence

Existence of a global order, which affects people’s lives both positively or negatively, is one of the main central arguments of the Cosmopolitan approach. It is so central that because of it, Cosmopolitans argue that principles of justice should be applied at the global level, as Rawlsian “basic structure” applies at the global level.109

Beitz discusses international financial institutions, transnational corporations, increasing trade of goods and capital as some of the constructing blocks of a global regulative structure.110 A good example of global interdependence comes from *The Economist*, “poor countries could export $700 billion more a year by 2005 if rich countries did more to open their markets”.111 Pogge argues that the “existing international order engenders dangerous arms races, oppressive governments, as well as extreme poverty and inequality which affect all human beings”.112 Pogge stresses technology and increasing interdependence for this phenomenon, by giving the example of “the
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devaluation of the Thai currency, a change in British interest rates, or a commodity futures trading frenzy in Chicago might literally make the difference between life and death for large numbers of people half a world away”.

Therefore, global interdependence, accompanied by negative global externalities created at the domestic level is significant enough for Cosmopolitans to be justified in talking of a “global basic structure”. As emphasized above, that is why they would argue for a global interpretation to Rawlsian principles of justice.

4.3.2 Global Inequalities

Cosmopolitan approach defines ‘inequality’ as follows: The worse-off are very badly off, both in absolute and relative terms; the inequality is permanent, pervasive and avoidable. Cosmopolitan flank criticizes several inequalities created in the global institutional order. Both Pogge and Beitz underline the aspect of coercion, by arguing that global order is coercively imposed on the vulnerable poor by the affluent rich, and global poor are excluded from the benefits. Pogge puts forward the observation that within a national context, a one-person-one vote democracy may prevent large inequalities from expanding, but there are no democratic practices for the global poor to affect the economic rules beyond their own society. Beitz gives the infamous example of the World Bank, whose decisions primarily concern the less developed countries, but whose governing board distribute votes according to each country’s ownership of capital stock in the Bank.

In line with that unpopular topic of “democratic deficit”, Nielsen emphasizes the same “deficit” in World Trade Organisation (WTO) and International Monetary Fund
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(IMF) by arguing that 1000 capitalist economists control the economic policies for 1.4 billion people in the less developed countries, and given the extent of human misery in these countries, there must be a certain inequality in the given situation.\textsuperscript{118}

Protectionist trade policies of the affluent countries, as another element creating inequalities, are charged as costing 100-150 billion $ to developing countries, which is equal to 2-3 times of the amount of aid they are receiving annually.\textsuperscript{119} Different bargaining power of states is also problematized in this context, as inequalities in bargaining power may cause international interactions unfair and coercive.\textsuperscript{120}

4.3.3 World Poverty

Bittner asks how come world poverty does not have a higher priority in people’s agenda and comes up with the answer that because it is a political problem not significant enough.\textsuperscript{121} Cosmopolitans yet argue that it is the biggest problem of our century. To put it simply, Pogge gives the example of poverty-related deaths. He states that an approximate number of 18 million people die annually due to poverty-related causes. In other words, since the end of the Cold War, some 250 million people (in 2002) have died because of poverty. He compares that with other human-made horrors such as 11 million death in Nazi holocaust, 30 million in Mao’s Great Leap Forward, 800 thousand in Rwanda and many other deaths in local conflicts. He concludes that world poverty is therefore the biggest problem our age is facing, since 250 million deaths outweighs any conflict or war-related deaths.\textsuperscript{122}

Some 2.8 billion or 46 percent of humankind live below the World Bank’s $2/day poverty line, whereas 1.200 billion of them live even below the absolute poverty line of
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$1/day. On the other hand, the “high-income economies” with 15% of world population own 80% of world aggregate income. The 1999 Human Development Report states that “the wealth of the top three billionaires of the world are more than the combined Gross National Product (GNP) of all least developed countries and their 600 million people ....and besides, the additional cost of achieving and maintaining universal access to basic needs for all (education, health, food, safe water and sanitation) is less than 4% of the combined wealth of the 225 richest people in the world”. In the light of this contrast between the rich and the poor, Pogge asks “how can such a severe poverty of almost half of humankind continue despite enormous economic and technological progress and despite the enlightened moral norms and values of our heavily dominant civilization?”

4.3.4 Moral Universalism

Combined together, the dynamics of global interdependence, the patterns of global inequalities and the facts of world poverty might raise the same question: do we need to do anything about that? Cosmopolitans’ answer would be yes, since they consider all humans as equal units of moral concern. In the light of this answer, “moral universalism” here is understood as equal moral concerns for all humans universally.

Since everyone counts and counts equally, Cosmopolitans lament the fact that global poverty is largely ignored. Nielsen argues that it is grossly inhumane to show a total disregard for the lives of great masses of the people. Pogge stresses the discrepancy between national and global contexts. He gives the example of a fictional country ‘Sub-brazil’, where income inequalities would be extremely unjust and which produces life-threatening poverty for a significant amount of people. He asserts that such an economic order would be intolerable for most people in the developed countries. Hence, he asks, how can we then tolerate the global economic order which is imposed by
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our governments to global poor and which creates poverty and inequality? At that point, he insists, Moral Universalism would demand a plausible rationale for this discrepancy. He adds that today we have more capabilities of eradicating severe poverty than ever before, and our generation is in fact committed to moral universalism, unlike our ancestors in earlier centuries. His conclusion is this tolerance of world poverty do not fit with our commitment to moral universalism.

Cosmopolitans highlight the global factors as the real causes of world poverty. However, even if the fundamental cause of global poverty is not global order but, say, irresponsible domestic policies, moral universalism would still apply. In other words, moral universalism would require that we can’t hold people responsible for the wrong choices of their irresponsible (most likely corrupt) leaders, just like in national context we try not to hold responsible the unfortunate kids for wrongdoings of their parents.

4.3.5 Global Responsibility

Just as the Cosmopolitan approach requires equal concern for all human beings, it also assigns all humans the responsibility for the existing prevailing order and the responsibility of improving it. Discussing our responsibilities with regard to world poverty, Shei explains this global collective responsibility as “personifying humankind” and he argues that humanity as a whole is responsible for the plight of global poor. He also asserts the example that Bill Clinton, then president of the United States of America (USA), could have single-handedly shaped the WTO treaties quite differently from how they are. The point he makes is all humans share responsibility, but some do share more responsibility, due to their capabilities and agencies, in sustaining or changing this global order.
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Pogge assigns this responsibility to citizens and governments of the wealthy societies who impose the global economic order, which significantly contributes to the persistence of severe poverty, hence we all share moral responsibility. And he adds that the principle “that who bears a responsibility for an injustice should compensate for it” is deeply rooted in Western moral ideas.

Hinsch and Stepanians approach responsibility from a different perspective. They argue that one may still be responsible for rectifying a wrong, even though they were not the cause of the wrong. By fragmenting responsibility into two dimensions, retrospective and prospective, they argue that the former deals with the causal results of actions in the past, whereas the latter deals with who can do something to change it for the better irrespective of who brought it about. They conclude that responsibility matters mainly because of its prospective dimension and all those capable of action are responsible agents for a natural duty of assistance.

4.3.6 Institutional Reform & Distributive Justice

Despite the fact that moral debate about global justice is largely focused on the extent to which affluent societies or persons have obligations to help others, Cosmopolitans highlight the need for global institutional reforms, which have to do with duties of justice, rather than focusing on duties of humanity, which deal with positive duties of assistance.

The aim of these institutional reforms is understood as achieving distributive justice, and distributive justice is understood in the light of how to choose or design the economic ground rules which regulate all patterns of economy, including cooperation,
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exchange, production and distribution. Rawls argues for principles of distributive justice only at the national context. The Cosmopolitan approach, on the other hand, argues for a global distributive justice, due to the existence of a global economic order that is affecting all humans’ lives. Hence, global distributive justice, is considered as a distinguishing element of Cosmopolitan thought.

4.3.7 Proposals of Redistribution & Satisfaction of Basic Needs

Together with the principles of distributive justice, the Cosmopolitan approach also discusses about proposals of redistribution. The reasons for redistribution have to do with the cosmopolitan responsibility that prioritizes the satisfaction of basic needs at the global level.

Redistribution, in this context, means a further distribution of benefits and burdens, after a distribution has already taken place. However, concept of redistribution is criticized by some, as redistribution schemes do not necessarily take into account whether the initial distribution was just or not. Redistribution, in this sense, is seen as a compromise, despite its potential of raising funds to be used in development projects all around the world. For example, Pogge’s proposal of a Global Resource Tax (GRT) is criticized by some others who think that GRT takes the present global order as given and it abandons ideal theory for pragmatist concerns.

Official Development Assistance (ODA), which is a form of development aid given by member states of Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), might be considered as the best real example of a re-distribution scheme. Although designed to contribute to the welfare of developing countries, ODA is questionable whether it is meeting its goals. Pogge states that only 19% of the 56 billion in ODA goes to the 43 least developed countries, and only 8.3% is spent on meeting basic needs.
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Another example of a proposed redistribution scheme is the Tobin Tax (TT), which operates by taxing short-term financial speculation at the global level, such as currency trade, thereby meeting two targets: firstly, reducing the speculative short-term currency trade, with the idea that short term speculation is destructive for the vulnerable economies of developing nations, and secondly, using this tax revenue for development projects throughout the world.

Together with the GRT, ODA and TT, Barry mentions other proposals of redistribution as follows: a surcharge on air tickets, a charge on ocean maritime transport, a special fee for maritime dumping of waste, parking fees for geostationary satellites, charges for fishing rights in certain areas and a carbon tax.

Since Cosmopolitanism is concerned with the well-being of all individuals, satisfaction of basic needs for all is given a high priority in Cosmopolitan discourse. Nielsen quotes from Sterba, who argues that only after meeting the basic needs of the poor, can the rich legitimately enjoy their surplus goods and resources. Pogge also stresses that any universal criterion of justice should prioritize satisfaction of basic needs of all. Against the communitarian arguments of prioritizing the satisfaction of basic needs of one’s compatriots (rather than all the humans as Cosmopolitans would argue), Kok-Chor gives the analogy of families and countries. He states that just as families favor their children with their post-tax income, countries should be able to favor their own citizens only after paying their share of the cost of global justice.

Setting the arguments for moral priority on satisfying the basic needs of all, one may wonder what is understood from basic needs in this context. Although basic needs are not strictly defined in Cosmopolitan thought, it could be argued that basic needs
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include the most essential basic goods that are truly needed for a worthwhile life.\textsuperscript{147} It is often agreed that this includes adequate food, clothing, shelter, health care and primary education. The important point is that institutional order should be \textit{just} in whatever benefits and burdens it is distributing or redistributing among people.

\textit{Conclusion}

The theoretical framework has two fundamental aims: to present the Cosmopolitan framework, by building it on Rawls’s legacy, and to identify the Cosmopolitan concepts to be used in the analysis of the debates in the European Parliament. To that end, the Rawlsian framework has first been presented. Then, I have outlined Cosmopolitan framework, based on an analysis of the two leading Cosmopolitans, Beitz and Pogge. Finally, I have drawn out and identified the seven key Cosmopolitan concepts which will be used as tools for analysis. The analysis section will aim to illuminate how the normative debate in the European Parliament over these Cosmopolitan concepts takes place.

\textbf{5. METHODOLOGY:}

The aim of this thesis is to analyse how Cosmopolitan ideas and considerations are reflected in the European Parliament. In other words, my main aim in conducting such a thesis was to understand how “Cosmopolitan” was the debate in the European Parliament (EP), which is considered as the “representative of the peoples of Europe”. To that end, the Cosmopolitan approach has been outlined. Before I outline my analysis, I will discuss my methodology on conducting this research.

\textit{Qualitative Research}

A qualitative research strategy has been used in my analysis. Qualitative research is defined as a strategy that usually emphasizes words rather than quantification in the

\textsuperscript{147} Pogge (2002), p.38.
collection and analysis of data.\textsuperscript{148} Qualitative research is usually criticized for being too impressionistic and subjective, due to the observation that findings of qualitative research rely too much on the researcher’s own perception of what is significant and what is not.\textsuperscript{149} Moreover, as the main instrument of data collection, researcher’s own beliefs and ideas have a significant impact on choosing the relevant data.\textsuperscript{150}

Acknowledging the criticism that qualitative methods are more vulnerable to criticisms concerning objectivity, I still chose to use a qualitative method. Given an analysis of the EP debates are necessarily an analysis of written material, it lends itself to qualitative research. Qualitative research is relevant for two other important aspects: inductivism and interpretivism. Inductivism means that theory is generated out of the research, whereas in deductivist methods, theory comes first and then the data is analyzed for its ‘fit’ to the theory. Interpretivism proposes to understand the social reality through interpretation of it by the participants.\textsuperscript{151} Hence, my analysis is inductivist, since I analyse the EP debates and then conclude how the Cosmopolitan ideas are discussed in these debates, instead of identifying a theory and ‘testing’ the theory through analysis. My analysis is also interpretivist, since the analysis relies on my own interpretation of the interpretations of the speakers in the debates.

\textit{Collection of data}

In many democracies today, there is a vast collection of public records, including the work of parliaments and parliamentary committees. These public records are in fact “potential goldmine” for researchers, despite the fact that these records are under-utilized.\textsuperscript{152} Public records have two main advantages: first, they are relevant to many important issues; second, they are easily accessible.\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{149} Ibid, p 284
\textsuperscript{150} Ibid
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid, p.266
\textsuperscript{152} Zimmerman, David (1993), \textit{Interpreting Qualitative Data}, London: Sage Publications, p. 68
\textsuperscript{153} Ibid
In order to analyse the Cosmopolitan reflections in the EP debates, I have used the official records of the debates in the EP. Official website of the EP provides online access to the full texts of the debates in the parliamentary sessions. During the debates, speakers generally speak in their own language and their speech is simultaneously translated into the 21 official working languages of the EP. The debates are recorded and automatically transcribed into texts. And finally, full texts of the debates are put into the official website of the Parliament.

I searched the transcripts of the full texts of the EP debates, using ‘key word’ searches based on relevant concepts of Cosmopolitan thought. The official website of the EP allows the internet user to do a word search, and then lists all the debates that include that word in their full texts. Therefore, I have sorted out the relevant concepts to Cosmopolitan thought and I have selected the debates through use of those words. For instance, when “global responsibility” is written in the search link, 11 debates from the fifth term (1999-2004) and 10 debates from the sixth term (2004 till now) are identified. As you can see from the Table 5.1 below, I have used 19 Cosmopolitan ‘key words’ to search the debates, and these ‘key words’ are derived from the Cosmopolitan theory, which has been outlined in the theoretical framework. Through this method, I have identified 94 debates to analyse.
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154 This information is taken from European Parliament functionary Alexandros Karides in personal correspondence in April 2006.
155 The word ‘cosmopolitan’ has also been searched, however it’s meaning in the debates does not coincide with the meaning we use in the academic debate on Cosmopolitanism. The word ‘cosmopolitan’ usually refers to ‘multicultural’ in the debates, due to my interpretation out of 13 debates that include the word.
156 For access to debates, go to www.europarl.eu.int, click “activities”, then click “parliamentary business”, then click “debates” and finally click “advanced search”. The access to debates should be available as choosing the working term, choosing “in text” option, writing the particular word and then clicking “search” search it.
Table 5.1 Debates founded through searching of Cosmopolitan concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Justice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Injustice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Justice</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Injustice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Poverty</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Inequality</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Inequality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Responsibility</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Responsibility</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Priority</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Priority</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Interdependence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Interdependence</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Morality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Morality</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Universalism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Distributive Justice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Distributive Justice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Redistribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Data

I then conducted a textual analysis of the 94 debates. This textual analysis is a qualitative content analysis, which permits me, the researcher, to interpret the meaning within a text from the relevant context.\textsuperscript{157} I have chosen this research design since qualitative content analysis is argued as the most prevalent approach to the qualitative analysis of documents.\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{157} Bryman (2004), p.183
\textsuperscript{158} Ibid, p. 392
The textual analysis entailed reading the full texts of the debates and then coding the statements in the debates into preliminary categories. For example, here is a statement from Commissioner Nielson, taken from the debate on “Financing of the development aid” dated 6 February 2002:

Nielson – Commission (AA) (E)

The present crisis will impact on economic development worldwide and it will be once again the poorest who pay the highest price. We must counter this tendency by trying our best to make globalization work for the poor and not against the poor.

From this statement, I consider that there are two direct references to interdependence and moral universalism. The speaker’s argument that the crisis will have worldwide impacts is interpreted as ‘global interdependence’ (which I code as AA), whereas his idea that this tendency should be countered for the benefit of the poor is interpreted as ‘moral universalism (which I code as E), since there seems a concern for the global poor.

Through this method, all relevant statements in the 94 debates were coded, in relation to the Cosmopolitan ideas they are reflecting. Out of all the debates covered, I found 481 references that could be counted as reflections of Cosmopolitan ideas and arguments. Moreover, as the website is designed, one can see which speaker from which party group (or the Commission, or the Council) makes the statement. Hence, it allows one to identify which party groups and which speakers focus on which Cosmopolitan concept(s) or issue(s), as I have identified them.

The statements in the debates are divided into seven main coding categories, which have been outlined in the theoretical framework under the sub-section “cosmopolitan tools”. The coding categories are: global interdependence, global inequalities, world poverty, moral universalism, global responsibility, institutional reform, and redistribution and satisfaction of basic needs. Within each category, the relevant statements are further classified into sub-categories. For instance, the statement
of Nielson above is classified under the sub-categories of ‘interdependence’ and ‘solidarity’, in relation to ‘global interdependence’ and ‘moral universalism’ respectively.

The design of my qualitative content analysis involves two dimensions. Firstly, the analysis of words allows me to interpret the statements in a more reliable manner, than a quantitative content analysis could offer. Quantitative content analysis quantifies content with predetermined categories (such as use of certain words). However, the weakness of this type of analysis it can not differentiate between different approaches to the topic, since the analysis is dominated by quantification of preliminary categorized words. On the other hand, my qualitative design allows me to differentiate between how different statements approach to the relevant topic.

Secondly, due to the fact that one can see which speaker debates what in the Parliament, we will be able to see which party groups and other speakers discuss the relevant topics in the chosen debates. In other words, we will be able to state, say, that the party group Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL) seems to be the most critical in discussing the fall in the amount of aid given to the developing countries.

The research design I choose for this thesis seems to me the most applicable one. However, I acknowledge the main criticism towards qualitative research in general. Qualitative research is interpretivist, as the analysis of data largely relies on the interpretation of the researcher. My methodology is also prone to such a criticism, as the choice of concepts, collection of data and analysis of debates depends on my interpretation of both the theory and the debates. Nevertheless, given the nature of the research, I cannot see a way to avoid this problem.

---
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PART II: ANALYSIS

This section aims to analyse the reflection of Cosmopolitan considerations and arguments in the EP debates. Having presented the theoretical tools and the methodology, I will now summarise my analysis of how Cosmopolitan concepts are discussed in the EP debates. The analysis to be presented here cover 94 different debates from the fifth and sixth working terms of the EP, the former dating from 1999 to 2004, whereas the latter from 2004 till today (December 2006).

To ensure the reader has an appropriate understanding of the EP context, I first introduce the EP as an institution. Two aspects of EP are covered: its institutional character as the representative of the European peoples and its feature of being a forum for debate, including issues that Cosmopolitan theory deals with. The reader is also introduced to the composition of EP, through discussing different party groups in the EP.

6. European Parliament as an Institution:

European Parliament as the representative of European peoples

The origins of the EP date back to 1957, when Parliamentary Assembly of the European Economic Community (EEC) was founded as a consultative body. In the beginning, the Assembly had no direct popular legitimacy, no control over the budget of the EEC, and no direct ability to influence legislative outcomes. None the less, since then, two major transformations have altered the institutional nature of the Assembly (today’s EP): introduction of direct elections in 1979 and granting of several powers with the time, starting with the partial decision-making power through the cooperation procedure in 1987 with the Single European Act (SEA).  


\[161\] Ibid. p.7
Representing an approximate number of 450 million European Union (EU) citizens, today’s EP is unique in the sense that its members, Members of European Parliament (MEPs), are directly elected by European citizens every five years. Other international organisations, such as Council of Europe or Western European Union, also possess parliamentary assemblies, but the members of those assemblies are appointed by governments. Because the MEPs are directly elected by peoples of Europe, the EP is considered as “representative of peoples of Europe” or “the only Community institution directly responsible to the people of Europe”.162

Enjoying its unique status as the “representatives of European peoples”, the EP has increased its power, with the consequent revisions of Treaties of the EU.163 It shares legislative powers with the Council of EU, which means that EP can accept, reject or amend the content of European legislation. Again together with the Council of the European Union, the EP constitutes the budgetary authority of the Union, which enables EP to accept, reject or amend the annual budget of the entire Union. The EP also exercises some supervisory powers, such as asking questions of both the Commission and the Council, or proposing the Commission and the Council develop new policies. In addition, the Parliament has the power to approve or reject the in-coming members of the Commission, before the Commission takes the office. This is specifically important since the European Commission, which is the main body proposing EU-legislation and which represents the Union in the international arena (such as in trade negotiations), needs to be approved by the EP, which is the “representative of European peoples.”

**European Parliament as a forum for debate**

In the light of the powers identified above, it can be argued that today’s EP deserves to be considered a legislature capable enough of significantly impacting the decision-making and policy processes of the European Union.164 Together with its certain powers concerning European legislation, the EP is an important forum for debate of important

---

162 Amie (2001), p. 72
164 Amie (2001), p.1
issues, with the opportunities of raising awareness and consciousness throughout the Union.\textsuperscript{165} Most of these debates take place in plenary sessions, which include agenda setting, voting, question time, speeches of Commissioners or members of Council, guest speakers from outside EU and debates on general topics.\textsuperscript{166} In other words, the EP not only votes on legislative amendments, but also important debates take place on general issues. Quoting from \textit{Financial Times}, Desmond Dinan gives the example of Egon Klepsch, one of the former Presidents of the EP, who urges his fellow MEPs to “deal with technicalities in committee, and keep the plenaries for debating the big issues that people care about”.\textsuperscript{167}

\textit{Composition of the European Parliament}

Together with the last enlargement of EU in 2004, the EP is recently comprised of 732 MEPs coming from twenty-five different Member States. It has been mentioned earlier that MEPs are elected for a working term of five years. Since the introduction of direct elections in 1979, EP now operates in its sixth working term, which began in 2004 and will end in 2009.

Every Member State is allocated a certain number of seats, according to its population. For instance, Germany sends 99 MEPs to the EP, due to being the largest population in the EU, whereas Malta only sends 5 MEPs. However, after MEPs are elected by the citizens of the Member States, the Parliament is divided along party groupings and registered European political parties, rather than national lines. As an example, European People’s Party-European Democrats (PPE-DE), also known as the “Christian Democrats” and “Conservatives”, constitute the largest party group in the Parliament, occupying 264 seats in the EP, with MEPs coming from all twenty-five member States. In contrast to EPP-DE, party group of European Greens-European Free

\textsuperscript{165} Dinan, Desmond (1994) \textit{Ever Closer Union?: An Introduction to the European Community}. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.p.269
\textsuperscript{166} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{167} Ibid., p.287, quoted from \textit{Financial Times}, January 22, 1992, p.10.
Alliance (Greens-ALE), usually called the “Greens”, occupy 42 seats in the Parliament, with fellow MEPs coming from thirteen different Member States.\textsuperscript{168}

The sixth term of the EP, from 2004 to 2009, is comprised of seven party groups and thirty-six non-allied MEPs. The party groups are (in the order of number of seats): European People’s Party-European Democrats (PPE-DE), Party of European Socialists (PSE), Alliance of Liberals and Democrats for Europe (ALDE), European Greens-European Free Alliance (Greens-ALE), European United Left-Nordic Green Left (GUE/NGL), Union for Europe of the Nations (UEN), Independence and Democracy (IND/DEM). Some of the party groups reveal their affiliations with their names, however it seems helpful for the reader to state that the last two parties listed above, UEN and IND/DEM, have a more nationalist and Euro-sceptic attitude, respectively. UEN highlights its support on respecting the powers of National Governments of the Member States\textsuperscript{169}, whereas IND/DEM group “incorporates EU-critics, Euro-sceptics and Eurorealists...and has the main goals of rejecting the Treaty establishing a constitution for Europe and opposing all forms of centralisation”.\textsuperscript{170}

Given my analysis covers both the fifth and sixth term of the debates in the EP, it is essential to state that fifth term of EP, from 1999 to 2004, included two other party groups, which are not mentioned above. These parties are: Europe of Democracies and Diversities (EDD), which has integrated into IND/DEM in the sixth term; and European Liberal, Democrat and Reform Party (ELDR), which is now represented as ALDE.\textsuperscript{171}

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{168} Official data taken from European Parliament website \url{www.europarl.eu.int} accessed in November 2006
\textsuperscript{169} UEN Official Website “Welcome Message” \url{www.uengroup.org} accessed in November 2006
\textsuperscript{170} IND/DEM Official Website “Our Program” \url{http://indemgroup.org/} accessed in November 2006
\textsuperscript{171} For more information on party groups, see EP website \url{www.europarl.eu.int}
\end{footnotesize}
7. Debate in the European Parliament:

I shall now summarise the debates according to my coding.

7.1 Global Interdependence: Existence of a Global Order

It has been underlined in the theoretical section that the existence of a global basic structure, which means institutions and rules operating at the global level and affecting people’s lives to a significant extent, is a central element of Cosmopolitan thought. It is so central that, because of the existence of such a global order, certain distributive principles ought to be applied at the global level, parallel to what Rawls had in mind at the domestic level. In other words, the idea that one’s life is largely affected by the global dynamics taking place beyond national borders refers to the existence of a global order, which distributes benefits and burdens. Cosmopolitans argue that a global order exists and we live globally interdependent lives, which also includes externalities.

Table 7.1: Reflection of Global Interdependence in the EP debates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Interdependence</th>
<th>Interdependence</th>
<th>Trade &amp; Domestic Policies</th>
<th>Global economic order</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPE/DE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDR/ALDE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens/ALE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUE/NGL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/DEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Inscrits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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As it can be seen from Table 7.1 above, I have found 53 references to discussions concerning global interdependence. These references approach global order from three different dimensions: Increasing global interdependence, trade and domestic policies (particularly those of the EU) and global economic order. From these three different dimensions, discussion over the existence of a global economic order dominates the reflections on global interdependence, as it is referred 26 times out of 53. Another significant finding is that, it is predominately the Left wing MEPs who discuss the dynamics of global interdependence: 12 MEPs from PSE, 11 from GUE/NGL and 9 from Greens.

The first dimension, which I have coded as ‘global interdependence’, has to do with speakers who admit the idea that “we live in a global world, faced with global responsibilities...We have to acknowledge our increasing dependence on one another and that we are closer to one another”. Speaking of the patterns of global interdependence, French MEP Laguiller argues that it is “the majority of the world’s countries.... do not profit from progress in the area of production...the billions of human beings being the casualties of progress”.

The second dimension, which I have coded as ‘Trade and domestic policies’, is comprised of statements which highlight the effects of various policies on other populations. The reason I label this dimension ‘trade and domestic policies’ is because this dimension involves references to different policies, especially trade and agricultural policies of the EU. For example, Swedish Conservative MEP Fjellner states that “poor and vulnerable countries are robbed of prosperity and opportunities through customs duties”, whereas his co-national Carlshamre seem to support him by arguing that “We

in the rich part of the world have obtained large amounts of money at the expense of poor people far away... and our agricultural policy with its subsidies, including export subsidies is a direct impediment to families in developing countries”.\(^{177}\) By arguing that the “EU has contributed to bringing about global problems of poverty through unfair trade rules and a protectionist agricultural policy”, Goudin’s statement sums up the points of her Swedish colleagues.\(^ {178}\)

Criticisms of the trade and agricultural policies of the EU have to do with the adverse effects of those policies, in other words have to do with externalities. Existence of a global order is possible due to global patterns of interdependence, including externalities imposed on the outsiders. For instance, any free trade area might very well create externalities on the outsiders, by depriving them of equal competition with the “insiders”. Dutch MEP Hulthen seems to be aware of the externality issue, since “what we do in the Union affects the world around us ...and we must review our agricultural policy, as well as the negative effects it is having on the opportunities for other countries to develop”.\(^ {179}\) Speaking of externalities in particular, global order in general, Italian MEP Martelli does not even doubt that “the explosive growth of the richest countries has left the poorest countries even farther behind”.\(^ {180}\)

The third and the most dominant dimension of global interdependence, discussion over what I have coded ‘global economic order’, includes several topics such as the role of WTO in world economy, or adverse effects of global economic order in general, or negative consequences of IMF policies. To begin with, both the WTO and the IMF are generally criticized by Left-wing MEPs, the former for “perpetuating the imbalance in

---


world trade and establishment of rules that are unfavourable to the developing countries"\textsuperscript{181}; and the latter for “failing in its role of monitoring global economic stability by failing to anticipate-or indeed actually provoking- a number of regional and international financial crises”. \textsuperscript{182}

An interesting finding of my analysis is that MEPs from GUE/NGL dominate the discussion on global economic order with 10 references out of 26, whereas MEPs from PPE-DE (the most populous party group in the EP) discuss global economic order only with two references. However, despite the relatively small amount of participation from the Right-wing MEPs on discussion over global interdependence, those who participate seem to also have a critical view, in line with their Left-wing colleagues. Here is how the right-wing MEP Couteaux (UEN) discusses the global economic order:

“The international economic order...is preventing the majority of our partners in the South...acceding to the conditions for development that is even remotely sustainable. Such conditions are demolished by the blind application of free trade, accompanied by the obsessive, ideological privatisation of the exploitation of most of their wealth”. \textsuperscript{183}

The Cosmopolitan approach argues that due to the existence of global patterns of interdependence, we are all participants to a global ‘basic structure’, which distributes the burdens and benefits. Hence, we are all responsible from the outcomes of this global social cooperation.\textsuperscript{184} In other words, if global inequalities exist, we are all responsible for that. To put in another way, “the problem of poverty throughout the world is a political problem...and it is pointless to seek the people responsible....We do not have

\textsuperscript{182} Statement by MEP Benoit Hamon (PSE), European Parliament debate on “Transatlantic Relations”, dating 08.06.2005, taken from European Parliament website www.europarl.eu.int accessed in November 2006
\textsuperscript{183} Statement by MEP Paul Couteaux (UEN), European Parliament debate on “Poor Countries’ Debt”, dating 17.05.2000, taken from European Parliament website www.europarl.eu.int accessed in November 2006
\textsuperscript{184} Pogge (1989), pp. 272-6.
guilty and innocent parties here, just victims. And all the rest of us are guilty to a greater or lesser extent”, as Conservative MEP Fernandez would also confirm.\textsuperscript{185}

To conclude, global interdependence is acknowledged by the MEPs, together with its patterns and inequalities. It is predominately the Left-wing MEPs, with a smaller proportion of the Right-wing MEPs discuss global interdependence from various dimensions. Throughout the discussion on interdependence, global inequalities created within global interdependence have also briefly been touched on. However, discussion over global inequalities constitute the coming sub-section of my analysis, to which I am proceeding now.

7.2 Global Inequalities

It has been discussed in the theoretical section that Cosmopolitans accept the Rawlsian understanding of society as the ‘basic structure’ and ‘object of justice’, and they argue for extending these reasoning to the global level for two reasons: First, global interdependence exists, hence we are all participants of a global social cooperation; Second, the patterns of global social cooperation creates global inequalities, hence we \textit{ought to} have principles of global distributive justice, which is based on an extension of Rawlsian theory of justice to the global level. Pogge and Beitz both call the global order “unjust” for its being coercively imposed on the vulnerable poor by the affluent rich, and poor are excluded from its benefits.\textsuperscript{186} That “unjust” global order, as Pogge and Beitz argue, incorporates global inequalities.

There are 56 references to global inequalities. As it can be seen from Table 7.2 below, parallel to the findings of the previous sub-section on discussion over global independence, Left-wing MEPs dominate the discussion on global inequalities. Out of the

56 references, 19 come from GUE/NGL, 13 from PSE, 6 from Greens, whereas it is only 3 speakers from PPE-DE who discuss global inequalities in the EP debates.

Table 7.2: Reflection of Global Inequalities in the EP debates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Inequalities</th>
<th>Coercive Imposition &amp; Democratic Deficit</th>
<th>EU's policies</th>
<th>Global economic order</th>
<th>Opposition</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPE/DE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDR/ALDE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens/ALE</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUE/NGL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/DEM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Inscrits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The discussions over global inequalities are centred on four main dimensions: Coercive imposition of policies by strong over weak (including democratic deficit in WTO), agricultural policies and export subsidies of EU, global economic order in general, its adverse effects in particular and finally, opposition (to some of the statements pointing a certain inequality).

Regarding the first dimension on inequalities, it has been recently mentioned that both Pogge and Beitz underline the existence of a coercively imposed global order. Throughout the debates in the Parliament, this issue of coercive imposition is also discussed, together with the “democratic deficit” of the WTO. Green MEP Maes describes the situation as “economic globalisation is being imposed by the rich North and it is wreaking havoc in countries with weak economies”, when she discusses trade
Trade liberalization is also discussed by Greek MEP Alyssandrakis, who states that “WTO is the main imperialist mechanism which imposes the terms of the multinationals and the full liberalisation and opening of the markets on international trade”. This concept of coercive imposition is repeated by the joint statement of three fellow MEPs who argue that “The imperialist countries impose their law on third world countries”, since “economic relations between countries, and trade relations in particular, obey only one law—the law of the strongest”.

The issue of coercive imposition is associated with the “democratic deficit”, which is described by Green MEP Lannoye as follows:

“Having the representatives of the most industrialised countries meet in a conference room...while the others wait in the antechamber before having to sign a text prepared in advance seems to me an unacceptable process”.

Parallel to the debate in the EP, the democratic deficit is also discussed within the Cosmopolitan debate by both Beitz and Pogge, where they underline the asymmetry between rich nations who participate in the WTO negotiations as large teams with lawyers and economists, and poor countries, on the other hand, who can not participate effectively to WTO negotiations, let alone having a permanent representation in Geneva, where WTO headquarters are. Socialist MEP Desir emphasizes the same issue, when he mentions that “most of the developing countries feel marginalised by its (WTO) operation and cut off from the decision-making process, since at least 24 developing

---

countries have no permanent representation in Geneva, and numerous others have only very small delegations that do not allow them to follow all of the proceedings that concern them”.  

The second dimension of inequalities, agricultural policies and export subsidies of EU, has to do with these particular EU policies, which are criticized within the EP debate. In the previous sub-section concerning discussion over global interdependence, criticisms of agricultural policies and export subsidies of the EU have briefly been presented, as evidence that some MEPs discuss some elements of global interdependence, such as agricultural policies. In the context of discussion over global inequalities, agricultural policies and export subsidies of EU are explicitly condemned by some MEPs, such as Kreissl-Dorfler who feels “bound to say that this also has something to do with the way we pursue our agricultural policy” when he thinks about forty million people are starving in Brazil. Speaking of agricultural policies, Left-wing MEP Agnoletto refers to the Parliament report on Doha Development Agenda to be sent to the Commission and he asks “why there is no mention of the disaster caused by the subsidies for intensive agriculture paid out by Europe and the United States”. Green MEP Auroi seems to agree with her colleagues when she states that food crops in Africa “have been ruined for years by the dumping effects of EU export subsidies....and the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), by subsidising the export prices of cereals, meat or sugar, has inundated the countries of the South for a long time”.  

Only a few Right-wing MEPs adopt a critical view on EU’s agricultural policy and export subsidies. Dutch MEP Martens accepts that their “adverse effects on the local

---


market are already known”\textsuperscript{196}, whereas her fellow MEP Cunha highlights the “enormous contradiction between our intentions in development and cooperation policy and the damage we inflict with our sectoral policies”.\textsuperscript{197} Sandbaek, who is also a Right wing MEP, emphasizes the “catastrophic effects the EU’s common agricultural policy has had on developing countries, by dumping of beef in Sahel and South Africa, tomato purée in West Africa and milk powder in Jamaica”, and she asserts that “there is neither coherence nor human decency here...as the agricultural sector accounts for 69% of the total work force there compared with 1.7% in the EU, as well as 34% of the developing countries’ gross national product, compared with 5.3% in the EU”\textsuperscript{198}. These criticisms over the EU’s policies show similarities with Pogge’s discussion on protectionism, where he gives the example of WTO regime, by quoting from \textit{The Economist} that “poor countries could export $700 billion more a year by 2005 if rich countries did more to open their markets.”\textsuperscript{199}

There are different aspects to the third dimension on inequalities, that is ‘global economic order’. Agricultural policies, coercive imposition and democratic deficit all constitute elements of ‘global economic order’. However, regarding a general discussion over global economic order, former Commissioner Pascal Lamy calls it as “market capitalism” and states that “the instability and injustice that were condemned both at Davos and Porto Alegre are one of the consequences of the effectiveness of this market capitalism”.\textsuperscript{200} In addition to market capitalism, former Italian minister Adolfo Urso, who was then member of the Council of the EU, highlights that “there is a world in the south...which are not benefiting from the globalization but, if anything, merely suffering

\textsuperscript{196} Statement by MEP Maria Martens (PPE-DE), European Parliament debate on “Doha Development Agenda”, dating 11.05.2005, taken from European Parliament website \url{www.europarl.eu.int} accessed on November 2006
\textsuperscript{199} Pogge(2002), p.17
the consequences”. This statement of Urso shows similarities between Pogge’s argument that global poor is excluded from the benefits of global social cooperation.

In line with the statements both from the Commission and the Council, Portuguese MEP Miranda quotes from Michel Camdessus, “a fair man who is (was then) still director of the IMF”, who argues that “the international community gives with one hand and takes away with the other”.

Concerning global economic order, non-attached MEP Kronberger highlights the fact that “it is the countries with a wealth of raw materials, such as Angola or Nigeria, whose people are the poorest”, and stresses that “this is not by chance, there is a system behind it”. The “system” being referred here is also discussed by Pogge, under the discussion about “Dutch Disease”, which offers a negative correlation between the amount of a country’s natural resources and its chances of attaining a democratic, politically stable form of governance. The reason for Dutch Disease is, due to international resource privileges, any government of any country is counted as the legitimate owner of that country’s natural resources. This ownership, recognised by the international community attracts military rulers, and gives them an incentive to make coup attempts, thereby reducing the chances of political stability, democracy and eradication of poverty. Hence, those developing countries with more natural resources are more vulnerable to political instabilities, since their military leaders there have more incentives to acquire power by undemocratic means, and then oppress the vulnerable populations.

205 Ibid
206 Ibid
The fourth and final dimension of discussion on inequalities, which I call as ‘opposition’, is comprised of arguments rejecting from the Commissioners to those MEPs who discuss certain ‘inequalities’. Although these statements are arguing against criticisms of EU policies, they nevertheless are referring to Cosmopolitan concepts. For instance, with regard to harsh criticisms mainly on EU’s agricultural policy, Commissioner Mandelson seems to disagree with those who condemn the CAP, by arguing that “CAP is really not responsible for the problems of world poverty today, as Europe offers the most open markets in the world”. 207

On the issue of democratic deficit in WTO, Commissioners Lamy and Mandelson partly disagree with the criticisms on WTO. Lamy admits that “with regard to statement that decision making within the WTO is the sole preserve of the richer nations, this may once have been true”, but also he mentions their efforts “to ensure that these meetings include both rich and poor countries, and that they guarantee a representative mix both in terms of geography and in terms of stages of development”. 208 Mandelson stresses the absence of “a better form of global government that exists in our world today that matches the WTO in its democracy”, and he adds that the WTO takes decisions against the “most powerful in the world”, and argues that “it is the only international institution...that I know that can challenge and compromise the sovereignty of the United States and get away with it.” 209

To conclude, debates in the EP regarding global inequalities tackle certain topics such as coercive imposition, EU’s agricultural policies and export subsidies, global economic order, as well as some oppositions exclusively from the Commissioners. Though mainly from the Left-wing MEPs, global economic order, or the “market

capitalism”, or the “system”, is considered as the causes of underdevelopment in developing nations and world poverty. Agricultural policies and export subsidies are also condemned for their adverse effects on the economies of the developing nations. Coercive imposition of the rules, which are to the benefit of the “imperialist” or “rich” nations, are also denounced by MEPs, mainly by those from the left of the Parliament, as my findings confirm. Lack of democratic legitimacy of the WTO, or “democratic deficit” as famously known in the literature, is also challenged within the debates in the EP.

7.3 World Poverty

‘World Poverty’ is another topic of importance to the Cosmopolitan approach. Cosmopolitans cannot help but ask how the poverty of almost half of humankind can persist, despite such technological and economic progress, coupled with enlightened moral norms of Western civilization. As mentioned earlier in the theoretical part, Pogge gives the example of 18 million poverty-related deaths annually and contrasts it to the sum of conflict and war-related deaths of the 20th century. The conclusion he makes is world poverty is the biggest problem we are facing, since 250 million deaths in the last fifteen years outweigh any conflict or war-related deaths.

As it can be seen from the Table 7.3 below, I have found two main dimensions to discussion on world poverty. The first dimension speaks of poverty as a reality, mainly by presenting the facts of poverty, such as numbers. The second approach takes a critical stance on world poverty, mostly by condemning those responsible for it or those who “do not do something about it.”

A significant outcome of my findings is, unlike the discussions about global order and global inequalities, there is an equal balance between the Right wing and Left wing

---

MEPs in discussions on world poverty. As seen in the table, out of 27 references, 9 come from PPE-DE, 8 from PSE, 3 from GUE/NGL, 2 from Greens, 2 from IND/DEM.

**Table 3.3: Reflection of World Poverty in the EP debates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>World Poverty</th>
<th>Reality of poverty</th>
<th>Condemnation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPE/DE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDR/ALDE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens/ALE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUE/NGL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/DEM</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Inscrits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, within the second approach concerning condemnation, Socialist PSE and Conservative PPE-DE both have equal numbers of references. These findings suggest that, unlike the discussions on global interdependence and global inequalities, concern with world poverty and its condemnation is more homogenously shared within the party groups in the EP.

Regarding the first approach, ‘reality of poverty’, MEPs highlight either the “bare facts” or they admit that it is a “bitter reality”. Socialist MEP Van den Berg calls them as “bare facts” when he mentions that “1.2 billion people live on less than one dollar a day. The three richest people together own more than total income of the world’s 48 poorest
countries, and 130 million children never attend school”.

Another MEP, this time from the right-wing of the Parliament, presents the arithmetic of world poverty as follows:

“During my two minutes speaking time, 40 people will die of hunger: 3.5 seconds per person; 24,000 people per day; 9 million every year; 400 million in the past 50 years – 3 times the number of people killed in all the world wars of last century”.

The last part of the statement shows great resemblance to Pogge’s approach to world poverty. As mentioned above, Pogge also compares poverty-related deaths with conflict and war-related deaths, and comes up with the conclusion that it is the poverty which causes the greatest number of casualties ever in the human history.

Together with the numbers presented, some MEPs see poverty as a “bitter reality” and some wonder why it is so. Italian MEP Martelli mentions that “despite global growth over recent decades, progress remains inadequate and unequally distributed. Poverty, injustice and appalling conditions ...are still the bitter reality for many developing countries”.

Quoting from teachings of his co-national Holy Father John Paul II, Polish MEP Tomzcak asks “why then are millions of people dying of starvation, if the Earth has enough resources to feed all humankind?”.

This argument of Tomzcak, also repeated by other MEPs in a similar fashion in several debates, is similar to the Cosmopolitan question, of how such an extreme poverty can continue, despite such human progress.

As regards the second approach, which is ‘condemnation’ of poverty, it is discussed from both sides of the Parliament, both the Christian Democrats and the left

wing, including PSE, Greens and GUE/NGL. British MEP Corrie argues that “it is unacceptable that even today, more than one billion people are living on less than a dollar a day in rural areas of developing countries”, when she criticizes “sadly” that “international aid for rural areas in Sub-Saharan countries has dropped from 14 billion Euros in 1988 to 8 billion in 1998”.\textsuperscript{218}

When condemnation of poverty comes from the left side of the Parliament, the tone of the argument gets more critical. French MEP Laguiller calls “the economic system” as “absolutely criminal”, when she mentions that the “subsidies set aside and destroys or stores food so as to prop up prices, while on the other hand leaving 826 million people undernourished, 16 million of them to starve to death.”\textsuperscript{219} She also asserts that “remaining silent about why an economic system based on profit is so damaging, and remaining silent about the responsibility of the major industrial, commercial and financial groups for the extreme poverty, hunger and impoverishment of the majority of the world’s population, is akin to remaining a passive bystander of crimes against humanity and thus acting as an accomplice to them”.\textsuperscript{220} Italian Morgantini approaches poverty from a similar view, as she considers poverty as “illegal” and “outlawed” since “poverty is not inevitable, but the result of political and economic decisions taken at national, regional and international level.”\textsuperscript{221}

To conclude, world poverty is discussed within the various contexts in the Parliament debates. Some barely talk of poverty, while some condemn those responsible for poverty. In the cases of global interdependence and global inequalities, it was mainly

the Left-wing MEPs who discuss these two related concepts. However, with regards to world poverty, there seems a balance between speakers from the Right and Left wing party groups. However, when the members of the Left party groups discuss poverty, they seem to show stronger criticism or condemnation, such as in the example of calling it “absolutely criminal” or “illegal”.

7.4 Moral Universalism

It has been mentioned earlier that, according to Rawls, a just society should be designed in such a way that, inequalities arising out of this very design should be optimized in a way that would provide the least advantaged participant as much as possible.\(^{222}\) Hence, a Rawlsian approach is *individualist* in the sense that the well-being of individuals is the criterion for assessing if a society is just or not. Cosmopolitanism is also individualist, but this individualism applies to all humans equally. In other words, for Cosmopolitans, all humans, rather than only compatriots, are considered as equal units for moral concern.\(^{223}\) This Cosmopolitan understanding of individualism, also called “moral universalism” by Pogge, brings about two fundamental considerations: First, justice requires an institutional order that would take into account the concerns of all parties, including the weak, vulnerable and the poor. Second, due to equal moral concern for all, even if the poor are responsible for their own fate, there still remains a responsibility for those in need.\(^{224}\) This second point constitutes the main idea of Cosmopolitan responsibility, which will be analysed in the coming section on ‘global responsibility’. Regarding both points, Pogge argues that if we are concerned about the poor in our own domestic societies, we also *ought to* be concerned about world poverty as well, regardless of if we are contributing to world poverty or not.\(^{225}\)

\(^{222}\) Rawls (1971), p.179
\(^{223}\) Pogge (2002), p.92
\(^{225}\) Pogge (2002), p.100-101
My findings confirm that the concerns related with moral universalism are also reflected in the debates in the EP. As it can be seen from Table 7.4 below, it is mainly Left-wing MEPs who express concerns regarding moral universalism, similar to concerns discussed in the Cosmopolitan approach. The second majority party group in the EP, Socialists (PSE) constitute the major group who discusses moral universalism: 33 references, out of 115 in total. Those speakers participating on behalf of the Commission or the Council also express elements of moral universalism, such as five references to expressions of solidarity coming from the Commission.

Table 7.4: Reflection of Moral Universalism within EP debates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moral Universalism</th>
<th>EU's values &amp; priorities</th>
<th>Global justice &amp; solidarity</th>
<th>Need for reform</th>
<th>Compatibility</th>
<th>Security concerns</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPE-DE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDR/ALDE</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUE/NGL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/DEM</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Inscrits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have found five different but related perspectives to the discussion of moral universalism, the first four approaches being reflective of moral universalism and the last approach emphasizing the need for poverty eradication, but focusing more on security concerns rather than concerns related to moral universalism.

As it can be seen from Table 3.4, 16 references emphasize that EU’s fundamental values and priorities are compatible with moral universalism. For instance, French MEP Desir speaks of “solidarity”, when arguing that “EU’s trade policy must reflect the
Union’s fundamental values and objective...for this reason, the EU’s priorities must be the establishment of fair and equitable trade, a democratic multilateral system, and a reformed WTO”.226 Another MEP, Van den Berg, underlines the Articles 177 and 178 of the Treaties of the European Union. Article 178 states that “The Community shall take account of the objectives referred to in Article 177....which are likely to affect developing countries”, whereas Article 177 defines these objectives as “ sustainable economic and social development of the developing countries....and campaign against poverty in the developing countries”.227 Departing from the legal background of EU’s objectives, he underlines that “these objectives are not arbitrary, and these are statutory articles, which form part of the European acquis which the European institutions and Member States must comply”, and he asserts that it is “also a moral interest” when he discusses about poverty reduction.228

As the mostly discussed approach (77 out of 115), the second approach to moral universalism, ‘global justice and solidarity’, stresses the necessity of global justice and concerns of solidarity with the other societies. The issue of solidarity constitutes a fundamental element of Cosmopolitan approach, which accredits all humans as the equal units of moral concern. As an example, speaking of trade negotiations, German MEP Markov underlines the moral need that “when negotiating, we must always put ourselves in the position of the party with whom we are negotiating; that is to say, we must be prepared to make concessions... without expecting anything in return”.229 Austrian MEP Karas underlines that “our understanding of fundamental freedoms and human rights...know no borders, whether these be borders of countries or of continents, and in

In addition to these MEPs, Barroso, the President of the Commission, seems to be committed to moral universalism, as he speaks of “managing the impact of globalisation, both at home and across the world” and “offering billions of people a decent chance in life”\(^\text{231}\)

Some MEPs seem not convinced about these expressions of moral universalism. Comparing the global response given to 9/11 attacks with the reaction to world poverty, Irish MEP Cushnahan asks if “in Africa, 10 000 people die every day from AIDS, why is there not a similar response”, and concludes that “regrettably, the harsh truth is that the developed world does not place the same value on human life in Africa.”\(^\text{232}\)

The third approach to moral universalism, the ‘need for reform’, highlights the need for reform for EU’s some policies, which are considered as harmful to other societies. Regarding the need for reform, Swedish MEPs Malmström and Schmidt summarizes the situation as follows:

“...the common agricultural policy shows a lack of solidarity with the developing countries and must be reformed immediately”\(^\text{233}\)

Dutch MEP Hulthen stresses a similar need, by arguing that “what we do in the Union affects the world around us” and asserting that “we must review our trade relations and


\(^{233}\) Joint statement by MEPs Cecilia Malmström & Olle Schmidt (ELDR), European Parliament debate on “Address by his Holiness, the XIVth Dalai Lama”, dating 24.10.2001, taken from European Parliament website www.europarl.eu.int accessed on November 2006
our agricultural policy, as well as the negative effects that the latter is having on the opportunities for other countries to develop”.  

The fourth approach to moral universalism does not deny equal concern for all, but rather underlines the point that EU’s priorities should not be forgotten, since EU’s policies can be made compatible with moral concern for other societies. British MEP Lambert emphasizes “the need to examine the ideal of becoming the world’s most international competitive continent in the light of asking ourselves what the implications are for the global losers if we are the global winners”.  

This expression of concern for others, accompanied by not undermining EU’s objectives is also reflected by Belgian MEP De Clercq, who reminds his fellow MEPs that “we must not negotiate solely on the basis of our own interests but also on the basis of the other countries and other parts of the world”.  

This focus on compatibility of EU’s interests with the concern for the others is shared by Cosmopolitans, such as Kok-Chor who argues that responding to the demands of your compatriots (patriotism) is in fact compatible with responding to demands of global justice.  

Though only referenced by one MEP, the last approach to moral universalism, namely ‘security concerns’, is different from previous approaches. It argues that world poverty should be fought against, but it presents different reasons other than equal concern for all. Spanish MEP Fernandez talks about “solving the problem of poverty...in which 1500 million humans live”, not out of a moral concern for poor, but for the fact that “our concern is to combat international terrorism...and unless we solve the problem of poverty, we will continue to be exposed to situations such as those we are experiencing

---

237 For a detailed discussion, see Kok-Chor (2004)., pp 135-162
now.”238 This statement can be interpreted as EU’s concern for poverty eradication in the world might also have to do with its own security concerns, however German MEP Hänsch rejects this idea by arguing that “we are making this effort for a more just world order not solely out of belief that we will thereby be depriving terrorism of its breeding ground” and he asserts that “we seek a more just world order because that reflects our values and our dignity as Europeans—a dignity we share with all the peoples of the earth”.239

To conclude, Cosmopolitan concepts related with moral universalism are also reflected in the EP debates. Some speakers underline that EU’s values require moral concern for the global poor, whereas some reveal their belief in solidarity and global justice. Some speakers stress the need for reform in certain policies, within the context of requirements of moral universalism. Some speakers underline that EU’s interests should not be forgotten, but be made compatible with the demands of moral universalism. One MEP distances his reasoning from moral universalism, by underlining EU’s security concerns as the real reasons for fight against poverty.

7.5 Global Responsibility

It has been argued in the theoretical section that the Cosmopolitan approach assigns collective responsibility to all humans for the persistence of world poverty. The idea behind this collective responsibility is that we are all participants in a global order and it is eventually our product.240 Pogge further argues that by imposing a global economic order, the citizens and governments of wealthy countries contribute to the persistence of world poverty and hence, share moral responsibility for it.241 Cosmopolitans argue that whether or not poverty and underdevelopment are mainly due to domestic or global

240 Shei (2005), p.154
241 Pogge (2002), p.115
factors, we still share a responsibility towards the global poor, as moral universalism would require equal moral concern for all humans.\textsuperscript{242}

In addition, Cosmopolitans argue that we are also \textit{capable} of doing what our global responsibilities require of us: Pogge stresses the extent of economic and technological progress\textsuperscript{243}; Shei gives the example of impact that top politicians could have, say, on trade negotiations\textsuperscript{244}; Hinsch stresses the prospective dimension of responsibility, which would require that “all those capable of action are responsible agents for a natural duty of assistance.”\textsuperscript{245}

My findings allow me to argue that these Cosmopolitan concerns over global responsibilities are also reflected in the debates in the EP. As it can be seen from the table 7.5 below, global responsibilities are discussed in four different dimensions.

\textbf{Table 7.5 Reflection of global responsibility in the EP debates}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Global Responsibility</th>
<th>EU's Responsibilities</th>
<th>Capability of agents</th>
<th>EP's role</th>
<th>Cosmopolitan Responsibilities</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPE/DE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDR/ALDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens/ALE</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUE/NGL</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/DEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Inscrits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{242} Pogge (2002)., p.22
\textsuperscript{243} Pogge (2002)., p.3
\textsuperscript{244} Shei (2005)., p.151
\textsuperscript{245} Hinsch (2005)., p.308.
Some MEPs and other speakers discuss what they think EU’s global responsibilities should be. Some speakers emphasize the issue of capabilities and conclude that capabilities, such as economic power, bring the capable actors certain global responsibilities. Few MEPs discuss the EP’s role, and some MEPs reveal their thoughts on cosmopolitan responsibilities, without specifying any actor, such as EU.

As reflected in the Table 7.5, 20 out of 48 references have to do with EU’s responsibilities, and it is mainly the Socialist MEPs and members of the Commission who discuss this topic. The EU’s global responsibility is defined by Swedish MEP Anderson as “how the EU interacts with the rest of the world with regard to trade and development policy”, whereas Commissioner Wallström adds that “Europe also has an international responsibility for sustainable development”. Not only the Socialist MEPs, but also Conservative MEPs believe in EU’s responsibilities. Dutch Conservative MEP Martens summarizes her thoughts on EU’s responsibilities as follows:

“EU is responsible not only for the peace, prosperity and well-being of the people in the EU itself, but also has a responsibility with regard to the rest of the world, particularly the poorest countries”.

Concerning the EU’s responsibilities, Barroso, the President of the Commission, seems to agree with those MEPs who would admit that “European leadership is required to face the challenges arising from globalisation...and EU is a world player and we have to accept that responsibility.”

Regarding the second dimension of the discussion over global responsibilities, some MEPs and Commissioners highlight the responsibilities rising out of capabilities.

---


For instance, in the debate about the Doha Summit, French MEP Daul underlines that “the negotiators taking decisions today carry a heavy responsibility faced with the future of millions of men and women.” In the cosmopolitan framework, a very similar argument is presented by Shei, who highlights the potentials of top politicians in making a difference, thereby arguing that capable actors share more responsibilities. The aspect of capability is also taken into account by British MEP Kinnock, who asserts that “We (the EU) are an agricultural superpower and we can lead in the whole post-Doha agenda by opening markets and ending the dumping....”, over discussing the global trade rules in general, European protectionism in particular.

Not only the EU, but also other capable actors, such as USA or multinational companies, are considered to have responsibilities by MEPS. For instance, Finnish MEP Hautala assigns the EU and USA responsibility for global development, since they together “make up the world’s largest trading blocs”, whereas Belgian MEP Maes talks about “imposing a code of conduct which protects weak economies, governments and peoples against arbitrariness and exploitation” on multinational companies, since “their great power brings with it commensurate responsibility for the world.”

Regarding global responsibilities, the EP is also believed to have a role. French MEP Arif discusses the EP’s role, by arguing that “neither the World Economic Forum nor the World Social Forum...is a political actor that can turn demands into political decisions”, and by concluding that “This is why European Parliament is duty-bound to

---

251 Shei (2005), p.151
pass on and lend powerful support to a number of initiatives, such as cancelling the debt of poor countries...reforming international trade rules...”

The fourth and final dimension of discussions regarding global responsibilities includes several MEPs’ commitments to the cosmopolitan responsibilities, without going into any further specification. In other words, some MEPs reveal their sympathy with the idea that we humans have a collective responsibility for each other. This dimension of ‘cosmopolitan responsibility’ is best reflected in the statement of Austrian MEP Karas, who summarizes our global responsibilities as follows: “We live in a global world, faced with global responsibilities, and we are in search of global solutions. We have to acknowledge our increasing dependence on one another...” This statement of Karas shows strong similarity with the Cosmopolitan thinking, which believes in the existence of global interdependence and assigns all humans a collective responsibility for the global order and its outcome.

To conclude, parliamentary debate in the EP about global responsibilities reflects some elements of the Cosmopolitan arguments, as presented above. Some speakers discuss the role of EU in general or the EP in particular, arguing that they both have certain global responsibilities. As can be seen from the Table 7.5 above, many speakers from different party groups associate capability with responsibility and underline the responsibility of, say, EU for being the “world’s largest donor of development cooperation and as the largest international trading power”.

7.6 Institutional Reform & Distributive Justice

It has been argued in the theoretical section that global distributive justice is a distinguishing element of Cosmopolitan thought.\(^{258}\) The argument behind this is the extent of global institutional dynamics have transformed the circumstances of justice so fundamentally that distributive justice cannot be kept within the borders of ever more interdependent states.\(^{259}\) In order to separate distribution from re-distribution, Pogge explains his conception of distributive justice as “how to choose the economic ground rules that regulate property, cooperation and exchange, and hence condition production and distribution”.\(^{260}\) This idea of global distributive justice, which is called by Kok-Chor as ‘duties of justice’, is contrasted to ‘duties of humanity’, which are limited-term commitments with a definable goal. In other words, ‘duties of humanity’ take the global institutional order as given, but foresee some measures of assistance, whereas ‘duties of justice’ is concerned with the ground rules of that global institutional context, hence requires a “paradigm shift” from humanitarian assistance to an institutional focus.\(^{261}\)

With the eventual aim of achieving distributive justice at the global level, Cosmopolitans propose various institutional reforms to that end. Global trade rules are challenged as uneven, and hence the need for a fairer global trade scheme is presented. Particularly, protectionism of affluent countries is discussed as preventing developing countries from the benefits of global trade.\(^{262}\) Also, democratic legitimacy of certain institutions (such as WTO and IMF) is tackled by many Cosmopolitans.\(^{263}\) For instance, Pogge gives the example of asymmetry between rich nations participating in a trade summit with large teams of lawyers and advisors on the one hand, and weaker countries, on the other hand, having no efficient representation at all, thereby merely being the signatories to trade agreements that affect their citizens to an immense extent. Trade-

\(^{258}\) Caney (2003)., p.266
\(^{260}\) Pogge (2002)., p. 176
\(^{261}\) Kok-Chor (2004)., p.23-24
\(^{263}\) Kok-Chor (2004)., p.26
Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) agreement is questioned by Cosmopolitans as well, since it fails to pay attention to demands and needs of vulnerable populations.\textsuperscript{264}

Cosmopolitan arguments related to institutional reform and distributive justice are reflected in the EP debates, however the word ‘distributive justice’ is never used, but various reforms are mentioned. As it can be seen from the Table 7.6 below, I have identified five different dimensions of institutional reform, the reforms related with trade barriers and subsidies constituting the major dimension (39 out of 99) and Socialists being the major party group (with 35 out of 99 references) to discuss institutional reforms.

Table 7.6: Reflection of Institutional Reform & Distributive Justice in EP debates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inst. Reform &amp; D. Justice</th>
<th>Dem. deficit &amp; WTO</th>
<th>Long-term measures</th>
<th>Fair trade</th>
<th>Trade barriers &amp; subsidies</th>
<th>TRIPS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPE-DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDR/ALDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUE/NGL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/DEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Inscrits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first dimension, which has to do with democratic deficit in international institutions in general, and reform of WTO in particular, is mainly discussed by Left wing MEPs: 9 MEPs from PSE, 5 from GUE/NGL and 4 from the Greens. Speaking on behalf of the

\textsuperscript{264} Ibid, p.25
Socialist party group PSE, Desir mentions that “although WTO has started to acknowledge the need for reform, this recognition has to be translated into the necessary changes” and he underlines their proposal in “reforming the dispute settlement system, because there are still inequalities linked to the market share of the various member countries”. German MEP Behrendt states that “we must make the whole WTO more open, more democratic and more transparent”. Both from PPE and the Commission, only one speaker discusses the reform of the WTO, though their arguments are in line with the Left wing MEPs. German Conservative MEP Schwaiger proposes that “reform of the WTO is urgent and imperative”, whereas the former Commissioner Lamy also calls for a “institutional reform of the WTO”, as he discusses the need to extend the negotiations to all the partners, including developing countries.

In addition to reform of the WTO, several other speakers address other institutions. Italian MEP Frassoni considers reform of the international financial institutions as “the challenge...which we feel to be particularly important for EU”, whereas Dutch MEP Van Hecke tackles the World Bank, by arguing that “it is in urgent need of drastic reforms” and underlines that “as long as the developing countries have no real say in its policy and decision-making, it will continue to be perceived as a control instrument in the hands of the rich.”

---

The second dimension to discussions of institutional reforms, which I label as ‘long-term measures’, is made up of the statements that replace trade-related measures with aid. In other words, speakers highlight the significance of bringing about prosperity to developing countries through trade (mostly fairer trade), thereby discrediting the temporary aspect of aid policies. This dimension to institutional reform is largely reflected in the Cosmopolitan thought, as I have discussed through the concept of “paradigm shift” from humanitarian assistance to an institutional focus. Regarding global sustainability, Spanish MEP Tormo implicitly refers to ‘ground rules’ of Cosmopolitan theory, by arguing that “the only hope for global sustainability is to change the methods of production and consumption”, and she lists some of “the elements required to achieve fair growth” as “transparency and openness in the markets...social and environmental responsibility”. In addition, British MEP Deva underlines that “it is trade not aid that will eliminate world poverty and accelerate sustainable development...that will increase industrial, intellectual, educational and infrastructural capacities in developing countries...that will drive the solutions to food security, clean water, housing, sanitation and information technology”.  

Not only trade, but fair trade is emphasized by some MEPs. Admitting that “trade is an important tool for development and a means of reducing poverty”, Conservative Portuguese MEP Queiro underlines that “it is impossible to attain real progress towards these objectives unless fair rules are established”, whereas British MEP Kinnock considers it obvious that “of course poor countries need more aid, but they also need better and fairer export opportunities.”

---

The third dimension to discussion of institutional reforms involves calls for fairer world trade rules. Austrian MEP Kronberger conceptualizes rules of “fair trade” as those “in which raw materials have to be at the prices they deserve, and in which the net product must remain in these countries in order to develop their infrastructure”. 276 Socialist MEP Arif emphasizes the dimension of “economic and social justice”, when he argues that “we must re-evaluate all world trade rules in a more equitable manner”. 277

The fourth dimension to institutional reform comprises the major topic of debate. I have labelled this dimension “trade barriers and subsidies” since the discussions involve various sub-themes from agricultural subsidies to import barriers, from fisheries policy to dumping policies. For example, British MEP Lucas acknowledges that “it is nice to recall the EU’s important decision to grant duty-free access for essentially all products,” however she underlines that “it would have been more significant to have gone beyond the famous ‘essentially all’ to include those products of real importance to the poorest countries, such as agricultural goods.” 278 Dutch MEP Van Den Berg argues that “export subsidies in Europe that seriously affect the developing countries must be abolished”. 279

Regarding reforms on trade and agricultural policies, Commissioners share the view of those speakers critical about trade barriers and subsidies. For instance, responding to the several statements on the “need to make progress in reforming the agricultural policy in Europe in order to be able to present ourselves in a credible manner internationally”, Commissioner Nielson states that “he could not agree more”. 280, whereas

---

Commissioner Mandelson stresses that “not only the EU, but there must be visible efforts by all industrialised countries to reform their farm policies and a substantial reduction of industrial tariffs...always respecting the special circumstances of the weak.”

The TRIPS agreements, which have to do with property rights of intellectual products, matter to Cosmopolitans for their adverse effects on the poor populations who cannot afford to buy essential drugs for the treatment of tropical diseases, if those drugs exist or continue to be produced. As regards TRIPS, British MEP Kinnock presents the facts that “of the 1223 new drugs marketed between 1975 and 1996, only 13 of those drugs were developed for tropical diseases and only 4 of those 13 were the result of the pharmaceutical industry’s research”, and argues that “there is now a clear need for a new interpretation of TRIPS....as we need to ensure that it is the interests of poor countries that are put first” since “this is an issue of fundamental social justice”. In addition, Italian MEP Agnoletto explains the situation as “after 1 January 2005, when the derogation from Article 31 of the TRIPS agreement expires, India, with a billion inhabitants, and other developing countries will then no longer be able to produce the drugs”, and proposes that “EU therefore...needs to make every effort to obtain a further derogation from the TRIPS agreement, pending a complete change to it.”

As a central element of Cosmopolitan thought, distributive justice has to do with the ‘ground rules’ that determine all aspects of economy, ranging from regulation to production, from cooperation to competition. To that end, the Cosmopolitan approach proposes certain institutional reforms in various areas, such as legitimacy of WTO, trade policies of affluent states, agricultural subsidies, intellectual property rights and trade

---


rules. In a similar fashion, the debates in the EP reflect these concerns of Cosmopolitan thought. Some speakers demand reforms in the decision-making procedure of the WTO, and IMF; some highlight the priority of improving the trade opportunities of developing nations, rather than merely giving them aid; some demand fairer trade rules; some propose reforms in the trade and agricultural policies of the EU; and a few discuss intellectual property rights (the “TRIPS” agreement) and the pharmaceutical sector, in terms of failure in providing the global poor the essential drugs they need for their tropical diseases and AIDS.

7.7 Redistribution and satisfaction of basic needs

Re-distribution differs from distribution or distributive justice. It refers to successive distribution (of wealth and/or resources), after the primary distribution takes place. Some examples of redistribution proposals can be given as Global Resource Tax\textsuperscript{285}, principle of International Resource Redistribution\textsuperscript{286}, a global tax on short-term speculative currency transactions (The ‘Tobin Tax’) and Carbon Tax\textsuperscript{287}. The common element of these and similar proposals is that they all include a certain amount of money or resources transfer to those in a disadvantaged position.

However, the Achilles’ heel of re-distribution is that it does not necessarily require that primary distribution took place under just conditions; in fact, redistribution schemes might even be considered as undermining distributive justice, since redistributive measures might very well sustain the prevailing unjust distributive order, with certain short-term remedies. For instance, Pogge’s idea of Global Resource Tax is criticized as “abandoning the ideal theory for pragmatist reasons”\textsuperscript{288}. On that issue, Rawls would disagree with those critical of redistribution and would argue that liberal peoples only

\textsuperscript{285} Pogge (2002), p.207
\textsuperscript{286} Beitz (1979), pp. 127-143
have a duty of assistance to the burdened societies, since political culture is the fundamental cause of the problems in the burdened societies.289

Leaving aside the academic and parliamentary debate over redistribution, it can still be argued that the Cosmopolitan approach seems to support redistributive measures in a non-ideal theory. In other words, though the distributive justice still remains as the pivotal element of Cosmopolitan approach, redistribution is not excluded, since transfer of money and resources might still be of significant use to the needy populations. That concern for the needy in the Cosmopolitan debate stems from its moral universalist aspect. In other words, since each human is an equal unit of moral concern for all, those suffering populations far away ought to matter for ‘us’, who are relatively more capable in helping those in need.

Together with the proposals of redistribution, this morally universalist aspect of Cosmopolitan approach brings about the moral need for satisfaction of basic needs. Cosmopolitans seem to be highly concerned with those basic needs, as the redistributive proposals discussed above all eventually aim one target: creating funds for global development projects, in other words providing the money for satisfaction of basic needs. As discussed in the theoretical section, Pogge argues that any universal criterion of justice should prioritize satisfaction of basic needs of all290. Moreover, Cosmopolitans refer to Article 28 of Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) which entitles everyone to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms (including economic and social rights) can be “fully realized”.291

Some elements of Cosmopolitan debate on redistribution and basic needs are also discussed in the EP debates. As it can be seen from Table 7.7 below, I have found five topics on the relevant discussion: Debt Cancellation, Conditionality of Aid, Amount of Aid, Global Funds, and lastly Basic Needs. Among these five topics, amount of aid is the most discussed issue, with 33 out of 83 references; in addition to that, as the table

289 For a detailed discussion, see Rawls(1999), pp.106-111.
290 Pogge (1989), p.275
291 Pogge (2002), pp.64-5
indicates, we see a balance in the debates between different party groups. In other words, not only the Left wing MEPs, as it was the case in some of the previous topics, but also other party groups, such as PPE-DE discuss topics related with the Cosmopolitan concepts on redistribution and basic needs.

Table 7.7: Reflection of Redistribution and Basic Needs in the EP debates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Redistribution &amp; Basic Needs</th>
<th>Debt Cancellation</th>
<th>Conditionality of aid</th>
<th>Amount of aid</th>
<th>Global Funds</th>
<th>Basic needs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPE-DE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELDR/ALDE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greens</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUE/NGL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND/DEM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Inscrits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To begin with, the first topic has to do with debt cancellation. Some MEPs, mostly from the Left wing party groups, argue for total or partial cancellation of the debts of the Third World, mainly the Least Developed Countries. I have included this topic in my analysis on redistribution and basic needs, having in mind that although debt cancellation does not involve any redistribution, it still permits those indebted countries from avoiding paying off their debts, thereby letting them use that money for public development projects. In other words, debt cancellation includes an indirect aspect of redistribution, and it has to do with the cosmopolitan moral concern for the needy populations. For instance, German MEP Junker mentions that “Africa is the continent most seriously affected by the injustices of the international economic and financial systems and consequences of globalisation”, and argues that debt cancellation will help,
since “the high level of debt is an obstacle to investments...and hence one of the biggest obstacles in the fight against poverty”.

Debt cancellation not only has to do with the fight against poverty, but also it includes a certain aspect of morality discussed in the Cosmopolitan framework. Spanish MEP Rueda highlights the “twin opportunity” in cancellation of debts, which is not only “an act of compassion, but as recognition of the fact that the people who have already suffered as a result of irresponsible regimes should not have to suffer all over again by having to pay off their debts”. This statement is closely in line with Cosmopolitans who argue that if we try not to hold responsible the children for wrongdoings of their parents in a domestic context, then we can not also hold those populations responsible for the wrongdoings of their leaders, upon whom they barely had any control. Pogge advances the argument and underlines that it is the global institutional order that allows the leaders of the developing countries to borrow money on behalf of the country, then oblige the vulnerable populations to have to pay off “their” debts, thereby worsening the situation by transferring the money from satisfaction of basic needs to payments of the illegitimate debts. Hence, Cosmopolitan concern over debt payments is also reflected in the EP debates, as exemplified with the statement of MEP Rueda above.

The second topic, which I label as ‘conditionality of aid’, refers to those statements which emphasize putting some prerequisite conditions (such as fight against corruption, good governance, improvement of participatory democracy) on those countries to receive aid. The dilemma here, in my opinion, is that donor countries quite legitimately demand their aid money to be used properly, but on the other hand, it would again be the poorest populations to suffer the consequences, if the aid is not delivered on the grounds of not fulfilling the conditions. This concern of mine is in line with

---


Cosmopolitan approach which would prioritize the well-being of individuals and which would reject the suffering of people for the irresponsibility of their leaders.

The direction of the debate in the EP seems to be in favour of putting conditionalities on aid. For instance, Amado from the Council stresses that “there will have to be some changes in the framework within which these countries now receiving aid operate, particularly the need to fight corruption and to maintain democracy and good governance as fundamental principles in developing their political systems.” Nielson from the Commission explains their aid policy as “we base the allocation of funds not only on an assessment of each country’s needs, but also of its policy performance”. Not only the members of the Council and the Commission, but also the MEPs from both Right and Left reflect a supportive tendency towards conditionality of aid. For instance, Dutch Conservative MEP Weggen underlines “the need for a new Africa policy, in which democracy and sound management are prerequisites for aid and cooperation”, whereas French MEP Rod, from the Greens, emphasizes the “incoherence” of EU policies as “we state that good governance and an end to corruption are mandatory but we continue to pour hundreds of thousands of euros into Swiss bank accounts via the portfolios of a number of Heads of State.”

Another topic of importance to the discussion over redistribution is the amount of aid. The Cosmopolitan approach criticizes the fall in the amount of aid: For instance, Pogge states that only 19% of the 56 billion in ODA goes to the 43 least developed countries, and only 8.3% is spent on meeting basic needs.

---

Regarding the amount of aid, all speakers in the EP seem to agree on one aspect: increasing the amount of aid. Highlighting the issue that “EU on average is far from providing the pledged 0.7%”\textsuperscript{300}, the MEPs argue that “the level of aid by the rich countries ought to be increased,”, and underline that “this ought to be done with a view to combating poverty and through investing in the development of capacity.”\textsuperscript{301} For example, French MEPs Krivina and Vachetta emphasize that “what we term ‘development aid’ to the ACP has fallen constantly from 70% of total EU aid in 1986 to 30% in 1998”, and they argue that “the EU prefers to send its funds to Eastern Europe, the former USSR and Asia, where there is greater opportunity for profit”.\textsuperscript{302}

Those MEPs supportive of aid are also supported by their colleagues in the Commission. Commissioner Nielsen underlines that total official development assistance has decreased to 0.23%, and argues that “many governments could and should do more”\textsuperscript{303}. Two years later, he repeats the same need for increasing the volume of development assistance, but this time he emphasizes the target of achieving the MDGs.\textsuperscript{304} His Swedish colleague Wallström, another Commissioner, shares the same view as Nielsen, since she highlights the EU’s “international responsibility for sustainable development” and underlines the “EU’s commitment to achieving the UN’s objectives for aid and development aid of 0.7% of GNP.”\textsuperscript{305}

The fourth dimension to the discussion over redistribution involves the creation of sources of finance for the development projects. Labelled in my analysis as ‘global funds’, several ideas are discussed in the EP debates. For instance, French MEP Boudjenah argues that “new funding must be found urgently” and she gives the example of French President Chirac’s suggestion on “taking a small percentage of the wealth created by the globalisation to finance the fight against its negative effects”.  

Polish Conservative MEP Zaleski also thinks that “it is a good idea to impose taxes on the negative side of globalisation, such as flash capital or the arms trade”. Greek MEP Papadimoulis proposes that “the European Parliament support the proposal...on a global tax on capital transactions, arms sales and the consumption of non-renewable energy, in order to finance emergencies from natural disasters.”

Discussing the French initiative on the imposition of a global tax, Hungarian MEP Levai argues that “we must move on this, it is unacceptable that more than a billion people in the world live on less than one dollar a day.” Finnish MEP Korhola proposes the establishment of “a global infectious disease fund”, as she wants “to give some credibility to calls for altruism in the pharmaceutical industry.”

However, the discussion over creation of global funds seems to remain a minor issue in the agendas of the European decision-makers. On that matter, Luxembourguian Minister Schmit, who was then President-in-Office of the Council under Luxembourg Presidency, informs the EP that “it is true that so far the Council has not yet adopted a

---

position on the innovative sources of finance for aid”, but he asserts that “a certain number of ideas have been put forward.....which are no longer regarded as taboo” and concludes that “we need to find additional and alternative sources of finance.”\textsuperscript{311}

The fifth and the last dimension of discussion over redistribution and basic needs include statements referring to humanitarian aid in general, and satisfaction of basic needs in particular. As can be seen from the Table 3.7 above, it is mainly MEPs from PPE-DE who reveal their concerns over humanitarian assistance and satisfaction of basic needs. For instance, Portuguese MEP Castro considers the “fight against poverty, containing the spread of HIV/AIDS and universal access to primary education across the world are aims worthy of support” and urges his fellow MEPs that “the EU must not turn a blind eye.”\textsuperscript{312}

Stressing “the need to go further in development aid policies towards developing countries”, another Portuguese MEP, Miranda from Left wing GUE/NGL, proposes “assistance in sensitive areas such as food safety, humanitarian, educational and health-related issues...”\textsuperscript{313} In the debate over financing EU aid for Tsunami victims in Asia, British MEP Gill demands from the Commission not to transfer any funds from projects in India to aid for Tsunami, since “it would be \textit{criminal} to take from the world’s poorest to fund this tragedy”.\textsuperscript{314} A significant element of Cosmopolitan thought, ‘moral universalism’, is reflected as the MEP was also concerned about the fate of the “poorest” population, despite the emergency of the situation after Tsunami. Over this issue, Dutch MEP Martens seems to agree with her Socialist fellow, as she mentions that “The world’s

attention is on Asia with good reason, but tomorrow some 20 000 people will die again of poverty-related illnesses."

However, the concern for humanitarian aid does not only have to do with moral concern for the needy. As a minor but important example, Dutch MEP Van Velzen urges his fellow MEPs that “if our humanitarian aid efforts do not run smoothly, we will create a new breeding ground for the Bin Ladens of this world” and hence argues that “it is therefore crucial to get it right.” This line of reasoning shows similarity with those MEPs who were supporting the fight against poverty not for sake of the poor, but for security-related concerns such as terrorism, by stating that “our concern is to combat international terrorism...and unless we solve the problem of poverty, we will continue to be exposed to situations such as those we are experiencing now”.

To conclude, debates in the European Parliament on redistribution and basic needs seem to reflect a slight equal balance between the Right and Left party groups. In other words, the Left champions certain topics such as debt cancellation or creation of global funds, whereas the Right discusses more the satisfaction of basic needs. General tendency in the EP towards conditionality of development aid is that MEPs are in favor of preserving the present conditionalities and enhancing the efficiency of the aid policies against corruption or lack of good governance. The major consensus in the EP on the discussions over redistribution and basic needs is that all the speakers highlight the need for cancellation of debts.

PART III: CONCLUSION

With the help of the theoretical tools (the Cosmopolitan concepts), an analysis on how the Cosmopolitan debate is reflected in the EP has been presented. I have approached to the analysis from two dimensions. Firstly, there has been a focus on the discourse of the speakers. By quoting the statements of the speakers, I have tried to present to the reader how the arguments are discussed. The second dimension has dealt with the how the MEPs from the different party groups, as well as guest speakers, discuss the issues. My main aim regarding the second dimension has been to analyse if there was any significant correlation between the speakers’ party affiliations (or institutional role) and their discourse.

8. COSMOPOLITAN REFLECTIONS IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT:

For the purposes of integrating the findings of the analysis, let us return to my two main research questions:

- How are the Cosmopolitan assumptions, arguments and considerations reflected in the European Parliament debates? Is it possible to argue that Cosmopolitan approach is significantly reflected in the discourse of the speakers?

- How do the MEPs from different party groups and guest speakers (from the Commission or the Council) discuss the relevant concepts central to Cosmopolitan thought? Is there a significant correlation between one’s party affiliation and the degree of their ‘cosmopolitan’ discourse?

Table 8.1 below is a summary of the analysis, and therefore a summary of the answers to both of my research questions.
### Table 8.1: Summation of Cosmopolitan Debates in the European Parliament

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party groups &amp; Others / Cosmopolitan Concepts</th>
<th>PPE-DE</th>
<th>PSE</th>
<th>ELDR / ALDE</th>
<th>Greens / ALE</th>
<th>UEN</th>
<th>GUE/NGL</th>
<th>IND/DEM</th>
<th>Non-Inscrits</th>
<th>Commission</th>
<th>Council</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Interdependence</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade &amp; Domestic Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Economic Order</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Inequalities</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coercive Imposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU's Policies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Economic Order</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>World Poverty</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty as Reality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condemnation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moral Universalism</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU's Values &amp; Priorities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Justice &amp; Solidarity</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Reform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Concerns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Responsibility</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU's Responsibilities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capability of agents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP's role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmop. Responsibilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ins. Ref. &amp; Dist. Justice</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic deficit &amp; WTO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Measures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair trade</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Barriers &amp; Subsidies</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Redistr. &amp; Basic Needs</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Cancellation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditionality of Aid</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Aid</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Funds</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Needs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.1 COSMOPOLITAN DISCOURSE IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Concerning the first research question on how the Cosmopolitan debate is reflected in the European Parliament, my findings confirm that the Cosmopolitan approach is reflected, in its many dimensions, in the debates. The analysis section of this study details how the Cosmopolitan assumptions, arguments and considerations are reflected in the debates, so I will not detail that again. However, it seems difficult to talk about a homogeneous division of these reflections in the debates. In other words, Cosmopolitan concepts are discussed in the parliamentary debates, but some discuss more than the others.

The second part of my first research question asks ‘is it possible to argue that Cosmopolitan approach is significantly reflected in the discourse of the speakers?’ The answer is yes, but with some further explanations. As also exemplified in the analysis section with numerous statements from different speakers, Cosmopolitan approach is reflected in the EP debates. However, some party groups and/or some speakers are more reflective of Cosmopolitanism, compared to others. For example, Left wing MEPs seem to dominate the discussion over global inequalities. These dynamics of party affiliation and degree of Cosmopolitanism takes me to my second research question.

8.2 PARTY AFFILIATION AND THE DEGREE OF COSMOPOLITANISM

As it can be seen from the Table 8.1, it is mainly the Left wing party groups that reflect a Cosmopolitan approach in their discourse. Out of 481 references, 137 come from PSE, 73 come from GUE/NGL, 64 come from the Greens and only 82 references come from the Right wing party group PPE-DE, which holds the majority in the Parliament. In addition, usually Left wing MEPs adopt a more critical attitude in their statements, compared to their Right wing counterparts. As regards the tone of the statements, I observe that a rather more critical tone seems more closer to Cosmopolitan approach, due to the strong tone of the basic cosmopolitan arguments of “we are contributing to poverty” or “we are imposing an unjust order on the global poor”.
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The Cosmopolitan approach is reflected, but not equally by all party groups. Out of 7 cosmopolitan concepts discussed, 3 of these concepts (global interdependence, global inequalities and institutional reform) are dominated by the Left wing party groups, whereas in 2 of these 7 concepts (moral universalism and global responsibility) one can talk of a slightly equal distribution. Only in the remaining two concepts, namely ‘world poverty’ and ‘redistribution’, one can observe a relatively equal distribution.

As can be seen from the Table 8.1 above, MEPs from the PPE-DE remain silent on the centrally Cosmopolitan topics of global economic order, coercive imposition, need for reform, democratic deficit, debt cancellation. Left wing MEPs seem to champion the reflection of these Cosmopolitan concepts in the debates. For instance, speakers from both PSE and GUE/NGL reflect strong cosmopolitan views on the issues of global economic order, coercive imposition and debt cancellation. As an example, Greek MEP Alyssandrakis calls WTO as “the main imperialist mechanism which imposes the terms of the multinationals”\(^{318}\), whereas three fellow MEPs, from GUE/NGL, argue that “the imperialist countries impose their law on third world countries”.\(^{319}\)

Moreover, when the Right wing reflects any criticism, the tone gets less critical. For example, speaking of EU’s export subsidies, Dutch MEP Martens accepts that their “adverse effects on the local market are already known”\(^{320}\), whereas her fellow MEP Cunha highlights the “enormous contradiction between our intentions in development and cooperation policy and the damage we inflict with our sectoral policies”.\(^{321}\)

---


Concerning the discussions on world poverty, which one can talk of a relative balance between the Right and the Left-wing, it can be argued that Left wing MEPs adopt a more critical tone. French MEP Laguiller calls “the economic system” as “absolutely criminal”, and she also asserts that “remaining silent about why an economic system based on profit is so damaging...is akin to remaining a passive bystander of crimes against humanity and thus acting as an accomplice to them”.

Looking at the results of the findings on the debates ‘moral universalism’ and ‘global responsibility’, a more equal balance can be observed. All party groups, as well as the Commissioners, reflect Cosmopolitan concepts in their discourses. An important finding regarding these topics is that Commissioners discuss these topics more, compared to others. As can be seen from the Table 8.1 above, Commissioners state their commitments to considerations of global justice and solidarity, they also discuss the EU’s responsibilities under the discussion of global responsibilities.

The debate regarding institutional reform and distributive justice presents interesting findings. As expected, and as it was the case in the debates on ‘global interdependence’ and ‘global inequalities’, MEPs from PPE-DE remain silent on some of the central cosmopolitan concepts. For instance, there is only 1 reference from PPE-DE to the reform concerning democratic deficit, while there are 9 from PSE, 5 from GUE/NGL and 4 from Greens. Regarding the reform on trade barriers and subsidies, there are 7 references from PPE-DE, whereas it is 6 from Greens and none from GUE/NGL. These findings make it harder to conclude whether MEPs from PPE-DE are reflective on institutional reforms or not.

Cosmopolitan considerations over redistribution and satisfaction of basic needs seem to be reflected in an equal balance in the EP debates. Not only the MEPs from the Left, but also those from the Right, as well as members of the Council and the

---
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Commission, reflect their Cosmopolitan considerations on these discussions. Socialists champion the proposals of debt cancellation and creation of global funds, whereas Conservatives champion the concern with the assistance towards satisfaction of basic needs. If there is any topic that is exclusively agreed by all the party groups and guest speakers, it is the need for increasing the development aid to the committed level of 0.7% of GNP.

In conclusion, my findings show that the discussion of three topics, global interdependence, global inequalities and institutional reform, are dominated by the Left, whereas in the remaining four topics, there is more even balance between the different party groups.

The second part of my second research question is ‘Is there a significant correlation between one’s party affiliation and the degree of their ‘cosmopolitan’ discourse?’. To analyse if party affiliation is relevant to the degree of Cosmopolitanism, I will benefit from the findings presented in the Table 8.2 above. I have two observations.

**Table 8.2: Main Party Groups with regard to Cosmopolitan Arguments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debates / Parties</th>
<th>PPE-DE</th>
<th>PSE</th>
<th>Greens</th>
<th>GUE/NGL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Interdependence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Inequalities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Poverty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Universalism</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Responsibility</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Reform</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution &amp; Basic Needs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first observation has to do with sensitive topics in the debates. There are four main party groups that dominate the Cosmopolitan debate: one party from the Right, PPE-DE; and three party from the Left (PSE, GUE/NGL and Greens / ALE). Among the Left party groups, one can not see a significant difference, however Right wing PPE-DE remains silent in certain ‘sensitive’ issues, for example global inequalities and global interdependence. When it comes to ‘less sensitive’ issues, such as world poverty or moral universalism or global responsibility, it is observed increases in the number of statements coming from PPE-DE. However, when looked more in detail from the Table 8.1, readers might notice that what PPE-DE raises its voice about is either ‘poverty as reality’ (rather than ‘condemnation’), or ‘solidarity’ (rather than ‘need for reform’), or ‘cosmopolitan responsibilities’ (rather than ‘EU’s responsibilities). In other words, although MEPs from PPE-DE discuss those three topics, they are likely to discuss less sensitive aspects of the topics, such as condemning world poverty (rather than criticizing those responsible for it), or stating commitments to solidarity (rather than proposing a specific institutional reform) or accepting cosmopolitan responsibilities (rather than discussing the EU’s responsibilities). Hence, I observe that party affiliation definitely matters since, as the data reveals, MEPs from PPE-DE (and right wing in general) tend to avoid critical statements, but rather remain satisfied with “softer”, hence less controversial, statements.

My second observation is about the party group GUE/NGL. With 73 references out of 481, this party group ranks as the third in terms of references to Cosmopolitan concepts. When looked more in detail in Table 8.1, one can see 10 references to ‘global economic order’ under global interdependence, 9 references to ‘coercive imposition’ and 8 to ‘global economic order’ under global inequalities, 5 to ‘need for reform to democratic deficit’, and finally 8 for ‘increasing the amount of aid’. This deliberate focus of the MEPs from GUE/NGL on certain topics, I believe, is a clear reflection of the relationship between party affiliation and degree of cosmopolitanism. And also, the focus of GUE/NGL on these topics is a clear indication of how ‘cosmopolitan’ it is, compared to other party groups.
Concluding Remarks:

Cosmopolitan approach is reflected within the debates in the European Parliament. Although Cosmopolitanism is a normative ethical approach, its ideas and considerations prevail outside academic circles. As it has been shown within the parliamentary debate, the discourse of some speakers is significantly similar to the discourse in the academic debate. Some speakers highlight our globally interdependent lives; whereas some criticise the inequalities. Some lament global poverty, whereas some argue that all of us are responsible for the world order and world poverty. Some reveal their concern for their undernourished fellow human beings, while some underline the responsibility arising out of the capabilities. Some propose institutional reforms, whereas some argue for helping more to the needy. Cosmopolitan approach, hence, is reflected in the European Parliament.

Both sides of the Parliament reflect those concepts of Cosmopolitanism. However, as the tables show, the Left is more likely to criticize what they see as unjust, and more likely to demand reforms. Some MEPs, though not many, from the Right also take a critical tone, in line with their Left wing counterparts. However, the Left and the Right seem to consent upon two ideas: moral universalism, that we should have equal concern for all human beings; and global responsibility, that we bear a responsibility for the poor and we are capable enough of helping those in need. As regards the remaining Cosmopolitan concepts, the analysis illustrates that the Left will be more committed to Cosmopolitanism than their Right counterparts.
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