

Political Space Philosophies in the History of the Political Thoughts of the Western European Universalism and the European Union

İdiris Demirel

Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey
idiridemirel@gmail.com

Hüseyin Gül

Adnan Menderes University, Aydın, Turkey
huseyingul@adu.edu.tr

Abstract

There exist certain historical premises and foundations thought to render the idiosyncratic structure of the European/western civilization possible. One of the most important domain related to these foundations and premises is the political -space philosophy along with the European Universalism that stemmed from the European history of political roots. The political space centered on the Polis (city-state) in the ancient Greek political sphere is replaced the "world state" thought of the Cynic and Stoic philosophers of the Ancient Hellenistic and Roman political spheres. The early Catholic Christian philosopher St. Augustine and the late Catholic philosopher St. Thomas converge to a great extent on a universalism and "world" domain while the Protestant politician is rather related to the modern nation state notion. The Dante of the late middle age and the early modernism had a more secular conception of universalism and "world state" in terms of political space. These Western approaches can be viewed in relation with the "European Universalism" framework set by the Wallerstein. The goal of this study is not to investigate the European Union or the process of Turkey's European Union membership per se. Rather, the goal is restricted to the investigation of the historical background of this phenomenon incorporating the European Universalism approach.

Key Words: Political Thoughts, Political- space, West/Europe, World State, European Universalism, and European Union.

Introduction:

The Greek Political Thought and the Polis as the Best Political Space

When the European thought is viewed from a historical perspective from the beginning it can be seen that the primary question was the best type of state or governance. Although the near antique philosophers including Platon and Aristotle suggested different opinions with respect to the attributes of best state or best forms of governance, one common feature of their view was the general appreciation for political space without further discussions. Even though the political systems that the philosophers adhered differs to a large degree, it is evident that the polis, the city states were adopted by the philosophers as the best space for the application of the political systems per se (Ebenstein, 1996, p. 27-29; Tannenbaum and Schultz, 2010, p. 72-74). At this stage, a city beyond the boundaries of a city-state was not identified as the best. The notion of best here is at the heart of universally valid truth.

The ancient empire that was built by Alexander the Great did not lead to a political space philosophy that differs from the Greek Philosophy of its age. As for Platon, the philosopher who resembles the philosophical thought of the ancient Greek, the polis was the most convenient political space so it was for his pupil Aristotle, the tutor of the Alexander the Great.

Not only for the philosophers but also for the different social strata the polis was the focal in the design of the community life. Citizenship denoted the identification with the polis which one belonged at that age where the communal and personal categorizations such as slavery, foreignness, citizenship were valid. By a kind of early Eurocentric distinction, being a Greek not being a Barbarian and being a part of the Greek civilization was primarily related with the polis, the political space of that era. The population those city states varied between 2000-10000. The population of Athens exceeded 100000 from time to time. There was a collective desire to keep the population at a level which ensured the familiarity among the people in the community. Organic state life was the case for the polices as the ideal and the actual best political space.

Political space was also related to social structure and properly regime. Those who were entitled to be citizens' higher social status and have the right to hold property. Those who did not have a citizenship bound to the city were lower in the social status hierarch. They did not have right to have property in the example of slavery. Besides the common beliefs or rituals each polis had peculiar belief gods and rituals. Briefly, it was not European wide, worldwide, empire wide or a nationwide political space theory or practice without determine marked the Ancient Greek sphere. The political and humanities war focus consisted of and was determined by state in the Polis form. The collective and public identity which had belonged to the Polis was above and beyond individual and private identity. Moreover there was no evident social emphasis that was separated from state by Platon and Aristo. The political place which is called the Polis were both societal political and social per se and these characteristics were bound to each other within on organic integration.

Helenistic and Roman Political thought Transtion from Polis World State

When we rule out of the Greek sphere of the antique Europe from geographic and historical aspects and take Hellenistic and roman political thought into account, it can be see that there is a paradigm sight toward quest and philosophy of political thought and political space on a world scale centered on the Polis. Another way of saying, following the Ancient Greek when we look at schools of antiquity such as Cynics and Stoah we can observe certain paradigm shift around the issue of political space. They envision a universal world state beyond the imagination of city- state "nation state", "empire" or "European Union".

This new political place philosophe donates a critique against the Greek word and a notable innovation. There upon while the political space expands beyond the city scale and European Union side, leapingto several world scale, the superiority of public over private and collecting over individuality ends. A more individual centered world-scale political space philosophy emerges. On practice, essentially for the Roman and Macedonians before them smalljurispenceof local governments in the real politic. The new real politic of world emprialism individual must come to terms with the idea that he is the part of a

complex political space full of foreign people and thoughts (Ebenstein, 1996; p. 57; Tannenbaum and Schultz, 2010, p.104-104; Frank and Gills, 2003, p.246). When compared with the citizens of the city-state, the citizens of the new empyreal faced with double anxiety. First, they were at a more intensely faith individual domain and from they were entrapped in more universal realism than before perceptively. In this venin, when the issue is the best state or the best government, the political thought suggests the world state concept drawing on a universal idea. In the non-Greek but Hellenistic political of the Antique Europe not only sphere vision of space expanded but also the nation of individual cosmopolitanism and “world citizenship” also value. Considering of the interaction between the imaginative political thought and the social economic and political reality, Polises are focused to unite morale, to overcome the problems of self-sufficiency stemming from being a small state to protect against the Macedonian and Persian threats.

In the Hellenistic philosopher ancient era virtue/knowledge cosmopolitanism political space or state philosophy were interactively operationalized, accommodating each other. A person who has knowledge/wisdom/virtue/ turns into type of person who acts in a world-scale perspective, detaching himself from his local bounds. There is no one culture, tradition, no one peculiar nationalism, religion or language for this person. The cynics who criticize the local state thought instead suggest a world state where all human-beings have equal citizens Hence, the city state philosophy of the Antique Greek expanded radically. City focused citizenship thought practice and theory was forsaken for world citizenship thought. Going from Stoics toward Hellenistic's at the same time means to evolve from the Hellenistic world to Roman world. Running approximately from BC 300 to AD 200 Stoicism was one of the most eras; it was founded by foreigner in the Greek sense. Stoics did not see the individual as a unit of the collective rather took the person as individual per se. In the tightly over state of Platon an Aristotle individual was to submit the law and tradition of his own society, whereas now it exists on his own and the goal is not to submit to the collectively rather “to live in harmony with the nature” and “know oneself”. It would not be wrong assert that the groundwork of “universal human rights” idea was set by human premises of the Stoic philosophers. The notion of the “world sate” developed by the Stoics in also associated with their presumption of reason, universes god, and legislation, universalism and law. In so far as, all universes the humans essentially operate with the same reason. There is only one common sense in all conditions. Hence, there is a law on which the universe including the humans acts, which is called the universal law. This universal law is valid in all space and time horizons Stoic thinkers called law as the “natural law” not only is the human beings and other things but also God acts in accord with the universal law (Ebenstein, 1996, p. 58; Çaha, 2008, p.32-35). Universal reason, universal legislation, together bring about the notion of a “world state”. Since the humans are the same by nature, their governance should be the same within take same state. Whilst the humans are bound to their local states through their tradition, they are simultaneously a citizen of the state through their reason. The universal law of the world state would be above the local state and law binding the rulers and their followers as well (Çaha, 2008, p.32-35). Here, the radical innovation of the world state philosophy bearing upon universal law should be emphasized.

Cicero, one of the most influential names of the antique era, also adopted the universal law principle through a stoic understanding, reflecting on the existence of a natural law that originates from the God's rule or the universe and the human's possession of reason. This natural law is valid and binding for all times, spaces and societies. It would be unthinkable to deviate from the natural law when engaging in positive law regulations. Hence, this

natural law becomes a kind of a kind world state constitution (Çaha, 2008, p. 39-40). According to the Ebenstein, a remarkable novelty seems to arise when the inner meaning of the political thought of Cicero is taken into consideration. Namely, Cicero has a world view. On the contrary, when the “best” political-space philosophy of Platon and Aristotle are reviewed. It can be recalled that they could not go beyond the conception of Polis/City-state. Both Platon and Aristotle did not incorporate a universal humanity conception in their political philosophy. For them, the World is separated between the Greeks and the Barbars and the Barbars are inferior to the more cultivated and civilize Greeks who have the right to enslave them. Contrary to this conception, It is apparent that Cicero has a more universal view arising from the political and administrative the Empire. When the Hellenistic and roman political thought is taken together in a concise manner in terms of political space philosophies, it is evident that the city-bound political thought had been abandoned, the local state scale had been replaced by universalist scale, and a new World state perspective transcending the European Union idea owing to Universalist idea emerged. Besides the World State nation, individual attains higher priority within the individual collective distinction, and contrary to the Greeek sphere the view of universal equity of humans is defended (Ebenstein, 1996, p. 52-53; Çaha, 2008, p. 36). Briefly, both the city-state scale and the type of human it accommodates remain in the past as a European development phase.

Christian Politaical Thought and the Modern Political Thought and the European Unversalism

In terms of political space philosophy the western political thought can be elaborated including both Catholics and Protestantism. In this vein, both “God State” and the world state philosophies of St. Augustine, one of the early Middle age Catholic philosophers are designs that transcend local and national boundaries According to St. Thomas, a Catholic philosopher of the Middle age of Europe since the universe was created beginning with God in a gradually descending hierarchy reaching lower beings, it is maintained by a universal will while the catholic universalism of World state maintaining a kind of natural law and World-scale under the influence of ancient Greek, Helen and Roman political thought rather engaged in modern nation state, setting European Unity aside (Çaha, 2008, p. s. 52; Tannbaum and Schultz, 2010, p. 122, 144-148. When Protestants encourage the national churches as an argument against papacy and Roman Church, they also encourage the nationality, national languages and national identities, hence, the development of nation state as “the best” political space (Wallerstein, 1993; s. 188). National Churches promote nation state in the political space sphere, gradually suggesting national attachments, submission to national ruler and state. It would be necessary to designate that Protestantism also promotes secularity individualism and, hence the modernity (Çaha, 2008, p. 60-61).

Dante Alighieri (1269-1321), a poet and a philosopher at the down of the modernity also advocated the World state in the contest of political space philosophy. Dante reflected on and indeed advocated a World state reeled by a monarch for the sake of human welfare in his political masterpiece *De Monarchia*. For him, since the monarch is to be at everyone's service, the humanity would be freer in such a regime when compared with local and national states/monarchies. It is worthy to note that Dante's quest for World state successfully discriminates between the consequences of political domination that the central power must assume and the cultural autonomy. As each of the nations, kingdoms and states would have different legislation, the nations would protect themselves within a political World state via cultural autonomy. Dante goes beyond Christian political

universalism by discharging Ebenstein, 1996, pp. 106-116). Owing to a secular approach that involves the direct, intermediated authority of God without any guidance, assistance and intervention of Church/Papacy. Not only political thought of the ancient age but also political thought of Middle Age apparently abandoned for modernity. By the 16th century, national states gradually emerged as the best political space.

Conclusion

European universalism and European Union

With its approximately 2500 year background, the universalism approach whose frame work was set by the Cynics and Stoic philosophers drawing on the World-scale ideas continued in the late modern era the way it existed in the Middle Ages and early modernity. According to Wallerstein "The rhetoric of the Pan-European leaders, mass media and the founding intellectuals is full of references to universalism of their policies. That is quite apparent when they talk particularly about their policies about "others". The "others" are the countries outside the Europe, poor people and "underdeveloped" nation (Wallerstein, 2007; s. 11; Samir Amin, 1993; s. 24-25). While the remarks of the speaker were uttered in manner, the politics are always presented as the reflection of truth and universalism.

Samir Amin says "according to representatives of this dominant Eurocentric trend, Europe have already found the answer. Hence, their motto is "We are following Europe, the best of the existing worlds." What is meant by the European Universalism in the fore mentioned quotations is the attitude to justify the aggressive expansionism against the non-European poor people and underdeveloped policies under the cover of universal values and facts.

European universalism which is characterized by the interpretation on non- European societies from European point of view can be classified in to three types with respect to its course of existence. First, policies that are accepted by the Paeuropean- European leaders are set to promote the protection of human rights and democracy. Second, European Universalism embedded in the jargon of clash of civilization. According to this argument, since western civilization is the only depending on universal values and facts it is deemed to be superior to other civilization. Thirdly, the governments have no alternatives but to accept and apply the laws of economics within the context of scientifically justified facts of the market. According to Wallerstein, these are not brand new themes. By contrast, they are the theme that have evolved since at least sixteenth century and make up the rudimentary rhetoric of powerful (Wallerstein, 1993, p. 12; Mackerras, 2005, p. 737).

The same European Universalism can be viewed from the aspect of modern world system as the history of the system to a large extent was the history of the expansion of the Europe States and nations to the rest of the world. Remanding the earlier world state emphasizes the system geographically became global and in the late 19th century and incorporated the periphery of the world in the late 20th century. The system contains several political regimes that surely matters the people who live in that particular states. However, these differences do not change the fundamental fact that they are the constituents of the modern system, the capitalist world economy. On the other hand, in the aftermath of the "cold war" it is thinkable that a salient polarization was replaced by a fuzzy polarization involving many players more or less equal to each other (Wallerstein, 2001, p. 79). The aforementioned Western/European expansionism means the military invasion, economic exploitation and subjugation of the non-European part of the world to legal and political

injustice. Those who carry out the universal European expansionism thought to legitimize their policies by claiming that “they are bringing in more benefit for the humankind” European Universalism has been operationalized as the ideology of the existing historical and modern capitalist system. The general argument is that the European expansionism comes with “benefits” such as civilization, economic growth, development, progress and is often operationalized by so-called the “natural law”. It is claimed by the European expansionism is not only a “beneficial development for humankind but also proves to be historically unavoidable” (Wallerstein, 1993, p. 40; Demirel, 2008, s. 49) . The rhetoric used to describe and legitimize this expansionism sometimes occurs in the form of the theology or religion, sometimes relies on secular world view. The expansions and interventions over the “non-civilized regions” of the world by the west are specifically built upon four basic legitimizers within the framework of Wallerstein, first, the others being Barbar, namely uncivilized, second the aim to end the violation of universal values, third need to protect the innocent among the other oppressors and fourth enabling the expansion of the universal values. However, this expansion and interventions under the cover of “fight against terrorism” and sending democracy” in the aftermath of 9-11 were enabled through the political and military power of the dominant forces and were inherently induced by material gains from the invasion. One of the implications of these discussions is related to European Union. European Union is tough to be built upon universal European values, however, it is often disregarded that these values are the social construction of dominant constituencies of specific world within the context of a specific cultural geography and civilization (Wallerstein, 1996; p. 12; Amir, 2000, s. 5-7).

References

- Amin Samir, (1993). *Avrupamerkezcilik Bir İdeolojinin Eleştirisi*, (Türkçesi: Mehmet Sert), Ayrıntı Yay., İst.
- Amin Samir, (2000). *Değişim Halindeki Dünya Sistemi*, (Türkçesi: Fikret Başkaya), Maki Bas. Yay., Ank..
- Çaha Ömer, (2008). *Siyasi Düşüncelere Giriş*, Dem Yay., İst..
- Demirel İdiris, (2008). *Batı Avrupa Bilimine Ontolojik Temelleri ve Avrupamerkezci İdeolojik İçerimleri Ekseninde Heideggeryen Bir Yaklaşım*, Uludağ Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, C: XXVII, S: 1.
- Ebenstein William, (1996). *Siyasi Felsefenin Büyük Düşünürleri* (Türkçesi: İsmet Özel), Şule Yay., İst.
- Gills Barry, K., (2003). “Dünya Sisteminde Hegemonik Geçişler”, Andre Gunder Frank ve Barry K. Gills (Der.), *Dünya Sistemi Beş Yüzyıllık mı, Beş Binyıllık mı?*, (Türkçesi: Esin Soğancılar), İmge Kitabevi, Ank.
- Mackerras Colin, (2005). “Eurocentrism”, *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, (Ed: Maryanne Cline Horowitz), Thomson-Gale Publ., USA.
- Tannenbaum Donald G. Ve Schultz David, (2010). *Siyasî Düşünce Tarihi Filozoflar ve Fikirleri*, (Türkçesi: Fatih Demirci), Adres Yay., Ank.

Wallerstein Immanuel, (1993). Jeopolitik Ve Jeokültür Değişmekte Olan Dünya—Sistem Üzerine Denemeler, (Türkçesi: Mustafa Özel), İz Yay., İst.

Wallerstein Immanuel, (1996). “Kapitalizmin İdeolojik Gerilimleri: Irkçılık ve Cinsiyetçilik Karşısında Evrenselcilik”, Etienne Balibar ve Immanuel Wallerstein, Irk Ulus Sınıf, (Türkçesi: Nazlı Ökten), Metis Yay., İst.

Wallerstein Immanuel, (2001). Ütopistik Ya Da Yirmi birinci Yüzyılın Tarihsel Seçimleri (Türkçesi: Taylan Doğan), Avesta Yay., İst.

Wallerstein Immanuel, (2007). Avrupa Evrenselciliği İktidarın Retoriği, (Türkçesi: Sinan Önal), Aram Yay., İst.