Preface

Taking a critical and nuanced position on the phenomenon of globalization has become increasingly difficult in our time. Only recently, it seemed the positions were clear. When the opening up of the world market and the emergence of new digital networks palpably increased the pace of globalization in the 1970s, and when this process again accelerated to breathtaking speed after the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, advocates and opponents of globalization made their respective cases in clearly contrasting terms.

On one side were the proponents of globalization, who saw free trade and cross-border communication as a gain for the development of humankind. After the notion of the ‘global village’ had made the rounds, ‘one world’ gained currency as a slogan for the promotion of worldwide cooperation. However, what drove this was, above all, the marketing of global corporations in opposition to trade restrictions. Politically, this corresponded to radical neoliberalism celebrating thirty years of victories. Its message was that the process of ‘deregulation’ ought to be carried on into the future.

In opposition to this apologia for globalization, the so-called ‘anti-globalists’ soon made their voices heard with the help of their own, in part globally active, organizations. These critics pointed out the negative consequences of unbound capitalism: the mounting inequality between the wealthy industrial nations of the north and the poor countries of the south; the emergence of new kinds of wars and globalized terrorism, with their resulting migrations; the exploitation of natural resources; and, not least, the catastrophic effects on the global climate. Under the new umbrella term ‘global governance’, transnational organizations would serve to mitigate such damages.

Recently, however, the fronts between the apologists and the opponents of globalization have shifted dramatically. At least since the resurgence of populist parties and Great Britain’s exit from the European Union, as well as the election of Donald Trump to the presidency of the United States of America, a novel repudiation of globalization has emerged. The critique comes no longer exclusively from the left in its opposition to capitalism; it comes, rather, from the far right, which sees the open world market as a threat to its domestic economies and longs for a return to the old nation states. The irony here is that such nostalgia is obviously an unintended and undesired side effect of globalization itself.

How are we to respond to this? If the new opponents of globalization are nationalists, racists and fascists, the constellations have shifted. Neoliberals believe they can and should simply cling to the idea of free trade. But this is to overlook the fact that the objections to particular effects of globalization will

not resolve themselves simply because they are raised by the ‘wrong’ side. Precisely because globalization has begun to provoke dangerous reactions, the anxieties to which such reactions give expression must be taken seriously. This presents the old critics of globalization with a twofold task: on the one hand, it is essential that they not give up on their critique of neoliberalism and continue decrying the exploitation of human beings and nature. On the other hand, they must clearly distinguish themselves from the new resistance by showing how a critical alternative to nationalism can be developed on the basis of the theoretical conception and practical advancement of alternative forms of globalization.

As we aim to demonstrate in this volume, this is a project to which philosophy too can contribute. The goal is to present a critical concept of globalization that is as comprehensive as possible, by taking into account economic, political, ethical, social and cultural aspects, according to a methodology of philosophically grounded reflection. The historical dimension receives special emphasis, including the history of globalization, the topic of globalization in the history of philosophy, and the philosophy of history’s contribution to a systematic theory of globalization. As a collection of contributions from authors from Europe and Latin America, this volume offers an opportunity to depict the topic from diverse perspectives and in an intercultural frame of reference.

The first chapter addresses the process of globalization in the areas of economy, politics and society. In the course of economic transformation, political institutions change in such a way that social actors lose influence. It is thus necessary to investigate the remaining conditions of the possibility of intervention (Griselda Gutiérrez), a question that also bears on the political action of persons with complicated citizenship status (Alejandro Alba). The complex structures of action that ultimately arise can be designated as ‘cooperative cognition’ (María Navarro). Yet such social phenomena can only be sufficiently explained if globalization is conceived first and foremost as an expansion of western capitalism (Franz Heilgendorff). In light of such a conception, it becomes evident that capitalistically constituted nation states use the exportation of democracy as a pretext to wage wars and expand their power (Constanze Demuth). The bellicose notion of a ‘clash of civilizations’ is contradicted by a ‘soft’ or ‘critical’ universalism that acknowledges cultural differences while also trying to conciliate them (Markus Tiedemann, Omar Acha).

The process of globalization leads to social inequalities and thus to demands for global justice—the topic of the second chapter. This calls for political and ethical standards, which are being deformed in the global age (Concha Roldán). There is a practical need for global institutions that fight injustices in the world (Elisabetta Di Castro). Instead of merely demanding the fulfillment of char-

itable aid obligations, it ought to be considered whether, for instance, the right to health can be legitimated as a human right (Julia Muñoz). Such ethical challenges give rise to the question of who are the subjects of global justice (Alberto Ruiz). These include generations whose impact reaches into the future, which invites contemplation of intergenerational justice (Irene Gómez). Nevertheless, the fact that the injustices in the world were created in the past, and must be compensated in the present, indicates the historical import of the topic (Johannes Rohbeck).

The history of globalization is also the focus of the third chapter. Examples range from the colonial history of Latin America (Nicholas Miller)—in particular the Jesuit mission in Paraguay (Rolando Carrasco) in the eighteenth century—to the urbanization of Mexico City in the nineteenth century (Sergio Miranda). Case studies from Turkey include intercultural hiring practices in the Ottoman Empire's engineering sector (Darina Martykánová and Meltem Kocaman), the cartography of the Sea of Marmara and the Black Sea (Kaan Üçsu), and contrasting theories of 'modernization' and 'dependency' (Rıdvan Turhan). These are followed by a contribution on the transition from feudalism to capitalism in Poland (Agnieszka Pufelska).

As the fourth chapter shows, globalization is also a topic in the history of philosophy. This begins in the historical Age of Enlightenment, during which the idea of cosmopolitanism first took on concrete form. In this regard, it can be shown that Raynal's and Diderot's critiques of colonialism influenced Kant (Ricardo Gutiérrez, Roberto Aramayo), who, with his concepts of hospitality and world peace, is among the pioneers of a philosophical theory of globalization (Efraín Lazos). The debate around such an Enlightenment philosophy persists into the present (Iwan-Michelangelo D'Aprile). The political economy of Marx is also to be counted among the first theories of globalization (Facundo Nahuel Martín). The idea of globalization is also contained in Heidegger's metaphysics, since both are directed at the world in its totality (Marco Kleber). Following Ernst Cassirer, globalization can be understood as a symbolic form that in contemporary discourses functions as a worldview (Lucas von Ramin).

Finally, the fifth chapter investigates how philosophy of history may contribute to the systematic analysis of the phenomenon of globalization. The interdisciplinary conception of 'Global History' is well suited for the establishment of a post-narrative and post-ethnographic historiography of globalization (Daniel Brauer). To this end, historians can invoke both Koselleck's theory of history—as well as Foucault's critique thereof (Elías Palti)—without naively upholding the Enlightenment notion of progress (Adrián Ratto). Following Benjamin, it is much more a matter of rethinking the historical space of the global (Francisco Naishtat). In the end, the question of the future also belongs to philosophy of

history, since historical awareness involves not only experience with the past, but also expectation directed towards the future (Rosa Belvedresi). These investigations bring the discussion full circle to the initial descriptions of the economic and political process of globalization, and the subsequent explorations of the ethical challenges faced by the utopia of global justice.

The articles presented here form the core output of the confluence of two international research projects led in the last four years by Concha Roldán: (IFS-CSIC) “Philosophy of History and Globalisation of Knowledge. Cultural Bridges between Europe and Latin America” (WORLDBRIDGES: F7-PEOPLE-2013-IRSES: PIRSES-GA-2013-612644); and “The Philosophical-Moral Prisms of Crises. Towards a New Socio-Political Pedagogy” (PRISMAS: FFI2013-42935-P, co-directed with Professor of the Institut of Philosophy of Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, IFS-CSIC, Roberto R. Aramayo).

All the authors of this volume are members of the project WORLDBRIDGES.¹ In this sense, this book represents the scientific results of this joint project, which was sponsored by the European Union’s 7th Framework Program on Research, and which has made possible the exchange between more than forty researchers from Europe and Latin America.

The following institutions have participated in the project on the European side: The Spanish National Research Council (Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, CSIC: located in Madrid, under the direction of Professor Concha Roldán), the University of Potsdam (Universität Potsdam, UP: under the direction of Professor Iwan-Michelangelo D’Aprile), the University of Dresden (Technische Universität Dresden, TUD: under the direction of Professor Johannes Rohbeck) and the University of Istanbul (UI, under the direction of Professor Meltem Kocaman); and on the Latin American side: the Center for Philosophical Research (Centro de Investigaciones Filosóficas, CIF: Buenos Aires, Argentina, under the direction of Professor Daniel Brauer) and the National Autonomous University of Mexico (Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México: UNAM, under the direction of Professor Griselda Gutiérrez).

The project PRISMAS, financed by the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Industry and Competitiveness (MINECO), has allowed us to carry out some other meetings and activities necessary for our objectives beyond the financing of the European project.

¹ The following authors also belong to the PRISMAS project: Roberto R. Aramayo (IFS-CSIC), Daniel Brauer (UBA), Iwan D’Aprile (UP), Irene Gómez Franco (UP), Griselda Gutiérrez (UNAM), Ricardo Gutiérrez Aguilar (IFS-CSIC/UCM), María G. Navarro (USAL), Johannes Rohbeck (TUD), and Concha Roldán (IFS-CSIC).

The stereotype of an economic crisis has become a pretext that has permitted the creation of apocalyptic political designs with a specific ideological bias undermining the welfare state. Our aim in PRISMAS was to analyze the concept of crisis from several different perspectives: philosophical, sociological, historical, juridical, political and ethical ones. This is reflected in the title of the project, ‘The Philosophical-Moral Prisms of Crises’—in plural. We base our thinking on the hypothesis that crises always respond to changes of paradigm, and that the humanities, being intrinsically interdisciplinary and transversal, permit us to analyze the crises conceptually, providing a plural diagnosis that is complementary to the scientific-technical ones, in order to design scientific, education and labor policies. Therefore, our team brings together conceptual historians, philologists, historians, sociologists and political scientists coming from different cultural traditions. In our opinion, it is necessary to rehabilitate politics and produce new collective actors, in accordance with concepts such as *isogoria* and *isonomy*, without leaving aside the necessary gender perspectives. This seems to be a suitable contribution to the Horizon 2020, since the rules of the democratic system are in jeopardy.

We pursue a multifaceted approach, the methodology of which examines the more or less hidden axiological backgrounds of every crisis, to show that crises are not a fateful destiny, but instead depend on many different factors and facilitate radical changes. Revising the history of thought in light of this aim can provide us with keys that can help us understand and face more actively and efficiently the issues of the present—because as Koselleck pointed out in his *Critique and Crisis*, concepts can be normative. In this sense, let us remember the empathy that according to Rousseau was an indispensable pillar of a political community, or the Kantian principle of publicity that served to discriminate injustice.

The analysis of the above-mentioned issues requires a good diagnosis, and etymology itself is useful for such a complex inquiry. After all, besides separation and dispute, crisis also means process and even justice in Greek; from *divide* (*krínein*) comes *kritikós*, the one that distinguishes or passes judgment, and from there comes the critique or the aptitude to judge. The assertion of the critical spirit and of the values of the Enlightenment can help us to counterbalance the hegemonic way of thinking, which is riddled with prejudices that prevent independent thinking. To recover the Enlightenment ideal of republican cosmopolitanism could serve to re-direct the dangerous drifts of globalization.

It is here that WORLBRIDGES takes up the torch to develop in detail the ethical-political aspects of globalization, which for a few decades now has ceased to be a concept with a univocal meaning. We have tried to refine the assumptions that operate at its base from the history of philosophy itself, but without ignoring

aporetic aspects of the philosophy of science and philosophy of history. These are aspects that we have tried to accomplish with an adequate gender perspective—which flourishes in some of the works presented here (Griselda Gutiérrez, Irene Gómez, Concha Roldán)—but that also need to be revised in detail in order to unravel the real depth that feminism brings to an adequate treatment of the problem of globalization.

The bridges built by globalization enable the interchanging not only of goods, but also of knowledge, received historical heritage and ethical-political projects that can complement one another. International cooperation can be fruitful only if based on real dialogue, interaction and engagement. In our specific case, this concerns that of Europe, the Euro-Mediterranean and Latin America.

Not only the three editors of this collective volume (Concha Roldán, Daniel Brauer and Johannes Rohbeck), but also many of its authors have been part of both projects. In truth, the results here are also an innovative development of previous results and projects, such as the International Marie Curie Project “Enlightenment and Global History” (ENGLOBE: Marie Curie Initial Training Network: FP7-PEOPLE-2007-1-1-ITN), or the Spanish Project “Philosophy of history and Values in Europe of XXI Century” (FFI2008-04279//FISO). In this context, we would like to devote special mention to remembering Günther Lottes—researcher and professor at Potsdam University, unfortunately deceased in Berlin on 28 January 2015—who co-directed with Iwan D’Aprile ENGLOBE during 2010–2013, and whose dissertations planted the seed of these new projects that united a group of researchers who have since worked as a team for almost a decade.

The cooperation that was initiated mainly between philosophers and historians has been gaining an increasingly interdisciplinary spirit. As such, we wish to thank especially Darina Martykánová for the initial impulse given to the request of these projects and for her invaluable support in organizing them. Scientific cooperation in the humanities—especially in philosophy—is one of the main goals of this international team, as a way to escape from a conceptual solipsism, which also leads to an ethical-political stagnation. Following Leibniz’s motto “*Theoria cum praxi*”, we strive to use multiple theoretical instruments of the humanities to correct their own erroneous applications; in other words, our projects aims to use multiple theoretical tools from the humanistic domains to overcome any misguided practical applications. Therefore, the result of these two projects (besides having been part of several publications—the perfect end) is that they are also becoming future projects, since our objective is none other than a genuine and positive globalization of knowledge, which we claim here, demanding new approaches and disseminating the results at an international level.

In this regard, we are grateful to the project WORLBRIDGES for having favored the approach of our research and the exchange of ideas—and to the project PRISMAS for funding the English-language revision of this volume by Greg Gottlieb, whom we thank for his work and dedication. Last but not least, we are very grateful to the Walter de Gruyter publishing house for its invaluable support in this publication.

December 2017
Madrid, Buenos Aires, Dresden

Concha Roldán
Daniel Brauer
Johannes Rohbeck