

Political Science-Legal Seminar
Modern Internationalism: A Chance, a Fantasy, or Reality
January 25, 2022

PANEL II: 16:00 – 18:00

moderator: dr Piotr Obacz

Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Faculty of International and Political Studies

prof. Michael Byers

University of British Columbia, Department of Political Science; Canada Research Chair in Global Politics and International Law

Modern Internationalism: The governance challenges of Outer Space

Outer Space offers a case-study into modern internationalism. It is an "area beyond national jurisdiction" that is governed by international law, centrally including the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, which prohibits the "national appropriation" of the Moon and other celestial bodies. Current developments -- the rise of commercial actors such as SpaceX, the rapidly increased abilities of China, some very recent unilateralism from Russia – are challenging that multilateral regime. They are also creating risks, including a "tragedy of the commons" in Low Earth Orbit due to congestion caused by thousands of satellites, anti-satellite weapon tests, collisions, and space debris. The solution to a tragedy of the commons is, of course, cooperation, which raises the question: Why there is not more support for the existing international legal regime?

dr hab. Paweł Laidler, prof. UJ

Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Faculty of International and Political Studies (Dean)

The impact of national security paradigm on internationalism in the 21st century politics.

The national security paradigm has been rooted in the 20th century politics of various states, including the main proponent of national security rhetoric – the United States. It has been systematically used since the late 1940s, usually applied by the executive with regard to foreign policy (Theoharis 2011). It became the main paradigm during the Cold War period, and, later, in the aftermath of 9/11 terrorist attacks, as well as in the post-Snowden surveillance reality (Dudziak 2000; Farber 2008; Greenwald 2014; Glennon 2015). Today, again, the U.S. administration uses national security as a justification of certain policies in the wake of the occurrence of the Covid-19 pandemic. I argue that the often-overused rhetoric of safety and security, usually serves as an effective legitimization of activities undertaken by several governments in times of so-called emergency, having impact on their attitude towards internationalism. As a consequence, sovereignty and unilateralism become attractive values raised by politicians in order to spread fear, anxiety, and the feeling of increasing danger from everything "foreign". Paradoxically, there are also instances where internationalism and international cooperation is enhanced by common reference of states to national security, which may be especially observed with regard to foreign intelligence surveillance policies. The purpose of the presentation is to discuss the real impact of national security paradigm on internationalism with a special focus on 21st century world politics.

prof. Ramona Coman

Université Libre de Bruxelles, Institute for European Studies (President)

Towards new types of conflicts of sovereignty in the EU?

Sovereignty is a long-standing concept associated with the emergence of the modern state, when the desideratum of all rulers was to gain both internal and external control (Grimm, 2015: 6). The meaning of the concept has changed over time, more profoundly so as States in post-war Europe agreed to create supranational polities in order to address transnational problems (Walker, 2003) and curb the dangers of nationalism. Because 'no state today is sovereign in the traditional sense of the term' (Grimm, 2015, 6; Bellamy, 2013) and because of the disputed reconfiguration of sovereignty brought about by the creation of supranational institutions, it has been often argued that this principle is outdated (Lindahl, 2003, 87). And yet, the history of EU integration has been shaped by different conflicts of sovereignty, some of them latent, others more visible and divisive. As Bellamy put it, sovereignty has remained central to the nature of politics (2013, 158). In recent years, this concept has been brought back to life by both political and legal actors within the EU polity. Claims to sovereignty today have been exacerbated. They are multidimensional and more divisive than ever, involving crucial – and unresolved – dilemmas for decision-makers (Brack, Coman and Crespy 2019, 818). How are the mounting claims to sovereignty to be understood? Who invokes them and with what purposes? What kind of claims and, more to the point, what is at stake? With a focus on the ongoing rule of law debate in the EU, this presentation is organised as follows. Section 1 distinguishes between the state-centred approach and the ideal of shared/pooled sovereignty at the EU level. Section 2 argues that beyond the traditional opposition between national sovereignty and embryonic forms of supranational sovereignty, new conflicts emerge which take the form of conflicts between different claims to sovereignty at the national level itself. Section 3 shows that antagonistic understandings are pitted against each other about who – executives or parliaments? – performs the most legitimate representation of the people and who – parliaments or courts? – shall have the last word.

prof. Cecelia M. Lynch

University of California Irvine School of Social Sciences

The Need to Reframe "Internationalism" and "Localism"

In this presentation, I call for reframing our conception of "the local," generally conceived of as the opposite of "the international," in order to rethink the problem of inclusion in the global system of states, organizations, and peoples. "Modern internationalism" is a concept that plays to a range of ideological fantasies, but its fitful practice has had "real" political, social and economic effects. In my work on humanitarianism and religion, one issue that always returns to the fore is the necessity for political practices that cross borders to become more inclusive in ways that take into account the survival and dignity of the populations they purport to serve. This necessity, in turn, requires a new openness to "onto-epistemologies" that are often mistakenly deemed to be "local" and therefore not relevant to the global polity. Drawing on the work of feminist scholars as well as scholars of both *Ubuntu* and the pluriverse, I argue in favor of reframing our conceptualizations and practices to recognize and incorporate ways of being and knowing that in fact constantly escape from the "local" boundaries imposed on them by our assumptions about the international.

prof. Glenda Sluga

University of Sydney, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences

Methodological Nationalism as a useful category of historical analysis

How should we write the history of nationalism? It has been a number of decades since nationalism studies peaked. Since then the international has come to the fore, while the national has suffered from

a relative lack of social scientific interest. In this paper I will survey the social science thinking on methodological nationalism, and methodological cosmopolitanism as its antithesis, and what it may have to offer for the writing of history.