

CLIMATE CHANGE CHALLENGES AND THE COSMOPOLITAN IMPERATIVE

Bellarmino Nneji
bellarminechika@gmail.com

**Department of Educational Foundations
Alvan Ikoku Federal University of Education
Owerri
Imo State**

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17080035>

Abstract

Climate change has brought with it adverse challenges, most of which are unprecedented. Some are creating tensions and making existing regulations of world order incapable of handling the outcomes and consequences of climate change. This has motivated the call for cosmopolitanism, a moderate cosmopolitanism that calls for redefinition of sovereignty and relaxation of territorial borders. Based on the above, a new cosmopolitan framework, based on the theories of care ethics and categorical imperative, was suggested and recommended.

Keywords: climate change, cosmopolitanism, care ethics, categorical imperative, territorial integrity, sovereignty.

Introduction

Climate change and its impacts not only threaten us as humans on the planet earth but also threaten our geographic locations/existence as nations and also our identities as nations. Life and survival are already threatened and opportunities diminished in many current locations and natural habitats. Sovereignty is threatened as nations are washed away. Survival depends on the charities of neighbouring states and nations who need to maintain their own territorial integrity and identity. This however compounds the problems of the affected (washed away) nations.

Should safe nations stick to current sovereignty status while nations undergo extinction? The hospitality of one nation to another is limited by many factors and thus demands that others show same to ease off the situation. Thus hospitality should not be limited to only neighbours of affected (washed away) nations. These are challenges brought about by climate change that need a global collective action. This global collective action is not in any way addressed by the issue of only giving aids to affected nations and territories. It is a global action that needs a reconsideration of the Westphalian basis of sovereignty.

The adverse situations which sparked off inundation and loss of territories were not initiated by the victim nations. They are not the real culprits. Many developed nations are the greater felons in the entire climate change scenario – butterfly effect. We are collectively guilty in different ways and thus we need to collectively take care of the consequences.

In such situations, is it proper and justifiable to maintain the status quo since one is not the crying victim? If the reverse were to be obtainable, would one still stick to one's gun? Some of these issues are to be approached and appreciated through the Kantian lenses of cosmopolitanism, categorical imperative and imaginative empathy.

A holistic appreciation of the entire climate change scenario exposes the fact that climate change not only impacts on both life and living but also threatens many fundamental natural and other rights as a necessary corollary. These create many untoward consequences (a multiplier effect) which also threaten and challenge existing territorial integrities and sovereignties. In fine, this view believes that there is need to readdress, if not replace, the Westphalian approach to international relations and give cosmopolitanism a chance. (With such a view, majority of the global crises of exclusion may diminish)

We inherited the earth and our current geographical locations without any consultations. That each nation and peoples are fortunate to find themselves in areas not affected adversely and directly by the effects of climate change is just a sheer luck. Also that some are that unfortunate is not due to their own making. Some are suffering because of the sins of commission and omissions by 'fortunate' nations as far as climate change is concerned. This situation calls for serious ethical and moral considerations of the entire globe of humanity. Reason and natural law has to prevail.

Theoretical Framework

The idea of cosmopolitanism is reinforced in the ethics of care and the Kantian categorical imperative. These are the theoretical bases of the quest for cosmopolitanism induced by the challenges of climate change.

The ethics of care was championed by Carol Gilligan and Nel Noddings. It was a direct affront, challenge and rejection of the traditional ethics of justice. The major thrust of the ethics of care is that everything is not about justice and rights, there has to be a paradigm shift to that of care which is all encompassing and geared towards human welfare. It is thus inferred that once humanity imbibes the ethics of care, the idea of rights and justice would be already taken care of.

According to Tronto (1994) care is a species of activities that includes everything we do to maintain, contain and repair our world so that we can live in it in an accommodating manners. It involves such variables as responsibility, attentiveness, and responsiveness all in our attempts to ensure harmonious relationships with our fellow humans. It gives room for subjectivity and cultural variations, tolerance, and integration which are totally abhorred by traditional ethics.

Tronto (1994) identified four sub elements of care ethics: 1. Attentiveness - ability to recognize and become aware of the needs of others, this involves appreciating ones situations and circumstances indicating that there is attentiveness. 2.Responsibility - willingness to respond and take care of the needs of others, we owe one another the responsibility of care. In the line of thought of Kant this responsibility is a duty, a duty for all humanity. 3. Competence - the required skills of providing good and successful care for others. This idea of competence incorporates creating a conducive arrangement and atmosphere for rendering care, or to even such conducive for one to take care of ones situations and circumstances. 4. Responsiveness - consideration of the position

of others as they see it – feeling with. This summarizes the entire provisions and variables of care from the Trontoan perspectives.

A critical and cursory look at care ethics, as analysed from the Juan Toronto perspectives above, points to a similarity with the summary of the Kantian categorical imperative. Care ethics despite calling for a subjective approach to ethics, is subtly calling for an objective universalizing of the core care principles. Thus, if all across the globe have these core care principles practiced, the categorical imperative would have been applied.

The ethics of care focuses on realizing the welfare of people we come into contact with. This care and welfare remain blind to discriminations, racism, segregation, territoriality, etc. It is a call for care without borders. This has to be universalised, humanised (making it part of humanity), make it an invisible law grounded in natural law, it has to be an end in itself, ie a duty (from the Kantian perspective). These variables can easily be infused into and translated to the various formulations of the Kantian categorical imperative. We now see the Kantian categorical imperative.

On the other hand Kant (2019) formulated the categorical imperative. The categorical imperative is a call for all to see all as one humanity and treat all as one would like to be treated. Treatment needed here is a treatment that shows care and appreciation of one humanity despite and irrespective of various diversities.

The categorical imperative has various formulae. We have the humanity formula. This calls on us to treat humanity as one. It calls on us to treat others as an end in themselves and not as means to any other end. It is stated thus: Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never merely as a means to an end, but always at the same time as an end. This calls for the respect and dignity of the human being. It calls for the respect of persons.

The other is the universal legislator formula. It is stated thus: Act only in accordance with a maxim that you can consistently will to become a universal law. This is a call for the universalisability of morals and good actions. This means that every action performed by one, one would accept such when performed by others on one. If an action is good one would want others to be doing such. This imperative calls on us to make laws in a way that we would be happy when such a law is applied on us or be applicable universally. We also have the Kingdom of ends formula. It is stated thus: Act as if you were a member of a kingdom of ends, where all rational beings are treated as ends in themselves. We are one humanity by virtue of possessing rationally. We also have an aspect of the kingdom of ends known as the Autonomy formula (often considered in consonance with the third formulation with Kingdom of ends). It is stated thus: Act in such a way that your will can regard itself at the same time as making universal law through its maxims. These frameworks are the pedestal on which this call for cosmopolitanism is based. They project and call for hospitality, one humanity, and tolerance. These are some of the variables that form the contours of cosmopolitanism. With these frameworks, it is believed that the cosmopolitan quest becomes fluid.

Cosmopolitanism and its Historical Antecedents

The idea of world citizen, world citizenship or cosmopolitanism is traceable to the Cynic Diogenes who argued that he is a citizen of the world thereby denying affiliation to any specific geographical or political territory. As was pointed out by Kleingeld (2014) Diogenes was the first philosopher

to give a perfectly explicit expression to world citizenship. This was around the fourth century BC. The stoics followed suite in the development of the idea of cosmopolitanism. Cicero also theorised about the world citizen arguing that human beings are global citizens bonded by reason and speech and these unite humans in a kind of fellowship.

Miller (2011) distinguished the Diogenes cosmopolitanism from that of Cicero. Cicero's world citizen is in union with extended humanity and remained more social than that of Diogenes which was individualistic thereby denying any social affiliations. He noted that Cicero's account involved concentric circles of human associations of close relations in a strict sense whereas that of Diogenes was freeing oneself from such concentric circles. He noted that Diogenes' position was very essential for his philosophical project. In essence the spirit of world citizen was more philosophical in Diogenes than it was in Cicero which was more political. This is one of the major distinguishing factors between the two figures. Miller further believed that Cicero's world citizen had concrete ethical implications. Thus from this ethical implication of world citizenship the essence is for the protection of humanity from harm. This I call the 'Cicero harm principle' hereinafter. It is for the purpose of global security. Here Cicero is almost pre-empting the need for world citizenship to take care of the crisis emanating from climate change which is already creating tensions. Thus there is need for a global citizenship of mankind. This will solve the problem of climate displaced persons who have become endangered. Thus Miller gave an example of the 'Cicero harm principle'; 'where there is plenty of water in the stream for all to drink, it would be wrong to deny another person his draught, just because he is not from such an area or any other reason. Thus one can decipher that one of the ulterior ethical motive of the Cicero world citizenship is the duty of aid - see Cicero (1991).

There have been other traces of cosmopolitanism in many writers and scholars. Dante, according to Kleingeld and Brown (2014) pleaded for a universal morality in his work *De Monarchia*. She also noted that Erasmus of Rotterdam, advocated for world citizenship, the unity of mankind, over the division into states and peoples which is geared towards a global peace. Hugo Grotius also called for a great society of states.

In contemporary period, cosmopolitanism was seen in the works of Hayek, Smith, Friedman, etc. in such ideologies as global capitalism, open market, international workers movement, etc. Majority of them here subscribe to economic cosmopolitanism. Contemporary views of cosmopolitanism especially in the 18th century indicate open-mindedness and impartiality. In also became a philosophical conviction and way of life re-echoing the cynics in Greek thought as in the case of Fougeret de Montbron. Later on a paradigm shift was observed when Kant emerged.

Having seen the historical development of world citizenship, it is now easier to glean at the Kantian version/perspective of it through the lens of the categorical imperative bearing in mind one aspect of the theoretical framework of this work. This is a sort of introduction to its application to the current climatic situation that humanity is seriously facing.

Cosmopolitanism and Kant's categorical imperative are pointing to the fact that humanity has an ethically moral responsibility to assist others and to ensure there is an atmosphere to ensure global peace and harmony since all are culprits of the global climate crises. The globe is interrelated and from a structure-functionalist perspective, any problem in any sector/part of the globe, from this

climatic situation, definitely affects other parts of the globe. This makes the clarion call a holistic and comprehensive approach where all are involved in finding and proffering the right and justifiable approach to the entire situation that would be fair to both victims and culprits. This is the medium of this cosmopolitan perspective. We need to go back to the drawing board to redesign a new world of citizenship. This demands a critical look at current understanding of sovereignty.

The Strategy of Sovereignty (and International Relations)

Here we take a look at the implications of sovereignty to the current crises of climate change. We probe into the issue of how long are we to stick to claims of territoriality and sovereignty in the current faces of territorial losses. Territory, being a major criterion for statehood/nationhood; with its disappearance or loss, does it then mean that the inhabitants no longer have a right to self-determination. If we stick to the old concept of sovereignty, there is bound to be global friction and political crises. Thus there is need to redefine and reconceptualise sovereignty in the face of climate displacement and loss of territories.

Here, this work critically looks at the issue of sovereignty as it relates to the problems of climate change. Is sovereignty a hindrance to addressing and resolving the issues and threats raised by climate change? Are we to still stick to the current concept of sovereignty in the face of serious barriers it poses to the remediation of damages, rights denials, abuses and threats to life, etc.? The same situation that played out which led to current debacle in climate change (especially carbon reduction) is again playing out but from a different perspective. Shouldn't this call for a redefinition and reconceptualisation of sovereignty?

The idea of sovereignty can abate or abet the unpleasant situations created by climate change. In view of this, we need to understand what is meant by sovereignty. We need also understand the relationship between sovereignty and statehood/nationhood. How does sovereignty influence international relations? What is its strategic nature and influence on the efforts to tackle climate change? With the current situation of loss of territories as a result of the impacts of climate change, should sovereignty be redefined, what alternatives do we proffer to the present challenges the concept of and practicalisation of sovereignty faces in the face of loss of territories. Thus the concept of sovereignty by way of its redefinition or reconceptualisation remains strategic in the international effort to take care of the irreversible impacts of climate change especially on territory (territorial losses), a substantial hallmark of sovereignty.

The issue of sovereignty in politics was arrived at as one of the solutions to the Hobbesian state of nature. It was to take care of one state's interference in another's territory as territory is one of the major prerequisites for sovereignty. It was also for the sake of protecting the weak from the strong - see the treaties of Westphalia 1648 and Utrecht in 1713. Primitive societies and pre-Westphalian societies were characterised with survival of the fittest and annexation. There were death of states and nations.

The treaty of Westphalia according to (see *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*) led to modern concept of sovereign states. Before the treaty there were various hegemonies in different parts of the world especially in Europe. They were equally competing for supremacy. Also the Catholic Church was equally seriously exerting its own influence. This was the situation till the peace of

Augsburg in 1555 which brought into existence the doctrine of *cuius regio eius religio*. This brought more crises in Europe for over 30 years and later led to the treaty of Westphalia in 1648 – see Tischer (2021).

With the Westphalia treaty states emerged with substantive constitutional powers. The Westphalia treaty ended the intervention of religion in politics.

Stratford et al (2013) had noted that the manner in which territory is understood in the terms set down in the treaty of Westphalia has translated poorly into many nations and regions, arguably because for the most marginalised sovereignty and territory are driven by the primacy of economic interests and not by non-economic rights or a conception, however broadly, of justice. They further argued that the present meanings of sovereignty and statehood are constrained by the legacy of the treaty and consequential instruments like the Montevideo convention on the rights and duties of the state.

Sovereignty according to Philpott (2004) is a supreme legitimate authority within a territory. It is a supreme authority within a territory which implies both undisputed supremacy over the land's inhabitants and independence from unwanted intervention by an outside authority. According to *Blacks Law Dictionary* (2013), sovereignty is the supreme absolute and uncontrollable power by which any independent nation/state is governed. According to Lee (2005) this definition has three interpretations. First, it implies that a state has right and power to regulate its internal affairs without external intervention. Second, each state's absolute control of its internal affairs is limited externally by the legal equality of all other states. Third, shared power/recognition of external power can only be by consensus between independent and sovereign nations.

According to the Government of Yukon (2005) sovereignty is a recognised right, ability and will to exercise exclusive jurisdiction within a geographical are (with a defined border, people within it and some form of government)

The current events of loss of territories by the impacts of climate change have brought serious challenges to the concept of sovereignty from the normative, political and legal perspectives. Among the challenges already identified include: territorial sovereignty and territorial integrity.

According to Lee (2005) territorial sovereignty means the freedom of each state to use its territory without any restrictions while territorial integrity is the right of each state to prohibit any impacts on its territory arising from the territory of another. He further noted that: the absolute claim of one state to use its territory freely is incompatible with the absolute claim of integrity of another state considering the transboundary impact of most activities on an industrial scale. He further noted that these two principles territorial sovereignty and territorial integrity virtually exclude each other. See also Litfin (1997)

Thus one nation's freedom to do whatever they wish within their territory is limited by its effect on another's territory. If the two are mutually inclusive, it then means that each nation can selfishly embark on activities that would benefit them and detriment other neighbours, since there is no physical trespass on territory.

Summarily, Lee (2005) would be saying that current perspectives and conceptions of sovereignty are conflict and crisis prone, especially in the face of current climate change impacts. Legislations at the international level which tend to prevent or restrict nations from any such activity that might detriment others have been seen as a challenge on such a nation's sovereignty. (This is seen as the Harmonic Doctrine – absolute territorial sovereignty) This is one of the major reasons why carbon emission restriction/reduction has failed globally. Thus sovereignty has a serious political and legal undertone. Thus in order to avoid such conflicts from the current idea of sovereignty, the concept of sovereignty has to be abandoned or redefined. This is a necessary sacrifice Lee (2005) observed.

However with current global problems emanating from climate change, as already seen above, sovereignty has been threatened. According to Dingman (2010) climate change could radically impact the already contested concept of sovereignty. There is need to assess sovereignty based on the novel problem emanating from climate change especially with climate displaced persons. He noted that such factors that are threatening the existence of many nations would affect the current definition of sovereignty.

Evidentially, territorial integrity has been the cause of major conflicts and wars across the globe. Currently we have cases of Russia-Ukraine, Israel-Palestine, Trump vs Canada/Mexico, etc. All these are territorial issues that can be easily taken care of by the cosmopolitan arrangement. Government and citizens would no longer be burdened by boarder or boundary issues. Both the Lockean criminal stranger and the fool's argument in the social contract would come to apply. We are citizens of the world, whatever that is wrong or good has no territorial limitations. We have to obey existing laws wherever we are of take the option of leaving. One major advantage of cosmopolitanism is the issue of security, especially terrorism. There would not be any more enemy territory to target. There would be global challenge on terrorism. Many government's sponsor terrorist attacks on other territories. This would be dislodged. There would be no known permanent enemy territory. Israel would not launch missiles attack on Palestine and likewise Palestine would not do same knowing there is no particular people on such targeted areas.

From the above, we can see that the current views on sovereignty need to be readdressed. This would redefine international relations and laws. According to Oxford Reference (2025) since human beings share the capacity for reasoning and by nature share common humanity and common universal community, this should not be limited by political boundaries of sovereignty. There has to be a shift from the global Westphalian system, it concluded.

Climate Change vs. International Relations

Does climate change imply any special burden on international relations? In what ways does climate change affect/impact on the relations among nations. Many believe that climate change has incurred different levels/degrees of responsibilities and obligations on some nations. To these we now turn.

Climate Change has brought about many problems for individuals and nations. Many nations have lost their territories. This was as a result of climate induced inundations. These climate induced inundations stem from various anthropogenic issues as gas flaring, carbon emissions, use of fossil fuels, etc. The most affected nations are Low-Lying Islands like Tuvalu and Kiribati. Many have to buy territories in other nations. Kiribati has gone into buying land in the Fiji – see UNDRR (2012). It was reported in *Smithsonian Magazine* that Kiribati bought a land around \$8.77 million

in the Island of Vanua Levu – see Griggs (2014). The government intends to relocate the nation and its citizens. Some individuals relocate by themselves. These can be said to be climate induced refugees. According to the Climate Adaptation Platform (2024) many small islands developing states are struggling against sea level rises. These are more experienced along the Pacific Islands. According to National Geographic (2024) Tuvalu is fighting to retain its territory. They have to look for another location that would allow them preserve their identity and culture. There are many endangered nations facing similar fates across the globe. There has to be global action and response to such situations. Sticking to Westphalian arrangement no longer suffices.

It has to be noted that majority of these threatened nations are not majorly and solely responsible for their predicaments. Majority of the developed nations that strongly cling to Westphalian arrangement are the major culprits. Thus looking at this situation from both the care ethics and categorical imperative perspectives, one sees the cogency for the call for cosmopolitanism.

It is no longer a matter of contention that climate change has brought many burdens on international relations. The ways these burdens/obligations are handled and approached have brought serious strains on the relations among nations at the international level. It has made existing international relations framework to show a big lacuna which if not adequately and promptly taken care of can cause more cracks in the relations among nations.

With the advancements in the destructive nature of climate change there seems to be a re-enactment of the pre-Westphalian societies of Hobbesian nature. According to Flawith (2011), alarm bells will soon begin to ring loudest when the states begin to feel the reality of climate change through territorial losses as a result of rising sea levels and other issues as inhabitability of certain areas. This his position is based on the fact as we have already seen above, that modern states derive their legitimacy from the claim to posses territory. When threatened by loss of territory, the face of international relations will change. Thus he was circumspect to observe that rising sea levels and inundations remain the direct assault on the claim to territory.

Here one remembers the case of Tuvalu, Kiribati and other cases.

In view of this, many powerful states now recognised globally are not even safe. The wrath of nature recognises not nor respects such issues. There is a necessary corollary between permanent population and territory in the criteria for statehood. Loss of territory definitely affects permanent population. Territory gives room for stable society or community.

Park (2011) pointed out that when nations are displaced or relocate, their protection now depends on the host country. The rights they will enjoy would be limited and only rely on those of the host country. The problem here is that since they are not de jure refugees the rights they will enjoy are those arbitrarily recognised or accorded them by the host country. This situation significantly affects the enjoyment of fundamental human rights. This has been aptly pointed out by many researches.

According to Willcox (2012) loss of territories will seriously undermine the enjoyment and realisation of many fundamental human rights and that of nations. It would challenge the recognition of nations as a state under international law as a major criterion has been lost. Thus he

noted would affect the rights to self-determination. Thus with loss of territories citizens rights can no longer be protected. Thus loss of territory may tantamount to loss of rights.

Many scholars believe that the current idea of sovereignty is a major hindrance to environmental justice and solutions to the impacts of climate change. For some it impedes environmental protection. (Example is the politics surrounding the restriction of emissions among leading industrial nation in the globe) This position is identified by Litfin (1997) as 'sovereignty-as-enemy' thesis. Thus he suggested that environmental responses to climate change necessarily leads to a reconfiguration of sovereignty. He argued that no fully sovereign state exists today for there is nothing like divisibility of environment, thus no absolute control again. However he was reluctant to admit that we can do away with the concept entirely.

Harris (2010) has argued strongly that Westphalian norms (of sovereignty) have stifled diplomacy and prevented policy innovations fundamentally ignoring the rights, responsibilities and duties of individuals. This situation, he believed is due to the fact that Westphalian norms of justice is communitarian in nature instead of cosmopolitan. Thus nations have few and limited duties of justice, responsibility towards other nations.

Economic Cost of Climate Change on Sovereignty

Climate change comes with serious economic hurdles which many nations may not scale through. This equally threatens their survival and existence in many ways especially loss of territories.

Standard & Poor (2015) believe that climate change has serious pernicious impacts on many societies. They observed that there are multiple channels through which climate change can affect the growth prospects of national economies and eventually levels of prosperity. According to them some of the most potent may be: changing patterns of rainfall which will adversely affect food and agriculture; productivity will be affected due to deplorable sanitary condition which will consequently affect mortality and morbidity rates; salinisation due to rising sea level; inundations that would affect infrastructures and loss of territories; dwindling taxes and revenues which will put undue pressure on budgets; and buying of territories as in the case of Kiribati and Tuvalu.

We can see that that the current conceptualisation of sovereignty remains a serious barrier towards any speedy resolution of the mounting crises generated by anthropogenic climate change. The current conceptualisation depicts strict and unrepentant clinging to communitarian and communal citizenship which is tenet-wise opposed to the cosmopolitan views being advocated. It is thus clear that such a conservative position remains unethical in the face of imminent death of nations and individuals who in most cases are not the major culprit of their various degrees and levels of predicaments. Life is larger than logic and semantics. Sovereignty has to be redefined. This would save a lot of avoidable disasters and future conflicts since a dying person would always cling to any straw till the last moments of life. Threatened nations and individuals can only be barred temporarily as the situation would definitely explode beyond the capacity of the defending nations at the borders. Influx of climate refugees would overburden the rejecting nations which may definitely leads us back to the state of nature. The earlier the situation is settled amicably through memoranda of understanding (a sort of cosmopolitan arrangement) at the global level, the better for the entire globe. From the purview of this work, one can see that the current conceptualisation

of sovereignty has been deficiented by the current negative impacts and events of anthropogenic climate change on many nations and territories. This has called for serious alternative global arrangement and conventions at the international levels. This was so pronounced in the work of Stratford et al (2012) where they noted that all legal and policy reforms addressing climate change emigration must be enriched by accounting for the emotional geographies that attend the changing real and conceptual borders of sovereignty and by creating alternative spaces of hope and action.

To put thought to practice, one needs to look critically at the expenses already being incurred by developed nations in protecting and policing their borders. This huge concentration of energy and finance has however been camouflaged or covered under the aegis of screening or preventing terrorists from entering into the territories. In most cases these are expended against 'illegal' migrants. 'Illegal' migrants here are people who are running for safety and seeking for survival against the scourge of climate change. This is a right to life and a right to survival and self determination. This thus nullifies the illegal perspective of such migrants from the ethical point of view). The law can be considered ethical and just which prevents a drowning person from rescuing oneself onshore.

With all these one can begin to see what Kant (2013) had already envisaged when he recommended cosmopolitanism for solutions to such global emerging issues as climate change. Kant's cosmopolitanism is a grand plan and design for world peace. The current climate change has created serious global conflicts and cosmopolitanism seems adequate to take care of the situation. Kant is not alone here. We have many budding and modern Kantian cosmopolitans. They include Thomas Pogge, Held and Beitz.

Pogge (2010) rejects the idea of sovereign territory from the point of view of property. Thus territoriality as part of the system of sovereignty is not welcome as it constitutes the major source of conflicts among nations in the quest for resource controls. He argued that present territorial borders are really problematic and has led to serious inequalities and disadvantages. Pogge was arguing for an international distributive justice system. Held (2004) had argued for the deterritorialisation of the globe. He rejected political claims to territory. For him territories were created illegitimately through initial political onslaughts by the west. Beitz (1999) saw territory as being rooted in property law. For him this is a barrier to international global distributive justice.

Evaluation and Conclusion

Cosmopolitanism is advocating for a common humanity and for a less regulated borders which would allow for the self-determination and fulfilment of peoples and individuals. Some have been moderate on such issues some are strictly in support of such a call.

Borders, territorial sovereignty were drawn or delineated or conceived when there was the least idea or apprehension of such threatening natural issues as loss of territories. Now that the reality of this loss of territories has dawned on humanity, there is need for the international community to readdress international relations and laws as it concerns the concept and frameworks of sovereignty. The status quo is threatened. There is need for a cosmopolitan consideration before the situation overtakes humanity.

Cosmopolitanism is not a highfalutin recommendation. It is a pragmatic approach and suggestion as part of efforts for everlasting global peace. It would have many salubrious effects across the globe.

The cosmopolitanism being recommended here is a moderate one that seeks open borders to citizens of nations or lost nations/territories. It is a cosmopolitanism of open borders which allows nations of similar climes of natural endowments, skills and lifestyles to assimilate or integrate without loss of skill for livelihood and survival. In essence it is a cosmopolitan solidarity (and hospitality) of like ecosystems. Thus people naturally endowed for life win a landlocked area may not see it as charitable to be relocated to water-locked areas.

Scholars like Pecoud and Guchteneire (2007) had argued for migration without borders whereby there will be free movement of peoples. They equally noted that there is as yet no international framework which has provided for that to take care of climate displaced persons. Their argument is based on the fact that with current trends such has become inevitable. Thus they believe that there has to be a critical rethinking of current global policies and practices regarding migration and territorial sovereignty. These have to be done from the ethical, human rights, economic and socio-cultural perspectives. Further, they pointed out that the Universal Declaration on Human Rights in its article 13-2 stated that ‘everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own and return to his country’ to them this declaration is limited in application and perspective. It only recognised the fundamental right to emigrate but not to immigrate. Thus the current quest is to ensure that there are more comprehensive frameworks to ensure the free movement of persons in a cosmopolitan manner. Weininger (1996) had already noted that there appears to be a fundamental contradiction between the notions that emigration is widely regarded as a matter of human rights while immigration is regarded as a matter of national sovereignty. This makes sovereignty a serious hindrance in the enjoyment of certain fundamental rights. This position had been earlier echoed and corroborated by Dowty (1987) when he pointed out that it is a logical absurdity to assert a right to emigration without a complimentary right of immigration. He thus implies that this torpedoes the ‘assumed’ fundamental nature of the right to emigrate. Thus the Universal Declaration on Human Rights is seriously faulted on this framework.

Many do remark that the law takes care of lacunae in moral issues. Here, we are seeing that ethics and morality is taking care of legal lacunae. They have to compliment each other.

Ghosh (2007) in view of the recent global events which border on sovereignty had pointed out that the concept of state sovereignty, as it emerged in Westphalia should not however be seen as a static one. He pointed out that already modern states have adjusted themselves in response to exigencies of forces and changes in the world society. Such factors as post-natural human rights, citizenship are having discernible impacts on traditional Westphalian states. Thus, with the current global crises generated by climate change there is serious need to chart for a new cosmopolitan framework. This has to be a political-ethical framework.

Thus, when it is argued that cosmopolitanism is not feasible and that it is mere philosophical badinage, the event of the time with respect to loss of territory and the attached means of livelihood and sustenance of live, one cannot but rethink it. For the philosophically circumspect, the restriction of borders is only a temporary measure which will fade out in no distant time. When untoward and unprecedented situations emerge there is need for reconceptualisation. The European Union has been forced to adopt an open borders within its regions. Very soon the globe

will follow suit and cosmopolitanism would be achieved whether moderately or entirely. Thus, as many have started observing, present attempts to close, restrict and monitor borders will no longer hold water in the near future. They will all become efforts in futility.

Linklater (1998) also talked about the need to widen the boundaries of moral and political communities necessary for shared mutual concerns. This has become a cogent global option.

In discussing the strategic relevance of this idea of cosmopolitanism and the cogency for its recommendation for the solution to myriads of global crises such as the current impacts of climate change, Willcox (2012) by way of recommendations pointed out the following:

Some of the ways to ensure successful cosmopolitanism is by developing a global normative framework that would regulate actions and relationships over the globe. There has to be also unique frameworks based on similar climate environment and societies. This would take care of migrations of people already conditioned by their original environmental backgrounds. This is more specifically with regards to loss of territories.

In recommending a normative framework, the ethics of care as opposed to traditional ethics of justice becomes the most appropriate. The traditional ethics of justice will continue to stick to territorial integrity which would continue to be detrimental to the idea behind cosmopolitanism. The ethics of care operates from the prism of one humanity that has the responsibility of seeing the welfare of others. The ethics of care ensures the avoidance of harm, inclusiveness, equal worth, active moral agency, etc. It is a call for global solidarity of care, a sort of the humanity formula of the categorical imperative. This calls humans to treat others with dignity and seeing them as ends in themselves and not as means. The framework should expand to incorporate basic human rights, respect of people as rational beings, human dignity, etc. The ethics of care emphasises universal human interconnectedness and interdependence. Cosmopolitanism equally focuses on global community of equal humans which is not territorially limited. This underscores the synergy between care ethics and cosmopolitanism.

There has to be a redefinition or relationship based on territorial integrity. Territorial integrity has to be deemphasised. It has been the source of crises and wars across the globe. Go to Israel-Palestinian relationships, one would see the havoc wrecked by the traditional ethics of justice emphasizing territorial integrity. Go to Russia-Ukraine relationships, we see the same thing equally. This would not be so where the ethics of care regulates international relations. The ethics of care has no boundaries once one humanity is acknowledged. The ethics of care operates on a universal level appreciating global human values and worth.

There is need for new global structures, new structure that would give room for the recognition and fulfilment of moral obligations of responsibility for all humanity.

There is also need to add across the curriculum, the programme and idea of 'learning to live together' – a strong pillar of education. This has been the call by UNESCO since the millennium. When we learn to live together, the cases of global crises and terrorism would be minimized. This is the bottom line for intercultural philosophy and education. These are some of the necessary conditions for global citizenship and cosmopolitanism. We are one humanity.

The globe is still challenged with the consequences of climate change. Many believe that the consequences are yet to escalate and spiral out of control. This may lead to anarchy if frameworks are not put on ground now. The same goes with cases of terrorism, the latest territorial crime across

the globe. There is need to rethink and relax the current conceptions of sovereignty and consider cosmopolitanism as a viable option out of the climate change conundrum.

REFERENCES

- Beitz, C. R. (1999). *Political Theory and International Relations*. Princeton University Press.
- Blacks Law Dictionary (2025). Sovereignty: Definitions and Citations. *Blacks Law Dictionary*. 2nd edition.
- Cicero, M. (1991). *On Duty*. M.T. Griffin and E.M. Atkins (eds). Cambridge university press.
- Climate Adaptation Platform (2024). *Small Islands Developing States Struggling Against Sea Level Rise*. Climate Adaptation Platform.
- Dingman, E. (2010). 'Does Climate Change Redefine Sovereignty?' Paper prepared for the Inuit studies conference.
- Dowty, A. (1987) *Closed borders: The Contemporary Assault on Freedom of Movement*. Yale University press.
- Farbotko and Lazarus (2012). The First Climate Refugees? Contesting Global Narratives of Climate Change in Tuvalu. *Global Environmental Change*. 22(2). 382-390.
- Flawith, R. (2011) Climate Change: A Crisis for State Sovereignty. *Climate Himalaya*. May 26, 2011 Available at: <http://chimalaya.org/2011/05/26/climate-change-a-crisis-for-state-sovereignty/>
- Ghosh, B. (2007). 'Managing Migration: Towards the Missing Regime? In A. Pecoud, and P. Guchteneire, (eds) *Migration Without Border: Essays on the Free Movement of Peoples*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Government of Yukon (2005) Developing a new Framework for Sovereignty and Security in the North. A discussion paper prepared by the government of Yukon.
- Griggs, M. B . (2014). Kiribati's Climate Change Plan B: Buy a New Island Home. *Smithsonian Magazine*.
- Harris, P.G. (2010). *World Ethics on Climate Change: Learning Guide*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Held, D. (2004). *A Globalizing World*. Routledge.
- Kant, I. (2013). 'Idea for a universal history from a cosmopolitan point of view. Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, I. (2019). *Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Oxford University Press.
- Kleingeld, P. and Brown, E, (2014) "Cosmopolitanism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2014 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/cosmopolitanism/>>.
- Lee, L. (2005). 'Sovereignty over, Ownership of, and Access to Natural Resources. *Environmental Laws and their Enforcement Vol. II* Encyclopaedia of life support systems –EOLSS).
- Linklater, A. (1998). *The Transformation of Political Community: Ethical Foundations of the Post-Westphalian era*. Polity press.
- Litfin, K.T. 'Sovereignty in World Ecopolitics'. *Mershon International Studies Review*, Vol.41 (1997) pp170-72
- Miller, D. (2011). 'The Idea of Global Citizenship. *Nuffield's Working Papers Series in Politics*.
- National Geographic (2024). *This Pacific Island Country is Disappearing. What Happens Next?* National Geographic.

- Oxford Reference. (2025). *Cosmopolitanism*. Oxford Reference.
- Park, S. (2011). *Climate Change and the Risk of Statelessness: The Situation of Low-Lying Island States*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
- Pecoud, A. & Guchteneire, P. (2007). *Migration Without border: Essays on the Free Movement of Peoples*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Philpott, D. (2004). 'Sovereignty: An Introduction and Brief History. *Journal of International Affairs*. 48 (2) 353-368.
- Pogge, T.W. (2010). *Cosmopolitanism and Sovereignty. The Cosmopolitan Reader*. 114-133. Polity Press.
- Standard and Poor (2015). *The Heat is on: How Climate Change can Impact Sovereignty Ratings*. Standard and Poor Global.
- Stratford, E., Farbotko, C. & Lazarus, H. (2013). Tuvalu, Sovereignty and Climate Change: Considering Feuna, the Archipelago and Emigration. *Island Studies Journal*. 8(1). 67-83
- Tischer, A. (2021). *Peace of Westphalia (1684)*. *Oxford Bibliographies*. doi:10.1093/OBO/9780199743292-0073.
- Tronto, J. (1994). *Moral Boundaries: A Political Argument for an Ethics of Care*. Psychology Press.
- UNDRR (2012). *Migration not a Matter of Choice but Survival, says Kiribati President*. UNDRR. Available at: undrr.org.
- Weiner, M. (1996). 'Ethics, National Sovereignty and the Control of Immigration. *International Migration Review*. Vol.30. No.1. 171-197.
- Willcox, S. (2012). 'A rRsing Tide: Implications of Climate Change Inundation for Human Rights and State Sovereignty. *Essex Human Rights Review*. Vol.9, No.1.