

FEMINISM AND COSMOPOLITANISM: SOME INEVITABLE CONNECTIONS

DIANA ELENA NEAGA*

Abstract

In this paper I will approach the issue of feminism and cosmopolitanism in order to give arguments in sustaining the fact that, today, feminism and cosmopolitanism are inevitable connected. In constructing my discourse I will begin by laying out the main ideas of cosmopolitanism, followed by a presentation of the construction of the feminist movement over time, inter-relating these two discourses at the end of the analysis.

Connected with political ethics, political theory and political philosophy, the theoretical framework selected for this paper is based on the cosmopolitan theory developed by scholars like Martha Nussbaum, Fiona Robinson and Kwame Anthony Appiah who, underlining universality, define cosmopolitanism as a universal concern with every human life and its well-being, but who are also giving value to the differences (seen as cultural or/ and of identity) insofar as they are not harmful to people.

Keywords: *Feminism, cosmopolitanism, differences, identity, ethics.*

Introduction

What are the connections, if they are, between feminism and cosmopolitanism – this is the main questions at which I try to give an answer in this paper. In order to achieve my goal I divided the paper in three parts. In the first one I present the way cosmopolitan discourse developed over time, but in the same time I try to give some practical answers to some critics that put the cosmopolitan theory in difficulty, critics related to the problem of identity and diversity. The main scholar the are guiding my arguments in this part are Martha Nussbaum, Fiona Robinson and Anthony Appiah. In the second part of the paper will be focused on the presentation of the successive stages that feminism went through in order to become the present movement, stressing along this presentation, the common elements between the feminist and the cosmopolitan construction. At the end of this paper I will underline how the *cosmopolitan discourse* which revolves around a few principles regarded as being fundamental is highly convergent with that promoted by the feminist movements. In order to do so I will answer to the questions: *How did the feminist movement evolve in time? What were the central and defining concepts of the three waves?* by using the main core of cosmopolitan principles - humanity, universality of the human rights, acknowledging, understanding and valorizing differences – and the metaphor of concentric circles developed by Martha Nussbaum.

The discourse of cosmopolitanism is revolves around some basic principles, among which: *humanity* which is a distinctive feature to all humans, the *universality of human rights* resulting from their very belonging to humanity, the awareness and understanding of the *differences*, principles by the means of which it aims at designing a truly inclusive and universal „human community”, namely encompassing all human individuals.

The philosophical origins of cosmopolitanism reside with the stoics, who claimed that the moral foundation of the human being consists in its very quality as member of the humanity, perceived as

* PhD Candidate, National School of Political Studies and Public Administration (NSPSPA) University, Bucharest, beneficiary of the project “Doctoral scholarships supporting research: Competitiveness, quality, and cooperation in the European Higher Education Area”, co-funded by the European Union through the European Social Fund, Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007-2013; (e-mail: diana_elena_neaga@yahoo.com).

being essentially rational¹. Diogenes the Cynic was the first one to refuse his membership with the local community by defining himself as a „citizen of the world”. Besides the stoics, another important contribution to the development of the cosmopolitist moral was Descartes', who assumed the task of reconstructing the entire philosophy on the basis of a mathematical model, applicable with the entire science, model that could mediate the transition from doubt to certainty. Therefore, by means of the „doubt method” he attempted to systematically deconstruct the contemporary accepted beliefs in order to gain access to the *essence*, namely to that which can no longer be subject to deconstruction, i.e. reason – „I think therefore I am”. Strongly influenced by the Cartesian philosophy, by the logic that there had to be a certain *a priori*, an undoubtable essence, the philosophy of Immanuel Kant is one of the sources on the grounds of which a model of universal ethic was later on developed, claiming as fundament the aforementioned “essence”, namely the very quality as a human being, especially by postulating the categorical imperative – “act only according to that maxim whereby you can, at the same time, will that it should become a universal law”, respectively „act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end and never merely as a means to an end.”² This universal ethic is guided by a fundamental principle claiming that any human being must be humanly treated, that is in keeping with an undeniable dignity hypostasized in a global attachment to a culture of non-violence and respect for life, to a just economical order, to tolerance, to a life led by truth and, last but not least, to the principle of equal rights³.

Alejandro Colas defines cosmopolitanism through the following three principles:

1. all individuals are members of a single moral community by virtue of their humanity;
2. therefore, they have reciprocal moral obligations that transcend the particular boundaries of ethnicity, nationality or of any other particular definition of identity;
3. these obligations require political involvement with respect to their enforcement⁴.

Easily discernible is the fact that the first two principles refer to the moral dimension of cosmopolitanism, while the third to its political one. These dimensions aroused strong debate with respect to the validity of this concept, more specifically to the possibility of transforming a moral vision into a political one. One of these critiques claim that a universalistic moral vision, once it has been transformed into a political vision, involves the great risk of imperialism and ethnocentrism, namely that of claiming that all, or at least part of “our” values are or should be shared by the “others”, the problem getting even more complicated once we try to find out what these values are.

These disputes bring to the forefront the problem of respecting diversity, looked upon as a solution both to these objections, as to the issue of the importance of the moral dimension promoted by cosmopolitanism with respect to identity construction. Therefore, as a way of avoiding the imperialistic or ethnocentric traps, the core of cosmopolitanism is fundamentally embedded with the *principle of respecting diversity*, concept which, I find, requires a few observations. The concept of diversity which I find to be related to cosmopolitanism implies the type of diversity that assumes not so much intrinsic valorization –diversity as a value in itself- as extrinsic valorization – that is valorization as a means of generating the kind of social emulation by the means of which

the citizens of the world can gain access to diversity as being empowering and not constraining⁵. At the same time, when I refer to diversity as a value in itself and to the instrumentality of diversity within a cosmopolitan construction, I do not necessarily mean to imply that lack of diversity would be negatively valued, but rather I attempt to avoid the use of diversity as a generative

¹ F. Dallmayr, *Cosmopolitanism. Moral and Political*, Sage Publication, *Political Theory* 2003; 31; 421, 23;

² A. Flew, *Dicționar de filosofie și logică*, (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1979), 193;

³ F. Dallmayr, *Cosmopolitanism. Moral and Political*, Sage Publication, *Political Theory* 2003, 6;

⁴ A. Colas, *Putting Cosmopolitanism into Practice: The Case of Socialist Internationalism*, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 23, no. 3, (1994), 513 – 534;

⁵ Diversity is valuable in the sense of becoming instrumental to the attainment of certain legitimate purposes within a cosmopolitan construction.

doctrine for certain forms of hierarchization unavoidably leading to various forms of moral exclusion, fact that would necessarily impinge on the cosmopolitan essence by the hierarchical categorization of the human beings. The same argument is also supported by the Frankfurt School, by the Habermasian tradition in particular, according to which universal inclusion presupposes a continuous dialogue between all the parties affected by a decision, dialogue which is grounded on the moral acknowledgement of the subjects resulting in their right to participate in the decision making⁶.

Differences and their acknowledgement are essential aspects of the discussion on constructing human identity. Although the cornerstone of cosmopolitanism is represented by the membership with the humanity, our quality as human beings remains only part of the complex identity puzzle, the mere *yarn of the fabric*. At the same time, identities can be not only dynamical, but also multiple depending on the contexts to which the individuals adhere, but these identities do not impinge on the cosmopolitan one, quite the opposite, they complete it without diluting it. Martha Nussbaum, one of the modern theorists of cosmopolitanism, stresses the fact that there is no conflict among the multiple identities, that is between the national, the ethnic, the religious and the cosmopolitan one, turning to the metaphor of the concentric circles in order to illustrate this idea of identity, in which context, the bigger circle obviously represents the membership with the universal human community⁷. This metaphor of the concentric circles is also assumed by Kwame Anthony Appiah when discussing cosmopolitan patriotism, presenting communities as small spheres within which individuals can perceive and at the same time bring into force their moral duties⁸.

These individuals become cosmopolitan by acknowledging, understanding, respecting and mediating the identity spheres of their interacting parties, thereby becoming “rooted cosmopolitans”⁹. “When identities are manifold, passions are divided and leave open the possibility of having particular loyalties and a universal moral concern at the same time”¹⁰.

As such, setting about with the acknowledgement of diversity we are, more or less unavoidably led to another essential concept for the cosmopolitan construction, namely that of identity, amply discussed by philosophers such as Nussbaum or O’Neill¹¹ who claim that precisely the kinds of identity, which are shaped within diversity, generate a complex set of interactions which sometimes can be conflictual in nature, but which are especially useful for creating a cosmopolitan perspective. There might be added the cosmopolitan interpretation of the well known Hegelian dialectic, in the sense that conflictual interactions among nations, ethnic groups, religions etc. are conducive to that type of *conflict* which could reveal in the end that something that unites us all, namely our capacity as human beings. This struggle for acknowledgement can therefore generate mutual understanding and respect by getting to know *the other*¹². A notable aspect is the fact that the shaping of the cosmopolitan citizen cannot be realized by the elimination of the process of knowing/understanding the other, therefore, dialectically speaking the synthesis necessarily presupposes both thesis and antithesis.

⁶ Fioana Robinson, *Cosmopolitan Ethics and Feminism in Global Politics*, *All Academic research*, accessed on 12.02.2011, http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/7/4/3/8/pages74386/p74386-1.php

⁷ Nussbaum M., *Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism*, *Boston Review, A Political and Literary Forum*, accessed in 12.02.2011 at <http://bostonreview.net/BR19.5/nussbaum.html>;

⁸ Kwame Anthony Appiah, *The Ethics of Identity*, (London: Princeton University Press, 2005) chapter 6, *Rooted Cosmopolitanism*;

⁹ *ibid.*, 232

¹⁰ Fioana Robinson, *Cosmopolitan Ethics and Feminism in Global Politics*, *All Academic research*, pp. 7, text accessed in 12.02.2011, http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/7/4/3/8/pages74386/p74386-1.php

¹¹ D. O’Neill, *Justice, Gender and International Boundaries*, *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Oct., 1990), 11;

¹² F. Dallmayr, *Cosmopolitanism. Moral and Political*, *Sage Publication, Political Theory* 2003, 2;

If someone wanted to sketch the generic portrait of a cosmopolitan citizen, the following features should be account for:

- continuous swinging between the local and the global spheres, with a definitive influence on the shaping of the global citizenship;
- respect for and acknowledgement of cultural diversity whenever possible, therefore the enactment of an interested diletantism;
- general intent and opening to cultural diversity, leaving open the possibility of rejecting certain principles this diversity implies;
- high mobility rate, as empowering factor ;
- perceiving the notion of “home” in an extremely diverse manner;
- critical attitude with respect to fixed boundaries.¹³

In short, cosmopolitanism requires a continuous swinging of the individuals along a central axis determined by their membership to humanity, by their capacity as human beings. Therefore, on one end of the axis there is humanity, the citizens of the world, *sifted* through many diversity and contextual filters, thereby generating, first groups of individuals¹⁴ (nations, ethnic and religious groups), then communities and, on the other end, the individual, whose identity is defined, according to Martha Nussbaum, by the small circle, namely that of the family. The essential link between the latter aspect and the cosmopolitan citizen is the humanity membership, but the individual, along its identity construction process, can just as well get to the other end of the axis, as he can stop along the way, at any intermediary point.

II

After this presentation of cosmopolitanism, I want to return to the main subject of this paper, namely cosmopolitan feminism. In what follows I aim at showing why today, as I was claiming in the beginning, feminism can only be seen as a cosmopolitan movement. In constructing the argument I will appeal to the *conceptual mechanism* involved with the construction of the cosmopolitan citizen which I have previously described.

I set about my argument, with a nutshell definition of feminism, followed by a presentation of the successive stages that feminism went through in order to become the present movement, stressing along this presentation, the common elements between the feminist and the cosmopolitan construction. As such, in short, feminism represents the movement for the women’s rights. As such, the substance of the feminist movements and theories can be traced back to the following minimal assumptions: a) women are the subjects of systematical oppression; b) gender relationship are neither natural nor immutable; c) they are unjust with respect to women and therefore political action is called upon for their amendment.¹⁵ Feminism is also defined as the belief that men and women are the equal heirs of the world and while most societies favor men as a group, the emergence of social movements promoting the idea of equality among men and women becomes unavoidable and legitimate¹⁶. However it would be false to assume that these are the definitions by which the first feminists operated, as would be equally false to imagine that these definitions, just as any others in fact, would have the capacity to convey the fierce unrests which generated them, or to exhaustively cover the concepts employed by feminism. These definitions are intended to raise interest for the realities behind the defined concept through a, so called, minimal effort shortcut.

¹³ K. Gunesch, Education for cosmopolitanism? Cosmopolitanism as a personal cultural identity model for and within international education, *Journal of Research in International Education* 2004; 3; 251, 16;

¹⁴ Individuals who are aware of the common interests.

¹⁵ M. Miroiu, O. Dragomir, *Lexicon feminist*, (Iasi: Polirom 2002), 121;

¹⁶ B. Winslow, Feminist Movements: Gender and Sexual Equality, in T. A. Meade, M. E. Wiesner-Hanks (ed), *A Companion to Gender History*, (London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004), 186;

Therefore, what lies behind the concept of feminism? Most authors, in explaining the emergence of feminism, take as landmark the Enlightenment discourse, the concept outspreading in Europe during the second half of the 19th century. The feminist movement initially manifested through the publication of a few isolated works¹⁷ in which the opinion according to which women are an inferior social category, a “minority”, was objected. But these works were the product of thousands of years of male dominance, during which women were denied the *privilege* of humanity¹⁸ and treated accordingly. Toma d’Aquino, one of the most important Christian philosophers, claimed that women are “defective men”, the source for this interpretation being The Old Testament, more specifically women’s birth out of Adam’s rib¹⁹. Several other sources of oppression are to be found in other religions as well. For example, the sacred Hindu text, The Law of Manu, classifies the Indian society according to castes and gender (“the woman is guarded by her father during childhood, by her man during her youth, she must never be allowed to act according to her will”²⁰), while Imam Nawawi claimed that the seduction of men is in the nature of women and that is why the prophet did not appreciate their company²¹.

The degree of oppression varies across societies²², but generally speaking, women were disadvantaged for being borne as such, disadvantages that generated, along millennia, various reactions. Initially those were isolated reactions, most of the times consisting in religious revolts. For example, Mohammed’s third wife, A’ishah created her own religious norms; in India, a group of women supported the *bhakti* movement objecting to one of the forms of the Hindu religion, demanding spiritual equality with men; in Europe, at the end of the 13th century, Guillemine of Bohemia created a women’s church by which means she contested the catholic norms²³. However, the origins of modern feminism can be traced back to the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, Marry Wollstonecraft’s *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* being one of the grounding works of feminism²⁴. In the same period, the feminist movement in the USA was grounded, event marked by the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848, the main demand of which involved the complete abolition of all gender based discrimination forms.

Generally speaking, most of the initial feminist demands revolved around what we call today First-wave feminism – that of *equality*. As previously mentioned, the First-wave feminism started with the identification and deprecation by a group of women of the injustices they were subject to. The debate originated with a certain type of society, the Western one – Great Britain and USA, with a certain intellectual context – the Enlightenment – sticking to this circumstance for a significant period of time. At the same time, the demands strictly involved equal rights²⁵ and their attainment is

¹⁷ Just as isolated was Diogene’s position when claiming he was rather a citizen of the world than of the local community;

¹⁸ They were denied membership to humanity;

¹⁹ Another source for women’s oppression also to be found with The Old Testament is the doctrine of the original sin, but I will not follow this path, as it doesn’t strictly concern the subject of this paper.

²⁰ I. Mihălcescu (trad.), *Lega lui Manu*, (Craiova: Chrater B.), 229;

²¹ B. Winslow, *Feminist Movements: Gender and Sexual Equality*, in T. A. Meade, M. E. Wiesner-Hanks (ed), *A Companion to Gender History*, (London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004), 188;

²² For example, in societies that venerated goddesses such as Astarte, the Summerian goddess Innana, the Greek Gaia; in Egypt, during the Old Kingdom, women were allowed to manifest within the public sphere, girls had equal inheritance rights with those of boys; in the Aztec civilization women had parallel but equivalent parental rights with those of men etc..

²³ B. Winslow, *Feminist Movements: Gender and Sexual Equality*, in T. A. Meade, M. E. Wiesner-Hanks (ed), *A Companion to Gender History*, (London: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004) 192;

²⁴ Among those who gave political coherence to the first wave feminist demands were John Stuart Mill, with his work *Subjection of Women* (1869) and his wife Harriett Taylor with her *Enfranchisement of women* (anonymously published).

²⁵ Women’s access to higher education, the secondary and high school education reform, the access of women to some professions from which they had been previously excluded (especially those related to medicine and law), the

still regarded by some theorists as sufficient correction of the injustices. At the same time, the First-wave feminism predilectly answered the needs of certain categories of women: *white, European, middle class*. The main point of this stage in the evolution of feminism was the attainment of rights for a specific category of women and was less responsive to issues concerning race, worker women and peasant women matters. Notwithstanding the fact that some of the voting right militants were also abolitionists, among which Elizabeth Candy Stanton, the former movement had a separate agenda from the latter²⁶. The women's rights movements in Asia and Middle East have assumed some of the Western principles, while at the same time opposing imperialism and strongly supporting nationalist, socialist and anti-colonialist movements.

Therefore, if we were to make an analysis of the origins of the feminist movement according to Martha Nussbaum's cosmopolitan model, we should place it somewhere close to the middle of the representation, where it is preponderantly characterized by a strong loyalty to a certain group of women belonging to a certain geographical region, ethnic group, social class or even religion.

Even if after a long period of feminist militantism, the demands of the First Wave became a reality for most women, its results were not quite those envisioned, in the sense that equal rights proved to be a necessary but not sufficient aspect of the elimination of gender inequalities, part because it became a rather formal equality and part because the application of such rights, that were originally conceived for a masculine model, on other groups (consisting of both men and women), characterized by very different needs could not have led to the desired results. Therefore the feminist discourse started to include a completely different concept as to the difference and diversity issue, concepts which were related to certain needs to which the new theoretical constructions should provide an answer, thereby widening the militants' view of the nature of rights and women's emancipation.

The starting point of the Second-Wave Feminism – that of difference and liberation – was marked by Simon de Beauvoir's *The Second Sex* (1949), in which the author attempts to find an explanation for the inefficiency of equal rights with respect to women's emancipation and reaching the conclusion that in order to benefit from such rights, women must become men. Simone de Beauvoir paves the way for the new manners of approaching the issue of women on the grounds of the concept of difference. In 1963 another capital work for the Second-Wave Feminism is published, i.e. Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique*, stressing the aspect of women's identity construction, that up to that point had always been considered as being closely and naturally linked to the private sphere and to family life. She objects to the mainstream thought of that time, in the view of which women can only perfect themselves by raising and caring for their children and, generally speaking, through activities strictly belonging to the private sphere. Thereby, the problem of equality through and in diversity, problem that includes, alongside equal rights issues, that of the gender specific differences, leading to the acknowledgement of the common interests based on common experiences.

During the same period and following the acknowledgement of the common interests, the concept of trans-racial women's solidarity gains strong support²⁷. As such, while, for example, the original feminist movement was ignorant as to the problems faced by coloured women, under the assumption of the preeminence of the racial criterium and, therefore, that coloured women would become fierce critics of white women and, followingly, reject feminism, dialectically Afro-american women contributed to the revival of the feminist movement during the 60's and the 70's, movements such as Black Woman's Liberation Committee of Student Non Violent Coordinating Committee, The Third World Women's Alliance, The Harlem-based Black Women Enraged and The Oakland Black Women Organizig for Action belonging to this period. Moreover, during this period the radical

acknowledgement of the property right for married women, legislation improvement with respect to divorce and child custody, as well as, the gradual extension of the right to vote (M. Miroiu, 2004, 22);

²⁶ M. Miroiu, *Drumul către autonomie*, (Iasi: Polirom, 2004), 21;

²⁷ M. Miroiu, *Drumul către autonomie*, (Iasi: Polirom, 2004), 24;

movement promoting an internationalist view and supporting the anti-colonialist and liberation movements from South Africa, Palestine, Mexico and Cuba emerged. The radical feminism in that period demanded a deconstruction of the gender based order, which was considered to be male-centered and a reconstruction convergent with the particular experiences of women, thereby militating for the construction of a distinct feminine culture.

Obviously, the Second Wave feminism is a feminism of contrasts, of swinging between the local and the global dimensions, between women and women groups, between race and gender, between national and international, between androcentric and ginocentric. By the same dialectical logic, just as with cosmopolitanism, we can notice how the struggle for the acknowledgement of women's rights (First Wave) led, first, to a better understanding of the interests of women, second to a better understanding of women's and men's interests (Second Wave). This knowledge and understanding led to the possibility of the internationalization of the women's movement by organizing conferences (World Conference on Women, Mexico City 1975), by the signing of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against women etc..

The internationalization of the movement coincided, not at all by accident, with the starting point of the Third-wave Feminism – that of *autonomy*, beginning in the 80's, that lays special emphasis on contextualization. This wave is generically characterized by the refusal of universalistic thought, accused of imperialism and ethnocentrism, and by the stressing of the importance of the plurality of women's experiences. The agenda of the Third Wave includes the acknowledgement of "pluralism, of the hybrid orientations, of the fact that opinions differ with context. [...] Feminism is an argument, an action directed to women that have to preponderantly direct themselves towards capacitation [...] a new political generation is born, in the context of which neither age, nor the old statal frameworks matter, but rather the relevance of the similar experiences[...]"²⁸. Therefore, pluralism and diversity are the values that oppose the imperialistic universalism, that could facilitate the empowerment of the individuals, of women, in this case. Boundaries become flexible and criticizable, a permanent interaction between the local and the global spheres takes place, interaction leading to the understanding of diversity as an empowerment generating mechanism. The change in the problems' approach strategy is very important, this consisting in the formulation of punctual solutions, coherent with a maximum degree of autonomy, the general purpose remaining however the same: the elimination of the oppression of women²⁹.

In short, thereof we speak of the First Wave as the struggle for the acknowledgement of women as persons, as moral subjects, realized through ensuring equal rights for men and women; the Second Wave mainly refers to the struggle against the imposition of the male model as rights landmark, to the discovery and valorization of the differences between men and women, to the internationalization of the movement, grounded on the acknowledgement of the common interests; the third wave, bringing forth a much more nuanced concept of difference, stressing the differences among women and the necessity of knowing, acknowledging and understanding womens' multiple identities.

Conclusions

At the beginning of this paper we were speaking of the fact that the *cosmopolitan discourse* revolves around a few principles which it regards as being fundamental and that, as I will hereafter attempt to prove, are highly convergent with those promoted by the feminist movements: *humanity, universality of the human rights, acknowledging, understanding and valorizing differences*.

²⁸ M. Miroiu, O. Dragomir, *Lexicon feminist*, (Iasi: Polirom, 2002), 143;

²⁹ Notwithstanding our acceptance or denial of the theory by which women have common interests resulting from their specific experiences – womanly and feminine- the feminist movement still revolves around the idea of oppression even if its deployment mechanisms became ever more subtle.

How did the feminist movement evolve in time? What were the central and defining concepts of the three waves? First, the First Wave stressed the importance of **acknowledging women as persons, as moral and as legal subjects**, militating, first and foremost, for the acknowledgement of their humanity and, on these grounds, for the universalization of the human rights. The universality of the human rights which resulted from the membership to the human community, brought forth **women's rights as human rights**, while at the same time underlining an aspect that had been previously neglected, namely the issue of the differences. This issue, that proved to be central with the Second-wave Feminism, determined and stimulated the theoretical constructions regarding the acknowledgement and understanding of the differences – **both between men and women, as among women**. Further on, the acknowledgement, understanding and valorization of the differences, involves a specific sensibility as to the **identity constructions** and to the **autonomy support**. As such, the Third Wave emerges, promoting principles by the means of which it seeks to shape a community which is truly inclusive, **as to both men and women**. – by taking into account, this time, the multiple differences among the individuals and **their valorization**.

As it can be seen, this entire edification of the feminist movement took place on two interconnected levels:

1. *the actual, pragmatic level*, related to the actual emancipation of women;
2. *the theoretical construction level* involving the consolidation of the feminist theory;

The two levels evolved in a permanent interconnection, their ultimate goal remaining that of promoting, as efficiently as possible, the rights of women and creating a just society. As such, the theoretical constructions have always had the same purpose, namely that of integrating women *as women* in a construction in which hierarchies are not determined by gender and in which humanity, involving equal respect for the dignity of women as human beings, is the fundament of any judgement of value. Therefore, we speak of ineluctable connections between the theoretical and the practical evolution of the feminist and cosmopolitan movements and perspectives. These connections consist, on the one side, in the stagial and, at the same time, non-exclusive³⁰ construction of both theories, on the other, in the assumption and promotion of the previously mentioned valorical core.

References:

- Andersen M., Thinking about Women: A Quarter Century's View, *Gender and Society*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (Aug., 2005);
- Appiah K. A., *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, (Norton, 2006);
- Appiah K. A., *The Ethics of Identity*, (London: Princeton University Press, 2005);
- Colas A., Putting Cosmopolitanism into Practice: The Case of Socialist Internationalism, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 23, no. 3, (1994), 513 – 534;
- Dallmayr F., Cosmopolitanism. Moral and Political, *Sage Publication, Political Theory* 2003, 31: 421-442;
- Flew A., *Philosophy and Logic Dictionary (Dicționar de filosofie și logică)*, (Bucharest: Humanitas, 1979);
- Gunesch K., Education for cosmopolitanism? Cosmopolitanism as a personal cultural identity model for and within international education, *Journal of Research in International Education* 2004; 3; 251;
- Hercus C., Identity, Emotion, and Feminist Collective Action, *Gender and Society*, Vol. 13, No. 1, Special Issue: Gender and Social Movements, Part 2 (Feb., 1999);
- Meade T. A., Wiesner-Hanks M. E. (ed), *A Companion to Gender History*, Blackwell Companions to History, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004;
- Mihălcescu (trad.), *Legea lui Manu*, ed. Chrater B, București;
- Miroiu M., Dragomir O., *Feminist Lexicon (Lexicon feminist)*, (Bucharest: Polirom, 2002);
- Miroiu M., *The Road to Autonomy (Drumul către autonomie)*, (Bucharest: Polirom, București 2004);

³⁰ Third-wave Feminism does not exclude First-wave Feminism, just as, in the case of cosmopolitanism, the familial loyalty does not exclude the loyalty to the global community.

-
- Nagar R., Lawson V., McDowell L., Hanson S., Locating Globalization: Feminist (Re)readings of the Subjects and Spaces of Globalization, *Economic Geography*, Vol. 78, No. 3 (Jul., 2002);
 - Nussbaum M., Capabilities and Social Justice, *International Studies Review*, Vol. 4, No. 2, International Relations and the New Inequality (Summer, 2002);
 - Nussbaum M., Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism, *Boston Review, A Political and Literary Forum*, accessed in 12.02.2011 at <http://bostonreview.net/BR19.5/nussbaum.html>;
 - Nussbaum M., Public Philosophy and International Feminism, *Ethics*, Vol. 108, No. 4 (Jul., 1998);
 - O'Neill D., Justice, Gender and International Boundaries, *British Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 20, No. 4 (Oct., 1990), pp. 439-459, Cambridge University Press;
 - Ossewaarde M., Cosmopolitanism and the Society of Strangers, *Sage publications, Current Sociology* 2007; 55; 367;
 - Robinson F., Cosmopolitan Ethics and Feminism in Global Politics, *All Academic research*, accessed at http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/0/7/4/3/8/pages74386/p74386-1.php;
 - Vallance Z., Women as Moral Beings, *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (Jan., 1902);