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**1. Summary of the Reading**

In this chapter the author deals with the organization of the world order and its transformation, which nowadays has a cosmopolitan character. According to her, cosmopolitanism aims at blurring and transcending the boundaries between states, unifying and organizing humanity according to given rules, thanks to which the differences between people will be blurred.

The chapter is thus primarily concerned with how cosmopolitanism designates and views the enemy. In particular, the author of the text criticizes cosmopolitanism's approach to the enemy because it views and defines the enemy as unjust and inhuman. According to the author, such a view has led to discriminatory wars that are much more destructive than the wars that were fought in the period after the Peace of Westphalia until the First World War. To support this argument, the author uses the arguments of Schmidt, who says that after the Peace of Westphalia, the great powers did fight wars, but these wars were mainly fought outside the European continent and were not aimed at annihilating their enemies. The enemy at this time Schmidt defines as justus hostis, which presumably means a just enemy who is respected and has the right to defend himself. It is precisely because the enemy is respected that it is possible to make peace with him.

This is not possible in today's world order, according to the author, because in a cosmopolitan world the enemy is seen as inhuman and therefore peace cannot be made with him. The only way a conflict such as the war on terror declared by the United States can end is through the total annihilation of the demonized enemy.

The author is therefore of the opinion that universal humanity is not a guaranteed path to a world without violence. It is not the effort to end wars that has led to greater humanization and reduction of wars, but on the contrary to their more violent and intense waging.

**2. Critical Analysis**

The strongest argument of this text, then, is that the enemy today is not seen as justus hostis (Righteous Enemy), but as an enemy who is inhuman and therefore impossible to make peace with. Because of this, it is impossible to rationalize war and humanize it, because the enemy is no longer considered human. Thus, according to Schmidt and the author, the devastating wars in the modern period are due to the universal humanity that is part of cosmopolitan thinking. The inability to draw clear lines and the attempt to remove these lines led to any other distinctions being taken as wrong because they did not correspond with the set universalism established primarily by Western states.

**3. Relation to the Main Reading**

This argument is related, for example, to the issue addressed by Judith Butler in that the US denies basic rights to captured terrorist fighters and denies them POW status. This corresponds to the modern concept of the enemy, who are not regarded as human beings and therefore there is no reason why these prisoners should be guaranteed human rights from the US perspective*.*