Please cite the Published Version

I Respond to Critics and Explain My Integrated Multiverses

Pierluigi Chiassoni, Oscar Pérez de la Fuente and Gabriel Encinas brought unique perspectives and critical analyses that significantly enrich the discourse around my book's central themes. To address their questions, comments and suggestions, I have structured this response into three main sections. I will start with an introduction briefly referencing each commentator's points, followed by dedicated responses to each of them, and conclude with a succinct explanation of how my works are integrated.

Firstly, Pierluigi Chiassoni's critique, titled *Two Proposals for Universal and Perpetual Peace: A Short Comparison*, provides a thoughtful analysis and offers a critical examination of the theoretical underpinnings and philosophical assumptions I present in the book. He raises concerns about my potential overemphasis on state sovereignty and its implications for cosmopolitanism, as well as the feasibility of my proposed legal framework. In the following sections, I will address Chiassoni's comments by elaborating on my project's integration of practical realism, interdisciplinary theoretical foundations and my nuanced consideration of pluralisms and evolving dynamics. Through this detailed response, I aim to clarify misunderstandings and demonstrate my project's relevance and adaptability in achieving universal and perpetual peace.

Oscar Pérez de la Fuente's critique, titled *On Territorial Disputes: Some Iusphilosophical Remarks*, brings a meticulous analysis of my monograph, focusing on key issues such as territorial disputes, the role of relativism in universal law and exclusive positivism in international relations. De la Fuente raises important questions about my practical application of self-determination, the consistency of relativism within a universal legal framework and my separation of law from morality. In the following sections, I will respond to his comments by elaborating on my project's balance between self-determination and territorial integrity, my pragmatic approach to minimal moral agreement and the theoretical and practical implications of exclusive positivism. Through this detailed response, I aim to address the complexities highlighted by de la Fuente and demonstrate my project's potential to navigate the intricate landscape of international law and politics.

Gabriel Encinas' critique presents an insightful evaluation, particularly focusing on my multidimensional approach. He explores how my project encompasses intersectionality and interlegality that enrich the theoretical and practical aspects of my framework. Encinas highlights my project's ability to address the complexities of global justice, legal and political

fragmentation and power asymmetries. In the following sections, I will respond to Encinas' comments by elaborating on my integration of multidimensionality, the practical implications of intersectionality and interlegality and my project's potential to foster more equitable and effective legal practices. Through this detailed response, I aim to demonstrate how my multidimensional approach enhances our understanding of legal reasoning and responds to the various challenges that international law and politics present.

Pierluigi Chiassoni, *Two Proposals for Universal and Perpetual Peace: A Short Comparison*

Chiassoni's critique suggests that I grant an unlimited and unconditional value to state sovereignty in my universal law project, potentially undermining the cosmopolitan component of my proposal. However, this misunderstands my stance. While I recognize the current political reality that states are unlikely to relinquish their sovereignty, I do not sanctify sovereignty unconditionally. Instead, I promote a coordinated approach where respect to state sovereignty is in conjunction with universal legal standards aimed at protecting human rights and addressing global issues.

The criticisms can be divided into four themes: a) Cosmopolitan protection and legal enforcement; b) Value pluralism and normative core; c) Comparison with global constitutionalism; and d) Ethical and pedagogical pacifism.

Firstly, Chiassoni's concern about my cosmopolitan component being illusory due to states' reluctance to accept limited sovereignty is valid. Nonetheless, I design my proposal of a global organization equipped with enforcement capabilities to address this very challenge. I aim for the establishment of such an organization to create an environment where states are held accountable to universal legal standards, thereby reducing the likelihood of human rights violations and other global scourges. Secondly, the critique pertaining to value pluralism and normative core highlights, in other words, the potential ideological drawback of my endorsing value pluralism and political realism. I do not intend to support any moral relativism but to create a legal framework that accommodates diverse values while maintaining fundamental principles of humanity, efficacy, simplicity, acceptability and balancing. I ensure through this approach that my universal law remains adaptable and inclusive, while still upholding essential human rights standards. Thirdly, the comparison with Ferrajoli's global constitutionalism project is insightful. While both projects aim for universal and perpetual peace, I emphasize a gradual and practical integration of state sovereignty with universal legal standards in my work.

Ferrajoli's proposal, on the other hand, advocates for a more radical rethinking of sovereignty and a direct transition to a global constitutional framework. I see merits and challenges in both approaches, and I believe they may indeed be complementary in striving towards global peace. Finally, Chiassoni suggests that my universal law project may lack an ethical or pedagogical dimension in promoting peace. While I primarily focus on creating a robust legal framework, I do not dismiss the importance of educating people about the value of peace. I believe legal structures and educational efforts must go hand in hand to foster a culture of peace and understanding. My universal law project can serve as a foundation upon which ethical and pedagogical initiatives can be built. In short, while I acknowledge the critiques and challenges highlighted in the text, I argue that my universal law project offers a viable and pragmatic approach to achieving global peace and addressing major global issues. By respecting state sovereignty within a coordinated legal framework and promoting universal legal standards, we can create a more just and peaceful world. I suggest that the complementary nature of my universal law and Ferrajoli's global constitutionalism projects indicate that a collaborative effort could yield the most effective results.

My universal law project is underpinned by my pragmatic understanding of the political realities that govern international relations. By acknowledging the persistence of state sovereignty and the current necessity of respecting it, my project considers the power dynamics and interests that shape state behavior. I ensure through this practical realism that my proposed legal framework is not merely idealistic but grounded in the real-world context in which it would operate. Therefore, to address, particularly the point about my project's feasibility compared to Ferrajoli's, I find it important to make clear that my project integrates law and realpolitik by including theoretical foundations and methodological and hermeneutical elements.

Theoretical Foundations

I draw upon a rich theoretical foundation that includes elements from legal and political sciences, as well as international relations. My work allows for a more comprehensive understanding of global issues and the complexities of state interactions through this interdisciplinary approach. I include here some of the key theories that inform my project: 1) Legal realism: I emphasize the importance of considering the practical effects of legal decisions and the influence of social, economic and political factors on law through this theory. By incorporating legal realism, I recognize that laws must be adaptable to the realities of the

international system; 2) Political realism: I focus on the role of power and national interest in international relations through this theory. I acknowledge that states act in their own interests and that any legal framework must accommodate these interests to be effective; 3) Cosmopolitanism: While my project respects state sovereignty, I also incorporate cosmopolitan principles that emphasize the rights and responsibilities of individuals as global citizens. I ensure through this dual focus that I address both state-level and individual-level concerns in my project. Furthermore, I go beyond sovereign states and individuals to include agents such as communities in my work. Therefore, I argue for a multi-agent focus.

Methodological Elements

I employ various methodologies to develop and implement my universal law project. Among others, my project includes: 1) Comparative legal analysis: By comparing different legal systems and principles, I identify commonalities and best practices that can be incorporated into my universal law framework. I ensure through this comparative approach that my proposed laws are inclusive and widely acceptable; 2) Empirical research: I rely on empirical data to identify the most pressing global issues and to evaluate the effectiveness of existing legal frameworks. My project helps design laws that are responsive to current challenges through this data-driven approach; 3) Scenario planning: By considering different future scenarios, I ensure that my proposed legal framework is robust and adaptable to changing circumstances. I enhance the feasibility of my project through this forward-looking approach.

Hermeneutical Elements

I also incorporate hermeneutical elements, which involve the interpretation and understanding of legal texts and principles as well as those pertaining to political science and international relations. By engaging in a hermeneutical analysis, I ensure that my universal law framework is not only legally sound but also culturally and contextually relevant. I allow for the reconciliation of diverse legal and political traditions and values through this interpretative approach, making my project more inclusive and acceptable to a broader range of stakeholders.

While I find Ferrajoli's global constitutionalism project ambitious and intellectually daring, I note that it is primarily based on legal considerations. I believe this focus might lead to an underestimation of the political and practical challenges involved in implementing a global constitutional framework. By contrast, I address political realities by arguing for a multidimensional approach that incorporates legal and extra-legal elements. By integrating realpolitik, I make my project more attuned to the interests and power dynamics that shape

state behavior. I increase the likelihood of state buy-in and compliance through this practical realism; by drawing on theories and methodologies from multiple disciplines, I equip my work better to address the complex, multifaceted nature of global issues; and, importantly, I recognize that any project (including mine) must complement legal solutions with political, social and economic measures. I ensure through this holistic approach that my project is not only legally sound but also practically effective. In other words, my universal law project brings together legal and realpolitik elements in a way that enhances its feasibility compared to Ferrajoli's primarily legalistic approach. By employing a multidimensional approach that encompasses multidisciplinary, empirical and interpretative methodology, I address both the legal and extra-legal dimensions of global issues in my work, creating a more robust and adaptable framework for achieving universal and perpetual peace. I make my multidimensional approach and the universal law project proposed in my work stand out by embracing a comprehensive and dynamic way to consider a variety of pluralisms, including agents, roles, contexts, realms and modes of existence. Unlike Ferrajoli's mainly legalistic approach, I ensure through this nuanced perspective that my project remains relevant and adaptable to the complexities of international relations and global governance.

For brevity, different from traditional approaches that primarily focus on states as the main actors in international law, I include a diverse array of agents. My project encompasses not only states but also individuals, communities and other agents. I acknowledge the multifaceted nature of global interactions and the importance of various stakeholders in shaping international norms and policies through this broader consideration. Moreover, by incorporating game theory and prospect theory, I illustrate how different agents can play various roles in their interrelations with one another. I provide a framework for understanding the strategic behaviors and decision-making processes of agents through these theories, taking into account their preferences, incentives and potential outcomes. I ensure through this analytical approach that my project is grounded in a realistic understanding of how agents operate within the international system. I also consider the diverse contexts and realms in which these agents operate. Therein, the project includes political, social, economic and cultural elements and features in the domestic, regional and international contexts, which I find crucial for understanding the intricacies of international relations. By addressing these varied contexts, I keep my universal law project sensitive to the specific circumstances and challenges faced by different agents, thus enhancing its applicability and effectiveness. In tune with this, I acknowledge different modes of existence, recognizing that agents may function in various

capacities and settings. For example, I note that individuals can be citizens, refugees or members of transnational communities, each with distinct roles, rights and obligations. I ensure through this recognition that my legal framework accommodates the diverse realities of global agents. Finally, and importantly, my project incorporates variables such as space and time, which I find critical for understanding the evolving dynamics of international relations. I involve, for example, the geographical distribution of agents and their interactions across borders in spatial considerations, while I address the changing nature of global issues over time as well as scholarly paradigms applicable to them that include among others: concepts, conceptions, assumptions, methodological and hermeneutical elements. By integrating these variables, I keep my project responsive to current realities and future developments both in theory and practice.

My work is particularly timely and always evolving because I acknowledge the realities of realpolitik. Currently, I see sovereign states as appearing to be the most central agents in the international system. I respect this reality in my project by highlighting the current situation regarding state sovereignty while also paving the way for the inclusion of other agents such as individuals and communities in the framework of international law and politics. By considering a variety of pluralisms and incorporating theories that elucidate the roles and interrelations of diverse agents, the project offers a robust and adaptable framework for addressing global challenges. I ensure through this multidimensional approach, characterized by my acknowledgment of a variety of pluralisms including agents, roles, contexts, realms and modes of existence, that this project is both practical and progressive, accommodating the current political landscape while promoting a more inclusive and cosmopolitan future.

In short, my universal law project is distinguished by its comprehensive and multifaceted approach. The inclusion of variables such as space and time further enhances its relevance, ensuring that the proposal remains timely and capable of evolving with the changing dynamics of international relations.

Oscar Pérez de la Fuente, *On Territorial Disputes. Some Iusphilosophical Remarks*

Oscar Pérez de la Fuente's critique of my work concerns the application of self-determination in territorial disputes, the role of relativism in universal law and my defense of exclusive positivism in international relations. Therein, I will clarify the theoretical foundations of my

arguments and demonstrate their practical relevance in the paragraphs that follow, while acknowledging the complexities and intricate nature inherent in these issues.

1. Territorial Disputes and the Right to Self-Determination

Pérez de la Fuente's critique of my approach to self-determination underscores the difficulties in applying this principle to real-world scenarios. He contends that my work may lack explicit criteria. However, I acknowledge these challenges by advocating for an approach where I consider self-determination a fundamental right yet apply it within the context of territorial integrity and sovereignty. My proposal respects the principles of international law and promotes decisions on a case-by-case basis through this approach, rather than suggesting a one-size-fits-all solution. By balancing the aspirations of peoples seeking self-determination with the current necessity of maintaining stable international borders, my framework addresses both concerns effectively.

I maintain that it is of utmost importance to understand the application of self-determination within a broader legal and political context. While I see self-determination as a fundamental right, my proposal cannot universally impose its application without considering the implications for territorial integrity and state sovereignty. I emphasize the importance of respecting international law principles, such as non-interference and the preservation of existing state boundaries, while also recognizing the legitimate aspirations of groups seeking self-determination. I find this balance crucial for maintaining international stability and preventing conflicts that could arise from unchecked secessionist movements.

To address Pérez de la Fuente's concern for explicit criteria, I explain that international law already provides mechanisms and principles for evaluating secessionist claims. For example, I note that the right to self-determination is enshrined in the United Nations Charter and various international covenants, but I also subject it to limitations that ensure its application does not undermine territorial integrity. However, I acknowledge the lack of a concept of self-determination stipulated in public international law and, therefore, this results in several hermeneutical problems including how we understand the following notions: dismemberment of territory, the right to determine political status and the concept of "people." I advocate for a contextual and pragmatic approach, where the assessment of each case is based on its unique circumstances, historical context and the potential impact on domestic and regional stability. Importantly, since there is no unequivocal and binding legal definition of self-determination, I

believe the concept of "who counts?"[1] should be clearly articulated. Once we determine the "who counts," it is possible to explore further questions such as "on what grounds" or according to what category of claim.[2] Finally, I note that different agents—e.g. communities that may have the right to self-determination—can move toward finding mutually beneficial solutions.

2. The Role of Relativism in Universal Law

Regarding the role of relativism in universal law, Pérez de la Fuente points out the potential inconsistency or paradox in my defending relativism while aiming for a universal legal framework. It is important to distinguish between absolutism and relativism to highlight the challenge of crafting laws that respect diverse cultural interpretations while maintaining a cohesive legal order. Whether I adopt a "believing relativist" positioning or not in my project, I argue that my minimal moral agreement is not about an exhaustive list of moral principles but about establishing a pragmatic baseline for international cooperation. I suggest that this baseline could include fundamental human rights or principles such as non-aggression that are broadly accepted across cultures. In that vein, I might see this approach as advocating for a pragmatic relativism where we minimally agree upon universal principles (like Rawls's overlapping consensus) for practical governance, rather than endorsing full relativism.

On the one hand, I suggest that the nature of relativism indicates that absolute clarity might be unattainable or even undesirable in a culturally diverse world. I advocate for a flexible framework where humanity might evolve minimal moral agreement through dialogue, treaties and international jurisprudence. My project allows for adaptability and responsiveness to changing global dynamics through this evolving agreement. I see the process of defining minimal moral agreements as inherently part of the legal practice itself, shaped, for example, by international bodies, scholars and state practices over time. Furthermore, I recognize through this perspective that international law is not static but continuously develops through interaction and consensus-building among diverse agents that include sovereign states, but I do not limit it to or by them. Indeed, I advocate for the incorporation of other agents such as individuals and communities. On the other hand, in terms of universal acceptance, I

---

[1] For the author's view on "who counts" in negotiations about territorial disputes and sovereignty conflicts see Jorge E. Núñez, *Sovereignty Conflicts and International Law and Politics: A Distributive Justice Issue* (London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2017), Chapter 6; and Jorge E. Núñez, *Territorial Disputes and State Sovereignty: International Law and Politics* (London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2020), Chapter 4.

[2] For details about different categories of claims relevant to territorial disputes see Jorge E. Núñez, *Territorial Disputes and State Sovereignty: International Law and Politics* (London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2020), Chapter 4.

acknowledge that while my project might never achieve full consensus, there are mechanisms like international conventions, customary international law and judicial decisions by bodies like the International Court of Justice that gradually forge a path toward acceptance. I note that the universal principles in question might not be accepted by all at once but grow through a process of legal and political evolution. I acknowledge different levels of commitment or interpretation by agents such as sovereign states through this process but aim at a convergence where practical governance may be achieved.

3. Exclusive Positivism in International Relations

Pérez de la Fuente's criticisms concerning perspectives of "circumstances of justice" and the internal point of view of law (as articulated by Hart, Rawls and Hume) challenge my take on legal positivism by arguing that morality plays an integral role in law's functionality and acceptance. In that vein, I see my exclusive positivism as an attempt to separate law from morality to understand law's structure and efficacy independently, which I find necessary for analyzing state behavior in international law. However, I note that critics like de la Fuente could rightly point out that this separation might not hold in practice since legal systems often require moral acceptance to function effectively. Therein, de la Fuente and others could think that I might be arguing for a theoretical model rather than a practical application, where I acknowledge moral considerations but do not make them foundational in defining what law is. I believe these points deserve more precision to avoid this kind of misunderstanding.

I do not preclude practical application in my argument for exclusive positivism; rather, I see it as a necessary step to understand law autonomously from morality to analyze how legal systems function without moral justification. I do not mean that I ignore moral considerations but rather that I do not make them the defining criterion for law's existence or validity. I aim to understand law autonomously from morality in my defense of exclusive positivism, analyzing legal systems' structure and efficacy independently. I acknowledge moral considerations in law's application but do not imply that law must be morally justified to exist. Instead, I focus through this approach on discerning how laws operate in reality, for example, where states may act based on legal obligations irrespective of moral alignment. This approach aids in legal analysis and diplomacy through the theoretical model proposed, providing strategies for compliance, enforcement and reform. More precisely, in practice, I note that international lawyers, diplomats and policymakers can work with existing legal frameworks, striving for moral improvements through legal amendments, treaties or custom, rather than starting from a

moral premise. I find law's efficacy often lies in its formal aspects, predictability and stability, which my proposal can then leverage to introduce or reinforce moral principles over time. By understanding law as a system that can function independently of moral justification, it is possible to gain a clearer perspective on its mechanisms and limitations. I allow for more effective engagement with the law through this understanding, identifying areas where humanity can introduce or strengthen moral considerations through legal processes.

Pérez de la Fuente's overall critique highlights the need for clarification in my approach to relativism and exclusive positivism in international law. I accept my project pushes the boundaries of traditional legal theory by confronting these paradoxes head-on, inviting further debate on how scholars and policymakers can or should understand law in an interconnected world where cultural relativism and legal positivism coexist. While some might see my theory as challenging practical governance, I argue it contributes to shaping future discussions on adapting international law to global diversity while maintaining some form of universal applicability. I acknowledge the interplay between theory and practice, where my project aids practical governance by providing a flexible framework that evolves with moral and political realities through theoretical clarity.

Ultimately, I aim to provoke intellectual discourse and encourage scholars to reconsider or refine existing legal theories in light of modern international complexities. While I may not resolve all paradoxes in my work, I add depth to the ongoing discourse on law, morality and international relations. By addressing these critical issues, I intend to contribute to the development of a more comprehensive and adaptable international legal framework that can effectively navigate the challenges posed by cultural diversity and global interdependence.

Gabriel Encinas

Gabriel Encinas provides a detailed critique of my book, *Cosmopolitanism, State Sovereignty and International Law and Politics: A Theory*, highlighting its significant contributions to the fields of cosmopolitanism and sovereignty. Encinas commends me for integrating the concept of multidimensionality, which challenges traditional isolated legal systems by emphasizing interrelations and pluralities. He appreciates my nuanced approach to law-applying operations, viewing law and adjudication as cultural objects. Encinas also underscores the importance of intersectionality and interlegality in my framework, which provide a comprehensive understanding of legal and political issues. He notes that my multidimensional approach offers

both theoretical depth and practical applications, addressing the complexities of global justice and promoting more inclusive and effective legal solutions. In a nutshell, I agree with Encinas. By integrating the notion of multidimensionality, my proposal effectively addresses various dimensions of jurisprudence and its methods. This approach allows for a more holistic understanding of legal and political issues, moving beyond simplistic and isolated perspectives. I will refer to these points in more detail.

1. Multidimensionality and Universal Law

I present the concept of multidimensionality in my work, challenging the traditional assumption of isolated legal and political issues. By emphasizing the interrelations and pluralities within and without the object or subject of study, my work provides a more comprehensive framework for understanding universal law. Indeed, as Encinas points out, this approach could align with Hart's distinction of law-making, law-identifying and law-applying operations, but I go further by considering the broader context and interconnectedness of legal practices.

2. Law-Applying Operations (Universal Application of Law)

According to Encinas, I transition from dialectical phenomenology into adjudication in my integrative methodology, highlighting the cultural nature of law and adjudication. By presenting these as cultural objects rather than ideal or metaphysical entities, according to him, my book emphasizes the importance of understanding the material and experiential aspects of legal reasoning. In that sense, my proposal may resonate with both semantic conceptions of norms and recent contributions to the analytic metaphysics of law through this perspective. As Encinas rightly highlights, my multidimensional approach, when applied to legal reasoning, can embrace two concepts: intersectionality and interlegality. To reply to these comments, I will refer only to Encinas' points about intersectionality and interlegality first in the next subsections and, thereafter, explain how we may incorporate them in my multidimensionality. However, I find it important to make clear that my multidimensionality goes beyond interlegality—i.e. I do not limit multidimensionality to law but acknowledge other normative systems like religion. Therefore, my multidimensionality incorporates internormativity.

A. Intersectionality: In short, by employing a vertices-like approach, intersectionality reveals how various sources of discrimination and disadvantage intersect and build upon each other. As Encinas notes, this concept, initially introduced by Kimberlé Crenshaw, has gained traction in legal scholarship and has been reinforced by UN-level reports and general recommendations. I find my plea for a cosmopolitanism that acknowledges, for example, factual and individual

differences crucial for ensuring that the underlying reasons and impacts on diverse groups are considered in legal and political decisions.

B. Interlegality: Interlegality challenges the one-jurisdiction-at-a-time perspective by emphasizing the relevance and interaction of multiple legal norms. I align this approach with my critique of tunnel vision in legal reasoning and highlight the importance of considering diverse legalities. By addressing intersections among individual diversities and interfaces among various legal frameworks, it is possible to better reflect the complex realities of global justice in my legal doctrines.

In this sense, Encinas captures the encompassing nature present in my work. I offer a transformative approach through my theory of multidimensionality that help integrate intersectionality and interlegality to provide a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of legal and political issues. For brevity, I explain how these concepts and my multidimensionality work and offer both theoretical depth and practical applications:

A. Multidimensionality and Intersectionality

Intersectionality focuses on how different forms of discrimination and disadvantage intersect and compound each other. I go beyond looking at individual sources of inequality in isolation, recognizing that these sources interact in complex ways. I acknowledge these intersections in my multidimensionality by considering multiple dimensions of, for example, identity, experience and context. Through my approach, I move away from unidimensional perspectives that oversimplify legal issues. This results in both theoretical and practical implications: a) Theoretical implications: By incorporating multidimensionality, I provide a more accurate and detailed analysis of how legal norms and policies impact diverse groups differently. I allow for a deeper theoretical understanding of justice, equality and human rights; and b) Practical applications: In practical terms, this approach can lead to more inclusive and effective legal solutions through my multidimensional because it integrates intersectionality. For example, multidimensionality can inform the creation of legal frameworks that better address the needs of marginalized communities by recognizing and addressing the compound effects of various forms of discrimination.

B. Multidimensionality and Interlegality

Interlegality involves the interaction and overlap of different legal systems and norms. It challenges the idea that legal reasoning should be confined to a single jurisdiction or legal

system. Interlegality is integrated in my multidimensionality by recognizing that legal issues often involve multiple overlapping legal norms and jurisdictions. I acknowledge the complexity and interconnectedness of legal systems through this approach. This results in theoretical and practical implications: a) Theoretical implications: By incorporating multidimensionality, I offer a richer theoretical framework that reflects the realities of globalization and transnational legal interactions. I challenge the tunnel vision of considering only the law of a single jurisdiction, promoting a more holistic view; and b) Practical applications: Practically, this approach can lead to more effective legal solutions in contexts such as international law, human rights and global governance. Multidimensionality allows for the consideration of various legal perspectives and the harmonization of conflicting norms, leading to more coherent and just outcomes.

By encompassing both intersectionality and interlegality—or, more precisely, internormativity, I provide a framework through my multidimensionality that is both inclusive and adaptive. I recognize the diversity of human experiences and the complexity of legal systems. And, more precisely, by incorporating internormativity, I also recognize the intricacy presented by different normative systems, not just law, in my multidimensionality. On the one hand, I allow for more in-depth theoretical analyses through this comprehensive view by considering multiple dimensions of identity, context and legal norms. I challenge reductive approaches and promote a more nuanced understanding of legal and political issues. On the other hand, in practice, my multidimensionality enables the development of legal solutions that are more responsive to the complexities of real-world issues. My approach facilitates the design of legal frameworks that address the interconnectedness of different forms of discrimination, the overlapping nature of legal systems and the diverse needs of affected communities. In other words, I offer a comprehensive approach through my theory of multidimensionality, by integrating intersectionality and interlegality—or, more precisely, internormativity—that enhances both theoretical and practical aspects of legal analysis. I move beyond traditional, siloed perspectives and provide a more holistic view that can address complex legal conundrums in ways that other theories and practitioners have struggled to achieve. My multidimensionality enriches our understanding of law and justice and paves the way for more equitable and effective legal practices.

3. Law-Identifying Operations (Universal Recognition of Law)

Encinas underlines that I highlight the constraints and limitations of isolated legal systems through my observation that each legal jurisdiction may offer a limited number of possible solutions. Encinas characterizes my theory as recognizing the need for a balance between maintaining the distinct identity of legal systems (classification) and allowing for integration of valuable external influences (qualification). Indeed, this dual approach could align with my broader concept of multidimensionality in law, where I consider multiple dimensions and perspectives to provide a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of legal and political issues. By combining classification and qualification, my approach offers a versatile framework that can adapt to various contexts and challenges in international law and politics. I underscore the importance of both internal coherence and external adaptability, ensuring that my project can respond effectively to the complexities of a globalized world through relevant legal systems.

Furthermore, by advocating for a multidimensional approach, I move beyond Kelsen's epistemological unity of national and international law, offering a more nuanced perspective that recognizes the coordinative function of universal law. This approach emphasizes the importance of role recognition at various levels and the analytical reconstruction of conflicting arguments and judgments.

4. Conclusion

Encinas has captured many of the hallmarks that constitute my work, those concerning multidimensionality. Encinas stresses that I propose a multidimensional approach that is a significant contribution to the literature on global justice. By moving beyond the confines of single systems or traditions, I provide a framework for addressing legal and political fragmentation, power asymmetries and methodological divisions. I can only be grateful for such a detailed account and analysis. In fact, Encinas includes examples and applications that go beyond the ones I use in the monograph. For example, interestingly, this means that my approach may be particularly relevant in the context of investor-state dispute settlement regimes and other global issues, where it can help integrate various legal rationales and ensure more equitable outcomes through a multidimensional perspective. I want to express my gratitude to Encinas for taking my work to pastures new.

My Integrated Multiverses

I extend my deepest gratitude to Pierluigi Chiassoni, Oscar Pérez de la Fuente and Gabriel Encinas for their dedication to my work. In summary, regardless of the individual comments, questions and suggestions, they agree that my proposal offers an original and groundbreaking perspective on cosmopolitanism, state sovereignty and international law and politics. By emphasizing the importance of multidimensionality in different ways, they all agree that, through my work, I provide a comprehensive framework for understanding the complex interplay of legal and political issues in a globalized world. This approach enriches our understanding of legal reasoning and has practical implications for addressing global justice and ensuring more inclusive and equitable legal practices in situations of crisis like territorial disputes and sovereignty conflicts. I am truly humbled. However, I must be more precise in this response. I see this monograph as one of a series of steps pertaining to territorial disputes and sovereignty conflicts in the hope of bringing together a body of theory and guidelines that favors cooperation over domination.

In the face of escalating global crises—such as territorial disputes, sovereignty conflicts and the erosion of human rights—the inadequacies of our current world order have never been more apparent. Traditional paradigms, rooted in unidimensional thinking, fail to grasp the intricate, interconnected nature of these challenges, leaving us ill-equipped to foster lasting peace or justice. My work confronts this reality head-on, arguing that without a fundamental shift toward more comprehensive, multidimensional approaches, we risk not only perpetuating but exacerbating these crises. The urgency of adopting new frameworks cannot be overstated; as global tensions rise, the window for meaningful change narrows, and the consequences of inaction grow ever more dire. Only by embracing complexity and pluralism can we hope to navigate the turbulent waters of our time and build a future grounded in cooperation rather than conflict.

I began the path with my 2017 work,[3] which presented sovereignty conflicts as a matter of ideal theory and, therefore, did not consider real case implications in detail. By bringing together historical and conceptual analyses, I focused in my 2017 work on disputes between two sovereign states (*de jure* and *de facto*) over the sovereignty of a populated non-sovereign third territory (e.g. Falkland/Malvinas Islands, Gibraltar, Kashmir) and argued for a hypothetical agreement to deal with them by suggesting principles that cannot be reasonably

---

[3] Jorge E. Núñez, *Sovereignty Conflicts and International Law and Politics: A Distributive Justice Issue* (London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2017).

refused. Thereafter, in my 2020 work,[4] I explored factual and theoretical, ideal and non-ideal features in ongoing territorial disputes and sovereignty conflicts around the world. Together with conceptual elements, I introduced many current case studies to compare and contrast some differences and find some common, arguably constant, features. Therein, while I offered an understanding of the dynamics of territorial disputes and sovereignty conflicts in my 2020 work, this also contributed to the literature on international law and politics by developing a more integrated approach to theory building. Having determined in theory and in fact the intricate nature of territorial disputes and sovereignty conflicts in my 2017 and 2020 works, I found it obvious that current disciplinary understandings in the legal and political sciences and international relations were inadequate to comprehend and assess their complex nature. Therein, in my 2023 work,[5] I introduced a novel theory and methodology. In contrast to the traditional unidimensional understandings applied by the legal and political sciences and international relations, I proposed what I call the multidimensional approach. I acknowledge through multidimensionality the complexities present in issues concerning cosmopolitanism and state sovereignty and their dynamics, e.g. territorial disputes and sovereignty conflicts. To gain a better understanding of this complexity and show how the multidimensional approach could work, I advanced and characterized the notion of "pluralism of pluralisms" and several variables—i.e., agents and players; contexts, realms, and modes of existence; dimensions; and time and space.

To bring more precision about how I integrate these works, I bring together my frameworks from *Sovereignty Conflicts and International Law and Politics: A Distributive Justice Issue* (2017), *Territorial Disputes and State Sovereignty: International Law and Politics* (2020), and *Cosmopolitanism, State Sovereignty and International Law and Politics: A Theory* (2023) using quantum entanglement to briefly explain my novel perspective in the final part of this response:

My Theoretical Frameworks

- **2017 Framework (Sovereignty Conflicts):** I introduce the "egalitarian shared sovereignty," proposing that humanity can resolve sovereignty conflicts by, for example, sharing authority rather than treating it as an all-or-nothing prize. Rooted in

[4] Jorge E. Núñez, *Territorial Disputes and State Sovereignty: International Law and Politics* (London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2020).
[5] Jorge E. Núñez, *Cosmopolitanism, State Sovereignty, International Law and Politics: A Theory* (London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2023).

distributive justice, I push against traditional exclusive sovereignty through this model, advocating for equitable arrangements that prioritize fairness among parties.

- **2020 Framework (Territorial Disputes and State Sovereignty):** I delve into territorial disputes worldwide, grounded in real case studies—like the Falkland/Malvinas Islands, the Israel-Palestine difference, Gibraltar, the South China Sea and Kashmir—and empirical data. I blend hermeneutics, legal analysis, political dynamics and historical context to show sovereignty as fluid, shaped by competing claims, and resolvable only through approaches that balance state, community and individual interests with domestic, regional and international realities.

- **2023 Framework (Cosmopolitanism and State Sovereignty):** I present the multidimensional approach and the notion of "pluralism of pluralisms," where I see sovereignty operating across several dimensions pertaining to agents (e.g. individuals, communities and sovereign states), that play different roles (i.e. hosts, participants, attendees and viewers) in different contexts (i.e. domestic, regional and international), viewed through different realms (e.g. rational, empirical and axiological) and encompassing different objects (i.e. ideal, natural, cultural and metaphysical). I argue that state sovereignty and cosmopolitan ideals—like global citizenship—can coexist, enhancing each other in a multidimensional system involving diverse agents, roles, contexts, realms and modes of existence.

Quantum Entanglement and Sovereignty

1. **Entangled Sovereignty:** I note that quantum entanglement, where particles are fundamentally linked, mirrors sovereignty in my frameworks. I reveal through my 2020 case studies how territorial claims entangle agents like states empirically, while I suggest through my 2017 shared sovereignty and 2023 cosmopolitanism that these links extend to rights, obligations, and domestic, regional and global norms. Therefore, I see a change in one state's sovereignty—for example, a territorial assertion—rippling through this system, affecting others in ways that demand interconnected solutions.

2. **Distributive Justice in a Quantum Context:** I note that in quantum mechanics, an entangled particle's state depends on its counterpart. Likewise, I tie justice for one agent to others through distributive justice (2017) and the empirical disputes of 2020. I show through the real-world data from 2020 that fairness in sovereignty—whether territorial

or shared—requires a holistic view, ensuring equity in one case (e.g. Kashmir) influences justice elsewhere.

3. **Multidimensional Sovereignty and Quantum Superposition:** I evoke quantum superposition through my 2023 multidimensionality and "pluralism of pluralisms," paired with 2020's empirically observed fluidity—where I can see sovereignty existing in multiple forms (e.g. exclusive, shared, territorial, cosmopolitan) until resolved. I illustrate this potential multiplicity through the 2020 case studies, like Gibraltar, suggesting disputes remain unresolved until they may result in a singular outcome through a "measurement" (e.g. egalitarian shared sovereignty).

4. **Cosmopolitanism as an Entangled State:** I cast sovereignty as an entangled state of sovereign state claims; community and individual interests, rights and obligations; and international law and politics through my 2023 cosmopolitan framework, enriched by 2020's real-world grounding. I show through empirical data disputes (2020) how territorial shifts impact global justice, while I offer a way to balance these entanglements through my 2017's shared model, fostering mutual responsibilities over isolated wins.

5. **Policy and Diplomacy in an Entangled World:** I argue that diplomacy could (and should) adopt a quantum-inspired lens, informed by my 2020's empirical insights into disputes, 2017's justice-driven sharing and 2023's pluralistic vision. I highlight through the real case studies how territorial moves—like in the Falkland/Malvinas Islands—affect broader systems, urging diplomats to anticipate resonances across this entangled network of sovereignty, rights and ethics.

In short, I suggest through my integrated multiverses that territorial disputes and sovereignty conflicts could transcend traditional approaches by embracing quantum-like complexity. I anchor this speculation in reality through my 2020 reliance on real case studies and empirical data, while I expand it theoretically and methodologically through 2017 and 2023. I might not merely divide or assert sovereignty in my solutions but seek balanced states that reflect the entangled interplay of territorial claims, human rights and global justice.