

Cambridge Journal of Education

EXECUTIVE EDITOR

Professor Nigel Norris, *University of East Anglia, UK*

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Dr Paul Andrews, *University of Cambridge, UK*

Dr Julia Flutter, *University of Cambridge, UK*

Dr Linda Hargreaves, *University of Cambridge, UK*

EDITORS

Dr Kristine Black-Hawkins, *University of Cambridge, UK*

Dr Nalini Boodhoo, *University of East Anglia, UK*

Dr Jo-Anne Dillabough, *University of Cambridge, UK*

Professor Terry Haydn, *University of East Anglia, UK*

Dr Esther Priyadharshini, *University of East Anglia, UK*

Professor Diane Reay, *University of Cambridge, UK*

MANAGING EDITOR

Anne Chippindale, *University of Cambridge, UK*

EDITORIAL PANEL

Dr Michael Bonnett, *University of Cambridge, UK*; Ms Gabrielle Cliff-Hodges, *University of Cambridge, UK*; Professor Benő Csapó, *University of Szeged, Hungary*; Professor Erik De Corte, *University of Leuven, Belgium*; Professor Sheelagh Drudy, *University College Dublin, Ireland*; Ms Mary Jane Drummond, *formerly University of Cambridge, UK*; Professor Jannette Elwood, *Queen's University Belfast, UK*; Professor Lani Florian, *University of Aberdeen, UK*; Dr Ellice Forman, *University of Pittsburgh, USA*; Professor John Furlong, *University of Oxford, UK*; Professor Gerald Grace, *University of London, UK*; Dr Hazel Hagger, *University of Oxford, UK*; Dr Frederick Hess, *American Enterprise Institute, USA*; Professor Wing-on Lee, *Hong Kong Institute of Education, Hong Kong*; Professor Selma Leitão, *Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Brazil*; Dr Anthony Loughland, *University of Sydney, Australia*; Professor Paul Morris, *University of London, UK*; Dr Ian Munday, *University of Stirling, UK*; Professor Pamela Munn, *University of Edinburgh, UK*; Professor Judy Sebba, *University of Sussex, UK*; Dr Linda Skrla, *Texas A&M University, USA*; Professor Roger Slee, *Institute of Education, University of London, UK*; Mr David Stevens, *University of Durham, UK*; Professor Morag Styles, *University of Cambridge, UK*; Professor Harry Torrance, *Manchester Metropolitan University, UK*; Professor Lieven Verschaffel, *University of Leuven, Belgium*; Mr Brian Wakeman, *formerly South Luton High School and Community College, UK*

Abstracting and indexing services

Cambridge Journal of Education is currently noted in: *Academic Search*; *British Education Index*; *Contents Pages in Education*; *EBSCO CD Rom Database*; *EBSCOhost EJS*; *Education Journal*; *Educational Administration Abstracts*; *Educational Research Abstracts online (ERA)*; *ERIC Clearinghouse on Social Studies/Social Science Education (ERIC/SSO)*; *European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH)*; *MLA International Bibliography*; *Psychological Abstracts*; *psycINFO*; *Research into Higher Education Abstracts* and *Sociological Abstracts*.

CONTENTS

Editorial

- Human rights and citizenship education: re-positioning the debate
Dina Kiwan 1

Articles

- Cosmopolitan democracy: a restatement
Daniele Archibugi 9

- Human rights, cosmopolitanism and utopias: implications for citizenship
education
Hugh Starkey 21

- Being human or being a citizen? Rethinking human rights and citizenship
education in the light of Agamben and Merleau-Ponty
Ruyu Hung 37

- Human rights and public education
Bill Bowring 53

- Human rights within education: assessing the justifications
Tristan McCowan 67

- Human rights education in Japan: an historical account, characteristics and
suggestions for a better-balanced approach
Sachiko Takeda 83

- Human rights, education for democratic citizenship and international
organisations: findings from a Kuwaiti UNESCO ASPnet school
Rania Al-Nakib 97

- Book reviews** 113

Cosmopolitan democracy: a restatement

Daniele Archibugi*

Italian National Research Council, Rome, Italy and Birkbeck College, University of London, London, UK

(Received 18 February 2011; final version received 8 December 2011)

Can democracy be expanded beyond borders? For many years, it was taken for granted that the norms and values of democracy could be applied within the boundaries of a state only. But over the last 20 years, it has been increasingly argued that democracy can also inform international organizations and global politics. This article recapitulates the foundations of cosmopolitan democracy, a project of normative political theory developed since the early 1990s. The article also explores the possibility of moving towards cosmopolitan democracy in specific domains such as: (1) the development of a global rule of law; (2) the direct participation of stake-holders in trans-border political decisions; and (3) the possibility of giving voice to citizens through a World Parliamentary Assembly. The paper finally explores how citizenship education can use cosmopolitan democracy and, at the same time, provides a model of it.

Keywords: globalization; democracy; cosmopolitanism; citizenship education; World Parliament; global rule of law

What is cosmopolitan democracy?

Cosmopolitan democracy is a project of normative political theory that attempts to apply some of the principles, values and procedures of democracy to the global political system. As a consequence of the fall of the Berlin Wall, democratic regimes have spread in the East and in the South. For the first time in history, elected governments administer the majority of the world population and, although not all these regimes are equally respectful of basic human rights, there is a significant pressure to achieve representative, accountable and lawful administration. Democracy has become, both in theory and in practice, the sole source of legitimate authority and power.

The victory of liberal states should have produced another equally important development: the expansion of democracy as a mode of global governance. But, unfortunately, the rules of the international system have changed little. Global political affairs continue to be dominated by *raison d'état*. Issues concerning war and security are still in the hands of national governments that, as in the past, take decisions autonomously. In spite of the increasing web of interactions among governmental and non-governmental players, the bulk of contemporary political choices are taken within states. And even if coordination in international decision-making is

*Email: daniele.archibugi@cnr.it

increasing, it is not subjected to democratic procedures but rather to the relative strengths and interests of the various players.

This state of facts generates a major contradiction: democracy is preached as the universally superior political system of the global age but globalization is not ruled according to democratic values. In addressing this issue, cosmopolitan democracy is an attempt to combine the important progress achieved in democratization within states with the need to apply also some of the principles of democracy in the international scene (Archibugi, 2008; Archibugi & Held, 1995; Archibugi, Held, & Koehler, 1998; Falk, 1995; Held, 1995; Marchetti, 2008). Cosmopolitan democracy is based on two assumptions. The first is the empirical observation that states are *de iure* sovereign but *de facto* non-autonomous (Held, 1995). Environmental threats, contagious diseases, trade, terrorism and migration make it more and more difficult for states to be truly independent. Each political community has to cope with phenomena that take place outside its territorial jurisdiction and for which it has no direct accountability and control. In these circumstances it is becoming increasingly difficult to preserve meaningful democratic decision-making within states. If the democratic principle of involvement and equality of all members affected by decision-making shall be preserved, the boundaries of political community should be re-thought. This, in turn, requires a rethinking of some of the basic principles of democratic practice and organization, which has so far been based upon the existence of territorially delimited communities, where the participation of individuals in the democratic procedure is disjunctive (the individual belongs to community A or community B, but not to both, and therefore can participate in the democratic process either of A or B).

Although globalization put states' democracies under stress, it also provides new opportunities that can be used also in political life. New information and communication technologies are opening the gates to a genuine global public sphere, and it has become technically feasible for communities living in remote parts of the world to take part in the same deliberative process. Such deliberations are already happening in elite circles such as professional associations, students' exchange programmes and epistemic communities. But they can also involve the global demos as a whole, especially when issues that affect the destiny of all humanity (such as environmental and security issues) are at stake.

The second assumption is that the foreign policy of democratic states is not more virtuous than those of non-democratic states. Even the most democratic states can be aggressive, selfish, and prepared to defend their vital interests by unlawful means. History provides large abundance of aggression wars perpetuated by democratic regimes as well as by despotic ones. The hypothesis according to which 'democracies do not fight each other' (the so-called peace among democracies) is widely debated in international relations (Doyle, 1983; Russett, 1993). According to this hypothesis, even if democracies are often war-prone, there have never been wars among consolidated democracies. Not everybody agrees with this fact (see for example my own critical reading of the evidence in Archibugi, 2011), but those that do agree also claim that if all states of the world were democratic, war may disappear. The normative implication is that to achieve the goal of peace it is necessary to induce internal democratization. Some policy-makers of democratic nations misunderstood the implications of this hypothesis and went so far as to wage war against despotic regimes with the aim of forcing a regime change and inducing these countries to become democratic.

Cosmopolitan democracy has an opposite approach: although it shares the desire to increase both the quantity of democratic states and the quality of their democratic procedures, it does not assume that the goal of peace can be achieved acting on the internal constitution of individual states only. Moreover, it argues that 'exporting' democracy through war is contradicting the very nature of the democratic process since this requires to be built from below and not from above. For these reasons, cosmopolitan democracy suggests that an international system based on co-operation and dialogue is a fundamental condition to foster democratic progresses inside individual countries and also to allow peoples living under dictatorship to change endogenously their own regime. While the 'peace among democracies' hypothesis tends to stress the causal link from internal democracy to international peace, cosmopolitan democracy points out at another equally important link: from international peace and co-operation to internal democracy.

To encourage the adoption of a more just and fair foreign policy and to increase the number of democratic states is certainly important. But something more is needed to safeguard the basic democratic principles of equality and participation, namely the willingness of states to undertake agreements respectful of the rule of law and of the procedures of democracy among states. These agreements sometimes involve states, as in the case of international organizations, but in more audacious circumstances might and should also involve individuals, allowing them to be at the same time citizens of a state and citizens of the world (Heater, 2002).

For this reason, cosmopolitan democracy does not believe that the proposal of a League of Democracies, namely an international organization whose membership should be restricted to elected governments only, is very helpful. A League of Democracies will be another inter-governmental body which would not necessarily give voice to individuals. Rather than encouraging peoples living in autocratic states to demand a regime change in their own countries, it might have the effect of isolating them from the global society, making it more difficult to induce them to embrace and to fight for the democratic faith.

Genealogy and definition of the terms

Cosmopolitan democracy can be seen as a modern revival of some peace theories. In particular, it is an attempt to refine and apply in the current political landscape some of the insights of institutional pacifism. Peace can be achieved through a variety of methods and one of them is strengthening international norms, covenants and organizations (see Bobbio, 1984). Several peace projects of the past, including those of Émeric Crucé, William Penn, the Abbé of Saint-Pierre, Jeremy Bentham, Immanuel Kant, and Claude-Henri de Saint-Simon, already designed international organizations with the function to sort out conflicts through peaceful means rather than through war. This body of thought had a crucial role in the creation of modern international organizations, including the League of Nations, the United Nations (UN) and the European Union (see Archibugi, 1992). It is today possible to reform these international organizations to accommodate a direct political role to citizens. While traditional peace theories somehow delegated to governments the task to find agreements for international co-operation, cosmopolitan democracy focuses on the role of citizens who should be empowered in order to exercise their rights and duties, not just in their nations, but also in the political communities which affect their lives.

'Cosmopolitan democracy' might appear to be a strange combination of words. Both words were commonly used in classical Athens and originate from the Greek *cosmos* + *polis* and *demos* + *kratos*. However, while *cosmopolis* (literally, the city of the universe) was used to describe an ideal condition, *democracy* (the power of the many) was employed for very practical purposes, i.e. the everyday management of public affairs. Only selected elites could afford to be cosmopolitan, while on the contrary every adult free man belonged to the *demos*. But circumstances have dramatically changed, and globalization provides the material conditions that could allow the expansion of the principles and procedures of democracy at the global level.

Other similar terms have been introduced in the literature. Democracy has been qualified as post-national (Habermas, 2001) to designate the development of forms of political organization different from state-centred traditional ones; transnational (Dryzek, 2006) to describe connections across non-governmental organizations and sub-state political units; or global (Archibugi, Koenig-Archibugi, & Marchetti, 2011; Patomaki & Teivainen, 2004) to denote the need to democratize global governance. Cosmopolitan democracy is also closely linked to world federalism (see Levi, 2008), but it is less inclined to support concentration of coercive means in the hands of a central authority.

We have preferred to label this project *cosmopolitan*, rather than *global*, democracy because its aims are not addressed to problems that affect every world citizens only. The democratization of global governance is certainly one of the main objectives of cosmopolitan democracy, but it is not the only one (for a collection of essays on the *global* component, see Archibugi et al., 2011). The term 'cosmopolitan democracy' thus aims to incorporate changes not just at the global level but also at the local, national, transnational and regional levels. At each of these levels of governance there are actions that can be taken in order to apply the values and norms of democracy.

The programme of cosmopolitan democracy is based on a partisan vision of democracy. While there are a variety of competing models of democracy (see Held, 2006), the preferred understanding of democracy is of a collective procedure that works not only at the state level, but also in other institutions including political parties, local governments, companies and international organizations. As a collective procedure, the common understanding of democracy can be summarized in three core concepts: the acceptance of the principle of nonviolence among the various factions or political parties, political equality among the members of the community, and popular control over decisions and decision-makers.¹ These three principles are not unique to democracy at the state level, but may also be applied to institutions below and above the state as well as to the private sector.

Levels of democratic governance

While there are many overlaps in the use of the various terms, cosmopolitan democracy is best conceptualized as different, linked levels of governance: local, state-wide, inter-state, regional, and global.

The local dimension

Local networks are often active on the global level. On the one hand, local communities may already experience a multi-cultural dimension associated to the co-presence of different ethnic groups or of flows of migrants. On the other hand, there

are issues pertinent to local communities that belong to more than a single state. States seldom devolve competencies on specific issues to inter-local institutions and relevant actors are often forced to extend their activities beyond their assigned jurisdictions. As a result, more and more organizations – governmental and non-governmental – are being created that connect communities and local bodies not necessarily in the same state. Cosmopolitan democracy implies, therefore, the strengthening of the structure of local government when this entails crossing state borders.

The state dimension

Democratic states could be as much a laboratory as an agent of cosmopolitan democracy. For example, states today are called upon to grant rights to individuals – such as refugees and immigrants – who traditionally have been denied these rights. Yet democratic states face the dilemma as to whom they should regard as citizens: those who are born in a specific democratic community? Those who live in it and pay taxes? Or those who would simply like to be citizens of the community? Each state could already be a champion of cosmopolitanism by granting some rights also to individuals coming from different communities (for the idea of cosmopolitan states, see Brown, 2011). A test of cosmopolitanism is today the way in which each community treats immigrants. Some states are more willing and better equipped to accommodate them and to provide specific rights or even to grant citizenship (see Benhabib, 2006).

The inter-state dimension

The existence of inter-governmental organizations (IGOs) – for example, the UN or the European Union, is an indicator of states' willingness to extend to the inter-state level certain democratic principles such as: formal equality between member states, public accountability and the rule of law. At the same time, however, it is an expression of the difficulties involved in achieving this (see Dahl, 1999). Are IGOs democratic institutions? And, if not, could they ever become so? Most IGOs are founded on the formal equality of their member states; this, in turn, guarantees each state the right to one vote irrespective of the size of its population and their involvement in decision-making, or of its level of political and military power. As a consequence, in the UN General Assembly, a myriad of small states whose population comprise just 5% of the world total have the majority of votes. However, it would not be an improvement to endow the Assembly's majority to just six large states (China, India, United States, Indonesia, Brazil and Russia), even if they represent more than half the world's population. IGOs are a typical case indicating that the majority principle should be reformulated to guarantee a fair democratic process.

The regional dimension

In many cases governance might be most appropriately conducted at the regional level. The most striking historical example of this is Europe, where slowly, and more or less continuously, a political system has developed which is capable not only of strengthening itself, but also of increasing the level of democracy within its

member states. The European Union is distinguished from any other regional organization by the presence of a parliament elected through universal suffrage, and by the success it had in enlarging the association from the first six to the current 27. Even within this region of solely democratic states, it is difficult to bridge democratic deficits. The demos may have very different views from the elites that have so far driven the political integration of the old continent. The recent referendums in France, the Netherlands and Ireland have bitterly shown that the demos at large is not necessarily favouring integration. But not even these referendums have stopped integration in Europe. Elsewhere, regional organizations have also increased and intensified their functions, with a particular focus on trading agreements. It has to be seen if, when and how these regional agreements will evolve in political terms through the creation of accountable and representative institutions.

The global dimension

For the past decade or so, non-state subjects have made their voices heard at various UN summits, as well as within such agencies as the International Monetary Fund and World Trade Organization; this has given rise to the growing demand that international organizations should become increasingly representative and accountable to global public opinion. Non-governmental organizations have no decision-making powers to date, and their role has been mostly of advocacy. But a level of governance that goes beyond the state's sphere of action is nevertheless gradually emerging. The UN and other international organizations, in spite of their inter-governmental character, have started to open their doors to non-governmental players. The call for global governance is strong in many areas: financial flows, immigration, environmental concerns, human rights, development aid (Koenig-Archibugi, 2002). Initiatives and campaigns pushing for greater accountability and democratization are active with regard to each of these. If the existing international organizations continue to open their doors to this infant global civil society, the first seeds of democratic governance at the global level will be planted, and they will likely grow.

The relations between the levels of governance

As both the levels and institutions of governance are increasing, the question that arises is: how can the various competencies be shared among these different bodies? Would the existence of institutions endowed with overlapping competencies give rise to new conflicts? The key concept is sovereignty, the foundation of the international legal system. Cosmopolitan democracy belongs to that school of thought that has regarded sovereignty as a dogma to be overcome. The assumption that a political or institutional subject should be exempted from responsibility for its actions is incompatible with the essence of democracy. Each political actor, whether a tyrant or a 'sovereign' people, must come to terms with other actors when competencies overlap. Cosmopolitan democracy shares the view that the concept of sovereignty should be replaced, within and between states, with that of constitutionalism. Conflicts over competence that arise as a result of the different levels of governance must be solved within the domain of a global constitutionalism and referred to jurisdictional bodies. These, in turn, must be based on an explicit constitutional mandate. To imagine that conflicts can be solved on a global level by constitutional and juridical procedures, rather than by force, is visionary. But it rests on the

assumption that norms can be respected even in the absence of a coercive power of last resort. The project of cosmopolitan democracy is thus identified with a much broader ambition: that of turning international politics from the realm of *antagonism* into the realm of *agonism*, that is, preserving conflicts but also allowing them to be addressed in a non-violent and dialogic manner.

The roads to cosmopolitan democracy

The project here summarized is certainly very ambitious. But the ambitions of the project should not hide that its politics is rooted in daily campaigns, and that there are a number of small and progressive targets that can be achieved. There is a wealth of campaigns for the progressive transformation of international affairs which somehow need to be associated with a vision of a desirable new world order and the principal aim of cosmopolitan democracy is just to provide a framework in which these campaigns could be located. Three specific lines of actions will be reviewed below: the rule of law, the participation of stake-holders and the possibility of achieving global representation through a World Parliament.

Rule of law

The rule of law is an essential condition of any democratic system. Within the cosmopolitan democracy framework, the rule of law does not necessarily imply the creation of a coercive supra-national power. In fact, several international organizations, including the European Union and the UN, already have complex legal norms and an embryonic judicial power. The decisions of this judicial power are often ignored and this is hardly surprising given the lack of a coercive power. Nevertheless, if international norms and jurisdiction become more sophisticated, it will be increasingly difficult for governments to ignore them.

Over the last decade, the desire to reinforce a global rule of law has mostly focused on international criminal law. The creation of several *ad hoc* international courts and, above all, the foundation of the International Criminal Court (ICC) have generated new hopes to hold politicians accountable for their actions. Indeed, the ICC is the most significant institutional innovation introduced in the last 20 years. Much should still be done in order to make the Court fully operative, and to induce all countries to accept its jurisdiction. But it is already possible to assess its first few years of activities. So far, the ICC has mostly acted on African suspected culprits, and on insurgents fighting against, and denounced by, incumbent governments (the case opened against the Sudanese President Omar al-Bashir is a significant exception). All investigations so far undertaken are well documented, but the coverage is too selective. There is the danger that the ICC will be perceived as an instrument of incumbent governments against rebels and another burden of the white man over the black man. Those who hoped that the ICC could also be an instrument in defence of the weaker actors against the most powerful ones have so far been disappointed (see Glasius, 2009). There is therefore the need to balance the action of the Court to cover also cases in which the crimes are committed by Western individuals and powers.

The interest for the ICC has somehow darkened an equally important aspect, namely the need to address inter-state controversies through legal instruments. The International Court of Justice (ICJ), the body delegated to address these

controversies, is highly under-used mostly because its activation is possible only when both parties in a dispute are willing to accept its own jurisdiction. Unfortunately, this happens very seldom and for insignificant controversies. If we read the sentences and the opinions provided by the Court, we will have a very unfaithful description of the major events of world politics since 1946. The Vietnam war, the invasions of Hungary and Czechoslovakia, the Iraq war, the legitimacy of nuclear weapons and many other key historical events have not received any attention from the Court for the very simple reason that states were not willing to submit the case to its judgement.

A major expansion of the global rule of law will require empowering the ICJ with compulsory jurisdiction (see Falk, 1998). In such a case, the Court will no longer act as a 'referee' among two states, but as a proper Tribunal. This does not necessarily imply that the ICJ will have the power to enforce its own sentences. But even in the absence of enforcement, a sentence denouncing the behaviour of some states will have an important impact on international relations.

The role of stake-holders

Decision-making is not necessarily based on territorial communities. As argued above, there are an increasing number of areas in which political problems are non-territorial or involve stake-holders in very different capacities. Human communities may need to have political participation because they speak the same language in different continents, they have similar health problems or share similar values (see Gould, 2004). The idea that becoming a sovereign territorial state is the only option for these groups of peoples to apply democratic values and norms is baroque. Different forms of political representation could be tried (see Dryzek, 2006; Macdonald, 2008), allowing these communities to benefit from democratic procedures.

The number of transnational actors that are in charge of specific domains is increasing as are the number of administrative bodies involving both public and business members. Transnational movements for social justice have already experimented ways to link subjects across borders.

The rise of new players claiming political legitimacy leads to the question: who are the stake-holders? For good and for bad, the organization of political communities based on states has provided an answer: it is the state that decides at the same time who are the citizens inside and that represents them outside.

If the state is complemented with other forms of political representation, it will be much more difficult to assess who the stake-holders are. Are the stake-holders of the oil business the consumers of the industrial society or citizens of oil-producing countries? If the answer is likely to be 'both of them', there must also be discussion regarding what relative weight there should be for the relative categories in the political process. This in turn calls for the need to get a representative body with the authority and the competence to distribute political competence to the various stake-holders. According to the cosmopolitan democracy model, such an authority should be a World Parliament.

World Parliament

The dream of a World Parliament is very old, coming back into the fore in particular in the last few years (see Falk & Strauss, 2003). Such an institution will be the

natural and most effective way to bring together the peoples of the earth, allowing them to deliberate on common issues. It is unlikely that such an organ will have effective powers (at least in the short period), but even as a forum of global public opinion it could have an important role in identifying what the real and the imagined differences are among various civilizations. Such a new institution should complement the UN General Assembly. In the last decade, such a proposal has been supported by a variety of authorities and institutions (for a list of the endorsers, see the Campaign for the Establishment of a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly, at <http://en.unpacampaign.org/news/374.php>).

The basic function of a World Parliament is to allow individuals to have a voice and representation in global affairs that is not associated with the voice and representation of the government of the state to which they belong. This, in turn, is based on the assumption that the agendas of governments, even when democratically elected, do not necessarily correspond to the interests and the will of their population. A common forum of the citizens of the world is more likely to find workable solutions in cases of controversies.

Some of these plans have envisaged a Parliament made up of about 600 deputies with a criterion of representation that will favour delegations elected in small nations. According to the Charter, the UN General Assembly can establish such an organ. Such a legislative Assembly should not necessarily be involved in every aspect of global political life, but rather it would concentrate on the most relevant issues either for their impact on global life (such as the environment) or for their political significance (such as major violations of human rights). On other occasions, the World Parliamentary Assembly may limit itself to providing suggestions on what would be the most appropriate constituency to address issues that cut across borders.

There are many transitional devices that can lead to the establishment of a directly elected World Parliament. The three principal ones are: (1) the formation of an Assembly of the few thousand international non-governmental organizations recognized by the UN; (2) a Parliament made of representatives nominated by national parliaments – the European Parliament, prior to the first direct election in 1979, followed this route; (3) a treaty among a selected number of like-minded states, in the hope that other states will follow. The institution of the ICC has followed this route.

Implications for citizenship education

The idea of a cosmopolitan democracy is certainly very ambitious and at first sight it may appear difficult to identify the political players that have an interest to fight for it. Specific agents may have selected interests in reforming one or a few of the actions indicated, and a variety of initiatives may contribute to obtain a more transparent, accountable and participatory global governance. But since a cosmopolitan democracy will imply a sea change in political organization, it should be seen if new generations will be sympathetic to it. This will also depend on how identity is sociologically perceived. Empirical research based on the World Values Surveys already indicates that 15% of the world's inhabitants perceive their principal identity as post-national (either regional or cosmopolitan) compared to 38% who privilege their national identity and 47% their local identity (Norris, 2000). But the post-national identity increases considerably among the younger generation and among

the more educated. This raises at least the hope that dealing with cosmopolitan citizenship in education could contribute to fertilize an already receptive generation. Although I am not an expert on education, the conversations and collaborations I have developed with scholars in the field suggest that cosmopolitan democracy has a direct relevance for citizenship education in at least four directions.

The first is to educate young people to live in a multicultural context, especially when they already have to face daily the presence of multi-racial, multi-language and multi-cultural groups (see Osler & Starkey, 2003). Rather than making an attempt to divide heterogeneous groups into more homogeneous units, the cosmopolitan perspective suggests to integrate these heterogeneous groups, teaching them to cope with diversity and to manage its tensions. Such an attempt will contribute in perspective to the formation of citizens that accept the idea that their own state has not responsibilities towards its own citizens, but also towards world citizens. This can contribute to change perceptions on migration, development aid and more generally foreign policy priorities.

Second, an attempt to make young people sociologically keener to deal with diversity is an important precondition to obtain so that they will also be willing to apply the values and rules of democracy when decisions should to be taken across communities. One of the core assumptions of the idea of cosmopolitan democracy is that the membership of democratic constituencies should not be defined and closed ex-ante, but on the contrary that it should be able to include in the decision-making process all the agents that have a stake in the decisions to be taken. An increasing globalizing society is making communities more and more permeable. If democracy should be preserved as political method, it should learn how to include unexpected groups of stake-holders. Learning through education to use the political space to accommodate also unexpected guests and interests is an asset that will prove to be useful in international organizations, non-governmental organizations, transnational movements and even in multinational corporations.

Third, one of the core lessons shared by many teachers in the field of human rights is that looking at the problems experienced by other societies offers an excellent opportunity to have an 'inward' look into the systems in which students are generally living. The human rights discourse is often a Western agenda aimed at looking at the violations experienced in other contexts. This leads to the idea that Western communities are more satisfactory than others, and that democratic institutions are the best to guarantee human rights. Cosmopolitan democracy somehow questions the idea that the human rights agenda should be written by the West for the Rest. On the contrary, it is an attempt to involve also distant communities in the attempt to design a common human rights agenda and practice.

Fourth, and more instrumentally, education has always been an important arena for transnational exchanges. Students' international exchange programmes and sabbaticals have been one of the areas where it has been easier to plant the seeds for a cosmopolitan society. Such a potential can easily evolve also towards an institutional cosmopolitanism by allowing students to simulate the possibility of more democratic world governance. Programmes such as the 'Youth Delegates to the United Nations' or initiatives such as the 'National Model United Nations' may help to make future generations better citizens of the global society. I have reported above the envisioning of a World Parliamentary Assembly. It is possible to fantasize that its first prototype may be generated by a Parliament of World Students. It shall

certainly not be the first time that the educational sector pioneers changes to be applied later by the society at large.

Conclusions

Cosmopolitan democracy started to be formulated on the hope that the fall of the Berlin Wall would lead to a more democratic world order. These hopes have, so far, been frustrated. One obvious and major constraint is the existence of a variety of tyrannical governments. But there is also another and less evident constraint, and this is represented by the fact that the club of states that dominate the world – all of which have elected governments – too often pursue a foreign policy that is incompatible with their own internal constitution. If democratic states will consistently apply their constitutional principles also to foreign polity, in the short or medium term there will be no single state that will be able to resist the internal pressures to introduce and/or expand democracy. And, at the same time, the hegemonic power of a few states will be seriously constrained. Cosmopolitan democracy argues that internal democratization is also strictly associated with the global landscape: the more channels of dialogue and participation available, the more it will be possible to obtain political participation within states. This in turn puts additional responsibilities on the shoulders of aware citizens: the struggle to obtain human rights protected also beyond national borders started a long time ago. But it is unlikely that such an old promise will be maintained unless duties are also extended beyond borders.

Note

1. The principle of non-violence is based on Norberto Bobbio (1987), while the principles of political equality and popular control are based on Beetham (1995). I have elaborated on these definitions in Archibugi (2008, chap. 2).

Notes on contributor

Daniele Archibugi is a Research Director at the Italian National Research Council in Rome, and Professor of Innovation, Governance and Public Policy at Birkbeck College, University of London. He works on innovation and on the political theory of international relations. In June 2006 he was appointed Honorary Professor at the University of Sussex. He is an adviser to the European Union, the OECD, several UN agencies and various national governments. He has led many research projects for the European Commission and other international organizations. He has co-edited *Cosmopolitan Democracy* (Polity Press, 1995), *Re-imagining Political Community* (Polity Press, 1998), *Filosofi per la pace* (Editori Riuniti, 1999), and has edited *Debating Cosmopolitics* (Verso, 2003). *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens. Toward Cosmopolitan Democracy* (Princeton University Press, 2008) has been translated into several languages. His latest co-edited book is *Global Democracy: Normative and Empirical Perspectives* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).

References

- Archibugi, D. (1992). Models of international organization in perpetual peace projects. *Review of International Studies*, 18, 295–317.
- Archibugi, D. (2008). *The global commonwealth of citizens, Toward cosmopolitan democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Archibugi, D. (2011). From peace between democracies to global democracies. In D. Archibugi, M. Koenig-Archibugi, & R. Marchetti (Eds.), *Global democracy: Normative and empirical perspectives* (pp. 254–273). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Archibugi, D., & Held, D. (Eds.). (1995). *Cosmopolitan democracy, An agenda for a new world order*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Archibugi, D., Held, D., & Koehler, M. (Eds.). (1998). *Re-imagining political community, Studies in cosmopolitan democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Archibugi, D., Koenig-Archibugi, M., & Marchetti, R. (Eds.). (2011). *Global democracy: Normative and empirical perspectives*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Beetham, D. (1995). *Democracy: A beginner's guide*. London: One World.
- Benhabib, S. (2006). *Another cosmopolitanism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Bobbio, N. (1984). *Il problema della guerra e le vie della pace*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Bobbio, N. (1987). *Future of democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Brown, G.W. (2011). Bringing the state back into cosmopolitanism: The idea of responsible cosmopolitan states. *Political Studies Review*, 9, 53–66.
- Dahl, R. (1999). Can international organizations be democratic? A skeptical view. In I. Shapiro & C. Hacker-Cordón (Eds.), *Democracy's edges* (pp. 19–36). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Doyle, M. (1983). Kant, liberal legacies, and foreign affairs. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 12, 205–235.
- Dryzek, J. (2006). *Deliberative global politics*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Falk, R. (1995). *On humane governance. Towards a new global politics*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Falk, R. (1998). *Law in an emerging global village: A post-Westphalian perspective*. Ardsley, NY: Transnational Publishers.
- Falk, R., & Strauss, A. (2003). The deeper challenges of global terrorism: A democratizing response. In D. Archibugi (Ed.), *Debating cosmopolitics* (pp. 203–231). London: Verso.
- Glasius, M. (2009). What is global justice and who decides? Civil society and victim responses to the International Criminal Court's first investigations. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 31, 496–520.
- Gould, C. (2004). *Globalizing democracy and human rights*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Habermas, J. (2001). *The postnational constellation*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Heater, D. (2002). *World citizenship, Cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents*. London: Continuum.
- Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the global order*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Held, D. (2006). *Models of democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Koenig-Archibugi, M. (2002). Mapping global governance. In D. Held & T. McGrew (Eds.), *Governing globalisation* (pp. 47–69). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Levi, L. (2008). *Federalist thinking*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Macdonald, T. (2008). *Global stakeholder democracy, Power and representation beyond liberal states*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Marchetti, R. (2008). *Global democracy: For and against*. London: Routledge.
- Norris, P. (2000). Global governance and cosmopolitan citizenship. In J. Nye & J. Donahue (Eds.), *Governance in a globalizing world* (pp. 155–177). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review*, 55, 243–254.
- Patomaki, H., & Teivainen, T. (2004). *A possible world: Democratic transformation of global institutions*. London: Zed Books.
- Russett, B. (1993). *Grasping the democratic peace*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.