come with the silent constitutionalization of norms and rules of international institutions. As a result, a global political order that requires political legitimacy is emerging. People are beginning to judge international institutions with the same measures that they use in their political order at home: fairness and legitimacy have made their way into the international sphere. Both, the demand for effective international institutions and the demand for legitimizing those institutions are growing. Meeting the demand for effective international regulation with the means of executive multilateralism and not taking into account the growing demand for legitimacy will increase resistance against international institutions and possibly undermine them in the long run. This is why cosmopolitan principles belong on the agenda of international institution-building.

Fighting Transnational Exclusion: From Cosmopolitanism to Global Democracy

Raffaele Marchetti
LUISS University, Italy

The year 2001 was a signal year in the changing context of global politics. Both the terrorist attacks of 9/11 and the first gathering of the World Social Forum in Porto Alegre strongly reaffirmed the need to discuss again the terms on which the current political system is built. From the different world fora to the United Nations General Assembly, from national to regional parliaments, the issue of the effects of increased global interconnectedness, with its unchecked intrusiveness into the daily life of virtually every citizen, occupies the center of public debate. The responses to these new global circumstances vary. On the one hand, the reaction to increased interdependence has often been negative, characterized by an attempt to protect local prerogatives against the competition of powerful external agents. Evidence of this attitude can be seen across a wide spectrum of political phenomena, including the US/EU protectionist positions in some key areas of the negotiation rounds of the World Trade Organization, the widespread rise of right-wing nationalistic parties, the Islamic movements in defense of traditional values, the isolationist stance of groups such as the Movimento dos Trabalhadores Rurais Sem Terra (Landless Peasants Movement) in Brazil, or the openly antiglobalization view of the influential newspaper Le Monde Diplomatique.

On the other hand, a number of equally at-odds positions can be distinguished among those who claim to foster a more global approach to politics. They comprise among others: neoliberal support of global capitalism, the neo-imperialist ambitions of the US, liberal-democratic reformists advocating a more

democratic global governance, and those advocating the radical alternative of "globalization from below"—of transnational solidarity outside the current global market system.

Underpinning the debate between the different views on the phenomenon of globalization is the issue of democracy (as well as human rights) in its various interpretations: various in terms of both scope (local, national, or global) and method (participatory, deliberative or representative). Whereas isolationists, for instance, advocate self-contained communities under the assumption that real democracy is only feasible at the local, participatory level, supporters of globalization argue, conversely, that a global capitalist system represents the unique basis for an effective democracy in which the individual can pursue his or her entrepreneurial activities in unconstrained competition with minimal, representative institutions. Those holding onto traditional political thought have been reluctant to recognize global phenomena as such, for a long time almost ignoring the political discussion on the new forms of democracy and concentrating mainly on the individual and domestic domains of justice. Even theories of liberal democracy, based as they are on the principles of self-governance, consent, representation, and popular sovereignty, have been at a loss to offer a viable response to global phenomena until very recently. However, over the last 30 years, this traditional bias privileging domestic agendas has become a crucial focus of criticism within the debate on international political theory. In this debate cosmopolitan theories have played a leading role in stressing the key relevance of the expanding scope of moral agency, and thus political responsibilities. No conception of political theory can afford to ignore the global dimension of the socio-political system and the correlated demands for its democratization. The perspective of cosmopolitanism has become central to normative discussion on international relations.

Today, almost 40 years after its re-emergence, and in light of our experience of globalization during that time, what observations can be made on the strengths and weaknesses of cosmopolitan thinking? Starting with the former, the capacity to accompany and facilitate the profound revolt against realpolitik in the academic and political debate remains a crucial achievement of cosmopolitan thinking. Cosmopolitanism has offered key conceptual tools to interpret current political circumstances and to propose alternative arrangements. However, with the passage of time we are also able to identify a number of significant limits in cosmopolitan scholarship that need to be overcome in order to formulate a stronger proposal for global democracy. Beyond the realist-style critiques, three principal types of relatively sympathetic criticisms have been advanced. From a normative point of view, cosmopolitan proposals have been seen as too universalistic and "modern" (or more pointedly, western-centric and colonialist) for they have not been sufficiently sensitive to cultural pluralism. From an institutional point of view, they have been considered too centralized, in that they have not been attentive enough to the claims

---


of rooted social actors. Finally, from a more political perspective, cosmopolitanism has also been accused of being too much embedded within neo-liberal globalization and thus too supportive of predatory capitalism. It is from these criticisms that we need to begin rethinking the project of global democracy in non-exclusionary terms.

Either democracy is global or it is not democracy. That is the fundamental message of a renewed project of global democracy. Any political system that applies allegedly democratic principles within a limited scope is either hypocrisy or an illusion. The ideal of democracy requires the creation of a system in which all citizens have a voice in the formulation of norms and decisions that have a public scope. In particular, such an ideal requires a system to be framed on different layers, each of them allowing for the maximum participation of all citizens. By contrast, a system that allows for public actions that do not undergo citizens’ political scrutiny and yet have a public impact does not qualify as democratic. And this is the current situation at the international and transnational level. Vast sections of the world’s population have, in fact, no say in trans-border decisions that (often profoundly) affect their lives. From a democratic perspective this lack of voice is not acceptable, and it is just this kind of institutional discrimination that is here challenged.

We need to refocus the discussion of global democracy on the crucial pathology of political exclusion. Transnational exclusion occurs when an actor is deprived of his/her entitlements to influence public decisions at the international and global level. This kind of exclusion is here considered to be the key deficit of the international system and thus the component that must be addressed in order for the international political system to regain legitimacy. An analogy may help illustrate this point. Suppose the activity of a private club pollutes a river that passes through the club’s grounds. The members of the club argue that it is their right to allow this as long as the club governing body accepts it. That is one side of the story. The other side of the story concerns the citizens of the area surrounding the club. After passing through the club, the river is in fact polluted and the neighboring citizens cannot take a bath, go fishing or simply enjoy the river any more. They complain about their well-being, and more generally about their health, which has been damaged by the activity of the club. Their children will face an even worse situation in a few years’ time because of the cumulative effects of environmental depletion.

In a situation like this, any democrat would be ready to defend publicly the citizens’ right to protest and impose restrictions on the club. The democrat would not accept as valid that decisions taken by a limited group could significantly affect the life prospects of those outside the group without the latter having the legal opportunity to contest the outcomes. Since the non-members suffer from the consequences of actions that have a public effect, then, a democrat would reason, they should be politically entitled to voice their concern and vote for a law to protect the environment and preserve their quality of life. At the local and national level this logic would be fully endorsed by any democrat; i.e., were the private club and the surrounding citizens in the same national jurisdiction, the non-member citizens would certainly be granted institutional power to block the polluting activity of the club members. Were, however, the club in one country and the surrounding people in another, the situation would be entirely different; and far fewer so-called

democrats would be ready to protest. A national boundary is thus enough to invalidate democratic justice. At the international or global level, the situation is in fact very different and activities such as those of private clubs are most of the time allowed. Still too few, for instance, are those people who believe that a state should not be allowed to pollute the world’s atmosphere. Still too many tolerate the fact that individuals worldwide do not have a voice to complain about global environmental issues. The environmental case is just one clear instance among many of the democratic limits of the current international system. It is a case of a larger phenomenon that I call transnational exclusion, a phenomenon that is, among other things, pushing people in the street to protest against the kind of executive and exclusionary global governance that is increasingly the standard mode of decision-making nowadays in global politics. The motto of the demonstrations in Genoa in 2001 “you are G8, we are six billion” aptly summarises this concept.

As a response to the current international political fragmentation, which generates political exclusion, the alternative political project offered here envisages a cosmopolitan system in which all world citizens are included within a scheme of direct representative participation under an overarching authority that governs the democratization of world affairs. The pursuit of the democratic ideal in terms of scope is thus implemented in this proposal through a reworked notion of citizenship as global, multi-layered, and all-inclusive. In essence, this entails an expansion of the domestic model of democracy to the transnational level, structured on several layers that take into account different jurisdictional boundaries as coordinated through a world federalist system. Only through the radical project of stretching the paradigm of democratic inclusion to encompass the whole of humankind, together with recognizing the legitimacy of multiple political allegiances, can the inhuman mechanism of partial inclusion as exclusion-generator be avoided. If the phenomenon of illegitimate political exclusion is to be avoided, the authority to define jurisdictional boundaries needs to be reallocated, from groups with a circumscribed scope, to a public democratic mechanism which is global in kind.40

This proposal is meant to articulate a criticism of this exclusionary situation. In a novel bridging of divergent strands of contemporary cosmopolitan research, this study focuses on the need to include globally marginalized actors by shining a light on the institutional side of transnational exclusion. There are three such strands. First, there is the original international political theory/international ethics research on cosmopolitanism of the 1970s and 1980s—i.e., moral cosmopolitanism.41 Second, there is the subsequent international relations/political science research on global institutions of the 1990s—i.e., institutional cosmopolitanism.42 And third, there is the...
more recent sociological research on global inclusion of the 2000s—i.e., social cosmopolitanism.\footnote{Boaventura de Sousa Santos and César A. Rodríguez-Garavito (eds), \textit{Law and Globalization from Below: Toward a Cosmopolitan Legality} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Sidney Tarrow, \textit{The New Transnational Activism} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).} Ethical theory, institutional design, and social struggles represent the three key dimensions of any viable political project. Consequently, any theoretical reflection that does not grapple with all three equally will inevitably miss an important aspect of the bigger political picture. This position is committed to critically articulating the phenomenon of transnational exclusion and to proposing an alternative project for global democracy, keeping a multidisciplinary perspective that includes all three of these dimensions. Reinterpreting the cosmopolitan ideal in the light of marginalized people and translating newly acknowledged subaltern claims into an inclusive institutional design, this essay bridges these dimensions of cosmopolitan thinking and thus advances the discussion on global democracy.

The viability of this interdisciplinary project requires the revision of a number of first principles so that the limitations determined by methodological nationalism can be overcome. Corresponding to the aforementioned strands of cosmopolitanism, three are prominent among these principles: moral agency, multilevel dimensionality, and rootedness. The principal challenge political exclusion poses for international political theory is thus played out on the interpretation of these latter notions.

The major distinguishing characteristic of the version of global democracy presented here consists in its consideration of moral and political agency as mutually dependent on and operating within a universalistic and all-inclusive conception of responsibility and vulnerability. The strength of this theory is the flexibility of its paradigm, which allows it to respond more strongly than others to social and political reality. This is a particular strength in these times of radical transformation. Our world system increasingly attenuates the relationship between those who take decisions and those who bear the costs of those decisions. This has the double effect of broadening the possibility for cooperation (e.g., the improvements in transportation and communication) and impoverishing the moral ties of disapproval. In the past, the effects of actions were principally circumscribed by a defined territory; most people influenced, for better or worse, the lives of a limited number of other people. The situation is now different, with many of the actions/omissions we perform often having an (unintentional) relative impact on thousands of others. Even if these effects are imperceptible when taken singly, they often become decisive when combined with the effects of thousands of similar actions. Consequently, insofar as local possibilities acquire a global dimension, our moral responsibility is revealed to encompass a far greater field of inclusiveness. The moral question must, therefore, evolve into the following: in what way is my action part of a complex set of actions of different agents, organized by public rules, which taken together affect others? Hence the concept of global agency, with its correlate of negligence, becomes a crucial component of any international political theory.

Accordingly, the present proposal of global democracy includes consideration of both sides of the equation of global ethical concern. Choice-makers, i.e., those who have the power to decide and carry out an action which produces...
consequences, are made responsible through a precise method of multiple accountability based on the capacity to influence the outcome, wherever it takes place. Choice-bearers, i.e., those who suffer the consequences of others’ actions are, by contrast, identified as potentially vulnerable and as a result protected.\textsuperscript{44} According to the normative ideal of democracy, and in opposition to that of Hobbesian realism, a mechanism of congruence should be established between choice-makers and choice-bearers, in which the latter can impose on the former a duty of accountability concerning their actions. Since there can be multiple agents on both sides, an ethical-political theory based on impartiality cannot in fact be complete when it fails to identify clearly the moral position of every agent involved in the situation under scrutiny.\textsuperscript{45} In presenting a comprehensive reading of the issue of international agency, this essay challenges its rivals by offering a consistent version of interlinked political responsibilities and social vulnerabilities.

The politically most relevant consequence of this comprehensive conception of moral-political agency is its insistence on the institution of cosmopolitan citizenship. Against state-centric logic, this essay holds that the concept of citizenship is not linked to the notion of a sovereign state, insofar as it can be unfolded and spread out over a number of different political spheres. Consequently, no normative obstacles impede the expansion of the traditional notion of polis to the entire cosmos. Among the consequences of such a normative shift, a significant change is related to the issue of migration. According to a fully developed cosmopolitan position, migrants and residents should be ultimately considered equal, as citizens of the world. When this is accepted, a new truly global migratory regime should be established.\textsuperscript{46}

Moreover, it is through this new interpretation of the meaning of political membership that a comprehensive understanding of political responsibility can be consistently linked with social vulnerability. The ideal of political responsibility can only be fully realized through the conceptualization of an all-inclusive system of political membership, which, avoiding exclusion, imposes on each political agent his/her correct burden of responsibility, or alternatively alleviates him/her from the condition of social vulnerability. Once some basic social and political entitlements are identified, the agent, i.e., the one in the position to influence the outcome concerning the potentially vulnerable, needs in fact to be made responsible, and in case of failure to comply with his/her duties, needs to be sanctioned proportionately. This legal setting, though, has to be complemented by a multi-layered political system which enables responsibilities to be enforced through a net of intermingled and subsidiary duties.

In this way, the issue of global moral agency also directly informs the second significant characteristic of this version of global democracy, namely that concerning multi-layered dimensionality. As individual and social existence is increasingly spread over a number of different domains, a common socio-political


framework is needed to bring together this diffusion of engagement. This can be achieved through neither the traditional intergovernmental system nor the recent global governance arrangements. Both of these institutional solutions generate transnational exclusion at their foundations and thus deny the democratic assumptions on which they claim to be built. The failure of these frameworks fragments the social and political existence of individuals, and therefore renders any pursuit of a good life most likely self-defeating. The only solution to this issue of exclusion consists in the creation of a center of federal democratic power able to coordinate and govern global affairs. Once the recognition of multiple and yet integrated political actions is accepted, then the issue of jurisdictional boundaries and equilibrium arises. The system proposed here claims, as one of its virtues, the capacity to balance properly the complex inter-jurisdictional tension—the tension between the different levels of political action—through the use of a single, all-inclusive principle of justice. In a highly pluralistic world the only legitimate exclusion is self-exclusion, and that can only be warranted after an all-inclusive mechanism with which to draw jurisdictional boundaries has been established. With this all-inclusive mechanism in place, the normative content of political action at both the individual level and the state level is consistently integrated with that at the regional and global levels of interaction.

Global multidimensionality, however, must not and need not fall into a hidden defense of current transnational power positions. Any global project today in fact risks supporting the predominant trend of western-centric institutionalism, with its correlate of insensitivity or even exploitation of other cultures and social institutions. A genuine project for global democracy is needed first and foremost for the excluded and ostracized individuals at home in the weaker parts of the world. This is the third key challenge of international political theory: rootedness within a global political project. Within current global circumstances, global democracy constitutes a revolutionary project that aims to be true to the democratic principles that are widely, if not unanimously, accepted worldwide. It is a project that intends to give a legitimate voice to the voiceless, and thus a voice to subaltern social actors. In this vein, the framework of global multidimensionality has to be coupled with a strong tie to local emancipatory politics, thus recognising the value of political pluralism. The transition from the desirability to the feasibility of the normative objectives needs to pass through the integration of institutional and social components of global democracy. In being all-inclusive, global democracy has thus to be simultaneously multi-layered and rooted. Articulating the feasibility of this is the challenge ahead of the project of global democracy.

A further overall remark concerning the degree of this proposal’s comprehensiveness must be made here. In order to avoid misunderstandings, it is important to stress from the beginning that the theory elaborated here does not aim to be a comprehensive theory of the good life; it does not aim to tell people how to live. On the contrary, it aims to clarify the normative weaknesses of the current political system and to propose an alternative scheme of public rules. In this vein, the question with which it is engaged is not metaphysical, but political. It
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is about how we are to live together, given that we have different ideas about how to live, and not about what is the right idea of a good life. In this regard, it outlines a theory and a political framework within which each individual can participate agonistically in the elaboration of public rules on an equal standing, while maintaining differing ethical perspectives on the meaning and values of life. The present perspective remains fundamentally pluralistic in that it recognizes that different individual life projects cannot be reduced to a single political project. Hence, politics (and especially world politics) is intended as the place of the agonistic encounter of different world views. In more concrete terms, it is a proposal to dispute the power positions which characterize the international social reality by redefining the legal institutional setting. Its ultimate institutional objective consists in providing to every human being an equal opportunity to influence the public decision-making and frame-setting (i.e., the institutional meta-rules that organize the concrete decision-making) processes, and so maximally preserving his or her own freedom of choice. In this regard, it is different from phenomenological and postmodern directions of research insofar as it firmly believes in the unique value of political institutions to resist and redress social inequality. Even more, it holds that some form of democratic participation is necessary for any viable project of critical theory, in that without the support of such an egalitarian participatory structure no dialogue aiming at genealogical self-investigation can hope to be freed from power relationships; indeed, be a dialogue at all. A minimal democratic structure is necessary to frame the basic mode of the relationship, be it political or cultural, from which any phenomenological enquiry is to be carried out. Failing such egalitarian and all-inclusive structure, no viable principle of respect for otherness can be identified, and without these grounds for recognizing difference, an undifferentiated acceptance of any alternatives, including those based on power positions, remains as the only possible attitude. Global democratic institutions are thus needed both to reinterpret critically the current international system, and to redress practically part of its illegitimate inequalities.

The Ideal of Global Stakeholder Democracy

Terry Macdonald
Monash University

Introduction

One of the central questions posed in this symposium concerns the best reformist strategy for fostering greater democratic legitimacy at the level of global politics. While there is now wide agreement that much of the power wielded beyond the boundaries of nation-states suffers from a significant “democratic deficit,” it is not clear how this deficit can most successfully be remedied in practice within the constraints of real-world international political life. My contribution to the symposium responds to this question by setting out the rationale for a particular