PhD Program in Political Theory
CERSDU – L.U.I.S.S. Guido Carli
XXI Cycle

The Cosmopolitan Democracy project:

assigning a role to the individual human beings in the path towards a peaceful global order

or, presenting some proposals for and measuring the humankind's progress towards this end

- abstract -

Supervisors: Dr. Sebastiano Maffettone   Candidate: Daniele La Cagnina
                   Dr. Gianfranco Pellegrino

«The world is in crisis». This sentence is common and in different ways and moments of occurrence has been applied to describe the dynamics of the global situation since time. Recently this expression has become daily, a sort of 'label' of an historical moment which lasts at least since a tens of years. To be true, the alarm does not seem to be completely unjustified. Indeed, beside the traditional issues that run from the Middle East question to the relations between East and West or to the development of post-colonial states, new occasions of threats and insecurity have appeared on the international scenario. Apart from their obvious contingent specificities, these challenges to the 'quite flow' of the global coexistence are not new in themselves and their cause if not their logic can be easily traced back and interpreted accordingly to past dynamics. Yet, what is new is the context in which they occur that shape the happening of both old and current issues in an original fashion. As Nelson Mandela notes:

> In the globalized world in which we live, evens in one corner of the planet can have an immense effect upon the fortunes of others far away and not at all involved in those events […] This state of affairs should remind us that as we affect the fate of one another, we also have a common responsibility in the world […] Together, we all live in a global neighbourhood and […] we need a globalization of responsibility as well. Above all, that is the challenge of the next century[1].

In this respect, the following dissertation gives an account of the evolution of the global governance system. More significantly, it aims at investigating the most recent debate on the necessity of its reform and it endangers some proposals in this sense. In particular, it describes the shift from the Westphalia model to the model of the UN Charter. With regards to the latter, David Held and Anthony McGrew emphasized the paradox between the stated goals of global governance which since the end of the Second World War and the advent of the UN Charter include human security and development, and the reality of the evolution of the international affairs which have seen the spread of both global inequalities and social exclusion along with the escalation of several military conflicts[2].

In the perspective of this paradox, this thesis mainly focalizes on the contemporary critique to the sovereignty criteria as guide principle of the world political organization. In reason of a general consciousness of the new globalized context, some scholars have in fact called for a radical change in the approach to global issues and for a deep re-thinking of global governance organization and its structures. Their claims have being articulated in a political project that sets the path 'toward a

---

[1] Nelson Mandela, 'The Challenge of the Next Century: The Globalization of Responsibility', in *NPQ: New Perspective Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 34-5, 2000.
[2] David Held and Anthony McGrew, 'The Great Globalization Debate: An Introduction', in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2002, p. 14

Cosmopolitan Democracy'. As Daniele Archibugi put out, this political project may be intended as "the attempt to reconcile the globalization phenomenon with the success obtained by the democratic system. It takes its stances from the recognition that a state-based democracy, the only one we know until now, risks to be made empty by the processes of globalization." At the same time, he further specified, the state centrism which traditionally characterizes the representation of the interests and their enforcement at the international level, fails to address successfully questions that the globalization puts outside of the state's capability of resolution.[3] Moreover, "the state governments[,even those democratic,]have shown to be too weak to obstruct an imperialist world policy view or even too connive at it. The existing international organizations, as from the United Nations, are essentially inter-governmental and they don't possess yet the necessary legitimacy to oppose to the dominant states."[4] Although we are far from living in an anarchical international scenario still in the normative literature on global governance and, particularly, in the strand of cosmopolitan democracy the present system is regarded as distorted in so far as it reflects a hierarchy of power which too frequently promotes the interests of the most powerful states and global social forces at the expense of the majority of world inhabitants.[5] As Patrick Hayden noticed "participation in the creation of government policy that some citizens enjoy in the internal affairs of their respective countries and the accountability provided by democratic elections do not extend similarly to international affairs, leading to widespread concerns about what is referred to as the 'democratic deficit' of global governance".[6] In this regards, Archibugi denounced that many decisions taken at the global level, while they grandly affect the world inhabitants lives, lack of any significant accountability and are rather taken by "hidden operators over whom neither individuals nor the states they belong exert any control."[7] "This is the real deficit of democracy", he better clarified, "the existence of organized transnational interests far removed from any popular mandate."[8] In the last stance, these authors suggest, we actually live a gigantic contradiction. On one side, the democratic system of political organization spreads quantitatively becoming the predominant form of government and the only legitimated one in most of the world states. But, on the other side, it failed in affirming its regulative principles and values at the international arena. "In one word, democracy got important goals within the states, but of little relevance in the

---

[3] Daniele Archibugi, 'Sogni cosmopolitici e incubi mattutini', in Sebastiano Maffettone e Gianfranco Pellegrino, *Etica delle relazioni internazionali*, Marco Editore, Cosenza, 2004, p. 323 (my tran.)
[4] Ibid pp. 327
[5] Daniele Archibugi, 'Cosmopolitical Democracy', in Daniele Archibugi (ed.), *Debating Cosmopolitics*, London, 2003, p.8
[6] Patrick Hayden, *Cosmopolitan Global Politics*, Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005, p. 23
[7] Daniele Archibugi, 'Sogni cosmopolitici e incubi mattutini', in Sebastiano Maffettone e Gianfranco Pellegrino, *Etica delle relazioni internazionali*, Marco Editore, Cosenza, 2004, p. 322 (my tran.)
[8] Daniele Archibugi, 'Cosmopolitical Democracy', in Daniele Archibugi (ed.), *Debating Cosmopolitics*, London, 2003, p. 9

international sphere."[9] This paradox is the crux that the intellectuals in first place are call to clear up if we want to obstacle the concentration of power and impede to a simple strength-based logic to have the upper hand in the international scenario at the expense of wide-spread sufferings.

Aiming at both corroborating this general depiction and showing on concrete case studies the on-going international situation, this thesis contemplates some events of the latest evolution of the political world context. In particular, it focalizes on recent wars and the contemporary economic crisis. The account aims at making evident the failure of the actual system of global governance as a means for maintaining a peaceful world order and securing human freedom, development and well-being. The analysis of the most recent economic and political happenings shows furthermore that, as observed among others by Jürgen Habermas, beside the state-centered logic, a problematic unilateral and nationalistic approach to international issues is currently taking place. "As such", Hayden said, "any role that global governance can have in achieving human development through poverty reduction and the provision of both welfare and human security often is marginalized by the self-interested considerations of the realist power system".[10] Yet, the globalization phenomenon not only weaves together different issues making the local, regional and international puzzles merge into a greater general global question, but it extends the consequences of these matters potentially at a worldwide dimension, putting out their dynamics from the simple state control.

In opposition to the on-going state of world affairs, this dissertation examines the evolution of the cosmopolitan approach to global politics and the main points of its proposal. In particular, it highlights the consequent implications of this perspective for the manner in which questions are faced within contemporary international political theory. As Archibugi explained advocating what he calls a 'cosmopolitical democracy':

> Above all, what distinguishes cosmopolitical democracy from other such projects is its attempt to create institutions which enable the voice of individuals to be heard in global affairs, irrespective of their resonance at home. Democracy as a form of global governance thus needs to be realized on three different interconnected level: within states, between states and at a world level.[11]

What is here projected then is certainly not the abandon of the state. Neither the approach of cosmopolitan democracy prefigures its imminent collapse nor would welcome its eventual actual

---

[9] Daniele Archibugi, *La democrazia cosmopolitica*, Asterios Editore, 2000, p. 16
[10] Patrick Hayden, *Cosmopolitan Global Politics*, Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005, p. 24
[11] Daniele Archibugi, 'Cosmopolitical Democracy', in Daniele Archibugi (ed.), *Debating Cosmopolitics*, London, 2003, p. 8

occurrence. Rather according to this view, the state will rightly remain an institution of terrific importance in the general schema of the world political organization. Similarly, it will continue to keep its role of privileged referent of the individuals instances and main place where many of those needs could find an adequate satisfaction. As Archibugi admonished, the state is not necessarily a democratic institution but without a recognized institution as the only authorized one to the legitimated use of force, democracy would be not possible.[12] At the same time, a cosmopolitan democracy cannot be built either "destroying that existing within states" or simply turning the model of domestic democracy as such at the international level. What these theorists rather proposed, is a deeper and wider "imaginative effort akin to that of two centuries ago, when we shifted from direct democracy to the representative one."[13] This call for a radical change gets substance in pressing the global organization to "add a level of governance" to the already existing national and international stages. This further addition aims at providing individuals with a "more active role" that will be endorsed in the recognition and exert in virtue of their "double function […] of citizens within their belonging state and […] citizens of the world." In this sense, Archibugi said, "the cosmoplitical democracy suggests to create institutions and representative channels for all individuals […] to make the instances of the citizens directly represented in the global affairs. This means to found the deliberation on the global matters from the more (the majority)."[14] As noticed by Held and McGrew, what is surprising looking to the panorama of global governance is the contrast between the substantial failure of the political global asset and the considerable success of public and private agencies in promoting economic globalization. In the most recent time, the contemporary economic crisis brings up strong concerns even on the real success of this economic promotion. At the same time, it confirms the validity of the illustration of these authors on "how the current system of global governance [had] privilege[ed] its market enhancing functions over its market correcting ones."[15] More significantly, it imposes with greater strength the urgency of giving solution to the question of the 'democratic deficit' of global governance raised by the advocates of the cosmopolitan democracy. The majority of the analysts in fact agree in tracing back the cause of the current economic turmoil to the villainous behaviour of both national and transnational corporations and banking institutes. The same experts share that the crisis developed in the guilty default of the mechanisms of auditing and economic management of nation-states and world institutions. Then, to fill the 'democratic deficit' appears essential to avoid the current

[12] Daniele Archibugi, *La democrazia cosmopolitica*, Asterios Editore, 2000, p. 15

[13] Daniele Archibugi, 'Sogni cosmopolitici e incubi mattutini', in Sebastiano Maffettone e Gianfranco Pellegrino, *Etica delle relazioni internazionali*, Marco Editore, Cosenza, 2004, p. 324

[14] Ibid. p.327-328

[15] David Held and Anthony McGrew, 'The Great Globalization Debate: An Introduction', in David Held and Anthony McGrew (eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 2002, p. 14

puzzling economic situation to be solved simply leaving entirely its resolution to the same culpable subjects according to the same ineffective apparatus. More importantly, the overcoming of the 'democratic paradox' which affects the global arena aims at providing the guiltless individuals that naturally suffer for the hardest consequences of similar crises with concrete instruments to make their voice heard in the related policies. In one word, the project for a cosmopolitan democracy intends to avoid people in such critical circumstances to be left only with the sad consciousness of his/her own impotence in front of decisions taken by a narrow number of oligarchs whose actions are out of any accountability. With respect to this aspect of the question, Hayden wrote,

> The new supernational layers of governance created by the nation-states seeking to promote or regulate the effects of globalization generally have few mechanisms of accountability accessible to the general population; these global institutions are for the most part accountable only to states and operate according to nondemocratic principles (disproportionately to any popular size). Other influential global actors, whether from the private sector (transnational corporations) or from civil society (nongovernmental organizations), also are often unaccountable to or unrepresentative of a variety of members of international society.[16]

If we look outside the borders it is particularly surprising, Ulrich Beck said, that, while the transnational economic interests and the military power may rely upon well-functioning global organizations, the political parties are still expression of a national logic.[17] In other words, Archibugi sentenced, "the forms of political representation have remained unbearably confined within the frontiers of the state even in an epoch in which the civil and economic society works thickly on a transnational base."[18] In conclusion, according to the perspective of cosmopolitan democracy, the contemporary global governance system as mainly based on the nation-state sovereignty principle not only show itself to be unable to master phenomena more and more not only universal but global. But, at the same time, it crystallizes at the global arena a situation of 'democratic deficit' which gets substance in the simultaneous lack of any accountability granted to the main international operators with respect to the world citizens and the almost complete negation of any possible representation of the latter's own reasons. In contrast with this situation, the idea of the advocates of cosmopolitan democracy is that of spreading democracy not only within but even between and above the states. After all, from an historical point of view, Archibugi stated echoing Stephen Krasner, sovereignty has been an artificial creation, an "organized hypocrisy" that in few

[16] Patrick Hayden, *Cosmopolitan Global Politics*, Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005, pp. 24-25
[17] See. Ulrich Beck, 'Democracy Beyond the Nation-State', in *Dissent*, XLV, 1999, pp. 53-55
[18] Daniele Archibugi, *La democrazia cosmopolitica*, Asterios Editore, 2000, p. 22

cases succeeded in setting limits to the extra-territorial interests of the states.[19] In fact, he elsewhere clarified, "there is no [immediate and direct] threat to the state interests of Italy, France, or Great Britain if a genocide is committed in Iraq, Iran, or Turkey." [20] Similarly, it could be said, the plans settled by the Mexican, Brazilian or Indian 'raison d'état' are not at all affected if humanitarian crises took place in Palestine, Chechnya or Sudan. Rather than assuring the non-interference principle, the sovereignty criteria as more manifestly allowed massacres and genocides to be perpetuated with impunity within the states. In response to the violence of this evidence, Archibugi called, in unison with Luigi Ferraioli's point of view, for a general recognition of the clean contraposition between the democratic and the sovereignty principle and, consequently, for the abandon of the latter.[21] At this propos, he said,

> If the protection of human life is one of the main inspiring criterions of the global political system's architecture, […then], it is necessary to replace the category of sovereignty with that of the *global constitutionalism*, in which the use of the international strength, especially when turned to domestic problems, is not only deliberated but also managed by global institutions". […] Experience teaches that, in absence of institutions and procedures fitted to guarantee real humanitarian interventions, it is better that the (western) states abstain from the use of strength. But, [at the same time], this imposes to seek non-violent tools of interference with the purpose to prevent genocides, to defend human rights and even to affirm the right of the people to choose his/her own government. [22]

More comprehensively then the final priority of cosmopolitan democracy appears double. On one side, it is necessary "to address [the conflicts at global level] towards a global constitutionalism and submit them to jurisdictional organisms, as Kelsen had already wished, that should act on the base of an explicit constitutional mandate."[23] On the other side, it is essential to establish components of what Held called "cosmopolitan democracy law" or, "a democratic public law entrenched within and across borders"[24]. In this respect, in place of putting what Archibugi termed "the by-now-

---

[19] Stephen D. Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organised Hypocrisy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1999, cited in Daniele Archibugi, 'La Democrazia Cosmopolitica: Una Visione Partecipante', in *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*, Vol. 35, No. 2, August, 2005, p. 272

[20] Daniele Archibugi, *La democrazia cosmopolitica*, Asterios Editore, 2000, p. 21

[21] Luigi Ferraioli, *La sovranità nel mondo moderno*, Anabasi, Milano, 1995, cited in Daniele Archibugi, 'La Democrazia Cosmopolitica: Una Visione Partecipante', in *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*, Vol. 35, No. 2, August, 2005, p. 272

[22] Daniele Archibugi, 'Sogni cosmopolitici e incubi mattutini', in Sebastiano Maffettone e Gianfranco Pellegrino, *Etica delle relazioni internazionali*, Marco Editore, Cosenza, 2004, pp. 331-332

[23] Daniele Archibugi, 'La Democrazia Cosmopolitica: Una Visione Partecipante', in *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*, Vol. 35, No. 2, August, 2005, p. 272

[24] David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1995, p. 227

Baroque category of sovereignty" as bulwark of people's autonomy[25], the normative foundation of cosmopolitan democracy law in the end proposes to rely upon what Held referred to as "the principle of autonomy" which requires that all individuals have the ability to participate in political decisions that directly impact upon them[26].

The project of cosmopolitan democracy to globalize democracy both within the government institutions and in those of the - existing or to build - institutions of global society certainly "marks a goal but it also suggests a route". In this sense Archibugi wrote,

> the necessity of such a route is founded on the assumption that an ethical adhesion is developed that makes the citizens more and more participating of what happens to other individuals and communities even when those are geographically and culturally distant from their own. The interests, in fact, are not what draws up the destinies of the peoples [but, rather, human beings' perception] of a feeling of solidarity that often crosses the state borders.[27]

Paraphrasing the title of an Archibugi's article we may say that this ethical adhesion is the very core of 'what of cosmopolitan is in the cosmopolitan democracy'. Easily in fact can be sough out, enclosed in this idea, those that Hayden defined as the "three basic premises" which constitute "the systemic articulation" of "cosmopolitanism in its modern form". The first is that individuals human beings are the ultimate sources of moral and political concern. The second, known as universalism, is that all human beings possess equal moral status. The third is that persons are subject of concern for everyone. In other words, no one can exempt him/herself from his/her obligations to respect the equal status of all other human beings.[28] The concrete ways in which the cosmopolitan premises should be interpreted, and the question of which conditions and preconditions are required for their realization have been intensively discussed for several centuries. In this respect, the cosmopolitan democracy is only a modern historical product, "one of the many hopes produced by the collapse of the wall in Berlin"[29], as regards a long-standing debate whose early contributions can be tracked back to ancient Greeks and the Stoics. Yet, the Stoic philosophy remained little more than a general ethical world view which failed to offer any concrete conception of norms, agents, and institutions of a global political community. It is only with the Enlightenment and particularly with the work of

[25] Daniele Archibugi, 'Sogni cosmopolitici e incubi mattutini', in Sebastiano Maffettone e Gianfranco Pellegrino, *Etica delle relazioni internazionali*, Marco Editore, Cosenza, 2004, p. 331
[26] David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance*, Polity Press, Cambridge, 1995, p. 147
[27] Daniele Archibugi, 'La Democrazia Cosmopolitica: Una Visione Partecipante', in *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*, Vol. 35, No. 2, August, 2005, p. 264
[28] Patrick Hayden, *Cosmopolitan Global Politics*, Aldershot, Hants, England; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2005, p. 11
[29] Daniele Archibugi, 'La Democrazia Cosmopolitica: Una Visione Partecipante', in *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*, Vol. 35, No. 2, August, 2005, p. 261

that extraordinary thinker that was Immanuel Kant that we find the most serious attempt to apply a modern mode of cosmopolitan thought to question of politics. With respect to the thinking of the philosopher of Königsberg, this dissertation describes the main traits of the rigorous integration of his moral, legal, and political philosophy which constitutes the fundamental character of his approach to cosmopolitanism. In particular, a chief question stands on the base of the entire Kant's cosmopolitanism and it is the question about what a man is. The answer is essential for a philosophy that, not by chance, is called 'cosmopolitan'[30]. This attribute, analyzed within the ambit of Kant's philosophy of history, represents the unitary perspective of the human existence as a whole[31]. In this sense, once approached from a cosmopolitan point of view, the original question about the man, becomes the problem of humanity's accomplishment of its common destination. That is, the progress toward the foundation of a global political community. In virtue of the "constitutive connection"[32] which Kant draws between right and morality, this political community turns out to be the world which recognizes itself and acts as an ethical community. In this way, a cosmopolitan asset becomes the condition of possibility for a universal and perpetual state of peace. As regards to this last suggestion, this thesis clarifies the role assigned by Kant to cosmopolitanism in his more general recipe toward a peaceful order, globally shared. In addition, it clarifies what links and what distinguishes his perspective from that of cosmopolitan democracy.

The 1795 Kant's famous peace plan: *Toward Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Stretch* is still object of strong concern in the contemporary literature on international relations. Discussions got particularly reinvigorated since Doyle built his assertions and constructed his theories to conceptually explain the dynamics of the peaceful nature of democratic regimes[33]. In this context, this dissertation examines the current debate in political philosophy about the problem of war and peace. In particular, it focalizes on the role assigned to individuals in achieving or frustrating peace at global level by the different positions that compete in the panorama of this theoretical contest. In this respect, two contrasting approaches are here analyzed: one represented by Democratic Peace (DP) theories and, the other, by the Realist school of thought. The theoretical depictions of the international scenario and the analyses of the guiding factors of its dynamics presented by these divergent traditions simply differ, when not hardly oppose, to those of the movement for a cosmopolitan order. After having illustrated their respective stance, this thesis answers to the critiques they moved against the project of cosmopolitan democracy and raises counter-objections. Then, it shows how cosmopolitan democracy sets itself as a successful alternative to those.

---

[30] Kant, Logic in Taraborrelli p.23 nota 15
[31] Arent, Lectures on Kant
[32] Angela Taraborelli, Cosmopolitismo, dal cittadino del mondo al mondo dei cittadini, pp.
[33] Michael Doyle,

Furthermore, it describes how the development of Kant's ideas in the theories of discourse ethics and cosmopolitan democracy confirms the relevance of Kant's cosmopolitan ideal to current discussions about peace.

According to Kant's conception of 'an universal history from a cosmopolitan perspective', the philosophy of history has to accomplish a double task. It has to give meaning to the history and guide human actions. This means in his view that it has to promote the perfect civil unification of human beings interpreting and judging history from a cosmopolitan standpoint and working up a plan to get to this goal. In a ideal parallelism Archibugi similarly stated, referring to 'cosmopolitical democraticy', that,

> The project of cosmopolitical democracy has two components: the first one is more properly analytical, and it is devoted to appraise the state of health of democratic systems in front of the challenges of globalization. The second component is instead essentially normative, and questions itself on how democratic systems should change to preserve their own nature in a world in which the interactions among states have become so remarkable.[34]

Following their remarks, this thesis finally applies the same analytical and normative principles to the approach of cosmopolitan democracy. For what concerns the first aspect, Kant already noticed, drawing his notion of humankind's progress towards a final destination, that the very idea of this concept necessarily implies the problem of determining an objective measure of this evolution. But, between the political community and the ethical community, he further theorized, there will be always an unavoidable and inescapable distance. They will never match perfectly and the ethical community will reveal itself only in "states of the instant"[35], in an endless tending of the political towards the ethical. However, this suggests that in the political community can be detected some events that prefigure the ethical community, showing that the cosmopolitan destination of the human gender is effectively already on work. Although the problem of humanity's progress cannot be solved immediately by direct experience, Kant put forward in the end, only through the experience it is possible to find evidences of this advancement[36]. In accordance with the analysis of the philosopher of Königsberg, this dissertation seeks through a 'cosmopolitan reading' of some significant case studies, properly not only to offer some arguments in support to the cosmopolitan project but, also, to demonstrate that this plan is already an on-going evolutionary process shaping

---

[34] Daniele Archibugi, 'La Democrazia Cosmopolitica: Una Visione Partecipante', in *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*, Vol. 35, No. 2, August, 2005, pp. 262-263
[35] Kant
[36] Kant

in some way the norms and practices of contemporary global politics. The mass demonstrations which took place during the 1999 and 2001 G8 at Seattle and Genoa, together with the public protests that have spread in all Europe in 2003 against the US military intervention in Iraq, besides the recent demonstration held in London for the G20 and the current economic crisis, are significant in this sense. In fact, as Archibugi suggested, "despite there is a tendency to exaggerate the citizens' involvement in matters that don't concern directly their own political community," these events demonstrate that "it is growing a feeling of affiliation to a planetary community that has assumed a political dimension."[37] Yet, as the same author denounced, in similar occasions "it is uncertain what the purposes of both vertexes and anti-vertexes are" and, still now, on the side of the so-called movements "the protest prevails on the proposal."[38] Just as regards to the normative side of the matter, Kant's idea of a progress of the human gender discloses a run whose degree of success in approaching its final purpose, the perfect civil unification of humankind, is reflected in the quality of the changes set in the legal and normative order to conform the global apparatus to such an end. Particularly for what is of significance in this dissertation, this means to adjust the latter to fit a cosmopolitan global institutional asset which provides for the respect of people's cosmopolitan right. In this sense, this thesis endanger some proposal of reform of the current global governance system which encompass both changes in norms and procedures of traditional political and economic world institutions and recognized status for no-governmental subjects, as well as the establishment of new stages for the global representation of human beings interests.

«The world is in crisis». Today, more than ever, we are haunted by this grave and apparently inescapable certainty. As such, the same idea of crisis commonly evokes moments of perturbation, difficulty, suffering. Yet, it represents more simply a sudden modification of a no-more-sustainable morbid state that in such way asks for an urgent intervention. On this perspective, it may be said, it is the same work of the man that turns against its master, shouts 'that's enough', and imposes him to rebuild. Once endangered in this light, a crisis appears not only as a defeat but also as the occasion for a profitable general rearrangement. In fact, in such occasions they are not only the certainties of the individuals to weaken but also the ties that hold together structures of consolidated power. In similar circumstances, then, it is necessary to avoid states and individual to be pushed by the dismay that is often accompanied with these kind of happenings towards both forms of nationalistic closures and populist and authoritarian policies. Nevertheless, "repeating that the

---

[37] Daniele Archibugi, 'La Democrazia Cosmopolitica: Una Visione Partecipante', in *Rivista Italiana di Scienza Politica*, Vol. 35, No. 2, August, 2005, p. 265

[38] Daniele Archibugi, 'Sogni cosmopolitici e incubi mattutini', in Sebastiano Maffettone e Gianfranco Pellegrino, *Etica delle relazioni internazionali*, Marco Editore, Cosenza, 2004, p. 334

strength is the main source of political legitimacy it not enough, it is necessary to wonder if the strength is tameable."[39] In this respect, the modest opinion of the author of this dissertation joins those of more authoritative scholars that the project for a cosmopolitan democracy is both the best approach to maintain stably this intent and get it to effective realization.

---

[39] Ibid p.330