The Human Security Paradigm and Cosmopolitan Democracy[1]

Andreea Iancu

Abstract: This paper discusses the relation between the human security paradigm and the cosmopolitan democracy scenario as models for humanizing and changing the current international system and transforming it in a global security and development system centered on the individual rather than on the nation state. The main idea for which I argue is that the human security paradigm and the changes it determined in international relations (especially through the responsibility to protect principle) are compatible with the cosmopolitan democracy scenario for changing and transforming the current international system.

Keywords: human security, responsibility to protect, cosmopolitan democracy, sovereignty as responsibility

Introduction

This paper discusses the relation between the human security paradigm and the cosmopolitan democracy scenario as models for humanizing or changing the current international system and transforming it in a global political, security and development system centered on the individual rather than on the nation state. Excepting the introduction, the paper is structured in 3 main sections. The first two sections shortly describe the human security paradigm, the responsibility to protect principle, as the main operational principle of this paradigm, and, respectively, the cosmopolitan democracy model. The third section highlights the main shared attributes (and implications) of the human security paradigm and the cosmopolitan democracy model in order to show that the human security paradigm, the responsibility to protect principle, and the changes they determined in international relations are compatible with the cosmopolitan democratic scenario for changing and transforming the current international system.

Andreea Iancu

The Human Security Paradigm and Responsibility to Protect Principle

The human security paradigm can be described, in short, as the rhetoric that encompasses and promotes the right of all people, regardless of the national boundaries, to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair. It has mainly two major concerns: to enlarge the freedom of choice for the worldwide individuals, and to ensure their development in a secure environment. As highlighted in the 1994 Human Development Report, the human security paradigm is built on solidarity principles and tries to ensure for the worldwide individuals a participatory existence, in the spirit of human worth and dignity (UNDP 1994, 22-3). The paradigm redefines the concept of *security* in order to include extensively the "concerns of ordinary people (...) which symbolize protection from the threat of disease, hunger, unemployment, crime, social conflict, political repression and environmental hazards" (UNDP 1994, 22). So, human security is conceptualized as "the right of all people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair" (United Nations 2004), or, more commonly, as the "freedom from fear and freedom from want" in the context of human dignity. As such, as used in the human security paradigm, *human security* is a very large and complex concept, incorporating (and not being limited to) economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, community security or political security. The concept encompasses participation in the public sphere, personal integrity, autonomy, control over personal life, well-being, or human dignity, which means that numerous state and non-state correlated issues can affect the human security. (Landman 2006, 14). This makes the human security paradigm the meeting and intersecting point of many issues, like security, governance and politics, or social and economic development (Beebe and Kaldor 2010, 159).

The main operational principle of the human security paradigm is the responsibility to protect principle (R2P or RtoP). The principle is one whose implementation is meant to ensure the protection and security of all worldwide citizens. As stated in the "Responsibility to Protect 2001" Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty Report, the principle has three fundamental pillars: (i) the state responsibility implies protection responsibilities; (ii) every state has the primary responsibility to protect the people on its territory; and (iii) the international community has a residual responsibility to step in if states are unable or unwilling to protect the people on their territory (ICISS 2001). This definition establishes a double-edged-sword responsibility of the state, within and beyond its borders. In addition, the report also mentions that, under this principle, the state and the international community has as main pillars of action not only the "responsibility to react," but also the "responsibility to prevent," and the "responsibility to rebuild" in case of intervention (ICISS 2001, 17). This principle was institutionalized at the World Summit in 2005. The United Nations (UN) took the responsibility, in the name of the international community, to protect all the

citizens of the world. The article 139 of the World Summit Outcome in 2005 stated the engagement of the international community to protect the entire humanity. This article mentions the engagement of the international community for preventing genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing and also, that it is ready to take all the necessary steps to accomplish this desiderate.

Though, the R2P principle is not a revolutionary idea. It is built on the classic just war doctrine, being structured on the principles of right intention, just cause, last resort, proportionality, the question of evidence and right authority in cases of interventions, when states fail to meet the responsibility to protect their population. The R2P principle represents an extended form of *ius gentium* and the responsibility towards the governed, specifications that were embedded from the start in the UN Charter (Weiss and Thakur 2010, 310). In this conjuncture, *ius cogens* and the *customary law* include the principle of the non-use of force, the only explicit exception being the article 51 of the UN Charter.

The Cosmopolitan Democracy Project

As resumed by Daniele Archibugi, one of its leading proponents, the main aim of the cosmopolitan democracy project is to increase the accountability, transparency and legitimacy at a global level by introducing democracy within every state, between states, and create global or cosmopolitan democracy (Archibugi 2004, 438-442). Cosmopolitan democracy, its defenders are arguing, is the only ethical and viable „method of global governance on the benefit of mankind" (Archibugi 2008, xvi).

As a global governance model, cosmopolitan democracy is defined as multilayered governance, grounded on the principles of democracy, democratic justice, peace, rule of law and human rights. As for the form of organization, the model of the cosmopolitan democracy stands between the federalist and the confederal model, keeping a moderate centralization of power. The cosmopolitan democracy approach rejects the idea of a global government, because it could degenerate in forms of totalitarianism. So, the cosmopolitan democracy scenario rejects the formation of a global cosmopolitan institution with the ultimate authoritative function, as defended in other cosmopolitan governance proposals (Archibugi 2008, 86).

The cosmopolitan democracy model is a project that aims to develop democracy at different levels of governance. These levels are dependent of each other and should be pursued simultaneously, although each needs distinct procedures (Archibugi 2008, 110). In order to achieve cosmopolitan democracy, there should be created a voluntary and appealable alliance of governments, meta-governmental institutions, NGOs, international organizations and transnational corporations that would share coercive power and create rules for judicial control, with an outstanding emphasis on global (civil) society. A highly

important entity in the cosmopolitan democracy project is global (civil) community, a transnational entity that will counterpoise the current global democratic deficit and can create bottom-up pressure for the implementation of the individual-centered principles and for (gradually) achieving world (cosmopolitan) citizenship (Archibugi 2008).

In the cosmopolitan democracy model, the nation state loses its centrality as actor of international relations. This model both integrates and limits the functions and responsibilities of the state, transferring some of them to the institutions that focus on the citizens of the world, who have, besides the national citizenship, the cosmopolitan citizenship (Archibugi 2008, 103). However, the cosmopolitan democracy logic does not cancel the national citizenship, the national boundaries or the national sovereignty, but only limits them in order to empower the citizen, to ensure the respect for human rights and to assure the accountability of the layered-decision making process (Held 1995, 118).

In the cosmopolitan democracy project, the global actors are to be subjects of the jurisdiction of an International Court, whose decisions and sanctions take effect within the national level. At the core of the global cosmopolitan organization is, among others, the control over the use of force and the principle of non-violence (Archibugi 2008, 88). Military force is used only as a last resort when the driving principles are attacked and it needs the legitimization of the institution of global citizens (Archibugi 2008, 105).

The Human Security Paradigm and Cosmopolitan Democracy

As I already mentioned, the main point of this article is that the human security paradigm and the changes it determined in international relations (especially through the responsibility to protect principle) are compatible with the cosmopolitan democratic scenario for changing and transforming the current international system. This is especially because the human security paradigm shares some key 'cosmopolitan' premises, aims, principles and implications.

The cosmopolitan democracy model is grounded in the natural law theory and the inter-related cosmopolitan ethics assuming that the individual belongs to a moral global community, that human being is of central importance, that each individual is of equal moral worth, and that social and political institutions are obliged to protect the dignity of each individual (Coates 2001, 90). The cosmopolitan democratic law is based on Kant's cosmopolitan law and the principle of universal hospitality, which transcends the borders of the national state and entails the protection of freedom and autonomy of all (Held 1995, 228). As Held (2009, 537) highlights, the idea of responsibility "for the satisfaction of the basic human needs, that all human beings require equal moral respect and concern" is a prerequisite and also the main foundation of the cosmopolitan democratic principles. Likewise, the human security paradigm is grounded in the natural law theory, the cosmopolitan ethical principles, and the universal

individual rights doctrine. The R2P principle is grounded on the universal legal obligations under the human rights, the humanitarian laws and the human protection declarations and encompasses human security as one of its core concepts (Bădescu 2011, 40). This commitment has an evident ethical origin, being related to the cosmopolitan ideas of equality and moral principles that apply to all people. Due to the universal human rights doctrine, states, as members of the international community, have the responsibility to protect not only their own citizens, but also the citizens of the world. Like the cosmopolitan democracy model, the human security paradigm insists on the idea that individuals, regardless of their citizenship, location, and identity ought to be made secure from a range of fears, threats, and deprivations (Franceschet 2006, 31). Moreover, the human security principles entail the idea that the security of the individuals all over the world is a matter of common concern and, consequently, a shared responsibility (Tigerstrom 2007, 72). These ideas are synthesized in the responsibility to protect principle and find their justification in the same ethical principles that ground the cosmopolitan democracy scenario.

The cosmopolitan project relies on the principle of proportionality mentioning that it should never be done something that would cause more harm than it saves (Doyle 2011, 77-79). This corresponds with the just cause threshold and with the precautionary principles that are clearly stated in the founding document of the responsibility to protect principle. Although cosmopolitan democracy aims to a global democratic order based on peace, it is not a utopian model that excludes the possibility of violations of the global principles. In this case, the cosmopolitan democracy admits that there could be cases when the use of force is necessary. The legitimized military intervention would be used in the same conditions as the R2P principle. All the precautionary principles of the R2P and the necessity of a just cause are included in the cosmopolitan democracy ethics, in the global law that would govern its order. Thus, if the democratic peace theory and the desire of the cosmopolitan democracy to implement democracy within and between states are taken into consideration, it can be assumed that the use of military intervention would be limited.

In the cosmopolitan democracy scenario, states failing to protect the fundamental rights of the world citizens do not have the right to be free from intervention. All states have a duty to protect and to intervene, if an intervention is necessary, to provide subsistence needs for all human beings (Doyle 2011, 77-79). Like the cosmopolitan democracy model, the human security paradigm and its reification, the responsibility to protect principle, also challenge the sacrosanct principle of non-intervention (Tigerstrom 2007, 80) that guided, within the Westphalian order, the process of maintaining worldwide peace (Reisman 1990, 872). At the intersection of the human security paradigm and the responsibility to protect principle, in the post-Westphalian world, states enjoy "sovereignty as responsibility," which means that they have the right of non-interference only as long as they respect the fundamental rights of their

citizens (Bellamy, Williams and Griffin 2010, 13). When this threshold is overpassed and the states fail to ensure the security of their citizens, the international community is obliged to act according to the responsibility to protect doctrine. So, both the human security paradigm and the responsibility to protect principle are overpassing and challenge the traditional concepts of the Westphalian world, sovereignty and core statehood, conceptualizing an incipient cosmopolitan core of the new global dynamics.

The new concept of sovereignty, sovereignty as responsibility, implies three functions of the state: firstly, the state is responsible of the safety, lives and welfare of its citizens; secondly, the state is responsible internally, to its citizens, and externally, to the UN; thirdly, this principle institutionalizes the fact that the states are responsible for their "commission and omission" actions (ICISS 2001, 13). The „sovereignty as responsibility" principle relates to the universal right to hospitality, as presented by Kant and reiterated in the cosmopolitan democracy scenario (Weiss and Thakur 2010, 313-4), and can easily be interpreted as a step towards the institutionalization of the cosmopolitan outlook. Although the international community is divided in the debate around the right to intervention, the UN started to design the new form of sovereignty, described as well as 'liberal sovereignty,' which is one of the core principles of the cosmopolitan democracy model of governance. In the report on the responsibility to protect it is also stressed that "the issue is not the right to intervene of any state, but the responsibility to protect of *every* state" (United Nations 2004, 56). The R2P principle bounds every state of the world in a mechanism that focuses on the individual. This entails that the R2P is at least compatible with the cosmopolitan democracy project, if not quite a revolutionary step favoring its implementation. In fact, the R2P principle can be described as institutionalizing the cosmopolitan principle of a duty to protect all the citizens of the world (Dower 2010, 12). As I already stressed, the R2P is a principle whose implementation is meant to ensure the protection and security of all the citizens of the world. It implies that states are obliged to respect the universal human rights that are imposed by universal moral duties.

These observations raise some very interesting questions: are we entitled to interpret the current changes in the international system determined by the human security paradigm (especially through the responsibility to protect principle) as a step towards cosmopolitan democracy as a global political form of organization? Could the R2P have a spillover effect and accelerate the process through a more concentrate global governance system that could take the form of cosmopolitan democracy? I think that the right answer to these questions is affirmative. However, I am aware that for proving my assertion more than I highlighted in this article is needed. Of special importance in this sense is proving that a cosmopolitan democratic model of global governance is both desirable and, crucially, feasible. In other words, in order to prove my assertion I must show that the critics of cosmopolitan democracy are wrong when they

argue that it is "utopian in the sense of illusory – impossible of realization under realistically foreseeable conditions" (Keohane 2006, 77). Unfortunately, I will not accomplish this very complex task here.[2] I am committed, however, to approach it in one of my future papers.

References

Archibugi, Daniele. 2004. "Cosmopolitan Democracy and its Critics: A Review." *European Journal of International Relations* 10(3): 437-473.

___. 2008. *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens. Toward Cosmopolitan Democracy.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bădescu, Cristina Gabriela. 2011. *Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect: Security and Human Rights.* New York: Routledge.

Beebe, Shannon D. and Mary Kaldor. 2010. *The Ultimate Weapon Is No Weapon: Human Security and the New Rules of War and Peace.* New York: PublicAffairs.

Bellamy, Alex J., Paul Williams, and Stuart Griffin. 2010. *Understanding Peacekeeping,* Second Edition. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Coates, Tony. 2001. "Neither Cosmopolitanism nor Realism: A Response to Danilo Zolo." In *Global Democracy - Key debates*, ed. Barry Holden, 87-101. London: Routledge.

Dower, Nigel. 2010. "Questioning the Questioning of Cosmopolitanism." In *Questioning Cosmopolitanism*, eds. Stan van Hooft and Wim Vandekerckhove, 3-21. London: Springer.

Doyle, Michael W. 2011. "International Ethics and the Responsibility to Protect." *International Studies Review* 13 (1): 72-84.

Held, David. 1995. *Democracy and the Global Order. From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Held, David. 2009. "Restructuring Global Governance: Cosmopolitanism, Democracy and the Global Order." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 37 (3): 535-547.

ICISS. 2001. *The Responsibility to Protect 2001.* Ottawa: International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty; International Development Research Centre.

Keohane, Robert O. 2006. "Accountability in World Politics." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 29 (2): 75-87.

Landman, Todd. 2006. "Democracy and Human Security. Essential linkages." In *Democracy, Conflict and Human Security*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.

---

[2] Some key points in answering this critique of cosmopolitan democracy can be found in Archibugi 2008.

Reisman, W. Michael. 1990. "Sovereignty and Human Rights in Contemporary International Law." *The American Journal of International Law* 84 (4): 866-876.

Tigerstrom, Barbara von. 2007. *Human Security and International Law. Prospects and Problems.* Oxford and Portland: Hart Publishing.

UNDP. 1994. *Human Development Report 1994.* New York: Oxford University Press.

United Nations. 2004. *Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit A/59/565.* Agenda item 55, United Nations, 2004.

Weiss, Thomas G. and Ramesh Thakur. 2010. *Global Governance and the UN: An Unfinished Journey.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.