گۆڤاری کوردستانیی بۆ لێکۆڵینەوەی ستراتیجیی

Daniele Archibugi's model Of Cosmopolitan Democracy:

A Critical study

Dr. Zana Tofiq Kaka Amin

M. Abdullah Kadir Faqe Ibrahim

Department of Law, University of Raparin, Rania, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.   -email: Zana.amin@uor.edu.krd - bdul899@uor.edu.krd

Abstract

End of the cold war and increasing the number of democratic states in globalized world has inspired some scholars in the international studies to think about democracy on the global level. This research objectively answers the question: could democracy be extended to the global level? Thus, this paper critically examines Archibugi's model of institutionalized cosmopolitan democracy which stems from the claims that states are no longer able to face the global challenges such as immigration, environment, and international security. In contrast, scholars like Robert Dahl and Thomas christiano deny the possibility of global democracy. For example, Dahl states that the global institutions are helpful to develop democracy within the states not among states, because of the absence of popular control over decisions and policies. Meanwhile, Christiano, states that cosmopolitan democracy cannot provide the minimum acceptable degree of justice for all participants of the democratic process. Therefore, the research uses a qualitative method to demonstrate all the aspects of the subject. This paper concludes that the more democracy extended to the global level the less democratic it becomes and any modification to the concept democracy to adapt with the global institutions would make it less practicable.

Key Words: Cosmopolitan Democracy, Institutionalized Cosmopolitan, Global Institutions, Archbugi, Dahl, Christano.

1. Introduction

Cosmopolitan democracy is relatively new subject, which emerged only few decades ago in the political sciences. It is a problematic concept criticised by many which is based on the theoretical understanding before the empirical (Gould, 2004, p.161). Bienen stating that, there are some points where the concept of democracy is changed with the development of the political system, the first application of democracy to the political system was in the city-states of archaic Greeks, where the direct democracy was practiced (Bienen, et al, 1998, p.292). The second, transformation of democracy was happened with the emergence of the nation-state in the Europe to adapt the new political system where the representative democracy was applied (Archibugi, 2008). Scholars of the democratic theory would agree that both of the alterations are meeting the normative theory of democracy. However, the third change according to some scientists like Held and Archibugi is coming with changes of different aspect of life after the cold war, by the impact of the globalization (Bienen, et al, 1998, p.292)

Hence, the main question in this research is that, could democracy be extended to the global level? Scholars have different view and answer about the global democracy for example, Hebermas argued that Democracy has been qualified as post national (Habermas, 2001), the Hebermas's moral answer for the globalization of democracy is different from Achibugi's political answer by the fact that Hebermas is depending on the democracy and human right as a "moral universal" to legitimize the international decisions in the normative way while archibugi is depending on the global institution as a "world government" (Urbinati, 2003, p.3), and he is considering it as the only way to give the democratic answer for the global issues (Archibugi, 2004, p.450).

However, this paper is only concentrating on archibugi's institutional view of cosmopolitan democracy. Archibugi states that one of the legacies after the cold war was increasing the number of the democratic countries, especially in the Eastern Europe, Asia, and some African countries. Therefore, it is rational to anticipate the new democratic global system based on the single administration to adjust with this new progress of democracy which will be based on the greater participation of the individuals (Archbugi, et al, 1998A, p.2). He also points out that, "the state is too large for small issues, too small for bigger ones" as the states are no longer able to solve the new problems which emerged with the globalization. For example, the international system failed so far to solve the problem of the stateless people and immigration. Additionally, the growing interdependent between the states is making decisions in one state affect many other states, e.g., the US decisions has a big impact on the many states of the world (Archibugi, 2000, pp.139-140). Furthermore, Archibugi considered cosmopolitan democracy as a new attempt to manage the international order in a peaceful way, like other peace theorists, by the global institution, which is giving the global role to the citizens (Archibugi, 2011, p.4).

However, his views are criticised by Dahl, who claims that democracy can only be extended up to the nation- state, because democracy at the lowest point is understood as a "popular control over the decision making" (Dahl, 1999, p.4) and he is looking at the "global democracy as unachievable dream" (Archibugi et al, 2012, p.1). Christiano is also criticising the global level of democracy especially as a global institution. He suggests that their decisions cannot be legitimized because they cannot provide equal opportunity for all citizens. Moreover, Urbinati criticizes moral foundation of the global democracy which is coming from the Kantian philosophy of global peace by the fact that it breaches Kantian grounds of global peace which will be mentioned and explained in later sections (Urbinati, 2003, p.2).

In this regard, qualitative methods can be more useful for identifying and characterising all the aspects of the subject. In order to examine the extension of democratic decisions on the global level, it is important to know what cosmopolitan democracy is. Therefore, this article is focusing on the Archibugi's model of cosmopolitan democracy first, and then engaging with the different arguments refuting global democracy. There are some scientists who think that the democracy can be extended worldwide by depending on some specific features of democracy. In contrast, there are some others who are disapproving the possibility of the global democracy, especially the cosmopolitan model of Archibugi, like Dahl, and Christano. Their views are supported in this paper, because on the one hand, they recognize the impact and role of the globalization and the important position of the international globalization in spreading democracy within the states, on the other hand, they deny democracy at the global level. And also, Gould, although she believes in democracy at the regional level, she still mentioned some problems about the democracy at the global level. Before criticising cosmopolitan democracy, it is essential to describe the features of the cosmopolitan democracy and its possibility in the globalized world.

2. Literature Review

Cosmopolitanism is a complicated term. It has been understood and used in different ways, not all of which seem to be in line with the original meaning of the term, which, is refers to as "being a citizen of the world" (Celikates, 2019,p.208). The basic principle of Kant's cosmopolitanism is that peace depends on the formation of a union of states, regulated by laws of a cosmopolitan kind which would apply to the entire world. This is a cosmopolitanism built upon the universality of moral law, on rules of honesty, publicity, and the approval of the relations between states. However, this is a clear indication that Kantian cosmopolitanism it is based on the notion that all societies are organized and controlled by state. Its promoters neither unity of the human race nor world citizenship. Contrary to that, he advocates the development of a legal public order. Therefore, Kant is a moral cosmopolitan rather than a cosmopolitan in the 'internationalist' sense (Canto-Sperber, 2006).

The ethical cosmopolitanism has been clearly articulated by Jurgen Habermas(Canto-Sperber, 2006). He states that different peoples belong to different political groups and the state is merely one among them. Citizenship partly depends on nationality and not restricted to it. Such a cosmopolitan ideal is moderate form or it could take on a radical and striking form, as it is the case in the works of Jacques Derrida or Gorgio Agamben, or in the recent writings of Daniel Archibugi and David Held (Canto-Sperber, 2006).

In this regard, Archibugi defines Cosmopolitan democracy as "a project of political theory that attempts to apply some of the principles, values and procedures of democracy to the global politics" (Archibugi, 2020, p. 167). The word cosmopolitan democracy has a historical background as it has been used by the old "city states" of Greek, the Athens used the "cosmos + polis, and demos + kratos" the first combination means "the city of the universe" which is relating to the ideal situation, and the second combination means "the power of many" which is related to the administration of the people's affaire on the daily basis. The free normal people are considered as the demos (Archibugi, 2011, pp. 2-5).

Globalization first emerged to indicate that people are reaching longer distances in shorter time, as Marshall McLuhan describes this development as the "global village". The development of transnational trade and telecommunications among states has led the states to become more interdependent economically and culturally (Gould, 2004, p.160). These changes in the world have led some scholars like Archibugi to think that the world needs a new global order to find solutions for the problems which the states cannot control them on its own, for example issues like international trade, environment, and mass migration. And after the cold war, with the collapse of the Eastern bloc, the number of democratic countries has increased but it remained within the borders of the states (Archibugi, 2011, p.2) that new development of democracy is taking different forms if it is scaled up to the global level according to Archibugi (Archibugi, 2004, p. 438). Meanwhile, the normative stance behind the schemes of cosmopolitan democracy is a very strong one which emphasises on the importance of distinctive morality, where each individual is of equal moral worth (Coates, 2000, p. 90).

Moreover, there are three main presuppositions of cosmopolitan democracy which they have to be considered to obtain a better understanding. First, democracy is a "process" not a "set of norms and procedures" which means democracy can always progress, for example democracy can be tested in the democratic countries by checking, how much the rights are given to the strangers (Archibugi, 2004, p. 439). Second, the states have the internal control but externally not independent as there is quite many issues in the world that states cannot solve them single-handedly, for instance issues like disease, migration, and environment, therefore any democratic decisions about these issues within the states will be insignificant and impractical, because the states cannot control them and at the same time, they are not accountable (Archibugi, 2004, p. 441). Third assumption is that, the internal democratisation of the countries is not enough to build the peace in the world, because democratic countries do not necessarily have a peaceful foreign policy, therefore democracy among states is also necessary as the world become more interdependent by globalization. The democratic principles among the states should also allow the individuals to become international player (Archibugi, 2011, pp.3-4).

However, according to the communitarians the states are playing the major role in the international arena and the other international organizations have a secondary role, because the communitarians are concentrating on the cultural distinctiveness of the

humankind, on the contrary the cosmopolitans are thinking about the alternative organization to the states which provides the structure to extend democracy globally and making the worldwide citizens. Communitarians are criticizing this process by the expressing their concern, that how the accountability of that global institution is delivered and to whom, because that is seen as an opportunity for big powers of the world (Prokhovnik, 2004, section 6.2). Communitarians are also focusing on the aims of the community and they are questioning the legitimacy and morals within global politics, as they are mentioning the failure of the multi-ethnic states, self-determination, and prioritising of different rights.

3. Achibugi's Model of Cosmopolitan Democracy

Archibugi have a political approach for the global democracy as he thinks that it can be achieved through the global institution and legitimizes decisions of that institution by the world citizens as a political status not as a moral value and this would give a legislative dimension to the institutions. He also looks at democracy as a culture of participation rather than just a decision-making process (Urbinati, 2003, p. 3). According to Archibugi, Cosmopolitan democracy has three main dimensions as following: First, local dimension which is based on connecting the local communities not merely in the same country but on global level, and how much the government bodies are democratic to deal with the multiculturalism, because globalization has linked the local institutions and communities to outside world universally. Second, state dimension, Cosmopolitan democracy at this level is looking at the states as an agent to the global democracy and as a means to give the rights to the individuals in different communities and cultures. It is also looking at the bases which citizenships are given to individuals (Archibugi, 2004, p. 447). Third, global dimension, it is based on the necessity for reformulation of the principles of International Governmental Organizations (IGO) to become more representative and accountable globally (Beck 2006, p.9). This is because the big states who are a member of the international organizations, like UN have only one vote even though they have a big population (Archibugi, 2011, pp.5-7).

 As mentioned in the literature review, the relationship between dimensions is based on the assumption that any exemption of political or institutional subjects from responsibilities of their actions is incompatible with the essence of democracy (Archibugi, 2011, p.7). So, the idea of the cosmopolitan democracy is coming from the failure of the nation states to solve the new global problems and challenges that they came with the globalization such as international security, environmental issues and many other problems (archbugi, et al, 1998A, p. 7).

Therefore, Archibugi points out the possibility of different forms of global democracy that can be classified according to how similar or different from the three imaginative forms; First, the type is similar to the "confederation" which is more suitable with the communitarians view of global democracy, as citizens will be represented by their own states in the "confederation" body. States have internal control and the right to join and withdraw their membership freely. The Second, form is called "world government" or "world federation" which is accountable to all citizens directly and it has the main authority over all other small authorities, because it is elected directly by the citizens and some are called it multi-level of governance. Third form is "global governance" or "global stakeholders democracy" it holds different name according to different author, the main character of this form is that states are not the only player in the international system, the governmental and non-governmental international organizations also have a role and accountability according to their speciality, and this responsibility is not necessarily through the election system but also it can be through the permission (Archibugi et al, 2012, p.1).

Furthermore, he claims that Cosmopolitan democracy can be developed through a variety of policy and institutional changes. Some of them are already existing, such as states and international organizations. Others will imply new forms of political organization and will rely on the activities of new political agents (Archibugi and Held, 2011, p. 441).

According to Archibugi Cosmopolitan democracy is depending on the four characters of democracy which could be extended worldwide beyond the states, which they are; "democracy is an unfinished journey, democracy is an endless journey, democracy has a meaning in its historical context, and democracy needs an endogenous fabric to work" (archbugi, 1998B, p.200). These four features of democracy have led archibugi to believe that: First, the population of the world are not satisfactory represented by their states; therefore, the world parliament is a good channel for the individuals to express their views on the global issues, alongside of their governments. Second, people who are in the state, are no longer the stakeholders, as the globalization had a

big impact. And the political participation will be in different procedure because the stakeholders of the world have a similarity in the most of the global issues. Third, rule of the law is one of the requirements of democratic procedures, so in cosmopolitan democratic world order the decisions should not be neglected by the states, like what happened in the UN, but they are so important which make the norms strong enough to make the governments obedient to them. Finally, education has a big impact to build the "post national identity" as a citizen of the world, and making it easier to live in the multicultural societies (Archibugi, 2011, p.7-12).

Furthermore, Archibugi considered cosmopolitical democracy as a new peace plan to find solutions for the issues of humanitarian crisis which the current global system is failed to have a response. He is influenced by the Kant's statement that "a violation of rights in one part of the world is felt everywhere" (Archibugi, 2000, p.139-147). Urbinati on the other hand, acknowledges that, "the moral justification for a global democratic order is derived from the Kantian principle that a degree of association among the peoples of the world is needed to protect human rights and successfully oppose and prevent their violation" (Urbinati, 2003, p.2). However, she still thinks that Archibugi is violating the Kant's theory of peace by noticing a number of the dissatisfactions in cosmopolitan democracy; First, cosmopolitan democracy is starting the process of democratization from the transformation of the state system, which may be against the will of some individuals to impose the global institutions, and that is incompatible with the "Kant's longue durée" which do not want to make the individuals democratic in opposition to their will, the point here is, they want to start from the top to bottom by imposing this global body. Second, the cosmopolitan democracy believes that extending democracy within the states will not bring the peace on the global level, however Urbinati is asking that, would the global institution be democratic if some parts of the world is not democratic, it is the same like saying that US is democratic while some of its states are not democratic.

Finally, cosmopolitan democracy is disregarding the Kant's equality condition "equality proviso" by miscalculating of the role of the big power in the world, which in the case of the cosmopolitan order they will take the opportunity to impose and dominate their values worldwide that will lead to "creating an empire rather than cosmopolitan order" and in that case, achieving peace in the global order is almost impossible. (Urbinati, 2003, p.3). Bienen also thinks that Kant as a liberal cosmopolitan thinker did not give up the idea of the sovereignty of the states, that is why he was looking for the global order where the citizens' rights are protected at the same time protecting the sovereignty of the states, as he suggested the federation of the states as a way out (Bienen, et al, 1998, p.299).

Gould also is denying the cosmopolitan democracy in the practical life, because she thinks that democracy is based "on the equal right of individuals to participate in decisions concerning frameworks of common activity defined by shared goals" and this participation cannot be seen practically at the global level (Gould, 2004, p.163). Although she is aware of the pressure of globalization on the political life by the new progress in human rights discourse in which puts much pressure on the state's behaviour towards their citizens, she is still indicated to two main problems, in which democracy is facing under the new circumstances of globalization which they are; First, the accountability of the transnational organizations whether they are going through the democratic political procedure or not. Second, the legitimacy of the decisions of these new global bodies, are they legitimized by the member states or directly by the people of these states (Gould, 2004, p.162).

Similarly, Jackson acknowledges the globalization impact on weakening the states sovereignty by the fact that states are no longer have full control on the expansion of the world trade and economy (Jackson, 2007, p.139). However, he still thinks that the non-state players like international organizations cannot displace the state system, as they could only be active within the framework of international "peace and security" which the state system provides. This is because non-state players cannot take responsibility for the international peace and security, they cannot even be active during the war time (Jackson, 2007, p.154).

4. Discussion

Some scientists of the political theories have focused on different features of democracy; as a result, they reached different conclusions about the cosmopolitan democracy. For example, Dahl focused on two features of democracy; the first one is "democracy as a system of popular control over governmental policies and decisions" which means any decision from the government should come from the people directly like ancient world, or indirectly through the representatives "chosen by a lot" like today's

election system. The second feature is to see democracy as a provider of the civil and political rights since they are very indispensable for the "popular control" in the democratic system.

These two features have led Dahl to think contrary to Archibugi, because Dahl thinks that: First, global bodies and institutions are helpful and acceptable to enhance and support democracy within the states, but still describing them as intrusive, because they do not have even a limited popular control. Second, democracy on the international level cannot be achieved and these global organizations cannot be democratic, because; on the one hand, if the governments are small, their decisions will be more expressive to the peoples' will, and the people can control the governments' decisions more easily, as well as the government will be less powerful to fulfil all peoples' demand (Dahl, 1999, p.19-23).

On the other hand, if is big, the people have less or no capacity to participate or control the decisions of the government but the government becomes more powerful to achieve peoples' demand. Some of the scientists are optimistic about the democracy on global level under the light of globalization in today's advanced world. However, Dahl arguing even in the countries with the long tradition of democracy it is hard for the citizens to control the decisions which are related to the foreign policy so what do we expect from the governments on the global level (Dahl, 1999, p.19-23). In other words, global institutions cannot represent the peoples demand and protect their civil and political rights.

Similarly, Christiano has also criticised the cosmopolitan democracy because he relied on the equal opportunity for all as a different characteristic of democracy. He states that, many governments of the world are obtaining their legitimacy from democratic procedures like election system; similarly, the global bodies should undergo the democratic procedure to get their legitimacy for democratic decisions about worldwide problems, which ought to provide the minimum acceptable degree of justice for all in favour of participants of the democratic process. However, according to Christiano, this global democracy is facing three main problems as follow: First, "problem of stakes", One of the facts which global democracy is based on is the interdependent of different parts of the world in different aspects of life and their activities are affecting each other, some are call it "all affected".

Moreover, each person has their own saying as an equal opportunity for all on the basis of democracy, the main point here is when global bodies making democratic decisions it will be against or in the interest of some people who ought to have the same equal opportunity. Thus, the democratic decision is failed to provide the minimum acceptable degree of justice. However, that will be different on the state level as citizens interests in one state are more attached together than the citizens of other state. This is because the issues which are important and affecting the people's life in one state are different from the other states. (Christiano, 2012, p. 73-75).

The same point is explained by Dahl but through the "foreign affairs and popular control" approach. Dahl is claiming that the decision, which is related to the foreign issues even in the democratic country like US, is not coming under the citizens control by the fact that people are not interested in the foreign policy. As a solution, for the "popular control" on foreign issues decisions, Dahl is using the term "Public good or general interest" and he also acknowledges that measuring the "public good", which is "substantive and procedural", is problematic, the former is considers the people's concerns and interests and the latter is the democratic procedures to legitimize the decisions through different democratic and representative institution of the government. These procedures are easier in the states as its population is not multicultural "homogeneous" (Dahl, 1999, p. 23-28).

 Additionally, the common good or interest is more problematic in the multicultural or multi-ethnic countries. So, the main point here is that if we transferred the "public good" to international level it became more problematic as the population of the international system is more "heterogeneous" and even the application of these two previous solutions cannot solve the problem (Dahl, 1999, p. 23-28).

Furthermore, Gould also thinks that the legitimacy of the global body is still questionable, as there is no factual accountability for the international bodies. Even if they get some very weak accountability by the fact that each member state has participated in democratic decision making equally and freely and representing their citizens. It would only be acceptable if; first, each member of these transnational bodies was internally democratic and their membership decision was based on the democratic procedures like referendum. Second, the citizens of the member states were educated enough to be aware of the issues and activities of that transnational body. Third, the component parts of these global bodies were giving the "due representation" to the member states.

Empirically none of these conditions can be seen, that means there is not truthful accountability. (Gould, 2004, p. 163-164).

The second problem which Christiano points out is "persistent minorities on global scale". Some of the democratic countries have a minority problem which will become more intensified as democratic governance is extended to the global level. These problems are dealt with on the state level by two ways, one is raising the level of majority to "supermajority" to include the minorities in important decision makings, and the other is giving a degree of political freedom to make some decisions for themselves, like a federal system. Christiano considers both ways undemocratic, because in the former case, it is like giving right to minorities to reject some decisions which is not compatible with the equal opportunity for all, and in the latter case the minorities are not included in the global governance and that leads the world to be ruled by the combination of the minorities which will weaken the political body (Christiano, 2012, p.75-77).

In addition, Dahl is also concerned about the problem of minorities, as he is stating that the exercise of democracy, requires "delegation", which means the authority is given to some people to represent the people, as Dahl call it "polyarchies". So, the point here is, the size of these representations is very important, because it decides to what extent the decisions are subject to the "popular control" (Dahl, 1999, p.19-22). Predictably, Communitarians also did not hide their concern about the problem of minorities, as they are arguing that it is very difficult to achieve democracy in the multicultural society rather than all the same society and the most evident case for that is the failure of the multi-cultural society, as Danilo Zolo "warns that democracy cannot be exported" (archbugi, 1998B, pp. 205-207).

Finally, there is another problem which is mentioned by Christiano and known as "the problem of citizenship at the global level". He states that citizens have a lack of information problem about the policies of their state especially in the bigger states, which affects the responsibility of the citizens towards the democratic process of election and voting. Citizens dealt with this problem by prioritizing their own interest over the others or through the political means by joining the pressure groups or political parties. The point here is how the problem is dealt with at the global level, as there is no political parties or other democratic institutions to express different views and interest of the citizens, and consequently, the legitimacy of the global body will be affected (Christiano, 2012, pp. 77-79).

Inevitably, Dahl refers to this problem under the lens of the "popular control over the decisions" and stating that if democracy extended from a state to international level, then, on the one hand, the citizens would obviously face more problems to control the decisions of the "elites" and, on the other hand, it will not be clear on which base the people would be represented. Because, whatever system is used, the votes of the smaller groups and states would be neglected as the bigger countries would have more control. And any problem which citizens are facing in democratic states it would be bigger on international scale (Dahl, 1999, pp. 28-32).

Therefore, democracy in the smaller extent would be more visible and in the international extent would be almost in nowhere to be found (Dahl, 1999, pp. 28-32). In other words, as Dahl thinks that "democracy can be applied beyond states, and regard the idea of a global democracy as an unachievable dream" (Cited in Archbugi et. 2011, p. 1). The most obvious finding to emerge from the analysis is that the size of the political bodies is also significant for Dahl, as the bigger sizes of the political bodies have less "popular control".

On the top of that, Hassner is explaining the situation through analysing the situation of the refugees between the reality and theories. He is arguing that the refugees without the status is the same like the stateless people who are defended by Hanna Arendt stating that they have a "right to have a right". In theory, if the world citizenship is achieved then nobody can become a refugee. However, in reality there is more restriction on the refugees which is contradicting with the world citizenship (Hassner, 1998, p. 273). Even the scientists who believe in global democracy, like, Hebermas, did not give the political status to the citizens on the global level. He thinks that citizenship should stay in the states and all citizens in the world are sharing in the "moral universalism" in the "global public sphere" to make "global public opinion". Hebermas is putting more weight on the global civil society, intergovernmental and non-governmental international organizations instead of the world citizenship. (Urbinati, 2003, p. 3). The most obvious finding to emerge from the analysis is that the world has not experienced democracy on the global level yet, that has led to the lack of the empirical studies on cosmopolitan democracy. The global issues such as environment, immigration, and

security are dealt with within the framework of international relations and international institutions.

5. Conclusion

In sum, few decades after the end of cold war, much different world can be seen. It is noticeable that more countries are practicing democracy in their political system; therefore a good future can be seen for democracy globally within the states. However, it can be said that it is too early to talk about democracy on the global decisions as the answer is hidden in the future. Under the light of the critics which were mentioned earlier, it can be said that cosmopolitan democracy is not practicable especially the institutional idea of cosmopolitan democracy. It is very important to know which definition of democracy is used by experts, because different definitions would take you to different results on the global level of democracy, and each scholar is dependent on different characteristics and features of democracy to justify their theory or argument.

It seems that the researchers are not very much sure about the future of the global democracy under the current political analysis, but they are sure about that Archibugi's model of cosmopolitan democracy that is weakening the concept of democracy and making it less visible. This is because the problems which are facing democracy on the global level would affect the very essence of democracy, as a result, Archibugi's model of cosmopolitan democracy is becoming less reliable and feasible for obtaining a peaceful democratic world order.

It is noticeable that, any modification to the concept of democracy to adapt with the political bodies on the bigger scale, like globally, would make it less practicable and less democratic, because it becomes less representative of the peoples need. That is why some scholars did not hide their concerns about the idea of cosmopolitan democracy, and they criticised it like Dahl as he depended on the "popular control over the decisions" in his critics. The size of the political bodies is also very important for Dahl, as the bigger sizes of the political bodies have less "popular control" therefore they become less democratic.

Similarly, for Christiano the equal opportunity for all and the size of the political body is equally important, the bigger size of the political bodies, the less capable to provide equal opportunity therefore they are less democratic. It can be said that there are some similarities and differences in the critics. The critics are expressed in different ways but they have the same result in which the bigger size of the political bodies, the less democratic they become. Consequently, the archibugi's project of the cosmopolitan democracy is less democratic than the democracy on the state level. Both Dahl and christiano are aware about the impact of the globalization, but they are expecting that, it will help the democratization process within the states not on the global level.

مۆدێلی دانیێل ئارکیبوجی بۆ دیموکراسی کۆسمۆپۆلیتان: لێکۆڵینەوەیەکی ڕەخنەیی

پوختە

کۆتایـی جەنگـی سـارد و زیادبوونـی ژمـارەی دەوڵەتانـی دیموکراسـی لـە ئاسـتی جیهانـدا، بوونـە هۆکارێـک بـۆ گرنگـی پێدانـی زیاتـری سـکۆڵەرانی پەیوەندییـە نێودەوڵەتییـەکان بـەم بابەتـە. ئـەم توێژینەوەیـە بەشـێوەیەکی سـەرەکی وەڵامـی ئـەو پرسـیارە دەداتـەوە: کـە ئایـا دەکرێـت دیموکراسـی بـۆ ئاسـتی جیهانـی درێژبکرێتـەوە؟ بۆیـە توێژینەوەکـە بەشـێوەیەکی ڕەخنـەی لـە مۆدێلـی ئارکیبوجـی (Archibugi) دیموکراسـی گەردوونـی (Cosmopolitan Democracy) دەکۆڵێتـەوە، کـە بانگەشـەی ئـەوە دەکات دەوڵەتـان چیـتر ناتوانـن ڕووبـەڕووی ئاڵنگارییـە جیهانییەکانـی وەک کـۆچ، ژینگـە و ئاسایشـی نێودەوڵەتـی ببنـەوە. لـەم نێوەندەشـدا، ئارکیبوجـی پێشـنیازی بـە دامەزراوەییکردنـی دیموکراسـی گەردوونـی لـە ئاسـتی جیهانـیدا دەکات. لـە بەرامبـەر ئـەم تێروانینـەدا، بەشـێک لـە توێژەرانـی تـری وەک ڕۆبێـرت داڵ (Robert Dahl) و تۆمـاس کریسـتانۆ (Thomas christiano) ئەگـەری دیموکراسـی جیهانـی بـە تایبەتـی مۆدێلـی ئارکیبوجـی ڕەت دەکەنـەوە، چونکـە لـە لێکۆڵینەوەکانیانـدا پشـتیان بـە تایبەتمەندییـە جیاوازەکانـی دیموکراسـی بەسـتووە. داڵ دەڵێـت کـە دامـەزراوە جیهانییـەکان تەنها یارمەتیـدەرن بـۆ پەرەپێدانـی دیموکراسـی لەنـاو دەوڵەتانـدا نـەک لـە نێـوان دەوڵەتـەکاندا. هۆکاری سـەرەکی ئەمـەش دەگەڕێتـەوە بـۆ نەبوونـی کۆنتڕۆڵـی جەماوەریـی لەسـەر ئـەو بڕیـار و سیاسـەتانەی کـە کاریگـەری لەسـەر جەوهـەری دیموکراسـی هەیـە. لـەوەش زیاتـر، کریسـتانۆ لـە ڕەخنەکانیـدا کـە پشـتی بـە هەڵـی یەکسـان بـۆ هەمـووان بەسـتووە، دەڵێـت دیموکراسـی گەردوونـی ناتوانێـت کەمتریـن ئاسـتی دادپـەروەری قبوڵـکراو بـۆ هەمـوو بەشـداربووانی پرۆسـەی دیموکراسـی دەسـتەبەر بـکات. لـە کۆتاییـدا، ئـەم توێژینەوەیـە بـەو ئەنجامـە دەگات، کـە تاوەکـو دیموکراسـی بـەرەو ئاسـتی جیهانـی بڕوات، دیموکراسـی کەمـتر دەبێتـەوە و هـەر هەموارکردنێـک بـۆ تێگەیشـتنی دیموکراسـی بـۆ خۆگونجانـدن لەگـەڵ دامەزراوە جیهانییەکانـدا دەبێتـە هـۆی ئـەوەی کـە کەمـتر جێبەجـێ بکرێـت.

وشە کلیلیەکان: دیموکراسی کۆسمۆپۆلیتان، دامەزراوە جیهانییەکان، ئارکیبوجی، داڵ، کریستانۆ.

Archibugi, D., & Held, D. (2011). Cosmopolitan democracy: paths and agents. Ethics & International Affairs, 25(4), 433-461.

Archibugi, Daniele, Held, D and Koehler, M. (1998), (Ed). 'Re-imagining Political Community Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy' (Cambridge: Polity Press)

Archibugi, Daniele. (2000) 'Cosmopolitical Democracy, New Left Review' Vol: 40, No: 4, Jul-Aug 2000. PP137-150.

Archibugi, Daniele. (2011) 'Cosmopolitan Democracy: A Restatement; social science research network. Version: 17/02/2011 PP1-15.

Archibugi, D., Koenig-Archibugi, M., & Marchetti, R. (2011). Introduction: Mapping global democracy. 1-21.

Bienen, D, Rittberger, V, and Wagner, W. (1998) 'Democracy in the United Nations System: Cosmopolitan and Communitarian Principles' in Archibugi, Daniele, Held, D and Koehler, M. (Ed). 'Re-imagining Political Community Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy' (Cambridge: Polity Press). PP287-3-9.

Beck, U. (2006). Cosmopolitan vision. Polity.

Canto-Sperber, M. (2006, January). the normative foundations of cosmopolitanism. In Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society (Vol. 106, pp. 267-283). Aristotelian Society, Wiley.

Coates, T. (2000). Neither cosmopolitanism nor realism, in B. Holden ed. Global Democracy. Key Debates. London: Routledge. pp.87-101.

Christiano, T. (2012) 'Is Democratic Legitimacy Possible for International Institutions?' in Archibugi, D. Koenig-Archibugi, and M. Marchetti, R. (Ed). 'Global Democracy, Normative and Empirical perspectives' (New York: Cambridge University Press) PP69-95.

Celikates, R. (2019). Three Types of Cosmopolitanism? Liberalism, Democracy, and Tian-xia. Yearbook for Eastern and Western Philosophy, 2019(4), 208-220.

Dahl, R. (1999), (Ed) 'Can International Organizations be Democratic? In Shapiro, I and Casiano Hacker-Cordon 'Democracy's Edges'. (New York: Cambridge University Press) PP19-37.

Gould, Carol C. (2004) 'Globalizing Democracy and Human rights' (Cambridge University Press).

Habermas, J. (2001) The Post national Constellation. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hassner, P. (1998) 'Refugees: A Special Case for Cosmopolitan Citizenship' in Archibugi, Daniele, Held, D and Koehler, M. (Ed). 'Re-imagining Political Community Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy' (Cambridge: Polity Press). PP273-287

Jackson, R (2007) 'SOVEREIGNTY, Evolution of an Idea' (Cornwall: Cornwall polity press)

Prokhovnik, R. (2004) 'Rights and justice in international relations' in (Brown, W. Bromley, S and Athreye, S) (Ed) 'Ordering the International: History, Change and Transformation. (Pluto Press)

Urbinati, N (2003) 'Can Cosmopolitical Democracy be Democratic? 'Political theory Daily Review, 2003 PP 1-10 to link on the internet http://www.politicaltheory.info/essays/urbinati.html   accessed on 16/03/2021

نموذج دانييل أرشيبوجي للديمقراطية العالمية:
دراسة نقدية

الملخص

إن نهايـة الحـرب البـاردة وزيـادة عـدد البلـدان الديمقراطيـة في العالم ألهـم بعـض الباحثين في الدراسـات الدوليـة للتفكيـر في الديمقراطيـة عـلى المسـتوى العالمي. وهـذا البحـث يجيـب بموضوعيـة عـلى السـؤال: هـل مـن الممكـن أن تمتـد الديمقراطيـة إلى المسـتوى العالمي؟تقيـم هـذا البحـث نمـوذج أرشـيبوجي للديمقراطيـة العالميـة بشـكل نقدي الـذي يدعـي أن الـدول لم تعـد قـادرة عـلى مواجهـة تحديـات عـالم المعـاصر مثـل الهجـرة والبيئـة والأمـن الـدولي. ولذلـك، يقـترح الديمقراطيـة العالميـة المؤسسـية في النظام السياسي العالمي كإجابـة. وعـلى النقيـض مـن ذلـك، هنـاك بعـض لا يوافقـون عـلى إمكانيـة الديمقراطيـة العالميـة، وخاصـة النمـوذج أرشـيبوجي، مثـل روبـرت دال، و تومـاس كريسـتانو لأنهـم اعتمـدوا عـلى سـمات مختلفـة للديمقراطيـة في دراسـاتهم. يقـول دال إن المؤسسـات العالميـة تسـاعد فقـط في تطويـر الديمقراطيـة داخـل الـدول وليـس بـين الـدول. وذلـك بسـبب عـدم وجـود سـيطرة جماهيريـة عـلى القـرارات والسياسـات التـي تؤثـر عـلى جوهـر الديمقراطيـة. وعـلاوة عـلى ذلـك، فـإن كريسـتانو، الـذي اعتمـد عـلى تكافـؤ الفـرص للجميـع في انتقاداتـه، يقـول إن الديمقراطيـة العالميـة لا يمكـن أن توفـر الحـد الأدنى المقبـول مـن العدالـة لجميـع المشـاركين في العمليـة الديمقراطيـة. وأخـيرا، تخلـص هـذا البحـث إلى أنـه كلـما اتسـع نطـاق الديمقراطيـة إلى المسـتوى العالمي كلـما أصبحـت أقـل ديمقراطيـة، وأي تعديـل لمفهـوم الديمقراطيـة للتكيـف مـع المؤسسـات العالميـة سـيجعلها أقـل قابليـة للتطبيـق وغـير متوافقـة.

الكلمات الرئيسية: الديمقراطية العالمية ، المؤسسات العالمية ، أرشيبوجي ، دال، كريستانو.

References

Archibugi, D. (2020). Cosmopolitan democracy. In Cosmopolitanism in Hard Times (pp. 167-180). Brill.

Archibugi, D. (2008). The global commonwealth of citizens. Princeton University Press.

Archibugi, D (2004), 'Cosmopolitan Democracy and its Critics a Review

European Journal of International Relations,

[vol. 10, no. 3, September 2004, pp. 437-473].

Archibugi, D (1998 B) 'Principles of Cosmopolitan Democracy' in Archibugi, Daniele, Held, D and Koehler, M. (Ed). 'Re-imagining Political Community Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy' (Cambridge: Polity Press) PP198-228.

Archibugi, D. Koenig-Archibugi, and M. Marchetti, R. (Ed). (2012) 'Global Democracy, Normative and Empirical perspectives' (New York: Cambridge University Press).