

Deakin Research Online

This is the published version:

Slaughter, Steven 2003, *The neo-roman republican legacy and international political theory*, Department of International Relations, Australian National University, Canberra, A.C.T.

Available from Deakin Research Online:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30028759>

Reproduced with the kind permissions of the copyright owner.

Copyright : 2003, Australian National University, Department of International Relations

Working Paper 2003/5

The neo-roman republican legacy and international political theory

STEVEN SLAUGHTER

Canberra, December 2003

Published by Department of International Relations

RSPAS

Australian National University

Canberra ACT 0200

Australia

Tel: +61 (2) 6125 2166

Fax: +61 (2) 6125 8010

Email: intrel@anu.edu.au

Web: <http://rspas.anu.edu.au/ir>

Cover by RTM Design.

National Library of Australia Cataloguing-in Publication entry

Slaughter, Steven, 1970- .

The neo-roman republican legacy and international political theory.

ISBN 0 7315 3131 0.

1. Political science. 2. Roman law. 3. Liberty.

I. Australian National University. Dept. of International Relations. II. Title. (Series : Working paper (Australian National University. Dept. of International Relations : 1983) ; 2003/5).

320

©Steven Slaughter

Department of International Relations

Working Papers

The Department's Working Paper series provides readers with access to current research on international relations. Reflecting the Department's intellectual profile, the series includes topics on the general theoretical and empirical study of international and global politics, the political dynamics and developments in the Asia-Pacific region, and the intersection between the two.

Publication as a 'Working Paper' does not preclude subsequent publication in scholarly journals or books, indeed it may facilitate publication by providing feedback from readers to authors.

Unless otherwise stated, publications of the Department of International Relations are presented without endorsement as contributions to the public record and debate. Authors are responsible for their own analysis and conclusions.

Abstract

This paper claims that established accounts of international political theory overlook the neo-roman strand of republican political theory. It seeks to address this case of neglect and extend republican observations into international political theory in three steps. The first step examines the nature of international political theory. The second step examines the neo-roman strand of republicanism's conception of liberty and the institutions whereby this type of liberty is secured. Lastly, the main elements of a republican approach to international political theory are developed in a way that highlights republicanism's institutional approach to world politics and its commitment to the state.

The neo-roman republican legacy and international political theory

STEVEN SLAUGHTER¹

The purpose of this paper is to claim that the cosmopolitan–communitarian divide within international political theory (IPT) misses an important and long forgotten strand of political thinking—that of the neo-roman strand of republican political theory. While various strands of communitarian thought are well represented in IPT,² the neo-roman republican idea that political institutions ought to contest power and secure individual liberty is missing within IPT literature. The revival of neo-roman republicanism within political theory is attributable to writers such as Quentin Skinner and Philip Pettit.³ These writers have emphasised that reflections upon the historical and ideational ascendance of liberalism misses a distinct phase of Western history where a republican-inspired conception of liberty and good government reigned that was distinct from liberalism. While this revival has been important within political theory and the history of ideas, it has not systematically engaged with the international implications of this theory. In this sense the revival of republican thought is significantly incomplete.

This article seeks to address this case of mutual neglect and extend these republican observations into the international sphere by suggesting that neo-roman republicanism offers a distinct and compelling perspective on how global politics *ought* to be organised. This argument has three steps. The first step seeks to examine the positions within IPT by exploring the positions of realism and idealism as well as cosmopolitanism and

¹ Lecturer in International Relations, Deakin University. I would like to thank Yvette Slaughter, Philip Pettit and Lorraine Elliot for their constructive advice, although the usual disclaimers apply. I also thank the Department of International Relations at the Australian National University for the hospitality provided while this paper was written.

² See Chris Brown, 'Review article: Theories of international justice', *British Journal of Political Science* 27(2) 1997, pp. 273–97, and Nicholas Rengger, 'Political theory and international relations: Promised land or exit from Eden?', *International Affairs* 76(4) 2000, pp. 755–70.

³ In this paper republicanism refers to the neo-roman account of republicanism.

communitarianism.⁴ The second step turns to an explanation of the neo-roman strand of republicanism that includes both its conception of liberty and the institutions whereby this type of liberty is secured. Lastly, the main elements and claims of republicanism as an approach to IPT are explored. The primary objective of this paper is to provide a reasonably modest standard of proof for republicanism: that it is a viable and valuable alternative to prevailing approaches to IPT.

Before proceeding further it is important to note that I am aware that in examining what constitutes a republican approach to global politics, I am sidestepping important questions such as why republicanism has not generally been systematically involved within IPT or international relations (IR) and could be seen to be lifting republican notions out of an early modern context to a late modern context where they are ill suited and inconsonant. While the applicability of republican ideas within a globalising context clearly requires further study, the argument here rests primarily upon the recent scholarship of those reviving republican ideas and does not intend to resurrect the spirit of Machiavelli or Rousseau holus-bolus. Indeed, the intent here is to contrast a republican conception of politics to the more established approaches within IPT.

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL THEORY

Before the normative aspects of a republican perspective can be unfurled it is necessary to outline the manner in which investigations into the ethics of international politics are conducted. The examination of international or global ethics can be found in a number of political and philosophical disciplines including political theory and IR. Normative theory in regards to world politics is referred to as 'international political theory'⁵ or 'normative international relations theory'.⁶ Chris Brown defines this theory

⁴ Kimberly Hutchings, *International political theory: Rethinking ethics in a global era* (London: Sage, 1999), chapters 1 and 2.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xi.

⁶ Chris Brown, *International relations theory: New normative approaches* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992).

as a body of work which addresses the moral dimension of international relations and the wider questions of meaning and interpretation generated by the discipline. At its most basic it addresses the ethical nature of the relations between communities/states, whether in the context of the old agenda, which focused on violence and war, or the new(er) agenda, which mixes these traditional concerns with the modern demand for international distributive justice.⁷

This observation illustrates the long-standing but shifting way in which scholars of international relations and political theory have reflected on ethical concerns in world politics. IPT is the scholarly reflection on the nature, existence and problems of global ethics, which in the contemporary period have expanded beyond questions of war and distributive justice to issues of just governance and economic organisation as well as new issues of justice.⁸

According to Kimberly Hutchings, IPT can be seen to reflect on political life in at least two senses.⁹ The first is the idealist–realist axis, a contrast that since the seventeenth century has rested on a ‘double distinction: the distinction between morality and politics on one hand and the distinction between state and international politics on the other’.¹⁰ In IR theory this contrast has of course been drawn between the realist emphasis on state survival with the claim that states ought to operate according to an established morality or indeed promote individual justice at a global level.¹¹ Realism makes the claim of ‘moral scepticism’ in world politics.¹² This claim is that moral claims are not possible in the international realm because political action in an anarchical world is limited to survival which means that justice and even interstate cooperation come well after principles of

⁷ Ibid., p. 3.

⁸ Andrew Linklater, ‘The evolving spheres of international justice’, *International Affairs* 75(3) 1999, pp. 473–82.

⁹ Hutchings, *International political theory*, chapters 1 and 2.

¹⁰ Ibid., p. 23.

¹¹ Charles R. Beitz, *Political theory and international relations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979).

¹² Ibid., p. 13.

‘prudence’ and of power.¹³ At the other end of this axis rests the idealist position which forwards a belief that international politics is in fact a moral realm where justice and law can be developed. This position rails against the notion that international politics is a realm of reoccurrence and repetition by arguing in support of the notion that individuals and states can learn to avoid interstate violence and selfishness—through the development of cooperation and institutions. According to the idealist position, a state’s interests ought to include concern for justice and the rule of law in world politics. Thus this divide is focused upon the question of whether the international realm is hospitable to moral principles and rules.

The second sense in which IPT can be understood is the communitarian–cosmopolitan axis or ‘divide’.¹⁴ According to this axis the issue is whether the human species or the nation-state is the limit of moral community. However, Richard Shapcott notes that

much of the literature in political theory on which the International Relations literature draws is not concerned with boundaries as such but with disputes over the nature, source or grounding of morality. Characterized as a debate between liberals and communitarians, the central question is about how we acquire *knowledge* of the good, and the relationship between the right and the good, rather than over the boundaries of the moral community.¹⁵

Of course this divide is a ‘very crude aid’ because many scholars navigate intricate paths through these poles.¹⁶ Moreover, the liberal–communitarian debate itself can be criticised on many grounds, including on the grounds that the debate overstates the distinction between the two positions. This is especially true if we consider that liberalism has historically depended on communitarian affiliations in order to operate as a moral/political theory as

¹³ Hans Morgenthau, *Politics among nations: The struggle for power and peace*, brief edition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993), p. 12.

¹⁴ Richard Shapcott, ‘Beyond the cosmopolitan/communitarian divide: Justice, difference and community in international relations’, in Maria Lensu and Jan-Stefan Fritz, eds, *Value pluralism, normative theory and international relations* (Houndsmills: Macmillan, 2000).

¹⁵ Shapcott, ‘Beyond the cosmopolitan/communitarian divide’, p. 101.

¹⁶ Chris Brown, *Sovereignty, rights, and justice: International political theory today* (Cambridge: Polity, 2002), p. vii.

well as a way of life.¹⁷ Nevertheless the communitarian–cosmopolitan divide asks important questions: where and how is morality constituted and where should moral accountability ultimately lie? While the idealist–realist axis asks what motivation dominates world politics—self-interest or an interest in justice—the communitarian–cosmopolitan axis examines whether particular or universal moral principles should be the gauge of ethics. Different authors can be marked out as positions within the communitarian–cosmopolitan divide.¹⁸ Positions within a broadly communitarian framework that promote and defend particularism include Michael Walzer, Mervyn Frost and David Miller, while various cosmopolitan accounts can be found in the works of David Held, Mary Kaldor, Richard Falk, Martha Nussbaum and Andrew Linklater.

The diversity of these writers clearly demonstrates that cosmopolitanism is ‘not monolithic’.¹⁹ Some cosmopolitan positions emphasise the pre-existing nature of human community,²⁰ while others emphasise the development of global moral responsibility as actual practical interdependence expands globally.²¹ Another distinction is made between ‘political’ cosmopolitanism which forwards the creation of universal political institutions at a global level, on one hand and ‘moral’ cosmopolitanism on the other, which advances universal principles that do not automatically require global institutions but affirms ‘the basis on which institutions should be justified or criticised’.²²

In between these axes, some scholars have made the claim that while world politics has a moral nature it is only states that have ‘moral

¹⁷ Richard Bellamy, *Liberalism and modern society: A historical argument* (University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992).

¹⁸ See Brown, ‘Review article’, and Rengger, ‘Political theory and international relations’.

¹⁹ Rengger, ‘Political theory and international relations’, p. 763.

²⁰ See Martha Nussbaum, ‘Patriotism and cosmopolitanism’, in Joshua Cohen, ed., *For love of country* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996).

²¹ See Beitz, *Political theory and international relations*.

²² Charles Beitz, ‘International liberalism and distributive justice: A survey of recent thought’, *World Politics* 51(2) 1999, pp. 269–96, at p. 287. See also Nussbaum, ‘Patriotism and cosmopolitanism’, pp. 7–8.

character'.²³ There is also the observation that there are some strands of liberalism, in particular those that Charles Beitz refers to as 'social liberalism', which claim that the domestic character of justice claims differ from international claims.²⁴ Beitz suggests that 'social liberalism holds that the problem of international justice is fundamentally one of fairness to societies (or peoples), whereas cosmopolitan liberalism holds that it is fairness to persons'.²⁵ Thus there is the internationalist claim that states (or societies/peoples) are morally relevant and sovereignty protects them from some (but not all) claims of international justice as morality in the international realm is a 'thin' account that falls short of the 'thick' morality of actual communities.²⁶ As such internationalists advance the claim that only states have rights and obligations within international society. This means that moral claims are possible in world politics but only those that affect justice between states can be justifiable—not justice between individuals in different states.²⁷ Thus justice is recognised as a delimited practice but ought not come at the expense of order or the ability of states to coexist and cooperate within this 'society of states'.²⁸ Nevertheless, it must be noted that in recent times in political practice, this 'thin' account of morality has been 'thickening' in some respects as human rights and other issues are having an increased influence on the nature of world politics.

Thus, in contrast to realist and internationalist perspectives on morality and governance, the cosmopolitan arguments of the last two decades have pushed the powerful idea that states are not a viable location for a just future and that the states system is modifiable towards a more inclusive and just global order. Most telling have been cosmopolitan arguments forwarding the idea of distributive justice between rich and poor individuals (not just

²³ Beitz, *Political theory and international relations*, p. 76.

²⁴ Charles Beitz, 'Social and cosmopolitan liberalism', *International Affairs* 75(3) 1999, pp. 515–29.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 515.

²⁶ Michael Walzer, *Thick and thin: Moral argument at home and abroad* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994).

²⁷ See Hedley Bull, *The anarchical society*, 2nd edn (London: Macmillan Press, 1995 [1977]).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, and Hedley Bull, *Justice in international relations* (Waterloo, Ont.: University of Waterloo, 1984).

between rich and poor states) in a world of truly graphic inequality.²⁹ In addition, the intensification of globalising trends, including the positive indications of a transnational civil society and global consciousness, have been central to the cosmopolitan critique of the states system. Falk, for example, has mounted a wide-ranging cosmopolitan critique on the 'inhumane governance' perpetuated by the state-system within the context of globalisation,³⁰ while Held has claimed that state bound democracy is problematised by globalisation to such a degree that global cosmopolitan democracy is required for democracy to be fulfilled.³¹ Indeed it must be noted that cosmopolitan argumentation of both moral and political derivations is decisively shaping the field of IPT even if global political life is still largely dominated by communitarian—as well as realist and internationalist—inclinations. Nicholas Rengger notes that 'cosmopolitan theory, for all that it is greatly criticized, is very much setting the agenda for international political theory at present'.³²

The question that this paper seeks to address is how republicanism could fit into the field of IPT. It is also important to assess how compatible republicanism is with cosmopolitanism given the way in which the universalism of cosmopolitanism is shaping IPT. In order to assess how republicanism fits into IPT we must outline the philosophical and political legacy of neo-roman republicanism.

NEO-ROMAN REPUBLICANISM

In recent years there has been a revival of republicanism, a way of thinking about liberty and good government. Republicanism draws inspiration from the Roman period but only gained coherence in the Italian Renaissance and later in the revolutions in England, France and America. The central contemporary articulators of the neo-roman republican tradition, for the purposes of this article, are Skinner, Pettit, Maurizio

²⁹ Beitz, 'Social and cosmopolitan liberalism'.

³⁰ Richard Falk, *On humane governance: Toward a new global politics* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995).

³¹ David Held, *Democracy and the global order: From the modern state to cosmopolitan governance* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), pp. 1–2.

³² Rengger, 'Political theory and international relations', p. 763.

Viroli and Richard Bellamy. The central claim of these writers is that before the ascendancy of liberalism, the republican view of liberty was a prominent political conception that ‘slipped from sight’ during the nineteenth century.³³ This disappearance also occurred in thinking about politics in an international sense.³⁴ Central to the historical legacy of republicanism are the figures of Charles De Secondat Montesquieu, Niccoló Machiavelli, Jean-Jacques Rousseau and James Harrington. The contemporary revival of neo-roman republicanism has centred on this strand of thought being distinct from both liberalism and communitarianism.³⁵ As a political theory, republicanism has broadly criticised both liberalism, for its asocial view of freedom, and communitarianism, for the idea that involvement in a pre-political community can define freedom.³⁶ The guiding ideal of republicanism is that people must avoid domination by controlling public power. The ideal of non-domination has historically been conducted within a republican state shaped and controlled by a politically aware society who feel responsible for the state. This understanding of republicanism aims for an individual liberty that is only possible if it is constituted and institutionalised collectively.³⁷

The neo-roman conception of republicanism differs considerably from liberalism’s concern for negative liberty, or the non-interference of the state in individuals’ affairs, by claiming that non-arbitrary state intervention can actually assist in the constitution of liberty, rather than being a necessary evil in need of restraint.³⁸ The interpretation of the republican tradition drawn from the roman account differs markedly from the contemporary communitarian position heralded by Hannah Arendt and authors such as

³³ Quentin Skinner, *Liberty before liberalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. ix.

³⁴ Nicholas Onuf, *The republican legacy in international thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 2–3.

³⁵ Philip Pettit, *Republicanism: A theory of freedom and government* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 7–8; Quentin Skinner, ‘On justice, the common good and the priority of liberty’, in Chantal Mouffe, ed., *Dimensions of radical democracy: Pluralism, citizenship, community* (London: Verso, 1992), pp. 222–3.

³⁶ Bill Brugger, *Republican theory in political thought: Virtuous or virtual?* (London: Macmillan Press, 1999), pp. 12–14.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

³⁸ Pettit, *Republicanism*, pp. 22–3.

Michael Sandel and David Miller.³⁹ A clear distinction is drawn between communitarianism evident within the tradition of Aristotle and the neo-roman view of republicanism that stems from Machiavelli.⁴⁰ Pettit, Skinner and Bellamy hold that there is a distinction between the belief that participation in a political community is the constitution of liberty in the sense of positive liberty, and the neo-roman republican conception that political participation is the only means to establish a condition where society is free from domination. That is ‘rather than trading on a moralistic conception of positive liberty, therefore, Machiavelli urged civic involvement to avoid the domination of tyrants or elites’.⁴¹ Political activity on the part of citizens in this sense is the crucial step in the construction of liberty or ‘non-domination’ as Pettit refers to it.⁴²

The neo-roman strand of republicanism emphasises three key themes. The first is the constitutive relationship between liberty and the state. According to republican thought the pursuit of liberty is not a natural attribute but rather a civic achievement that requires a context where citizens are free from tyranny or domination.⁴³ The republican conception of ‘freedom consists not in the presence of self-mastery, and not in the absence in interference by others, but in the absence of mastery by others: in absence ... of domination’.⁴⁴ Pettit claims domination is defined by a relationship where

one person is dominated by another, so I shall assume, to the extent that the other person has the capacity to interfere in their affairs, in particular the capacity to interfere in their affairs on an arbitrary basis ... In the most salient case it is the capacity to interfere as the interferer’s wish or judgement—their *arbitrium*—inclines them ... If freedom means non-domination, then such

³⁹ Richard Bellamy, *Rethinking liberalism* (London: Pinter, 2000), p. xii.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 4.

⁴³ Richard Bellamy, *Liberalism and pluralism: Towards a politics of compromise* (London: Routledge, 1999), p. 120.

⁴⁴ Philip Pettit, ‘Republican freedom and contestatory democratisation’, in Ian Shapiro and Casiano Hacker-Cordón, eds, *Democracy’s values* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), p. 165.

freedom is compromised whenever a person is exposed to the arbitrary power of another, even if that power is not used against them.⁴⁵

Therefore, republican non-domination is a condition that is defined by the diminution or elimination of the act of arbitrary intervention *and* the capacity to arbitrarily interfere in a person's life.⁴⁶ Non-domination can thus be understood as liberty that includes a sense of security from various forms of power that could beset an individual and reduce their capacity to control their life.⁴⁷

Consequently, non-domination reflects a concern with the way that people can become dependent upon others. Hence the ways special interests and ambition/self-interest can corrupt the body politic and usher in dependency on the goodwill of these special interests, as well as more personal forms of domination in the home or workplace for instance, are of *equal concern* to the republican.⁴⁸ Non-domination is understood as the avoidance of subordination and vulnerability (rather than the liberal fear of restraint) and is dependent not upon the level of non-interference but the 'extent that there exist institutional protections against interference' of an arbitrary kind.⁴⁹ Thus republicans contend that publicly governed non-arbitrary law enables liberty in contrast to the liberal view that law restricts liberty and is only justifiable by lesser overall restrictions in the presence of law.⁵⁰ Republicanism is a constitutional perspective on ethics and politics which stresses that liberty understood as non-domination 'comes about only by design'; it is the 'freedom of the city, not the freedom of the heath'.⁵¹

Enacting non-domination in practice requires a republic. A republic (also known as a commonwealth or a *res publica*) is a type of state that is defined by the principle of sovereign self-government and is publicly controlled and

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Pettit, *Republicanism*, chapter 2.

⁴⁷ Philip Pettit, 'Freedom as antipower', *Ethics* 106(3) 1996, pp. 576–604, at p. 589.

⁴⁸ Ibid., pp. 589–91.

⁴⁹ Bruggen, *Republican theory in political thought*, pp. 6–7.

⁵⁰ Ibid., p. 6.

⁵¹ Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 122.

focused on a common or public good.⁵² The point of this form of polity is to be free from both '*imperium*', that is domination by the state, and from '*dominium*', meaning domination by private interests within society.⁵³ Thus the republic and the publicly controlled and thus non-arbitrary interference it imparts does not cause liberty but it 'constitutes' it⁵⁴—thereby acting as a form of 'antipower' aimed at curtailing domination.⁵⁵ Pettit argues that the republican position is 'that a state would not itself dominate its citizens—and could provide a unique protection against domination based on the private power or internal or external enemies—provided that it was able to seek only ends, and employ only means, that derived from the public good, the common weal, the *res publica*'.⁵⁶ This protection is established by a range of public institutions that compensate for various forms of subjection and vulnerability.⁵⁷ Thus central to the republican tradition is the existence of a state shaped by the idea of 'public power'—that is power that is publicly controlled and limited in the aims it is able to pursue but focused on the public aims it must fulfill in order to constitute liberty.⁵⁸

The second republican theme is the public good, understood not as a communally developed and pre-political conception of the good life, nor an aggregation of individual interests, but rather as a constructed common interest in goods that are not able to be obtained individually—particularly a shared liberty.⁵⁹ Non-domination is a shared and constitutive condition that is typified by the security of individuals understood as a public good. This

⁵² Skinner, 'On justice, the common good and the priority of liberty', p. 217.

⁵³ Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 13.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 108.

⁵⁵ Pettit, 'Freedom as antipower', pp. 588–9.

⁵⁶ Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 287.

⁵⁷ Pettit, 'Freedom as antipower', p. 590.

⁵⁸ A republican purpose for the state is noted in Denis Diderot, *L'Encyclopedie*: 'The aim of all government is the wellbeing of the society governed. In order to avoid anarchy, to enforce the laws, to protect the citizens, to support the weak against the ambitions of the strong, it was necessary that each society establish authorities with sufficient power to fulfill these aims'. Translated in John Ralston Saul, *The doubter's companion: A dictionary of aggressive common sense* (New York: The Free Press, 1994), pp. 237–8.

⁵⁹ Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 284.

observation is underlined by Pettit's claim that non-domination is an 'egalitarian good' and a 'communitarian good' in that it is only realisable if the non-domination is enjoyed more or less equally and has 'common and social' character—it is not the atomistic good associated with non-interference'.⁶⁰ Indeed the republican conception of the common or public good is where

one cannot create such an environment except through active collaboration with others, nor control the beneficial externalities it generates so as to channel them only to certain others, though one could cut oneself off from them through one's own anti-social and intolerant actions. Put another way, the condition of living as equals has to be desired in and for itself—as an intrinsic aspect of a certain kind of society—rather than instrumentally, since it would allow selective domination to acquire personal advantage.⁶¹

Thus the public nature of the republican conception of liberty is only possible if it is constituted collectively and institutionalised by a state that is principally designed to 'track' all the common interests held by the citizenry.⁶²

The third theme central to republicanism is that of citizenship and political participation. Again rather than being an end to political life, republicanism understands political participation as a crucial part in the promotion of the public good and the avoidance of domination. Rather than direct participation in the operation of all government decisions, republican thought has emphasised the importance of various avenues of contestation for decisions that are made by public representatives to ensure that public decisions reflect the public good and do not promote particular interests.⁶³ Thus citizenship is a virtuous concern in the public good evident by an active interest in public affairs that sees 'the people as trustor both individually and collectively and sees the state as trustee: in particular it sees the people as trusting the state to ensure a dispensation of non-arbitrary

⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 125.

⁶¹ Bellamy, *Liberalism and pluralism*, p. 139.

⁶² Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 290.

⁶³ Pettit forwards the idea of 'contestatory democracy' where people have both 'authorial' and 'editorial' powers and avenues in relation to government decisions. Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 296. See also Quentin Skinner, *Machiavelli* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981), pp. 65–7.

rule'.⁶⁴ This trust is backed up by a structure of the state that ensures the dispersal of power over a range of institutional bodies and a virtuous practice of citizenship that involves vigilance and a concern over the public good that transcends individuals own pecuniary or particular interests.⁶⁵ Thus rather than a necessary evil, the state is a crucial artifice of and for the people whom are its citizens.

Now, it is clear from the last two points that republicanism accepts the state as the locus for republican practice and promotes practices of virtue and patriotism. While critical theorists would be quick to note the inclusion and exclusion embedded in this account,⁶⁶ it is important to note two points that significantly moderate any idea of chauvinism in republican thought. First, republicanism must be differentiated from communitarian claims that deify particularist principles or nationalism. Republicanism is not a nationalistic theory in that it invokes a 'love of the political institutions and the way of life that sustain the common liberty of a people' rather than a love of a nation's 'cultural, linguistic and ethnic oneness'.⁶⁷ Republicanism also emphasises difference and promotes institutional avenues to support pluralism.⁶⁸ Second, while nationality could be a 'partial replacement' for patriotism in the modern world,⁶⁹ it is not sufficient for the active political motivation and participation embedded in the practice of patriotism.⁷⁰ Patriotism and citizenship are 'sustained by shared memories of [a] commitment to liberty, social criticism, and resistance against oppression and corruption'.⁷¹ Ultimately, republicanism does not embed any nationalistic norms or conception of the good life other than norms that entail public

⁶⁴ Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 8.

⁶⁵ Skinner, 'On justice, the common good and the priority of liberty', p. 217.

⁶⁶ See Andrew Linklater, 'The question of the next stage in international relations theory: A critical-theoretical point of view', *Millennium* 21(1) 1992, pp. 77–98.

⁶⁷ Maurizio Viroli, *For love of country: An essay on patriotism and nationalism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 1.

⁶⁸ Maurizio Viroli, *Machiavelli* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 40–1. See also Bellamy, *Liberalism and pluralism*.

⁶⁹ Miller, 'Bounded citizenship', p. 67.

⁷⁰ Viroli, *For love of country*, pp. 11–13.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

responsibility and oversight—norms that reflect the social nature of the morality that constitutes non-domination.⁷²

Republicanism provides a powerful statement of the potential of an appropriately designed state to achieve a robust account of liberty. Both liberalism and republicanism agree that the state should seek to uphold liberty but whereas liberalism claims this is possible by ensuring the non-interference in the chosen decisions of people, republicanism

maintains that this can never be sufficient, since it will always be necessary for the state to ensure at the same time that its citizens do not fall into a condition of avoidable dependence on the goodwill of others. The state has a duty not to merely liberate its citizens from such personal exploitation and dependence, but to prevent its own agents, dressed in a little brief authority, from behaving arbitrarily in the course of imposing the rules that govern our common life.⁷³

The scope of republican concern extends, as Skinner explains, not just to wariness of the state but to private sources of domination as well. Consequently, non-domination is a more demanding standard of freedom than non-interference in terms of the resources and laws needed to obtain it. While the liberal account of non-interference allows well organised or wealthy groups in society to dominate the political process and permits forms of personal vulnerability to develop from inequality and the relative absence of state intervention, the bottom line for republicanism is that *all* forms of power—both public and private—must be contestable. The republican state's law-making power is designed to remove 'certain forms of domination without putting new forms of domination in their place'.⁷⁴

Republicanism also distances itself from the direct democracy evident in some communitarian arguments to such an extent that Bill Brugger argues that Pettit's interpretation of republicanism is best termed 'weak republicanism'.⁷⁵ Pettit himself regards his conception of republicanism as

⁷² Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 8. See also Viroli, *For love of country*.

⁷³ Skinner, *Liberty before liberalism*, p. 119.

⁷⁴ Pettit, 'Freedom as antipower', p. 588.

⁷⁵ Brugger, *Republican theory in political thought*, p. 13. It is also important to note that contemporary republicanism is part of the legacy of republicanism that is long and winding and notable for its discontinuity as much as its historical coherence. Brugger notes that the militarism of early modern

‘gas-and-water-works republicanism’ which departs from romantic accounts of republicanism or democracy where

the goal is a dispensation under which the high ideal of freedom as non-domination flourishes. And certainly that dispensation requires a regime under which constitutionalism and democracy rule. But constitutionalism and democracy come to be stabilized only via arrangements that are no more intellectually beguiling than the infrastructure of gas and water supply.⁷⁶

This practical vision is what shapes the contemporary articulation of republicanism—it does not require a step back to the positive liberty or the ‘liberty of the ancients’.⁷⁷ The state is a crucial framework of public power and central to the republican legacy. The republican state is *empowered* to prevent certain people becoming dominated by others, it is *designed* not to be corrupted by sectional interests within society, and the state itself is legally and morally *constrained* from dominating people. However, republicanism rules out political passivity and requires a public ethos that entails that citizens actively cherish the state institutions that act as a bulwark against arbitrary forms of power in addition to being wary and vigilant in respect to potential threats to the public good.⁷⁸ Republicanism demands virtue and public concern on the part of citizens in order to contest power and construct institutions that secure the protection of citizens from domination. This requires citizens to be actively concerned about political affairs and existence of institutional mechanisms in which government action is transparent and open to public discipline

This overview of republicanism demonstrates the ways in which neo-roman republicanism intersects the liberal–communitarian debate. While republicanism is concerned with individual liberty it claims that such liberty is only possible within a social context that attempts to institutionally and

republicanism—particularly Machiavelli’s ‘republic for expansion’, the importance of canonical ‘law-givers’ or founding fathers, and the idea, made famous by Rousseau, of a ‘political religion’, are ideas associated with republicanism that have (rightly) been discarded in recent republican thought. Brugger, *Republican theory in political thought*, p. 182.

⁷⁶ Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 239.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 18.

⁷⁸ Viroli, *Machiavelli*, p. 45.

collectively control power. The question central to the purposes of this article is how republicanism interrelates with IPT. The problem of understanding republican thought within the interstate realm revolves around republicanism's focus upon the republican state. While republicanism is concerned with controlling power by the state, in world politics there is neither a global state nor the likelihood of such a state developing in the immediate future. While republicanism could be seen to advocate a single global republic—a *civitas maxima*,⁷⁹ the argument here rests on the potential of republican states to be guided by their citizens to create elaborate forms of interstate cooperation and common governance. As will become clear, republican political thought claims that the institutional nature of republicanism does not stop at the borders of a state. As such the interpretation of the republican legacy drawn here as a normative approach to global politics, is dependent on both republican states and the institutional means that allows these states to exist and cooperate towards republican ends.

REPUBLICAN GLOBAL ETHICS

Because republicanism endeavours to control power via institutional means, republicanism as a form of IPT has a distinctive vision of global governance required to establish this theory's ethical approach. In this sense the institutional essence of republicanism offers an interesting contrast to both prevailing forms of global governance and to the various approaches within IPT. In drawing republican ideals into the interstate realm it becomes clear that not only do republican ideals challenge prevailing forms of governance in a similar way to cosmopolitan approaches, but that republicanism is distinctive in that republicans promote the state as the foundation for ethical political action. I contend that there are three aspects to a republican approach to ethics in global politics.

First, at its core, republicanism's normative account of global politics is *directed at realising a situation where individuals are able to live within a condition of non-domination* by controlling to a maximal degree the power that is exerted over them. Those inspired by republican ethics see 'the

⁷⁹ Martin Wight, *International theory: The three traditions*, Gabriele Wight and Brian Porter, eds (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1991), p. 41.

domination of others as cause for *real* moral and political concern';⁸⁰ that being dominated is inherently wrong. This is a universal concern that animates the desire for the minimisation of vulnerability and subjection as well as the creation of a context where people are as autonomous as possible from arbitrary sources of power. This concern is also the justification for both domestic and international institutions that are designed to moderate or eliminate various forms of domination that could conceivably affect people.

Second, while non-domination and the control of power is the universal condition desired, the means by which non-domination is actually constituted are not centralised or universal. Republicanism makes explicit reference to *non-domination as being a social condition enabled by the publicly determined control of power through the state* and by reference to particular ways of life and conditions. There are two primary consequences of this aspect of republicanism. The first is that republican thought in relation to global politics still stresses the presence of the state and civic involvement. For non-domination to be constituted, not only must there be the means of organised law making and public power, but people have to feel an ongoing responsibility for the public power they exercise, and they must be able to observe and discipline this power. A republican state fulfils these characteristics and thereby ought to minimise forms of *imperium* and *dominium* so that the state does not itself dominate its population nor permit private forms of domination. No other institution can replicate this exercise of public power. The second consequence of republicanism's emphasis on the state and citizenship is that this account of politics is not cosmopolitan—at least not in the strong political sense mentioned earlier. Ultimately, there is no single way to establish civic liberty nor is there a global public to build a republican state or foster a global common good at this stage. While republicans are dubious about the potential existence of a world state as well as the probability of establishing a universal civic liberty, republican theorists such as Pettit and Bellamy do contend that the republican state is ultimately only possible within a wider association of republican states.

⁸⁰ Gurpreet Rattan, 'Prospects for a contemporary republicanism', *The Monist* 84(1) 2001, pp. 113–30, at p. 127. Emphasis in original.

Therefore the third aspect of a republican approach to ethics is that *the republican state's control of power is only possible via political agreements that extend between republican states*. Global governance of a republican inspiration will be aimed at enabling states to achieve the civic liberty particular to each society's articulation of their public good. For Pettit the importance of enacting civic liberty entails that

it is going to be in the interest of the republican state to encourage different layers of multinational cooperation and institutionalisation ... while the republican state represents an indispensable means of furthering people's non-domination ... there are some domestic issues on which it may be better from the point of view of promoting freedom as non-domination to give over control to those bodies and thereby to restrict the local state.⁸¹

As such Pettit believes republican sovereignty is not rigid or 'sacred', thereby recognising the possibility that the enactment of non-domination could be assisted by international institutions set up by the delegation of state authority.⁸² The desire to establish international cooperation that assists the development of non-domination requires a considerable elaboration of international institutions and a move away from exclusive and non-interventionist sovereignty.⁸³ The external nature of republican approaches can also be seen in Daniel Deudney's illustration of republicanism in the 'Philadelphian system' from 1781 until 1861 existing at the edge of the putative Westphalian system.⁸⁴ In arguing that the states of the American Union 'went beyond confederation, but stopped short of being an internally sovereign state', he offers a historically grounded account of what the external dimensions of republicanism might resemble in practice. In particular he claimed that external ethos of the American Union could best be referred to as 'negarchy' as the Union sought to avoid the alternatives of hierarchy and anarchy among its composite states.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 152.

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Onuf, *The republican legacy in international thought*, pp. 5, 160–1.

⁸⁴ Daniel Deudney, 'Popular sovereigns, bound states: The practices, structures and geopolitics of Philadelphian systems', in Thomas Biersteker and Cynthia Weber, eds, *State sovereignty as social construct* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁸⁵ Ibid., p. 205.

This observation clearly intersects with the argument made here that republicanism's primary *modus operandi* is non-domination.

In order to enable states to be able to prioritise the pursuit of their public good, the infrastructure of republican global governance must enable states to cooperate to *protect individuals from the domination of external sources and sanction states to pursue the common interests of their citizens globally*. Therefore the global infrastructure of republican governance requires the promotion of peace and security through the promotion of the rule of international law and preventive diplomacy. In addition republicanism would rely on a republican democratic peace similar to the idea of the liberal democratic peace.⁸⁶ Republican governance also requires effective global governance on matters that states cannot adequately manage alone—to curtail the effects of domination that cut across time and space by promoting transborder issues such as environmental governance and the movement towards regulation of the global economy according to common rules.⁸⁷ Governance aimed at non-domination ought to also promote the long-term benefits (seen in terms of non-domination) that stem from cooperation that assists states to create an infrastructure that prevents individual vulnerability and subjection. This means further extending international institutions that develop the capacities of states to address the broad ambit of human security concerns, which include measures that seek,

⁸⁶ Onuf, *The republican legacy in international thought*, chapter 9. See Michael W. Doyle, 'Liberalism and world politics', *American Political Science Review* 80(4) 1986, pp. 1151–69.

⁸⁷ There is no room here to detail the republican relationship with capitalism or the regulation of capitalism. Yet Pettit sees republicanism as falling short of a socialist agenda by protecting private property, promoting economic prosperity and promoting the socioeconomic independence of people (Pettit, *Republicanism*, pp. 158–63). Onuf makes the point that 'conspicuously missing from republican thought throughout its long and complex history is any conception of economic activity, of the economy as a sphere of activity that can (if given a chance) operate according to its own logic' (Onuf, *The republican legacy in international thought*, p. 247). Republicanism's aim is a society aimed at a common liberty where everyone in society feels secure—not a society where the wealth of a few individuals is prioritised. Consequently, republicans generally contend that this aim requires the regulation of capitalism. Thus there is a significant contrast between republicanism and neo-liberalism as well as liberalism more generally.

for instance, to secure individual's access to food, health resources and environmental protection.⁸⁸

While the preceding measures could be seen to parallel those of many strands of liberal international theory, the ideal type of international arrangement stemming from republicanism differs from cosmopolitan arguments in that the centrality of the state is more distinct, thereby moving towards a potentially global confederation; a confederative association of republican states. It could be claimed that republicanism moves towards the '*civitas maximus*' that Christian Wolff outlined over 200 years ago, as colourfully detailed by Nicholas Onuf.⁸⁹ However, the confederation is more like Onuf's characterisation of Emmerich de Vattel's confederation of states: an association of states that is consciously constructed by citizens and states—not a 'natural' association like Wolff's vision.⁹⁰ In this sense the institutional nature of the republican approach to politics does not stop at the territorial borders of the republican state.

This form of construction in global governance can be seen in the development of the European Union (EU), as emphasised by Bellamy and his colleagues. This articulation of republicanism is a position awkwardly termed 'cosmopolitan communitarianism' by Bellamy and Dario Castiglione.⁹¹ Rather than an EU informed by the abstract rights and federalism of cosmopolitanism or indeed the particular membership of political communities as suggested by communitarianism, Bellamy argues for an active encouragement of political negotiation between individuals and groups.⁹² Bellamy and Castiglione explain that the politically negotiated manner of this approach to the future of the EU

⁸⁸ For human security concerns see United Nations Development Programme, *Human development report 1994* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

⁸⁹ Onuf, *The republican legacy in international thought*, p. 58.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 60, chapters 3 and 4 more generally.

⁹¹ Richard Bellamy and Dario Castiglione, 'Between cosmopolis and community: Three models of rights and democracy within the EU', in Daniele Archibugi, David Held and Martin Köhler, eds, *Re-imagining political community: Studies in cosmopolitan democracy* (Cambridge: Polity, 1998), p. 162.

⁹² Bellamy, *Liberalism and pluralism*.

suggests the need for political rather than legal mechanisms, that are capable of mediating between different cultural and national groups. The normative foundations of this conception of the EU can perhaps be best characterized as a cosmopolitan communitarianism, in which different communities converge on a range of compatible perspectives on common goals and endeavours, rather than a communitarian cosmopolitanism which assumes a universal consensus on principles and procedures.⁹³

In seeing the EU as a contingent and constantly adapting political process the EU takes on a light that differs significantly from a federation or a European 'nation'. Nation-states would still exist within this 'constructionist' view of a republican inspired EU.⁹⁴ However, it seems that the ability of people to reshape the state in which they are citizens could be overtaken by the need to shape the EU and promote the goal of avoiding domination at the EU instead of at the state level. Even within Europe it is not clear that republicanism's support of multi-level governance should or must come at the expense of being responsible and disciplining the power of the state in which citizens reside.⁹⁵ At any rate the constructionist approach of republicanism offers a way of rethinking ethics and political responsibility within global politics in a way that incorporates republican values and practices into both state and interstate institutions.

REPUBLICANISM AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL THEORY

Republicanism, as it is understood here, is an approach to ethics within global politics that does not readily fit into the established accounts of IPT. Republicanism's account of the way that non-domination is achieved cuts across idealist–realist lines and does not readily fit into the communitarian–cosmopolitan divide, although I do think that even though republicanism does not convey *institutional* cosmopolitanism, it does possess *moral* cosmopolitan elements. While republicanism does entail a suitably empowered state, which requires active participation and responsibility of its citizens, it does so within a universal concern for freedom from domination.

⁹³ Bellamy and Castiglione, 'Between cosmopolis and community', p. 173.

⁹⁴ Ibid., pp. 164–5, 173.

⁹⁵ See Steven Slaughter, 'Republican liberty and the European Union', *Contemporary European Studies Association of Australia Review* 28, June 2001, pp. 26–34.

With respect to the axis of realism and idealism, it is clear that republicanism does contend that cooperation and institutions related to moral concerns are possible within global politics. Nonetheless, these practices are coupled with a profound concern for power. This concern for power shapes both the way that republicans conceive of liberty and the way this liberty is established, as well as influencing republicanism's approach to both domestic *and* global politics. Deeply embedded within contemporary republican thought and their antecedents is the idea that individual's virtue may well fail and that ambition and self-interest are ever-present parts of life. Also, within republicanism there is the perspective that power is extremely important to the realisation of a just society. It is not purely well intentioned laws or morals that will guide society towards one characterised by non-domination but institutions that marshal public power and use checks and balances to both ward off the ambitious from controlling the state and to prompt citizens from taking responsibility to ensure that no one group in society has its interests masquerade as the public interest.⁹⁶ However, claiming that republicanism takes power seriously does not mean that republicanism is a realist approach to IPT. Realism overwhelmingly concentrates upon the international consequences of military power and thus security is typified by a tense balance of power between states (at best). Republicanism's concern with power is wider and the emphasis is on personal security that is defined in a broader sense to include a security from non-military forms of domination as well as a concern for the domestic aspects of power which realism generally neglects. Furthermore, realism would clearly share little confidence in the republican idea that the building of international institutions can obtain security.

With respect to debates between cosmopolitanism and comunitarianism, republicanism possesses an account of political community that advances the idea that being a citizen is not an abstract status or merely a bundle of rights but an ongoing stake in the political operation of the state in which citizens reside. As such, republicanism seeks to develop forms of politically engaged and patriotic political communities that are not inward looking or self-absorbed. As discussed earlier the social nature of the morality that constitutes non-domination avoids communitarian notions. Republicanism

⁹⁶ Skinner, *Machiavelli*, pp. 56–8.

does not embed any ethnic or nationalistic norms or conception of the good life other than a set of rigorous procedural norms that revolve around public responsibility and oversight.⁹⁷ Furthermore, the republican tradition does express a concern for non-domination beyond the borders of one state. This extended concern does seem to move republicanism towards the cosmopolitan pole of the cosmopolitan–communitarian axis. This is because republicanism’s assertion of non-domination is universal—even if the political means whereby this universalism is enacted is not.

Nonetheless, republicanism does differ with cosmopolitanism in two main dimensions. First, while there is significant diversity within cosmopolitan approaches to IPT, republicanism can be seen to promote liberty through institutions that people are responsible for rather than laws and rights that promote liberty. At the root of this divergence is the difference between liberty being defined as non-domination and as non-interference—the former entails a liberty more dependent on the actions of people who construct and guide forms of public power to enable non-domination than a universal structure of law. In short: non-domination cannot be imposed. Second, and following from the first, is the importance of the state. Cosmopolitans such as Held and Falk discount the state from having the ideological and infrastructural coherence to be the site of a good society because the state is seen as being too territorial and too self-interested to address global problems. Thus it is no surprise that transnational social movements are forwarded as being able to act as the foundation for an alternative world order. This idea is most notably presented by Falk as the idea of ‘globalisation from below’.⁹⁸ This alternative to the system of states and economic globalisation promotes principles of humane inclusion by way of an ‘imagined community for the whole of humanity’.⁹⁹ Another formulation of a global polity that shares the belief that the state cannot manage globalisation is the idea of cosmopolitan democracy forwarded by Held. This proposal differs in that Held argues that no global vision is required, merely a belief in the principle of autonomy and in the process of

⁹⁷ Pettit, *Republicanism*, p. 8. See also Viroli, *For love of country*.

⁹⁸ Falk, *On humane governance*, pp. 205–6.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 243.

democracy.¹⁰⁰ Republicanism concurs with the need to think globally but argues against giving up on the idea of an appropriately empowered state that is connected to actual citizens. For republicans, the objective is to reconstruct the state and the practice of citizenship with republican lessons in mind.

The point of disagreement between cosmopolitanism and republicanism comes down to the issue of where power should rest. Republicanism is concerned by the potential of the global centralisation of power inherent in cosmopolitanism, its distance from ongoing public oversight and control, and the resultant reliance on the notion of rights rather than participation.¹⁰¹ For republicans, states ought to remain as the foundation of public power with interstate institutions not replacing but instead *augmenting* the state. Yet clearly there are lessons that republicanism needs to learn from cosmopolitanism. The central challenge facing the development of republican politics is to enable states to develop and maintain political engagement and patriotism within the state without resorting to nationalist imagery. In an increasingly globalising world it is clear that republicanism necessarily involves a cosmopolitan-global awareness coupled with a sense of political responsibility for the state.¹⁰²

While republicanism connotes the unavoidable necessity of the state, republicanism is not a form of realism or even internationalism. While the state can be defended on the grounds that it can play a 'positive role' in world politics, as Hedley Bull did in an internationalist vein, the republican justification for the state is *qualitatively* different.¹⁰³ Bull's defence of the state rested on four main claims: 'that the state, whether we approve of it or not, is here to stay'; that global problems such as war, social injustice and environmental collapse are not solely due to the states-system; that states

¹⁰⁰ Held, *Democracy and the global order*, chapter 7.

¹⁰¹ While there are questions relating to the dominance of Western values within these models (see Danilo Zolo, *Cosmopolis: Prospects for world government* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1997)), the republican state is central to the development of a secure liberty that balances universalism with particular cultural traditions and ways of life.

¹⁰² See Steven Slaughter, *Liberty beyond neo-liberalism: A republican critique of liberal governance in a globalising age* (Houndsmills: Palgrave Press, forthcoming).

¹⁰³ Hedley Bull, 'The state's positive role in world affairs', *Daedalus* 108, 1979, pp. 111–23.

can and do cooperate; and that there is no consensus for ‘transcending the states-system’.¹⁰⁴ Republicanism would add to these attributes that the state is the location of governance aimed directly at the expression of the public good and the construction of liberty—the *necessary role* of the state. The distinction between republicanism and internationalism here is that republicans contend that assisting states with the goal of non-domination of individuals should be the pole star of international institutions and that citizens, not just states, will have to play a role in ensuring that the international institutions needed to support that goal will be sufficiently developed.

Republicanism offers an alternative approach within IPT that is distinctive in three significant ways. First, republicanism’s core concern is the protection of individuals from subjugation or domination. Furthermore, individuals should be in the position to direct the deployment of means used to establish the means of protection both domestically and internationally. Second, republicanism’s hallmark is that the republican state should play a foremost role in this protection via the public disciplining of private forms of power through the state and through the state itself being designed to minimise potential domination. Third, republicanism’s emphasis is on *political ethics*. The institutional nature of republican thought demonstrates that global ethics and global governance are intimately inter-linked and that institutions are central to a preferred normative future. The idea that global governance ought to be understood as an ongoing construction of people trying to reduce domination differs from the idea that global governance is merely a technical exercise or a process determined by history or the mode of production or such. Republicanism can be seen to advance the idea that both the state and global governance ought to be more open to the conscious transformation by those wary of unaccountable and self-interested power.

CONCLUSION: FUTURE RESEARCH

The purpose of this paper is to advance the relatively modest suggestion that republicanism is omitted from conventional accounts of IPT and does not fit neatly into the established positions within IPT. However, the account of republicanism itself is a far from modest political program.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., pp. 112–20.

Like many accounts of cosmopolitanism, the republican account articulated here is an ambitious program that differs significantly from the prevailing nature of global politics. Not only are elaborate institutional arrangements needed at an interstate level but also significant changes are required from the ways people perceive authority and political responsibility within their state. Even 'gas and waterworks republicanism' within democratic states requires a massive shift in the way people live the idea of political responsibility in their own state. Even while the idea of citizen responsibility may be seen to rest well with ethical diversity and pluralism to the extent that such pluralism necessitates political mechanisms rather than a moral consensus there are clearly both practical and theoretical challenges facing the idea of a world constituted by republican states. Thus there is a research agenda that is associated with taking republicanism seriously as an approach to ethics within global politics that would have to include (among other issues) the study of:

The political and cultural applicability of republicanism: How well would republican ideas travel? How could republican practices extend across contemporary global politics? How would this construction be affected by various cultural particularities?

Development: Will republicanism be attractive to less developed states? What development programs and resources are needed to assist the formation of republican states? What processes of foreign development assistance are going to be able to offer constant and non-arbitrary sources of resources for less developed states?

Distributive justice: How are resources to be distributed in order to avoid domination and vulnerability? What factors affect the distribution of crucial resources such as medicine, food and water? Is the republican balance between universal non-domination and particularism going to provide a sound global distribution of resources?

Economic globalisation: How does the idea of a republican state interact with economic globalisation and neo-liberalism? What are the means by which republican states could ethically manage the world economy?

Treatment of domination that is displaced across space and time: The environment is the primary example in mind here. Is environmental harm

that crosses state borders or generations a case of domination? If so, how do we prevent the transborder domination of environmental harm?

Ultimately, given the institutional basis of republicanism, the details of these questions need to be examined in order for republicanism to be a robust perspective of IPT. Nonetheless, there is much to recommend republicanism as a novel approach to IPT and as a counterpoint to prevailing cosmopolitan arguments. Most importantly, the republican articulation of IPT is inextricably tied to reinvigorating the state. Republicans assert that we need not globally extend democracy as cosmopolitans suggest, but instead reinvent the purpose of the state by reinvigorating the practice of citizenship. Citizens are required to maintain an appropriately empowered state in order to constitute the condition of non-domination. The goal of this political practice is not to create self-interested and chauvinistic states but rather to develop wider and wider circles of non-domination through both the presence of publicly responsive states *and* the operation of international institutions. Not only is this a novel claim within IPT, it is particularly apposite in a world that bears witness to various forms of domination and insecurity. Thus in a worldwide sense this entails an approach to IPT that takes power seriously and advocates a move towards a world shaped by the universalism of non-domination that is mediated and in a real sense constructed by citizens acting to avoid subjection.

Department of International Relations

PUBLICATIONS

Send all orders to:

RSPAS Publishing (PICS)

Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies

The Australian National University

Canberra ACT 0200 Australia

Phone: +61 2 6125 3269 Fax: +61 2 6125 9975

E-mail: thelma.sims@anu.edu.au

Web: <http://rspas-bookshop.anu.edu.au>

KEYNOTES

- 04 **The North Korean Nuclear Crisis: Four-Plus-Two—An Idea Whose Time Has Come,**
by Peter Van Ness
- 03 **War with Iraq?,**
by Amin Saikal, Peter Van Ness, Hugh White, Peter C. Gration and Stuart Harris
- 02 **Refugees and the Myth of the Borderless World,**
by William Maley, Alan Dupont, Jean-Pierre Fonteyne, Greg Fry, James Jupp,
and Thuy Do
- 01 **The Day the World Changed? Terrorism and World Order,**
by Stuart Harris, William Maley, Richard Price, Christian Reus-Smit and
Amin Saikal

WORKING PAPERS

- WP2003/5 **The Neo-Roman Republican Legacy and International Political Theory,**
by Steven Slaughter
- WP2003/4 **The Requirements of European International Society: Modernity and
Nationalism in the Ottoman Empire,** by Ayla Göll
- WP2003/3 **Reimagining International Society Through the Emergence of Japanese
Imperialism,** by Shogo Suzuki
- WP2003/2 **The Evolving Dialectic Between State-centric and Human-centric Security,**
by Pauline Kerr
- WP2003/1 **Does China Matter? The Global Economic Issues,** by Stuart Harris
- WP2002/9 **Globalisation and China's Diplomacy: Structure and Process,**
by Stuart Harris
- WP2002/8 **Cosmopolitan Theory, Militaries and the Deployment of Force,**
by Lorraine Elliott and Graeme Cheeseman
- WP2002/7 **Critical Liberalism in International Relations,**
by James L. Richardson

- WP2002/6 **Bringing Legitimacy Back in to Neo-Weberian State Theory and International Relations**, by Leonard Seabrooke
- WP2002/5 **Corruption is Bad: Normative Dimensions of the Anti-Corruption Movement**, by Mlada Bukovansky
- WP2002/4 **Lost at Sea: Australia in the Turbulence of World Politics**, by Christian Reus-Smit
- WP2002/3 **Normative Progress and Pathological Practices: The Modern State and Identity Politics**, by Heather Rae
- WP2002/2 **Obligation and the Political Authority of International Law**, by Christian Reus-Smit
- WP2002/1 **Engendering International Relations: What Difference Does Second-generation Feminism Make?**, by Jacqui True
- WP2001/4 **Hegemony, Not Anarchy: Why China and Japan are Not Balancing US Unipolar Power**, by Peter Van Ness
- WP2001/3 **Threat Perception and Developmental States in Northeast Asia**, by Tianbiao Zhu
- WP2001/2 **Political Crises in Northeast Asia: An Anatomy of the Taiwan and Korean Crises**, by Stuart Harris
- WP2001/1 **Relating Global Tensions: Modern Tribalism and Postmodern Nationalism**, by Paul James
- WP2000/4 **The English School in China: A Story of How Ideas Travel and are Transplanted**, by Yongjin Zhang
- WP2000/3 **Death of Distance or Tyranny of Distance? The Internet, Deterritorialisation, and the Anti-Globalisation Movement in Australia**, by Ann Capling and Kim Richard Nossal
- WP2000/2 **Globalisation and Security in East Asia**, by Peter Van Ness
- WP2000/1 **Managing the US Base Issue in Okinawa: A Test for Japanese Democracy**, by Aurelia George Mulgan
- WP1999/5 **Internationalisation: What Scholars Make of It?**, by Natasha Hamilton-Hart
- WP1999/4 **The Asian Regional Response to its Economic Crisis and the Global Implications**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1999/3 **ASEAN and the Southeast Asian 'Haze': Challenging the Prevailing Modes of Regional Engagement**, by James Cotton
- WP1999/2 **Australia and Nuclear Arms Control as 'Good International Citizenship'**, by Marianne Hanson
- WP1999/1 **South Pacific Security and Global Change: The New Agenda**, by Greg Fry
- WP1998/3 **The Rise of an Environmental Superpower? Evaluating Japanese Environmental Aid to Southeast Asia**, by Peter Dauvergne

- WP1998/2 **Environmental Insecurity, Forest Management, and State Responses in Southeast Asia**, by Peter Dauvergne
- WP1998/1 **The ASEAN Regional Forum. A Model for Cooperative Security in the Middle East?**, by Michael Leifer
- WP1997/8 **From Paternalism to Partnership: Australia's Relations with ASEAN**, by John Ravenhill
- WP1997/7 **Globalisation and deforestation in the Asia-Pacific**, by Peter Dauvergne
- WP1997/6 **Corporate Power in the Forests of the Solomon Islands**, by Peter Dauvergne
- WP1997/5 **From Island Factory to Asian Centre: Democracy and Deregulation in Taiwan**, by Gregory W. Noble
- WP1997/4 **The Foreign Policy of the Hawke-Keating Governments: An Interim Review**, by James L. Richardson
- WP1997/3 **Hedley Bull and International Security**, by Samuel M. Makinda
- WP1997/2 **Island Disputes in Northeast Asia**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1997/1 **Nuclear 'Breakout': Risks and Possible Responses**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1996/9 **The Rajin-Sonbong Free Trade Zone Experiment: North Korea in Pursuit of New International Linkages**, by James Cotton
- WP1996/8 **The Declining Probability of War Thesis: How Relevant for the Asia-Pacific?**, by James L. Richardson
- WP1996/7 **The China-Japan Relationship and Asia-Pacific Regional Security**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1996/6 **You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists**, by J. Ann Tickner
- WP1996/5 **Framing the Islands: Knowledge and Power in Changing Australian Images of 'The South Pacific'**, by Greg Fry
- WP1996/4 **The Constructivist Turn: Critical Theory After the Cold War**, by Chris Reus-Smit
- WP1996/3 **Why Democracies Don't Fight Each Other: Democracy and Integration**, by Harvey Starr
- WP1996/2 **The New Peacekeepers and the New Peacekeeping**, by Trevor Findlay
- WP1996/1 **Ameliorating the Security Dilemma: Structural and Perceptual Approaches to Strategic Reform**, by Andrew Butfoy
- WP1995/10 **Contending Liberalisms: Past and Present**, by James L. Richardson
- WP1995/9 **Industry Policy in East Asia: A Literature Review**, by Heather Smith
- WP1995/8 **Recasting Common Security**, by Andy Butfoy
- WP1995/7 **Russian Policy Towards the 'Near Abroad': The Discourse of Hierarchy**, by Wynne Russell

- WP1995/6 **Culture, Relativism and Democracy: Political Myths About ‘Asia’ and the ‘West’**, by Stephanie Lawson
- WP1995/5 **The World Trade Organisation—Throwing the Baby Out With the Bath Water?** by P.A. Gordon
- WP1995/4 **The Neo-Classical Ascendancy: The Australian Economic Policy Community and Northeast Asian Economic Growth**, by Trevor Matthews and John Ravenhill
- WP1995/3 **In Search of a New Identity: Revival of Traditional Politics and Modernisation in Post-Kim Il Sung North Korea**, by Alexandre Y. Mansourov
- WP1995/2 **Implications of Taiwan–Chinese Relations for Australia**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1995/1 **New Light on the Russo–Japanese Territorial Dispute**, by Kimie Hara
- WP1994/10 **China’s Public Order Crisis and Its Strategic Implications**, by Greg Austin
- WP1994/9 **Nuclear Endgame on the Korean Peninsula**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1994/8 **Human Rights and Cultural Specificity: The Case of Papua New Guinea**, by Michael Jacobsen
- WP1994/7 **‘Climbing Back onto the Map?’: The South Pacific Forum and the New Development Orthodoxy**, by Greg Fry
- WP1994/6 **The Asia–Pacific: Geopolitical Cauldron or Regional Community?**, by James L. Richardson
- WP1994/5 **North Korea’s Nuclear Program: the Options are Shrinking**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1994/4 **Policy Networks and Economic Cooperation: Policy Coordination in the Asia–Pacific Region**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1994/3 **Australia’s Regional Security Environment**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1994/2 **The Future of Asia–Pacific Security Studies in Australia**, by Pauline Kerr and Andrew Mack
- WP1994/1 **Inter-Civilisation Conflict: A Critique of the Huntington Thesis**, by Jacinta O’Hagan
- WP1993/10 **Nuclear-Free Zones in the 1990s**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1993/9 **Australian Security in the 1990s**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1993/8 **Concepts of Security in the Post-Cold War**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1993/7 **An American New World Order?**, by James L. Richardson
- WP1993/6 **The Return of Practical Reason**, by Hayward R. Alker, Jr.
- WP1993/5 **Gaddis’ Lacuna: Foreign Policy Analysis and the End of the Cold War**, by Valerie Hudson
- WP1993/4 **The Environment and Sustainable Development: An Australian Social Science Perspective**, by Stuart Harris

- WP1993/3 **Environmental Regulation, Economic Growth and International Competitiveness**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1993/2 **Strategic Trade Policy: The East Asian Experience**, by Trevor Matthews and John Ravenhill
- WP1993/1 **The Practice of Common Security: China's Borders with Russia and India**, by Gary Klintworth
- WP1992/10 **Arms Proliferation in the Asia-Pacific: Causes and Prospects for Control**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1992/9 **Nuclear Dilemmas: Korean Security in the 1990s**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1992/8 **The Case For a Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone in Northeast Asia**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1992/7 **The Gulf War and Australian Political Culture**, by James L. Richardson
- WP1992/6 **The Economic Aspects of Pacific Security**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1992/5 **Moving Target—Korea's Nuclear Proliferation Potential**, by Peter Hayes
- WP1992/4 **Federalism and Australian Foreign Policy**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1992/3 **New Hierarchies in East Asia: The Post-Plaza Division of Labour**, by Mitchell Bernard and John Ravenhill
- WP1992/2 **Questions About a Post-Cold War International Order**, by J.L. Richardson
- WP1992/1 **After the Cold War and the Gulf War: Prospects for Security in the Asia-Pacific**, by Andrew Mack
- WP1991/10 **The Korean Nuclear Issue**, by Song Young Sun
- WP1991/9 **Implementing Foreign Policy: The Environmental Challenge**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1991/8 **Australia and the South Pacific: From 'Strategic Denial' to 'Constructive Commitment'**, by Greg Fry
- WP1991/7 **'Civil Society' and Nationalism in North Korea: Foundations for Political Change?**, by James Cotton
- WP1991/6 **The Drawbacks of the Detached View: Russia, the USSR and the Pacific**, by Artem Rudnitskiy
- WP1991/5 **China as a Third World State: Foreign Policy and Official National Identity**, by Peter Van Ness
- WP1991/4 **Foreign Policy Analysis, International Relations Theory, and Social Theory: Critique and Reconstruction**, by Ian Bell
- WP1991/3 **Continuity and Change in Cooperative International Regimes: The Politics of the Recent Environment Debate in Antarctica**, by Lorraine M. Elliott
- WP1991/2 **Middle Powers and International Sanctions: Generic Theory Reconsidered**, by Kim Richard Nossal

- WP1991/1 **International Trade, Ecologically Sustainable Development and the GATT**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1990/10 **The Influence of the United Nations on the Antarctic System: a Source of Erosion or Cohesion?**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1990/9 **The Limits to Liberalisation in Industrialising Asia: Three Views of the State**, by James Cotton
- WP1990/8 **Informal Theories of Rationality**, by James L. Richardson
- WP1990/7 **Peacekeeping in the South Pacific: Some Questions for Prior Consideration**, by Greg Fry
- WP1990/6 **The Politics of Baltic Nationalisms**, by William Maley
- WP1990/5 **Is Unilateral Trade Liberalisation the Answer?**, by Trevor Matthews and John Ravenhill
- WP1990/4 **India in Southwest Asia**, by Amin Saikal
- WP1990/3 **The Environmental Challenge: The New International Agenda**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1990/2 **The Soviet Far East**, by Geoff Jukes
- WP1990/1 **Middle Power Leadership and Coalition Building: The Cairns Croup and the Uruguay Round**, by Andrew Fenton Cooper and Richard A. Higgott
- WP1989/5 **Economic Change in the International System Implications for Australia's Prospects**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1989/4 **Analysing the Impact of International Sanctions on China**, by Peter Van Ness
- WP1989/3 **The Politics of Reassurance: Egypt and the Arab World, 1977–1987**, by Ralph King
- WP1989/2 **Agricultural Trade and Australian Foreign Policy in the 1990s**, by Stuart Harris
- WP1989/1 **The Changing Central Balance and Australian Policy**, by Coral Bell

STUDIES IN WORLD AFFAIRS

Ethics and Foreign Policy, edited by Paul Keal

Korea Under Roh Tae-woo: Democratisation, Northern Policy, and Inter-Korean Relations, edited by James Cotton

1. **Asian–Pacific Security After the Cold War**, edited by T.B. Millar and James Walter
2. **The Post-Cold War Order: Diagnoses and Prognoses**, edited by Richard Leaver and James L. Richardson
3. **Dependent Ally: A Study in Australian Foreign Policy**, 3rd ed., by Coral Bell
4. **A Peaceful Ocean? Maritime Security in the Pacific in the Post-Cold War Era**, edited by Andrew Mack

5. **Asian Flashpoint: Security and the Korean Peninsula**, edited by Andrew Mack
6. **Taiwan in the Asia-Pacific in the 1990s**, edited by Gary Klintworth
7. **Pacific Cooperation: Building Economic and Security Regimes in the Asia-Pacific**, edited by Andrew Mack and John Ravenhill
8. **The Gulf War: Critical Perspectives**, edited by Michael McKinley
9. **Search for Security: The Political Economy of Australia's Postwar Foreign and Defence Policy**, by David Lee
10. **The New Agenda for Global Security, *Cooperating for Peace* and Beyond**, edited by Stephanie Lawson
11. **Presumptive Engagement: Australia's Asia-Pacific Security Policy in the 1990s**, by Desmond Ball and Pauline Kerr
12. **Discourses of Danger and Dread Frontiers: Australian Defence and Security Thinking After the Cold War**, edited by Graeme Cheeseman and Robert Bruce
13. **Pacific Rim Development: Integration and Globalisation in the Asia-Pacific Economy**, edited by Peter J. Rimmer
14. **Evatt to Evans: The Labor Tradition in Australian Foreign Policy**, edited by David Lee and Christopher Waters
15. **Cambodia—From Red to Blue: Australia's Initiative for Peace**, by Ken Berry
16. **Asia-Pacific Security: The Economics–Politics Nexus**, edited by Stuart Harris and Andrew Mack
17. **China's Ocean Frontier: International Law, Military Force and National Development**, by Greg Austin
18. **Weak and Strong States in Asia-Pacific Societies**, edited by Peter Dauvergne
19. **Australian Outlook: a History of the Australian Institute of International Affairs**, by J.D. Legge
20. **Transforming Asian Socialism: China and Vietnam Compared**, by Anita Chan, Benedict J. Tria Kerkvliet, and Jonathan Unger
21. **The Politics of Nuclear Non-Proliferation**, edited by Carl Ungerer and Marianne Hanson

CANBERRA STUDIES IN WORLD AFFAIRS

- CS21 **Politics, Diplomacy and Islam: Four Case Studies**,
edited by Coral Bell
- CS22 **The Changing Pacific: Four Case Studies**, edited by Coral Bell
- CS23 **New Directions in International Relations? Australian Perspectives**,
edited by Richard Higgott
- CS24 **Australia and the Multinationals: A Study of Power and Bargaining in the 1980s**, by Neil Renwick
- CS25 **Refugees in the Modern World**, edited by Amin Saikal
- CS27 **Northeast Asian Challenge: Debating the Garnaut Report**,
edited by J.L. Richardson

- CS28 **The ANZUS Documents**, edited by Alan Burnett with
Thomas-Durell Young and Christine Wilson
- CS29 **Human Rights in the Asia-Pacific Region**, edited by John Girling
- CS30 **International Relations: Global and Australian Perspectives on
an Evolving Discipline**, edited by Richard Higgott and J.L. Richardson

AUSTRALIAN FOREIGN POLICY PAPERS

Australia's Alliance Options: Prospect and Retrospect in a World of Change.

by Coral Bell

Coping With Washington: Players, Conventions and Strategies,

by Davis Bobrow

The European Community in Context, by John Groom

Australia's Human Rights Diplomacy, by Ian Russell, Peter Van Ness and

Beng-Huat Chua

Selling Mirages: The Politics of Arms Trading, by Graeme Cheeseman

The Search for Substance: Australia–India Relations into the Nineties and Beyond,

by Sandy Gordon

Protecting the Antarctic Environment: Australia and the Minerals Convention,

by Lorraine Elliott

Australia's Taiwan Policy 1942–1992, by Gary Klintworth

Australia and the New World Order: Evatt in San Francisco, 1945,

by W.J. Hudson

The Beijing Massacre: Australian Responses, by Kim Richard Nossal

The Pacific Patrol Boat Project: A Case Study of Australian Defence Cooperation,

by Anthony Bergin

A Select Bibliography of Australia's Foreign Relations, 1975–1992,

compiled by Pauline Kerr, David Sullivan and Robin Ward

Australia's Evolving American Relationship: Interests, Processes and Prospects

for Australian Influence, by Henry S. Albinski