

Global Governance and Human Rights

**William Felice
Eckerd College
williamfelice.com**

Prepared for presentation at the Central and East European International Studies Association (CEEISA)-International Studies Association (ISA) Joint International Conference, Ljubljana, Slovenia, June 23-25, 2016

DRAFT: DO NOT CITE WITHOUT PERMISSION FROM THE AUTHOR.

Introduction

This paper draws from the final chapter of my forthcoming book *The Ethics of Interdependence: Global Human Rights and Duties* (Rowman and Littlefield, July 2016). In the book I develop the idea of a “human rights threshold” to determine when a radical change of state within a community, nation or region has occurred due to the most severe violations of fundamental rights. Four case-studies explored in the book are (1) mass incarceration in the US, (2) LGBT rights in Africa, (3) women’s rights in Saudi Arabia, and (4) environmental rights in China. These case studies are vivid illustrations of violations of the “human rights threshold” which should trigger human rights duties at the individual, nation-state and global levels.

From a perspective of universal human rights the distinction between domestic and foreign suffering is often spurious. The economic, political, and social links between all countries is now so extensive that it is impossible to draw a clear line of ethical duty at the border. This paper examines how a framework of “global governance” helps conceptualize individual and group rights, responsibilities and duties in this new cosmopolitan era. These approaches to global governance should not be viewed as alien

to Americans. In fact, as noted at the end of this paper, the ethics illuminating Franklin Delano Roosevelt's "Four Freedoms" embody this vision of global human rights and duties.

The Nationalist Challenge

In response to then-Senator Barack Obama's Berlin speech, August 3, 2008, syndicated columnist George Will wrote:

"'Citizen of the world' and 'global citizenship' are, strictly speaking, nonsense. Citizenship is defined by legal and loyalty attachments to a particular political entity with a distinctive regime and culture. Neither the world nor the globe is such an entity."¹

In this quote, Will captures the essence of the nationalist critique of the idea of global citizenship which presents a competing conception of the relationship between the individual, the state and humankind overall. From Aristotle to Hegel, the state was seen as the essence of the idea of the sanctity of the polis with the nation serving as the vehicle to provide the safety and security that allows individuals to lead moral lives. An individual citizen's loyalty and identity is thus tied to the nation and not to the "world" or distant strangers. The modern state system demonstrates the power of nationalism and how an often "invented" or "imagined" common culture and tradition can create a strong patriotic allegiance to a nation defined in terms of a specific geographical space.² This powerful socialization process creates entrenched political ties from which the rights and responsibilities of citizenship are defined and accepted. The state becomes central to how

¹ George Will quoted in Luis Cabrera, *The Practice of Global Citizenship* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 83.

² See Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (London: Verso Press, 1991).

the individual, and the community as a whole, understand ethical action, justice, rights, and responsibilities. From this perspective, it is nonsense to talk about citizenship and governance outside of the context of the state.

National patriotism continues as a driving force in world affairs in the twenty-first century. The challenge to those attempting to articulate a framework of global governance and global human rights duties is to overcome the arguments of the nationalists and communitarians on the importance of the nation-state as the singular vehicle for democratic politics and security. In the abstract, the ideas of global human rights may rhetorically present a framework that binds the peoples of the world together; but in reality, according to nationalists, it is local identities and traditions that truly bind people. Political philosopher Michael Walzer argues that rights need a location just as individuals need a home. Since the state remains the central actor in world affairs, it remains the critical arena of political life.³ And Walzer is correct: the state can protect the rights of its citizens while the UN and international organizations are frequently unable to act in a similar manner. And, furthermore, individuals residing in failed states and stateless persons not only do not have a government to protect them from abuse, but also often have no access to global human rights institutions and programs to come to their assistance.

Some communitarians argue further that the growth of globalist and cosmopolitan ways of thinking can undermine loyalty to the state and leave individuals with nothing to protect them, resulting in isolation and anomie. As Edmund Burke famously wrote in *Reflections on the French Revolution*:

³ See Michael Walzer, "The Moral Standing of States: A Response to Four Critics," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, Vol. 9, No. 3 (Spring 1980), pp. 209-229.

To transfer humanity from its natural basis, our legitimate and home-bred connection—to lose all feelings, for those who have grown up by our sides, in our eyes, the benefit of whose cares and labours we have partaken from our birth, and meretriciously to hunt abroad after foreign affections, is such a disarrangement of the whole system of our duties, that I do not know whether benevolence so displaced is not almost the same thing as destroyed, or what effect bigotry could have produced that is more fatal to society.⁴

Kwame Appiah addresses this anxiety directly by demonstrating how cosmopolitanism and patriotism can coexist in harmony and be mutually beneficial. But, some nationalists respond that Appiah ignores the dangers inherent in a globalist project and claim that transferring loyalties above the state can undermine patriotism and lead to social disintegration. Furthermore, some nationalists argue that a “global identity” will not attract the same loyalty that individuals find in their nations. Global governance is thus both undesirable and impractical.⁵

Other nationalists note the ways in which the people of the world are divided by geography, language, culture, religion and politics. They question whether there are global conceptions of justice and morality. While local cultural communities and nations have developed over hundreds of years, global citizenship and global governance is not so clearly rooted in historical experience. Does this mean that few people in the world can really think in terms of global human rights and duties? Some nationalists would

⁴ Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the French Revolution*, (ed. A. J. Grieve), (London: Dent, 1910), 82.

⁵ It is important to note that there are differences between individual philosophers linked to communitarianism. While both Charles Taylor and Alasdair MacIntyre, for example, are associated with the communitarian critique, Taylor would be much more sympathetic to aspects of an emerging global identity than would MacIntyre.

answer yes and assert that there is little world species consciousness to drive global governance forward.

Derek Heater summarizes three arguments put forward by critics of schemes of global governance and global citizenship. First, it is the nation-state “that remains for the vast majority of people their ‘community of fate’.” Second, any weakening of the state has come from below with the creation of “regional cultural identities, more than any succumbing to supranational forces.” And third, the “homogenizing thrusts of globalization have been exaggerated” and the world’s peoples remain in distinct civilizations with differing national interests and cultural priorities.⁶

Yet, the world’s major religions assert a common humanity across culture; biologically human beings are the same no matter where they are born; philosophers from the Greek Stoics through the Enlightenment have asserted the importance of acting on a framework of global citizenship; since WWII globally recognized human rights are based on the premise of the essential oneness of humankind; and economic and technological globalization has brought all of humanity closer together than ever before in history. In addition, an environmental consciousness has blossomed since the 1970s as the fragile state of the world’s ecosystem has brought a new awareness of common ecological vulnerabilities impacting all cultures. Solutions to these ecological dilemmas demand a global approach to sorting out environmental rights and responsibilities.

Perhaps the issue becomes: what difference does it make? If our goal is to create a just world system, that addresses the root causes of human suffering, which is more helpful—a nationalist approach or a global human rights and global governance

⁶ Derek Heater, *World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and Its Opponents* (London: Continuum, 2002), 63.

framework? In this era of complex interdependence with mutual vulnerabilities and sensitivities inside individual states to global economic, environmental, and political events, is the framework of global citizenship and global governance helpful in sorting out human rights and duties in the twenty-first century? Or, is the existing nationalist approach based upon communitarian principles of justice and morality the most viable framework to achieve justice?

A global governance framework can be constructed around human rights and duties with individual, nation-state and world dimensions. At the individual level, human rights duties revolve around consciousness and outer-awareness of moral interdependence. Such consciousness pushes individuals to expand their ethical circles of rights and responsibilities from family to nation to humanity as a whole. At the nation-state level, human rights duties involve the incorporation of international law, universal human rights and global environmental accords into national policy formation. Such a commitment recognizes the ways in which this cooperative normative framework boosts national security by grounding the international system on principles that enhance peace. At the global level, institutions and “regimes” of cooperation are pivotal to the creation of a world system responsive to conditions of ethical interdependence and global human rights duties. Such global institutions give state and non-state actors the ability to interact and engage with one another, building mechanisms of trust and verification. Neutral global institutions are better positioned to apply human rights norms fairly across boundaries and help to construct regimes of global governance responsive to the rights of the most vulnerable among us.

This tripartite (individual, nation-state, global) understanding of global human rights duties and ethical interdependence is not a radical position calling for an end to national affiliations or national patriotism. In fact, there is a long lineage of conservative and “main-stream” philosophers and practitioners who argue that patriotism and globalism go hand-in-hand. Aristotle, for example, viewed human affection growing through a hierarchy of attachments—family, household, village, and finally the polis itself. The conservative philosopher Edmund Burke wrote: “To be attached to the subdivision, to love the little platoon we belong to in society, is the first principle (the germ as it were) of public affections. It is the first link in the series by which we proceed toward a love to our country and to mankind.”⁷

Both national and global institutions are central to the protection of basic human rights and human flourishing. There is thus no contradiction in recognizing both a moral justification for allegiance to one’s nation-state and a moral justification for global institutions and regimes. In fact, the ability of the nation’s leader to protect her citizens from global economic, technological, and environmental forces depends upon such global institutions working towards common, equitable solutions to these global problems. To be clear, the argument here is not for a single world-government or world state. In fact, it is the narrower political communities of nation-states that allow for both cultural diversity to flourish and for democratic participation and popular control of societies. Global governance is designed to complement not replace national governance systems, and protect not squelch cultural differences. In fact, the safeguarding of local communities is dependent upon a viable, global framework of norms and institutions

⁷ Edmund Burke quoted in Michael W. McConnell, “Don’t Neglect the Platoons,” in Martha C. Nussbaum, *For Love of Country?* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 79.

designed to protect individuals and groups from the common global vulnerabilities confronting all individuals and states around the world.

Democratic participation through a framework of national citizenship is only partially empowering in the twenty-first century. State power is limited by global economic, political and technological forces, which individual nations cannot control. As many scholars have noted, these global forces demand that we rethink our traditional understandings of “sovereignty.” The legitimacy of the liberal state lies in its ability to protect basic human rights. Global dynamics—from ecological destruction to financial turmoil to aggressive war and genocide—point toward the need to augment the liberal state with a framework of global governance.

David Held, for example, argues for a “cosmopolitan model of sovereignty.” Held writes:

Cosmopolitanism is, contrary to popular criticism, the triumph of difference and local affiliations. Insofar as a cosmopolitan institutional project aims at the entrenchment of law-governed relations, it creates the requirements for political autonomy that each person and group needs in order to foster its ideas of the good life. Without such a framework, solutions will not be adopted on the basis of deliberation and law, but on the basis of power and economic strength. A world without cosmopolitan principles is not a world in which communal differences are entrenched and valued for their own sake, but rather a world in which power (in

its different manifestations) drives the resolution of what I have called the pressing issues of our time.⁸

Held points to the “difficulties of managing global risks associated with human interdependence” in “three policy domains of finance, security and the environment.” There is now wide spread understanding and recognition of how “complex interdependence” and “globalization” have created common economic, security and environmental vulnerabilities beyond the control of individual communities and states. Almost daily the media is filled with examples of nations confronting these types of global problems. The most widely recognized and acknowledged vulnerabilities arise from the integrated way in which the global economy now functions. And, there is further recognition that each state acting alone will be unable to resolve these issues, and thus unable to provide human security to its citizens. Yet, despite this recognition, our global international institutions are unfortunately often inadequately structured to provide much help. As Held writes: “Each of these three domains [finance, security, and the environment] suffers from what can be called a ‘capacity problem’—existing institutions which address the global nature of risk are not fit for purpose.”⁹

As early as 1994, moral philosopher Martha Nussbaum claimed that global citizenship, with its focus on universal rights and reason, should be the basis for civic education. Nussbaum justified this position with three main points. First, “by looking through the lens of the other,” Nussbaum argued, “we learn more about ourselves.” “[W]e come to see what in our practices is local and nonessential, what is more broadly

⁸ David Held, *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and Realities* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010), 19-20.

⁹ Held, *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and Realities*, 24.

or deeply shared.” Second, she believes that a cosmopolitan education promotes a constructive dialogue toward solving the world’s most pressing problems. “We make headway solving problems that require international cooperation.” And third, with a cosmopolitan education “we recognize moral obligations to the rest of the world that are real and that otherwise would go unrecognized.” Global citizens are more disposed to recognize moral obligations not only to one’s family and nation but also to humanity as a whole. Already in our democracy citizens are instructed to “join hands across boundaries of ethnicity, class, gender, and race.” A cosmopolitan perspective would also encourage young people to ‘join hands’ across national borders as well, which may help to curb aggressive jingoism.¹⁰

Many U.N. diplomats and human rights activists in NYC and Geneva perceive a growing acceptance of the ideas of global governance, the universality of human rights, and the need for international organizations around the world. The success of key global organizations since WWII, including the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Development Programme and so on, is now widely recognized in Europe, Latin America and elsewhere. In contrast, inside the U.S. there is deep skepticism toward the possibility of building regimes of cooperation and resistance to the ideas of global governance. The media’s fixation on perceived U.N. failures and

¹⁰ Martha Nussbaum, “Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism,” in *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, ed. Joshua Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 11-15. See also: Martha Nussbaum, “Toward a Globally Sensitive Patriotism,” *Daedalus* 137, no 3 (2008): 78-93.

scandals¹¹ enhances this distrust within the U.S. toward the U.N. and other key global organizations.

In addition, inside the academic community there is resistance to many of these ideas as well. The field of international relations remains focused on traditional approaches toward national security, often with an emphasis on “hard power,” i.e., military and economic resources. While there is wide acceptance in the academy of “economic interdependence,” only a few human rights scholars have the temerity to outline and document the ways in which we have become ethically interdependent as well. The “common sense” approach is to see distinct cultures and “civilizations” as unique, embedded communities, each having its own sense of right and wrong, its own definition of “justice”, its own framework of rights and responsibilities. Michael Walzer’s response to Nussbaum is perhaps a clear example. Walzer writes,

I am not a citizen of the world, as she would like me to be. I am not even aware that there is a world such that one could be a citizen of it. No one has ever offered me citizenship, or described the naturalization process...or provided me with a list of benefits and obligations of citizenship, or shown me the world’s calendar and the common celebrations and commemorations of its citizens.¹²

Yet, as previously explored, the ideas of global citizenship do not depend upon the existence of a “world state.” In fact, Walzer’s dismissive polemic ignores the reality on the ground. In the twenty-first century, the term “global citizenship” captures the ways

¹¹ See for example the media coverage of the UN’s “oil for food” program in Iraq. A summary is available at: Sharon Otterman, “Iraq: Oil for Food Scandal,” Council on Foreign Relations, 28 October 2005. Available at: <http://www.cfr.org/iraq/iraq-oil-food-scandal/p7631> (accessed 31 December 2015).

¹² Michael Walzer, “Spheres of Affection,” in Martha C. Nussbaum, *For Love of Country?* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1996), 125.

in which individuals and states already act on principles of global human rights and global duties. Global citizenship reflects elements of how the world actually “is” and not just how it “ought” to be.

The tensions between globalism and nationalism are often exaggerated for political purposes.¹³ Many, if not most, people take both sets of values seriously and do not view them as alien, contradictory or impossible to align. This does not mean that these normative approaches never conflict. Rather it is to argue that even when uncomfortable tensions exist, the resolution of those conflicts often involves compromise. The new “common sense” approach to citizenship is thus not to see “global” and “national” understandings of the term in conflict. Rather it is to understand that in this era of ethical interdependence, a holistic approach, with national and global dimensions, to the crafting of individual rights and responsibilities is a useful framework for addressing the common ethical problems confronting all of humanity.

Global Governance and Human Rights

The idea of “governance” is distinct from “government.” A government imposes a system of rule over a state and is legally “sovereign” in that there is no authority with the ability to override its decisions. Governance systems, on the other hand, often rely on formal and informal acceptance of rules, norms and decision-making procedures by a variety of local, national and global actors. While there is no global sovereign, the current functioning system of global governance is composed of nation-states, IOs, NGOs, civil society movements, philanthropists, organized labor and other powerful global actors,

¹³ For a seminal contribution on these issues see: Ian Shapiro and Lea Brilmayer, *Global Justice (NOMOS XLI)* (N.Y.: New York University Press, 1999).

including multinational corporations, private military and security companies, transnational criminal networks, and financial markets. To a large degree, these national and global organizations operate within an agreed upon system of rules and laws. This “global governance system” thus creates effective rule and policy; and, most importantly, *the ideas framing human rights and duties undergird the legitimacy of this governance system.*

International organizations, of course, remain key to global governance functioning. According to Karns and Mingst, there were 238 intergovernmental organizations at the start of the new century.¹⁴ Many of these IOs focus specifically on a human rights agenda, including the OHCHR, Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, World Health Organization, International Labor Organization, UN Environment Program, and so on.

International law is composed of treaties, customary practices and general principles that govern relations between nation-state and non-state actors. In addition to the extensive corpus of human rights law, nation-states have agreed to norms governing arms control, environmental sustainability and the law of the sea.

The focus of many NGOs remains on human rights norms, including Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Transparency International, and Oxfam. In addition, environmental rights are pursued by many organizations, including the World Wide Fund for Nature, Greenpeace, and others.

Such a voluntary system of global governance may be better able to adapt to the environmental, financial, technological, and economic security challenges of the twenty-

¹⁴ M.P. Karns and K. A. Mingst, *International Organizations: The Politics and Process of Global Governance*, 2nd edition (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2009), 7.

first century than a more centralized “top down” approach. Individuals, private organizations, and nation-states see the value of cooperative action around this human rights agenda. Their voluntary agreement and action creates a potentially more robust and long-lasting governance structure than one imposed by a hegemonic power. This jumble of formal and informal arrangements has opened up new avenues for addressing human rights issues across boundaries. There has thus been noteworthy progress since WWII toward the creation of an operational system of global governance based on human rights norms.

A UN priority has been to reframe global rights and responsibilities in relation to the following areas reflective of the ethics of interdependence: aggressive war and war crimes; environmental sustainability; crimes against humanity and genocide; terrorism; and basic civil and political rights. In fact, “sovereignty” has been re-conceptualized to include a “responsibility to protect,” e.g., the state has the primary responsibility for the protection of its population from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing. However, if the state fails to fulfill this responsibility, the international community is to be prepared to not only assist with diplomatic, humanitarian and other peaceful means, but also with stronger actions, including the use of force, to protect innocent populations.¹⁵ This framing of the “responsibility to protect” demonstrates the symbiotic relationship between national and global governance. The protection of the basic rights of citizens, including the right to life itself, around the world depends upon not only a humane national government, but also on global institutions dedicated to upholding norms of compassionate governance and the protection of human rights.

¹⁵ See *International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect* at: <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org> (accessed 22 May 2016).

The sovereign power and political authority of states is thus circumscribed within this human rights framework of global governance. A state today finds itself embedded within complex and overlapping regimes of political authority. The nation-state remains strong, but is no longer the sole center of legitimate power. And thus, the concept of “citizenship” shifts from the idea of exclusive membership within a territorial community to include the acceptance of global rules and principles also defining each individual’s rights and duties, i.e. global citizenship. As Held writes: “the meaning of citizenship thus shifts from membership in a community which bestows, for those who qualify, particular rights and duties to an alternative principle of world order in which all persons have equivalent rights and duties in the cross-cutting spheres of decision-making which can affect their vital needs and interests.” What this implies is that individuals come to “enjoy multiple citizenships—political membership, that is, in the diverse political communities which significantly affect them.” Individuals become citizens not only of their immediate political community based on geography, but also members of the regional and global networks that impact on their lives.¹⁶

Seyla Benhabib, for example, identifies a transition in the modern period from international to “cosmopolitan norms of justice.” Cosmopolitanism is based upon the idea of a single global ethical community, with all humans under the same moral standards. While traditional international rules emerge from treaty obligations and multilateral agreements among states, cosmopolitan norms of justice “accrue to individuals as moral and legal persons in a worldwide civil society.” The international legal and normative framework accompanying economic globalization, based on state consent, often fails to

¹⁶ Held, *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and Realities*, 101-102.

capture this new moral interdependence. Benhabib articulates the challenge that cosmopolitan norms of justice pose to democratic principles of self-determination. The distinctiveness of cosmopolitan norms is that they “endow *individuals* rather than states and their agents with certain rights and claims.” The uniqueness of the human rights system established after WWII is that it represents “an eventual transition from a model of international law based on treaties among states to cosmopolitan law understood as international public law that binds and bends the will of sovereign states.”¹⁷

A humane framework of global governance is thus linked fundamentally to the creation of a more democratic and equitable world system based on an understanding of the ethics of interdependence. Humane and benevolent global governance is designed to break down existing privileges and enhance individual human rights for all. Human rights flow from principles of equality, the idea that each person should enjoy impartial treatment based on rules and principles that can be universally applied.

In sum, due to economic, technological, and environmental interdependence, the nation-state acting alone is often unable to provide human security for its citizens. The movement for humane governance and human rights thus has a global dimension; a loosely integrated form of world order that coexists with rich cultural and political diversity between and within nation-states. In response to the growing inability of individual states to protect citizens from new global threats, the ideas of global governance and global citizenship have emerged to redefine boundaries and affirm the priority of individual and group rights in the development of national and global humane governance. In this era of globalized capital, an embryonic world society based on

¹⁷ Seyla Benhabib, *Another Cosmopolitanism*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 16-17.

normative principles of the equal moral standing of all human beings has also materialized.

President Franklin Delano Roosevelt (FDR) certainly embraced this perspective and sought to link American nationalism to a globalist human rights agenda.

FDR's Globalist Approach to Human Rights

On January 1, 1941, FDR slowly dictated in his small study on the second floor of the White House his famous declaration of hope for “a world founded upon four essential human freedoms”: freedom of speech and expression; freedom of religion; freedom from want; and freedom from fear. FDR believed these were not a vision for “a distant millennium” but “a definite basis for a kind of world attainable in our own time and generation.” Newspaper editors declared that the president had given the world “a new Magna Carta of democracy,” and the Four Freedoms became the moral cornerstone of the UN.¹⁸ Accordingly, the Four Freedoms formed the basis of the internationalist ethical principles found in the United Nations Charter and the UDHR that arose out of the great depression and the world wars of the twentieth century.¹⁹

In their original context, the Four Freedoms were designed as a global moral framework, on which to base the restructuring of international relations after World War II. While FDR's “New Deal” was primarily a domestic program of reform intended to

¹⁸ Townsend Hoopes and Douglas Brinkley, *FDR and the Creation of the UN* (Yale University Press, 1997), 26-27.

¹⁹ This concluding section on FDR is drawn directly from my article: William Felice, “Introduction: Ethical Dimensions to American Foreign Policy,” in *A Study Guide to the Four Freedoms* (N.Y.: Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, 2005). Available at:

http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/education/001/four_freedoms/5221.html (accessed 22 May 2016).

protect the weak and vulnerable in the United States, the Four Freedoms addressed a larger stage. FDR realized that national security and economic prosperity for our country depended upon the creation of a cooperative world system based upon ethical principles. FDR recognized the reality of ethical interdependence between peoples and nations everywhere. FDR thus called for freedom of speech and religion “everywhere in the world.” He sought freedom from want in “world terms,” meaning “economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants everywhere in the world.” And, finally, freedom of fear translated into world terms meant “a worldwide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—anywhere in the world.” FDR called for a “new moral order” based upon the “supremacy of human rights everywhere.”

FDR thus provides us with an example of a strong leader pursuing an agenda of global human rights framed within the concepts of global citizenship and global governance. In essence, he made the claim that it is morally and politically unacceptable to ignore global human rights concerns, including the plight of the world's poor. This ethical conclusion is based not only upon abstract moral principles, but also upon a new understanding of national security and national citizenship. FDR realized that security for U.S. citizens (freedom from fear) could not be attained through a sole focus on the assertion of military power. He recognized that a state of constant fear, fueled by the arms race, does not create secure rule, but rather a condition of instability and insecurity. Global security, on the other hand, can be built upon principles including freedom and democracy, instead of an over-reliance on military power. FDR's first freedom, “freedom

of speech and expression—everywhere in the world,” is thus central to the creation at home of a secure and just America.

It is interesting to note the many ways in which FDR’s vision was later articulated in the UDHR and international human rights treaties. FDR’s actions demonstrate how nationalist patriotism can align with a vision of global citizenship. In fact, American principles of personal responsibility, hard work and individual initiative depend upon the protection of basic human rights and duties at home and abroad. FDR’s globalism provides an inspiring historical example useful to draw on for the formulation of policies and programs responsive to the ethics of interdependence in the twenty-first century.