# Introduction

It is now widely accepted that one of the most significant developments in the present time is the enhanced momentum of globalization. Global forces have become more and more visible and take a huge variety of forms, from economic and technological to cultural and political. Globalization has brought about a tremendous transformation of social relations and it is no longer possible to think of nation-states, capitalism, the environment, citizenship, borders, consumption and communication in the same way. Virtually the entire span of human experience is in one way or the other influenced by globalization, by which I mean the overwhelming interconnectivity of the world. Yet the huge significance of globalization has some limits when it comes to social and political theory. There have been major works written on globalization as a societal condition and there has been increased recognition of the significance of transnational politics for political community. However, theories of globalization do not provide an interpretation of the social world that extends the methodological horizon of social analysis beyond a critique of some of the prevailing assumptions of modern social science. Manuel Castells's three-volume work on the information age, perhaps the most comprehensive analysis of globalization, explicitly avoided the elaboration of a normative theoretical framework and remained on an empirical level of analysis (Castells 1996, 1997, 1998). Globalization is a problem to be understood and explained, but it has not produced a significant philosophical or methodological framework. For the greater part, recognition of globalization as a reality has been incorporated into social and political analysis without leading to a significant shift in social and political theory.[1] Consideration of

---

[1] An exception in globalization theory is the work of Roland Robertson, who introduced a notion of globalization as world unicity in the sense of an awareness of the globally interconnected nature of the world (Robertson 1992). In this account, globalization is most notably present in local contexts rather than in supranational spaces.

1

moral and political problems such as rights and justice has of course been greatly influenced by the wider context of globalization, the rise of 'anti-globalization' movements and normative transnationalism. This critical and normative perspective on globalization opens up a range of theoretical and philosophical questions that are of great importance for a critical social and political theory.

The argument put forward in this book is that the normative significance of globalization rather consists of a different kind of reality beyond the condition of globalization as such and necessitates a new kind of imagination, which can be called the cosmopolitan imagination. The normative and methodological implications of globalization can be more readily assessed from the more conceptually and philosophically nuanced position of cosmopolitan theory, which while admittedly a diffuse field is one that offers a more far-reaching level of analysis than is suggested by the notion of globalization. Cosmopolitanism offers a promising way to link the analysis of globalization to developments in social and political theory. It is also a fruitful way to continue the cultural turn in social science, for the cultural dimensions of globalization resonate with new conceptions of cultural cosmopolitanism. As an approach to current times, cosmopolitanism offers both a critical-normative standpoint and an empirical-analytical account of social trends. While the normative literature has been the most developed and based on a long history of political philosophy, the social scientific literature has been steadily growing in recent years. This book aims specifically to advance the social scientific approach to cosmopolitanism and to propose a broad framework for a cosmopolitan critical social theory.

Cosmopolitanism offers critical social theory with a means to adjust to new challenges. It offers a solution to one of the weaknesses in the critical theory tradition of both the Frankfurt School and Habermas's social theory, namely a failure to respond to the challenges of globalization and move beyond a preoccupation with an exclusively Western range of issues.[2] The idea of a critical cosmopolitanism is relevant to the renewal of critical theory in its traditional concern with the critique of social reality and the search for immanent transcendence, a concept that lies at the core of critical theory.[3] It also opens a route out of the

[2] See also Freundlieb (2000) and Mendieta (2007).
[3] I am grateful to Piet Strydom for drawing my attention to the centrality of the concept of immanence transcendence for critical theory.

critique of domination and a general notion of emancipation that
has so far constrained critical theory. In addition, it offers a promising
approach to connect normative philosophical analysis with empirical
sociological inquiry. The cosmopolitan imagination offers critical social
theory a normative foundation that makes possible new ways of seeing
the world. Such forms of world disclosure have become an unavoidable
part of social reality today in terms of people's experiences, identities,
solidarities and values. These dimensions represent the foundations for
a new conception of immanent transcendence; it is one that lies at the
heart of the cosmopolitan imagination in so far that this is a way of
viewing the world in terms of its immanent possibilities for self-
transformation and which can be realized only by taking the cosmopo-
litan perspective of the Other as well as global principles of justice

   There has been widespread recognition of the salience of cosmopo-
litanism for an understanding of the present time. While cosmopoli-
tanism has become influential within normative political theory,[4] it
has been taken up in a different guise in disciplines such as history,
sociology, anthropology and cultural studies where the tendency has
been towards a more situated or rooted understanding of cosmopoli-
tanism as always contextualized. This has specific methodological
implications for social and political analysis and points to the need
for a new conceptual framework to understand the interconnectivity
of the world and go beyond national frames of reference. It would not
be inaccurate to speak of a cosmopolitan turn in social science. Recent
contributions by sociologists and social theorists have attempted to
open up new ways of understanding the social world and to explore
the methodological implications of cosmopolitanism for social
science.[5] Ulrich Beck, who has been at the forefront of sociological
cosmopolitanism, has argued for a methodological cosmopolitanism
to replace the methodological nationalism of much of social science.
There has been widespread recognition of the diminishing significance
of the nation-state and the related notion of 'society' as a territorially

---

[4] See for example Brock and Brighouse (2005) and Tan (2004).
[5] See for example the special issue of the *British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1), 2006
on cosmopolitan sociology, edited by U. Beck and N. Szaider and the special issue
of the *European Journal of Social Theory* 10 (1) 2007 on cosmopolitanism. See
also the special issue of *Theory, Culture and Society* 19 (1–2) 2002; Holton 2009;
Kendall *et al.* 2009.

bounded reality (Touraine 1998; Urry 2000).[6] Within mainstream
political science Pippa Norris (1997) has argued for the importance
of cosmopolitanism. But there is little of a substantive nature on the
relation between normative accounts and methodological considera-
tions for empirical social science. Recent publications have stressed
the relevance of cosmopolitanism to non-Western societies (see Hawley
(2008), Fojas (2005), Kwok-bun (2005) and Pollock (2006). However
this is largely an undeveloped field but undoubtedly one where the
future of cosmopolitan analysis lies.

The main approaches to cosmopolitanism can be summed up as
follows. First, there is cosmopolitanism as a political philosophy that
is concerned with normative principles relating to world citizenship and
global governance. In such accounts, as most prominently in the work
of Held and Archibugi, cosmopolitanism is seen as a new kind of
political framework based on global conceptions of rights and justice
and in which democracy can be established on a new basis beyond
the nation-state (Archibugi 2003, 2008). This can be termed global
cosmopolitanism. Second, there is cosmopolitanism in the sense of
liberal multiculturalism where the emphasis is on plurality and the
embracing of difference in the creation of a post-national political
community (Calhoun 2003a; Stevenson 2002). In such approaches,
which include Habermas's discourse theory and which may be termed
post-national cosmopolitanism, the focus is less on global governance
than on nationally specific forms of political community. Third, there is
cosmopolitanism as transnational movements, such as diasporas and
hybridity (Clifford 1992; Hannerz 1996; Nederveen Pieterse 2004,
2006). Culturally oriented approaches in anthropology, cultural studies
and sociology are increasingly stressing the cosmopolitan nature of
transnational processes and global culture, such as new modes of cul-
tural consumption and lifestyles, identities and communication. In such
approaches, which can be termed transnational cosmopolitanism, there
is a strong emphasis on hybridity and the mixed nature of cultural
phenomena, as well as a concern with aesthetic cosmopolitanism
(Szersznski and Urry 2002). Finally, a fourth development has become
apparent in a view of cosmopolitanism as a methodological approach

[6] See the special issue of the *European Journal of Social Theory* 10 (2) 2007 'Does
   the Prospect of a General Sociological Theory Still Mean Anything (in Times of
   Globalization)?'.

for social science responding to the challenge of globalization. As is best illustrated in the work of Ulrich Beck, it is possible to speak today of a cosmopolitan condition as the reality of contemporary society and which necessitates a new methodological approach. In this case, cosmopolitanism is not confined to identifiably transnational processes as such, but pervades the very nature of social relations and institutions more generally. In the work of William Connolly it extends into the domain of affect theory (Connolly 2002).

These approaches are varied, but it can be noted that underlying all is a view of cosmopolitanism as a new orientation in the world today and which has important implications for both normative theory and empirical analysis. Cosmopolitanism as a theoretical approach suggests a critical attitude as opposed to an exclusively interpretative or descriptive approach to the social world. In this sense it retains the normative stance of traditional notions of cosmopolitanism while offering a critical evaluation of current developments. The appeal of cosmopolitanism is partly due to the legacy of postmodernism in so far as this has opened up new ways of thinking about culture and politics. Although postmodernism has faded in its appeal as a foundation for social science, its impact has been considerable in the attention it has given to the mixed and overlapping nature of culture and the relativization of universal standpoints. This confluence of postmodernism and cosmopolitanism is noticeable in much of the literature that concerns cultural issues as well as postcolonial questions. Indeed, it is in postcolonial theory that important insights have been made in disengaging cosmopolitanism from purely Western assumptions (Breckenridge *et al*. 2002). Another and related topic is aesthetic cosmopolitanism, especially in relation to the spaces of encounters and dialogue that are constituted in contemporary arts (Papers7tergiadis 2006). However, it would be a mistake to see cosmopolitanism as a product of postmodernism. Its roots are much older and it should rather be situated in the context of modernity and the constitution of the subject around new modes of experience and interpretation. In addition, the relevance of cosmopolitanism for social science is due in no small part to theories of globalization that emphasize its non-economic dimensions. The growing interest in cultural and political expressions of globalization, as in the work of Robertson (1992), has invariably drawn attention to the interaction of the global with the local. One of the central claims of this book is that this dynamic opens up a range of considerations that bring globalization

theory in the direction of a new conception of cosmopolitanism as a mode of world disclosure and as a way in which to theorize the transformation of subjectivity in terms of relations of self, Other and world.

The distinctive approach adopted in this book will be termed critical cosmopolitanism in order to emphasize its essentially critical and transformative nature.[7] Invoked in this conception of cosmopolitanism is a new definition of social reality as opposed to a set of cosmopolitan principles or a cosmopolitan agent or political project. Rather than seeing cosmopolitanism simply as an ideal, as is indicated by the title of this book, the cosmopolitan perspective requires a particular imagination – the cosmopolitan imagination. In this respect, the aim is to advance the sociological approach to cosmopolitanism in a way that draws on the insights of some of the main contributions to cosmopolitan theory. The specific challenge now is to link the political philosophy of cosmopolitanism with the sociologically oriented approaches and the contributions of global history. Although the concerns of the various approaches are clearly different, there are common themes and a rich body of literature that is rarely brought together. The basic view of cosmopolitanism taken in this book is that it is rooted in two contexts: a new definition of social reality of immanent possibilities and a conception of modernity that emphasizes its multiple and interactive nature.

The notion of social reality that is referred to here is an essentially relational one. The social refers less to a clear-cut definition of 'society' as national society or a territorially or culturally bounded entity, but a field of social relations in which conflicting orientations are played out. In addition to this emphasis on conflict, contingency is an important methodological dimension of the cosmopolitan imagination for the analysis of the social world. Social action occurs increasingly in situations of uncertainty and there the outcome of individual or collective decisions is often determined by global contexts. The relational conception of the social does not exhaust all senses of the real, for reality is also a form of human experience. As will be argued throughout this book, cosmopolitan orientations and attitudes give expression to specific forms of experience of the world which also entail the interpretation of the world. The cosmopolitan imagination is both an experience and an interpretation of the world (Wagner 2008).[8]

---

[7] The term has been used by others, for example Mignolo (2000). See also Rumford (2008).
[8] On experience and interpretation, see Wagner 2008.

Four dimensions of the social that are constitutive of the cosmopolitan imagination can be highlighted. First, a cosmopolitan view of the social stresses, cultural difference and pluralization. This concern with cultural pluralism and heterogeneity ties cosmopolitanism closely with radical or postmodern approaches in multiculturalism; it suggests a view of not just social groups, but of societies as mixed and overlapping as opposed to being homogeneous. The recognition of cultural difference as both a reality and a positive ideal for social policy is one of the principal features of the cosmopolitan imagination. Second, the cosmopolitan moment occurs in the context of global–local relations. As mentioned, cosmopolitanism is not reducible to globalization but refers to the interaction of global forces with local contexts. This interaction takes many forms, ranging from, for instance, creolization and diasporic cultures to global civil-society movements. Third, the negotiation of borders. Territorial space has been displaced by new kinds of space, of which transnational space is the most significant. In this reconfiguration of borders, local and global forces are played out and borders in part lose their significance and take forms in which no clear lines can be drawn between inside and outside, the internal and the external. A cosmopolitan perspective on the social world gives a central place to the resulting condition of ambivalence in which boundaries are being transcended and new ones established. Thinking beyond the established forms of borders is an essential dimension of the cosmopolitan imagination. Fourth, the reinvention of political community around global ethics, and what Bryan Turner (2006: 140), has referred to as a 'cosmopolitan epistemology of a shared reality'. Without a normative dimension, cosmopolitanism loses its significance as a concern with finding alternatives and with transcending the immediately given. The challenges raised by the previously mentioned dimensions of the social all raise normative questions relating to difference, globalization and borders. The social cannot be separated from cosmopolitan principles and the aspiration to establish a new kind of political community in which national interests have to be balanced with other kinds of interests. Foregrounded in this are notions of care, rights and hospitality.

The definition of the social that emerges from these considerations introduces both a critical and a sociological perspective into the cosmopolitan imagination. The important point to be stressed is that cosmopolitanism has a social dimension as opposed to either a political or

cultural dimension conceived of in isolation from a concept of the social. A more complete account of this notion of critical cosmopolitanism requires a perspective that goes beyond the limits of the present to a historical contextualization. While globalization is generally associated with relatively recent developments, although by no means confined to current times, cosmopolitanism clearly has a much longer history. This will be discussed in detail in Chapter 1. The approach taken in this book is that the cosmopolitan imagination has been integral to the spirit of modernity and can be fully understood only by an analysis of the dynamics of modernity. The following four points sum up the main direction of the argument.

First, one of the key dynamics of modernity is the continuous transformation of present time by political designs for the future. The consciousness of modernity emerged with the experience of the unlimited possibilities of human freedom and the vision that human beings can create the world in a new image. Modernity signalled the break from the past and a great optimism about the future. The cosmopolitan vision of a new order was a central orientation within modernity and modernity itself was also greatly animated by cosmopolitan ideas of world openness and self-transformation. Second, modernity opened up the social and political world to new orders of interpretation in which the universe of meaning and interpretation was continuously expanded as a result of the encounter with new contexts. This has cosmopolitan implications for human experience in the constant self-problematization of what was previously taken for granted. This dimension of modernity had in addition a broadly critical thrust in the tendency towards self-confrontation in light of the encounter with the Other and with new modes of interpretation arising out of exchange, encounters and dialogue. Third, while modernity has often been associated with Western or European civilization, it should be seen as having a far wider civilizational relevance. Modernity can emerge in any civilization and while the Western tradition has indeed been important in shaping other experiences of modernity, this too has been a highly differentiated one. Rather than speak of modernity in the singular, it should be seen as having multiple forms. In this respect the civilizational dimension is particularly important, since the different forms modernity takes can be attributed more to civilizational differences than to, for instance, different national traditions. Fourth, the multiple nature of modernity is in itself an interesting instance of cosmopolitanism, but more significant

for cosmopolitan analysis is the inter-civilizational dynamic by which civilizations interact and as they do so they undergo change. This perspective draws attention to the role of cultural encounters, exchange, dialogue and the overlapping nature of civilizations as multiple orders of interpretation.

The implications of this approach to cosmopolitan analysis are far-reaching and go beyond conventional assumptions about both cosmopolitanism and modernity as Western or as universal. Locating cosmopolitanism as an orientation within modernity avoids a narrow view of cosmopolitanism as a recent development and a product of global culture or Westernization. Cosmopolitanism can instead be seen as one of the key dynamics of modernity and a context in which societies deal with the normative challenges raised by difference, the reconfiguration of borders, and the many questions brought about by globalization. If modernity is conceived of in multiple and inter-civilizational terms, cosmopolitanism loses its connection with simple notions of universalism. This means that the only acceptable kind of cosmopolitanism today can be post-universal, that is a universalism that has been shaped by numerous particularism as opposed to an underlying set of values (see Connolly 2002; Julien 2008; Tong 2009). This does not mean an entirely relativistic postmodernism, but the recognition that universal claims or normative principles are always limited and often context bound and, as Connolly has argued, can extend into the domain of the neuropolitical. Concretely it means that cosmopolitan orientations simply take different forms and can be found in many different cultural contexts and historical periods.

One of the most important developments in recent times within social and political science is the recognition that the Western understanding of the world needs to be considerably revised. At least three reasons for this can be given. First, the enhanced speed of globalization in all its forms has led to a more connected world. Second, there has been increasing recognition of postcolonial critiques of Western political thought and from within mainstream Western social science recognition of alternative routes to modernity. Finally, major shifts in the international political order have led to a post-Western world in which new centres of political power have arisen. Europe has become more important as a global economic and political actor and, in Asia, China and India have emerged as major economic powers. This all points to what can be called a post-Western world, in the sense that

the global world can no longer be considered primarily Western
(Delanty 2003). The diversity of cultures, social movements and forms
of political community do not correspond to a simple model of
Westernization. For these reasons the notion of a post-Western world
is relevant to the current situation in which contradictory global, regio-
nal and nationalist tendencies are in evidence.

Within Europe itself there has been considerable attention paid
to the tremendous transformation of the nation-state as a result of
Europeanization. However, there has been less attention paid to the
implications of the emerging post-Western world for European self-
understanding. In particular, current scholarship has not properly
assessed the multiple ways in which political community is shaped
by different cultural contexts and the implications of divergent routes
to modernity for inter-cultural understanding and political coopera-
tion. The collapse of communism has not only signified the integration
of Europe largely on the terms of Western Europe, but it also signifi-
cantly has shifted the core of the European integration project east-
wards, thereby questioning a purely Western European definition of
the project; it also draws attention to different civilizational back-
grounds of Europe and thus 'multiple Europes', and challenging a
Western European definition of the modern nation-state and its
role in European integration. At the same time, Europe's global cen-
trality appears to be on the decline now that Asia is increasingly
gaining prominence as an economic as well as a cultural and political
player (Delanty 2006). The question arises to what extent European
modernity is still the dominant modernity, also now that the West is
divided, and whether other modernities are gaining in importance
(Therborn 2003).

What is needed is an understanding of how political community is
being shaped today in light of new kinds of experience. The challenge
is to avoid an over-emphasis both on Westernization and on global
differentiation and also global polarization. On the one side, there is
much evidence – within Europe as well as in the rest of the world – of
societal differentiation and, with this, in many cases, challenges to
Western cultural and political models; on the other hand, there is some-
thing like a global normative political culture taking shape around
issues relating to democracy, human rights and climate change, and
which is in evidence in increased cosmopolitanism in terms of identities
and other dimensions of political community. The upshot of this is that