Contents

List of Tables vi

Preface and Acknowledgements vii

1 Introduction 1

Part I Theoretical, Conceptual and Historical Issues

2 Conceptualizing Cosmopolitanism: A Re-appraisal 29

3 A Historical Sociology of Cosmopolitanism 57

4 Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory 83

Part II Empirical Research Issues

5 Cosmopolitanism: Social and Cultural Research 113

6 Cosmopolitanism: Legal and Political Research 141

7 Cosmopolitanism in Ireland 171

8 Conclusion 194

Appendix 1: Cosmopolitanism, Cosmopolitan, Cosmopolitans, Cosmopolitics 212

Bibliography 220

Index 242

1

Introduction

Many people today feel the world is in a state of disarray and uncertainty. Globalization, war, inequality, environmental crisis, banking collapse, volatile markets, terrorism and ethnic cleansing have created an enormous pessimism. Some diagnose an impending 'war of civilizations' in which conflicts between the West and radical Islam play a major part. Another aspect of this sense of disarray is the seemingly inexorable process of global warming and doubts as to the willingness of governments and peoples to take action to minimize its destructive consequences. In this mood of uncertainty and doubt, it is not difficult to create a long list of global crises, social problems and popular anxieties about the capacity of markets, governments or communities to resolve the fundamental problems of the age. Many are sceptical about capitalism and socialism as adequate models for the future, while 'third ways' between the two are often regarded as flabby and ineffectual. Fundamentalist religious revival in some places has not undermined secularization elsewhere, while for populations in abject poverty and suffering, simply surviving with some sense of dignity from day to day is the immediate pre-occupation.

In the face of this tally sheet of major challenges facing individuals, communities and governments, it may seem perverse or simple-minded to believe any longer in solutions or at least in responses that offer a secure or satisfactory future. To take an optimistic stance may seem both unrealistic and insensitive to crises and problems all around us. It is often thought that it is only 'the haves' – those with wealth, education, and social networks – who have this capacity, privilege or luxury – a viewpoint that has some force but tends to be blind to responses from below. There are nonetheless an array of ways of life, moral principles, political ideologies and forms of governance that claim to offer or represent not simply strategies for survival but also improvement in the human condition and the creation of a better world. One of these, cosmopolitanism, is the subject of this book.

Proof

Cosmopolitanism at its simplest joins together two ideas, that of the *cosmos* or the world as a whole with *polis*, or political community. Put together, the two refer to ideas of a global politics involving citizens of the world. However the terms cosmopolitan and cosmopolitanism have come to take on far broader meanings, to do with being at home in a world of mobility and travel, involving contact between peoples and cultures. In this way, cosmopolitanism has recently become seen as a way of life as much as a sense of political or ethical obligation to the world as a whole.

In the process it has been associated with many different activities, values and institutions. Some of these are typically regarded in a positive way, such as connections between cosmopolitanism and the search for peace, an end to war, promotion of human rights over tyranny and racism, and tolerance of or curiosity about other cultures and ways of life. Other estimations are more negative, such as those that see cosmopolitanism as the privilege of the wealthy and powerful, as a rootless search for new experience that undermines community, or as a fruitless dream of global unity that flies in the face of local and national allegiances. Such estimations are both *moral or normative* – relating to views about how social life and politics should be organized – as well as *empirical* – pertaining to the reality of social processes and human endeavours. Political activists and lawyers, migrants and religious communities, internet users and tourists, workers, corporate managers and diplomats are all implicated in cosmopolitanism, for better or worse.

One reason for writing this book is to analyse why there has been a revival of interest in cosmopolitanism over the last twenty years, involving the worlds of practical politics, law, business, urban life and the media, as well as among scholars from a range of disciplines. It is important to analyse how and why this is so. What is it that is interesting, significant, and possibly inescapable about cosmopolitanism? And what are its strengths and limitations? How far can it really contribute to the resolution of the challenges and uncertainties of the age?

A second reason for the book is to draw attention to the way cosmopolitanism has been radically rethought in scholarship. This has involved prising the topic away from the grasp of philosophers and bringing it into a broader relationship with sociological, anthropological scholars, as well as political scientists, geographers, literary theorists and practitioners of cultural studies. What matters here is as much to do with analysis of what cosmopolitanism is, where and how it takes root and becomes built into enduring institutions, or fades away, as much as whether one should support cosmopolitanism as a political or ethical doctrine.

Proof

Scholarship in cosmopolitanism is at an exciting but often frustrating stage. Researchers have identified dozens of types of cosmopolitanism across space and time, deploying many new theories and concepts dealing with different facets of a topic. These have not so far been brought together in one place, but left to proliferate. The study of cosmopolitanism threatens to become over-burdened with so many disparate elements and implications that it will become incoherent chaos. This book is therefore designed as an intellectual mapping of an important but difficult and seemingly intractable terrain. This requires a surer grasp of definitions and concepts, as well as a more realistic sense of what evidence about cosmopolitanism has been assembled and analysed across multiple fields. This exercise is in turn important not only for an understanding of issues like globalization and social change and the prospects for a more just and democratic world, but also because evidence sheds light on the feasibility of cosmopolitanism and the challenges facing those who would seek to promote it.

A final reason for this book is personal in the sense that I am myself part of the phenomena in question, living and writing in three different countries. This creates not only puzzling difficulties for my identity – can I be simultaneously Australian, British and Irish? – but also awareness of the manner in which cultural, as well as economic and political processes, take a cross-border form. Few cultures stop or start at territorial boundaries, and it may be that few ever did. The world of ideas has never done so, while migrants and those connected with them have always faced challenges as to how the various claims and ties of place(s) of origin and destination are to be approached. As a writer, migrant, and traveller, I puzzle too about why it is that particular places, people and moments still matter so much for those that enjoy mobility and dislocation, but equally wonder whether forced mobility, poverty and higher-risk processes of cross-border mobility necessarily create obstacles and impediments to cosmopolitanism. The paradoxes of simultaneously global and local ways of life and affiliations have been a spur to writing this volume, as has a political interest in how cosmopolitan democracy might or may already be working in practice as distinct from mere rhetorical celebration of cosmopolitan values.

The Multiple Legacies of Cosmopolitanism

In one form or another, cosmopolitanism has a long history stretching back over 2,000 years to ancient Greece and Rome (Nussbaum, 1997; Inglis and Robertson, 2004, 2005). The word derives linguistically from

Proof

two terms, *cosmos*, or the world as a whole, and *polis*, referring to the idea of a self-governing political community. Put together these represent the idea that citizenship can and ought to be founded on a worldwide community, composed of citizens of the world, or cosmopolitans. In this world-view we all have a duty to help each other or at least to be sensitive towards our respective values and ways of life, regardless of political borders and cultural differences. As a *moral or ethical doctrine*, the cosmopolitan legacy to the contemporary world urges that universal or global commitments to all should, in some sense, override though not necessarily deny or negate local and particular loyalties of kinship, place and nation. Moral universalism takes precedence over moral particularism.

From its historic origins amongst philosophers, historians, empire builders and those who have held political office (Inglis and Robertson, 2005), ideas of this kind have surfaced and been reformulated in a range of settings across time and space, involving religion, the arts and popular culture, business and law. Cosmopolitanism is evident for example in early Christianity and medieval literature (Edwards, 2001), the 18th century Enlightenment, and more recent global movements for cosmopolitan law based on human rights, environmental sustainability and greater global democracy (Held, 1995).

Multiple and often inter-connected legacies have fed into cosmopolitan thought and action. It has also been linked, for example, with specific forms of cultural identity and daily activities in a globalizing world. Here the ways of life of social groups such as professionals, migrants, travellers and tourists also cross borders and require attention to the challenges of 'living with strangers' (Appiah, 2006). Alongside the historical connection with the very general and abstract values and obligations of world citizenship, the idea of cosmopolitanism as a varied array of inter-cultural ways of life has recently become far more significant. What matters here is not moral universalism able to transcend any particular social context, but the ways in which cosmopolitan impulses and ways of life emerge in specific contexts and carry with them particular traditions, meanings and social practices that are somehow brought into more general inter-cultural engagements with others.

In addition to prominent individuals over the ages who have been associated with cosmopolitanism, such as Socrates, Cicero, the Roman Emperor Marcus Aurelius, St Augustine, Geoffrey Chaucer, Immanuel Kant and Mother Teresa, there are many more unnamed and unsung cosmopolitans who should be added to the reckoning. These include millions of pilgrims who see themselves as part of a single worldwide religious community, whether Christian or Islamic, as well as those

Proof

who are physically mobile across borders and who actively engage with and learn from cultural difference. It also comprises those with a cosmopolitan imagination that crosses borders and seeks to create moral, cultural and political linkages, sympathies and solidarities, as well as movements of practical change. A striking example of this is contemporary environmentalism which has arisen as a response to environmental challenges that cannot be resolved on a national basis within single countries, and which draws emotional power from images of Planet Earth under imminent threat of ecological crisis.

Paradoxically, the idea of cosmopolitanism has now expanded in so many different ways that it cannot be easily identified with an explicit philosophical outlook or political theory enshrined in a set of formal principles to which adherents must sign up or commit. Cosmopolitan principles have certainly been enunciated (Kant, 1991 [1784]), and cosmopolitan manifestoes have emerged (Beck, 1998), but the term has also been extended in a more sociological and anthropological direction. Such extensions have seen cosmopolitanism presented as a leading principle of contemporary social life (Beck, 2006). As part of this process, 'ordinary' or 'vernacular' cosmopolitanism has been identified among many who may not explicitly think of themselves as political activists and who have not read the ancient philosophers, but whose thoughts and actions exhibit key features of cosmopolitanism as sketched above. Quite how many of such unwitting cosmopolitans there are, and in what social circumstances such views and practices emerge, is an interesting and complex question, which we shall return to at a number of points in this book.

For the moment we simply note the vast proliferation of settings within which cosmopolitanism has been identified. This includes a diversity of social groups (corporate, upper class, working class, migrant), cultural constellations (Black, Christian, Islamic, South Asian), types of social function (anti-colonial, democratic, emancipatory, exclusionary, Romantic) and forms of expression (aesthetic, ethical, institutional, normative-political, symbolic, and visceral). [Detailed citations for this body of work are available in Chapter 2 and in Appendix 1.] Meanwhile, a sense of the thematic range and disciplinary breadth of this body of research and commentary can usefully be gained from the following three examples.

The first is Mica Nava's (2002) study of cosmopolitanism as a 'structure of feeling' in certain aspects of consumer behaviour in the highly mobile cross-cultural setting of early 20th century London. This structure arises through a powerful intersection between the promotion of modernist fashion and décor in Selfridges department store and the arts more generally, on the one side, and the desires and imagination

Proof

of women consumers attracted by the symbolic and erotic allure of cultural difference in fashion, dance and theatre. Particular examples included the Oriental style in Russian ballet and the tango coupled with exoticized Latin lovers (e.g. Rudolf Valentino) in film. This is a long way from the earnest discussions of male philosophers in ancient Greece, yet for Nava this case study of modernist consumerism constitutes an affective rather than cognitive or explicitly ethical dimension of cosmopolitanism. They qualify as part of the cosmopolitan constellation, in her view, inasmuch as modernist white women's desires and world views became associated with culturally repudiated social groups outside the dominant rational Western political and cultural mainstream. Women in this example become active makers of cosmopolitan culture from below, as a counter-culture of modernity.

The second example deals in a different way with cities as supportive milieux for cosmopolitan rights for asylum seekers, emphasizing the need to take up the historic legacy of cosmopolitanism from the ancient world, Christianity and the Enlightenment. It draws on a speech made by the French post-structuralist writer Derrida in 1996 to the International Parliament of Writers (IPW) in Strasbourg. This called for cities to take up the role as protectors and promoters of rights of refuge for asylum seekers, a number of whom are writers and artists whom repressive regimes have tried to silence (Derrida, 2001). The immediate context for this was the tightening of French immigration restrictions in the mid-1990s, through the Debret Laws directed at border-crossers without official papers, which asylum seekers typically lack. Derrida was speaking on behalf of a worldwide IPW campaign which by 2001 had seen a number of writers and political activists facing censorship and imprisonment resettled through IPW networks. They included Svetlana Alexievitch from Ukraine, condemned as a literary traitor for critical commentary on the post-Chernobyl world, re-settled in Tuscany; Alia Mamdouth from Iraq, censored for discussing women's rights and sexuality, re-settled in Paris via Beirut and Rabat; and Bashkin Shehu from Albania, previously imprisoned for criticism of the Hoxha regime, re-settled in Spain (Banks, 2001: 2–3). This example reminds us that while the classical Occidental political legacy of cosmopolitanism no longer holds a privileged position, it cannot be discounted as irrelevant.

The third example is drawn from Rustom Barucha's (2006) study of Rabindranath Tagore, Nobel prize-winning Indian poet, educational reformer and political activist, and Okakura Tenshin, Japanese art curator and cultural commentator. Living and working in the late 19th and early to mid-20th centuries, Tagore and Okakura were indefatigable world travellers and centres of extensive global networks of 'rich

donors, dealers, agents, diplomats, connoisseurs, disciples and friends' (*ibid*: 112–13), and of political activists and writers (Holton, 2008). In an epoch of Empire and global political instability, they both supported the national resurgence of India and Japan, and the regional resurgence of Asia as a cultural and civilizational force. While neither claimed the identity of a cosmopolitan – regarded by Tagore as 'colourless vagueness' (Barucha, 114) – each travelled extensively in Asia and the West and engaged in cross-cultural conversation, conflict and sometimes polemic. While not self-styled cosmopolitans, Barucha presents them not as bearers of the Western traditions of philosophical and political universalism, but as examples of a militant kind of 'subaltern cosmopolitanism' (119–23).

These three examples cover a wide range of themes in time and space. Thematically they suggest the multiple origins and types of cosmopolitanism, which is very far from being an exclusively Western gift to the world. They not only indicate the uncoupling of cosmopolitanism from any sense of universalism derived from a particular social source, but also, taken together, reveal some of the ways in which a universalistic 'one size fits all' approach to cosmopolitan has been eroded in favour of a multiplicity of approaches.

A further important point concerns explicit and implicit senses of cosmopolitanism. Whether or not individuals and movements associate themselves with cosmopolitanism, as such, is of less centrality than the characteristics of what is thought and done, and how far what are effectively cosmopolitan practices (such as the Cities of Refuge), become part of sustained relationships and institutions. The three cases, the first provided by a sociologist based in the UK, the second by a French philosopher, and the third by an independent writer and theatre director living in Calcutta, are also symptomatic of the range of academic disciplines and writers that are currently contributing to the proliferation of commentary on cosmopolitanism. And they are but a small sample of a far greater diversity of theme and interest, a diversity which will be explored in terms of a systematic typology of cosmopolitanism in Chapter 2.

Meanwhile, having seen that cosmopolitanism is, in a metaphorical sense, a coat of many colours, it remains to be established what different kinds of threads are evident, how much strength the coat manifests, and how easily the coat may be unravelled by internal weaknesses, tensions, or faults in the fabric. Can a single coat really be made out of all this diversity? And what differences are evident among observers and wearers of the coat? Do all observers see it in the same light, or are we talking of a range of cosmopolitan apparel whose attractiveness is influenced by differences of cultural perception and inequalities of class?

Proof

Two initial cautions are certainly necessary as we move from metaphor to empirical analysis. One is to ensure that the numbers of unsung cosmopolitans are not exaggerated through absence of clear definition. It is as important to indicate the limits as much as the scope of cosmopolitanism. The second caution, however, is to be even-handed in recognizing complexities involved in assessing the extent of any world-view, whether conservative or socialist, nationalist or cosmopolitan. Such calculations are sometimes messy because the attitudes and practices of individuals and groups are often internally contradictory when judged by pristine evaluative criteria. Distinct and apparently obverse positions may sometimes be combined, as with nationalist cosmopolitans or cosmopolitan nationalists identified in recent research. Sorting out these complexities is important, and will be an extended feature of later chapters. Until this is done we should avoid the assumption that because there is so much nationalism around, there really is very little cosmopolitanism to speak of. Equally, we should avoid the converse assumption that because many instances of cosmopolitanism (explicit and implicit) can be identified, this represents, to switch metaphors, the tip of some gigantic cosmopolitan iceberg floating around out there whose wondrous dimensions are yet to be determined. Possibly so, but a good deal more analysis is required to be sure.

One strong and recurring political thread in the evolution of cosmopolitanism across time and space, is the dimension recently termed cosmopolitics (Cheah and Robbins, 1998; Archibugi, 2003). This alerts us both to the connection of cosmopolitanism with visions of the good society (of which world government is one), with policies designed to enlarge and enhance citizenship (such as global human rights) and ways of generating increased social participation and social cohesion (such as global civil society). The call for a league of nations to curtail war by the philosopher Kant at the end of the 18th century and the 20th century emergence of cosmopolitan law within and around the expanding array of global institutions are testimony to the robustness of this political thread. Theorists with an interest in post-colonialism have also emphasized this thread in ways which direct attention to non-Western or post-Western contributions (Cheah and Robbins, *ibid*). A final example of the resilience of political cosmopolitanism is the idea that cosmopolitan democracy might be a way of creating political institutions able to meet the current absence of effective and legitimate modes of global politics – that is, to meet the much-debated global democracy deficit.

Such ambitions, in turn, raise questions both about the political feasibility of cosmopolitics and its relationship with power structures.

Proof

Is cosmopolitanism simply a way of managing cross-border processes and inter-dependencies from above dominated by empires, powerful nation-states, global regulatory institutions like the World Trade Organization, business corporations and dominant Western cultural assumptions about the desirability of secular reason, democratic politics, and individualism? Or can it equally be seen in terms of cross-border forms of cultural life and politics that operate from below? Settings where cosmopolitanism has been identified as operating from below involve globally oriented social movements and networks of political activists, professionals and workers, intellectuals, migrants and artists linking cities and communities. So where does this diversity lead us? Is there, for example, a necessary and unbridgeable conflict between cosmopolitanism from above and from below?

It is clear that cosmopolitanism is, in a number of respects, a worldview and way of life suited to the more powerful and wealthy. In this vein critical comments have seen it as the class consciousness of frequent flyers (Calhoun, 2007), detached from the social realities of inequality and suffering. While cross-border mobility is not a monopoly of the privileged, it is far easier for those with wealth and power, who can both afford to travel, and who may have assets and interests in more than one territory or nation. Elite cosmopolitanism may also be connected with luxury consumption and a life divided between multiple residences in a number of cities and resorts. What matters here is not loyalty to and dependence upon a single national community, but the capacity to do without a national domicile, whether for reasons of cultural preference or tax avoidance. To this combination of global access and global interest, many critics would add a third feature of cosmopolitanism, namely a disdain for the national, local and parochial, as a less desirable and exciting way of life, with narrow horizons and small-minded prejudices.

In spite of the reality of elite cosmopolitanism, the argument developed in this book sees cosmopolitanism from below as an equally robust phenomenon. The connection between cosmopolitanism and domination is contingent rather than necessary. As will be expanded on in Chapter 3, there are many reasons why the less powerful and affluent may identify and connect with aspects of the world beyond their immediate origins. This may be as a way of escaping or resisting forms of local power in the name of the more universal claims of religious or political commitments, whether aimed at religious salvation or social revolution. Equally direct experience of geographic mobility and the creation of wide-ranging networks of cultural reference that span nations and territories, are to be found amongst migrants and kinship groups, as well as refugees and asylum seekers.

Proof

The anthropologist James Clifford (1992: 106–8) was one of the first to emphasize that cosmopolitanism was not an exclusively elite phenomenon, drawing attention to unprivileged as well as privileged travellers. These included companion servants and guides of the more prominent well-to-do travellers as well as large numbers of migrant labourers. This point has been well documented by others (Gilroy, 1993; Werbner, 1999, 2006; Waxer, 2001), leading to the development of notions of working class, vernacular or plebian cosmopolitanism. In the latter case, Gidwani and Sivaramakrishnan (2004: 339–41), writing of the Indian city of Chennai and northern rural districts of Tamil Nadu, identify class inequalities between higher income 'patrician cosmopolitans' working as skilled professionals in information technology and mobile 'plebian cosmopolitans' who migrate from villages to perform domestic labour for them, straddling in the process two 'cultural worlds' (341).

It is mistaken therefore to assume that it is only elites and dominant classes who inhabit what Castells (1996) calls 'the space of flows', while the less powerful live largely immobile lives in 'the space of place'. Inequalities of power are very important but they do not map so neatly onto the social geography of the globe. Meanwhile burgeoning innovations in communications technology render inter-connections across space more feasible and affordable, linking those who remain physically immobile, though far from immobile in their thoughts, hopes and fears.

Whether all global inter-connections, whether from above or below, constitute cosmopolitanism, is perhaps a more relevant but certainly a far more difficult question to resolve. Global connections may after all be trans-local, as amongst migrant diaspora or criminal fraternities, rather than potentially open to or somehow inclusive of the interests of all. This is an example of a third area of caution, in addition to two raised earlier, in this case, relating to the misleading equation of cross-border with cosmopolitan.

Cosmopolitanism: History, Conflict and Opposition

Cosmopolitanism as we have indicated has a long and diverse history. At some points in the ancient, medieval, and contemporary worlds it has been prominent, at other points its feasibility and dynamic has been seen to be over-ridden by contrary trends, while in all periods its incidence and impact is controversial. For some the cosmopolitanism

of the 18th century European Enlightenment, marked by an outward-looking study of the world beyond Europe, represented a world of greater fluidity and openness to strangers than the 19th century consolidation of European nation-states and competitive Imperial rivalry (Hopkins, 2002). Whereas the former gave birth to a sense of universal rights that transcended particular feudal jurisdictions as well as to the anti-slavery movement, the latter saw an increasingly tight Imperial and racial dichotomy between human social groups, reserving civilization for the West, justifying colonial annexation and missionary conversion harnessed to nationalist rivalries between European powers. Cosmopolitanism, in the more open-hearted 18th-century sense, was on the wane, only to revive in the period before 1914 in the form of liberal and socialist internationalism (Lyons, 1963), wane again between the two World Wars, and revive yet again in the period after 1945. These long waves of expansion and contraction will be examined in more depth in the historical sociology of cosmopolitanism attempted in Chapter 3.

In this long history, cosmopolitanism has clearly been confronted by scepticism, opposition, hostility and sometimes active repression. In many settings the terms 'cosmopolitanism' and 'cosmopolitan' have been terms of abuse rather than forms of self-identification. In this sense it is important to be alive to the significance of discursive power in the way that cosmopolitanism is conceived, ranging from its emancipatory claims as the way to global solidarity and democracy at one extreme, to its abject debasement as an unnatural and divisive form of treachery to nation and people.

Outright opposition is evident, for example, within Nazi Germany and Stalinist Russia, social settings in which the worldwide allegiances of cosmopolitanism were seen to challenge primary official allegiances to particular states and political cultures. Cross-border mobilities and connections were seen as generating 'rootless' and thus irresponsible individuals and groups, unable and unwilling to participate in national life and thus dangerous to social solidarity. Groups such as the Jewish financial and trading diaspora, or internationalists within socialist movements were singled out for severe criticism and repression.

Other far more considered criticisms have come from nationalists or nationally minded democrats and socialists, who in different ways wish to challenge the presumption that worldwide rather than national loyalties are capable of sustaining effective democracy and citizenship rights. A good deal of this considered debate is encapsulated in an edited collection of essays published under the title of *For Love of Country* by Nussbaum and Cohen in 1996.

Amongst the points made are the following. Why should one engage with others with whom one feels little in common, with different

Proof

traditions, ways of life, and values, some of which may be anti-democratic or seemingly incompatible with core values shared in particular nations and communities? And even if such connections are seen as potentially desirable, it remains possible to argue that they are rarely able to prosper, since most people's loyalties and affections remain on a smaller more localized and intimate scale.

The fortunes of cosmopolitanism have expanded and contracted, but have never been far from controversy and disagreement. The episodic character of cosmopolitan expansion, decline and renewal, however, requires close attention to processes of social change over the long term, as much as to arguments in debate. The most promising way of analysing such patterns is in terms of an historical appreciation of the long-run dynamics of globalization, an account which also requires appreciation of its discontents. Since globalization is an often ill-defined and poorly conceptualized process (Hirst and Thompson, 1996; Holton, 2005), some initial clarification is needed before its relationship with cosmopolitanism can be fully appreciated.

Globalization is often equated with contemporary economic processes that cross borders such as free trade, foreign direct investment, technology transfer and economic deregulation. These not only create profound inter-dependencies and power differentials between capital and labour, and between rich and poor nations, but also, so many think, profoundly undermine national sovereignty and political autonomy. Many more recent theorists of globalization (Held *et al.*, 1999; Scholte, 2005; Holton, 1998, 2005), while not discounting these processes and their impacts, treat globalization as a more complex multi-dimensional set of processes with autonomous origins involving culture, religion and politics as much as economic life. The world religions, movements for human rights or environmental sustainability, for example, cannot be regarded as simple effects of free trade or corporate power, in part because conflicts between the economic, political and cultural globalization are important, and in part because many aspects of globalization in areas such as religion or language and technology transfer pre-date today's global capitalism.

Within this multi-dimensional long-run historical approach, cosmopolitanism may be regarded as one aspect of globalization. Above all, its inter-cultural globally oriented political and cultural focus exhibits all the general characteristics associated with globalization, namely (a) cross-border activity, (b) inter-connection and inter-dependence, and (c) consciousness of the world as a single space (for further discussion see Holton, 2005). Periods in which cosmopolitanism has advanced have been those in which cross-border activities of one kind or another

Proof

have expanded, whether through trade, migration, imperial conquest, war, religious proselytization for converts, or some combination of these. They have also been ones where inter-connections and inter-dependencies, forced or chosen, deliberately engineered or the product of unforeseen circumstances, loomed large in the lives of those affected. Meanwhile, different world-views have also been in play, whether religious or Imperial, diasporic or politically focussed.

While Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006: xii), in his influential recent study, rejects any close nexus between cosmopolitanism and globalization, he does so because he sees this term either in narrowly economic terms, or alternatively as a vague over-generalization. This rather summary one-line dismissal is somewhat arbitrary and superficial. It is certainly incompatible with the work of many recent theorists of globalization who have felt well able to avoid both these potential traps (Robertson, 1992, 1995; Held *et al.*, 1999; Holton, 2005). If, however, we examine the West African context from which a good deal of Appiah's personal interest in and views about cosmopolitanism derives, it is hard not to see the effects of globalizing processes at work in the creation of the cultural and political milieux that Appiah draws on to elaborate his discussion of cross-cultural engagement among strangers.

The context is the Ghanaian trading town of Kumasi in the 1950s in the midst of impending colonial independence and its immediate aftermath. Appiah, raised in Kumasi by an Asante father and English mother, remembers it in the 1950s as a place of cosmopolitan conversation between traders, migrants, and colonial personnel. Here Indian, Lebanese and Syrian traders existed alongside Africans and a smattering of English and other European officials and professionals. While Appiah admits that 'conversations across boundaries can be fraught', he is equally of the view that 'they can also be a pleasure' (Appiah, 2006: xx). Such conversations might be about politics in the home country, but often simply about getting things done drawing on a range of sources including patronage. The point about all this is not that Kumasi is presented as a model of intimate inter-cultural harmony, but rather, through the juxtaposition of difference, a milieu in which conversations across boundaries was possible.

But where does globalization fit in? 'If by globalization you have in mind something new and recent', says Appiah, 'the ethnic eclecticism of Kumasi is not the result of it (102). This is because cultural mixture has been going on for centuries' including a long-run linkage with the world of Islam to the North and East. But if we do NOT regard globalization as necessarily new and recent – even if more intensely felt today – then the connection between cosmopolitanism and globalization

Proof

is restored. It is moreover restored from a wider perspective than is found in Euro-centric conceptions of its genesis in the outward expansion of Europe and the West. For what comes into focus, if we start from Kumasi, is Islamic cross-border globalization and the long history of migration and re-settlement, as much as Western imperialism and colonization. In this sense, it is preferable to analyse cosmopolitanism as a range of practices and institutions that very often transcend the divides between West and East (Delanty, 2006c).

Has globalization created such a profound new inter-dependence of peoples across political and cultural boundaries, that the human condition has now become cosmopolitan (Beck, 2006)? To the extent that it has, is this now a foundation for a new cosmopolitan politics and ethics that might create enduring cosmopolitan law and governance (Held, 1995)? Or is cosmopolitanism rather more sharply circumscribed limited to some social groups rather than others? Does cosmopolitanism take different forms in different locations? To the extent that it does, is there one basic template for cosmopolitanism or is it multiformed and varied? And if so, what common features lie behind the variety?

Cosmopolitanism is therefore a live issue in a number of inter-related senses. In a practical sense it is concerned with how we live our daily life in the face of the many human challenges created by the cross-border mobilities and inter-dependencies brought about by globalization, while in a more philosophical or theoretical sense it has re-emerged as a major preoccupation amongst scholars and thinkers engaged with questions as to the direction of social change and the possibility of creating a global political community of citizens able to engage with social inequalities, cultural conflicts and political instabilities of the early 21st century. The possibility and desirability of cosmopolitanism have provoked major debates not only among philosophers and historians, but sociologists, anthropologists, geographers, political scientists and academic lawyers.

This book provides a critical guide to this debate, the questions that have been raised and the answers offered. Given the proliferation of debate and discussion across many disciplines and traditions of thought, a good deal of intellectual mapping is required to make sense of the many cross-currents of argumentation involved and the complexity generated.

Any author engaging with wide inter-disciplinary topics and questions, inevitably brings their own disciplinary approaches to bear. In my case these derive from a background in *sociology* and *history*. This book has however been written with the aim of speaking across disciplines, and is intended to be accessible to readers with other intellectual backgrounds. From sociology I derive an interest in general

patterns of social change, power, inequality and opportunity, focussing both on structures of social life and institutions, and simultaneously on social actors' worlds and the way these are expressed within and shaped by institutions. Meanwhile from history I derive an interest in continuity and change across time, and in the ways that social actors use arguments about past, present and future to inform and inspire the search for a better and more satisfying life.

Beyond this, the building of wider inter-disciplinary links is reflected in several features of this study. First, bridges to *moral philosophy and ethics* are evident in the focus on the normative aspects of cosmopolitanism and its claims to create a better world. These are identified, not simply as moral positions in their own right, but also scrutinized in terms of the social locations that generate cosmopolitanism and the relationship of cosmopolitanism to other norms such as equality and justice. Second, bridges to the study of *politics* and *law* are evident in the focus on political institutions and concerns to identify whether and how far cosmopolitanism is capable of generating new types of governance and democracy grounded, in part, on new legal norms.

Third, there are bridges to the study of culture, which is itself widely distributed across disciplines like *cultural studies* and *anthropology*, as well as inter-disciplinary studies of post-coloniality, migration, diasporic communities, identity and language. Work in these genres often proceeds from a sense of the importance of recognizing 'new voices' and a diversity of forms of knowledge and experience that enter into cosmopolitan ways of life. The sociological and historical approaches from which I start out, overlap in part with this body of work, but may also derive much from it in terms of aesthetic and performative aspects of cosmopolitanism. The emphasis on cosmopolitanism as performance, for example, encourages an approach that is not simply tied to the texts that cosmopolitan philosophers or political leaders write down, but extends to the ways that cosmopolitan life is performed through conversation, song and consumption of goods, sexual preference and inter-personal relationships. This in turn breaks down any supposition that cosmopolitanism is of the mind, rather than the body.

The intellectual mapping of cosmopolitanism must then deal with both complexity and with a further characteristic of debates over globalization, namely an excess of conjecture and speculation over empirical analysis and the careful sifting of evidence. Theory and the empirical analysis of evidence, whether in relation to cosmopolitanism or anything else, should clearly not be read as separate and self-contained domains. This is because understandings of evidence are framed in terms of theoretical assumptions (whether explicit or implicit), and because there is constant feedback between evidence and theory.

Proof

These considerations raise general questions of epistemology in social analysis to do with the status and reliability of knowledge. General debates at this point usually rehearse the strengths and weaknesses of a positivist epistemology, in which it is claimed that facts and values can be easily separated, allowing rival interpretations of evidence to be tested with factual evidence. In addition to general criticisms and re-appraisals of positivism within the philosophy of science and social theory, Appiah (2006: 13–31) in his recent work on cosmopolitanism has indicated some of the problems in using a narrowly positivist approach in this particular area of enquiry. In what amounts to a post-positivist stance (for this approach see Alexander, 1982), Appiah seeks to balance two considerations. One is the importance of a realist perspective on the world, in which we cannot indefinitely hold on to erroneous factual beliefs without constantly confronting their inadequacies. Another is the irreducibility of values and value-laden interpretations of the world to questions of fact and techniques of analytical reason.

Discourses, debates and practical conflicts connected with cosmopolitanism cannot therefore be settled simply by the positivistic application of empirical analysis to conjecture, insofar as conjecture is based on values. What can be done is to review empirical evidence and collect or generate additional evidence with which to confront conjectures that rely on beliefs about fact. And in so doing it is important to emphasize with philosophers of science like Lakatos (1978) and Feyerabend (1993), that the problems posed in any research agenda cannot be settled simply by falsifying single propositions about the world. Rather research agenda, in this case around cosmopolitanism, comprise sets of testable propositions, nested within other kinds of intellectual devices such as organizing concepts and underlying philosophical assumptions. These nests of thought require unravelling, and cannot easily be dismissed through simple-minded testing of particular elements alone. Furthermore, their plausibility depends on their relative robustness as compared with rival interpretations, rather than their plausibility taken in isolation.

These epistemological considerations are intended to clarify the status of empirical analysis that forms a crucial part of this book. Research into cosmopolitanism has in recent years begun to take seriously the previous excess of theoretical speculation that characterized this area of enquiry. Work by writers such as Werbner (1999), Szerszynski and Urry (2002, 2006), Nava (2002, 2007), Nowicka (2006) and the empirical research agenda developed by Beck and Sznaider (2006a) is indicative of a turning-point in research into cosmopolitanism. This turning-point replaces theoretical speculation with theoretically

Proof

informed empirical analysis. The present book takes this turning-point as given and seeks to push forward beyond it, elaborating a more systematic intellectual map of what we currently know about cosmopolitanism, and what areas of analytical difficulty and confusion persist.

Defining Cosmopolitanism as a Subject for Research

In the first sections of this book, discussion jumped straight into a variety of currents of thought, ways of life, and institutions associated with cosmopolitanism. The key task of defining cosmopolitanism was deliberately delayed in order to emphasize the proliferation of ways in which the term has been used, and the problems of delineating the scope *and* limits to cosmopolitanism. We have, so to speak, collected along the way a series of ideas and prompts that are useful in constructing a definition, including ideas such as cross-cultural engagement, hospitality, world citizenship and cosmopolitics. How then may a clearer definition of cosmopolitanism be established, and how to discriminate between what is and what is not cosmopolitanism?

One way of proceeding would be to live with the diversity, and avoid definition altogether. Pollock *et al.* (2000), have argued that 'Cosmopolitanism may be a project whose conceptual content and pragmatic character are not only as yet unspecified but also must always escape positive and definitive specification, precisely because specifying cosmopolitanism positively and definitively is an uncosmopolitan thing to do'. They write from a post-modern perspective that seeks to challenge the coherence of unitary concepts in the name of diversity and complexity. Post-modern playfulness or irony towards excessively formalized definitions of emergent and rapidly changing social trends may be a salutary corrective to over-structured and mechanistically defined research problems. The alarming evasion of any definition at all seems nonetheless to be a classic instance of the self-defeating character of sceptical argument. If we apply scepticism to this example of post-modern scepticism, the argument is self-defeating because it cannot specify any substantive content to cosmopolitanism, leaving the term as a 'free-floating' discursive *geist* in search of material manifestation and embodiment. This is vulnerable, as Skrbis *et al.* (2004) point out, to serious problems of indeterminacy.

Proof

A more constructive way of proceeding here would be to resume the search for a generic definition, but to move beyond philosophical to a more sociological definition. A shift of this kind is a key part of the recent turning point in approaches to cosmopolitanism discussed above. The pioneering work of Ulf Hannerz (1990, 1996, 2004b) is of particular importance in this endeavour. Hannerz draws a key distinction between 'cosmopolitans' and 'locals', developed in part from older work by Robert Merton applied to towns and communities, rather than cross-border processes. Merton (1968) picked up on Carl C. Zimmerman's translation of Toennies' well-known distinction between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* (*ibid*: 447n7). Locals represented a commitment to *Gemeinschaft* or community, having parochial concerns and conducting ways of life based on maximization of useful contacts within their locality. Cosmopolitans, by contrast, represented *Gesellschaft* in the sense of a world of voluntary organizations, having ecumenical concerns beyond the locality, and life projects connected with the acquisition of skills and knowledge. Cosmopolitanism focusses here on cognitive capacities based around trans-contextual knowledge rather than immediate inter-personal worlds.

Hannerz applied aspects of Merton's formulation to the global arena, focussing on social actors who could be distinguished as cosmopolitans who moved across borders, as distinct from locals who didn't. This social action framework perspective is distinct from approaches centred on systems of philosophical ideas or institutions. The key quality of the cosmopolitan is openness to others, akin to bridge-building rather than the erection of walls. The cosmopolitan 'needs to be in a state of readiness a personal ability to make one's way into other cultures through listening, looking, intuiting, and reflecting' (1990: 239). Cosmopolitanism, on this basis, is seen as 'a perspective, a state of mind, or…a mode of managing meaning' (*ibid*: 238). This gives social action a highly rationalized meaning, that contrasts markedly with conceptions of cosmopolitanism as a set of feelings and desires (Nava, 2002, 2007; Walkowitz, 2006).

In Hannerz's definition, cosmopolitanism requires inter-cultural openness and knowledge. The mere fact of cross-border movement is insufficient, since this need not involve cognitive skills and sympathies. Accordingly, Hannerz in this earlier work was sceptical as to whether migrants, tourists, or refugees would qualify as cosmopolitans. Cosmopolitans, he felt, could be distinguished not simply from 'locals' seen as 'representatives of more circumscribed territorial cultures'. They also differed from 'frequent travellers', whether tourists or migrants whose world of meaning was, so to speak, carried internally within social networks that travelled with the groups,

thereby inhibiting inter-cultural contact with others. Those who were seen as qualifying were trans-national professionals like foreign correspondents or oil engineers whose professional life demanded intercultural skill and competence.

Bruce Robbins has called for greater 'intellectual order and accountability' in debates over cosmopolitanism, which he sees as characterized by 'gushingly unrestrained sentiments, pieties, and urgencies' and lack of a discriminating lexicon (1999:9). Hannerz's overall approach has been influential as a key reference point in this definitional confusion, in spite of the criticisms levelled at it. His influence is clear enough in recent empirical analysis by Szerszynski and Urry (2002) where cosmopolitanism is taken to be '…a cultural disposition involving an intellectual and aesthetic stance of "openness" towards peoples, places, and experiences from different cultures, especially those from different nations' (*ibid*: 469). This definition is interesting in adding aesthetic to intellectual openness, thereby including senses other than intellectual reason into cosmopolitanism. Visuality is one of these (Szerszynski and Urry, 2006), linking cosmopolitanism with the impact of visual representations of the world as a single place. This in turn directs our attention to imaginary or virtual travel as part of the cosmopolitan experience, whether through utopian projections or communications media, rather than actual physical travel.

The two most damaging criticisms of Hannerz's definition, are first that it privileges elite cosmopolitanism, thereby discounting cosmopolitanism from below (Tomlinson, 1999, *passim*; Werbner, 2006), and second that it ignores the ethical side of cosmopolitanism (Tomlinson, *op. cit.*). On the first point, it seems arbitrary to include some mobile groups such as professionals well able to give an account of their cross-cultural engagements, but exclude others such as migrants or tourists, whose engagements may in some contexts be similar, but which may be harder to discern. The qualities of openness involved may not in fact be necessarily connected with any particular social or occupational group, an issue to be explored later in this study. On the second point it seems problematic to exclude ethical issues, such as cosmopolitan values and commitments to the cosmos or world as a whole, or at least to principles and institutions that operate on this level.

In a more recent systematic review of problems of definition (Hannerz, 2004a), much of the thrust of these criticisms is accepted. Following Clifford and others, he now believes that more subtlety is required in analysing the relationship between cosmopolitanism and different mobile groups – whether elite or working class. Hannerz also re-emphasizes that his earlier stress was on professionals (and their cognitive orientations), rather than managers and elites *per se*. Meanwhile, he has taken

Proof

up the missing ethical dimension to earlier work, suggesting that definitions of cosmopolitanism must now come to terms with the dual character of this wide-ranging phenomenon. Cosmopolitanism, he argues, has two faces (*ibid*: 71). One is the cultural face, with which his research started out. The other is the political face, an aspect of cosmopolitanism which seems to subsume issues of ethics.

The former face is a 'happy' one, and has both intellectual and aesthetic aspects. It includes both knowledge of cultural repertoires and practices other than one's own, as well as what he sees as consumer cosmopolitanism, involving the enjoyment of new cuisines, music, and literatures. Happiness in this sense comprises both intellectual and cognitive satisfaction, as well as the satisfaction of desires through consumption of other cultural products and ways of life. There is no necessary relationship between any of this and cosmopolitan concern for global social inequality, the democratic deficit, and political change. These features belong to what he sees as political cosmopolitanism, which wears a 'worried' face. This is concerned, by contrast, with community, society and citizenship, focussing on rights and obligations rather than knowledge and desire. There is no necessary concern here with cultural enjoyment or engagement with others, indeed it would be possible to be a political cosmopolitanism acting from philosophical principles alone.

The evolution of Hannerz's definition of cosmopolitanism has been dealt with at some length, in part because of his long experience of research in the field, but mainly because it consolidates a central presumption of this book. The presumption is that cosmopolitanism can no longer be treated as a unitary phenomenon. This position has been advanced first by taking account of the enormous proliferation of themes and aspects taken to be examples of cosmopolitanism, drawing on literature which itself comments on issues of proliferation. The second line of argument here is evident in the evolution of Hannerz's thinking. His distinction between the cultural and political offers a relatively straightforward way of grasping a fundamental distinction between two modalities of cosmopolitanism, the relationship between which is contingent rather than necessary.

Two important issues remain. The first is the question of what common element is found in the two types of cosmopolitanism. The beginnings of an answer focus on the common property of 'openness' to the world, whether in an inter-personal or political and ethical sense. Skrbis and Woodward (2007), rightly point to the diffuseness and ambivalence of cosmopolitan openness, which is rarely absolute as well as taking multiple forms. This serves as a cautionary note, but does not foreclose on openness as a central category. Following Tomlinson (1999: 185),

Proof

openness may still be used as a basis for the definition of cosmopolitanism in terms of a

> disposition which is not limited to the concerns of the immediate locality, but which recognises global belonging, involvement, and responsibility, and can integrate these broader concerns into everyday life practices.

Here 'belonging, involvement, and responsibility' can take a diversity of forms. These may of course be incompatible with each other, as in involvement in personal consumption activity while remaining indifferent to what is consumed or how it has been produced, bypassing ethical and political concerns.

A second issue, following on from the first, concerns the relationship between culture and politics in this approach. The two may be distinguished for analytical purposes, as a basis for identifying different kinds of disposition to the world. They are also usually seen as distinct in ideologies of liberal free trade, where consumer choice is not required to display political or moral responsibility for the organization of production of goods and services. Empirically though the two are inter-twined in many senses. This is primarily because culture is not a politics-free zone. Politics, in the sense of power over the allocation of resources and the distribution of cultural goods, is intrinsic to culture, whether that is defined as the way of life of a social group, or in terms of particular symbolic resources and practical techniques of living that are created by and available for adoption by individuals, institutions, and communities.

The case of fair trade coffee makes this point well. We may drink coffee to be able to face the day, smooth over the exigencies of paid and unpaid labour, or as the completion of a meal. The use of coffee in this way is more culturally widespread in some contexts than in others, where tea may be the drink of choice. Most coffee marketing has hitherto been controlled by corporations who buy in markets supplied by small farmers, either for re-sale in retail shops and supermarkets, or, in the case of Starbucks, through direct sales. In either case coffee is powerfully marketed as part of modern culture. The power of corporations is far greater than that of farmers who receive prices that do not reflect the profitability that big business can extract from the market, though coffee consumers are freer to buy coffee or not, and with the best information to choose which coffee they buy. The fair trade movement (Holton, 2005) has grown up as a critical response to the poor prices many producers in low-income regions get for their produce. It is an attempt to re-distribute income from corporations and consumers to farmers.

Proof

So what does all this have to do with culture and politics, and with cosmopolitanism? Firstly, behind the cultural taste for and uses of coffee, lies a political dimension, represented, in the first instance, through the market power of corporations, and then in the counter-politics of fair trade. Secondly, a cosmopolitan disposition may be practised through consumer behaviour in the area of coffee-drinking. Most coffee drinkers may not care where their coffee comes from or how it is produced. However cosmopolitan coffee drinkers might do so, but in two different ways. For the consumer cosmopolitan coffee drinker, a gourmet interest in different types and ways of roasting beans, may also be linked with an awareness of different areas of production, and the characteristic tastes of coffee from such areas around the world through websites like *The Global Gastronomer* (2008). The political background is not of interest, even though it affects price and availability.

For the political cosmopolitan coffee drinker, by contrast, a similar interest in types and quality may be combined with concern for whether exploitative child labour is used in growing coffee, whether coffee is marketed through fair trade principles, as well as concern for the reliance of many poorer countries on coffee production. These concerns represent an explicit linkage of culture and politics and invest consumer purchase with some kind of political or ethical dimension in terms of choice of fair trade and country of origin. For others such concerns have taken the form of boycotts of Starbucks over its stance on the intellectual property rights of Ethiopian coffee farmers in a particular variety of bean.

Plan of Book

The remainder of the book is divided into two parts, followed by a conclusion.

In Part I attention is given to theoretical, conceptual and historical issues in the understanding of cosmopolitanism. Chapter 2 presents an in-depth review of attempts to conceptualize cosmopolitanism, expanding on and deepening the focus in the present chapter on both multiple modalities and multiple types of cosmopolitanism. The aim is to provide a systematic mapping of this expanding and proliferating field starting out from the six-fold conceptualization of different modalities of cosmopolitanism recently offered by Vertovec and Cohen (2002). This spans a range of disciplinary fields, and offers a useful way of charting the dozens of types of cosmopolitanism that have emerged in the last twenty years of scholarship.

Proof

Chapter 3 deals with a major theme in the book, namely the elaboration of a new historical sociology of cosmopolitanism. One prominent feature of my argument centres on problems with the influential theory of cosmopolitanism as the second age of modernity, developed by Ulrich Beck (2002a, 2006). His argument is noteworthy for the greater emphasis given to change rather than continuity in the recent historical evolution of modernity. The historical basis of Beck's argument on the relationship between new forms of modernity and cosmopolitanism is subjected to systematic assessment and critique and found wanting. The chapter goes on to develop an alternative historical sociology to that of Beck. This focusses both on the long-term connections and discontinuities between cosmopolitanism in ancient, medieval and modern worlds, and on different spatial contexts and modalities of cosmopolitanism both within and outside what is often referred to as the West. This chapter serves both as a contribution to the history of cosmopolitanism, as well as an understanding of modernity.

In Chapter 4 the coherence of cosmopolitanism is discussed in relation to the development of social theory. What do cosmopolitan perspectives add to theories of society? Consideration will be given to a number of the theoretical currents that have exposed cosmopolitanism to critical scrutiny, including theorists of capitalism and modernity, feminism, post-modernism and post-colonialism. In the second part of the chapter, attention is given to recent arguments that methodological cosmopolitanism should replace both methodological nationalism and methodological globalism, as proposed by Beck (2006). Does this represent a much-needed re-direction of thinking, or is it to vastly over-extend the scope and impact of one social trend into an axial principle of social life? However the balance is struck here, it remains interesting that the language of cosmopolitanism has recently been resurgent in a number of different discourses, from ethics and education to political activism and marketing.

In Part II concern shifts to empirical analysis, bringing together and making sense of a mass of detailed multi-disciplinary research. This part of the book is intended as the first state-of-the-art review of evidence relating to cosmopolitanism. It moves beyond the speculative theoretical mode of much existing writing, while also adding substance to current programmatic calls to research cosmopolitanism more thoroughly.

This section of the book starts out in Chapter 5 from a general discussion of the 13 research questions proposed by Ulrich Beck, to which several missing areas of enquiry, such as cosmopolitan law, are added. A number of methodological difficulties that complicate resolution of these questions are identified. These include the problem that much

Proof

available data is collected at a national level rather than in a form that engages with the incidence of cosmopolitanism, and the problem that a good deal of research that is explicitly concerned with cosmopolitanism fails to discuss limits. Attention is also given to the challenge of establishing the impact and incidence of cosmopolitanism as a popular and practical, as distinct from an elite and philosophical, disposition.

In the second part of the chapter attention turns to research findings on the socio-cultural rather than legal and political aspects of cosmopolitanism. Accordingly the focus is on analyses that link cosmopolitanism with consumption, employment, migration and settlement, travel and tourism, and mass media. These are treated separately and in terms of their relationship with each other. There are a number of important debates involved here, including the significance of travel or mobility to cosmopolitanism, and whether it is possible to be a physically immobile virtual cosmopolitan through new communication technology.

Chapter 6 examines political and legal aspects of cosmopolitanism. This theme deserves a chapter of its own because it has been underplayed within many of the cultural discourses on cosmopolitanism, and because relevant literature is spread across a wide range of disciplines, not only political science but philosophy, law and policy studies, that have not always been well integrated into sociology and social theory. The focus here is very much on cosmopolitan principles such as human rights and cosmopolitan institution-building, including cosmopolitan law and much that has been labelled as multiculturalism.

A much neglected question in many theoretical analyses of cosmopolitanism is the question of popular attitudes to cosmopolitan institutions and policies. This issue is discussed in terms of recent research, providing a sense of the extent to which nationalist or cosmopolitan attitudes prevail, and whether it is possible to combine the two.

In the final section of the chapter particular emphasis is also given to work which claims that Europe is the major source of contemporary progress towards cosmopolitanism. This begins with discussion of the comparative importance of human rights principles in Europe, Asia and Africa, investigating the sense in which non-European cultural practices may either obstruct or provide openings for engagement with cosmopolitanism.

Chapter 7 provides a case study of cosmopolitanism in Ireland, including both historical and contemporary material and commentary. This case study has been chosen because it dramatizes the paradox that countries with strong forms of national identity have simultaneously been homes to cosmopolitan thought and practice. This brings toge-

Proof

ther themes of religious cosmopolitanism connected with Catholicism, literary cosmopolitanism associated with the work of writers like Joyce, the contribution of Irish performers to popular culture, the global marketing of 'Irish' products, such as Guinness, together with migration and the Irish diaspora. Attention is given here both to the social construction of cultural cosmopolitanism, as much as cosmopolitanism as a form of social practice from below. The Irish case also raises questions about the limits to cosmopolitanism, limits that arise where certain trans-national processes are closed rather than open.

In the concluding chapter, the main features of the recent re-casting of cosmopolitanism are summarized, showing how the subject has been transformed from a philosophical enquiry into the nature of political rights and obligations to a far broader plurality of social and cultural as well as political and legal questions. Attention then turns to the broad findings of research arranged under the 13 elements of Beck's cosmopolitan research agenda, plus the additional theme of cosmopolitan law. Discussion then returns to the question with which the book began, namely whether cosmopolitanism represents a fruitful way of addressing many of the most pressing problems of the age, including war, global poverty and cultural conflict. Here ten theses on cosmopolitanism are presented, indicating bridges between analytical and evidence-based research and the normative plausibility and feasibility of cosmopolitanism. The argument is sceptical but still optimistic.

Index

Abbas, Akbar, 46
Abbasid dynasty, 68
Ab'd al Rahman, 68–9
Africa, 13, 32–3, 46, 71, 74–5, 105, 150, 154–5, 173
African-Americans, 74–5
Akbar, 72–3, 153
Ake, Claude, 154
Al Ghazzali, 67
Al Jazeera, 133
Al Qu'aida, 68
Aleppo, 46
Alexander, Jeffrey, 84–6, 93–4, 97–9
Alexievitch, Svetlana, 6
Allen, Kieran, 178, 183
American Revolution, 146
Amnesty International, 156, 183
Amsterdam, 37, 45
ancient Greece and Rome, 3–4, 45, 58, 62, 65–9, 77, 89, 152
Andalusia, 68–70
Anderson, Benedict, 129, 133
Anderson, Elijah, *et al.*, 118
Annales school, 59
anthropology, 15, 53, 74
anti-colonial cosmopolitanism, 36–7
anti-cosmopolitanism, 11, 71, 105, 127, 140, 166, 168–9
Appadurai, Arjun, 74
Appelbaum, Richard, 147
Appiah, Kwame Anthony, 4, 13–14, 16, 32–4, 85, 105, 114–16, 154
Arab influences, 69
Archibugi, Daniel, 8, 94
Architecture, 69
Asante, 13, 32–3
Ashoka, 153
Asia, 6–7, 35, 46, 71–4, 91, 151–4, 173
Assmann, Jan, 131
Australia, 120, 137, 171, 188, 197
Austro-Hungary, 79–80

Baghdad, 38, 47, 69–70
Balibar, Etienne, 32
ballet, 6, 180
Ballivor, 182–93
Ballygowan mineral water, 179–80
Bamyeh, Mohamed, 66, 70
banal cosmopolitanism, 50–4, 129
Band Aid, 129
Bangkok Declaration, 1993, 151–3
Bangla Desh, 157
Barucha, Rustom, 6–7
Batnitzky, Adina, *et al.*, 118, 121
Bauman, Zygmunt, 165
BBC, 133
Beck, Ulrich, 5, 14, 23, 31, 33–6, 39, 50–64, 76–82, 92, 97, 102, 105–10, 116, 119, 128–9, 136–7, 140–2, 146, 148–50, 160, 162, 166, 172, 195–208
Beck, Ulrich and Grande, Edgar, 142, 158–64, 167
Beck-Gernsheim, Elisabeth, 126–7
Beckett, Samuel, 176
Belgium, 184, 190
Bend it Like Beckham, 132
Benhabib, Seyla, 147
Bentham, Jeremy, 90–1
Berlin, 47, 123, 164
Berman, Paul, 87, 94–5, 148–9
Bhabha, Homi, 17
Bhebe, Ngwabi, and Ranger, Terence, 154
BHP Billiton, 156
Biao, Xiang, 126
Billig, Michael, 51
Binney, Matthew, 42–3, 84, 90, 130

Black Atlantic, 74–5
Bohman, James, 143, 151
Bokhara, 74
Boli, John and Thomas, George, 156
Bollywood, 132
Bombay (Mumbai), 46, 132
books, 40, 43, 128, 135, 201
borders and boundaries, 4–5, 12, 40–1, 50–3, 73, 79–81, 92, 136–9, 158, 162, 164–9
Bosnia, 148
Bourdieu, Pierre, 32
Bottomley, Gill, 120
Braithwaite, John and Drahos, Peter, 147, 156, 162, 167
Breckenridge, Carol, 17
Brenner, Neil, 105
Brenner, Robert, 51
buddhism, 73, 153
Bulgarians, 90
Butler, Judith, 92

Cairo, 46
Calcutta, 7
Caldwell, Lynton, 167
Calhoun, Craig, 9, 80–1, 99
Canada, 171, 175, 188, 199–200 *see also* Toronto and Vancouver
Caney, Simon, 143
capitalism, 35, 48, 51, 58–60, 93–5, 121
Carenti, Luigi, 151
Castells, Manuel, 10, 53, 99–101, 108, 130, 133–5, 164
Castles, Steven, 120
Catholicism, 25, 49, 67, 70 *see also* Ireland: Catholicism
Chakrabaty, Dipesh, 17
Charnovitz, Steve, 155
Chaucer, Geoffrey, 4
Cheah, Pheng, 8
Chen Wenhong, Boase, Jeffrey, and Wellman, Barry, 134–5
Chennai, 10
China, 46, 73–4, 101, 153, 181, 190, 198
christian cosmopolitanism, 39, 66, 70, 88, 159–60
Christianity, 4, 6, 39, 45, 48–9, 66–70, 72, 75, 77, 84, 172, 179
Cicero, 4, 89
cities of refuge, 6
citizenship, 8, 43–4, 66, 95, 141, 150, 160, 163, 167, 184, 186–7, 197–8
see also dual citizenship
City of God, 66
Civic republicanism, 144–5
civilization, 46–7, 152–4
'clash of civilizations thesis', 152–4
Clifford, James, 10, 19, 74
coffee, 21–2
Cohen, Robin, 22
Collins, Randall, 48, 77
colonial cosmopolitanism, 34, 37
Columbia, 121
communications technology, 40–1, 43–4, 78, 116, 119, 122–3, 128–35, 166, 202–3
communist cosmopolitanism, 35
Communist International, 150
communitarianism, 88, 100
Confucianism, 74, 153
Connolly, James, 175
Convention on Biodiversity, 167
Cordoba, 68–9
cosmopolitan
  borders, 165
  conversation, 7, 13, 32
  habitus, 30–3
  nations, 61
  outlook, 51–4
  patriotism, 104
  patriots, 105
  research agenda, 23–5, 118, 128, 141, 166, 169, 196–208
cosmopolitanism
  age and generation effects, 137–9, 157, 181, 184–5
  ambiguity and ambivalence in definition, 17–22, 38–41, 56, 113–18, 123
  and business, 121
  and cities, 13, 34, 45–7, 66, 73–7, 122–4
  and civil society, 47, 166–8, 208–9

Proof

cosmopolitanism – *continued*
and class, 5, 32, 37–8, 137, 166
and communications technology, 40–1, 43–4, 116, 119, 122–3, 128–35, 166, 202–3
and consumption, 5–6, 21–2, 32, 39, 43, 73–4, 95, 119–20, 129, 172, 178–80, 197, 208
and cultural mixture, 13, 32–3, 72–7, 123
and cultural skills, 18–19, 38, 43–4, 97
and democracy, 4, 8–9, 14, 39, 44, 94–5, 96–7, 100, 129, 143–70, 195, 202
and empire, 7, 34–5, 40, 45, 65, 68, 71–3, 80–1, 141, 160–1, 172–4
and employment, 18–19, 37–8, 117–22
and environmental concerns/crisis, 5, 119, 166–8, 207–8
and gender, 5, 91–2, 123, 127–8, 158, 184
and generation, 137
and global media, 119
and inequality, 9–10, 21, 41, 43, 74–5, 95–6, 99, 127, 162–3
and inter-cultural engagement, 13, 32–3, 68–9, 72–4, 84, 90–2, 120–8, 154, 163–4
and international news, 119, 133
and justice, 96, 101, 143, 168, 170
and knowledge, 34, 40, 69–70
and language, 48–50, 71–2, 87, 97, 119, 200–1
and law, 8, 14–15, 23–4, 62, 87–90, 94–6, 100, 119, 141–70, 196, 198–9, 208–11
and level of education, 137–9, 157, 166
and migration, 6, 18–19, 34, 37–8, 40–5, 47, 73–7, 101, 120–8, 137–9, 158, 162–4, 172–87, 201–2
and minority rights, 163, 199–200
and mobility/movement, 40–5, 73–7, 101, 116–20, 137–9, 173–6, 201–2, 205–6 *see also* cosmopolitanism and travel
and modernity, 6, 46–7, 54, 57–82, 84, 97, 172
and moral philosophy, 3–4, 11, 15, 43, 107–10, 141–70, 194–211
and nationalism, 8, 75–82, 105, 109, 115–19, 176, 206–7
and openness, 18–22, 37–8, 43–4, 47, 49, 69–70, 100, 114–18, 124, 158, 161, 164, 200, 206
and peace, 142–55
and performance, 15
and personal attitudes and identity, 135–9, 184
and political identity, 119, 136–9, 188–91, 206–7
and post-Communism, 157–8
and power, 8–10, 21–2, 34–42, 44, 49, 72–3, 76–7, 80–1, 84, 93–4, 128, 142–70
and professionals, 18–19, 117, 121, 205
and public opinion, 24, 135–9, 143, 157–8, 166, 189–91
and religion, 4–5, 35, 39, 48–9, 64, 66–73, 88, 95, 109, 172–3, 209
and science, 48–9, 70, 160
and self-interest, 85–9
and sexuality, 6, 91, 127–8
and social theory, 18, 83–110
and sovereignty, 85–9, 142–70, 198
and telephone conversation, 122
and television, 41, 129–30, 139
and the human condition, 33–4, 50–3
and the 'local', 2–4, 9–10, 18–19, 45, 50, 53, 61, 64, 71, 91, 102–10, 116, 118, 130–2, 136–40, 173, 176–7, 189–93, 206–7
and tourism, 18, 40
and trade, 73–7, 138, 143, 158, 203 *see also* trade and traders

and travel, 6–7, 38, 40–3, 67, 73–7, 119, 129–30, 143, 175–6, 201–2
and war, 11, 55, 89–90, 92, 96, 142–70, 208
and younger people/generations, 137–9, 157, 181, 184
as feelings and emotion, 5, 31–2, 52, 84, 91–2, 197
as moral philosophy, 4–5, 8, 15, 39, 43, 54–5, 62–3, 83–4, 87–93, 142–55, 158–9, 194–211
as social action, 30–3, 44, 51
as a socio-cultural condition, 30, 33–50
empirical measures of, 113–40, 196–208
from above, 5, 9–10, 19, 34, 37–40, 95–6, 100, 153, 160
from below, 5, 10, 19, 36–40, 92, 95, 100, 167–8
historical origins of, 3–4, 48, 152
historical sociology of, 10–14, 23, 42–4, 51–2, 57–82, 106–10, 152, 158–9
in Ireland, 171–93
limits of, 8–9, 11–12, 50, 69–71, 85–9, 95–6, 101, 105, 113–18, 128, 135–40, 144, 148–70, 177, 179–87, 209–11
modalities of, 30–3, 54, 64, 84, 97, 140, 209–11
practical, 190
problems of definition, 7–10, 17–22, 30–3, 113–18
proliferation of terminology, 3, 5–7, 29–36
quantitative and qualitative evidence, 117, 134–5
types of, 5–7, 33–50, 211–19
working definition for empirical analysis, 113–18
see also ecumenism, human rights, universalism
cosmopolitanisms, 7, 22, 33–50, 52, 56, 64, 82, 84, 95, 97, 118, 194–211
cosmopolitanization, 50–4, 67, 81, 129, 162, 172, 182
cosmopolitans
minoritarian, 36
nationalist, 8
patrician and plebeian, 10
subaltern, 36
unnamed and unsung, 4
unwitting, 5
working class, 19, 36–8, 121, 206
cosmopolitics, 93–4, 141–70
Council of Europe, 159, 164–5
Cover, Robert, 149
crime, 10, 119, 204
Crowley, Una, Gilmartin, Mary and Kitchin, Rob, 177, 186
Cuba, 121
cultural studies, 15, 118

Damascus, 68–9
dance, 6, 127, 180 *see also* ballet
Dar al Islam, 39, 66, 95
Davis, Michael, 153
Davis, Thomas, 187–8
D'Azeglio, Massimo, 80
Delanty, Gerard, 14, 137, 160, 165
Delany, Martin, 75
Denmark, 138, 190
Derrida, Jacques, 6
Desai, Jigna, 132
De Valera, Eamon, 175
Diawara, Manthia, 154
diasporic populations, 13, 37, 101, 126, 132
Dilwale Dulhaniya Le Jayenge (The Lover Takes A Bride), 132
Diouf, Mamadou, 71, 101, 205
Disraeli, Benjamin, 81
Donia, Robert, 148
Douglass, Frederick, 75
Douzinas, Costas, 90
Doyle, Michael, 148
dual citizenship, 119, 197–8
Du Bois, William, 75
Dubai, 47

Proof

Dunhuang, 74
Durkheim, Emile, 90

East Timor, 191
East/West conflicts, 6–7, 46, 151
East/West connections, 6–7, 46, 65–70
ecumenism, 48–9, 65–8, 70–3, 209–10
Eder, Klaus and Giesen, Bernhard, 160
Edwards, Robert, 66
emancipatory cosmopolitanism, 36, 39
English Patient, The, 92
Englishness, 127–8
Empire *see* cosmopolitanism and empire
Environmental/ecological crisis, 60, 119, 128, 166–8
epistemology, 16–17, 49, 59
Equiano, Olaudah, 75–6
ethic of caring, 92
ethnic cleansing, 140
Euben, Roxanne, 39–40, 42, 64–6, 68–70, 72, 130
Europe, 11, 24, 58, 68, 71–4, 108, 144, 158–64, 170, 173, 181, 186, 188
European Commission, 159, 161
European Convention of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms, 159, 187
European Council of Ministers, 159, 161
European Court, 159
European Court of Human Rights, 144, 159
European Enlightenment, 4, 6, 11, 32, 45, 65, 70, 77, 84, 158–60
European Parliament, 156, 159
European Union, 104, 108, 147, 156, 160–1, 177, 187–8

Faist, Thomas, 197–8
Falk, Richard, 115
Fanning, Brian, 183, 185
Featherstone, David, 76
feminist theory, 90–3
Feyerabend, Paul, 16
film, 6, 40–3, 128, 131–2, 201
Fine, Robert, 57, 83–5, 142, 149
Finland, 187, 190
Finlay, Andrew, 189
Fire, 132
Fitzgerald, John, 177
Foreign Affairs globalization index, 171
foreign correspondents, 19, 133, 205
Fortuyn, Pym, 138
Foster, Roy, 174
France, 6, 80, 105, 184
French Revolution, 58, 146
Freud, 91

Gaelic Athletic Association (GAA), 180
Gangjian, Du and Gang, Song, 153
Gannoushi, Rachid
Gans, Herbert, 125
Garsten, Christina, 121
Gemeinschaft and *Gesellschaft*, 18
Geneva, 78–9
Geneva Conventions, 78, 96, 150
Genghis Khan, 72
genocide, 48, 76, 127, 140
Germany, 79–80, 108, 136, 138, 190, 197
Ghannoushi, Rachid, 67
Gheorghiu, Christian, 49, 70
Giddens, Anthony, 97
Gilroy, Paul, 10, 74–5, 121
Glazer, Nathan, 115
Global Gastronomer, The, 22
global networks
  civil society networks, 166–8
  east/west networks, 7
  Europe as a network, 164
  expatriate sociability networks, 122–3
  general issues, 99–102
  global advocacy networks, 101, 166
  global business networks, 100–1
  Islamic networks, 39–40, 67
  trade routes, 72

Proof

global *realpolitik*, 54–5
globalization, 12–13, 35–6, 50, 55, 61, 63, 83, 93–4, 99–110, 136–7, 146–9, 162, 171–4, 187, 190–1, 196–7
glocalization, 52, 55–6, 106–10, 131, 172, 177, 181–2, 188, 202, 209–11
governance, 142, 147–70, 208–11
great transformation argument, 52, 58–9
Greece, 187, 197
Greenpeace International, 156, 166–7
Gregory, Lady, 176
Guantanamo Bay, 150
Guillén, Mauro and Suaréz, Sandra, 134
Guinness, 25, 171–2, 179–80

Habermas, Jürgen, 60, 89, 97, 142–5, 150
Haines, Robin, 174
Haiti, 76
Hannerz, Ulf, 18–19, 30–1, 44, 71, 133, 201, 205
Hardt, Michael, and Negri, Antonio, 161
Hardy, Thomas, 75
Harper, Tim, 46
Hebrew, 74
Hegel, Georg, 58, 107–8
Held, David, 4, 12, 55, 86, 94, 145
hellenization, 65
Herrero, Martha, 176
hibernian cosmopolitans, 181
Hiebert, Daniel, 123, 125–6
Himmelfarb, Gertrude, 115
hinduism, 72
Hirst, Paul and Thompson, Grahame, 12, 106, 156
Hogan, Edmund, 173
Hollywood, 127, 131–2
Holocaust, 96, 131
Holton, Robert, 7, 12, 21, 35, 42, 46, 55, 59, 61, 64, 88, 101, 105–6, 172, 201
Holy Roman Empire, 145–6, 160
Hong Kong, 46, 101
Honneth, Axel, 146, 166
Hopkins, Antony (A.G.), 36, 64, 107
hospitality, 89–90, 113–14, 198
human rights, 4, 24, 39, 55, 60, 62, 86–7, 89–90, 94, 141, 146–70, 172–3, 190–3, 197–8, 209–11
Hungary, 190
Huntington, Samuel, 152
hyphenated identity, 125

Ibn Khaldun, 67
Ignatiev, Noel, 175
India, 6–7, 10, 132, 153–4
Industrial Revolution, 58, 146
Inglehart, Ronald, 136
Inglis, David, 3–4, 58, 65
Inglis, Tom, 173, 178–82, 197
International Criminal Court, 149–50
International Monetary Fund (IMF), 95, 162
International Parliament of Writers, 6
International Postal Union, 156
international relations, 86–9, 95–102, 142–70
International Social Science Program surveys, 187–8
International Telecommunications Union, 134
internationalism, 11, 105, 150, 175
internet, 43–4, 68, 128, 133–5, 202–3
Iran, 67
Iraq, 6, 55, 150–1
Ireland, 24, 138, 171–93, 200
  catholicism, 172–5, 178, 180, 188–9
  Celtic Tiger economy, 171–2, 178, 183, 188, 190
  citizenship rights and exclusions, 184, 186–7
  colonization by Britain, 172, 174
  cosmopolitan and national identities, 171–93
  culture, 174–5, 179–80
  diaspora, 171, 174–5, 177, 179
  famine, 174

Proof

Ireland – *continued*
foreign policy, 176
Free State, 175–7
generation effects on attitudes, 184–5
global reputation, 179, 192
Good Friday peace process, 177, 189
human rights, 190–3
migration, 172–6, 181–2, 184–9
missionaries, 173, 177
national identity, 188–91
north-south relations, 171, 189
priests, 173, 178
public policy toward migrant settlement, 185–7
racism, 183–7
relations between Catholics and Protestants, 177
Rising (1916), 175
writers and intellectuals, 174, 176
Ishiguro, Kazuo, 92
Islam, 4, 13–14, 38–40, 48, 66–70, 72–3, 75, 95, 144–5
Islamic cosmopolitanism, 39–40, 64–70, 72–3, 88, 95
Italy, 80, 138, 184

James, C.L.R. (Cyril), 76
Jameson whisky, 172, 179–80
Japan, 6–7, 47, 181, 190
Java, 72
jazz, 127
Jelin, Elizabeth, 167
Jews, 11, 37, 68–9, 72, 101
Joyce, James, 174, 176
jurispersuasion, 149, 155

Kant, Immanuel, 4, 43, 64, 89–90, 92, 96, 107, 118, 142–8, 154, 159, 166, 198, 206
Karim, Karim, 68
Keane, John, 47, 168
Keck, Margaret and Sikkink, Kathryn, 101, 166
Kennedy, John F., 175, 179
Kennedy, Michael, 191
Keohane, Robert, Haas, Peter and Levy, Marc, 167
Kigongo, J.K., 154
Kivisto, Peter, 198
Klein, Naomi, 121
Kleingeld, Paula, 115
Köhler, Martin, 60
Kokaz, Nancy, 160
Kosovo, 55, 90
Kristeva, Julie, 91–2
Kuala Lumpur, 133
Kuhling, Carmen and Keohane, Kieran, 172, 178–80, 183
Kumasi, 13, 32–3
Kyoto Protocol, 167

Laffan, Bridget, 188
Lagaan, 132
Lakatos, Imre, 16
Lamy, Pascal, 155–6, 158
Lapidus, Ira, 39, 67
Lash, Scott, 97
Latin America, 121
latin lovers, 6
League of Nations, 191
Lentin, Ronit and McVeigh, Robbie, 183, 186
letters, 40, 44, 74
Levenson, Joseph, 34–5
Levy and Sznaider, 131
libraries, 69, 74
Liszt, Franz, 76–7
Little Moscows, 206
Lockwood, David, 93
London, 5, 75–6, 81, 123, 133, 175–6
London Corresponding Society, 75
Loyal, Steven, 183
Lyotard, Jean-Francois, 97

McAleese, Mary, 179
McDonaldization of the world, 94
McGrew, Tony (A.G.), 12, 55
MacIntyre, Stuart, 206
McRobbie, Angela, 92
Malta, 190
Mamdouth, Alia, 6

Proof

Manchester, 175
Mandaville, Peter, 68
Mandela, Nelson, 129
Mann, Michael, 35, 59, 144, 172
Mann, Thomas, 105
Marco Polo, 73–4
Marcus Aurelius, 4
Maris, Virginie, 151, 167
markets, hierarchies, and networks, 98–102
marriage, 41, 125–7, 200
Marx, Karl, 46, 51, 58, 93, 108
mass media, 40–1, 43–4, 116, 128, 202, 206
Mecca, 38, 67
Mediterranean, 46, 65, 69, 73
melting pot, 47, 124
memory, 130–1
Menocal, Maria, 68–70
Merton, Robert, 18, 116
methodological cosmopolitanism, 54, 60, 103–10, 116, 137, 160–1, 169, 195
methodological ecumenism, 66
methodological glocalism, 107–10, 137, 195
methodological nationalism, 60, 103, 106–10, 160–1
Mexico, 147
Microsoft, 156
Middle East, 37–8, 133, 150
Mignolo, Walter, 61, 65, 84, 94
military humanism, 55, 90, 150–1, 197–8, 210
Mississippi Masala, 132
Mitchell, Kathryne, 92–3
modernity *see* cosmopolitanism and modernity
Morocco, 157
Mother Teresa, 4, 129
Mughal Empire, 40, 68, 72
multiculturalism, 124–8, 153–4, 189, 199
multi-level governance, 104–5, 161
Mumford, Lewis, 47
Murid sect, 71, 101
music, 10, 20, 78–9, 104, 121, 182
national cosmopolitanism, 105
nation-states, 9, 59–63, 76–82, 95–6, 102–10, 115–18, 142–93, 195 *see also* cosmopolitanism and sovereignty, national societies, and Westphalian system
nationalism, 11, 32, 51, 60, 63, 76, 105, 136–9, 144–70, 172, 206–7
Nazi Germany, 11, 131, 148, 186
Nava, Mica, 5, 16, 18, 31, 91–2, 123, 127–8, 132, 197
Near East, 73
NEC corporation, 181
Netherlands, 138–9, 184
New York, 47, 101, 121
Nigerian migrants, 177, 181
Norris, Pippa, 118, 136–8, 157–8, 189–91
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), 90, 150, 162
North American Free Trade Association (NAFTA), 156–8
Northern Ireland peace process, 192
novels, 92
Nowicka, Magdalena, 16, 117, 121, 205
Nuremberg trials, 148
Nussbaum, Martha, 3–4, 11, 89, 113–14

Ó Gráda, Cormac, 174
O'Mahony, Eoin, Loyal, Steven and Mulcahy, Aogan, 183
O'Riain, Sean, 183
Ohmae, Kenichi, 61, 165
Okakura, Tenshin, 6–7
Ondaatje, Michael, 92
ordinary cosmopolitanism, 5, 53
orientalism, 42, 127
Orthodox Christianity, 49, 70
Osiander, Andreas, 145–6
Ottoman Empire, 40, 68, 80

Palestine, 67
Panhumanism, 44
Paris, 101, 176
Parsees, 72

Proof

Parsons, Talcott, 85, 88, 90
particularism, 4, 42, 45, 58, 71, 90, 109, 210 *see also* universalism
Persian Gulf, 37, 121
Petitt, Philip, 144–5
Philips, Tim, 118, 137–9
Phillips, Adam, 91
philosophy of history, 56, 59, 82, 107–8, 210
pilgrimage, 67
poetry, 69, 79
Polanyi, Karl, 58
Poland, 190
Pollock, Sheldon, 17, 71–2, 118
political representation of minorities, 199–200
port cities, 46
post-national epoch, 60, 144
Powell, Wiliam, 98
Prodi, Romano, 164
protestantism, 48–9, 58
psychoanalysis, 91
Puerto Rico, 121

Qu'ran, 39, 67
Quebec, 199

Race and racism, 83, 183–7, 200, 211
radio, 135, 164
rational action/rational choice, 85–9
Red Cross, 129
refugees, 18, 190–1
regions, 102, 158–70, 171, 177
Remains of the Day, The, 92
Renaissance, 58,
Rickard, John, 176
Rio Earth Summit, 1992, 167
risk, 58–60
Ritzer, George, 94
Riverdance, 172
Robbins, Bruce, 8, 29, 32, 92
Robertson, Roland, 3–4, 13, 52, 55, 61, 65–6, 97, 103, 105–9, 116, 162, 195
Robinson, Francis, 39, 72
Robinson, Jennifer, 47
Robinson, Mary, 189
romantic cosmopolitanism, 79
rootedness, 53, 77
rootlessness, 11
Rorty, Richard, 96, 114
Rother, Nina, and Medrano, Juan, 138–9, 184–5
Ruane, Joseph and Todd, Jennifer, 189
Rumania, 177
Rumford, Chris, 137, 162, 164–5
Russia, 90

Safavid empire, 68
Said, Edward, 42
sailors, 121
Samarkand, 74
Sand, Georges, 79
Sanskrit, 72
Sassen, Saskia, 134, 147
Schiller, Herbert, 131
Schindler's List, 131
Scholte, Jan-Art, 12
Selfridges department store, 5
Sen, Amartya, 42, 72, 153
Seneca, 89
Senegalese, 71
sexuality, 6, 92, 175
Shanghai, 46, 123
Shariati, Ali, 67
Shehu, Bashkin, 6
Sh'ia Islam, 67
Shore, Cris, 160
Silk Road, 73–4
Singapore, 122–3
Simmel, Georg, 46–7
Sinnott, Richard, 188
Skrbis, Zlatko, 17, 20
slavery, 74–7
Smith, Adam, 88
Smith, Philip, 139
Socrates, 5
social theory, 83–110
  the problem of action, 18–19, 30–3, 44, 84–93, 107–10
  the problem of order, 60, 93–110
  the problem of scalar complexity, 102–6, 158–70, 194–5
socialism, 11

sociology of organization, 85–9, 98–102
Sogdian, 74
Somalia, 177
South Africa, 149, 191–2
Soysal, Yasmin, 144
Spain, 67–70, 138
St. Ambrose, 66
St. Augustine, 4, 66
Stalinist Russia, 11
Starbucks, 21
Stoicism, 48, 62, 64, 89–90, 154
Stockholm Intergovernmental Conference on the Holocaust, 131
Strick, Joseph, 180
subaltern cosmopolitanism, 6, 36
Sufism, 37, 67
Sulieman, Hajji, 37
Sunni Islam, 39, 67
Sutherland, Peter, 189
Sweden, 184–5, 197
Swetschinski, D., 37
Synghe, John Millington, 176
Szerzynski, Bronislaw and Urry, John, 16, 19, 42–4, 120, 128–31, 135
Sznaider, 16, 57

Tagore, Rabindranath, 6–7
Tamerlane, 72
Taoism, 74
television, 41, 43–4, 128, 130–5
Teubner, Gunther, 147
Thompson, Craig and Tambyah, Siok, 122–3
Thompson, Edward Palmer (E.P.), 51, 75, 166
Thompson, Grahame, 98
Tibetan, 74
Töennies, Ferdinand, 18
Toledo, 70
tolerance and intolerance, 48, 67, 70, 72, 95, 97, 113, 127, 131, 138–9, 184–5
Tomlinson, John, 19–20
Tonra, Ben, 191
Toronto, 124–5
tourism *see* cosmopolitanism and travel/tourism
Tovey, Hilary and Share, Perry, 174, 177, 185
trade and traders, 45, 55, 64, 69, 73–8
translation, 97
Treaty of Nice, 188
Tunis, 46
Turner, Bryan, 101, 121
two modernities argument, 57–82, 106–7, 195

Ukraine, 6
Umayyad Caliphate, 68–9
United Kingdom (UK), 5, 75–6, 81, 127–8, 132, 136, 138, 171, 183–4, 187
United Nations, 115, 121, 146–9, 156–8, 169, 190–1, 200
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), 167
United Nations World Conference on Human Rights, Vienna, 1993, 151
United States of America (US), 47, 55, 80, 121, 124–5, 127, 131, 136, 138, 147, 149–50, 167, 171, 175, 179, 183, 197–8
Universal Declaration on Human Rights, 96, 146, 148
universalism, 4, 42, 48–9, 58, 66, 71, 75, 90, 108–9, 118, 151–5, 158–9, 210 *see also* particularism
Urry, John, 16, 19, 42–4, 120, 123, 128–31, 136

Valentino, Rudolf, 5
van der Bly, Martha, 181
van der Veer, Peter, 34, 48
Vancouver, 123, 125–6
Venezuela, 121
Vansina, Jan, 154
vernacular cosmopolitanism, 5, 36, 53, 71, 101
Vertovec, Steven, 47, 123, 163–4
Vertovec, Steven and Cohen, Robin, 22, 30–1

Proof

visceral cosmopolitanism, 32
visuality, 40–1, 44
Voice of America, 133
Von Richtofen, Ferdinand, 73

Waldron, Jeremy, 163
Walkowitz, Rebecca, 18, 176
Wallerstein, Immanuel, 93–4, 97, 106
Waltz, Kenneth, 86, 148, 151
war on terror, 95, 150
Ward, Eilis, 191
Waxer, Linda, 10, 121
Weber, Eugen, 80
Weber, Max, 30–3, 46, 48–9, 59, 83, 88, 93
Werbner, Pnina, 16, 19, 37–8, 41, 118, 121
West, The, 46, 105, 138, 151–5, 158–9, 210 *see also* East/West conflicts and East/West connections
Westphalian system, 61, 80–1, 145–6
Williams, Bernard, 151–2
Wimmer, Andreas and Glick Schiller, Nina, 106
Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 97
women, 5–6, 91–2, 127–8, 158
Wood, Frances, 73–4
Woodward, Ian, 17, 20
World Bank, 156, 162
World Council of Churches, 70
World Trade Organization, 9, 95, 162
World Values Survey (WVS), 136–9, 157–8, 184, 189–91
World Wildlife Fund, 167
working-class cosmopolitanism, 36

Yeats, William Butler, 176

Zangwill, Israel, 124
Zubaida, Sami, 124–5
Zubrzycki, George, 124