A Critical Assessment of "New Cosmopolitanism"[1]

: Characteristics and Challenges

1. Introduction

Since the 1990s, there has been a renewed interest in the theory of cosmopolitanism (Appiah, 1996; Archibugi, 1998; Beck, 1998; Bhabha, 1996; Cheah and Robbins, eds, 1998; Held, 1997; Kaldor, 1996; Nussbaum, 1996; Pollock, 1998; Werbner, 1999). This revival gained particular momentum after the year 2000 (Archibugi, ed, 2003; Appiah, 2006; Beck, 2006; Delanty, 2009; Delanty, ed, 2012; Fine, 2007; Harvey, 2009; Held, 2010; Holton, 2009; Kendall et al., 2009; Vertovec and Cohen, eds, 2002). Discussions on cosmopolitanism developed into an interdisciplinary movement sometimes referred to as "new cosmopolitanism," especially after the destruction of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War (Fine, 2007). Distinguished from classical cosmopolitanism, new cosmopolitanism engages in discussions that are not limited to a single discipline and are referenced mutually across various disciplines, including sociology, social theory, politics, geography, cultural theory, anthropology, philosophy, and history, resulting in transdisciplinary knowledge.

An unprecedented social transformation brought about by the phenomenon of globalization was behind the revival of cosmopolitanism. Globalization has produced a tremendous change in social relations. These changes have consequently led to the complete transformation of concepts like nation-states, capitalism, economies, citizenship, risks, consumption, culture, and communication. As a concept, cosmopolitanism has enjoyed a revival as an attempt to articulate the challenges that have emerged along with the phenomenon of globalization and the creation of a highly interconnected world.

Several pieces of research have been conducted to understand how globalization has changed society. As Lemert et al. argue, "Whether celebrated or deplored, globalization as a concept becomes in our own time increasingly central to contemporary cultural outlooks" (Lemert et al., 2010: xxiii). Globalization has become a major issue in the social sciences and humanities and has produced voluminous literature. However, as Gerard Delanty argues, it has not produced a significant philosophical or methodological framework (Delanty, 2009: 1). Conversely, debates on cosmopolitanism are marked by an attempt to produce such a framework.

In other words, discussions on cosmopolitanism attempt to take the research one step further by answering a normative question, "How can/should we deal with the transformation?" as well as a descriptive question, "What kind of transformation has globalization produced?" Delanty states that the rise of cosmopolitanism is ascribed to the considerable disquiet about the impact of globalization as well as the recognition that a globally connected world must find solutions that take into account the perspectives of others beyond one's immediate context (Delanty, ed, 2012: 2). As Kymlicka and Walker (2012) assert, some form of cosmopolitanism has become almost inevitable because the pressure of globalization has made it increasingly untenable for older concepts of national autarky or isolation. There is an increasing awareness of the need for some normative conception of global community, responsibility, and governance, which is what new cosmopolitanism has tried to address.

In this paper, I mainly focus on the theoretical endeavors of new cosmopolitanism and examine its theoretical potential and challenges. First, I identify the major characteristics of new cosmopolitanism, noting that it has not only created extensive interest but also perhaps faced a theoretical impasse, resulting in a paradoxical consequence. Second, I refer to Ulrich Beck's cosmopolitanism as a prime example of new cosmopolitanism that embodies its characteristics

as well as its challenges. Finally, I highlight the need to discuss the normative and argue that cosmopolitanism could be a useful theoretical tool for realizing a better coexistence in the globalized world.

2. Characteristics of "New Cosmopolitanism"

2.1. Two critiques in new cosmopolitanism

Cosmopolitanism has gained renewed significance as "new cosmopolitanism," which has led to the recent explosion of literature on cosmopolitanism.[2] The revival of cosmopolitanism since the 1990s is not a simple rehash but a critical and reflexive reconsideration of two aspects: (1) the critique of the dichotomy between the local and the global and (2) the critique of Eurocentrism.[3]

(1) Critique of the dichotomy between the local and the cosmopolitan

In classical cosmopolitanism, emancipation from local belongings and attachments is desirable. For Held, "allegiance is owed, first and foremost, to the moral realm of all humanity, not to the contingent groupings of nation, ethnicity, and class" (Held, 2010: 40). Underpinning this idea is the belief that the cosmopolitan does not belong to any specific place. Thus, the cosmopolitan is seen as not rooted like the local. Charles Beitz's description of the cosmopolitan perspective provides insight into this dichotomy (Beitz, 1994). For Beitz, the cosmopolitan perspective is inclusive and nonperspectival. Beitz writes (1994: 120):

> By 'inclusive', I mean that a cosmopolitan view encompasses all local points of view. It seeks to see the whole of which these are the parts. By 'non-perspectival', I mean that a cosmopolitan view seeks to see each part of the whole in its true relative size. There is no foreground and background; the proportions of things are accurately

represented so that they can be faithfully compared. If local viewpoints can be said to be partial, then a cosmopolitan viewpoint is impartial.

Cosmopolitan theorists criticize this dichotomy between the local and the cosmopolitan because the boundary between the local and the cosmopolitan, or "the inside" and "the outside," has gradually blurred as a result of the social world becoming increasingly mixed, hybrid, and diverse due to globalization. As quoted above, Beitz argues, "If local viewpoints can be said to be partial, then a cosmopolitan view is impartial." However, critics argue the opposite is possible: the local can encompass the cosmopolitan. Delanty claims that "the local and the global are intertwined in complex ways and in ways that have created new spaces in which a cosmopolitan reality has been constituted" (Delanty, 2009: 15). Such spaces are not beyond or outside the national or the local but are distinct from the national and the local. Thus, they should not be seen as external and merely reactive to globalization (Delanty, 2009: 15). As Rumford (2008: 12) claims, the world is shaped by encounters between the global and the local as well as the universal and the particular. Thus, many cosmopolitan theorists have stressed the importance of hybrid spaces where the local and the cosmopolitan connect and blend together.[4]

(2) Critique of Eurocentric cosmopolitanism

The second critique is of Eurocentrism, which has historically been embedded in cosmopolitanism. The idea of cosmopolitanism developed in Western genealogy. As Pollock et al. (2000) explain, in historical intellectual terms, "cosmopolitanism" is irredeemably European. In classical cosmopolitanism and a few contemporary discussions of cosmopolitanism, the historical and geographical specificity of cosmopolitanism tends to be overlooked. Classical cosmopolitanism overlooks differences and imposes unilateral "universality," which is not universal but specific to a region, namely Europe. In such a discussion, the world is conceived

as singular and not plural, denying the multiplicity of worlds. An example of this is noted by Kymlicka and Walker (2012), who argue that Enlightenment cosmopolitanism aspires to a single world order with a single common language and culture. This cosmopolitanism is both utopian and dystopian; "it is utopian in their expectations of a democratic world state, but dystopian in their suppression of cultural and linguistic diversity and in the way they open the door to imperialism" (Kymlicka and Walker, 2012: 3). In the name of cosmopolitanism, a specific region's values and order are considered universally applicable and acceptable. Such a view that places the West at the center has led to a disregard for people from other regions.[5]

There has been a critical reflection on the power of cosmopolitanism's Western genealogy. As Delanty argues, cosmopolitanism should not be confined to Western genealogy alone and should relate to other experiences in different contexts (Delanty, ed, 2012: 4–5). Thus, new cosmopolitanism has been linked to various contexts, including non-Western regions. Furthermore, it is linked to postcolonial theory and incorporates marginal spaces and nonelite experiences, such as vernacular cosmopolitanism (Bhabha, 1996 and 2004) and working-class cosmopolitanism (Werbner, 1999).

2.2. Rootedness

In addition to the two critiques, there are two other crucial elements for "new cosmopolitanism": rootedness and openness. First, I argue that in contemporary discussions of cosmopolitanism, some scholars have attempted to define cosmopolitanism as rooted. The emphasis on rootedness is strongly related to the abovementioned two critiques. Rather than unilaterally imposing a single abstract vision of cosmopolitanism "from above," such as Eurocentric cosmopolitanism, some scholars have attempted to conceive cosmopolitanism "from below," that is, from concrete local spaces that are pluralistic, hybrid, and mixed, which

is contrary to the dichotomy between the local and the cosmopolitan. In other words, they have attempted to explore "actually existing cosmopolitanism" (Cheah and Robbins, ed, 1998). Cheah and Robbins (1998: 2) write as follows:

> Cosmopolitanism is *there*—not merely an abstract ideal, like loving one's neighbor as oneself, but habits of thought and feeling that have already shaped and been shaped by particular collectivities, that are socially and geographically situated, hence both limited and empowered.

Although new cosmopolitanism has often been conceived as "the rooted," cosmopolitanism, in a general sense, may imply the contrary, "the rootless." Cosmopolitanism may still evoke an idea that prioritizes the ethics of a world citizen over other ethics. This may produce negative images of cosmopolitanism suggesting it is lofty, fantastical, uprooted, unfeasible, divorced from reality, and so forth.[6] However, most recent discussions on new cosmopolitanism neither deny the importance of local belongings/attachments nor argue for cosmopolitanism as a highly abstract norm. Rather, the relationship between cosmopolitan concern and local attachment is often seen as compatible or even complementary (Kendall et al., 2009). Scholars have emphasized the importance of theoretical tasks, such as connecting local belongings to cosmopolitan ethics and situating cosmopolitanism in concrete places. For instance, Kendall et al. (2009: 35) argue that the concept of cosmopolitanism is of little use and lacks reality if the concept cannot be connected to particular social spaces. They have examined relationships between cosmopolitan values and local contexts, rather than articulating cosmopolitanism as highly abstract ethics of world citizens that should be spread worldwide. This is because a local place that is physically near can be connected to distant places or places far away. Eduardo Mendieta (2009: 242) rightly notes:

> One is never cosmopolitan without setting out from some locality, whether it be

spatial or temporal. One is never simply rooted, localized without that indexicality being deciphered with reference to some view of the global map. To be local is a trajectory from a distance to a place, and from that place back toward that horizon of distantiation.

2.3. Openness

In addition to the idea of rootedness and the two critiques, "openness" is also an important element of new cosmopolitanism. As Robert Holton (2009: 116) asserts, "Openness is a crucial defining feature of cosmopolitanism." "Openness" is an ambiguous term that has been defined in various ways, but there are roughly three articulations. First, new cosmopolitanism generally regards openness as a desirable attitude for people living in contemporary society. As Skrbis and Woodward (2007) note, although the understanding of cosmopolitanism varies, most scholars accept that cosmopolitans would embrace a broadly interpreted disposition of openness toward others: people, things, and experiences of nonlocal origin.

Second, openness is considered a worldview, which Rumford calls "world openness" (2008: 11). World openness affirms the multiplicity of worlds and resists the closed view that the world is a single place. This notion of world openness comes from Delanty's idea that cosmopolitanism attempts to conceptualize "the social world as an open horizon in which new cultural models take shape... and wherever new relations between self, other and world develop in moments of openness" (Delanty, 2006: 27; Rumford, 2008: 11). According to Rumford (2008: 1), whereas globalization theories uncritically present a strong vision of the singularity of the world—for example, a vision that globalization makes the world a single place—cosmopolitanism is concerned with developing a multiplicity of viewpoints and acknowledging the possibility of multiple worlds. As Rumford (2008: 15) notes,

"Cosmopolitanism allows us to imagine the multiplicity of worlds that may exist, while globalization teaches us that we live in 'one world'." Furthermore, Delanty (2009: 14) claims:

> Cosmopolitanism must somehow invoke a sense of openness as opposed to a closed or particularistic view of the world. This orientation, which can be regarded as central to the cosmopolitan imagination, can be referred to as an orientation toward world openness or world disclosure. It is in the interplay of Self, Other, and World that cosmopolitan processes come into play.

For Delanty, cosmopolitanism refers to an orientation that exists in the imagination rather than in a specific social condition. The imagination can take several different forms depending on the historical context and social conditions (Delanty, 2009: 14). Mendieta (2009) also claims that cosmopolitanism is not a destination but constitutes a direction. In other words, cosmopolitanism can offer us new worldviews and new ways of thinking and imagining, rather than a single normative vision.

Third, "openness" reflects the idea that cosmopolitanism is open to many definitions and interpretations. Pollock et al. (2000: 577) write:

> Cosmopolitanism may instead be a project whose conceptual content and pragmatic character are not only as yet unspecified but also must always escape positive and definite specification, precisely because specifying cosmopolitanism positively and definitely is an uncosmopolitan thing to do.

It is difficult to grasp the meaning and intent of cosmopolitanism as new cosmopolitanism is not confined to a single definition. Moreover, as there is abundant literature on cosmopolitanism, new cosmopolitanism as a whole is difficult to comprehend and may sometimes be misunderstood in distorted forms. Holton (2009: 29) argues that the marked increase in the literature on cosmopolitanism runs the risk of intellectual or analytical chaos, which may be the

new reality.

Thus, cosmopolitanism is an ambiguous concept that can sometimes be misleading. However, this ambiguity should be embraced in reconstructing cosmopolitanism because a single, fixed definition can lead to a false universalism, as in the case of Eurocentric cosmopolitanism. It is crucial to articulate cosmopolitanism in its plural form: as cosmoplitanisms (Pollock et al., 2000). Cosmopolitanism can exist in many forms according to various contexts, places, and spaces.

3. Paradoxical Consequence of New Cosmopolitanism

New cosmopolitanism has not only attracted extensive interest but also reached a theoretical impasse with a paradoxical consequence. In the early stages of discussing new cosmopolitanism, there was a demand for some normative vision to address the unprecedented transformation caused by globalization. There was wishful thinking for cosmopolitan solidarity to combat global problems.

However, with the increasing number of theorists who have taken cosmopolitanism seriously, the self-limiting discussions on ethics and norms have become even more dominant. Cosmopolitanism may be nothing but a theory that depicts cultural mixture or multicultural cohabitation. A few theorists have highlighted this predicament. For instance, Delanty argues that "the tendency in recent cosmopolitan theory in social science is to reduce cosmopolitanism to transnational space or cultural diversity" (Delanty, 2009: 16). Tariq Jazeel also notes that "cosmopolitanism itself remains in place as an increasingly unquestioned byword for living together" (Jazeel, 2011: 77).

Why has cosmopolitanism become a byword for transnational space or living together? One answer is the critique of Eurocentric cosmopolitanism and the emphasis on self-criticism as

a requisite attitude for discussing cosmopolitanism. As argued above, critics have raised concerns about deep-rooted Eurocentrism in cosmopolitanism. As Mendieta astutely notes, unless cosmopolitanism is reflexive about its historical standpoint and European genealogy, it will become both arrogant and despotic, namely what Mendieta calls "imperial cosmopolitanism" (Mendieta, 2009: 254). Thus, theorists of cosmopolitanism have been cautious about the pitfalls of cosmopolitanism and have attempted to articulate the theory reflexively and self-critically. One of the main concerns in new cosmopolitanism is to criticize Eurocentric cosmopolitanism and to seek ways to conceive cosmopolitanism more critically. Spencer (2011: 13) lists three cosmopolitan virtues—humility, self-criticism, and democratic discussion—about what it means and takes to be cosmopolitan:

> It should be too self-critical for that, too committed to the procedure of self-examination, and too conscious that cosmopolitanism is a process, not a finished vision. We have need of what Scott Malcomson calls a cosmopolitanism of *humility* (1998, 236; emphasis in the original). I do not think we should be afraid to espouse cosmopolitan principles of solidarity, community, democracy, and human rights.... Cosmopolitanism therefore enjoins at least as much self-criticism as evangelism.

Spencer is not the only theorist who holds this view. Mendieta (2009: 250) also claims that cosmopolitanism must entail a self-critique of one's prejudices as well as a confession and disclosure of one's epistemic standpoint. However, Spencer (2011: 14) states that we face two dangers when discussing cosmopolitanism: "imposing our ideas and priorities in the mistaken belief that they serve cosmopolitan purposes; and, in fear of this danger, relinquishing the goal of cosmopolitanism altogether and settling for the status quo." I would argue that our fear of the first danger has made the second danger a reality, which could be a paradoxical consequence of new cosmopolitanism.

4. Ulrich Beck's Cosmopolitan Theory

Beck's cosmopolitanism embodies some of the characteristics of new cosmopolitanism. First, Beck's cosmopolitan theory can be viewed as a typical new cosmopolitanism because his theory contains two critiques. First, Beck criticizes the dichotomy between the local and the cosmopolitan by employing his concept "cosmopolitanization." The term "cosmopolitanization" describes the actually existing cosmopolitanism. "[I]n reality today, a 'banal', 'coercive', and 'impure' cosmopolitization unfolds unwanted, unseen, powerful and confrontational beneath the surface or behind the façade of persisting national spaces, jurisdictions and labels" (Beck 2011: 19). In the era of cosmopolitanization, "the global other is in our midst," not in distant places far from us (Beck, 2002: 18). By introducing this new term of "cosmopolitanization," Beck attempts to describe the new world reality in which the borders between national and international, local and cosmopolitan, and domestic and foreign have become more ambiguous. Beck calls the dichotomy "the either-or principle" and rejects it, arguing in favor of accepting the "both/and principle" (Beck, 2006).[7]

Second, since the early stages of his theorization of cosmopolitanism, Beck has been critical of a Eurocentric form of cosmopolitanism that imposes a single vision "from above." For this reason, he coined the term "cosmopolitanization" to signify a banal and coercive process happening not only in Europe but also everywhere and in everyday life.[8] Beck and Grande also present "methodological cosmopolitanism" as a research agenda for overcoming Eurocentrism (Beck and Grande, 2010).

Furthermore, I would argue that Beck's cosmopolitan theory is the very example of the paradoxical consequence of new cosmopolitanism. Beck had presented cosmopolitanism as a relatively normative political vision in his earlier work (Beck, 1998 and 2005). In his later years,

Beck discontinued using the term cosmopolitanism and stopped dealing with normative ideas; instead, he employed descriptive terms such as cosmopolitanization and cosmopolitan risks (Beck, 2011, 2015, and 2016).[9] Beck became increasingly reluctant to discuss cosmopolitanism in a normative sense and instead emphasized the borderlessness of cosmopolitan risk and the phenomenon of cosmopolitanization.

Beck focuses on the fact of cosmopolitanization rather than ethics because like other cosmopolitan theorists he emphasizes self-criticism when discussing cosmopolitanism (Beck, 2002: 18). Engaging in a healthy amount of self-criticism has been seen as a requisite attitude for new cosmopolitanism. Moreover, because Beck's cosmopolitanism had invited widespread criticisms concerning Eurocentrism, he has strengthened his self-critical stance on cosmopolitanism (Bhambra, 2011 and 2016; Gilroy, 2010; Krossa and Robertson, 2012). This enhanced self-critical stance may be responsible for his distancing away from a normative argument and his strong emphasis on cosmopolitanization as a descriptive fact. Beck stresses that cosmopolitanization "is not about ethics, but about facts" (Beck, 2012: 8).

However, this rhetoric—"not about ethics, but about facts"—is ambivalent and undermines the theoretical strength of cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitanization as "fact" could shed light on the new realities that arise in the era of globalization. In addition, the emphasis on fact may be a good strategy for escaping criticism of Eurocentrism; however, I argue that it is not.

This is because there is a tradeoff relationship between Beck's emphasis on cosmopolitanization and a critical disruption of the dominant reality. As long as "cosmopolitan" connotes some positive ethical values, Beck's emphasis on "the reality is becoming cosmopolitan" would lead to some affirmation of the status quo. Even if Beck (2010) stresses that cosmopolitanization does not always lead to an ethically desirable situation, the emphasis

on a cosmopolitan reality would mean settling for the status quo and avoiding criticism of existing realities of injustice and discrimination. This rhetoric has the possibility of not only obscuring the global inequality that has been constructed in the historical context of colonialism but also ironically highlighting the Eurocentrism that Beck aims to avoid.

5. Cosmopolitanism as Utopian Realism

Grasping Beck's concept of cosmopolitanization could be a beginning step in acknowledging the interconnectivity and interdependence between different regions and people, which can be one of the important elements for the realization of a better coexistence in the highly globalized world. However, this acknowledgment does not directly lead to cultivating openness toward others and deepening mutual understanding. Being thrown into a "cosmopolitan" situation, such as recognizing that the "global other is in our midst," does not always lead to the realization of a better coexistence. It is perhaps necessary to reflect upon the original purpose of new cosmopolitanism and to conceive cosmopolitanism as a normative concept to address new challenges in the interconnected world.

It is important to conceive new normative visions to deal with the fundamental social transformations caused by globalization. However, this is very difficult because radical imagination of new sociopolitical visions often tends to be ignored. As Ghassan Hage argues, we tend to withdraw to the conservative domains of "what is" and "what has been," which are often called the "real world." The "real world," however, is increasingly devoid of the potentiality of "what can be," and "what can be" is often dismissed as "unrealistic" (Hage, 2015: 32). An example of this hegemonic form of thinking is the contemporary social thought around neoliberal ideals. As it is often proclaimed, neoliberalism is considered to have "no alternative." The tendency is to think that we have no choice but to just keep up with or adjust

ourselves to neoliberal globalization, rather than addressing the fundamental problems inherent in an ever-changing society and envisaging new sociopolitical visions. For instance, former Prime Minister of Japan Shinzo Abe made the following claim about neoliberalism, partly due to his adulation of Margaret Thatcher. In 2013, he stated that "I would like you to understand that for Japan at this juncture, to echo the approach of the late Baroness Margaret Thatcher, this is a case of 'TINA'—there is no alternative."[10] Under the mantra of a "strong" Japan, he tried to transform the country to fit what he perceived as the "global standard" and implemented an intense neoliberal reform at the expense of minorities and social welfare, which he considered "realistic" and "the only way."

Masao Maruyama, a Japanese political scientist, identifies three pitfalls of realism (Maruyama, 2010 [1952]). First, although reality is always remade, the plastic nature of reality is always ignored. Reality is likely to be conceived as given, namely a fait accompli. Thus, being realistic means referring to a fait accompli. Second, reality is multidimensional. However, the complex formation of reality is ignored, and only its unitary nature is emphasized. Third, the dominant power is considered "realistic," while the opposition is likely to be labeled as "unrealistic" and "ideological." Hage similarly refers to "mono-realism": "the idea that there is one, and only one, reality that our thought is, or can be, connected to" (Hage, 2015: 8). What we commonly call "reality" is merely a dominant reality among other realities.[11] There is a tendency to stumble into pitfalls, cling to "mono-realism," and lose utopian visions for a better world. What is necessary is an alternative realism that can undermine "mono-realism" and offer utopian imagination for other realities.

Cosmopolitanism can be considered an alternative realism or a form of utopian realism.[12] This "utopian" realism is a "relative utopia" in Karl Mannheim's sense. First, Mannheim (1929) distinguishes between "ideology" and "utopia"; ideology is based on the past,

whereas utopia is based on the future. While ideology tends to legitimize the present reality based on what has happened in the past, utopia criticizes the present reality from the perspective of the future or outside of the present reality and tries to transform it. Mannheim divides utopia into "absolute utopia" and "relative utopia." While "absolute utopia" belongs to a different ontological order, "relative utopia" has the potential to transform an old reality into a new one (Mannheim, 1929; Sawai, 2004). Cosmopolitanism is not detached from reality; instead, it tries to shed light on other multiple realities that are hidden by ideology, so that it can transform the worldview into a more inclusive and open one.

Conceiving cosmopolitanism in the global age could be utopian as well as realistic. Cosmopolitanism may not be a solution per se, but research on cosmopolitanism can encourage utopian imagination and provide many suggestions for how we can live together better. As James Brassett claims, cosmopolitanism represents an excellent "hook" for developing ethical approaches to globalization (Brassett, 2010: 117). Cosmopolitanism is just one attempt among many others in making globalization more equal and ethical, so that examinations of cosmopolitanism may lead to more suitable renderings of cosmopolitanism (Brassett, 2010: 99).

6. Conclusion

First, I described the characteristics of new cosmopolitanism: (1) two critiques—the dichotomy between the local and the cosmopolitan and Eurocentrism, (2) rootedness, and (3) openness. I then highlighted that cosmopolitanism has become nothing more than a descriptive concept that signifies cultural mixture or multicultural cohabitation. I also asserted that it has lost its normativity. However, as seen from the pitfall of Beck's rhetoric, descriptive cosmopolitanism hardly has the theoretical potential to criticize exiting realities of injustice, discrimination, and inequality, and it could potentially result in strengthening the status quo.

Since cosmopolitanism was revived approximately 20 years ago, there has been a backlash to globalization, which involves renationalization and deglobalization, and it has become difficult to consider cosmopolitanism. However, it is undeniable that we live in an intercultural reality; we are mutually connected, interdependent, and interrelated. We also cannot escape the question of how we can live together better. It is impossible to live without connecting to global others in contemporary society. Therefore, we are tasked with determining how to relate to others and live together with differences. To do so, cosmopolitanism can be a useful theoretical apparatus. Although cosmopolitanism is not a solution per se, cosmopolitanism offers us many clues for conceiving the normative in contemporary society.

Being reflexive about the historical and geographical context and the imperialistic aspects of cosmopolitanism has been fraught with challenges. However, we should not abandon discussions on cosmopolitan visions, norms, and ethics. Calhoun (2003: 546) confirms this very point:

> We have the option of being self-critical as we do, but not of entirely abandoning cosmopolitanism because we cannot act effectively without it. Nor should we want to abandon it, since it enshrines many important ideas like the equal worth of all human beings and—at least potentially—the value of cultural and social diversity.

We should desire to be self-critical, carefully scrutinize cosmopolitanism, and develop the theoretical potential for living together better.

References

Appiah KA (1996) Cosmopolitan patriots. In: Nussbaum M and Cohen J (eds) *For Love of Country*. Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 21–29.

Appiah KA (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Archibugi D (1998) Principles of cosmopolitan democracy. In: Archibugi D, Held D and Köhler M (eds) *Re-imagining Political Community*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 198–230.

Archibugi D (ed.) (2003) *Debating Cosmopolitics*. London: Verso.

Beck U (1998) Cosmopolitan manifesto. *New Statesman* 127(496): 28–30.

Beck U (2002) The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(1–2): 17–44.

Beck U (2005) *Power in the Global Age: A New Global Political Economy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Beck U (2006) *The Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Beck U (2010) Remapping social inequalities in an age of climate change: for a cosmopolitan renewal of sociology. *Global Networks* 10(2): 165–81.

Beck U (2011) We do not live in an age of cosmopolitanism but in an age of cosmopolitisation: the 'global other' is in our midst. *Irish Journal of Sociology* 19(1): 16–34.

Beck U (2012) Redefining the sociological project: the cosmopolitan challenge. *Sociology* 46(1): 7–12.

Beck U (2015) Emancipatory catastrophism: what does it mean to climate change and risk society? *Current Sociology* 63(1): 75–88.

Beck U (2016) *The Metamorphosis of the World: How Climate Change is Transforming Our Concept of the World.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck U and Grande E (2010) Varieties of second modernity: the cosmopolitan turn in social and

political theory and research. *British Journal of Sociology* 61(3): 409–43.

Beck U and Sznaider N (2006) A literature on cosmopolitanism: an overview. *British Journal of Sociology* 57(1): 153–64.

Beitz C (1994) Cosmopolitan liberalism and the states system. In: Brown C (ed.) *Political Restructuring in Europe: Ethical Perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 119–32.

Bhabha HK (1996) Unsatisfied: notes on vernacular cosmopolitanism. In: García-Moreno L and Pfeiffer PC (eds) *Text and Nation*. London: Camden House, pp. 191–207.

Bhabha, H. K. (2004) The Location of Culture. London: Routledge.

Bhambra GK (2011) Cosmopolitanism and postcolonial critique. In: Rovisco M and Nowicka M (eds) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Cosmopolitanism*. Farnham: Routeledge, pp. 313–28.

Bhambra GK (2016) Whither Europe? *Interventions* 18(2): 187–202.

Brassett, J (2010) *Cosmopolitanism and Global Financial Reform: A Pragmatic Approach to the Tobin Tax*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Calhoun C (2002) The class consciousness of frequent travelers: toward a critique of actually existing cosmopolitanism. *South Atlantic Quarterly* 101(4): 869–97.

Cheah P and Robbins B (eds) (1998) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Cheah P (2006) Cosmopolitanism. *Theory, Culture & Society* 23 (2-3): 486–96.

Delanty G (2006) The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1): 25–47.

Delanty G (2009) *Cosmopolitan Imagination*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Delanty G (ed) (2012) *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies*. London; Routledge.

Eckersley R (2007) From cosmopolitan nationalism to cosmopolitan democracy. *Review of International Studies* 33(4): 675–92.

Fine R (2007) *Cosmopolitanism*. Florence: Routledge.

Fine R and Cohen R (2002) Four cosmopolitan moments. In: Vertovec S and Cohen R (eds) *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 137–62.

Giddens A (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gilroy P (2010) Planetarity and cosmopolitics. *British Journal of Sociology* 61(3): 620–26.

Hage G. (2015) *Alter-Politics: Critical Anthropology and the Radical Imagination*. Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press.

Harvey D (2009) *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Held D (1997) Cosmopolitan democracy and the global order: a new agenda. In: Bohman J and Lutz-Bachmann M (eds) *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 235-51.

Held D (2010) *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and Realities*. Oxford: Polity Press.

Holton R (2009) *Cosmopolitanisms: New Thinking and New Directions*. New York: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Jazeel T (2011) Spatializing difference beyond cosmopolitanism: rethinking planetary futures. *Theory, Culture & Society* 28(5): 75–97.

Kaldor M (1996) Cosmopolitanism versus nationalism: the new divide. In: Caplan R and Feffer J (eds) *Europe's New Nationalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 42–58.

Kant I (1983[1795]) *Perpetual Peace and Other Essays*. Indianapolis; Cambridge: Hackett

Publishing Company.

Kendall G, Woodward I and Skrbiš Z (2009) *The Sociology of Cosmopolitanism: Globalization, Identity, Culture and Government*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Krossa AS and Robertson R (eds) (2012) *European Cosmopolitanism in Question*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kymlicka W and Walker K (2012) *Rooted Cosmopolitanism: Canada and the World*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Lemert C, Elliott A, Chaffee D and Hsu E (eds) (2010) *Globalization: A Reader*. London: Routledge.

Mannheim K (1929) *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd.

Maruyama M (2010) *Maruyama Masao Serekushon* [A Selection of Maruyama Masao]. Tokyo: Heibonsha.

Mendieta E (2009) From imperial to dialogical cosmopolitanism? *Ethics & Global Politics* 2(3): 241–58.

Nussbaum MC (1996) Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In: Nussbaum MC and Cohen J (eds) *For Love of Country*. Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 3–20.

Pollock S (1998) The cosmopolitan vernacular. *Journal of Asian Studies* 57(1): 6–37.

Pollock S, Bhabha HK, Breckenridge CA and Chakrabarty D (2000) Cosmopolitanisms. *Public Culture*, 12(3): 577-89.

Rumford C (2008) *Cosmopolitan Spaces: Europe, Globalization, Theory*. London: Routledge.

Sawai A (2004*) Kaaru Manhaimu: Jidai wo Handan Suru Boumeisha* [Karl Mannheim: An Exile to Diagnose the Age]. Tokyo: Tōsindō.

Skrbis Z and Woodward I (2007) The ambivalence of ordinary cosmopolitanism: investing the

limits of cosmopolitan openness. *The Sociological Review* 55(4): 730–47.

Spencer R (2011) *Cosmopolitan Criticism and Postcolonial Literature*. Houndmills, U.K.; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Vertovec S and Cohen R (eds) (2002) *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Viveiros de Castro E (2014) *Cannibal Metaphysics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Werbner P (1999) Global pathways: working class cosmopolitans and the creation of transnational ethnic worlds. *Social Anthropology* 7(1): 17–35.

Ypi LL (2008) Statist cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Political Philosophy* 16(1): 48–71.

---

[1] This paper is based on the author's PhD thesis, which is not yet published.

[2] Holton lists the typologies of cosmopolitanism; see Holton (2009: 21–219). Beck and Sznaider also makes an overview of cosmopolitanism studies; see Beck and Sznaider (2006).

[3] These two characteristics are not necessarily found in every cosmopolitanism study. However, these two aspects have renewed the idea of cosmopolitanism and constitute the "new" of new cosmopolitanism.

[4] Notably, Eighteenth-century cosmopolitanism did not necessarily negate local attachments and belongings. Cheah points out the existence of D'Alembert's entry on "cosmopolitan" in the eighteenth-century *Encyclopedia* and notes that his reference to universality in cosmopolitanism does not necessarily imply rootlessness or the elimination of the local. Cosmopolitanism entails a universal circle of belonging that involves the transcendence of the particularistic and blindly given ties of kinship and country (Cheah, 2006: 476; Kendall et al., 2009: 37). Although this

cosmopolitanism may allow people to form an attachment and sense of belonging to their immediate communities and for compatibility between the local and the cosmopolitan, this view is apparently based on the dichotomy. This "Enlightenment cosmopolitanism" still considers the local to be something that should be transcended, which differs from new cosmopolitanism. New cosmopolitanism attempts to illuminate the new reality in which the local per se has become increasingly hybrid and pluralistic.

[5] For instance, a well-known cosmopolitan, Immanuel Kant's ideas on cosmopolitanism have been criticized for their sexist, racist, and Eurocentric assumptions (Jazeel, 2011; Harvey, 2009; Mendieta, 2009). Mendieta warned that "we replicate the colonial and imperial implication of Kant's universalistic cosmopolitanism if we remain blind to its geographical and anthropological grounding" (Mendieta, 2009: 243).

[6] "Cosmopolitan," on the one hand, refers affirmatively to international elites, such as diplomats and staff working at the United Nations. On the other hand, it has a derogatory meaning, referring to those who have lost or neglected their home or to people without patriotism. For instance, historically speaking, an anti-Semitic phrase was "cosmopolitan Jews." Jewish people were often referred to negatively as "cosmopolitan" because the Nazis regard them as rootless, nationless and without loyalty to anything except some dark conspiracy of their own (Fine and Cohen, 2002: 146). In the era of globalization, the motif of the cosmopolitan as privileged, globally mobile, and capital-laden is the dominant image in cosmopolitan studies (Skrbis and Woodward, 2007: 731). Craig Calhoun calls elitist cosmopolitanism in the globalized era "class consciousness of frequent fliers," meaning "an ethical orientation for those privileged to inhabit the frequent-flyer lounges" (Calhoun, 2002: 893).

[7] One example of the both/and principle is the cosmopolitan patriot. Beck states that cosmopolitanism and nationalism are compatible. In addition to Beck, others have attempted to

make cosmopolitanism and nationalism compatible, such as cosmopolitan nationalism or national cosmopolitanism (Beck, 2006; Eckersley, 2007; Ypi, 2008).

[8] Cosmopolitanization is sometimes spelt as cosmopoliticization (Beck, 2010) and cosmopolitization (Beck, 2011). Cosmoplitanization, cosmopoliticization and cosmopolitization are interchangeable; they convey almost identical meanings. In this paper, "cosmopolitanization" is used because this is most commonly used.

[9] It should be noted that Beck's nomenclature shifted around 2010 from "cosmopolitanization" to "cosmopolitization" with the publication of an article titled, "We do not live in an age of cosmopolitanism but in an age of cosmopolitization." With this shift, he started to emphasize the empirical aspects of cosmopolitan theory with hitherto unseen vigor, mainly using cosmopolitization and sometimes employing a similar concept of "metamorphosis" (Beck, 2015, 2016). By emphasizing the borderlessness of cosmopolitan risk and cosmopolitization, Beck became increasingly reluctant to discuss cosmopolitanism in a normative sense and tended to stress cosmopolitanization as a descriptive concept.

[10] Economic Policy Speech by Prime Minister of Japan Abe Shinzo in London on June 19 of 2013 Available at:

https://japan.kantei.go.jp/96_abe/statement/201306/19guildhall_e.html(accessed 4 February 2021).

[11] Recent anthropological thought, such as the multi-naturalism of Viveiros de Castro, invites us to think of ourselves as always inhabiting a multiplicity of intersecting spatialities and realities (Hage, 2015; Viveiros de Castro, 2014).

[12] Likewise, Anthony Giddens argues that utopian realism is necessary; we must balance utopian ideals with realism (Giddens, 1990: 152).