INTRODUCTION

Making sense of cosmopolitanism

*Magdalena Nowicka and Maria Rovisco*

Investigations of actually-existing cosmopolitanisms (Robbins 1998) and of cosmopolitanism as a research method to study the social beyond the national are now at the heart of the research agenda of the social sciences. This renewed scholarly interest on the notion cosmopolitanism draws attention to changes in the social world, from the expansion of global markets, transnational networks, and new patterns of collective attachment, to the expansion of new forms of global governance. A great deal of research has identified and described migrants and members of transnational communities as ‘cosmopolitans’. However, it is often unclear how this condition involves a genuinely felt moral commitment to the world. Other research has focused on cosmopolitanism as an ethico-political project that underpins new institutional and political arrangements at a worldwide scale. These are visible, for example, in the way human rights conventions turn into international laws, and in the implementation of international criminal tribunals to stop humanitarian crises and wars against humanity. Yet, in this research agenda, individuals are often deemed only significant as abstract subjects of an emerging cosmopolitan world order and there is little sense of the role that ordinary individuals and social groups play in the making of this new cosmopolitan order (see Nash 2006).
Overall, and despite a considerable body of research that has already emerged from within a variety of disciplines, cosmopolitanism remains largely a prescriptive concept concerning the development of a new world order or a descriptive concept that enables one to label and distinguish between cosmopolitans and non-cosmopolitans (Hannerz 1992; Roudometof 2005, 116). The problem of treating cosmopolitanism purely as a social category to describe and analyze particular types of groups is that the term is routinely used to refer to some kind of identity that singles out ‘cosmopolitans’ in opposition to ‘locals’ or ‘nationals’ (see Jones 2007: 74-75). But how are cosmopolitan ideas, narratives and values, which are institutionally-embedded, shaping everyday life experiences and practices? How are ordinary individuals and groups making sense of their identities and social encounters in ways that can be said ‘cosmopolitan’?

The aim of this book is to illustrate some of the ways in which cosmopolitanism can be used as an analytical tool to explain certain identity outlooks and ethico-political practices that are discernible in a variety of social and institutional settings. This collection of essays focuses on empirically grounded research and engages current debates and new research findings on a variety of cosmopolitan practices, meanings, ideas and narratives. In terms of structure, the chapters have been grouped into three parts – Mobilites, Memories and Tensions - each part reflecting a major concentration of study on cosmopolitanism from a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches.

The purpose of this Introduction is to introduce the reader to the themes of this collection of essays, especially in light of the major trends and issues of concern to scholars researching the topic of cosmopolitanism. While the first part sheds light on the analytical framework and theoretical interventions that underpin this volume, the second part sets out
the organizing themes of the book and illustrates some new directions in the research agenda.

**Cosmopolitanism as practice and moral ideal**

*Cosmopolitanism in Practice* is concerned with cosmopolitanism at two analytical levels: (1) cosmopolitanism as a practice which is apparent in things that people do and say to positively engage with ‘the oneness of the world’ and the oneness of the world; (2) cosmopolitanism as a moral ideal that emphasises both tolerance towards difference and the possibility of a more just world order.

As a moral ideal, cosmopolitanism can be traced back to the thinking of the ancient Cynics and the Stoics, re-appearing, more forcefully, in various forms, within Enlightenment universalism (cf. Stade 2008; see also Fine and Boone 2007). In Enlightenment thinking, the notion refers to a normative ideal which purports that every singular human being is worthy of equal moral concern and ought to have an allegiance to the community of humankind. Kant (1991), for instance, defends that all human beings are equipped with the ability to discern what is morally demanded from them and envisions a loose confederation of nations obedient to cosmopolitan law. In the current research agenda, the idea of cosmopolitanism is more commonly tied to claims concerning the recognition of difference or the rise of new supranational arrangements and social movements founded on the human rights regime.

It is important to stress that cosmopolitanism – understood as a moral ideal – and cosmopolitanism – as enacted in the outlooks and practices of ‘ordinary’ individuals and groups – are dimensions of cosmopolitanism which, although analytically distinct, are intrinsically related at the level of empirical reality. In this sense, and in some particular
contexts more than others, concrete individuals embrace and mobilize – with different
degrees of reflexivity – certain cosmopolitan values and ideas which allow them to develop
a cosmopolitan imagination and a moral standpoint. Where in some social settings
cosmopolitan sensibilities remain latent, in other contexts, they are more actively and
consciously displayed by people. These are visible in the ways people manage their sense
of living in ‘one world’ and with ‘others’, while being also articulated in the collective
actions and ‘reflexive capabilities’ (Kloger 2005) of the members of those transnational
networks of social movements who struggle against global injustices through various forms
of ethico-political practice (Vandenberghhe 2006; Kurasawa 2007).

All in all, cosmopolitan sensibilities, orientations and ethico-political outlooks
presuppose an ontological dimension (Rapport and Stade 2007) and can be readily captured
in personal narratives. It is against this background that this book seeks to address some of
the links between cosmopolitanism as moral ideal, institutionalized forms of
cosmopolitanism, and cosmopolitan identity outlooks, which remain largely unelaborated
in the literature (cf. Cheah 2006, 492). Theoretically, the contributions to this volume are
particularly concerned (although not exclusively) with cosmopolitanism as grounded
category (Škrbiš et al. 2004) – as something that people do and is ‘in the making’ – rather
than an abstract idea (cf. Pollock 2000, 593). Hence, cosmopolitanism can be used as an
analytical tool to explain a particular mode of self-transformation that has been observable
in everyday social and political life for a long time (cf. Rumford 2005: 4).

**Cosmopolitan Perspectives**

It is useful to briefly sketch the main intellectual traditions of thinking and theorizing
cosmopolitanism for the purpose of giving the reader a better sense of how this collection
of essays suggests ways of widening the discussion. It is under the umbrella of three perspectives - moral cosmopolitanism, political cosmopolitanism and cultural cosmopolitanism (see also Kleingeld 1999; Delanty 2006) - that distinct theoretical orientations and empirical analyses have developed in disciplines as diverse as international relations, sociology, anthropology, political science and cultural studies.

Moral cosmopolitanism is the philosophical perspective that posits that all human beings ought to be morally committed to an essential humanity above and beyond the reality of one’s particularistic attachments (such as nationality, kinship, religion) (see Nussbaum 1996; Turner 2002). As a moral standpoint, cosmopolitanism does not necessarily entail a duty to reshape the international political world order. Yet it does involve political duties, insofar as morality provides guidelines for one’s actions in one’s capacity as a citizen. This cosmopolitan ethic does not prescribe a set of readily applicable principles but it requires everyone to judge each situation in context and to act reflexively (Kleingeld 1999, 516). Moral cosmopolitanism has shaped and informed cultural and political cosmopolitanism approaches. In positing the moral equality of all human beings and all cultures, it sets the ground for the view of cosmopolitanism as a competence based on tolerance and openness towards ‘other’ cultures and value-systems, a perspective that is commonly found among the advocates of cultural cosmopolitanism. In a different vein, moral cosmopolitanism also involves a strong notion of universal morality that is strongly implicated in calls for a cosmopolitan world order.

While rejecting both cultural relativism and ethnocentrism, cultural cosmopolitanism approaches are concerned with the problem of the recognition of difference and the respect for the variety of cultures (Kleingeld 1999, 517). A great deal of
theorising - informed by notions such as ‘vernacular cosmopolitanism’ (Bhabha 1996; Nava, 2007), ‘rooted cosmopolitanism’ (Appiah 1998, 2006; Beck 2003), and ‘actually-existing cosmopolitanism as a reality of multiple attachments’ (Robbins 1998) - attempts to transcend the tension between universalism and particularism. The underlying question here is, as Werbner (2006, 496) puts it, ‘whether there can be an enlightened normative cosmopolitanism which is not rooted […] in patriotic and culturally committed loyalties and understandings’. Some authors have shown how past and present cosmopolitanisms shape distinct worldviews and identities in a variety of times and places (Mignolo 2000; Pollock 2000). Falzon (Chapter 2, this volume), for example, suggests, in a case study of the Sindhi diaspora, that spatial unboundedness per se does not make the cosmopolitan grade and that actually-existing cosmopolitanisms are always located within some historical and geographical framework.

Other scholarship stresses the need to overcome the gendered, class and ethnocentric biases that blight the literature. For example, the figure of the cosmopolitan as a typically privileged, male and upper class citizen (Kanter 1995; Calhoun 2002; Hannerz 2004; Sklair 2000) has been challenged by research that points towards the existence of cosmopolitan attitudes among ordinary and working-class groups (Werbner 1999; Lamont and Aksartova 2002; Sassen 2006) and focus on the vernacular, emotional, and everyday expressions of cosmopolitanism (Nava 2002, 2007).

Other authors (Pollock et al. 2000) offer a critical reading of triumphalist and neoliberal notions of cosmopolitical coexistence. It is in this vein that Cheah (2006) criticizes Habermas’s (2001) vision of a cosmopolitan global public sphere which remains oblivious of the neoliberal logic of global capitalism, especially, with regards to the
imbalance in power relations created by an allegedly cosmopolitan North that is sustained by global exploitation of a postcolonial South in structural conditions of deep inequality. There is here a call for ‘cosmopolitanism from below’ which is not utopian, elitist or Western-centred and that has political implications of its own (Werbner 1999; Bhabha 1996; Nava 2007).

Overall, anthropologists and sociologists have been primarily concerned with the less reflexive aspects of cosmopolitanism which are apparent in mundane practices and lifestyle options on the micro-scale of daily interactions. In contrast, other authors, particularly political scientists and IR scholars writing within the tradition of political cosmopolitanism, understand cosmopolitanism as an ethico-political ideal that seeks to respond to the limitations of the nation-state unit in addressing global challenges and problems. In this context, cosmopolitanism emerges a political project that fosters new forms of supranational and transnational governance (e.g. NGOs, the human rights regime) as well as the emergence of a robust global civil society (see e.g. Held 1995, 1999; Archibugi et al. 1998; Kaldor 2002; Rumford 2007).

Some advocates of political cosmopolitanism posit the development of a global legal order which can be seen as the institutional embodiment of cosmopolitan values of equality, solidarity and human rights, as well as the expression of a universal political consensus (Habermas 2001). This perspective is inspired by the cosmopolitan vision of Kant, which can be found in his writings on perpetual peace, and remains an authoritative approach within political cosmopolitanism. In Kant’s view, cosmopolitan law regulates not only the relation between states, but also the interaction between state and individuals. The latter have the right to attempt to establish relations with other states and their citizens, but
not the right to enter or settle in a foreign territory (cf. Kleingeld 1999, 513). Kant conceives the global federation of republic states as a form of political organization based on cosmopolitan right (\textit{ius cosmopoliticum}), which is negatively defined as the right of ‘hospitality’, i.e., the right of a stranger not to be treated with hostility (Kant 1991). This cosmopolitan vision still holds sway in contemporary arguments suggesting that individuals and states ought to be morally and legally bound to international law agreements (Beck 2002). Finally, other authors point towards the development of a cosmopolitan citizenship that ought to be accompanied by an ethical change underpinning ways in which concrete citizens of different national states live and act towards ‘others’ regardless of national boundaries and in transnational contexts (Benhabib 2002, 183). Nash (2006), for example, suggests that the international human rights system can only set the ground for the development of a more cosmopolitan world order if ordinary people are able to identify themselves with the values that constitute this system.

It is important to note that the essays included in this volume are not representative of traditional ‘schools of thought’ (namely, the ‘moral’, the ‘cultural’ and the ‘political’). While many contributors deal with themes and issues that are typically developed and encountered in cultural cosmopolitanism approaches, in practice, we find that some contributions deal with issues of concern to more than one of the perspectives above outlined.

Overcoming disciplinary divisions, recent approaches to cosmopolitanism underpin, in a more forceful fashion, the claim that the social sciences need to break with the research lens that takes the national frame (collectives and systems of classification) as the given unity of analysis (Martins 1974, Chernilo 2006; Beck 2002, 2004; Beck and Sznaider
The advocates of the so-called ‘cosmopolitan turn’ emphasise the limitations of the national \textit{imaginaire} (Robins 2006, 19) and reject the assumption that human groups live in closed and self-contained spaces, and that cultures ‘are clearly delineated as identifiable entities that coexist, while maintaining firm boundaries’ (Benhabib 2002, 8). More importantly, there is here a call for an epistemological turn that occurs ‘within an interpretative framework in which […] “methodological cosmopolitanism” replaces the nationally centred ontology and imagination dominating thought and action’ (Beck 2004, 132). This is predicated on a new ‘grammar’ that is enacted in actual challenges to boundaries – between internal and external, local and global, us and them – which become more complex, pluralized and ambivalent as we enter the twentieth-first century. This new ‘grammar’ equips the social sciences with the capability to grasp the ‘real-world of cosmopolitanisation’ (Beck 2004, 133). This new research lens is also concerned with aspects of a cosmopolitan imagination that is articulated in cultural models of world openness that enable novel understandings and explanations of the local/global nexus (Delanty 2006).

In its scope and aims, the present volume is indebted to this emerging cosmopolitan research agenda and its methodological presuppositions, which lay the ground for understanding cosmopolitanism as an analytical tool to study a particular mode of self-transformation.

\textbf{Cosmopolitanism as a Mode of Self-Transformation}

This volume involves, above all, an attempt to move beyond the tendency to purely identify and describe a social category of cosmopolitans. The contributions to this volume illustrate how cosmopolitanism can be seen as a \textit{mode of self-transformation}, which occurs when
individuals and groups engage in concrete struggles to protect a common humanity and become more reflexive about their experiences of otherness. This capability enables people to reflexively rework the boundaries between self and other, us and them (cf. Lamont and Aksartova 2002), and, thus, come closer to the reality of others and the world taken as a whole in fields often loaded with tensions and emotions. Self-transformation implies a sense of continuous self-scrutiny both with regards to the ways one positively engages the otherness of other cultures and people, and to the ways one is committed to the building of a more just world in conditions of uneven globalization. A key assumption here is that people can actually become more cosmopolitan in ways that are both reflexive and emotional.

Furthermore, the fact that individuals may at times seemingly act in a non-cosmopolitan fashion or display non-cosmopolitan feelings does not necessarily mean that people are then becoming less cosmopolitan. There is evidence in the contributions to this volume that cosmopolitanism as a set of practices and identity outlooks is not to be seen as predicated on the transcendence of the particularistic and parochial ties, which are often associated to non-cosmopolitan feelings and dispositions. While this stance may render irrelevant the antinomies between universalism and particularism, cosmopolitanism and nationalism, one should not lose sight of the limits of the cosmopolitan imagination, a consideration that is sometimes overlooked in the literature. Jansen (Chapter 4, this volume), for example, shows that the grammar of difference in post-Yugoslav antinationalism, which is carried on by a group of self-professed urbanites, attempts to resist nationalist closure by deploying cosmopolitan openness in a way that implies closure to some types of difference. Cosmopolitanism - as expression of both an attachment to ‘the
World’ and a characteristic of the civilised urban self – works here as a rhetorical resource in these struggles to value certain forms of belonging over others.

Cosmopolitan identity outlooks and practices that are observable in real life situations have to be seen in connection with the way cosmopolitan norms and values become increasingly institutionalized in the contemporary world. Formal organizations, such as the United Nations, have included cosmopolitan values in their mission, whereas transnational non-governmental organizations, grassroots social movements and informal networks of NGOs are also appropriating cosmopolitan values and ideas for accomplishing their causes and agendas. These are all forms of an institutional cosmopolitanism that is embedded in various formal rules, laws and organizational structures.

It is against this backdrop that Cosmopolitanism in Practice seeks to explore the connection, rather than the tension, between institutional cosmopolitanism and forms of ‘actually-existing’ cosmopolitanism. It does so by acknowledging that, on the one hand, there are cosmopolitan ideas already ingrained in formal structures, imaginaries and ethico-political projects and, on the other, that individuals deploy – with different degrees of consciousness and in a variety of contexts – a set of cosmopolitan practices and orientations. The contributors to this volume take up cosmopolitan self-transformations in terms of people’s ‘real life’ struggles to bridge boundaries between self and other or to profess an allegiance to humankind, and do so with different analytical and empirical focuses. While some contributors highlight individual interpretation to explore cosmopolitanism as a mode of self-transformation (Chapters 1 and 2), other authors pay special attention to the cosmopolitan imaginaries that shape and inform cosmopolitan
identity outlooks (Chapters 4, 5, 6 and 8) or the situational contexts and social structures that both enable and constrain cosmopolitan self-transformations (Chapters 3, 7, 9 and 10).

**Mobilities**

In this part, the contributors consider how patterns of mobility and interconnectivity shape the cosmopolitan identities of particular groups. Some authors have focused on networks, patterns of consumption, and complex flows and mobilities of people, capital, technologies, and cultural forms to explain and theorise cosmopolitanism (Urry 2002, 2003; Szerzynski and Urry 2002; Thompson and Tambyah 1999; Molz 2006). Inspired by globalization theory (see especially Robertson 1995; Appadurai 1996; Hannerz 1996), other scholarship ties cosmopolitanism to processes of transnational contact by looking at migrants, exiles and refugees. Examining issues of class location, ethnicity and subjectivity, this research has theorised the cosmopolitanism of working class labour migrants (Werbner 1999; Kofman 2005) and the emergence of a cosmopolitan citizenship in transnational contexts (Ong 1998). This is a major area of interest which has generated a good deal of scholarship in sociology and anthropology. The essays presented in this part take up this agenda to show how active geographical mobility might enable as well as constrain the experience of cultural engagement with ‘others’ and ‘the world’. Cosmopolitanism is often seen as a characteristic of the global elites insofar it is them who enjoy less financial barriers to frequent travel (see e.g. Calhoun 2002).

Yet, as the contributions to this part suggest, the unobstructed movement of people across national borders is not per se always consequential in terms of fostering cosmopolitan self-transformations. The fact that some mobile people are being more exposed and aware of ‘other’ cultures and value-systems does not necessarily mean that the
conditions for positive interaction and engagement with others are created *a priori*. We might also be aware of the existence of ‘others’ and yet find ourselves in a situation when we are unwilling to interact with ‘them’. The research agenda is thus challenged by the need to understand to which extent wide exposure to the ‘Other’ *always* encourages more cosmopolitan openness and dialogue with other cultures and realities.

Magdalena Nowicka and Ramin Kaweh address this question by focusing on cosmopolitanism as a mode of personal interaction with culturally different ‘others’ in alien local contexts. By focusing on an instance of cosmopolitanism among highly mobile professionals of an international organization (the United Nations), they go on to show that cosmopolitanism requires a constant effort to overcome one’s emotional distance towards ‘others’ despite the reality of their bodily co-presence. Arguing that the institutional context of the UN enhances the cosmopolitan self-identification of individuals who describe themselves as citizens of the world, the chapter contrasts narratives of world-oppeness with the reality of everyday practices of UN professionals in unfamiliar sites, and demonstrates how moments and expressions of openness alternate with experiences of closure towards ‘others’.

In a similar vein, Paul Kennedy examines the different personal quests that propelled a group of around sixty continental Europeans from fourteen countries to ultimately settle in Manchester, and traces their ‘cosmopolitan careers’ by exploring the complex relationships and personal networks they develop with other non-British nationals and with the ‘locals’. He goes on to show that, despite the rich cultural resources that skilled middle class migrants bring with them, they also experience several difficulties in gaining entry to local social networks and that many gravitate towards other foreigners. He argues that it is
through the incidence of encounters with both foreigners and locals that these continental Europeans forge their paths into local society and, ultimately, become more cosmopolitan as they attain greater levels of self-understanding, personal autonomy, and openness to aspects of the wider world.

Whereas Nowicka and Kaweh’s and Kennedy’s contributions stress the personal networks and life trajectories of a particular category of highly mobile people to probe their cosmopolitan identity, Mark-Anthony Falzon explores, from an ethnographic lens, the dynamics of the social processes that make the cosmopolitan grade and argues that there is no necessary contradiction between ethnicity and one’s commitment to ‘world society’. Looking at the case of Sindhis, he shows that belonging to this diasporic Indian group constitutes a powerful and well-trodden path into the cosmopolitan way of engaging with the world – even if mitigated by factors such as caste, resources, location, occupation, and level of education. He probes the essentially paradoxical set-up in which a particular group that is known by its mobility and defines itself on the basis of kinship and locality produces a particular type of cosmopolitanism with far-reaching economic and social consequences.

Overall, the three essays included in this part suggest that cosmopolitanism is better seen as a form of imagination – that one can exert and develop in certain transnational contexts - rather than an essential quality of mobile people.

Memories

The contributions to this part focus on the changing meanings of cosmopolitanism, especially with regards to the consideration that cosmopolitan self-transformations are tied to historically-specific cosmopolitan imaginaries and frames of memory. Cosmopolitan approaches often link the condition of globalization to postnational phenomena and the
reality of an emerging cosmopolitan age. This is consistent with the fact that there has been in the literature a great deal of emphasis on cosmopolitanism as a condition of the ‘present’ that assigns meanings to a ‘past’ (understood as less cosmopolitan) and to a ‘future’ (expected to be even more cosmopolitan) (see Fine 2003; see also Jansen, Chapter 4, this volume). With the speed-up of new patterns of travel, tourism, and communication via the electronic media, there have been important changes in the ways in which more and more people are able to come close to the reality of other cultures in a variety of world sites. But while there is ground to argue that the current stage of globalization – in its economic, cultural and technological dimensions – facilitates, in an unprecedented fashion, the rise of a banal and latent cosmopolitanism (Beck 2004, 134), a sense of the historical grounding of present and past cosmopolitanisms is often sidelined in the literature. As Pollock et al. (2000, 584) insightfully noted ‘cosmopolitanism must give way to the plurality of modes and histories – not necessarily shared in degree or in concept regionally, nationally, or internationally - that comprise cosmopolitan practice and history’. In fact, while individuals can become more cosmopolitan in distinct world sites in rather banal ways (synchronic time), cosmopolitan identities, practices and ethico-political outlooks of various kinds are also tied to historically-rooted memories and imaginaries (diachronic time).

The essays presented in this section are primarily concerned with ways in which the cosmopolitan imagination functions as a cultural resource that allows one to trace shifts in the meanings of cosmopolitanism with regards to historically specific socio-cultural contexts. Issues related to how concrete individuals and groups experience cosmopolitan self-transformations that are observable in concrete practices and outlooks, and issues related to the links between cosmopolitanism and spatial unboundedness, which were all at
the heart of the previous part I, are given somewhat less attention in this part. The focus is here placed on the temporal dimension and the discursive frames of actual cosmopolitan memories.

Stef Jansen’s chapter draws on long-term ethnographic fieldwork in the post-war period in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia to look at non-dominant memories of home amongst a specific group of urbanite activists and other post-Yugoslav refugees. He argues that these are people who recall they had lived, until very recently, lives that they may now sometimes describe as ‘cosmopolitan’, but they feel they have been robbed of them in the context of the post-Yugoslav conflicts of the 1990s. He shows that the ethico-political practices and identities of these activists rely heavily on strategies of continuity with a remembered ‘normal’ cosmopolitan past, and that the grammar of difference of post-Yugoslav antinationalism attempted to resist nationalist closure by insisting on the previously open nature of national boundaries in a messy everyday life context, where national loyalties coexisted along urban-centred collective self-understandings.

Rob Kroes’ contribution on cosmopolitan engagements of Europe through the lens of American mass culture shares some of the concerns of Jansen’s paper, arguing that certain discursive frames and forms of representation are tied to historically-specific cosmopolitan imaginaries. Yet, while Jansen’s uses an ethnographic approach to suggest that the grammar of antinationalism underpins the imagination of a cosmopolitan past among post-Yugoslav refugees, Kroes underlines, through a historical and semiotic reading, how both a European tradition of high-minded cosmopolitanism and the vernacular memory of cosmopolitan ‘Europes’ have cut across lasting ethnic and national divides, but are yet unable to provide an overarching imagery of Europe that is potentially
meaningful for all in the context of a wider EU. Looking at American iconography in public space, Kroes shows, more specifically, how American mass culture allows cultural exchanges and conversations across older dividing lines in Europe, while being also used as a subtext in forms of European resistance against global cultural icons. Ultimately, he argues that such cosmopolitan cultural exchanges are visible in a self-conscious and ironic appropriation of American mass culture in popular culture.

The chapter by Ulrich Beck, Daniel Levy and Natan Sznaider makes a rather more radical case for a cosmopolitan memory that is combined with memories manifested in many different places. They argue that the shared memories of the Holocaust provide the foundation for a cosmopolitan memory that is of universal applicability and involves an orientation towards a shared cosmopolitan future. Arguing that this new cosmopolitan memory lends political and moral authority to the human rights regime, the chapter analyses the historical roots of the transition from national to cosmopolitan memory by looking at instances of forgiving and restitution in the context of concrete legal practices. Specifically, the authors develop their argument by presenting two case studies – the Polish struggle for a cosmopolitan memory in the discourse on *Jedwabne* and the German reparation of the 1950s – in which they show how the discourses of guilt and forgiveness are indicative of a new historical awareness detaching itself from the boundaries of the nation-state.

Notably, the contributions to this part illuminate how cosmopolitanism has been, alongside nationalism, a powerful form of collective imagination in the western world.

**Tensions**
The papers presented in this part discuss if and how cosmopolitan ideas and discourses actually foster cosmopolitan outlooks in settings blighted by ethnic, religious or gender tensions. The contributions contained on the previous parts of this collection were more specifically concerned with the role that dimensions of time and space consciousness play in the makeup of cosmopolitan identities or imaginaries. Whilst these remain issues of concern for the contributors to this part, the chapters here presented turn to a more close consideration of how, in the contemporary world, certain cosmopolitan discourses and ideas - which are increasingly articulated in institutional settings - enable specific individuals and groups to bridge differences with ‘others’ (cf. Lamont and Aksartova 2002, 1). They are indicative of a move in the research agenda that shows that cosmopolitan ideas and values are tied to particular worldviews, and investigates whether such ideas and values can actually foster cosmopolitan practices and identities (see Vertovec, Chapter 7, this volume). Cosmopolitanism is here understood in terms of new strategies and ways of coping with problems and challenges concerning the problem of the recognition of difference. In this context, cosmopolitanism proves useful as an analytical tool to deal with the question of tension and conflict in the social and political world, an aspect which is often neglected in the literature (cf. Delanty 2006, 33). If we accept that conflict and strain are intrinsic features of social life (Douglas 1966; Alexander 1992, 302) and not a condition, or a social malaise, that an emerging cosmopolitan world order would completely eradicate, we can see how cosmopolitanism is instantiated in some of the ways individuals and groups overcome social tensions between self and other, us an them.

This section begins with an essay by Steven Vertovec which makes a case for both display and fostering cosmopolitanism in Berlin via a case study of the public station SFB4
Radio Multikulti. With its ethnically diverse personnel and distinctive programming, broadcasted daily in several languages, Radio Multikulti handles a diversity of news topics, debates and world music which appeal to diverse local audiences. Drawing on Nussbaum’s proposal for cosmopolitan education, Vertovec argues that this media experiment actually fosters cosmopolitanism in communicating cosmopolitanism - as a socio-cultural condition - that is reflected in representations of Berlin as a site of multiple cultural entanglements and vibrant ethnic and cultural diversity - and also - as an ideology – that is conveyed by Radio Multikulti’s programming strategies. This programming agenda not only facilitates cosmopolitan orientations and affiliations but also the respect for human rights and anti-racism.

While Vertovec shows how a particular media environment fosters cosmopolitan imagination in the way Radio Multikulti helps its diverse local audiences to bridge racial and ethnic differences, Gillian Youngs’s contribution, by contrast, places the limits of the cosmopolitan imagination at the center of her argument. Departing from a critical reading of Woolf’s *Three Guineas*, she shows, for instance, how masculine cosmopolitan imaginaries entail an abstract notion of the cosmopolitan individual that has prevented women’s voices of participating more fully in the cosmopolitan debate. Youngs argues that at the heart of Woolf’s arguments is a concern about the exclusions and limitations resulting from national masculine traditions of higher education – in particular, the fact that cultural and economic resources have been explicitly diverted away from women to men – and that these exclusions are consequential in terms of investigating the limits and possibilities of a cosmopolitan orientation on education in the so-called Age of the ‘War on Terror’. She draws attention for the critical question, raised in *Three Guineas*, of how and
why has women’s influence on bringing about a more peaceful world across local and national divides has been historically restricted, and demonstrates that Woolf’s critical thinking on education, as a means by which cosmopolitan worldviews that are not shaped by masculine characteristics can bring about social change and self-transformation, is still relevant nowadays.

Like Youngs’s, Kira Kosnick’s contribution is concerned with a particular expression of the limits of the cosmopolitan imagination. In her ethnographic study of migrant artists with a Turkish background who are residents of the city of Berlin she suggests that while young postmigrant artists of second and third generation display cosmopolitan affiliations and sensibilities in their life trajectories, cosmopolitanism is appropriated in the rhetoric of urban cultural policy as an ideology that actually prevents and conflicts with the accomplishment of such actually-existing cosmopolitan affiliations. Kosnick examines the tension between an urban cosmopolitan discourse that seeks to market Berlin as a world-open capital and an urban integrationist discourse aiming at discouraging transnational and diasporic identifications of migrants. She suggests, ultimately, that the localizing drive of these urban policy measures and discourses is subverted by the activities and orientations of artists and people with Turkish background who work in the cultural industries.

Whereas the contributions of Youngs and Kosnick engage the limits of the cosmopolitan imagination by focusing on particular ideological frames, Maria Rovisco’s chapter highlights ways in which the situational context can actually constrain the cosmopolitan imagination of concrete people. By contrasting the accounts of youths who volunteer within the religious networks of the Catholic Church with the accounts of youths
who volunteered within a nonreligious organization, she shows that young Portuguese volunteers, who participate in programs of cooperation and development in Africa, adopt a cosmopolitan ethico-political outlook by drawing on cosmopolitan narratives, worldviews and ideas that are channelled and enforced in the institutional structures of the organizations where they volunteer. She goes on to make a case for a Christian cosmopolitanism that does not necessarily entail parochialism or religious intolerance. Whereas this type of cosmopolitanism is contrasted with the cosmopolitan outlook of nonreligious young volunteers, she also shows that the image of the cosmopolitan as someone that travels smoothly between cultures and value-systems, and as a consumer of global tastes, does not hold sway in view of the various challenges, uncertainties and tensions the volunteers face in the local sites where they care for others.

The essays contained in this last part are representative of an emerging line of research that places the management of differences and tensions of various kinds (e.g., religious, ethnic and sexual) at the heart of the research agenda. Taking all chapters together, we hope to have shown that cosmopolitanism can be used as an analytical tool to study ‘real life’ self-transformations and that this has implications for future research on the topic. We also hope that the empirical evidence the contributors offer will generate fruitful discussions among scholars across the social sciences and beyond traditional disciplinary divisions.
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