Ulrich Beck's cosmopolitanism for social sciences re-visited: overcoming dualisms towards pragmatic ends?

Ms Sirkka Komulainen, PhD (sociology)

Abstract

In social sciences, cosmopolitan theorizing as a paradigm has gained increasing currency as a theoretical movement since the rise of Global Studies in the 1990s and 2000s. In Europe, prominent sociological theorists such as Ulrich Beck then sought for new theoretical frameworks for understanding the increasingly 'borderless world' (Skey, 2012; Dallmayr, 2012; Robertson & Krossa, 2012; Beck 2006). Beck called for a major cosmopolitical paradigm shift toward what he envisaged as Cosmopolitan Sociology. Such sociology would not only cross more physical borders between countries. It would also make a stronger, epistemological move away from 'sociologically naïve philosophy' (first modernity) towards cultural and disciplinary relativity (second modernity; Beck, 2006; Ypi, 2010) – and beyond.

Over the years Beck's work has been critiqued on several grounds. For example, a debate between Beck and Bruno Latour (2004) regarding cosmo/political social research has caught subsequent attention. In its understanding of 'global consciousness', Beck's cosmopolitan thought has also been seen as too Kantian and Eurocentric (e.g. Harvey, 2009). Further, although thinkers like Beck have made efforts to overcome dualisms in social sciences, it has been argued that cosmopolitan thought cannot escape the dualism us/the Other (see e.g. Krossa, 2012).

However, in recent years, the tensions between nationalist and cosmopolitan ideals have become increasingly political and urgent on a global scale (Cuomo, 2011; Castles, 2014) as migration and movement of people have taken new forms and routes. There are increasingly quests for humanist politics and global consciousness working for global justice whereby pragmatic approaches may be called for. This paper weighs up Beck's ideas and their criticisms, especially those by Latour in how they may could work in sociological and cross-disciplinary research on migration and mobility.

1. Introduction

As indicated in the introduction by Caselli and Giordani (page), over the years, numerous requests have been made by several authors to move beyond what has been variously defined as 'methodological nationalism' (Beck 2004), 'embedded statism' (Sassen 2000) or 'methodological territorialism' (Scholte 2000) to better understand Globalization. One of the key issues involved in such a move is that of *global consciousness* (ibid, page; as per Holton, 2005). In this paper the focus is on this very idea of global consciousness and more precisely on Cosmopolitan thought.

In political philosophy and within social sciences, Cosmopolitanism has been defined in numerous ways. Dallmayr (2012: 171-174) distinguishes between three main interpretations of Cosmopolitanism: empirical, normative, and practical or interactive. There may be macro-level

concerns about European/world politics regarding Globalisation, as well as micro-level studies with interests in cosmopolitan actors, both involving the concept of global consciousness.

This paper looks specifically in the work of Ulrich Beck as his programme for Cosmopolitan Sociology addressed both macro-level politics <u>and</u> sociological research practice. The starting point is that due to the current turbulences affecting Europe, as well as the exclusivist, dualist and Othering sentiments surfacing not least in the Anglo-American public rhetoric, such a programme may have become ever more relevant for social scientists.

Currently, public debates worldwide and in Europe revolve around migration as a threat. From 2010 or so, an increasing number of European Union countries have considered the new 'asylum seeking crisis' as one of the most difficult problems that has led to revisions in common European asylum system (European Commission, 2015). As for Dallmayr (2012: 172; emphasis by author):

As a counter-move to social or cultural interaction and interdependence, we witness in many parts of the world the return of virulent forms of 'identity politics', where identity is defined in national or ethnic or religious terms (and sometimes in all these terms simultaneously). Exclusivism is manifest in the erection of new walls or fences between peoples and, on a legal level, in the imposition of new restrictions on immigration and citizenship".

It is proposed that certain ideas within Beck's programme for Cosmopolitan Sociology could be re-considered more strongly in sociological theory and empirical practice. It is suggested that especially the aim to <u>move beyond dualisms</u> (such as domestic/foreign, national/international, roots/wings) is ever more relevant due to current developments in migration. Cosmopolitan theorizing could help in making a stronger move beyond previous (Anglo-American and other) dualisms, such as certain colonial frameworks (Bhabha, 2009; Komulainen, 2013), where they alone no longer account for current social changes. The discussion highlights certain key points in Beck's thought, i.e. the heightened need for a 'cosmopolitical turn' and 'cosmopolitan realpolitik' in contemporary Europe to address global inequalities (Beck, 2003); key critiques of Beck's work;

responses to criticisms especially by Beck and Sznaider (2006; 2010) as well as by subsequent analyses of Beck's and Latour's (2004) ideas; and implications for sociological research thereby. Prior to that Beck's thought is located into the wider context of Cosmopolitan Studies, which today is a hybrid field in itself.

2. A brief overview of Cosmopolitan Studies as a paradigm

In the last twenty years or so, there has been a revived interest in writing about Cosmopolitanism **a) within social sciences.** For Skey (2012:471), one of the key challenges facing the social sciences at the current time is developing new theoretical frameworks for making sense of a 'borderless world'. Although the idea of the cosmopolitan – the citizen of the world - itself dates back to Stoics, attempts are being made to understand and redefine various processes of interaction that extend beyond local or national contexts. Some differences in orientations may be found between anthropology, sociology or political philosophy, for instance. Delanty (2012), refers to a so-called post-disciplinary moment – as perhaps with any paradigm these days - where Cosmopolitanism may not adhere to any one disciplinary tradition[i].

Apart from recent social scientific approaches, Cosmopolitanism as a **b) humanist philosophy** has a long history, stemming from the ancient tradition of moral universalism not only in Europe but around the world (Delanty, 2012). Cosmopolitanism has stood for global justice and diversity as well as sameness (Brown & Held, 2010). Regarding influential European thought over centuries, for Axtmann (2011: 20-23), any contemporary discussion of Cosmopolitanism as a political philosophy still needs to engage with Kant's thought[ii]. This bears relevance also to social sciences, as Kant and Rawls have, for example affected the academic discipline of 'international relations', where there has been a willingness to moderate global power-political concerns, especially the demand of global justice (Dallmayr, 2012: 177). Today, (western) Cosmopolitanism at large features much in this

Enlightenment-influenced manner from global political discourses to intercultural education paradigms to grass-root level refugee and migrant integration practices aiming at non-discrimination.

On a **macro-level**, Cosmopolitanism as a term is akin to Globalization where the latter refers to the global extension of financial and communications network (ibid). Szerszynski and Urry (2006) have distinguished two other conceptualizations of Cosmopolitanism: it is a political project to build transnational institutions; and a political project for recognizing multiple identities (Weenink, 2008). In political philosophy and theory, many authors have approached Cosmopolitanism primarily as a normative theory (or indeed discussed as to whether or how it may be normative) (e.g. Krossa, 2012). Here Cosmopolitanism stands for the recognition of the essential humanity we may have in common; not so much despite our differences, but by virtue of our differences (Fine and Boon, 2007: 6).

Within sociological research practice, authors have assessed the ways in which Cosmopolitanism - or cosmopolitan individuals or groups – may be studied empirically (Skey, 2012). **Micro-level** concerns related to Cosmopolitanism are to do with everyday interactions between people and groups. On the one hand, Cosmopolitanism may be akin to concepts such as (inter)cultural competences and (inter)cultural capital (Delanty, 2012; Weenink, 2008; Bourdieu, 1986). On the other, for Skrbis and Woodward (2007), for instance, cosmopolitanism may not be a fixed category or an attitude of a person but a dimension of social life that must be actively constructed through practices of meaning-making in social situations.

Cosmopolitans as subjects of research are usually associated with voluntary mobilities. For Chernilo (2012: 48), public discourses tend to assign migrants with different kinds of statuses. There are the migrants/cosmopolites *"with a happy face, experiencing, consuming, and enjoying the world".* Then there are those considered as immigrants subject to state control, citizenship, integration policies and unwelcoming attitudes. Discursively, to the former, a migrant status is a privilege whereas for the latter it is a deficit.

For Chernilo, cosmopolitanism involves at least one novel, significant dualism. It is a socio-historical condition of this day and age, where estranged victims of recent globalisation have been uprooted by processes of socio-political transformation and therefore have been left stranded between the old and the new. They are likely to feel both liberated and humiliated at the same time: liberated by the weakening of constraints on their behaviour as well as humiliated by the loss of support for their sense of identity and purpose (see also Komulainen, 2013). There may also be so-called 'ordinary cosmopolitans' (Lamont & Aksartova, 2002), who may have 'integrated' in their host country yet are living on the margins where they might by chance only occasionally surface as agentic citizens (Komulainen, 2013). Moreover, some argue that even for the more privileged, cosmopolitanism is a demanding and difficult way of life (Fine and Boon, 2007: 9).

Delanty (2011:7) has summed up the aforementioned dimensions in that Cosmopolitanism as a field of study consists of three dimensions: 1) it concerns empirical phenomena in the form of 'experience'; it is real; 2) the normative component of Cosmopolitanism is empirically grounded; it is related to a particular kind of experience of the world; 3) then there are meta-level interpretations beyond personal experiences and/or where they are subject to philosophical and social scientific reflections. Many authors have for long seen that Cosmopolitanism is a contested term; there is no uniform interpretation of it in the growing literature (Skey, 2012; Beck and Sznaider, 2006).

3. Ulrich Beck's 'Methodological Cosmopolitanism' and critique of dualisms

Mainly in the 2000s, from a macro-level perspective, Ulrich Beck sought for new theoretical frameworks for understanding the increasingly 'borderless world' (Skey, 2012; Dallmayr, 2012; Robertson & Krossa, 2012; Beck 2006). Here it is highlighted that (among a multitude of other issues) Beck suggested a move away from dualisms, i.e. the aforementioned epistemological move away from 'sociologically naïve philosophy' (first modernity) towards cultural and disciplinary relativity (Beck, 2006; Ypi, 2010). Here 'methodological nationalism' (i.e. focusing only on nation-states) would be turned into *Methodological Cosmopolitanism.*

Beck's (2006) Methodological Cosmopolitanism posed challenges to all levels of social research: a) to theory, in terms of conceptualizing the social forces and effects of cosmopolitization; b) to comparative methods, in terms of specifying new units of research beyond and below the nation; c) to data generation, in terms of novel transnational forms of research organization; d) and to normative self-reflection, in terms of thinking through questions of cosmopolitical agency. Beck and Sznaider (2006) called for a re-conceptualization of the social sciences by asking for a **'cosmopolitan turn'**. The issues to consider would be as follows.

First, on a macro-level, Beck and Sznaider (2006; 2010) suggested that Cosmopolitanism must not be equalized with Globalization, as with concepts such as 'world system theory' (Wallerstein), or with 'world-society' (Luhmann), as this would be again continuation of using dualisms. Such concepts presuppose basic dualisms, such as domestic/foreign or national/international, which in reality are ambiguous. Instead, Methodological Cosmopolitanism would open new horizons by demonstrating how to empirically study border crossings and other transnational phenomena. The resulting Cosmopolitanism sought to overcome dualisms by proceeding based on a logic of **'both-and' instead of 'either/or'**, as against parochial, sedentary sentiments and pathologising mobilities (Malkki, 2012; Komulainen, 2013).

Second, Beck proposed that the twenty-first century should become an age of Cosmopolitanism. This could and should be compared with other historical moments of cosmopolitanism, such as those in ancient Greece, or the Enlightenment. Following on from other influential works, such Hannah Arendt's analysis of the Human Condition in the 1960s and that of Francois Lyotard on the Postmodern Condition in the 1970s, Beck aimed at a theory of Cosmopolitan Condition for the 2000s (see Beck and Sznaider, 2006; 2010; Beck, 2006).

4. Earlier critiques of Beck's Cosmopolitanism for social sciences

Throughout the 2000s and 2010s, Beck's Cosmopolitanism has faced a multitude of criticisms. Robertson (2012: 176), for instance, has stated that *"Ulrich Beck appears to strive to explain or*

interpret virtually every empirical – as well as theoretical – idea in the Western cultural tradition with the "ubermaster" concept of Cosmopolitanism". For Axtmann (2011:28), Beck's analysis fails to convince that his macrostructural analysis is more promising than an actor-centred sociological theory on the transnationalisation of social spaces and the formation of a 'cosmopolitan', global consciousness or awareness of transnational actors.

Another significant critique of not only the work of Beck but Cosmopolitan Studies at large is the Western and European centric bias (Skey, 2012). For Harvey (2009: 83), *"Beck, Habermas, and others tend ... to look upon the European Union as some kind of Kantian cosmopolitan construction"*, in the process neglecting non-western cosmopolitan traditions in the rest of the world. Cosmopolitanism does not appear to be a historically invariable condition but has shifted several times in history, as in South America, China and India or the Caribbean (Delanty, 2012: 6). Area studies have posed challenges to Cosmopolitanism as simply a Western, Kantian product in that normative cosmopolitan theories tend to be American or Eurocentric (He & Brown, 2011: 427). The authors suggest that these problems highlight the importance of pragmatic Cosmopolitanism that can be rooted in everyday life, as well as call for empirical study that is not confined to Europe. For some authors, Beck's vision of a cosmopolitan future may be giving somewhat caricatured impressions of modernity or pre-modernity against which the change from 'pre-cosmopolitan' toward cosmopolitan thought and research is being measured (e.g. Inglis, 2014:104).

Famously, for Bruno Latour (2004: 450), Beck's *cosmopolitics* entailed neither cosmos nor politics: *"The problem with Beck's solution is that, if world wars were about issues of universality and particularity, as he makes them out to be, then world peace would have ensued long ago"*. For Latour (2004: 451), Beck's Cosmopolitan sociology struggled with a mixture of research and normative intervention, which has implications for the role of the social scientist (i.e. should they be impartial or not). Latour questioned the meaning of 'cosmos' in Beck's thought: *"For Beck, the word*

means culture, worldview, any horizon wider than that of a nation-state" (ibid, 453-4). For Latour, such approach was limited.

5. Beck's later responses to critiques

In an article by Beck and Sznaider (2010, paraphrased), the authors responded to some of the aforementioned criticisms. First, it now appeared that they did not only encourage a leap across national borders in social research, but also one across disciplinary boundaries. The intellectual undertaking of redefining Cosmopolitanism now became a trans-disciplinary one, including geography, anthropology, ethnology, international relations, international law, political philosophy, political theory, and increasingly sociology and social theory. They further argued that the novel turn to 'cosmopolitan realism' that they wished to promote was an identifiable intellectual movement.

Second, Beck used the term 'Methodological Cosmopolitanism' to unravel dualisms. The main point for Beck and Sznaider was that the dualities of the global and the local, the national and the international, us and them, have changed and now appear in new forms that require conceptual and empirical analysis. Unlike in the interpretation by Latour (2004), they did not see Cosmopolitanism as spatially fixed, or tied to the 'cosmos' or the 'globe', or indeed anything all-encompassing. The saw it being practiced (or as having the potential to be practiced) in neighbourhoods, in global cities, in the management of multi-national co-operations or human rights organizations, to name a few.

Third, in terms of social research practice, Beck spoke about large-scale comparative studies where researchers should avoid methodological nationalism[iii] . He argued that empirical comparative analyses of societies, such as the choice of statistical indicators tended to draw on methodological nationalism. The parameters would need to change *"if the social sciences want to avoid becoming a museum of antiquated ideas"[iv]*.

Fourth, Beck and Sznaider distinguished between normative-philosophical and empirical-analytical Cosmopolitanism; namely, between the cosmopolitan *condition* and the

cosmopolitan *moment*. They argued that much of the social scientific discourse had assumed the notion of Cosmopolitanism as a moral, political and normative standpoint and a universal commitment to a world citizenship diverse affiliations: *"Cosmopolitanism' has a noble ring in a plebeian age, the nobility of a Kant in a postmodern age"*[v]. Instead, the authors pointed towards *reflexive* Cosmopolitanism.

6. The wider problem of dualisms and the cosmopolitan subject

In this paper there is an especial interest in overcoming dualisms, not only in macro-theories regarding nations but also in theories regarding subjectivities and identities. The characteristics of the cosmopolitan 'Other' have been discussed also more widely in many debates around cosmopolitan research (Skey, 2012) and for example, within the Cultural Studies field, often with implicit or explicit colonial, imperialist features.

A prominent post-colonial approach addressing with migrant subjectivities and identities is Homi K. Bhabha's (2009) work on the in-between, Third Spaces. Bhabha proposed that there should be a move away from such singularities as 'class' and 'gender' towards more multi-dimensional understandings of cultural differences and how they are articulated and produced. A person ended up in a Third Space is 'stuck' between two cultures. The central elements to the Third Space are the locality of cultural translation and hybridity. The third space of enunciation happens when two social groups with different cultural traditions and potentials for power meet. As a result of the encounter between the two groups, both become displaced from their origins.

Bhabha's theory of the Third Space seems to suggest a dualism between two groups and two cultures leading to problematic identities. As for Ikas and Wagner (2009), however, the idea of the Third space has largely remained a parochial concept, since it has operated with homogenized understandings of culture and society in the West, insisting on seeing the contemporary world in terms of colonialism and not of modernity (see also Komulainen, 2013).

How would cosmopolitan thought address this problem? Fine and Boon (2009:8) have argued that:

"No single type of cosmopolitanism has so far overcome dualistic thinking with its inherent biases. The older ones relate to place (the West in opposition to Islamic regions, for instance) or ascriptive features (ethnicity, gender, etc.), with the nation-state and nationalism providing prominent opponents, despite the fact that nationality is no longer necessarily the most important criterion of differentiation (...) However much the cosmopolitan resists dualistic styles of reasoning, one cannot avoid the boundary question of who is the "cosmopolitan self" and who is the "non-cosmopolitan other"".

Beck and Sznaider (2010, paraphrased) proposed that the issue could be addressed by Methodological Cosmopolitanism to overcome naïve universalisms of Western sociology. Methodological Cosmopolitanism is sensitive and open to many, sometimes conflicting universalisms, such as the post-colonial experience; or the African, Asian and South-American experiences of 'entangled modernities'. For Beck and Sznaider, 'entangled modernities' replace the dualism of the modern and the traditional. Regarding the cosmopolitan subject, methodological cosmopolitanism is aware of 'strategic essentialism' and particularism in a moral sense in post-colonial, feminist or cultural theorizing: *"This is what social life under cosmopolitan conditions means. It creates the moral horizon for a newly conceived form of at times banal, and, at times, moral cosmopolitanism."[vi]*

The Third Space may be seen different from (or parallel to) a colonised-coloniser positioning. For Beck (2009), notions such as Bhabha's Third Space still depend on dualisms and either/or logic they try to overcome. Instead of dualisms, the 'migrant condition' today might be more about also/and relationships and identities, implying the transnational actors not so much pulling at different directions but 'having wings and roots at the same time' (also Komulainen, 2013).

7. Discussion: critical theorists as diplomats?

More recently, the debate between Beck and Latour (2004) regarding the cosmo/political subject has been analyzed in several accounts. For Wardle (2009), the debate indeed revolved around the cosmo/political subject for which humanist and 'organistic' answers were sought. For Wardle, Beck had adopted a Kantian, humanist stance, promoting the current condition of human subjectivity as paramount for social science whilst affected by world risks beyond their own making. Latour, on the other hand, would bring actor-network theory into the debate. Here subjectivity would emerge from and be shaped by networks of humans and non-human things in the 'cosmos'. Contrary to Beck, for Latour, the important discussion on cosmopolitanism was not whether cosmopolitanism was a 'good thing'. Instead Latour (2004) steered the attention towards the *diplomatic role of the social scientist.*.

Saito (2015), however, suggested that by combining Beck's sociological and Latour's actor-network theory perspectives, it is possible to achieve a better understanding of cosmopolitics that takes into account **both** political **and** ontological dimensions. For Saito, the proposed synthesis calls for a renewal of critical theory by making social scientists reflect on their involvement in cosmopolitics. It prompts social scientists to explore how they can **pragmatically** support certain ideals of cosmopolitics with their subjects of study who may live and experience different nations and cosmoses. Saito's argument seems to reflect the wider debate in sociology as to whether social scientists should be partisan or not.

Saito steered the conversation towards the ontological dimensions of cosmopolitics in Latour's actor-network theory (ANT). Such an approach looks into how scientists and others accomplish knowledge through various networks. Saito proposed ANT may be a good addition to Beck's cosmopolitan programme that did not quite detail such processes. A combination of the two approaches acknowledges that the paradigm shift towards cosmopolitan social sciences may not be linear but it needs to be achieved. The networks engaged may involve transnational solidarity networks, NGOs and so on. The combined approach also acknowledges the performative nature of

research, as well as reflexivity. For Latour (2004), scientific knowledge is not superior to ordinary knowledge but science could be at service of politics. This is how social scientists interested in Cosmopolitanism could be both critical theorists and diplomats.

Less optimistic counter-arguments against such a positioning for the scientist is can be found as well. Mobility *per se* seems a problem in the anti-migration rhetoric. Malkki (2012) has observed that mobile individuals do not exist in a power free space. In-between spaces, where aspects of power become secondary, are only temporary ones, and will be soon replaced by spatial modes requiring fixed positions. Even if the cosmopolitan subject wished to be postmodern, the modern spatiality inevitably limits the postmodern way of life (Malkki, 2012; Komulainen, 2013). Further, Globalization cannot be escaped. Hannah Arendt (cited by Axtmann, 2011: 25) had written that instead of doing good, technological development of the Western world has engendered globality. Humanity is *"no longer a beautiful dream of unity or a dreadful nightmare of strangeness, but a hard inescapable reality"*.

Similarly, for Beck and Sznaider (2010), there could be unintended and lived cosmopolitanisms, which may not be humanist and noble at all, but rather side-effects of Globalization. Beck and Sznaider considered it as naïve to think that a change in social scientific paradigm would inevitably lead to changes in the 'real world' and thereby the actual task of social scientists were to study the cosmopolitization of this very 'real world'. This was, for them, the distinction between a cosmopolitan philosophy and a cosmopolitan sociology.

As pointed out earlier, for Delanty (2011:7) Cosmopolitanism consists of empirical phenomena in the form of 'experience' whereby it is real as well as normative. In addition, there are meta-level interpretations beyond personal experiences and where they are subject to philosophical and social scientific reflections. Beck and Sznaider (2010) suggested that Cosmopolitanization could be conceived of as Globalization from within, as *internalized cosmopolitanism.* The question to ask here

would be as to whether this were the same as *global consciousness* and/or one that is neither dualistic nor naïve?

With Methodological Cosmopolitanism Beck developed a concept of cosmopolitan realpolitik to understand the 'positive sum-game of pooled sovereignties' as national problems could only be solved through transnational/national co-operation and state networks. The national perspective can obscure us from seeing large global inequalities. Beck argued that if realpolitik, macro-level issues were not solved, then there was little room on studying individual cosmopolitanisms, as they would diminish (Beck, 2003: 457-460). This, it is argued here, would apply also to such mobilities that are not restricted to the privileged (see e.g. Lamont & Aksartova, 2012).

For Stevenson (2014: 184; Beck, 2006), the global cosmopolitan task of our time is the cultural conversion of human rights into the rights of the citizen and human dignity. Questions of citizenship may be rethought through notions of solidarity (Alexander, 2006). Here a more just and inclusive society inevitably depends upon our sense of being connected to others. The possibility of cosmopolitan dialogue across cultural and national borders enables constructive global interconnections. For Stevenson (2014: 192-3; emphasis by author), these issues may become <u>the</u> central progressive cultural struggle of the 21st century.

8. Conclusion

In this paper Ulrich Beck's Cosmopolitanism for social sciences has been re-visited for both humanist and pragmatic purposes, in the spirit of global consciousness. A central idea has been to explore as to whether Beck's Cosmopolitan Sociology and cosmopolitics would successfully address theory and implications for research practice. This has been done by looking into both Beck's programme and its criticisms.

The move from the modern to the postmodern and towards reflexivity has been a wider interest in Beck's thought overall. In social scientific research with cosmopolitan sentiments, this would mean overcoming certain modernist dualisms that may at worst hinder the advancing of global justice.

Beck's Cosmopolitanism sought to overcome dualisms by proceeding based on a logic of 'both-and' instead of 'either/or', as against parochial, sedentary sentiments and pathologising mobilities (Malkki, 2012; Komulainen, 2013). The approach would undo such dualisms as 'rooted-mobile', or 'coloniser-colonized'. It would instead acknowledge multiple ways of being in the world, including what is called entangled modernities (Beck and Sznaider, 2010).

Both Beck and Latour addressed the cosmopolitan subject as an agent and a subject of study. Critics, such as Skey (2012) have, however, usefully searched for something of a practical 'manual' for studying those known as cosmopolites. To date, it seems that forced migrants are not seen as deserving such a denominator. Here Beck's cosmopolitics appears more purposeful than the diplomatic role of the social scientist proposed by Latour. To reiterate: unless macro-level issues were not solved, then there was less room on studying individual cosmopolitanisms (Beck, 2003: 457-460).

It is suggested that Beck's vision for cosmopolitan future may hold lasting relevance to current global and European migrant crises. The *cosmopolitan condition* and the *cosmopolitan moment* may be very tangibly felt in the current times towards the end of the 2010s. At the same time, Beck's programme could be enhanced by insights from other disciplines. Indeed this was what Beck himself seemed to call for to serve both global scientific and pragmatic ends regarding migration and mobility.

References

Alexander, J. (2006) *The Civil Sphere* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Axtmann, R. (2011) Cosmopolitanism and globality: Kant, Arendt, and Beck on the global condition, *German Politics and Society,* 29(3), pp.29-37.

Beck & Sznaider (2010) Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: a research agenda, *British Journal of Sociology*, 61(s1), pp. 381–403.

URL: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01250.x/full

Beck, U. (2009) Cosmopolitanization without cosmopolitans: On the distinction between normative and empirical-analytical cosmopolitanism in philosophy and the social sciences, in Ikas, K. & Wagner, G. (eds) *Communicating in the Third Space* (New York: Routledge), pp. 11-25.

Beck, U. & Grande, E. (2007) Cosmopolitanism: Europe's way out of crisis, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 10(1), pp. 67–85.

Beck, U. (2006) *The cosmopolitan vision* (Cambridge: Polity).

Beck, U. & Sznaider, N. (2006) Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: A research agenda', *British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1), pp. 1-23.

Beck, U. (2004) *Der kosmopolitische Blick order: Krieg ist Frieden* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag).

Beck, U. (2003) Toward a new critical theory with a cosmopolitan intent. *Constellations* 10(4), pp. 453-468.

Bhabha, H.K. (2009) Preface: In the cave of making: Thoughts on third space, in Ikas, K. & Wagner, G. (eds) *Communicating in the Third Space* (New York: Routledge) pp. ix-xiv.

Brown, G.W. & Held, D. (2010) *The Cosmopolitanism Reader* (Cambridge: Polity Press).

Bourdieu, P. (1986) The forms of capital, in
Richardson, J.(ed) Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education
(Westport, CT: Greenwood), pp. 241–58.

Castles, S. (2014) International migration at a crossroads, *Citizenship Studies* 18(2), pp.190–207.

Chernilo, D. (2012) Cosmopolitanism in social theory: An ambivalent defense, in Robertson, R. & Krossa, A.S. (eds.) (2012) *European Cosmopolitanism in Question*. (London: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 44--63

Cuomo, C.J. (2011) Climate Change, Vulnerability, and Responsibility, *Hypatia* 26(4), pp. 690-714.

Dallmayr, F. (2012) Cosmopolitanism: in search of cosmos, *Ethics & Global Politics* 5(3), pp. 171-186.

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

Fine, R. & Boon, V. (2007) Introduction: Cosmopolitanism: Between past and future, *European Journal of Social Theory*, 10(1), pp. 5-16.

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

He, B. & Brown, K. M. (2012) An empirical world of cosmopolitan Asia', in Delanty, G. (ed) *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies* (London: Routledge), pp. 427-442.

Holton, R. (2012) Some comments on cosmopolitanism and Europe, in Robertson, R. & Krossa, A.S. (eds) *European cosmopolitanism in question* (London: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 25–43.

Holton, R.J. (2005) *Making Globalization* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).

Ikas, K. & Wagner, G. (eds) *Communicating in the Third Space* (New York: Routledge), pp. 11-25.

Inglis, D. (2014) What is worth defending in sociology today? Presentism, historical vision and the uses of sociology, *Cultural Sociology*, 8(1), pp. 99 –118.

Komulainen, S. (2013) A chick cosmopolitan migrant condition, in Lindberg, S. (ed) *The Migrant Novel in Quebec and Scandinavia. Performativity, Meaningful Conflicts and Creolization.* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), pp. 161-180.

Krossa, A.S. (2012) Why 'European cosmopolitanism'? in Robertson, R. & Krossa, A.S. (eds) *European cosmopolitanism in question* (London: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 6-24.

Lamont, M. & Aksartova, S. (2002) Ordinary cosmopolitanisms: Strategies for bridging racial boundaries among working-class men, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19(4), pp. 1-25.

Latour, B. (2004) Whose cosmos, which cosmopolitics? Comments on the peace terms of Ulrich Beck, *Common Knowledge* 10(3), pp. 450-462.

Malkki, L. (2012) *Kulttuuri, Paikka ja Muuttoliike* (Culture, Place and Migration flows; SK translation), (Tampere: Vastapaino).

Robertson, R. & Krossa, A.S. (eds) (2012) *European Cosmopolitanism in Question* (London: Palgrave Macmillan).

Saito, H. (2015) Cosmopolitics: towards a new articulation of politics, science and critique, *The British Journal of Sociology*, 66(3), pp.441–459.

Sassen, S. (2000) New frontiers facing urban sociology at the Millennium, *British Journal of Sociology*, 51(1), pp. 143-159.

Scholte, J.A. (2000) *Globalization. A Critical Introduction* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).

Skey, M. (2012) We need to talk about cosmopolitanism: The challenge of studying openness towards other people, *Cultural Sociology* 6, pp. 471-87.

Skrbis, Z. & Woodward, I. (2007) The ambivalence of ordinary cosmopolitanism: Investigating the limits of cosmopolitan openness, *The Sociological Review*, 55(4), pp. 730-747.

Stevenson, N. (2014) Human(e) rights and the cosmopolitan imagination: Questions of human dignity and cultural identity, *Cultural Sociology*, 8(2), pp. 180-196.

Szerszynski, B. & Urry, J. (2006) Visuality, mobility and the cosmopolitan: Inhabiting the world from afar, *British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1), pp. 113–31.

Wardle, H. (2009) *Cosmopolitics and common sense*, University of St Andrews, Working Papers Series #1 URL: http://openanthcoop.net/press/2009/10/04/cosmopolitics-and-common-sense/

Weenink, D. (2008) Cosmopolitanism as a form of capital: Parents preparing their children for a globalizing world', *Sociology*, 42(6), pp. 1089-1106.

Ypi, L. (2010) Justice and morality beyond naïve cosmopolitanism, *Ethics & Global Politics*, 3(3), pp. 171-192.

ⁱ Some might argue that Cosmopolitanism does not necessarily involve migration in the same way as Transnationalism, for instance, which essentially involves movement between two or more nations, and is different and narrower a consideration from Cosmopolitanism in this respect (author's comment).

ⁱⁱ Kant's perspective has been carried forward by a number of later writers and philosophers with an emphasis on normative principles and legal rules. The influential work of e.g. Gadamer and Heidegger on this subject is beyond the scope of this article.

ⁱⁱⁱ These are different from micro-studies of individual actors or groups, see Skey, 2012 on these.

^{iv} Citation from the on-line full text by Beck & Sznaider, 2010 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01250.x/full

^v Citation from the on-line full text by Beck & Sznaider, 2010 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01250.x/full

^{vi} Citation from the on-line full text by Beck & Sznaider, 2010 http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2009.01250.x/full

5552 words