

# Preface

This volume focuses on the concept of *kosmopolis*, and includes research from a variety of disciplines. The aim of the volume is to investigate and illuminate the academy's increasing interest in cosmopolitanism by examining the different angles and perspectives used within both the humanities and the social sciences.

When asked where he came from, the Greek cynic Diogenes of Sinope answered "Kosmopolis". Diogenes' response embraced a radically different way of thinking about individual identity and social belonging than was customary in ancient Greece: Identity was firmly anchored in the topos of the city-state. From this first known use of the term, the concept of *kosmopolis* – of the cosmopolitan as a citizen of the world – developed further, eventually encompassing a variety of meanings. The Stoics used it to express a political and ethical ideal, using it to describe a way of living in the world that would be of universal benefit to humanity. From its inception, then, the cosmopole and the cosmopolitan have had significant utopian dimensions. Subsequent philosophical and historical developments show how the concept is in perpetual change. It is continually being defined, questioned, and redefined, and it continues to speak to our contemporary concerns about emerging world orders and the ethics of living in today's globalized society. *Kosmopolis* is not only an object of historical and philosophical interest, but has also become an ideal for an emerging world order, one with utopian connotations. To study cosmopolitanism is, in other words, not only to investigate it historically or philosophically, but also to view it as an analytical key concept for research attempting to address the future.

After being considered quite outdated for some decades, the latest rebirth of *kosmopolis* started after the decline of the Soviet empire and the end of the Cold War, a period in which some people

believed that the end of history had occurred. Indeed, it seems as if the end of the Cold War allowed for the growth of new ideas, and for the rebirth and redefinition of certain old ones. As a result, an upgrade of what was thought of as *kosmopolis* took place, and the concept developed into cosmopolitanism and the resulting theories of the cosmopolitan. Some of the older meanings of the concept nevertheless remained in use, and are often considered to concur with contemporary cosmopolitanism. Sociologists and political scientists were particularly keen to formulate theories for a new world order using this older concept, while others were using it in its more classic meaning. However, its classic meaning was far from homogeneous.

The end of the Cold War coincided with the beginning of an intensified economic globalization. The liberal idea of a global free market seemed to be closer to realization than ever before, as goods and money could move quite freely across borders. This also coincided with a renewal of political and philosophical interest in cosmopolitan ideals. Even if it has not always been clear in this discussion as to how globalization relates to cosmopolitanism, Ulrich Beck provides some illumination, as he considers economic globalization to be an empirical fact, and cosmopolitanism to be the ability or will to try to act on it. His theory can be regarded as a development of his criticism of modernity, as stated in his early work *Risk Society* (1985).

Sometimes cosmopolitanism and globalization are assumed to mean the same thing, but there are indeed major differences between them, as globalization does not elaborate on the idea of human rights and universal human ideals, characteristics that are usually quite distinctive in cosmopolitanism. While globalization, to a great extent, deals with the development of a free market, cosmopolitanism usually has some connection to the idea of natural rights and universal human rights, ideas that often turn out to be as naïve as the ideas of economic globalization and of unlimited freedom. However, historically there is a quite common use of the concept of cosmopolitanism that is not far removed from the concept of globalization.

If one considers globalization to be an ultraliberal type of ideal, that characteristic can also be seen in the 18th century cosmopolitan, that is, the free individual who is at home everywhere. Nowadays, however, not only globalization but also multiculturalism are related to cosmopolitanism, and are both part of the discourse. Multiculturalism, when examined in relation to cosmopolitanism, raises the question of the relationship between the universal and the particular.

Cosmopolitanism as linked to human rights and the question of rights in general is also relevant to general questions of rights and of legal order. International does not mean cosmopolitan, as the 'inter' signifies something between nations, while 'cosmopolitan' is beyond 'nation'. There have been recent efforts to create cosmopolitan systems of rights, and the relation between international and cosmopolitan is thus one of the issues in *kosmopolis*. The most difficult aspect of cosmopolitanism is perhaps the assumption that it involves a moral attitude. Given the last decade's criticism of universal moral values, not least from a multicultural and postcolonial perspective, these difficulties have become quite obvious, and illustrate how both globalization and the Internet complicate the Enlightenment concept of cosmopolitanism. Electronic communication via the Internet could be viewed as a social description of *kosmopolis*, giving it a totally new dimension.

While the development of contemporary cosmopolitanism, to some extent, has been dominated by sociologists, who see it as a theoretical way of understanding a globalized world characterized by immense migration and broadly available communication technologies, the concept does not have the same meaning in other fields. Within many disciplines *kosmopolis* has not one but several meanings from both the past and the present. It seems as if earlier concepts of its heritage from the Enlightenment as well as from ancient Greece and Rome still remain, although in newer forms.

As a reminder of the historicity of the term 'kosmopolis', we have decided to keep the Greek transcription inspired-spelling *kosmopolis*. This volume contains two main approaches to the concept of *kosmopolis*: one which deals with *kosmopolis* and the cosmopolitan from a historical and philosophical perspective, and one that

places it in a contemporary context, focusing on international law and the global world order. As the chapters will show, the idea of *kosmopolis* or the concept of cosmopolitanism does not follow a straight line throughout history. Still, there are many interesting connections to be made, not only among the different scholarly disciplines, but also between the past and the present.

In the first chapter, *Rebecka Lettevall* gives an introduction to the topic and outlines some of the critical points related to the concept of *kosmopolis*. Using the examples of Fougeret de Monbron and Immanuel Kant, Lettevall shows how the concept can be used in various ways, involving understandings and connotations that radically differ from each other. For Fougeret, cosmopolitanism is an aesthetical approach rather than a moral proposal. Fougeret's idea of himself as a 'citizen of the world' is based on what is already familiar to him: he is a cosmopolitan in his own world, based on European and Christian ways and values. Other cultures, which Fougeret comes in contact with on his travels, are seen as different, or even odd. In contrast to this is Kant, who hardly left his hometown of Königsberg, but who still remains the eternal example of the true cosmopolite. Lettevall argues that in Kant, cosmopolitanism can be understood both as an intellectual experience and a moral attitude. For Kant, being a cosmopolitan is not about travelling and experiencing the Other. Rather, it is about being part of a universal hospitality that surrounds humankind. Kant connects his idea of the cosmopolitan to universal political and international rights, which, in the end, should result in perpetual peace (which is also the English title of one of Kant's famous writings).

In the second chapter, *Hans Ruin* explores cosmopolitanism and the cosmopolitan ideal from a historical and philosophical point of view. He goes back to the roots, to what he argues to be the most ancient source on the topic: Heraclitus and his fragments of cosmos and logos. By combining Heraclitus with the Kantian conception of rationality, Ruin argues that the 'often naïve conception of natural right', which is fundamental to the cosmopolitan ideal, can and should be problematized. This is what Ruin claims to be the most significant task for philosophy today: 'to define what it would

mean for man to inhabit the Earth, to become at home in the world' – in short, what it means to be a cosmopolitan. This is an urgent question in the contemporary world, one which is rapidly changing, where former borders and barriers are being torn down at the same time as new ones emerge. As Ruin illustrates, there is a duality in the cosmopolitan ideal and its inheritance. This is also one of Ruin's main points: that there should and must be a certain amount of uncertainty in the meaning of our most central philosophical concepts.

As noted above, one can hardly think of *kosmopolis* and the cosmopolitan ideal without thinking of Immanuel Kant. The Königsberger philosopher and his category of the world citizen (*Weltbürger*) are the topics *Carola Häntsch* addresses in Chapter 3. Häntsch's aim is to problematize Kant's role as the great theorist of moral cosmopolitanism, and to instead show that Kant's uses of the idea of *kosmopolis* and the world citizen are more cautious than most scholars tend to assume. With reference to Josef Simon, Häntsch argues that one of the basic assumptions in Kant's philosophy is the strict distinction between what is moral and what is right. This further leads to a distinction between the moral politician and the political moralist, where the moral politician as a politician bases his politics on the moral as right/law, instead of morality as ethics. Häntsch translates the distinction of 'moral' and 'right' into the distinction of 'own' and 'alien' reason, and argues that this is of major importance in understanding Kant's concept of the world citizen. From the perspective of one's 'own' reason (or cosmopolitan morality), the 'world citizen' requires a point of view above the world, while from the perspective of 'alien' reason, citizens take their place in the world as a fellow citizen.

In Chapter 4, *Andreas Önnersfors* investigates the link between cosmopolitanism and secrecy. Inspired by Reinhart Koselleck's idea of secrecy and publicity as the historical twin pairing of the Enlightenment, Önnersfors traces the roots of enlightened ideas on world citizenship to the normative foundations of freemasonry in the early 18th century. By analyzing and comparing works of André Michel de Ramsay and Christoph Martin Wieland, Önnersfors shows that cosmopolitan values and ideas were formulated

within the framework of secret societies, but that cosmopolitanism at the same time requires no organization, and is a morality that is at least potentially conceivable to all. Public discourse was prepared within the secret, private spheres of 18th century enlightened culture, of which the freemasonry movement is an example, hence supporting Koselleck's thesis.

*Jessica Parland-von Essen* provides an interesting counterpoint to Önnersfors, as she in Chapter 5 writes about educational practices and cultural strategies within the Swedish nobility during the 18th century. Parland-von Essen argues that these practices and strategies were ways for the nobility to enter cosmopolitan society, and shows how patriotism is to thus be considered not in opposition to the cosmopolitan ideal, but rather as an ideal existing within the idea of the cosmopolitan – universal patriotism. This relationship, however, could sometimes – create conflicts in actual life, particularly when one had to choose between different loyalties. In her comparison of the educations of three females from the nobility during the 18th century, Parland-von Essen shows how the idea of a coherent cosmopolitan culture was fundamental to elite identity, and that similar strategies were used to become part of this culture.

The theme of patriotism is taken up by *David Östlund* in Chapter 6. Östlund examines Jane Addams, who worked on solving social problems among the Chicago immigrants around the turn of the 20th century. Addams found an everyday solidarity among the underprivileged population of the Chicago Slums, one which she claimed to be the seed of modern cosmopolitanism. This was at a time when cosmopolitanism was 'out of date' and issues like race, sex and nationality were on the agenda instead. This new cosmopolitanism was characterized by a mutual respect for differences, and focused on that which unites people from all cultures and countries – cosmopolitan humanitarianism. Addams understood this as a new ethos, a new moral attitude, which she called cosmic patriotism.

Chapters 1-6 address cosmopolitanism from a largely historical or philosophical perspective. *On-Kwok Lai* in Chapter 7, however, places cosmopolitanism into a more contemporary context. Lai investigates how the idea of *kosmopolis* can be understood within

the cyber-information age, where worldwide phenomena such as the growing globalization movement and the explosion of new media all contribute to challenging the way in which we understand the idea of 'world citizenship' from a communication perspective; that is, what it means to be a world citizen, and which actions must be taken in order to reach this ideal. Lai focuses on the global civil society, which he claims to be the new basis of *kosmopolis*, and raises questions about how values such as liberty and democracy must be re-considered in a world that is rapidly coming together through, for instance, trade and the exchange of information. He fears that the social cleavages and divisions between the rich and the poor parts of the world will not necessarily change as a result of globalization, and that the power structures will remain the same.

Within a world that is rapidly coming together as a result of international transactions, the question of international law becomes more and more crucial. How can international law be a useful tool in addressing the new questions and lines of conflict which have emerged during the last few years? This is the topic discussed by *Peter Kemp* in Chapter 8. Kemp identifies three current political problems: the problem of financial globalization, that of intercultural coexistence and that of the physical sustainability of the Earth. He argues that in order to approach these problems, and to be accepted by all people around the globe, international law must undergo a change. Its basis must be cosmopolitan, which implies that people have dual citizenship, one national and one cosmopolitan, and that both must be associated with rights and duties. But even if the two citizenships co-exist, the cosmopolitan ideal must always be superior to the particularities of a single nation or society. Cosmopolitanism is the normative basis which legitimates an international system of law and order, and which legitimates the institutions to uphold this law and order.

In the final chapter *Lena Halldenius* explores what the idea of 'global obligations' actually requires. Halldenius discusses three aspects of modern cosmopolitanism which, she claims, taken together form the backbone of contemporary cosmopolitan philosophy: first, the cosmopolitans' belief that they are members of a global community; second, the moral universalism connected to

cosmopolitanism; and third, the cosmopolitans' support of global or transnational institutions. Halldenus questions the assumption that the third aspect is a consequence of the first two. Instead, she argues that it should be considered 'the primary and distinctive feature of cosmopolitanism, importantly entailing a certain view of justice: justice as dependent on accountable institutions'. As a basis of the idea of an obligation of a global institution, pure universalism is not enough. Something more is needed and can be found in a theory of global justice.

Our hope is that these chapters will continue to inspire investigations and analyses of cosmopolitanism within the social sciences as well as within the humanities. This collection of articles is an offspring of the presentations and discussions from the conference on The Idea of Kosmopolis: Ethics, Politics, and Aesthetics of World Citizenship, which was held at Södertörn University College and the Nobel Museum in Stockholm in 2006. We express our gratitude for the financial support provided by the Foundation for Baltic and East European Studies and the Nobel Museum.

Rebecka Lettevall

My Klockar Linder