

■ Studies in Cosmopolitanism

”Cosmopolitan” can stand, or has stood, for a number of things, at different times and in different places, in the vocabularies of different people – it may refer to an individual with many varied stamps in his or her passport; or a city or a neighborhood with a mixed population; or, with a capital-C, a woman’s magazine (originally American, now with editions in many countries and languages), at least at one time seen as a bit daring in its attitudes; or a person of uncertain patriotic reliability, quite possibly a Jew; or someone who likes weird, exotic cuisines; or an advocate of world government; or, again with a capital-C, a mixed drink combining vodka, cranberry juice, a dash of Cointreau, and perhaps other ingredients. To offer some examples.

A word of such protean quality may not seem to hold out much promise as a term for scholarly use. Yet sometimes words become keywords not through the precision and consistency of their deployment but rather through appealing to our imagination by way of ranges of somewhat opaquely interconnected uses. ”Cosmopolitan”, and related forms such as ”cosmopolis”, ”cosmopolite”, ”cosmopolitics” and ”cosmopolitanism”, would seem to have been among such terms, serving as foci of attention for many kinds of thinkers, and as rhetorical equipment for others, over the years and centuries. It is a word with a history, and for that matter a geography. The history has been one of ups and downs.

Especially during the past fifteen years or so, ideas of the cosmopolitan have been on an upswing in many contexts, and not least in academic scholarship. This has been noticeable in a range of disciplines: anthropology, sociology, philosophy, political science, international relations... The reasons are not so difficult to find. The general increase in diverse kinds of global interconnectedness invests it with new relevance. In particular, the end of the Cold War, with its great divide running through the world, seemed to make it possible to think anew, on both large and small scales, about the unity and diversity of humanity, about cosmopolis, and about global citizenship and responsibility.

This issue of *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift* exemplifies some such thinking, and its manifestation in research. It draws on ongoing work in the project ”KOSMOPOLIT: Culture and Politics in Global Society”, supported since 2003 by The Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation, with participating scholars from the universities of Stockholm, Lund, and Malmö (four more senior scholars, three PhD students). The disciplines involved are political science and social anthropology, but within that combination, there are a number of orientations and overlapping interests, including media studies and peace and conflict research. The aim of the project has not been to rush toward a single understanding of cosmopolitanism, but rather to serve – in the general spirit of the concept itself – as a meeting ground for a certain variety of schol-

arly orientations, engaging with varied materials. While the contributions to this issue do not at all offer an exhaustive picture of research within the project, they illustrate some of its concerns.

One of these concerns is surely, as the subtitle of the project indicates, the relationship between the culture and the politics of cosmopolitanism. Ulf Hannerz, who first took an interest in the ideas and practices of cosmopolitanism in the 1980s and who initiated the current project, had focused his early interest on cultural aspects: experiences of cultural diversity, skills in handling it, appreciation of the variety of cultural forms, cosmopolitanism as a stance in cultural consumption. This was a facet of his research interest in cultural dimensions of globalization, but at the time the political aspects of cosmopolitanism were not so much on his agenda, or of that of too many other scholars.

Again, the end of the Cold War changed all that. As the academic scrutiny of cosmopolitan ideas gathered new force, however, in a transformed political situation, the question whether there is anything but a fortuitous connection between the cultural and political senses of cosmopolitanism could itself stand out as central. Hannerz dwells particularly on that question in his article.

Certainly that question relates to the more general question of the uses of the culture concept. This is a concept with rather different histories in the disciplines centrally involved here. In anthropology, it has been continuously and elaborately at the intellectual core of the discipline, although often contested, and even occasionally (also recently) rejected. In political science, it has been rather more peripheral, and drawing uneven attention over time. Ronald Stade takes a critical look at some of its uses in his article.

Although his point of departure is that of an anthropologist, Stade's particular emphasis within the larger research project is otherwise rather more on the political side, in that he is concerned with the ideas of institutions of "global governance" which became increasingly prominent in the late twentieth century. If we adopt a somewhat facile distinction between "top-down" and "bottom-up" cosmopolitanisms, global governance, with its commissions of international leaders and its think tanks, is clearly primarily a top-down form – a matter of policies and practices developed in macro-level, central, more or less powerful structures and institutions with a wide reach into society, even global society. Not least as it appears in the theoretical and practical fields of conflict and conflict resolution, cosmopolitanism is also in large part top-down. In this issue, Annika Björkdahl's article on the peace operations of the European Union and the United Nations in Macedonia analyzes one instance. The "conflict preventionism" which has emerged in recent times in the organizational shape of cooperation between the military and agencies of civil society, and discussed here by Mattias Viktorin, is also in large part a top-down cosmopolitanism.

Bottom-up cosmopolitanisms, in contrast, tend to have a starting point at a micro-level of personal or group experience and orientation, although possibly, through aggregation, they can reach up through existing structures, or bring into being new and wider structures and processes. We may discern that in scholarship concerned with cosmopolitanism, different disciplines tend to focus on top-down or bottom-up phenomena. Political scientists, political philosophers and legal scholars tend to focus

variously on issues of global governance and the construction of a cosmopolitan democratic order. Anthropologists, ethnologists, and sociologists at least in their more empirical work, on the other hand, tend to find bottom-up orientations to cosmopolitanism more in line with their established research interests. Yet such a division of research labor does not work out altogether neatly – again, Stade, and also Viktorin, have their main discipline backgrounds in social anthropology.

Hannerz discusses some of the more typical recent ethnographic work on bottom-up cosmopolitanism in his article. Within the current project, such research is best exemplified through a study by Katja Sarajeva, who unfortunately could not contribute to this journal issue because at the time of its preparation she was engaged in anthropological field work in Moscow, on the subculture of Russian gays and lesbians. The background assumption here is that people with a not-so-mainstream life style may be inclined to generalize their own experience into a more favorable overall stance toward cultural diversity. Moreover, subcultures of this kind nowadays tend in themselves to transcend national borders in different ways, leading to wider horizons and loyalties. Sarajeva's study is also among those which now suggest that there can be gender aspects to cosmopolitanism.

The contrast between top-down and bottom-up cosmopolitanisms may be practical in some ways, but it can also oversimplify matters. For one thing, the two may meet and intermesh. A strong, widespread manifestation of bottom-up cosmopolitanism may (although need not always) result in the emergence of top-down cosmopolitan institutions. Top-down cosmopolitanism may also entail a kind of cultural engineering, by which individuals are recruited into situations where they are likely to have personal experiences leading to cosmopolitan orientations. Ioannis Tsoukalas, whose research within the project deals with student exchanges within the EU Erasmus Programme, considers the possibility that while the purpose of the programme may be to promote a somewhat limited European identity, it results at least at times in a more generalized cosmopolitan stance among the participants. Tsoukalas' work is represented here by a review essay.

Whatever may be its uses and its limitations, the top-down/bottom-up distinction should not be confused with the issue of the social distribution of cosmopolitan personal orientations in human populations. There has been a strong tendency in discussions of cosmopolitanism as a phenomenon in history and into the present to claim, or implicitly assume, that it is a more or less elite (and male) phenomenon. Clearly there have been some reasons for such an expectation. Cosmopolitan orientations, in culture and in politics, may have tended to go with more education, the opportunity to travel, and the prosperity, security and leisure which allow one to cultivate a wider range of interests and experiences. The point of much recent research, however, has been that cosmopolitanism of one kind or other may in fact be more widespread than has been customarily assumed. A wider involvement in travel and migration is generally seen as one fact of contemporary life which sometimes, although not always, contributes to cosmopolitan skills and sentiments. Another major fact, however multifaceted and debated, is that of media growth. Less than ever do people now need to travel to be in touch with a wider world, if it comes into one's living-room anyway. Alexa Robertson's comparative study of involvements with television news

shows the attention of the KOSMOPOLIT project to such issues – how do viewers respond to stories about, and pictures of, people and human conditions elsewhere? Here again, we might note that one can see such responses in terms of a largely bottom-up, more or less cosmopolitan involvement. Yet it is certainly also a possibility that central institutions could actively and deliberately use media in top-down ways which do or do not foster cosmopolitanism in audiences – or, for that matter, that media formats are somehow chosen which less intentionally tend to have one such top-down effect or another.

The contributions to this issue of *Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, then, point to some of the issues currently involved in one can come to confront as one engages with matters cosmopolitan in some, but far from all, of their polymorphous, changing variety. In reaching out across the borders of disciplines, they may also, to a degree, evince a particular kind of academic cosmopolitanism. They are offered to readers who may choose to sit down and taste them together with a glass containing a certain mixture of vodka, cranberry juice, and Cointreau.

ULF HANNERZ