Cosmopolitanism as a Concept and a Social Phenomenon

Gulnaz K. Gizatova[1], Olga G. Ivanova[2], Kirill N. Gedz[3]

Abstract

The article is devoted to cosmopolitanism as a concept and a social phenomenon. The authors believe that cosmopolitan ideas and mentality are a necessary manifestation of modern globalization processes. Cosmopolitanism as a pattern of public consciousness reflects the essential features of modern social processes. At the same time, the very idea of cosmopolitanism is contradictory, multifaceted, and therefore it cannot be considered only within the framework of categorical opposition "local - global". That is why this research is carried out dialectically: from the point of view of the contradictory unity of the cosmopolitanism's objective manifestations and the diverse interpretations of this phenomenon. Considering a wide range of approaches in studies of the cosmopolitanism phenomenon prevailing in modern social theory, the authors emphasize the need for its comprehensive philosophical interpretation. In addition, referring to the historical overview of cosmopolitan ideas, the authors come to the conclusion that further studies of cosmopolitanism should be based on an interdisciplinary approach. Particular attention in this article is paid to a couple of "cosmopolitanism" and "patriotism" categories. The main conclusion of the article is that it is cultural cosmopolitanism as a concept and social phenomenon that can clarify the essential contradictions in modern social processes.

Keywords: Cosmopolitanism, Modern cosmopolitanism, Modern worldview, Domestic studies of cosmopolitanism, The image of the West, Delanty, Hannerz, Beck.

[1] Kazan Federal University, Assistant Professor, PhD in Philosophy Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Department of Social Philosophy; Address: 420008, Russian Federation, Kazan, Kremlevskaya st., 18. E-mail: Gulnaz.Gizatova@kpfu.ru

[2] Kazan Federal University, Assistant Professor, PhD in Philosophy, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Department of Social Philosophy; Address: 420008, Russian Federation, Kazan, Kremlevskaya st., 18; E-mail: Olga.Ivanova@kpfu.ru

[3] Kazan Federal University, Assistant, Institute of Social and Philosophical Sciences and Mass Communications, Department of Social Philosophy; Address: 420008, Russian Federation, Kazan, Kremlevskaya st., 18. E-mail: gedz_kirill@mail.ru

Introduction

At the turn of the 20th and 2st centuries, interest in the problem of cosmopolitanism sharply increased in connection with the development of globalization, the intensification of migration processes, and the end of the Cold War. Cosmopolitanism is a complex, multilevel phenomenon that manifests itself in various social spheres. So, as it seems to the authors, an adequate understanding of this phenomenon is possible only within the framework of a multidisciplinary approach. In the proposed article, an attempt is made to interpret cosmopolitanism culturally and philosophically, therefore the authors pay special attention to the problems of cultural cosmopolitanism.

In modern social theory, the natural possibility of numerous approaches to understanding cosmopolitanism and its definitions are emphasized, what predetermined its various interpretations, and the distinguishing of various characteristics, levels, etc. in this phenomenon. Many modern social theorists express deep doubts about the uniqueness of the evaluation of cosmopolitanism. Thus, the English culturologist R. Williams, analyzing the theoretical studies of cosmopolitanism, has expressed his "suspicion" that in these studies, the concept of "cosmopolitan" hides, first of all, the "image of the West". David Miller considers the perception of the world as "a kind of giant supermarket in which the place of residence is determined by an accessible set of goods (job, the benefits of civilization, climate, etc.)" to be the most important feature of the cosmopolitan world outlook (Palmer, 2003: 2). Professor of Political Sociology at the University of Sussex Luke Martell (2011) emphasizes the need to take into account the various dimensions of cosmopolitanism for a holistic interpretation of the latter and analyzes its various manifestations. In his opinion, cosmopolitanism includes such varieties as normative, philosophical, sociocultural, political and material. In our opinion, such an attempt to "classify" the manifestations of cosmopolitanism looks very conditional and contradictory. The author of this approach himself states that if cosmopolitanism is viewed not simply as a philosophy but as a phenomenon rooted in the socio-economic foundations of society, then the policy of cosmopolitanism raises doubts, despite all its value attractiveness, and in this case, there is a certain utopianism in the realization of cosmopolitanism. Martell sees a contradiction rooted in opposition to material interests in the world as the most important factor hindering its full implementation. Recognizing his skepticism in assessing cosmopolitanism as an integral phenomenon, the author is positive in assessing its social and political philosophy. Such a phenomenological representation leads the author to the following conclusion: its interpretation assumes a cosmopolitan justice without a cosmopolitan policy, and cosmopolitan goals without cosmopolitan means (Martell, 2011).

There are also distinguished such forms of cosmopolitanism as economic, political, moral, and cultural, but the most common is the approach within which moral, political and cultural aspects of cosmopolitanism are distinguished (Delanty, 2006).

Methods

As already noted, the complex and ambivalent nature of the phenomenon under study causes many different approaches to its understanding, and the absence of a unified concept for explanation of its nature and essence. Thus, U. Hannerz considers "intellectual and aesthetic openness to the perception of different cultural practices and the ability to accustom to other cultures" as an essential feature of cosmopolitanism (2005). Considering cosmopolitanism as a cultural perspective, the scientist notes that at the individual level it manifests itself, first of all, as the desire to "connect" with another. But this willingness to share common values with the another, the desire to "master" other, initially "alien" cultures lead to reflections on identity. Then cosmopolitanism can be regarded as possessing narcissistic traits: identity is constructed in a space where cultures reflect one another (Hannerz, 1990). From the

point of view of W. Beck, the central defining characteristic of cosmopolitanism is the "dialogic imagination" by which he means "the collision of cultures and rationalities within the framework of one human life, and *internalized* another person" (2003).

Discussion

Traditionally, cosmopolitanism is defined as an ideology, or a philosophical world view, or a certain type of world perception. In the domestic science, cosmopolitanism is understood predominantly and first of all as a "worldview position", "state of mind, ideology, life credo" (Chumakov, 2011), as a system of views "based on the refusal to recognize the priority of national traditions and culture over the traditions and cultures of other countries and peoples, proceeding from the common interests and values of all mankind, relating various manifestations of patriotism to primitive forms of human consciousness" (Ivina, 2004).

Throughout the course of history, various components come to the fore in the theory and ideology of cosmopolitanism. If starting from antiquity and until recently, cosmopolitan ideas developed within the framework of moral and political theories, today cosmopolitanism is beginning to be considered not only as an "ideological construct", but also a phenomenon rooted in social reality itself (Delanty, 2006; Beck, 2003).

At the turn of the century, more and more attention is paid to the understanding of various aspects of cultural cosmopolitanism, what is caused, first of all, by globalization processes. It is possible to say that cosmopolitanism is the core of the globalization ideology, and at the same time, the idea of globalization advocates the ideology of modern cosmopolitanism. Interpreting cosmopolitanism as an expression of the cultural aspect of globalization, W. Hannerz believes that this phenomenon has "two faces", one of which is more about culture, and another about politics, and the central question, in his opinion, is "the relationship between these two individuals of cosmopolitanism, culture and politics" (2005). Having analyzed the problem of the interrelation between cosmopolitanism and globalization, A. Chumakov notes that "cosmopolitanism is a cultural phenomenon that characterizes a person's worldview, whereas globalization is a tendency of social development aimed at the formation of an integral world" (2011).

Being a socioculturally conditioned phenomenon, cosmopolitanism is not something stiff and unchanging. Researchers note that both the phenomenon, and its reflection change. "Cosmopolitanism is neither homogeneous nor unique," writes P. McCormick. "In other words, cosmopolitanism is not a single phenomenon in its essence, and it has appeared more than once in history" (McCormick, 2014). This idea is also stressed by W. Beck, who believes that "no one can transfer any of the historical concepts of cosmopolitanism without any problem regardless of the cultural context from which it has been taken to modernity" (2003).

Further development of this concept allows us to identify many of its important features, objective and subjective factors that influence the views of both its supporters and opponents.

Today, researchers talk about the need to rethink the phenomenon of cosmopolitanism, and to develop new concepts that reveal the peculiarities of cosmopolitanism at the present stage of historical development.

In the vein of theories of multiple modernity, the concept of post-universal cosmopolitanism was formed which is characterized by a dialogical character, a critical attitude towards Eurocentrism and a view of the world as the unity of a multitude of different cultures. According to J. Delanti (2006), this cosmopolitanism can be called as "cultural cosmopolitanism". W. Beck (2003) introduces the concept of "cosmopolitan society" which, in his opinion, describes a qualitatively new form of social differentiation.

As already noted, there is no and, most likely, will not be developed a single concept of cosmopolitanism. One can agree with W. Beck that "cosmopolitanism is another term using which we can identify the debate on cosmopolitanism" (2003). First of all, it is necessary to answer the question: Does cosmopolitanism exist as a single undivided phenomenon or there are "different" cosmopolitisms? W. Beck believes that in our day cosmopolitanism implies a multiplicity of oppositions and differences, there are many interpretations of it, to this day no general characteristics have been developed (2003). The same view is held also by G. Delanty who notes that the starting point of the critical cosmopolitan social theory is the recognition of many kinds of cosmopolitanism (2006). At the same time, researchers recognize as an important characteristic of the cosmopolitan idea the emphasis on "openness", pluralism of the modern world order formed as a result of the interaction between local and global entities, and between different cultures themselves (Beck, 2003; Delanty, 2006; Hannerz, 1990, 2005).

Formation of a global culture and intensification of intercultural contacts actualize the problem of cultural cosmopolitanism, placing in front of researchers the task on a detailed analysis of the correlation between the concepts of "cosmopolitanism" and "multiculturalism". The lack of a clear definition of cosmopolitanism and "fuzziness" of this concept makes it difficult to draw a line between cosmopolitanism and various aspects and types of intercultural communication. So, for example, Western sociologists consider as a manifestation of cosmopolitanism in Briton women of the mid-20th century that they enjoyed visiting American-style department stores, viewing Orientalist Russian ballet, dancing tango, while Japanese women had a passion for learning foreign languages, studying and working abroad, etc. (Hannerz, 2005). The problem of correlation between cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism is also a discussion. Mostly the point of view prevails according to which, if multiculturalism is aimed at preserving cultural differences inherent in cultures, cosmopolitanism is aimed at overcoming cultural features and local specifics, for which it is often criticized.

"Multiculturalism, with all its claims to create a world of diversity and to affirm the principles of pluralism," writes W. Beck, "supports the collective notion of humanity, but cosmopolitanism claims the opposite and *assumes an* individualization in which a subject remains attached to his or her sphere of culture" (Beck, 2003). Within the framework of the post-universalist concept of cosmopolitanism, its content is the expression of tension between local and global, universal and particular, while multiculturalism is simply aimed at plurality (Delanty, 2006).

The nature of cosmopolitanism has not been sufficiently studied. In our opinion, it has both objective and subjective grounds. The basis for dissemination of cosmopolitan ideas and sentiments is the strengthening of economic and cultural interrelations in social development. Although these ideas arise in the conditions of the ancient polis system, they begin to actively spread with the creation of the empire of Alexander the Great. According to A. Chumakov (2011), the rise of interest in cosmopolitanism was observed in the Renaissance, when this phenomenon becomes really planetary. The most important stage in the development of cosmopolitan ideology was the era of the Enlightenment, when, with the development of bourgeois society, the links between states and peoples expanded and strengthened.

It seems legitimate point of view of A. Chumakov that cosmopolitan ideas are "not someone's schemes, but a natural and necessary condition for the joint life of different people in the global world" (2011). Thus, the study of cosmopolitanism in the new conditions of a globalizing world acquires particular relevance.

Results

1. Cosmopolitanism as a social and philosophical concept has a rich content which changes after the transformation of socio-cultural conditions. Therefore, there is not and cannot be a single out-of-historical

definition of cosmopolitanism; the content of this concept is concrete historical, in the course of history, cosmopolitanism manifests itself in diverse, sometimes contradictory, forms and contents.

2. At the same time, many researchers of cosmopolitanism emphasize such "universal" distinctive features of this phenomenon as the openness of a subject to other, alien cultures, willingness of a subject to perceive the values of representatives of other cultures, etc.

3. Since cosmopolitanism is specifically manifested in various spheres of human life, research on this phenomenon should be based on an interdisciplinary approach that can reveal the most significant manifestations of this phenomenon in society. As a consequence, such studies in aggregate will provide an opportunity for a more complete description of cosmopolitanism as a social phenomenon.

4. To date, cosmopolitanism in general and, above all, cultural cosmopolitanism has been mainly studied within the framework of the sociological approach. Therefore, it is necessary to philosophically comprehend these phenomena in order to develop appropriate complex concepts that can create the basis for further interdisciplinary research in the social and humanitarian sphere.

5. Up to the present time, a strict critical approach consisting in opposing this phenomenon to patriotism dominates in the domestic tradition of socio-humanitarian studies of cosmopolitanism. Therefore, modern researchers of social processes face the task of dialectical overcoming of narrow, one-sided interpretations in the study of cosmopolitan and patriotic tendencies in the modern world.

Conclusion

Speaking about the social basis of the phenomenon under study, it is necessary to note the following. It was considered customarily that cosmopolitanism has an elitist character; the representatives of the elite are the bearers of its ideas. Hence, cosmopolitanism was seen as an element of elitist culture in opposition to the culture of the mass. This, in particular, is alarmed by S. Huntington who noted the increasing "denationalization" of the American elite, and the ever widening gap between the cosmopolitan American business, political and academic elite and the American people (2004: 28). (This was reflected, in particular, in the results of the presidential elections in the USA, when a significant part of the supporters of the candidate H. Clinton was made up of creative and intellectual elite, and D. Trump of representatives of the economically and culturally lower layers of the population).

Today, the point of view gains more and more recognition that this approach is one-sided, since in the modern world, cosmopolitan ideas and sentiments are being spread in the lower strata of society. Modern researchers distinguish different types of "contradictory cosmopolitanisms" (Hannerz, 2005), "high" and "low" cosmopolitanisms. In the opinion of G. Delanty (2006), modern cultural cosmopolitanism, unlike previous similar projects, is more characteristic not of high, but of mass culture.

It should also be noted that the foundations of cosmopolitanism are rooted in the very nature of man as a tribal creature. In addition, individual psychological characteristics of a person play a certain role in the subject's inclination to cosmopolitan mentality.

However, one must bear in mind that it is by no means always the same thing to be a cosmopolitan and to attribute oneself to the bearers of cosmopolitan moods and ideas.

References

Beck, W. (2003). Cosmopolitan society and its enemies. Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology, 6(1), 24-53. URL: http://www.jourssa.ru/sites/all/files/volumes/2003_1/Bek_2003_1.pdf

Chumakov, A. (2011). Globalization and cosmopolitanism in the context of modernity. URL: http://www.intelros.ru/intelros/reiting/reyting_09/material_sofiy/10586-globalizaciya-i-kosmopolitizm-v-kontekste-sovremennosti.html

Delanty, G. (2006). The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory. The British Journal of Sociology, 57(1), 25-47. URL: https://oneworlduv.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/06/cosmopolitan_imagination.pdf

Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. Theory, Culture & Society, 7, 237-251. URL: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/026327690007002014

Hannerz, U. (2005). Two Faces of Cosmopolitanism: Culture and Politics. Statsvetenskaplig Tidskrift, 107(3), 199-213. URL: http://journals.lub.lu.se/index.php/st/article/view/3534/3113

Huntington, S. (2004). Who we are? Challenges of American national identity. Trans. from English by A. Bashkirova. Moscow: AST publishing house.

Ivina, A. A. (ed.) (2004). Philosophy: Encyclopedic Dictionary. Moscow: Gardariki. URL: http://dic.academic.ru/dic.nsf/enc_philosophy/560/COSMOSPOLISIS

Martell, L. (2011). Cosmopolitanism and Global Politics. Political Quarterly, 82(4), 618-627. URL: http://users.sussex.ac.uk/~ssfa2/cosmo%20pq.pdf

McCormick, P. (2014). Globalization and cosmopolitanism: Criteria, approaches, and life experience. In A.N. Chumakov & L. E. Grinin (eds.), Where is the age of Globalizaiton Moving? (pp. 262-271). Volgograd: Teacher. URL: https://www.hse.ru/pubs/share/direct/document/134782986

Palmer, T. G. (2003). Globalization, Cosmopolitanism, and Personal Identity. Ethics & Politics, 2, 1-15. URL: http://tomgpalmer.com/wp-content/uploads/papers/palmer-globcosmoidentity.pdf