

TITLE

Cosmopolitanism as a Transnational Identity Form in the time of Globalization

Paper submitted for the First International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry,
May 5-7, 2005, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

AUTHOR INFORMATION

Dr. Konrad Gunesch – The University of Hong Kong

Contact information: Dr. Konrad Gunesch, HKU Family Institute,
5/F, Tsan Yuk Hospital, 30 Hospital Road, Sai Ying Pun, Hong Kong

Tel.: (852) 2859 5314 / 2859 5300, Fax: (852) 2964 9475

Email: konrad@hkucc.hku.hk, konradgunesch@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

This paper proposes cosmopolitanism as a form of transnational identity in the time of, but at the same time independent from, globalization. It defines cosmopolitanism via a literature matrix of several aspects and issues of what constitutes a cosmopolitan person, or cosmopolitan individual cultural identity. Broadly defined, this is a cultural world citizenship which straddles the global and the local via an engagement with foreign local cultural diversity. The transnational aspect of this identity form will be given special focus, via literary definitions of cosmopolitanism as transcultures, as well as detailed analysis of the relationship between cosmopolitanism and the nation-state. Having developed the matrix of cosmopolitanism, the status of this identity form will be discussed in the context of, but clearly delineated from, the phenomenon of globalization. The main contribution of the paper is towards an improved theorization of cosmopolitanism.

Cosmopolitanism as a Transnational Identity Form in the time of Globalization

INTRODUCTION

Presenting cosmopolitanism as a form of transnational identity

The motivation for presenting ‘cosmopolitanism’ as a form of transnational identity is manifold, and is also a response to indiscriminate terminological use in the literature:

- First of all, it goes back to the writing of Ulf Hannerz, who will be described below as the key source for the modern understanding of cosmopolitanism, and who describes cosmopolitans as a form of ‘transnational cultures’ (1990: 243).
- Secondly, there are writers in the literature on cosmopolitanism who regard *internationalism*, although a component of cosmopolitanism as discussed below, as being no longer sufficient and wish to transcend the idea of *inter-nationalism* as being based on nation-states (Rée 1998: 88; Sarup 1996: 142).
- Finally, the idea of transnationalism is gaining strength in various academic fields, exemplified by international education: ‘The fact that the world is small, fragile, and its inhabitants increasingly dependent on one another...has also made it imperative that international educators...focus on issues and problems that are trans-national and trans-cultural’ (Gellar 2002: 32).

The model of cosmopolitanism presented below is original not least because while containing internationalism as a constitutive element, it also wishes in parts to transcend it.

As for the terminological diffusion, the literature on cosmopolitanism seemingly uses the terms of ‘transnational/ism’ and ‘international/ism’ indiscriminately. However, ‘internationalism’ seems to be used more often, especially in the context of the highly contentious nation-state issue, discussed in detail below. Etymologically and as the above Gellar quote also suggests, the term *transnational/ism* has more of a *transcending* quality regarding national issues and boundaries than *international/ism*. Throughout the main part of this paper, either of the two terms is used only when directly referring to literature voices, thus adopting their respective usage. Towards the end and just before the

conclusions, a differentiation between cosmopolitanism and internationalism will be made, again following the literature use of the term internationalism. The conclusions, however, contain a personal differentiation between the terms of international/ism and transnational/ism which goes beyond the usage of the literature.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The definition of cosmopolitanism

Since ‘cosmopolitanism is a protean term with a complex history’ (Mehta 2000: 620), this article focuses on contemporary literature on cosmopolitanism. However, roughly summing up two millennia, there seem to be three periods when the concept of cosmopolitanism was especially intensely debated: firstly, the time of the Greek Stoics of the 1st and 2nd century BC, secondly, the seventeenth/eighteenth century, and thirdly, as of the early 1990s (see Carter 2001: 1; Derrida 1997: 47-48, Edwards 2001: 34; Heater 2000: 179-180 and 2002: 11, 26, 40; Kristeva 1988: 84, 202). Regarding that third period, the literature openly admits cosmopolitanism to be lacking a sharp and detailed definition, and to be an identity form *sui generis* (see Anderson 1998: 267; Brennan 2001: 76; Clifford 1998: 365; Eagleton 2000: 63; Mehta 2000: 621; Pollock et al. 2002: 1; Robbins 1998b: 12; Waldron 1995: 110, 112). Moreover, cosmopolitanism has ‘appeared as a subject of interdisciplinary debate’ (Dharwadker 2001: 1). For these reasons, a literature matrix of cosmopolitanism or cosmopolitan cultural identity will be presented, with writings from several disciplines, because what is decisive was not a particular school or style of writing but the way somebody has decided to write about cosmopolitanism. Occasional references to historical sources will be made if these are taken up by recent writings.

Recent literature frequently refers to Hannerz, especially his essay *Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture* (1990), which appears slightly modified and shortened in his book *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places* (1996: 102-111). Many ideas from these two sources also appear in his book *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning* (1992), and all three sources often contain verbatim identical

passages. The reason for such frequent reference especially to Hannerz seems to be that he attempted to provide both a concise yet comprehensive model of cosmopolitanism as well as concrete definitions of various issues within it. Such attempts at concrete definitions are either lacking in the more recent writings, or are just implied by reference to Hannerz, or they are reproduced without substantial expansion of his core meanings and ideas.

For all these reasons, the definition of cosmopolitanism below is not merely a literature review, but a literature synthesis that has been, in turn, subjected to substantial critical thinking. Cosmopolitanism can usefully be pre-defined by the catchword phrase reoccurring in the literature, of ‘feeling at home in the world’ (see for instance the title of Brennan’s 1997 book *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*). This feeling at home in the world could be specified as interest in or engagement with cultural diversity by straddling the global and the local spheres in terms of personal identity. Straddling in this sense means having one foot in each sphere, and finding a balance in which the global is decisive without necessarily dominating all the time.

The cosmopolitan straddling of the global and the local

Part of the literature distinguishes between cosmopolitanism and localism, or between cosmopolitans and locals: For Hannerz, both forms are part of what he calls ‘world culture’, which is ‘created through the increasing interconnectedness of varied local cultures, as well as through the development of cultures without a clear anchorage in any one territory’ (1990: 237, 249 and 1996: 102). The interdependence between cosmopolitan globalism and localism is central to Hannerz’s writing. He suggests that both cosmopolitans and locals ‘have common interests in the survival of cultural identity’. They are just biased towards different extremes, thereby complementing each other and in the end depending on each other as in an ecosystem, in which the cosmopolitan is interested in the survival of diverse cultural identities. For the local, cultural diversity, ‘as a matter of personal access to varied cultures, may be of little intrinsic interest... For the cosmopolitan, in contrast, there is value in diversity as such’.

But the cosmopolitan cannot come into contact with this diversity, ‘unless other people are allowed to carve out special niches for their cultures, and keep them’ (1990: 249-250). Hannerz’s conclusion ‘that there can be no cosmopolitans without locals’ (1990: 250 and 1996: 111) seems then logical. Others come to the same conclusion: ‘The opposition between cosmopolitan and local is a simple deduction from the meaning of cosmopolitan itself, a notion that presupposes the existence of at least two local cultures’ (Friedman 1994: 204-205 and 1995: 78-79; similarly Beck 2002: 19, 36; Pollock 2002: 17; Roudometof 2005: 121). Other literature amends the global and local existences with a notion such as ‘living in between’ or ‘a balancing act’ (Anderson 1998: 276; Clifford 1992: 108 and 1997: 36; Rabinow 1986: 258). In sum, one could follow either Hannerz’s rather black-and-white conception of cosmopolitan globals and locals, or the literature that takes into account spaces in between, shades of grey, and especially the balancing act between the global and the local. One could also think of a continuum between the global and the local, so that a development process of the individual cosmopolitan from the local can be taken into account. The idea of a continuum is used several times in this literature synthesis.

Cosmopolitan competence or mastery

Linking up with the relationship between the global and the local spheres, Hannerz describes local competence as a characteristic of cosmopolitanism, namely as ‘not a way of becoming a local, but rather of simulating local knowledge’ (1990: 247). He specifies different grades of expertise within that simulation of local knowledge:

Cosmopolitanism tends also to be a matter of competence, of both a generalised and a more specialised kind. There is the aspect of a state of readiness, a personal ability to make one’s way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting, and reflecting, and there is cultural competence in the stricter sense of the terms, a built-up skill in manoeuvring more or less expertly with a particular system of meanings. In its concern with the Other, cosmopolitanism thus becomes a matter of varieties and levels. Cosmopolitans can be dilettantes as well as connoisseurs, and are often both, at different times. Competence with regard to alien cultures for the cosmopolitan entails a sense of mastery. (1992: 252-253; similarly 1990: 239-240 and 1996: 103)

In view of the number and differentiation of alien cultures, the cosmopolitan is a connoisseur regarding some of the alien cultures, and a dilettante regarding probably the great majority of the other existing cultures. Again, one could think of a continuum here, from the state of a dilettante to the state of a connoisseur, so that a development process can also be taken into account. So the idea of a continuum might apply on two levels: firstly, the differentiation between cosmopolitan globals and locals; secondly, the competence or mastery aspect of cosmopolitans in relation to particular local culture(s).

Hannerz's metacultural position

Hannerz describes the core meaning of his notion of cosmopolitanism as follows:

A more genuine cosmopolitanism entails a certain metacultural position. There is, first of all, a willingness to engage with the Other, an intellectual and ethic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences. (1992: 252; similarly 1990: 239; 1996: 103)

[It is] a search for contrasts rather than uniformity. To become acquainted with more cultures is to turn into an *aficionado*, to view them as art works. (1990: 239, original emphasis; similarly 1996: 103)

This core meaning has been adopted by recent writings: some quote it verbatim and link it to the historical dimension: 'Hannerz's...exposition of the cosmopolitan ideal harmonizes well with the Hellenic conception of the world citizen which gave rise to the term' (Kaufmann 2000: 1091; similarly Abbas 2002: 211). Others describe the notion almost verbatim (Mehta 2000: 622), or refer to some of its key features such as engagement with the Other (Papastephanou 2002: 69-70) or open-mindedness (Fullinwider 2001: 341). Although Hannerz does not say so explicitly, it is quite clear that his 'metacultural position' is the subjective side and requirement of a cosmopolitan, while his 'cosmopolitan mastery' outlined earlier is the objective side and requirement.

The question of mobility or traveling

If one thinks of cultures remaining located geographically, one might require mobility, in order to experience and feel at home in them. This raises the question of whether and to what extent physical mobility is essential for cosmopolitanism. Some dictionaries offer a definition of cosmopolitanism with a central mobility (travel) aspect:

Cosmopolitan: Adj. 1. With features of different countries: composed of or containing people from different countries. 2. Well-travelled: familiar with many different countries and cultures. 3. Un-prejudiced: free from national prejudices. 4. Knowledgeable and refined: showing a breadth of knowledge and refinement from having travelled widely...N. Well-travelled person: somebody who has travelled to many different countries around the world. (Rooney 1999: 427; similarly 2002: 189)

Also for a part of the literature the travel experience seems to be a central aspect of cosmopolitanism, either by mentioning it directly (Appadurai and Breckenridge 1998: 5; Beck 2000: 96; Clifford 1992: 103; Kelsky 1996: 175; Morley 1996: 332-333), or by describing the mobility that enables travel experiences (Brennan 1997: 19; Clifford 1998: 362; Ong 1999: 13; Wilson 1998: 352; Zachary 2000: 1). But Hannerz contrasts simply moving around in the world with his metacultural position:

Often the term [cosmopolitan] is used loosely, to describe just about anybody who moves about in the world. But of such people, some would seem more cosmopolitan than others, and others again hardly cosmopolitan at all. A more genuine cosmopolitanism entails a certain metacultural position. There is, first of all, a willingness to engage with the Other. (Hannerz 1992: 252; similarly 1996: 102-103)

Hannerz compares cosmopolitans with other groups of people who can also be described as mobile, 'footloose, or on the move in the world', as for example tourists, exiles, expatriates, transnational employees and labor migrants. He makes clear that mobility alone is no guarantee of cosmopolitanism, but rather the (sole) characteristic of the typical tourist. For him, tourists are 'not participants, but mere spectators' and thus 'incompetent' (1990: 240-242; 1992: 246-248; 1996: 105). This description can be seen as an antithesis to the cosmopolitan state of mind. In Tomlinson's critique, 'Hannerz's anthropological eye is useful in reminding us that the sheer increase in mobility... is not in itself sufficient to engender a cosmopolitan disposition' (1999: 186; similarly Nava

2002: 88; Robbins 1998a: 254; Roudometof 2005: 114). Hence this more critical part of the literature does not see mobility or traveling as sufficient for real cosmopolitan experiences.

The relationship between cosmopolitanism and tourism

One could see the relationship between cosmopolitanism and tourism as an aspect of mobility or traveling, or vice versa. However, various writers seem to attach special importance to the example of the tourist, although not all of them clearly distinguish the tourist from the cosmopolitan. It seems that the tourist is an interesting case in as much as the typical tourist is largely excluded from cosmopolitan status, but tourism and cosmopolitanism in general do not seem to exclude each other. The tourist is also the personal embodiment of mobility or traveling mentioned earlier, but the focus is now less on the means or extent of travel than on the motives.

Hannerz's definition of tourists as 'not participants, but mere spectators' and as 'incompetent' given above in contrast to the cosmopolitan, can be found in a variety of other literature sources, which primarily address language teaching, European politics, cultural identity or culture in general, and even encompass the travel writing and the novel genre, even if cosmopolitanism is in most cases not directly referred to. Tourists are thus described as:

- Just keeping to beach holiday stereotype experiences (Curtis and Pajaczkowska 1994: 201; Featherstone 1993: 182 and 1995: 98);
- Staying only a short and hurried time in contrast to the traveler who dwells over a longer time before moving on (Bowles 1990: 13; Curtis and Pajaczkowska 1994: 201; Fischer 1996: 73-74; Todorov 1986: 21);
- Avoiding close encounters and deep involvement with the target culture (Baumann 1996: 29; Bruckner 1996: 247, 249; Carter 2001: 77; Curtis and Pajaczkowska 1994: 202; Featherstone 1995: 98; Shore 2000: 229; Todorov 1986: 21);
- Projecting their home experience onto the target culture, gaining only exotic fringe benefits from cultural differences (Theroux 1986: 133); or vice versa,

- Having unreasonably high expectations of exotic differences to their home experiences (Rée 1998: 81);
- Remaining in the end without substantial challenge or change contributed to or received from the target culture (Byram 1997: 1-2; Fischer 1996: 74-76).

Hannerz's critique of Theroux's writing is very useful to sum up all these categories: 'Such travel is not for cosmopolitans, and does little to create cosmopolitans. Much present-day tourism is of this kind' (1990: 241 and 1992: 247 and 1996: 104-105).

In sum, the literature unanimously excludes the tourist from the connoisseur status and from feeling at home in the place and with the locals. However, it is difficult to imagine that a cosmopolitan cannot be a tourist as well, at least from time to time. Indeed, Appiah says about cultural tourism that it is something 'which the cosmopolitan admits to enjoying' (1998: 91). Consequently, one can assume that the other literature has basically the cliché of the 'typical tourist' in mind. Since part of the literature defines the difference between cosmopolitanism and tourism in terms of 'not being the other form', it is probably fair to say that the counter-image one gets is then the 'typical cosmopolitan'. This means that the overwhelming majority of the literature sees cosmopolitanism and tourism as a black-and-white cliché, a polarity, and does not suggest either any variation in these extremes, nor any possible forms or stages of development between them. My empirical research with multilingual people, exploring how they revealed themselves against the cosmopolitan model (which by the way confirmed the model's robustness), strongly suggested such a rigorous and even tautological view as being too limited, and for a flexible continuum model once more being useful (Gunesch 2002: 263-264, 273). However, to keep things simple and within the scope of this paper, here we will keep rather strictly to the 'cosmopolitan' and not the 'tourist' model.

Hannerz's 'home' for the cosmopolitan

Having dealt with the issues of mobility or traveling as well as tourism, the question remains of where 'home' is for the cosmopolitan, because home in a 'classical' sense is somehow understood as a counterpart to mobility. This classical sense might or might not be a part within the cosmopolitan shorthand definition of 'feeling at home in the world',

since the cosmopolitan home can now be located literally anywhere within or between the local and the global. Hannerz is the only literature representative discovered to explore this question. The only two other voices found merely point out the alleged 'homelessness' of the cosmopolitan in one single instance, respectively (Eagleton 2000: 63; Iyer 2000: 136), while some deal with reverse culture shock of cross-cultural travelers who re-enter the area of their cultural departure, however without reference to cosmopolitanism (Storti 1990: 99).

Hannerz goes somewhat deeper; he maintains that the cosmopolitan person can easily disengage from his culture of origin: 'The cosmopolitan's surrender to the alien culture implies personal autonomy vis-à-vis the culture where he originated. He has his obvious competence with regard to it, but he can choose to disengage from it' (1990: 240 and 1992: 253). He then presents an open definition of home: one possibility is that cosmopolitans 'are never quite home again, in the way real locals can be', since there is no more 'taken-for-grantedness'. Or, 'the cosmopolitan makes 'home' as well one of his several sources of personal meaning' or, 'he is pleased with his ability both to surrender to and master this one as well'. Another possibility is that 'home is really home, but in a special way; a constant reminder of a pre-cosmopolitan past, a privileged site of nostalgia...where once things seemed fairly simple and straightforward'. Or, home could be 'a comfortable place of familiar faces, where one's competence is undisputed... but where for much the same reason there is some risk of boredom' (1990: 248; 1992: 253-254; 1996: 110). One could think of the possibility of 'multiple homes', which is not mentioned in this way by Hannerz, who presents a variety of single alternatives, without any hint of a possible multiplicity. In the end the question of where home is for the cosmopolitan remains literally wide open. This is why its substantiation within the following hugely contentious issue of the nation-state promises to be an interesting challenge.

The relationship between cosmopolitanism and the nation-state

A very important discussion point recurring in the literature is the relationship between cosmopolitanism and the nation-state or national identity. It is included in our matrix of cosmopolitan cultural identity in the sense that the nation-state deeply permeates the daily life of contemporary persons in a variety of ways, culturally as well as politically. While the borders between cultural or political permeation are often impossible to delineate clearly, the general salience of the nation-state for identity issues is reflected in literature, which does not treat cosmopolitanism, but which describes national identity and the nation(-state) as still the globally most prevalent single identity frame or reference point, compared to other possible identity frames or reference points (see just Greenfeld 1996: 10; Guibernau 1996: 73 and 2001: 257; Opello and Rosow 1999: 253-254; Moore 2001: 56; Parmenter 1999: 454; Smith 1991: 170; Wallerstein 1991: 92).

Cosmopolitan models opposing the nation-state

If one keeps in mind the etymological meaning of ‘cosmopolitan’ from classical Greek *kosmou politês* as a ‘citizen of the world’, of which the literature is aware (Carter 2001: 2; Cheah 1998: 22; Derrida 1997: 11; Edwards 2001: 34; Heater 2000: 179 and 2002: 7, 27; Münch 2001: 69; Pollock 2002: 25; Robbins 1992: 184; Rooney 1999: 427; Tomlinson 1999: 184; Wollen 1994: 189), some authors can be seen as stating the logical consequence of this:

Cosmopolitans are, almost by definition, people who regret the privileging of national identities in political life, and who reject the principle that political arrangements should be ordered in such a way as to reflect and protect national identities. (Kymlicka 2001: 204; similarly Buzan, Held and McGrew 1998: 388-389; Friedman 1994: 204-205 and 1995: 78-79)

Sarup and Rée go considerably further in their personal involvement and attempt to construct a new model of cosmopolitanism or world citizenship:

I think we should be thinking in terms beyond the nation-state. Internationalism is inadequate because it assumes the existence of the nation-state. I suggest that we try and discover a new form of world citizenship. Is it too idealistic to hope that, wherever you are, you are a

citizen of that place?...A cosmopolitan is...one “who has no fixed abode” or one “who is nowhere a foreigner”. (Sarup 1996: 142-143)

Is it possible to hope for a new cosmopolitanism, after internationality?... Perhaps we may look forward to a future in which people could interpret themselves without any reference to the idea that their nation is their self, in fact without any essential reference to nationality at all...A new cosmopolitan world, which could put the illusions of internationality behind it, for good. (Rée 1998: 88)

Strongest of all, in her essay *Patriotism and cosmopolitanism*, Martha Nussbaum (described by Heater 2002: 11 as ‘one of the most influential scholars in the field of cosmopolitan writing, in particular through her essay [just mentioned]’) holds an ‘emphasis on patriotic pride’ to be ‘morally dangerous’ (1996: 4), and ‘nationalism and ethnocentrism’ as a ‘morally irrelevant characteristic’ (1996: 5). She explicitly puts forward a model of cosmopolitan identity as ‘world citizenship’ based on the Greek Stoics after Diogenes the Cynic (1996: 6-9) but filled with contemporary meaning. It reiterates several aspects of the cosmopolitan matrix developed by this author, while others are taken up by critical literature discussed below:

The Stoics stress that to be a citizen of the world one does not need to give up local identification, which can be a source of great richness in life. They suggest that we think of ourselves not as devoid of local affiliations, but as surrounded by a series of concentric circles. The first one encircles the self, the next takes in the immediate family, then follows the extended family, then, in order, neighbours or local groups, fellow city-dwellers, and fellow countrymen – and we can easily add to this list groupings based on ethnic, linguistic, historical, professional, gender, or sexual identities. Outside all these circles is the largest one, humanity as a whole. Our task as citizens of the world will be to ‘draw the circles somehow toward the centre’ (Stoic philosopher Hierocles, 1st–2nd CE), making all human beings more like our fellow city-dwellers, and so on. We need not give up our special affections and identifications... But we should...give the circle that defines our humanity special attention and respect. (Nussbaum 1996: 9)

Models reconciling cosmopolitanism and the nation-state

In decisive opposition to Nussbaum’s model, a number of authors explicitly embrace the nation-state attachment. As a result, the model of a ‘rooted cosmopolitanism, or if you

like, a cosmopolitan patriotism' (Appiah 1998: 91) is put forward, which stresses the feasibility and necessity of having loyalties to nation-states as well as to larger and smaller entities at the same time:

The cosmopolitan patriot can entertain the possibility of a world in which *everyone* is a rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of his or her own, with its own cultural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different, places that are home to other, different, people... We cosmopolitans *can* be patriots... It is because humans live best on a small scale that we should defend not just the state, but the county, the town, the street, the business, the craft, the profession, the family, *as* communities, as circles among the many circles narrower than the human horizon, that are appropriate spheres of human concern. We should, in short, as cosmopolitans, defend the right to live in democratic states, with rich possibilities of association within and across their borders. (Appiah 1998: 91, 95, 96, 97, original emphases; similarly Beck 2002: 19, 36; Bhabha 1996: 202; Cohen 1992: 483; Fine 2003: 462; Hollinger 1995: 5; Malcomson 1998: 234-235, 242-243; Robbins 1998b: 1)

To sum up the relationship between cosmopolitanism and the nation-state: while models opposing nation-states seek forms of attachment and identity only beyond the nation-state, models that reconcile cosmopolitanism and the nation-state argue for forms of attachment and identity within as well as beyond the nation-state. The decisive point is that for both strands of cosmopolitanism, identity and attachment forms *beyond* the nation-state are a matter of course. The whole discussion hinges on the desirability of forms of attachment and identity *within* the nation-state. This means that while larger dimensions than the nation-state are taken for granted, the nation-state is not (not even by those supporting it). Useful as an overall summary of the theoretical implications of this complex issue is Robbins' suggestion that 'there is no simple relation between cosmopolitanism and the state' (1998b: 8). In sum, this is one of the most interesting aspects of the cosmopolitan matrix with respect to 'transnationalism' and 'internationalism', since 'cosmopolitanism' offers quite a different take on these notions, as is further discussed and summarized below.

Summary of the cosmopolitan matrix

The following are the main areas of personal concern or engagement for a cosmopolitan person according to the synthesized literature:

- *A straddling of the 'global' and the 'local' spheres*, with a decisive impact of the global ('world citizen');
- *A 'connaissance' with respect to (local) cultural diversity wherever possible*, otherwise an interested 'dilettantism';
- *A general willingness and openness towards engagement with cultural diversity*, which yet allows for 'dislike';
- *The mobility to travel*, with a discussion about whether this is sufficient;
- *An attitude not of the 'typical tourist'*, while the 'occasional tourist' accommodates fewer concerns;
- *A notion of 'home' that can be extremely varied*, while it is no longer undisputedly the 'home culture', it also is not 'everywhere'; and
- *A critical attitude towards the (native) nation-state*, which can range between 'rooted' and 'unrooted' identity expressions.

The differentiation between cosmopolitanism and internationalism

The differentiation between 'cosmopolitanism' and 'internationalism' as *independent* concepts is a complex one, further complicated due to internationalism being, as mentioned above, a *component* of the synthesized cosmopolitan matrix. However, with the above in mind, especially considering the relationship between cosmopolitanism and the nation-state, the following points seem crucial:

- *Inter-nationalism* by definition centers around *national* (meaning *nation-state*) categories, which triggers several logical geographical, political and cultural limitations from the viewpoint of cosmopolitanism:
- Internationalism cannot question, or transcend, or even try to ignore as a category, the nation-state as such, which are strongly discussed features of cosmopolitanism.
- Internationalism can not explain why a person's 'home' might actually be outside his or her own nation-state, or in several parts of the world, as symbolized in the cosmopolitan shorthand definition of 'feeling at home in the world'.

- ‘Being international’ is defined as having ‘attitudes which place the cultures and views of others on a par with one’s own’ or as ‘showing respect for others’ (Hayden, Rancic and Thompson 2000: 120). The possibility of viewing other cultures and views actually *above* one’s own or showing *more* than just respect for others (e.g. a strong emotional involvement or an emulation of local knowledge or habits) is thus better conceivable in cosmopolitanism.
- Cultural issues that are below or above the nation-state remit (for instance interest in small-scale local cultural diversity, like regions or cities, or an overarching identity dimension covering the whole world) are easier to capture with cosmopolitanism defined above as ‘straddling the global and the local’.

The differentiation between cosmopolitanism and globalization

Having thus outlined the model of cosmopolitanism, globalization could be seen as its antithesis insofar as it is associated with cultural uniformity and homogenization. Some writers classify contemporary cosmopolitanism as a phenomenon of globalization (Barker 2000: 113-114; Diouf 2002: 111-112; Held et al. 1999: 341, 374; Jones 1998: 146; Mehta 2000: 619-20; Tomlinson 1999: 185). Others differentiate between globalization and cosmopolitanism by claiming that ‘the first signifies an empirical phenomenon whereas the second denotes an ideal’ (Papastephanou 2002: 75), or by differentiating that ‘globalization is a set of designs to manage the world whereas cosmopolitanism is a set of projects towards planetary conviviality’ (Mignolo 2002: 157). However, none of them offers further substantial reasoning for their practice or position. Cosmopolitanism, as outlined above, and globalization seem to be substantively as well as historically completely different in character:

- There are two strands of opinions in the globalization debate: one associates globalization with cultural uniformity (see Callan 2000: 19; Jameson 2000: 51; Kress 1998: 57; Sifakis and Sougari 2003: 60; Watson 2000: 68-71) and one with fewer subscribers that (also) associates it with cultural diversity (see Scholte 2000: 23). Our model of cosmopolitanism belongs to the diversity strand: while only few authors seem to read cosmopolitanism as a synonym for uniformity (Gutmann 1993: 184),

others read it as diversity (Bohman 1998: 107; Brint 2001: 10; Hannerz 1990: 237; Hollinger 1995: 84 and 103-104), as outlined above. To hammer the point home: with Hannerz being our pivotal literature representative, he also provides a clear and useful differentiation between his ‘world culture’ (to which the cosmopolitan belongs) and the uniformity strand of globalization: ‘World culture...means: not a replication of uniformity but an organization of diversity, an increasing interconnectedness of varied local cultures’ (1996: 102; similarly 1990: 237).

- With this differentiation in mind, the definition element of globalization that ‘it goes global and local at the same moment’ (Hall 1991: 27; similarly Cadieux and Esselink 2002: 24; Featherstone 1993: 169; Fishman 1998-99: 37; Guibernau 2001: 244; Held et al. 1999: 28; Isin and Wood 1999: 94; Jones 1998: 144, 149; Kaldor 1996: 44; Lo Bianco 2003: 287) is only superficially similar to our conception of cosmopolitanism of straddling the global and the local.
- While the concept and the debate about modern forms of globalization originated only in the 1940s (Nicholson 1999: 24; Scholte 2000: 16), the concept and the debate of contemporary forms of the cosmopolitan as a world citizen have much deeper historical roots. Here we can mention Fougeret de Monbron’s work *Le Cosmopolite ou le Citoyen du Monde* (written in 1750), or literature maintaining that ‘in English, *cosmopolite* came into frequent usage only [sic] in the seventeenth century’ (Malcomson 1998: 233, original emphasis; similarly Barnhart 1988: 224; Edwards 2001: 34). One could even go back to the original Greek Stoics’ concept of cosmopolitan as ‘world citizen’ of the 1st and 2nd century BC, illustrated by Nussbaum’s (1996: 6-9) writing discussed earlier.

CONCLUSIONS

With respect to internationalism, cosmopolitanism can challenge and further it in all the above mentioned ways, and consequently offer an identity model besides and beyond national identity, but also besides and beyond internationalism. This substantiation and challenge of internationalism can be applied to several fields, above all cultural identity. In the field of politics, especially its relationship with the nation-state, cosmopolitanism

could become at least a potential challenger for a politically defined internationalism. Finally, for the field of ‘international education’, research by the author has demonstrated in detail that ‘while cosmopolitanism might not need to replace internationalism, as a complementary (or even concurrent) notion it has its merits...advantageous to the philosophy of...“international understanding”’ (Gunesch 2004: 268).

With respect to transnational/ism, the literature has been shown to use this term rather indiscriminately and interchangeably with international/ism. In the light of the earlier differentiation between cosmopolitanism and internationalism, the use of the term transnational/ism would not be merely a more appropriate synonym, or just a slightly different connotation of the same notion. It would indeed convey a qualitatively different concept, the difference lying in the explicit transcendence of nation-state categories. I thus propose to see cosmopolitanism *explicitly and separately* as a *transnational* identity form which not only encompasses but *transcends* national boundaries and categories. This transcendence is meant to apply not only to the physical, political, cultural or ideological boundaries of particular nation-states, but to the very idea of national categories as the precondition for the notion of nation-states and internationalism. It has to be noted that any political implications of this transnationalism (in the sense of a model or a process towards a political world citizenship) cannot be treated in this paper, but also that this is an area in need of analysis, discussion and further research.

With respect to globalization, cosmopolitanism has been shown to be a model historically and conceptually independent from globalization. This is why I hope that, in the future, cosmopolitanism can grow further in theoretical construction as well as practical relevance for the development, construction and definition of individual cultural identities on a global scale. In this sense, and to conclude with a metaphor taken from the ‘mobility and traveling’ requirement of the cosmopolitan matrix, cosmopolitanism could be seen as currently traveling the path of the history of ideas in the company of, but by no means dependent on, globalization.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, A. (2002) 'Cosmopolitan de-descriptions: Shanghai and Hong Kong', in C.A. Breckenridge, S. Pollock, H.K. Bhabha and D. Chakrabarty (eds) *Cosmopolitanism*, pp. 209-228. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Anderson, A. (1998) 'Cosmopolitanism, universalism, and the divided legacies of modernity', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, pp. 265-289. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Appadurai, A. and C. Breckenridge (1998) 'Why public culture?' *Public Culture Bulletin* 1 (1): 5-9.
- Appiah, K.A. (1998) 'Cosmopolitan patriots', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, pp. 91-114. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Barker, C. (2000) *Cultural Studies: Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.
- Barnhart, R.K. (ed) (1988) *Chambers Dictionary of Etymology*. Edinburgh: Chambers.
- Baumann, Z. (1996) 'From pilgrim to tourist – or a short history of identity, in S. Hall and P. Du Gay (eds) *Questions of Cultural Identity*, pp. 18-36. London: Sage.
- Beck, U. (2000) 'The cosmopolitan perspective: sociology of the second age of modernity'. *British Journal of Sociology* 51 (1): 79-105.
- Beck, U. (2002) The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture and Society* 19 (1-2): 17-44.
- Bhabha, H.K. (1996) 'Unsatisfied: notes on vernacular cosmopolitanism', in L. García-Moreno and P.C. Pfeiffer (eds) *Text and Nation: Cross-Disciplinary Essays on Cultural and National Identities*, pp. 191-207. Columbia, USA: Camden House.
- Bohman, J. (1998) 'The globalisation of the public sphere: cosmopolitan publicity and cultural pluralism'. *The Modern Schoolman* 75 (2): 101-117.
- Bowles, P. (1990) *The Sheltering Sky*. London and Glasgow: Paladin Grafton Books.
- Brennan, T. (1997) *At Home in the World: Cosmopolitanism Now*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Brennan, T. (2001) 'Cosmopolitanism and internationalism'. *New Left Review* 2 (7): 75-84.

- Brint, M. (2001) 'The politics of identity and the culture of global technology', in R. Lukic and M. Brint (eds) *Culture, Politics, and Nationalism in the Age of Globalisation*, pp. 3-28. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Bruckner, P. (1996) 'The edge of Babel'. *Partisan Review* 63 (2): 242-254.
- Buzan, B., D. Held and A. McGrew (1998) 'Realism versus cosmopolitanism: a debate between Barry Buzan and David Held, conducted by Anthony McGrew'. *Review of International Studies* 24 (3): 387-398.
- Byram, M. (1997) *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cadieux, P. and B. Esselink (2002) 'Feeling guilty [sic]: defining the terms globalisation, internationalisation, localisation and translation'. *Language International* 14 (3): 22-25.
- Callan, H. (2000) 'The international vision in practice: a decade of evolution'. *Higher Education in Europe* 25 (1): 15-23.
- Carter, A. (2001) *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cheah, P. (1998) 'Introduction part II: the cosmopolitical – today', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, pp. 20-41. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Clifford, J. (1992) 'Travelling cultures', in Grossberg, L., C. Nelson and P.A. Treichler (eds) *Cultural Studies*, pp. 96-116. New York and London: Routledge.
- Clifford, J. (1997) *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press.
- Clifford, J. (1998) 'Mixed feelings', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, pp. 362-370. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cohen, M. (1992) 'Rooted cosmopolitanism: thoughts on the left, nationalism, and multiculturalism'. *Dissent* 39 (4): 478-483.
- Curtis, B. and C. Pajaczkowska (1994) "'Getting there": travel, time and narrative', in G. Robertson, M. Mash, L. Tickner, J. Bird, B. Curtis and T. Putnam (eds) *Travellers' Tales: Narratives of Home and Displacement*, pp. 199-215. London and New York: Routledge.

- Derrida, J. (1997) *Cosmopolites De Tous Les Pays, Encore Un Effort!* Paris: Éditions Galilée.
- Dharwadker, V. (2001) 'Introduction: cosmopolitanism in its time and place', in V. Dharwadker (ed) *Cosmopolitan Geographies: New Locations in Literature and Culture*, pp. 1-13. New York and London: Routledge.
- Diouf, M. (2002) 'The Senegalese Murid trade diaspora and the making of a vernacular cosmopolitanism', in C.A. Breckenridge, S. Pollock, H.K. Bhabha and D. Chakrabarty (eds) *Cosmopolitanism*, pp. 111-137. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Eagleton, T. (2000) *The Idea of Culture*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Edwards, R.R. (2001) "'The metropol and the mayster-toun': cosmopolitanism and late medieval literature", in V. Dharwadker (ed) *Cosmopolitan Geographies: New Locations in Literature and Culture*, pp. 33-62. New York and London: Routledge.
- Featherstone, M. (1993) 'Global and local cultures', in J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson and L. Tickner (eds) *Mapping the Futures: Local Cultures, Global Change*, pp. 169-187. London: Routledge.
- Featherstone, M. (1995) *Undoing Culture: Globalisation, Postmodernism and Identity*. London: Sage.
- Fine, R. (2003) Taking the 'ism' out of cosmopolitanism: an essay in reconstruction. *European Journal of Social Theory* 6 (4): 451-470.
- Fischer, G. (1996) 'Tourist or explorer? Reflection in the foreign language classroom'. *Foreign Language Annals* 29 (1): 73-81.
- Fishman, J.A. (1998-99) 'The new linguistic order'. *Foreign Policy* 113: 26-40.
- Fougeret de Monbron, L. (1970) *Le Cosmopolite, ou le Citoyen du Monde*. Bordeaux: Ducros. (Written in 1750.)
- Friedman, J. (1994) *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: Sage.
- Friedman, J. (1995) 'Global systems, globalisation and the parameters of modernity', in M. Featherstone, Mike, S. Lash and R. Robertson (eds) *Global Modernities*, pp. 69-91. London: Sage.
- Fullinwider, R. (2001) 'Multicultural education and cosmopolitan citizenship'. *International Journal of Educational Research* 35 (3): 331-343.

- Gellar, C.A. (2002) 'International Education: a commitment to universal values', in M. Hayden, J. Thompson, and G. Walker (eds) *International Education in Practice: Dimensions for National & International Schools*, pp. 30-35. London: Kogan Page.
- Greenfeld, L. (1996) 'Nationalism and modernity'. *Social Research* 63 (1): 3-40.
- Guibernau, M. (1996) *Nationalisms: The Nation-State and Nationalism in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Guibernau, M. (2001) 'Globalisation and the nation-state', in M. Guibernau and J. Hutchinson (eds) *Understanding Nationalism*, pp. 242-268. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Gunesch, K. (2002) *The Relationship between Multilingualism and Cosmopolitanism*. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Bath.
- Gunesch, K. (2004) 'Education for cosmopolitanism? Cosmopolitanism as a personal cultural identity model for and within international education'. *Journal of Research in International Education* 3 (3): 251-275.
- Gutmann, A. (1993) 'The challenge of multiculturalism in political ethics'. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 22 (3): 171-206.
- Hall, S. (1991) 'The local and the global: globalisation and ethnicity', in A.D. King (ed) *Culture, Globalisation and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, pp. 19-39. London: Macmillan.
- Hannerz, U. (1990) 'Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture'. In M. Featherstone (ed) *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalisation and Modernity*, pp. 237-251. London: Sage.
- Hannerz, U. (1992) *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organisation of Meaning*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hannerz, U. (1996) *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Hayden, M.C., B.A. Rancic and J.J. Thompson (2000) 'Being international: student and teacher perceptions from international schools'. *Oxford Review of Education* 26 (1): 107-123.
- Heater, D. (2000) 'Does cosmopolitan thinking have a future?' *Review of International Studies* 26 (5): 179-197.
- Heater, D. (2002) *World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and its Opponents*. London and New York: Continuum.

- Held, David, A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt and J. Perraton (1999) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hollinger, D.A. (1995) *Postethnic America: Beyond Multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books.
- Isin, E.F. and P.K. Wood (1999) *Citizenship and Identity*. London: Sage.
- Iyer, P. (2000) *The Global Soul: Jet Lag, Shopping Malls, and the Search for Home*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Jameson, F. (2000) 'Globalisation and political strategy'. *New Left Review* 2 (4): 49-68.
- Jones, P.W. (1998) 'Globalisation and internationalism: democratic prospects for world education'. *Comparative Education* 34 (2): 143-155.
- Kaldor, M. (1996) 'Cosmopolitanism versus nationalism: the new divide?', in R. Caplan and J. Feffner (eds) *Europe's New Nationalism: States and Minorities in Conflict*, pp. 42-58. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kaufmann, E. (2000) 'Liberal ethnicity: beyond liberal nationalism and minority rights'. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23 (6): 1086-1119.
- Kelsky, K. (1996) 'Flirting with the foreign: interracial sex in Japan's "international" age', in R. Wilson and W. Dissanayake (eds) *Global/Local: Cultural Production and the Transnational Imaginary*, pp. 173-192. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Kress, G. (1998) 'Visual and verbal modes of representation in electronically mediated communication: the potentials of new forms of text', in I. Snyder (ed) *Page to Screen: Taking Literacy into the Electronic Era*, pp. 53-79. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kristeva, J. (1988) *Étrangers à Nous-Mêmes*. Paris: Librairie Arthème Fayard.
- Kymlicka, W. (2001) *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2003) 'Making language education policies: a needed response to globalization'. *The Modern Language Journal* 87 (2): 286-288.
- Malcomson, S.L. (1998) 'The varieties of cosmopolitan experience', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, pp. 233-245. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

- Mehta, P.B. (2000) 'Cosmopolitanism and the circle of reason'. *Political Theory* 28 (5): 619-639.
- Mignolo, W.D. (2002) 'The many faces of cosmo-polis: border thinking and critical cosmopolitanism', in C.A. Breckenridge, S. Pollock, H.K. Bhabha and D. Chakrabarty (eds) *Cosmopolitanism*, pp. 157-187. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Moore, M. (2001) 'Globalisation, cosmopolitanism, and minority nationalism', in M. Keating and J. McGarry (eds) *Minority Nationalism and the Changing International Order*, pp. 44-60. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Morley, D. (1996) 'EurAm, modernity, reason and alterity: or, postmodernism, the highest stage of cultural imperialism?', in D. Morley and K.H. Chen (eds) *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, pp. 326-360. London: Routledge.
- Münc, R. (2001) *Nation and Citizenship in the Global Age: From National to Transnational Ties and Identities*. Basingstoke, UK and New York: Palgrave.
- Nava, Mica (2002) Cosmopolitan modernity: everyday imaginaries and the registers of difference. *Theory, Culture and Society* 19 (1-2): 81-99.
- Nicholson, M. (1999) 'How novel is globalisation?', in M. Shaw (ed) *Politics and Globalisation: Knowledge, Ethics and Agency*, pp. 23-34. London and New York: Routledge.
- Nussbaum, M.C. (1996) 'Patriotism and cosmopolitanism', in J. Cohen (ed) *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, pp. 2-17. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ong, Aihwa (1999) *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Opello, W.C. and S.J. Rosow (1999) *The Nation-State and Global Order: A Historical Introduction to Contemporary Problems*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner.
- Papastephanou, M. (2002) 'Arrows not yet fired: cultivating cosmopolitanism through education'. *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 36 (1): 69-86.
- Parmenter, L. (1999) 'Constructing national identity in a changing world: perspectives in Japanese education'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 20 (4): 453-463.
- Pollock, S. (2002) 'Cosmopolitan and vernacular in history', in C. Breckenridge (eds) *Cosmopolitanism*, pp. 15-53. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.

- Pollock, S., H.K. Bhabha, C.A. Breckenridge and D. Chakrabarty (2002) 'Cosmopolitanisms', in C.A. Breckenridge, S. Pollock, H.K. Bhabha and D. Chakrabarty (eds) *Cosmopolitanism*, pp. 1-14. Durham, North Carolina and London: Duke University Press.
- Rabinow, P. (1986) 'Representations are social facts: modernity and post-modernity in anthropology', in J. Clifford and G.E. Marcus (eds) *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*, pp. 234-261. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- R  e, J. (1998) 'Cosmopolitanism and the experience of nationality', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, pp. 77-90. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Robbins, B. (1992) 'Comparative cosmopolitanism'. *Social Text* 31/32: 169-186.
- Robbins, B. (1998a) 'Comparative cosmopolitanisms', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, pp. 246-264. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Robbins, B. (1998b) 'Introduction part I: actually existing cosmopolitanism', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, pp. 1-19. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rooney, K. (ed) (1999) *Encarta World English Dictionary*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Rooney, K. (ed) (2002) *Encarta Essential English Dictionary*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Roudometof, V. (2005) Transnationalism, cosmopolitanism and glocalization. *Current Sociology* 53 (1): 113-135.
- Sarup, M. (1996) *Identity, Culture and the Postmodern World*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Scholte, J.A. (2000) *Globalisation: A Critical Introduction*. London: Macmillan.
- Shore, C. (2000) *Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Sifakis, N. and A.M. Sougari (2003) 'Facing the globalisation challenge in the realm of English language teaching'. *Language and Education* 17 (1): 59-71.
- Smith, A.D. (1991) *National Identity*. London: Penguin.
- Storti, C. (1990) *The Art of Crossing Cultures*. Yarmouth, Maine: Intercultural Press.

- Theroux, P. (1986) *Sunrise with Seamonsters*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Todorov, T. (1986) 'Le croisement des cultures'. *Communications* 43: 5-24.
- Tomlinson, J. (1999) *Globalisation and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Waldron, J. (1995) 'Minority cultures and the cosmopolitan alternative', in W. Kymlicka (ed) *The Rights of Minority Cultures*, pp. 93-119. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wallerstein, I. (1991) 'The national and the universal: can there be such a thing as world culture?', in A.D. King (ed) *Culture, Globalisation and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*, pp. 91-105. London: Macmillan.
- Watson, C.W. (2000) *Multiculturalism*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Wilson, R. (1998) 'A new cosmopolitanism is in the air: some dialectical twists and turns', in: P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, pp. 351-361. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Wollen, P. (1994) 'The cosmopolitan ideal in the arts', in G. Robertson, M. Mash, L. Tickner, J. Bird, B. Curtis and T. Putnam (eds) *Travellers' Tales: Narratives of Home and Displacement*, pp. 187-196. London and New York: Routledge.
- Zachary, G.P. (2000) Dueling multiculturalisms: the urgent need to reconceive cosmopolitanism, Paper Presented at the Conceiving Cosmopolitan Conference, University of Warwick 27-29 April 2000. Oxford: Transnational Communities Programme.