Cosmopolitanism and Postcolonial Critique
Gurminder K. Bhambra

Introduction

The paradigms of postcolonialism and cosmopolitanism have emerged in recent times offering different responses to similar questions, the most pertinent, perhaps, being: how do we, with our manifest differences, live together in the world?[1] While the two approaches have been articulated and elaborated in a number of disciplines, my concern in this chapter is with their sociological expression in the context of a global world. In work spanning the first decade of the twenty-first century, Ulrich Beck (2000, 2006) has argued that a cosmopolitan approach is necessary to engage critically with globalization. As such, cosmopolitanism, for him, is defined explicitly in terms of a global world society, separate and distinct from the age of nation-states which preceded it (and which gave rise to the intellectual tradition of cosmopolitanism he uses).

Globalization has often been regarded as a synonym for modernization or Westernization and so it is not surprising that ideas of the global have similarly been equated with the modern West. In recent years modernization theory, with its assumption of global convergence to an explicitly Western model, has been supplanted by the approach of multiple modernities (Eisenstadt 2000). Within this theory, the modern is understood as encompassing divergent paths, with the diversity of cultures in the world giving rise to a multiplicity of modernities. Beck (2006) allies his version of cosmopolitanism with the global understood as multiple modernities and so cosmopolitanism confronts the modern world as, potentially, a multicultural world. This raises the question of cosmopolitanism's relation to multiculturalism.

In what follows, I shall I take issue with Beck's cosmopolitanism because of its inability to deal with issues raised by a multicultural world deriving from a 'Eurocentric' definition of the cosmopolitan.[2] He is not alone in his 'Eurocentric' definition of cosmopolitanism; in fact, in this regard, as we shall see, he is typical rather than unusual. However, what does make his work distinctive is that he places his argument in the context of an embrace of the idea of 'multiple modernities' and, in criticism of 'multiculturalism', both of which are central to my concerns. If we can now understand dominant approaches as Eurocentric, it is because of new voices

---

[1] The literature on both postcolonialism and cosmopolitanism is vast. As an indicative guide, see Bhabha (1994), Gutmann (1994), Nussbaum (1996), Loomba (1998), Vertovec and Cohen (2002), Fine (2007).
[2] The terms 'Europe' or 'Eurocentric' are used in this chapter as continuous with central aspects of North American social and political undertakings.

emerging in wider political arenas and in the academy itself, which might now be regarded as beginning to emerge as a 'multicultural' space. More specifically, I argue that postcolonial scholarship, with its critique of Eurocentrism in particular, provides more adequate resources for making sense of our contemporary world (Bhambra 2007a). The demise of colonialism as an explicit political formation has given rise to understandings of postcoloniality and, perhaps ironically, an increased recognition of the role of colonialism in the formation of the modern world and its associated concepts. Scholars such as Homi Bhabha (1994) and Walter Mignolo (2000) argue for the necessity of postcolonial or decolonial understandings as integral to the opening out and questioning of the assumptions of these dominant discourses. Such recognition, I suggest, is not present in most contemporary discourses on cosmopolitanism; what is required instead is a form of provincialized cosmopolitanism.

Cosmopolitan Eurocentrism?

What appears striking in not just the sociological, but also the wider academic literature on cosmopolitanism, is the extent to which 'being cosmopolitan' (as a practice) is associated with being *in* the West and cosmopolitanism (as an idea) is seen as being *of* the West.[3] As will be discussed later in this chapter, by writing out the wider contexts within which ideas and practices are located, a particular cultural homogeneity is assumed and this becomes a standard of universal significance. Anthony Pagden, for example, writes:

> 'it is hard to see how any form of "cosmopolitanism" can be made to address the difficulties of the modern world if it does not in some sense begin where Kant [and the Stoics] … began, that is with some vision of a community of 'the wise' whose views must in the end triumph … In the modern world it is equally hard to see, at least in the immediate future, that those views can be anything other than the reflection of the values of western liberal democracies' (2000: 19).

With this, Pagden asserts the origin of 'cosmopolitanism' – both as idea and as practice – in the history of what he claims as European, or, more generally, Western thought and draws a direct link between that history and our present – again, here, in the West. This is a parochial reading of cosmopolitanism which betrays the very ideals that the concept expresses. The issues with the claims made here are twofold. First, there is a refusal to acknowledge that there have been cosmopolitan practices and the development of cosmopolitan ideas in other parts of the world outside of European contact, in relation to European contact, and not subordinate to it (see, for example, Bhabha 1994, Pollock *et al* 2000). Second, there is no engagement with the problematic tension brought to the fore when we (*if, we*) address contemporaneous European domination over much of the world as the very real negation of the idea and ideals of cosmopolitanism otherwise put forward.

---

[3] This section is informed by arguments made in Bhambra (2010).

Even scholars critical of the standard forms of cosmopolitanism as expressed by Pagden, often remain circumscribed to a particular geographical territory and intellectual tradition in their exposition of a critical cosmopolitanism. Muthu (2003), for example, develops a sustained argument for 'Enlightenment against Empire', the title of his monograph, in which he uses the relatively lesser known (or 'underappreciated') resources of Enlightenment thinkers to elucidate the largely unacknowledged anti-imperialist strand within their philosophies of cosmopolitanism. Fine, in turn, presents a critical engagement with modern cosmopolitanism and seeks to reinstate it within the tradition of *social* theory as distinct from the natural law tradition from which it is said to emanate (2007: 133-4).

Yet, while opening up the space to consider the standard histories of cosmopolitanism differently, these histories also reproduce what it is that they are counter to and, in many cases, what *is* reproduced – even in the work of scholars who may not wish consciously to do so – is a European genealogy. It is not that forms of universalism are peculiar to Europe, but that Europe seems to have real difficulties with the universalism it espouses. While scholars argue for the universalism of what are assumed to be European categories, they then rarely acknowledge the processes through which that universalization is enacted, processes of colonization and imperialism for the most part. Nor do they address the forms of cosmopolitanism that have emerged in non-European contexts. As a consequence, they limit the possibility of cosmopolitanism properly to be understood 'cosmopolitan-ly'.

From Modernization to (Cosmopolitan) Multiple Modernities

Beck's (2000, 2006) argument for a cosmopolitan approach is based on his critique of the contemporary state of the social sciences. He argues that disciplines such as sociology and political science have been historically bound to nation-states in their emergence and development such that they are no longer adequate to the task of dealing with the problems and processes that emerge at the level of the 'global' world that is now increasingly our common fate. He highlights the increasing number of social processes that are no longer contained within national boundaries and suggests that, as a consequence, 'world society' should now be the starting point of sociological and other research. His argument is based on a perceived transition from a process of singular 'modernization' to one giving rise to co-existing 'multiple modernities'. This shift is understood by Beck as a shift from the first age of modernity – that is, one shaped by nation-states – to a second, global cosmopolitan, age.

Increasing recognition of the global context of sociology is evident in recent arguments against the supposed methodological nationalism of the past (although, see Chernilo 2007, for a qualification of this interpretation applied to past sociological discourse). This view is supported by a shift within sociology more generally towards the paradigm of multiple modernities as a more adequate frame within which to understand global, and globalizing, processes. Key to this development has been the work of Shmuel Eisenstadt (2000, 2001) in conjunction with a core group of European historical sociologists such as Johann Arnason

(2000, 2003), Bjorn Wittrock (1998) and Peter Wagner (2001).[4] In essence, they have argued that the problem with earlier modernization theory was that it understood modernization as a singular, uni-directional process that emerged in the West and, in its diffusion globally, brought other societies and cultures into line with its own presuppositions. Modernization was believed to have initiated a process of convergence and homogenization globally such that the rest of the world would, one day, become modernized, that is, Westernized. However, towards the latter part of the twentieth century there has been a growing realization that modernization was not coming to pass as had been expected in the heyday of modernization theory (Eisenstadt and Schluchter 1998).

The emergence of multiple modernities, then, came in the context of scholars beginning to appreciate that the differences manifest in the world were not, as had previously been believed, simply archaic differences that would disappear through gradual modernization. Instead, there is an appreciation that societies could modernize differently and that these differences, for theorists of multiple modernity, now represented the different ways in which societies adapted to processes of modernization. There was still a belief that modernity was, in its origins, a European phenomenon, but now, the argument is that in its diffusion outwards it interacted with the different traditions of different cultures and societies and brought into being a multiplicity of modernities. These modernities are defined in terms of a central institutional core that was taken from the European experience and the particular cultural inflections of that core as it was interpreted through the cultures present in other places. Beck concurs with this analysis by arguing that 'the Western claim to a monopoly on modernity is broken and the history and situation of diverging modernities in all parts of the world come into view' (2000: 87). The global age, then, is necessarily perceived as being a *multicultural* age, given that multiple modernities are said to be the expression of cultural differences.

Beck (2006) follows the multiple modernities paradigm in its general analysis, but his call for a *second age* of modernity, and what follows from this, is distinct and, I will argue, contradictory. In this age, he argues, not only is modernity now multiple, but the concepts which had been in use in developing sociological understandings in the first age are no longer adequate to the task. This is primarily a consequence of the fact that the standard concepts of the social sciences, according to Beck, were developed to understand a world of nation-states and now that we are in a global world, these concepts are no longer appropriate. What is needed is a new set of categories and concepts that would emerge from reflection upon this new cosmopolitan second age of modernity. While I have also argued that sociological concepts are inappropriately bounded – specifically, that they are 'methodologically Eurocentric,'[5] rather than methodological nationalistic – this is not something that is *only now* becoming problematic as a supposedly 'first modernity' has given way to a contemporary now-globalized world.

---

[4] See the two special issues of *Daedalus*: 'Early Modernities,' *Daedalus* 127 (1998) and 'Multiple Modernities,' *Daedalus* 129 (2000). For further details on the sociological debates on modernization and the shift to multiple modernities, see chapter 3 of my *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination*.
[5] I owe the coining of this term to Peo Hansen.

Such an approach, I suggest, is as limited as the state-centred approaches under criticism as it is based on the idea that the concepts of the first age of modernity were appropriate to that age and that the only problem is with the application of those concepts to the present and the future (for discussion, see Chernilo 2007; Fine 2007). At a minimum, however, the 'first age of modernity' is as much characterized by empires as by nation-states and so the concepts of that age would be, by that token, as inadequate in their own time as they are claimed to be today. There is little acknowledgement in Beck's work that if certain understandings are seen as problematic today then there is also an issue of whether they were not also problematic in the past and have, in fact, led to misunderstandings of the nature of the present in terms of how it has arisen from that past (for discussion, see Holmwood 1997). As such, the concepts of first age modernity require a more thorough overhaul than Beck proposes in his simple shift to a cosmopolitan second age.

Another significant problem with Beck's call for more appropriate sociological concepts is that his version of cosmopolitanism is at odds with the global age he describes. To the extent that multiple modernities, as the contemporary condition of the global world, are predicated on cultural inflections of modernity, then the world has to be understood as a multicultural world. Beck's version of cosmopolitanism, however, is set out in both explicit and implicit opposition, if not downright hostility, to understandings of multiculturalism. These issues will be discussed in further detail in the following section.

Cosmopolitanism and Multiculturalism

While Beck argues for the singular Western claim on modernity to have been broken and suggests that it is necessary to engage with divergent modernities, the place of Others within his new cosmopolitan paradigm is not straightforward. Cosmopolitanism, for him (Beck and Grande 2007), is something if not already achieved in Europe is nonetheless defined by the European experience. Its intellectual genealogy is seen to be European as is its political practice. In particular, Beck (2003) argues that the project of a 'peace-loving' Europe, which emerged in the wake of the Second World War, was a cosmopolitan project and one that was the political antithesis of the destructive nationalism that had culminated in the Holocaust. Europe, he suggests, was now to be 'motivated by clear ideas of inviolable human dignity, and of the moral duty to relieve the suffering of others' (Beck 2003: np). This duty appears not to apply, however, when those Others exist outside of commonly acknowledged European frontiers, or commonly accepted understandings of 'being European' (see Weber 1995, Ehrkamp and Leitner 2003, Saharso 2007). Quite apart from other anti-colonial struggles involving European states, as Hansen argues, not even a war fought *within Europe* – the Algerian-French War, 1954-62, which resulted in the deaths of over a million people and engaged approximately half a million French troops – 'has been able to impinge on the notion of European integration as a symbol of peace' (2002: 488); or as a symbol of cosmopolitanism in practice.

In the contemporary context, there appears to be little recognition of the potential discrimination against those subject to the face veil ban being proposed in France and other European countries (see, BBC 2010). What purchase does the idea of 'Europe' and its supposedly distinctive civic traditions have on cosmopolitanism when a number of states seek to repress the exercise of religious freedom of some of its citizens through an over-zealous attention to the clothes that women choose to wear? The political debates regarding 'banning the burkha' (see, Saharso 2007), call into question the depth of the cosmopolitan commitment within Europe that is otherwise, for Beck, seen to be one of its defining features. The issue, as I will go on to suggest, is that Beck's cosmopolitanism is a cosmopolitanism of similarly constituted individuals that is unable to accommodate Others within its conceptual or political frameworks. In fact, Beck addresses the issue of multiculturalism by pointing to its inherent incompatibility with the idea of cosmopolitanism.[6] He sets up the difference between the two in the following terms.

Multiculturalism, according to Beck, asserts a world of variety and plurality while at the same time presenting humanity as a collectivity divided on cultural grounds. Individuals within this conception, he continues, are seen as the product of their own languages, traditions, customs, and landscapes and have an attachment to their homeland which 'is regarded as a closed, self-sufficient and sacrosanct unity' (2002: 36-7). This entails a defence of that homeland 'naturally' against imperialism, but also, he suggests, against 'miscegenation, internationalization, and cosmopolitanism' (2002: 37).[7] This then leads to the conclusion, again without any substantiation, that 'multiculturalism is at loggerheads with individualization' and that, within multiculturalism, 'the individual does not exist,' being simply an 'epiphenomenon of his culture' (2002: 37). Cosmopolitanism, however, Beck suggests, 'argues the reverse and *presupposes* individualization' (2002: 37). However, Beck does not elaborate on how a cosmopolitanism of individuals is accommodated within a vision of the world as otherwise structured by different cultures. The concept of 'multiple modernities', as suggested earlier, expresses a form of global multiculturalism; cosmopolitanism, then, must also be a cultural issue, and one that, for Beck, is the expression of European culture. In this way, Beck's cosmopolitan version of multiple modernities is more thorough-going in its Eurocentrism than the simple version embodied in multiple modernities.

In a subsequent article, Beck and Grande develop the cosmopolitan perspective by arguing that 'it is vital to perceive others [both] as different and as the same,' but without lapsing into postmodern particularism (2007: 71). In other words, the active cosmopolitan tolerance of Others has to be balanced by 'a certain amount of commonly shared universal norms' (Beck and Grande 2007: 71). It is this, they suggest, that enables cosmopolitanism 'to regulate its dealings with otherness so as not *to endanger the integrity of a community*' (2007: 71,

---

[6] For a discussion of the relationship between cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism, see Stevenson (2002); see also Gutmann (1994).
[7] This attribution is ironic not least because the term 'cosmopolitan' was used in European discourse to indicate the 'de-racinated' foreigner – frequently, the 'Jew' – whose allegiance to national state formations and political communities could not be guaranteed.

emphasis added). Where cosmopolitanism had initially been defined, against multiculturalism, as being presupposed by the individual, it is now being defended as an expression of a particular community *threatened* by others. As Beck and Grande go on to argue, 'the *legitimate* interests of others' ought to be taken into consideration in the 'calculation of one's own interests,' (2007: 71, emphasis added), but there is little discussion on what basis 'legitimacy' is to be established or how those Others are constituted separately from oneself in a way different than within the premises of multiculturalism. What is clear is that the prescription for a cosmopolitan Europe 'united in diversity' takes little account of the diversity within Europe as constituted by its minorities within states.[8]

Beck's failure to address the place of Others internal to Europe – except obliquely, as mentioned, via a reference to 'cosmopolitan society and its enemies' (2002) – is exacerbated by the way in which he discusses the issue of Others explicitly seen as external to Europe and the West. Not only does he not recognize cosmopolitanism as also having a provenance beyond the European intellectual tradition, he is loath to discuss cosmopolitan practices in other places. Engagement with Others, in this new cosmopolitan age, seems to follow a pattern also prevalent in the previous age: condescension. This is nowhere better illustrated than in Beck's statement that: 'the West should listen to non-Western countries *when they have something to say* about the following experiences' (2000: 89, my emphasis).[9] He then lists four main themes: (1) the possibilities for coexistence in multi-religious, multi-ethnic and multicultural societies; (2) the question of tolerance in a confined space where cultural differences are prone to lead to violence; (3) 'highly developed' legal and judicial pluralism in non-Western countries (his use of scare quotes); (4) experience of dealing with multiple sovereignties (such as are a consequence of empire, although this word is not used). The implication is that, when non-Western countries are not speaking about these issues, it is not necessary for the West to listen. This appears to be less a form of cosmopolitan engagement, new and distinct from the nation-state hierarchies of the first age, and more like 'business as usual'.

Beyond the simple arrogance of listing areas where 'we' should listen to 'them', there is also much to comment on in the substance of the list itself. Not least, the aspect that the West and the non-West are presented as two internally homogenous blocs confronting each other as 'actors' in a world that is not recognized to have been structured by historically constituted hierarchical relations. Beck's (2002) argument, that he is not interested in the memory of the global past, but simply in how a vision of a cosmopolitan future could have an impact on the politics of the present, is disingenuous at best. He appears to think that it is possible simply to discuss 'the present implications of a globally shaped future' (2002: 27) without addressing the legacies of the past on the shaping of the present. He simply brushes away the historically inherited inequalities arising from the legacies of European imperialism and slavery and moves on to imagine a world separate from the resolution of these inequalities. Any theory that seeks

---

[8] The problematic place of Turkey within a cosmopolitan Europe is another issue within this debate. For discussion, see Ahiska (2003), Baban and Keyman (2008) and Parker (2009).
[9] The following paragraphs in this section are informed by arguments made in Bhambra (2010).

to address the question of 'how we live in the world' cannot treat as irrelevant the historical construction of that world (for discussion, see Trouillot 1995).

Beck (2000: 89) continues to ignore the presence of Others on the global stage with his assumption that the European 'social settlement' presents the apex of negotiating the contradictions of the modern world order. There is little discussion of other constructions of social solidarity that have existed such as the Universal Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) which, as Shilliam argues, 'stretched across 800 chapters in 40 countries on four continents' (2006: 379). Further, where there is some acknowledgement of 'development' in other places it is relativized through the use of scare quotes. The implication is that legal and judicial pluralism is only necessary in otherwise complex and developed Western societies because of the migration of populations to them from places that have such pluralism due to the presence of ethnic and religious differences (for discussion, see Amin 2004). This is then compounded by Beck's subsequent list of areas in which the West is 'beginning to adopt non-Western standards of reality and normality *which do not bode well*' (2000: 89, my emphasis). Presumably, the point is that they do not bode well *for the West* since, in his own terms, they are the everyday conditions of existence for the non-West – on which there is no comment. In particular, Beck identifies the de-regulation of the labour market in the West as leading to the 'abandonment of the co-operatively organized employee society that froze the class conflict between work and capital' (2000: 89). This is an expression of methodological nationalism, given that he does not comment on the conditions of the international division of labour, and the hierarchies between the global north and south, which were themselves a condition of this 'frozen' settlement.[10]

In another, again un-reflexive, example, Beck uses the image of a sand-pit to address the current world situation. He argues that the first age of modernity involved capital, labour and state 'making sand cakes in the sandpit', (where the sand pit is the national community), and attempting 'to knock the other's sand cake off the spade in accordance with the rules of institutionalized conflict' (2000: 89). The situation in the second age of modernity is akin to business having been given a mechanical digger which is being used to empty out the whole sandpit (2000: 89). The metaphor is peculiarly inept given the association of infancy with the sandpit and the use of adult-child metaphors to understand colonial relations and responsibilities from a Western perspective. What is clear is that Beck's construction is itself an example of the methodological nationalism he opposes. He appears ignorant of the processes of colonialism, imperialism and slavery, which 'emptied out' from the sand pit of the colonized, not only mineral resources, but also human bodies, and did so not 'according to rules of institutionalized conflict', but through naked appropriation.

In one rare attempt to address the issue of cosmopolitanism 'from below', Beck substitutes the term 'transnationality' for cosmopolitanism and writes that this 'characterizes not only the globalization elites, but the poor exploited immigrants as well. They are treated as "excluded

---

[10] For a discussion of the development of the UK welfare state in the context of the 'postcolonial' demise of a system of Commonwealth preferences and re-orientation to the EU, see Holmwood (2000).

others" in the United States, but Haitians, Filipino or Indian immigrants are at the same time active in sustaining "their" households overseas *and* engaging in political struggles against corrupt regimes [back home]' (2002: 33; emphasis in original). While Beck does not say 'back home' this is the clear implication at the end of that sentence (in that I don't think he means corrupt regimes in the 'West'); his emphasis on 'and' is also telling – the implication being that it should be of some surprise that these immigrants can be active in sustaining households overseas (as opposed to 'back home') as well as engaging in politics elsewhere. His refusal to ascribe the notion of 'cosmopolitanism' to the 'poor exploited immigrants' makes them 'excluded Others' from his framework and locates them in nationalistic particularity without providing any information on why this must be case. Further, there is little explanation about what makes global elites specifically *cosmopolitan* while these immigrants are only *transnational*. Beck's patronizing attitude towards these 'poor immigrants' continues a few lines along when he says that: 'it is not only the global players who are learning the de-territorialized game of power and putting it to the test, but also some *ethnic minorities*' (2002: 33). 'Global players' are not, in Beck's understanding, 'ethnic minorities' and 'ethnic minorities' are not 'global players'; the Eurocentrism implicit in the identification of 'global players' is apparent.

Beck's (2000; 2006) argument for cosmopolitanism is part of a long line of social theory that takes Western perspectives as the focus of global processes, and Europe as the origin of a modernity which is subsequently globalized, whether in convergent or divergent forms. Beck's cosmopolitanism is not a cosmopolitanism inclusive of Others who, in his terms, are different in some potentially radical way. He is not interested in what he can learn from them in their own terms.

Cosmopolitanism Provincialized

A 'provincialized' cosmopolitanism, as Pollock *et al* (2000) argue, would be made up of dialogues among a series of local perspectives on cosmopolitanism, with no unifying centre. If, as they argue, we were to take cosmopolitanism as *a way of looking at the world*, this would require us to take the perspective *of the world* in our considerations; that is, we would need to be cosmopolitan in our very practices in understanding what it was and is to be cosmopolitan. Cosmopolitanism, as a sociological or historical category, they continue should be considered as open and not pre-given in form or content: it 'is not some known entity existing in the world, with a clear genealogy from the Stoics to Immanuel Kant, that simply awaits more detailed description at the hands of scholarship' (2000: 577). Rather, they suggest, we should look at 'how people have thought and acted beyond the local' (2000: 586) in different places and across time to generate new descriptions of cosmopolitanism.[11] These would suggest new

---

[11] See Lamont and Aksartova (2002) for one example in which this has been successfully undertaken. Acknowledging that much of the literature on cosmopolitanism is either implicitly or explicitly associated with elites, they seek 'to explore ordinary cosmopolitanisms, defined as the strategies used by ordinary people to bridge boundaries with people who are different from them' (2002: 1).

practices, which in turn 'may offer a better understanding of the theory and history of cosmopolitanism' (2000: 578).

The primary argument made by Pollock and others is that the very phenomenon of cosmopolitanism is threatened by the work of purification that insists on regarding it as the product of one culture, emerging from a centre and diffusing outwards. If we wish an inclusive cosmopolitanism, it would have to be one outside a centred universalism. Mignolo, in putting forward an argument for a 'critical cosmopolitanism', similarly argues against the idea of a 'cosmopolitanism that only connects from the centre of the large circle outwards' (2000: 745). His argument for decolonial understandings resonates with Chakrabarty's (2000) call to provincialize Europe, that is, to decentre Europe in our considerations. At the same time, we would need to recognize contributions made in connections of which Europe had no part, as well as connections suppressed in representing the history of European uniqueness. Contra Pagden (2000), we do need to think of cosmopolitanism as something other than the values emerging from a reflection on western liberal democracy (though, this is not to say that there is nothing to be learned from such reflection). The task now is a provincialized cosmopolitanism that can learn from others where we recognize that what they contribute is *not a confirmation of what we already know*, but the bringing into being of new understandings relevant to the worlds we inhabit together. These new understandings both reconfigure our existing perceptions *of the world,* as well as inform the ways in which we live *in the world*.

Some of what is required is captured in Homi Bhabha's earlier work on postcolonialism. The starting point for Bhabha's (1994) explication of postcolonial theory is a history adequate to the political conditions of the present. Those conditions are not simply informed by understandings of 'globalization', but more specifically by an understanding of the postcolonial global conditions which are rarely the starting point for sociological analyses (see Bhambra 2007b). As Seidman remarks, sociology's emergence coincided with the high point of Western imperialism, and yet, 'the dynamics of empire were not incorporated into the basic categories, models of explanation, and narratives of social development of the classical sociologists' (1996: 314). The potential contribution to the sociological paradigm of events outside the west (and the experiences of non-Western 'others') has not often been considered (see Chakrabarty 2000, Bhambra, 2007a). This is, in part, a consequence of the erasures that are implicit when the remit of sociology is understood to be 'modern societies' – that is, societies engaged in processes of modernization – where the 'postcolonial' is necessarily associated with 'pre-modern' societies, societies that have traditionally fallen to anthropology, or to the interdisciplinary area of development studies. The association of cosmopolitanism with an intellectual genealogy that begins with the ancient Greeks and is located in the modern West similarly prevents any meaningful discussion of cosmopolitanism in a postcolonial context. As Bhabha argues, however, shifting the frame through which we view the events of 'modernity', or cosmopolitanism, forces us to consider the question of subaltern agency and ask: 'what is this "now" of modernity? Who defines this present from which we speak?' (1994: 244).

This is not a version of multiple modernities, in that it does not offer an alternative other modernity to be placed alongside those already seen to be existing. Rather, it calls on us to interrogate the conceptual paradigm of modernity, as it has commonly been understood, from the perspectives of those Others usually relegated to the margins, if included at all. These Others, constituted 'otherwise than modernity' Bhabha argues, exist both in the global south and the global north (1994: 6). Their perspectives are now taken to be central to understanding modernity conceptually. The task, as Bhabha puts it, is to take responsibility for the unspoken, unrepresented pasts within our cosmopolitan present and, in their renewal, to interrupt, refigure, and re-create present understandings adequate to that past (1994: 7). One aspect of this would be for the metropolitan centres of the West to confront their postcolonial histories whereby the 'influx of postwar migrants and refugees' would be constituted as part of 'an indigenous or native narrative *internal to [their] national identity*' (1994: 6 emphasis added; see also Amin 2004). It is not only by movement across 'borders' that migrants might be argued to express cosmopolitanism, but also in their very understanding of how those borders came to be constituted and their involvement in reconceptualising understandings of citizenship and belonging, that is, as cosmopolitan subjects within nation-state boundaries.[12] This reconsideration of modernity does not relegate difference simply to cultural expression, but calls upon that difference to make a difference to the narratives already in place.

For Bhabha, as for Edward Said (1978) before him, the social expression of 'difference' is to be contextualized with the historical 'emergence of community envisaged as a project', that is 'at once a vision and a construction' (1994: 3). As such, the question of difference is not to be addressed simply through its multiple expressions, but by problematizing 'the unity of the "us" and the otherness of the "other"' that *produces* these differences in an interconnected and interdependent world (Gupta and Ferguson 1992: 14). This is to be understood not in terms of a community of individuals who happen perchance to live in an age of cosmopolitanism – that is, individuals who, in Beck's terms exemplify the cosmopolitan age because they 'shop internationally, work internationally, love internationally, marry internationally, research internationally, grow up and are educated internationally (that is, multi-lingually), live and think transnationally' (2000: 80). Rather, they are a cosmopolitan community because of the postcolonial history that brought them into being – they are economic and other migrants, refugees, asylum seekers, temporary workers. Their cosmopolitanism is inextricably linked to their (post)colonial past, present, and future. The cosmopolitanism of 'now' within the West, then, has to be recognized as the outcome of a history that was colonial and then postcolonial; a history to which Others have always contributed whether willingly or not. While there have been few voices identifying a specifically 'postcolonial' Europe (see Hansen 2002, 2004, Bhambra 2009), there has been an increasing focus on the seeming diversity and hybridity of

---

[12] Thus, long before the 'rediscovery' of cosmopolitanism in Western discourse, minorities within Western populations were expressing cosmopolitan aspirations in their engagement with wider anti-colonial struggles. For example, Black American citizens were cosmopolitan in their pan-African engagements, while their fellow citizens were engaged with national expressions of citizenship (see Singh 2004). For a discussion of the limits of cosmopolitanism in addressing the situation of refugees and asylum seekers as they attempt to challenge nation-state border controls, see Morris (2009).

European cultural constellations that moves us beyond the stale binaries of much of the literature in this area (see Gilroy 1993, 2003, Stevenson 2006).

Cosmopolitanism, of course, is not simply at issue in colonial and postcolonial migration to the West (see, Yeĝenoĝlu 2005). The exercise of coloniality itself, as Mignolo (2000) has argued, needs to be considered as an important locus of cosmopolitanism, both in intent as well as practice. Mignolo begins his articulation of a critical cosmopolitanism, not from the Greeks, but in the commercial circuits that brought together 'the Spanish Crown with capitalist entrepreneurs from Genoa, with Christian missionaries, with Amerindian elites, and with African slaves' (2000: 725). He presents a philosophical consideration of cosmopolitanism that engages with European thinkers, but does so from the perspective of the historical debates on the Spanish engagement with the Amerindians in the sixteenth century. By bringing attention to otherwise 'silenced and marginalized voices' (2000: 736) within contemporary discussions of cosmopolitanism, Mignolo enriches the debate and opens up productive avenues for further exploring the question of how we live with and across differences. As he argues, critical cosmopolitanism must be truly dialogic where 'everyone participates instead of "being participated"' (2000: 744); that is, he is not arguing for the inclusion of Others in our conversations, but rather, for a recognition of their already existing participation, if only we could listen (see, Back 2009).

Beck's version of cosmopolitanism is an expression of cultural Eurocentrism masquerading as potential global inclusivity. As has been demonstrated, however, this inclusivity is dependent upon Them being included in Our designs. It is not an inclusivity that recognizes the Other as already constitutive of, if marginalized within, the frameworks of understanding. Further, while Beck uses the approach of multiple modernities to present the distinctiveness of the present age over preceding ones, he does not deal with the contradiction this poses for his commitment to his version of cosmopolitanism. Multiple modernities are predicated on an understanding of different cultures such that their vision of the global is constituted as a form of global multiculturalism. To the extent that Beck sets up cosmopolitanism in opposition to multiculturalism he denies the basis for the very global age he describes. Concluding an article on 'Understanding the Real Europe', Beck writes that '[m]ore than anywhere else in the world, Europe *shows* … Europe *teaches* … The catchphrase for the future might be Move over America – Europe is back' (2003: np; my emphasis). Perhaps what is also needed, however, is for Europe to listen, and to learn, for Europe and the United States, alike, to move over. A cosmopolitan sociology that was open to different voices would be one that *provincialized* European understandings, not one based on the perpetuation of 'triumphalist' ideas of Europe's singular contribution to world society.

Provincialising cosmopolitanism would require both a de-centring of dominant understandings of cosmopolitanism as well as an acknowledgement of understandings of cosmopolitanism outside of the otherwise canonical frame of reference exemplified by European thought and practice. This would need to be done through an address of global histories and interconnected experiences that requires 'both critique and the production of a different

archive of knowledge' (Featherstone and Venn 2006: 4). New understandings of such conceptual issues, however, cannot simply be added to already existing ones without in some way calling into question the legitimacy and validity of the previously accepted parameters – both historical and ethical. As such, a more thorough-going critique is needed, one which goes beyond *de-centring* to *transforming*. The provincialising of cosmopolitanism is not just a different interpretation of the *same* ideas, but the bringing into being of *new* understandings.

Bibliography

Ahiska, M. 2003. 'Occidentalism: The Historical Fantasy of the Modern,' *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, Spring/Summer 102 (2-3), 351-79

Amin, A. 2004. 'Multi-Ethnicity and the Idea of Europe,' *Theory, Culture and Society* 21 (2): 1-24

Arnason, J. P. 2000. 'Communism and Modernity,' *Daedalus: Multiple Modernities* 129 (1), 61-90

Arnason, J. P. 2003. 'Entangled Communisms: Imperial Revolutions in Russia and China,' *European Journal of Social Theory* 6 (3), 307-25

Baban, F. and Keyman, F. 2008. 'Turkey and Postnational Europe: Challenges for the Cosmopolitan,' *European Journal of Social Theory* 11 (1), 107-124

Back, L. 2009. 'Global Attentiveness and the Sociological Ear,' *Sociological Research Online*, 14 (4), http://www.socresonline.org.uk/14/4/14.html

BBC 2010. 'France MPs' report backs Muslim face veil ban' http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/europe/8480161.stm

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 Society* 19 (1–2), 17–44

Beck, U. 2003. 'Understanding the Real Europe,' *Dissent* summer

Beck, U. 2006. *Cosmopolitan Vision* Cambridge, Polity Press

Beck, U. and Grande, E. 2007. 'Cosmopolitanism: Europe's Way Out of Crisis,' *European Journal of Social Theory* 10 (1), 67-85

Beck, U. and Sznaider, N. 2006. 'Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda,' *The British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1), 1-23

Bhabha, H.K. 1994. *The Location of Culture* London, Routledge

Bhambra, G.K. 2007a. *Rethinking Modernity: Postcolonialism and the Sociological Imagination* Basingstoke, Palgrave MacMillan

Bhambra, G.K. 2007b. 'Sociology and Postcolonialism: Another 'Missing' Revolution?,' *Sociology* 41 (5), 871-84

Bhambra, G. K. 2009. 'Postcolonial Europe: Or, Understanding Europe in Times of the Postcolonial' in Chris Rumford (ed.) *Sage Handbook of European Studies* chapter 5 Sage, London

Bhambra, G. K. 2010. 'Sociology after Postcolonialism: Provincialized Cosmopolitanism and Connected Sociologies' in M. Boatcă, S. Costa, E. Gutiérrez-Rodríguez (eds) *Decolonizing European Sociology: Trans-disciplinary Approaches* Aldershot, Ashgate

Chakrabarty, D. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* Princeton, Princeton University Press

Chernilo, D. 2007. *A Social Theory of the Nation-State: Beyond Methodological Nationalism* London, Routledge

Daedalus 1998. Special Issue on 'Early Modernities' 127 (3)

Daedalus 2000. Special Issue on 'Multiple Modernities' 129 (1)

Eisenstadt, S.N. 2000. 'Multiple Modernities,' *Daedalus: Multiple Modernities* 129 (1), 1-29

Eisenstadt, S. N. 2001. 'The Civilizational Dimension of Modernity: Modernity as a Distinct Civilization,' *International Sociology* 16 (3), 320-40

Eisenstadt, S.N. and Schluchter, W. 1998. ,Introduction: Paths to Early Modernities – A Comparative View,' *Daedalus: Early Modernities* 127 (3), 1-18

Ehrkamp, P. and H. Leitner 2003. 'Beyond National Citizenship: Turkish Immigrants and the (Re)Construction of Citizenship in Germany,' *Urban Geography* 24 (2), 127-46

Featherstone, M. and Venn, C. 2006. 'Problematizing Global Knowledge and the New Encyclopaedia Project: An Introduction,' *Theory, Culture, and Society* 23 (2-3), 1-20

Fine, R. 2007. *Cosmopolitanism* London, Routledge

Gilroy, P. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* Cambridge, Harvard University Press

Gilroy, P. 2003. ''Where Ignorant Armies Clash by Night': Homogenous Community and the Planetary Aspect,' *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 6 (3), 261-76

Gupta, A. and J. Ferguson 1992. 'Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference,' *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1), 6-23

Gutmann, A. (ed.) 1994. *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition* Princeton, Princeton University Press

Hansen, P. 2002. 'European Integration, European Identity and the Colonial Connection,' *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (4), 483-98

Hansen, P. 2004. 'In the Name of Europe,' *Race and Class* 45 (3), 49-62

Holmwood, J. 1997. 'Postmodernity, Citizenship and Inequality: Social Theory in "the New Consumer Society"' in P. Sulkunen, J. Holmwood, H. Radner, G. Schulze, (eds) *Constructing the New Consumer Society* London, Macmillan Pp. 58-78

Holmwood, J. 2000, 'Europe and the "Americanization" of British Social Policy,' *European Societies* 2 (4), 453-82

Lamont, M. and Aksartova, S. 2002. 'Ordinary Cosmopolitanisms: Strategies for Bridging Racial Boundaries among Working-Class Men,' *Theory, Culture and Society* 19 (4), 1-25

Loomba, A. 1998. *Colonialism / Postcolonialism* London, Routledge

Mignolo, W. D. 2000. 'The Many Faces of Cosmo-Polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism,' *Public Culture* 12 (3), 721-48

Morris, L. 2009. 'An Emergent Cosmopolitan Paradigm? Asylum, Welfare and Human Rights,' *British Journal of Sociology* 60 (2), 215-35

Muthu, S. 2003. *Enlightenment against Empire* Princeton, Princeton University Press

Nussbaum, M (ed.) 1996. *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism* Boston, Beacon Press

Pagden, A. 2000. 'Stoicism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Legacy of European Imperialism,' *Constellations* 7 (1), 3-22

Parker, O. 2009. '"Cosmopolitan Europe" and the EU-Turkey Question: The Politics of a "Common Destiny",' *Journal of European Public Policy* 16 (7), 1085-1101

Pollock, S., Bhabha, H.K., Breckenbridge, C.A. and Chakrabarty, D. 2000. 'Cosmopolitanisms,' *Public Culture* 12 (3), 577-89

Said, E. W. 1978. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* London, Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd

Saharso, S. 2007. 'Headscarves: A Comparison of Public Thought and Public Policy in Germany and the Netherlands,' *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 10 (4), 513-30

Seidman, S. 1996. 'Empire and Knowledge: More Troubles, New Opportunities for Sociology,' *Contemporary Sociology* 25 (3), 313-16

Shilliam, R. 2006. 'What about Marcus Garvey? Race and the Transformation of Sovereignty Debate,' *Review of International Studies* 32 (3), 379-400

Singh, Nikhil 2004. *Black is a Country: Race and the Unfinished Struggle for Democracy* Cambridge, Harvard University Press

Stevenson, N. 2002. 'Cosmopolitanism, Multiculturalism and Citizenship,' *Sociological Research Online* 7 (1) http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/1/stevenson.html

Stevenson, N. 2006. 'European Cosmopolitan Solidarity: Questions of Citizenship, Difference, and Post-Materialism,' *European Journal of Social Theory* 9 (4), 485-500

Trouillot, M-R. 1995. *Silencing the Past: Power and the Production of History* Beacon Press, Boston

Vertovec, S. and Cohen R. (eds) 2002. *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice* Oxford, Oxford University Press

Wagner, P. 2001. *Theorizing Modernity: Inescapability and Attainability in Social Theory* London, Sage

Weber, B. 1995. 'Immigration and Politics in Germany,' *The Journal of the International Institute* 2 (3), spring

Wittrock, B. 1998. 'Early Modernities: Varieties and Transitions,' *Daedalus: Early Modernities,* summer 127 (3), 19-40

Yeĝenoĝlu, M. 2005. 'Cosmopolitanism and Nationalism in a Globalized World,' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (1), 103-131