

Kozmopolitanizm: Evin Sınırlarını Aşmak

Serhat Toker ^{a, b}

Özet

Bu katkı, kozmopolitanizm fikrini eleştirel bir şekilde ele almakta ve kozmopolitliği, kozmopolitleşme adına küreselleşmenin içsel boyutunu belirleyen bir süreç olarak sunmaya çalışmaktadır. Bu değerlendirmedeki ilk adım, küreselleşme ve kozmopolitanizm arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemektir. Ardından ikinci adım, yeni bir kozmopolitliği, "evde kozmopolitliği" tanımlamaktır. Bu makale, sınırlar – sınırları aşmak – ve ev ile ilişkisi açısından bir kozmopolitanizm anlayışı geliştirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Eğer kozmopolitanizm varsa, idealize edilmiş sınırları olan bir birlik biçimi olarak evin olması gerektiğini savunuyorum.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Kozmopolitanizm
Küreselleşme
Sınırlar
Ev

Makale Hakkında

Geliş Tarihi: 01.08.2023
Yayın Tarihi: 28.12.2023
Doi: 10.18026/cbayarsos.1336001

Cosmopolitanism: Crossing Borders of The Home

Abstract

This contribution engages with the idea of cosmopolitanism critically and tries to present cosmopolitanism as a process that designates the inner dimension of globalization in the name of cosmopolitanization. The first step in this treatment is to examine the relationship between globalization and cosmopolitanism. Then the second step is to define a new cosmopolitanism, "cosmopolitanism at home." This paper aims to develop a proper conception of cosmopolitanism with its relation to borders – crossing borders – and home. I argue that if cosmopolitanism exists, there should be a home as a form of unity with its idealized borders.

Keywords

Cosmopolitanism
Globalization
Borders
Home

About Article

Received: 01.08.2023
Published: 28.12.2023
Doi: 10.18026/cbayarsos.1336001

^a İletişim: serhattoker@hotmail.com.

^b Arş. Grv. Dr., Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyoloji Bölümü, 0000-0002-8294-8713.

Introduction

In the recent social scientific literature, there is an increasing concern about globalization in understanding social and cultural phenomena. According to Bohman and Lutz-Bahman (1997: 8), globalization can be defined as "the growing interconnectedness of states and societies, creating multiple rapid networks of interaction and coordination that include the global economic system, global networks of communication and transgovernmental, transnational interaction, and forms of multilateral diplomacy and regulation that restrict the policies available to governments and citizens." Besides this, we can find other definitions and explanations emphasizing different aspects of globalization. But, the theme of interconnectedness is prevalent in all the literature concerning globalization. In a broader sense, this theme is seen as the primary characterization of the globalization process. The emphasis on global interconnectedness as an essential component of social theory has become more significant day by day. Therefore, it is evident that something is changing in the trajectory of history and there is something new in the way of conceptualizing society and its ambiguous sources like nation, culture and identity. As Nederween-Pieterse describes it:

[any] kind of glossy advertising is one way in which the brave new world of globalization is taking shape. Technology gives instantaneous access the world. Credit cards open any doors. With cards open even wider. International brand name goods are available everywhere. Frontiers [boundaries, borders any confinements] are fading, borders are for crossing. Mobility is unlimited, communication instant, consumer choice growing, Ronald McDonald smiling in the brave new world of globalization. (Nederween-Pieterse, 2002: 2)

Although there is a consensus in the social sciences concerning the interconnectedness of today's world as the main character of globalization, there are also some kinds of approaches and debates about the nature of globalization. For Yeğenoğlu, the primary debate about globalization is whether it is a homogenizing process or whether the interconnectedness of globalization creates moral, cultural, or social unity. As she points out, on the one side of the debate, some "talk about a process by which the world is now becoming a single and unified space." Conversely, "there are those who emphasize the impossibility of envisioning a unified global culture" (2003: 2). For example, Cheah suspiciously treats the interconnected world imagination. He problematizes the idea of suggesting the globalized world as an interconnected unity, especially concerning world solidarity. For him (2006: 490), "there is an inadequation or lack of fit between the material interconnectedness brought about by global capitalism and the degree of formation of global solidarities." Thus in light of this inadequation of global capitalism, globalization is a process in which

transcultural encounters, mass migration and population transfers between East and West, First and Third Worlds, North and South, the rise of global cities as central sites for the management of global financial and business networks, the formation of transnational advocacy networks, and the proliferation of transnational human rights instruments have led to greater hopes that his inadequation can be overcome and that feasible global forms of political consciousness have in fact arisen (Cheah, 2006: 491).

In Cheah's argumentation, it is made clear that the global hegemony of capitalism does not necessarily give way to the globalization of social and institutional spheres in the same degree. In contrast to Cheah's views, Ulrich Beck (2002: 17) argues that in the conditions of the "21st century, the fate of human understanding as the human condition cannot be understood nationally or locally but only globally". But for him (2002: 23) to understand the main character of the global world, one question has to be posed and answered: "How is empirical sociology of the global becoming possible?" In other words, how can we understand the global, empirically and socially? Beck's answer is straightforward: "by looking local". But above all, this looking has to overcome some misunderstandings, which also indicate the "paradoxes of globalization." His approach to these paradoxes is twofold. The first one is related to the understanding of globalization simply and only as globalization since "globalization is about localization as well." The second paradox is "understanding globalization as an additive and not a substitutive aspect of nation-state society and sociological imagination" (2002: 23) Thus under the conditions of globalization, the national is no longer the national. This means that the national has to be rediscovered as the internalized global. For Beck, "internalized global" means the transnational reality of today's world as a consequence of what he calls the second modernity rather than the interconnected or international reality of the first modernity. So it is important to note that the main character of globalization in the Beck's argumentation is not interconnectedness but trans-nationality. He points out this distinction as such:

There are at least two ways of conceptualizing globalization. On the one hand, is what David Held (1995) calls interconnectedness. This view highlights the way in which interdependencies, networks and flows are increasing in the modern world (first modernity). This view still presumes that national units, which are being interconnected, are the ultimate reality... Cosmopolitanization, on the other hand... highlights how far social structures and institutions are becoming trans-nationalized. The premise here is that the national is ceasing to be the notional. (Beck, 2003: 22)

On the other hand, David Held (2003: 160) holds the idea that "there is something new about globalization in the current period; that is, about the confluence of change across [economic, political, legal, communicative and environmental] human activities." So for him, globalization could be distinguished from past phases of the world by its:

unique organizational features, creating a world in which the extensive reach of human relations and networks is matched by its relative high intensity, high velocity and high propensity across many facets of social life. The result is the emergence of a global economy, 24-hour trading in financial markets, multinational corporations which dwarf many a country's economic resources, new forms of international law, development of regional and global governance structures and the creation of global systemic problems. (Held, 2003: 161)

For Held these global systemic problems are: "global warming, AIDS, mass terrorism, market volatility [etc.]". All these new dimensions of globalization that is seen rather as the consequences of interconnected world- economically, politically and culturally – give rise to some shifts in the trajectory of the world history. Held treats these shifts also as the "challenges

of globalization". According to view, "contemporary processes of globalization creates overlapping networks of power which cut across territorial boundaries", hence "the idea of a self-determining people can no longer be located within the boundaries of a single nation-state alone" (Held, 2003: 161). Another challenge given way by the consequence of globalization is that by the increase of interaction and interconnectedness there only remains "cultural nationalism". But as the "assertion of the exclusive political priority of national identity and the national interest" (2003: 167), the political nationalism is not compatible with the process of globalization.

What is common in these conceptualizations of globalization, whether depends on an idea that an interconnected world leads to a homogenized world culture or not, is their attendance to discussion in which nation-state and national belonging are problematized. So, as Yeğenoğlu (2005: 106) points that "in a situation where the state is no longer the exclusive reference point of sovereignty, cosmopolitanism is seen as offering new possibilities for participation and rights that are beyond [the] state" borders. Then it is self-evident in this situation that the growing technological capabilities, from nineteenth century machine technologies and transport revolution to contemporary information technologies (internet, mobile technologies like gsm, gprs), enable cross-border movements that lead to the emergence of a new type of belonging that is today the main concern of the social and political sciences. It can be said that the name of this new form of belonging is cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitan way of belonging or with an etymologic translation being a "world citizen" – belonging nowhere or everywhere depends on conceptualizing. On the other hand, as Nederveen Pieterse (2006: 1248) points, it is not only a new way of belonging but also a new ethos: "globalization is circumstance and cosmopolitanism is the ethos".

Cosmopolitanism or Cosmopolitanization

Some ideas implying cosmopolitanism can be found in different cultural and religious traditions. On the other hand, the whole project of Enlightenment can be seen as based on the idea of cosmopolitanism. This project traces its roots back to the ancient Greek philosophy. Although there is not a uniform or universal definition or, let's say, interpretation of cosmopolitanism, there is a common aim to start the history of the term with the Stoics. The Stoic emphasis on the term cosmopolitanism comes from the double meaning which designates an antinomy in its Greek etymology: "the local community of our birth and community of human[ity]" (Nussbaum, 1996: 4), cosmos and polis. But as we learn from Nussbaum, there had been at least one cosmopolitan, before stoics who is when

asked where he came from, the ancient Greek Cynic philosopher Diogenes replied, "I am a citizen of the world." He meant by this, it appears that he refused to be defined by his local origins and local group memberships... and he insisted on defining himself in terms of more universal aspirations and concerns. (Nussbaum, 1996: 4)

The diogenic position is essential here because it involves a constant aspect of the views on cosmopolitanism. Although there are some historical moments of cosmopolitanism, it reappears in modern times with strong connotations. In the 1990's world which achieves a new form and momentum especially through the introduction of new communication technologies

and the market economy, Hannerz presented a Diogenic way of being cosmopolitan in a new form. He (1990: 239) describes cosmopolitanism as "an intellectual and aesthetic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experience". Through an aspiration from Merton's study he elaborates cosmopolitanism as opposite of local.

In the current debates and conceptualizations cosmopolitanism appears in different forms. Delanty (2006) groups these forms of cosmopolitanism under three headings. These are moral cosmopolitanism, political cosmopolitanism and cultural cosmopolitanism (p. 28). Also, Yeğenoğlu (2005) groups these conceptions of cosmopolitanism under two headings which provides a covering framework. These are "cosmopolitanism as a question of legal and political governance" and "cosmopolitanism as a question of cultural identity". Yet, Yeğenoğlu notes that "despite the differences between these two positions ... what brings them together is the round of applause they give to the allegedly diminishing significance of the role of the nation-state" (p: 106). It can be proposed that if the obsolescence of nation-state or national sovereignty is the main concern, it is because the fact that borders of nation-state are more certain and strong than that of cultures and identities and other forms of localities – I will suggest some reasons in order to understand this position in next sections.

The emphasis on the obsolescence of nation-state appears in Martha C. Nussbaum's thoughts about cosmopolitanism can be given as an example of the "disdain felt towards nation-state" (Yeğenoğlu, 2005: 116) and towards its borders. In Nussbaum's (1996: 4) moral and universalist cosmopolitanism discourse nation is presented as an obsolete way of understanding human condition - culturally, politically or socially. In opposition to patriotism, cosmopolitanism means "regarding all human beings as our fellow citizens and neighbors". For Nussbaum, education occupies a central place for the development of such a cosmopolitan vision:

So if we fail to educate children to cross those boundaries in their minds and imaginations, we are tacitly giving them the message that we don't really mean what we say. We say that respect should be accorded to humanity as such, but we really mean that Americans as such are worthy of special respect. And that, I think, is a story that Americans have told for far too long. (Nussbaum, 1996: 7)

Like Nussbaum, also Delanty (2006: 26) thinks that "the social world as territorially given, closed and bounded by the nation-state and the class structure of the industrial societies did not sit comfortably with the openness of the cosmopolitan idea, with its universalistic orientation". Therefore, he understands cosmopolitanism as an "revolt of the individual against the social world, for to be a 'citizen of the world' was to reject the immediately given and closed world of particularistic attachments" especially the attachments of the nation-state or given cultural space.

On the other hand, Cheah (2006: 491) thinks that in the modernity or globalization process, "the visions of cosmopolitanism have mutated from an intellectual ethos to an institutionally grounded global political consciousness". He makes a comparative reading between Kantian Cosmopolitanism and Marx's socialist cosmopolitanism. Cheah evaluates Immanuel Kant as a "true inaugurator of modern" or new cosmopolitanism, since he "retains the idea of membership to humanity as a whole by insisting on the importance of 'knowledge of a man as

a citizen of the world" in especially his *Perpetual Peace*. From this point of view according to Cheah, Kant articulates at least four different modalities which provide the main discussions of the contemporary way of conceptualizing cosmopolitanism. These are "first, a world federation as the legal and political institutional basis for cosmopolitanism as a form of right; second, the historical basis of cosmopolitanism in world trade; third, the idea of a global public sphere; fourth, the importance of cosmopolitical culture in instilling a sense of belonging to humanity" (Cheah: 2006: 487). But for Cheah, because of the discordance between economy and solidarity, "we cannot automatically assume that experiences of globalizing world where people, things, and events have become more and more connected necessarily lead to and form the substrate for a cosmopolitan form of politics that displaces that of the nation-state" (Cheah: 2006: 491). So for him "the feasibility of institutionalizing a mass-based cosmopolitan political consciousness... very much remains an open question" in contemporary world and "it is not enough to fold the pluralistic ethos of older cosmopolitanisms into the institutionalized tolerance of diversity in multicultural societies" or in a global cosmopolitan democracy (2006: 495).

On the other hand, some writers prefer to be vigilant about the ways of conceptualizing cosmopolitanism in the domain of cultural experiences. Jeremy Waldron (2000) is the one of them. Waldron, discusses cosmopolitanism under two topics: cultural cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanism as a right in Kantian thought. According to him one cannot speak about the cultural cosmopolitanism in a concrete meaning of the word, insofar as cosmopolitanism designates to self-consciousness about his/her or others' cultural reasoning, since for him, "social and cultural practices do not exist in order to make up a colorful distinctive culture of us to display and immerse ourselves in" (p. 234). In this situation, he suggests not cultural consciousness but internal aspect (internal story) which is for Waldron, more constitutive than self-consciousness. He gives an example of internal story:

If ... I ask an elder of the group to which I belong why we have and follow a norm of monogamy, he may tell me a story about the need for reciprocity and equality between lovers and explain why this is difficult or impossible in polygamous relationships, or he may tell me a story about the sun and the moon and about there being only one of each. (Waldron, 2000: 234)

So for him, at this point, there are two possibilities of either accepting or rejecting the internal story or in other words "find[ing] the sun-and-moon story bewildering or unsatisfying" (2000: 235). If the choice is the latter, then as Waldron puts forth, "[one] no longer understand or respect the norm on the basis on which it claims [his/her] respect and understanding" (p. 235). On the other hand, Waldron describes cosmopolitan right with an aspiration from Kant, as "one's willingness to do what is required by the general principle of sharing this limited world with others". And for him, "what is incompatible with cosmopolitan right is the presentation of one's engagement with a particular set of cultural norms and practices as though ... they were costumes or attributes rather than intelligent and intelligible structures of reasoning" (p. 242).

David Held (2003: 168) treats Waldron's approach to cosmopolitanism as an example of quasi misunderstanding. For Held cosmopolitanism, as appears in Waldron's work, "is not at

loggerheads with all aspects of state tradition; not it denies cultural difference or the enduring significance of national culture [shortly as a concept that] against cultural diversity". Instead, Held holds the view that "cosmopolitanism needs to be reworked for another age". In such a reworking, cosmopolitanism "should be understood as the capacity to mediate between national cultures or communities of fate and alternative styles of life" (p. 168). For him emerging of this kind of cosmopolitanism entails some principles that should be recognized. These principles are egalitarian individualism, reciprocal recognition and impartialist reasoning. He takes these principles of cosmopolitanism in order to describe the ethical and political space of it. Firstly, egalitarian individualism implies that "ultimate units of moral concern are individual human beings" in other words, not states, societies, nations or cultures and these individuals are belongs to "a single moral realm in which each person is equally worthy of respect and consideration". Second one, reciprocal recognition implies for Held, that "the status of equal worth should be acknowledged by everyone". And first and second principle both requires a third one, the impartialist reasoning which means that "each person should enjoy the impartial treatment of their claims" (Held, 2003: 169). Held thinks that these three principles of cosmopolitanism will be efficient insofar as a cosmopolitan democracy is developed. For him nation-states are the main mediator in achieving such a global framework. Otherwise these principles remain as ideal constructs.

At this point another way of conceptualization of the term comes from Ulrich Beck (2002, 2003 et al.). In his way of conceptualization, cosmopolitanism is treated as a process that mimics the globalization. He makes some distinctions while pointing out his way of conceptualization. As understood by him, cosmopolitanism could be conceived in three different streams which flow simultaneously: banal cosmopolitanism, methodological cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanization. What is clear in his approach is that (2003: 26) "the core of cosmopolitanism is the recognition of the otherness of other" and "it affirms other as both different and equal". Therefore, according to Beck, cosmopolitanism "sets itself against both racism and universalism" and "this includes making clear... [that] the ethnocentric universalism of the west is an anachronism that can be overcome". So it is obvious for him that "cosmopolitanism is an antidote to ethnocentrism and nationalism" and also is an attitude where the local and cultural attachments of nation-state comes its end – likewise Kantian notion of "kingdom of ends". In the long history of the term from ancient Greek philosophy to Enlightenment – Kant- as Beck argues, "cosmopolitan [always] ignores the either/or principle and embodies 'this-as-well-as-that' principle" (2003: 16). But in the conditions of modernity things become more complicated. In Beck's perception modernity has two historical moments: First modernity and second modernity. For him the first modern world was a nation world and

there was a clear division between inner and outer, between domestic and foreign. In that world the nation state was the principle of order. Politics were national politics, culture was national culture, labor, class formation and class conflict were all primarily features of the nation state. [on the other hand] International politics was a multiplication of nation states, each defining one another's borders and mirroring one another's essential categories. (Beck, 2003: 26)

In the first modernity, as the two sides of an interdependent whole national and international together brings about the process of globalization. Beck prefers to call second modernity instead of globalization but his main emphasis is on the trans-nationality. The importance of trans nationality for Beck, comes from the fact that "when we examine the world from a trans-national perspective, it is obvious that national and international are becoming harder and harder to distinguish" (2003: 26). So it can be said that the peculiarity of trans-nationality is the ambiguous character of the borders while distinguishing inner from the outer, nation from its outside. It means that the "defining parts of the nation becomes denationalized". This also eventuates with the transmutation of national into a phantom or "zombie category". Therefore, in this context what he called second modernity is a transnational or cosmopolitan modernity – as a type of modernity that he uses instead of the term globalization - that is in question "when society ceases to be a synonym for the nation state, and when all social [economic, cultural, political and technological development becomes first and fundamentally transnational. This process also comes up with "less regard for state boundaries [borders]" in which "people shop transnationally, love transnationally, educated trasnationally, live transnationally (that is combined multiple loyalties and identities)" (p. 27). While defining all these types of being transnational, Beck's preference is the term cosmopolitanization. He suggests cosmopolitanization as an "internal globalization" or in other words as "globalization from within the national societies... [that] transforms everyday consciousness and identities significantly" (Beck, 2002: 17). Also for him,

Globalization is a non-linear, dialectic process in which the global and the local do not exist as cultural polarities but as combined and mutually implicating principles. These processes involve not only interconnections across boundaries, but transform the quality of the social and the political inside notion-state societies. (Beck, 2002: 17-18)

Therefore, for Beck it is not the matter what is described as globalization, but rather as cosmopolitanization or as methodological cosmopolitanism which "builds a frame of reference to analyse the new social conflicts, dynamics and structures of trans-nationality". In asserting this Beck's main aim is to put forth the cosmopolitanization of cultural and social claims or realities as a process in which "cosmopolitan perspective or outlook emerges as the result of clash of cultures and rationalities within one's own life, the 'internalized other'" (2002: 18). On the other hand, if there is a lack of cosmopolitan perspective that is to say a lack of everyday consciousness of trans-nationality, then it means for Beck, "banal cosmopolitanism".

What makes Beck's position important in cosmopolitanism discourse is its inherent dynamics in which cosmopolitanism is understood as a process rather than an actual position or outcome. However, Roudometof (2005: 117) finds some contradictions in Beck's argumentation. For him, first of these contradictions is, his way of simultaneously employing cosmopolitanism both as a process and as an outcome; and second, Beck intertwines cosmopolitanism and transnationalism. Cosmopolitanism discourse that we mentioned thus far is critically evaluated by Calhoun.

He argues that "cosmopolitan liberals often fail to recognize the social conditions of their own discourse, presenting it as freedom from social belonging rather than a special sort of belonging, a view from nowhere or everywhere rather than from particular social spaces". The

views of cosmopolitan elites express privilege; as Calhoun points these views cannot be presented as "neutral apprehensions of the whole". So he also argues that "an approach that starts with individuals and treats culture as contingent cannot do justice to the legitimate claims made on behalf of 'thick attachments' to particular solidarities still matter – whether in the forms of nations, ethnicities local communities, or religions". For Calhoun to present cosmopolitanism as the universalistic enemy of particular, parochial or local solidarities is a kind of failure to understand the world as it is (Calhoun, 2003: 532).

As it seen from the debates on cosmopolitanism with respect to globalization now it is necessary to develop another point of view. In such a view cosmopolitanism should be understood as tension between home and away or local and global. This understanding of tension entails a discussion on border and belongings, their meanings and transformations in the historical course.

Thinking About Borders

In a global age, it is believed that by a consequence of the interconnectivity of the nation-states, cultures and worldviews are getting interwoven, and (in a large scale) new types of belonging are emerging. Thus in the social sciences, the emphasis on borders becomes more and more dominant than ever. No doubt it is the consequence of globalization and its interconnected nature in which by the time borders has become weakened and only seen as unused and obsolete utilities. Nevertheless, as Rumford points it, "a globalizing world is a world of networks, flows and mobility" and for him "it is also a world of borders" (Rumford, 2006: 163). So while thinking about borders, it is important to note that there are multiple and various types of borders. And it is important to know that in these conditions of globalization, nothing but borders concern us, but why?

In the light of this concern and in order to find a concrete answer to this "why?" Let's start with a basic assumption implied in the meaning of the concept 'border' that it is something uncrossable. Border must not be passed through otherwise it cannot be border. If the border is crossable or permeable, we can hardly talk about its possibility as a boundary, barrier or limit implied in its basic meaning. In fact, from this point of view as the ontology of border implies the impossibility of crossing other side, provides us an ability to make some distinctions within various conceptualizations of the border. Especially in the conditions of the global interconnected and especially as a phenomenon, border is usually employed in order to make distinctions between home and away – also between parochial and universal, local and global.

Thus, as we saw in the previous sections, the main character of globalization as interconnectedness, interdependency and interaction among states, cultures and more generally locales first and foremost affects – or more specifically mutating – both actually existing borders and perceiving, conceptualizing it. Therefore, it is not surprise that the main concern about globalization and cosmopolitanism inevitably concentrates on the significance of the world and home (roots) that is defined and confined by borders. This emphasis on border in the literature of globalization is echoed in the works of Balibar (1998), Beck (2002) and Rumford (2006). For example, as Rumford points that,

...theorizing borders and the dynamics of bordering and rebordering have become key components of understanding contemporary social and political change. Many of the themes central to contemporary social theory – globalization, cosmopolitanism, networked community, mobilities and flows – have led to both a rethinking of the nature and role of borders, and, at the same time, have caused social theorists to place borders more centrally in the study of society (Rumford, 2006: 155).

Rumford conceives the consequences of globalization as a tension between de-bordering and re-bordering, for him "increased mobility in society (and between nation-states) requires new borders to regulate forms of activity which old style territorial borders cannot achieve" (2006: 164). In such a view it can be seen that borders become permeable by the process of globalization that in turn leads to the reinforcement of the borders for the purpose of security.

As Balibar (1998: 220) puts forth "contemporary globalization is certainly bringing about what can be called an under determination of border, a weakening of its identity". Thus, for him it is certain that "borders are vacillating" and

[borders] are no longer localizable in an unequivocal fashion. It also means that they no longer allow a superimposition of the set of functions of sovereignty, administration, cultural control, taxation, and so on, and consequently a conferral on the territory, or better, or the duo of territory and population, of a simultaneously englobing and univocal signification of "presupposition" for all other social relations. (Balibar, 1998: 219)

Nevertheless, in Balibar's argumentation, the vacillation of borders "does not mean that they are disappearing" but rather "being both multiplied and reduced in their localization and their function" (1998: 220). But also he thinks that, the story of the vacillation of the borders goes beyond the globalization. For him the over determination of borders in the modern times, prepares a convenient condition to vacillation of borders in a global era. By the over determination of border, he designates the fact that the border of a state is identified with border of a culture and an identity (at least in Europe). Also this identification provides global visioning with a partitioning function. So in his approach, it can be said that mutually bordering (for the establishment of nation-state) brings about globalization, and globalization brings about under determination of borders. Then it is obvious that for Balibar that:

Notional borders would not be capable of securing (or trying to secure) identities, would not be capable of marking the threshold at which life and death are played out (in what in Europe is called "patriotism")... they would not be capable of being "internal borders" (internalized borders, borders for interiority) were they not idealized. (Balibar, 1998: 221)

Then, at this point it is also essential to pose a question that why borders were idealized? Balibar gives an answer to this question and he thinks that "they were idealized because they were imagined as the point at which "worldviews... were at stake" (1998: 221-22). But it is worth to think whether this answer is adequate. If it is inadequate, it would probably stem from its approach to ideal or the functionality of ideal through constitution of identity.

Also for Beck (2002: 19) in the global condition (reflexive modernization or second modernity), main problem is the "pluralization of borders". This is exclusively a problem especially "for the fundamental dualisms of the first modernity and before, as the border between nature and society, subject and object, life and death, We and Others, war and peace". From the perspective of cosmopolitanization or the internal globalization, pluralization of the borders "means the pluralization of nation-state borders" (Beck, 2002: 19). So it means that by globalization whether its source is internal or external, culturally, economically, politically, legally, technologically a new kind of multitude of "non-identical borders" emerges. Beck thinks that "in the terms of nation-state (or methodological nationalism) these borders coincide, but in the terms of methodological cosmopolitanism these borders diverge" (Beck, 2002: 19). So for him the pluralization of borders also means the mutation of borders in a divergent manner which exclusively and especially subverts the veracious nature and logic of border that assures the reliability of our representations of external reality – such as national, cultural realities.

Another or, say, a bit more sophisticated way of conceptualizing borders comes from Žižek (1993) whose argumentation engages with the Lacanian approach to self or identity construction. Žižek (1993: 216) evaluates the border[line] by setting out the Lacanian premise as "a horrifying, lethal and at the same time fascinating phenomenon". He marks the Lacanian conceptualizing of the border that is "what Lacan, apropos of Sophocles Antigone, attempts to indicate by means of the Greek word *ate*" (p. 216). What does the term *ate* mean for Lacan? For Žižek, Lacan uses the word to denote "simultaneously...a horrifying limit that can never be reached, the touch of which means death, and the space beyond it". So the main character of conceptualizing (theorizing, understanding, etc.) border, in this way is its understanding as a "primacy of limit over the space". In the case of *ate* this means that "we do not have two spheres (that of reality and that of pure fantasy) that are divided by a certain limit instead of this, "what we have is just reality and its limit" and "limit as the abyss or void around which it is structured". So in Žižek's words border or limit

marks a certain fundamental impossibility (it cannot be trespassed across, if we come too close to it, we die), while its beyond is prohibited [like nation-states borders] (whoever enters it cannot return, etc). We have thereby already produced the formula of the mysterious reversal of horror into bliss: by means of it, the impossible limit changes into the forbidden place. In other words the logic of this reversal is that of the transmutation of the real into the symbolic: the impossible-real changes into an object of symbolic prohibition. (Žižek, 1993: 216)

Žižek's impossible real can be understood through Wittgenstein's famous eye metaphor that "the eye ...can not ever be part of the seen reality" (Žižek, 1993: 203). By Žižek's way of conceptualizing the border with respect to its uncrossable and impossible character, it is more easy to understand why borders are idealized. Through this understanding of border, there is also a shortcut to explanation of home as a place of culture or as identical with national territory. Žižek describes home (or nation) as a "fantasy space" and he evaluates this space as secondary. Here, in a Lacanian approach fantasy "is the ultimate supporter of reality" or it is "far from being a kind of dreamlike cobweb that prevents us from 'seeing reality as it effectively is', fantasy is [directly] constitutive of what we call reality" (Žižek, 1993: 218). Thus,

as Žižek points so well, border (ate) functions through intervening the perception of reality by "transmutating impossible reality" into what he calls, "symbolic prohibition". This symbolic prohibition brings about a kind of "symbolic bliss" that its "logic ... enables us to articulate one of the fundamental mechanisms of ideological legitimization [of home, nation, nationality]: we legitimize the existing order by presenting it as the realization of a dream -- *not of our dream, but of the Other's, the Dead Ancestor's dream*, the dream of previous generations [in other words our roots] (1993: 217).

What makes Žižek's position privileged, in his way of thinking and theorizing borders is not only his approach to the phenomenon of border as an impossible entity, but also his answer to the question that how and why borders are idealized. The very logic of his approach, makes easy to understand double character of the border as an impossible limit and as a prohibited barrier. In this regard, it could be asserted that Balibar's point on the overdetermination of border, can be translated into Žižek's approach as the overdetermination of the prohibition of border as a barrier. As I will elaborate in the next section, Žižek's conceptualization of border as "the transmutation of the impossible real in to the symbolic prohibition" provides a large scope in order to develop an adequate model for the way of approaching cosmopolitanism.

Conclusion: Cosmopolitanism at Home

At this moment also as a conclusion, it is very instructive to ask some questions about the problem that has been discussed so far. One of these questions could be pose as: what does home and away mean in global circumstances- whether transnational or interconnected? Another one might be how a real or robust cosmopolitanism can be understood as a tension between home and away? In the light of these two question, I am not suggesting "feeling at home" but rather "appearing at home" or "initiation at home" and, therefore, my main aim is to ask where can we grasp "home" with its real function especially in relation to "cosmopolitanism" and how can it be conceptualized. I believe that such a conceptualization will prepare a convenient situation to understand the "real" meaning of cosmopolitanism.

An investigation that is made in order to find adequate responses to these questions, entails an examination of some alternative variants of conceiving cosmopolitanism. These considerations, as pointed out by Werbner (2006: 496) appear in an oxymoron fashion that "joins contradictory notions of local specificity and universal enlightenment" or of the local attachments and global detachments. This means also that as a subject matter of an inquiry, "how local, parochial, rooted, culturally specific and demotic notions could co-exist with the trans-local, transnational, transcendent, elitist, enlightened, universalist way of life". Or as a reversal of this, could there be an enlightened normative cosmopolitanism which is not rooted (or let's say, rootless) in patriotic and culturally committed loyalties and understandings? As a result of this way of combining apparently contradictory opposites, a kind of alternative conceptualization of cosmopolitanism emerges in the related literature: cosmopolitan patriotism, rooted cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitan ethnicity, working-class cosmopolitanism, discrepant cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanism at home. In her elaboration of Mamadu Diouf's (2002) suggestion, adds to these variations a new one which is vernacular cosmopolitanism. In this paper my aim is to examine another conceptualization which is, as suggested by Shemaam Black (2006) *Cosmopolitanism At Home*. But before examining it, there

is need to say something about Appiah's (1998) approach to cosmopolitanism in which cosmopolitanism appears in relation to compatriotism.

For Appiah, cosmopolitanism and patriotism should be understood as sentiments rather than as ideologies. As a sentiment cosmopolitanism means "taking pleasure from the presence of other, different, places that are home to other different people". So for him while cosmopolitan takes such pleasure, at the same time he/she could "be attached to a home of his or her own, with its own cultural particularities" (1998: 91). Appiah calls this situation, rooted cosmopolitanism. In asserting rooted cosmopolitanism Appiah argues that

In essence, that you can be cosmopolitan – celebrating the variety of human cultures; rooted – loyal to one local society (or a few) that you count as home; liberal – convinced of the value of the individual; and patriotic – celebrating the institutions of state (or states) within which you live. (Appiah, 1998: 106)

If we conceive this mode of being in Waldron's words, as if "they were costumes or attributes rather than intelligent and intelligible structures of reasoning" (2000: 242) and if we accept the main argumentation of "rooted cosmopolitanism", do not we remain blind to the question that how one become a cosmopolitan. In Appiah's rooted cosmopolitanism there are only answers or descriptions in which cosmopolitanism is presented as an outcome or as a consequence. But it seems to me that there is also a necessity of posing questions concerning cosmopolitanism. There might be roots or loyalties that are attached even to a cosmopolitan; but it is important to understand that whether these roots occupy a place that is central to identity or not.

Shamem Black, in her essay *Cosmopolitanism at Home*, explores how modern cosmopolitanism might paradoxically emerge through an embrace of domesticity and kinship. Through a reading of the Amitav Ghosh's fiction, *The Shadow Lines*, Black argues that as a vision or an outlook, "cosmopolitanism should be more committed to recognizing the world through the home" (2006: 45). She tries to articulate a new way of conceptualizing cosmopolitanism in contrast to the general way of conceptualizing, understood as "feeling at home in the world" or as a "world citizen". As pointed out by Black (2006: 46), Amitav Ghosh's fiction "illuminates the intimacy between the familial and foreign" and "his work suggests that a robust cosmopolitan sensibility requires close attention to the energies of domestic life". In asserting these ideas, Black conceives cosmopolitanism as an "attitude of open engagement with unfamiliar people and places". So it is obvious for her that what makes an individual cosmopolitan is neither embracing others with a humanitarian ideal nor appreciating their cultures or traditional practices, but first and foremost being open to other, unfamiliar or stranger (places or identities). Black point the discomfort of the theories of cosmopolitanism with the theme of "being at home" and also with the "parochial attachments and locality as well as the home as a space of the family that perpetuates the nationalist, communalist and provincial sensibilities". She thinks that the main reason of this general discomfort with the home and family is their metaphorical implication that "makes the social construction of community seem natural and inevitable" and also seems to bear "essentialist visions of belonging" (2006: 48). On the other hand, as she suggests,

the logic of *The Shadow Lines* requires collaboration between conceptualizing one's home and conceptualizing one's world. Individuals in the novel develop as cosmopolitan subjects both by confronting the contours of their own domestic location and by reaching outward to imagine the domestic lives of others unlike them. (Black, 2006: 50)

Through Tridip who is one of the cosmopolitan individuals of the novel, *The Shadow Lines* insist that robust cosmopolitanism emerges through attention to the contours of one's home. This insistence involves also a suggestion that "true cosmopolitanism demands careful contemplation rather than passive transcultural experiences" (Black, 2006: 54). At this point a proposition of Tridip, "imagination with precision" is suggested by Black as a slogan for ideal version of cosmopolitanism. In this sense, the paradoxical, if not oxymoron construction, of the idea of cosmopolitanism at home, comes from this phrase: "imagination with precision". For Black, imagination connotes that conceptualizing of others beyond positivism in a way that "offers more than a self-serving fantasy of cultural difference" and "demands a respect for the specificity and uniqueness of other lives". But this imagination should be with precision and this "precision develops exclusively through the overlooked details of domestic life" (p. 54). What makes Black's argumentation important is her regard about the functions of the domestic life and its borders. She conceives cosmopolitanism as a sympathetic perspective-taking and follows its traces in the inner space and architecture of domestic life – overlooked details of domestic life. As she points at the end of the *Cosmopolitanism at Home*, the most robust cosmopolitans are also the ones most bound to home (2006: 62).

Thinking on cosmopolitanism with the words of Black entails a revisiting of the Žižek's views about borderline. Žižek's conceptualization of border both as "symbolic prohibition" and as "impossible real" becomes very instructive in order to understand Black's suggestion of cosmopolitanism as a domestic orientation. What makes these two approaches similar to each other? Answer is not complex; Žižek's uncrossable border and Black's cosmopolitanism without crossing-border. But beyond this similarity there is also a kind of consistency: Žižek's impossible real that makes "home" as fantasy place without outside through the transmutation of the impossible to prohibition and Black's consideration of "away" as an extension of home where cosmopolitan individuals grow up.

References

- APPIAH, A. K. (1998). 'Cosmopolitan Patriots' in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 20 – 41.
- BOHMAN J. And LUTZ-BAHMAN M. (1997). Introduction, in James Bohman and Matthias Lutz-Bachman (eds.), *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*, Massachusetts: MIT press, pp 25 – 58.
- BALIBAR, E. (1998). The Borders of Europe, in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- BECK, U. (2003). 'Rooted Cosmopolitanism: Emerging from a Rivalry of Distinctions' in Ulrich Beck, Natan Sznaider, Rainer Winter (eds), *Global America? The Cultural Consequences of Globalization*, Liverpool University Press, pp. 15 –29.
- BECK, U. (2002). The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies, *Theory, Culture and Society* 19(1–2): 17–44.
- BLACK, Shameem (2006). Cosmopolitanism at Home. Amitav Ghosh's *The Shadow Lines*. *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 41 (3), pp.45-65.
- CALHOUN, Craig (2003). Belonging in the Cosmopolitan Imaginary, *Ethnicities*, vol. 3, pp. 531 – 553.
- CHEAH, Peng (1998). 'Introduction: part II: the cosmopolitical today', in P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 20 – 41.
- CHEAH, Peng (2006). Cosmopolitanism, *Theory Culture Society* 2006; 23; pp. 486-496.
- DELANTY, G. (2006). The cosmopolitan imagination: critical cosmopolitanism and social theory. *British Journal of Sociology*. Vol. 57, No. 1, pp 25 – 47.
- HANNERZ, Ulf. (1990). Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture, *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 7, pp. 237-251.
- HELD, D. (2003). From Executive to Cosmopolitan Multilateralism, in David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archibugi (eds.), *Taming Globalization: frontiers of governance*, Polity Press, pp 160 - 190.

- NEDERVEEN PIETERSE, J. (2006). Emancipatory Cosmopolitanism: Towards an Agenda. *Development and Change* 37 (6), pp 1247 – 1257.
- NUSSBAUM, Martha (1996). 'Patriotism and cosmopolitanism', in Joshua Cohen (ed.), *For Love of a Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press, pp. 1 – 44.
- RUMFORD, C. (2006). Theorising Borders, *European Journal of Social Theory* 9(2): 155–169
- WALDRON, James (2000). Who is Cosmopolitan? *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 227-243.
- WERBNER, Phina (2006). Vernacular Cosmopolitanism, *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 23, pp. 496- 498.
- YEĐENOĐLU, M. (2003). Liberal Multiculturalism and the Ethics of Hospitality in the Age of Globalization, *Postmodern Culture*, Vol. 13 No.2.
- YEĐENOĐLU, M. (2005). Cosmopolitanism and nationalism in a globalized world, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* Vol. 28 pp. 103 – 131.
- ZİZEK, Slavoj (1993). 'The Thing That Thinks': The Kantian Background of The Noir Subject, in Joan Copjec (ed.) *Shades of Noir*, Verso, pp. 199- 226.