

# COSMO-MULTICULTURALISM: TOWARDS COSMOPOLITAN SOLIDARITY

NENAD MIŠČEVIĆ

University of Maribor, Faculty of Arts, Maribor, Slovenia

Cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism are the main routes of escape from nationalism-populism. They can be combined, since there is no deep conflict between the two; moreover, their combination is consistent and desirable. It would be the global homeland of various vernaculars rather than a land of unitary Esperanto. The paper proposes relatively simple heuristics for passing from the usual multicultural conception to a cosmopolitan one. It lists the generally accepted requirements of multicultural solidarity and sketches the main lines of a cosmopolitan extension of them. Since a function of cosmopolitan norms is precisely to promote multicultural interests, this conception is conceptually coherent and morally progressive; one might hope that it is also politically feasible. This yields simple requirements on the cosmopolitan institutional structure needed to accommodate cultural pluralism.

DOI

[https://doi.org/  
10.18690/um.ff.11.2025.7](https://doi.org/10.18690/um.ff.11.2025.7)

ISBN

978-961-299-082-4

**Keywords:**

cosmopolitanism,  
multiculturalism,  
solidarity,  
cultural pluralism,  
education



University of Maribor Press

DOI  
[https://doi.org/  
10.18690/um.ff.11.2025.7](https://doi.org/10.18690/um.ff.11.2025.7)

ISBN  
978-961-299-082-4

**Ključne besede:**  
kozmopolitizem,  
multikulturalizem,  
solidarnost,  
kulturni pluralizem,  
izobraževanje

# KOZMOMULTIKULTURALIZEM: NAPROTI KOZMOPOLITSKI SOLIDARNOSTI

NENAD MIŠČEVIĆ

Univerza v Mariboru, Filozofska fakulteta, Maribor, Slovenija

Kozmopolitizem in multikulturalizem sta glavna načina bega pred nacionalizmom – populizmom. Lahko ju združimo, saj med njima ni globokega konflikta; poleg tega je njuna združitev konsistentna in zaželena. To bi bila globalna domovina različnih ljudskih jezikov in ne dežela enotnega esperanta. Prispevek predlaga razmeroma preprosto hevristiko za prehod od običajne multikulturne zasnove h kozmopolitski. Navaja splošno sprejete zahteve večkulturne solidarnosti in oriše glavne smernice njihove kozmopolitske širitve. Ker je funkcija kozmopolitskih norm ravno spodbujanje večkulturnih interesov, je ta koncept konceptualno koherenten in moralno napreden; lahko bi upali, da je tudi politično izvedljiva. To prinaša preproste zahteve za kozmopolitske institucionalne strukture, potrebne za prilagoditev kulturnemu pluralizmu.



Univerzitetna založba  
Univerze v Mariboru

## 1 Introduction

In teaching philosophy to future philosophy teachers, Kotnik has been discussing urgent political issues, and, among others, expressing attitudes in favour of migrants and refugees; in this respect he was promoting cosmopolitan education of future educators (see his 2017 paper, he wrote for my Festschrift – I am happy to return the favour with my contribution!).<sup>1</sup>

Here, we address the two faces of cosmopolitan attitudes, quite forgotten in the literature on cosmopolitanism in general but present in the work on cosmopolitan education. The first face is the one of theory, moral and political, the second is the “existential” face, the promotion of cosmopolitanism as an existential attitude. The paper discusses the ties between the two, questioning the isolationism of the mainstream theoretical cosmopolitan literature, which totally abstracts from the other, existential face. In the course of the discussion, it also refers to the issues of Slovenian reactions to the refugee problem, thus continuing Kotnik’s engagement with topics close to him and to his and our students. Our general topic is how to manage ethno-cultural diversity and retain elements of solidarity between diverse groups. It is a burning question on the present-day political scene, as testified by Chandran Kukathas:

“If any issue dominates contemporary political theory, it is how to deal with cultural diversity and the claims – moral, legal, and political – made in the name of ethnic, religious, linguistic, or national allegiance (Kymlicka, 2001, p. 17). Today, governments are confronted by demands from cultural minorities for recognition, protection, preferential treatment, and political autonomy within the boundaries of the state. Equally, international society and its political institutions, as well as states themselves, have had to deal with demands from various peoples for political recognition as independent nations, and for national self-determination” (Kukathas, 2004, p. 250).<sup>2</sup>

It is implicit in many international documents; for example in Article 27 of the *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*:

---

<sup>1</sup> The main ideas of the paper have been presented at the Department of Philosophy at the Faculty of Arts in Maribor, on Dec. 16, 2021; thanks go to all participants, in particular Friderik “Fridi” Klampfer, Bojan Borstner and Danilo Šuster, for their discussion.

<sup>2</sup> The quotation from Kymlicka is from his 2001 book.

“In those States in which ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities exist, persons belonging to such minorities shall not be denied the right, in community with the other members of their group, to enjoy their own culture, to profess and practise their own religion, or to use their own language.” (Adopted by the United Nations’ General Assembly on December 19, 1966.)<sup>3</sup>

Here, we shall be offering a minimalist sketch, merely indicating the direction in which to go. Let us start with the existence of three pure options in matters of political management of ethno-cultural diversity, nationalism, multiculturalism, and cosmopolitanism. Of course, there are intermediate options combining the pairs of the three pure ones; we shall be interested in one such option and in one pair constituting it.

Cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism are the main routes of escape from nationalism-populism. They can be combined, since there is no deep conflict between the two; moreover, their combination is consistent and desirable. Here, we shall be developing an intermediate option: a combination of multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism. Twenty years ago, I pointed out the availability and desirability of research in this direction, without explicitly giving it a name, in my book *Nationalism and Beyond: Introducing Moral Debate about Values*, published by CEU Press in 2001. Here is a taste of what I said then:

“In discussing political alternatives to nationalism in chapter nine we have sketched a model which rests upon both the practical necessities of the cohabitation of various ethno-national groups within a single state and across state boundaries, and the moral value of understanding and toleration. It is a moderately cosmopolitan model which welcomes macro-regional integrations that weaken the role of the state, as well as micro-regional diversity that often cuts across state borders” (Mišćević, 2001, p. 285).

Let us also mention Simon Caney and his “Cosmopolitanism, Culture and Well-Being: A Cosmopolitan Perspective on Multiculturalism.” We very much agree with his Thesis 1:

---

<sup>3</sup> Noticed by philosophers, and commented by Jeremy Waldron, (1992).

“Cosmopolitan principles and institutions require, for their realization, a certain ‘cosmopolitan political culture’ (the political constraint) and the requisite political culture is permissive and flexible but does place limits on the extent to which political bodies should support cultural minorities” (Caney, 2009, p. 23).

This is the direction we shall take in the paper. Interestingly, some prominent authors seem to deny the popularity of this direction, without, however, denying its relevance. Pauline Kleingeld and Eric Brown in their (2019) entry on “Cosmopolitanism,” in the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, list the main multiculturalists as being against cosmopolitanism. They note that “there has been a good deal of debate over cultural cosmopolitanism, with disputes over multiculturalism in educational curricula and with resurgent nationalisms.” And they rightly point out that “the cosmopolitan position in these disputes rejects exclusive attachments to a particular culture. So on the one hand, the cosmopolitan encourages cultural diversity and appreciates a multicultural *mélange*, and on the other hand, the cosmopolitan rejects a strong nationalism.” But then comes a strange turn: “In staking out these claims, the cosmopolitan must be wary about very strong ‘rights to culture,’ respecting the rights of minority cultures while rebuffing the right to unconditional national self-determination. Hence, recent advocates of ‘liberal nationalism’ (e.g., Margalit and Raz, Tamir) or of the rights of minority cultures (e.g., Kymlicka) generally seem to be anti-cosmopolitan.”

We shall document the sympathies of Kymlicka toward cosmopolitanism, denied by Kleingeld and Brown, and argue that the combination from our title is natural and acceptable. Unfortunately, because of space limitations, we must set aside the burning issue of feasibility of the relevant options (my thanks go to Friderik “Fridi” Klampfer), multiculturalism (see e.g., Jopke), cosmopolitanism, and their combination, cosmo-multiculturalism.

Here is the preview. We begin with what we see as the goal of the relevant political development: a global cosmo-multicultural structure. The general motivation for it, besides the classical pacifist one, is solidarity in the face of diversity. With the latter, two desiderata come together: respect for cultural diversity and the need to extend this respect globally, within a suitable institutional framework. The institutional structure has to leave a place for cultural variation, and no single state-like framework is needed. (We shall be quoting several contemporary authors who point in the relevant direction). In specifying the desiderata for the structure considered, we shall

distinguish two kinds of interaction of culturally distant groups. First, the proximal interaction between the neighbouring ones, which is the less demanding of the two. Second, the interactions between geographically quite distant groups and cultures – these point to the need for a truly cosmopolitan institutional structure.

We then move to the issue of the path to the goal: how can one pass from the present-day world to the cosmopolitan multiculturalist one? How realistic are the hopes of a multicultural world? The sketch has two parts, the general and the individual-existential one that brings us also to the work of Kotnik. The general idea relies on the de facto global connection and new proximities that phenomena like migration and pandemics are creating. The individual-existential part turns to the “existential” dimension, the role of multicultural interaction in the life of individuals participating.<sup>4</sup>

## 2 The goal: global cosmo-multicultural structure

### 2.1 The motivation and the method

So, let us start with the classical cosmopolitan motivation that comes from the need for peace. In its most classical form, in Kant’s project, it was already pointing to the norm of respecting others, which might come from our surroundings in different ways, based on the particular host country. The idea has been famously developed by Hanna Arendt (1958; 1968), and given a rather radical form in Derrida (2005). Let me illustrate this kind of motivation by two interestingly different phenomena, both pointing to pacifist and diversity-friendly motivation.

The first comes from the interaction of culturally different, possibly distant actors, which may be unpredictable, but very demanding in its consequences. A classical older example is the problem of the American Japanese people in the context of the Pearl Harbor attack. Overnight, the attack made the American citizens of Japanese origin highly suspect, and this resulted in their mistreatment and persecution. No global mechanism that could prevent or at least mitigate it was present. The present-day version comes from migrations and, very recently, pandemics. The global

---

<sup>4</sup> For the issue of cosmopolitan identity and its historical origins and contemporary relevance see the paper with this title by Marin Beroš (2016).

institutions centred around the UN are simply too weak to properly react to the problems generated and manage global non-state interaction.

The second comes from global state interactions, potentially threatening the given world order. A recent, highly relevant example are the interactions characterizing the new multi-polarism of today's world involving political and cultural contrasts of a global variety. In the week I am writing this, the media tell us about the states of Russia and China, represented by Putin and Xi Jinping talking to each other and conspiring together against "the West."

In most cases of relevant situations, both components are crucial – the nature of global structures at hand on the one side and ethno-cultural contrasts on the other. Institutional structure: cultural variation, no state-like framework. Proximal interaction is somewhat less demanding, whereas distal interaction raises the need for a truly cosmopolitan institutional structure.

Let us then borrow from Daniele Archibugi (2005) the metaphor about the characteristics of the future structural goal: should its medium be "vernacular or Esperanto"? He notes that Will Kymlicka has argued that "democratic politics is politics in the vernacular." And he asks the rhetorical question of whether this implies that democratic politics is impossible in a multilingual community, whether at the local, national, regional or global level – his answer is, of course, negative. He rightly maintains that democratic politics should imply the willingness of all players to make an effort to understand each other. And suggests that "any time that there is a community of fate, a democrat should search for methods that allow deliberation according to the two key conditions of political equality and participation" (2005, p. 537). I shall not follow Archibugi in his sympathies for a possible unitary solution, illustrated by the imagined role of Esperanto, and by the actual role of English in the early Indian state. So, I shall opt for vernacular, or, even more precisely, for vernaculars in the plural as the medium of cosmopolitan communication; this will be the multiculturalist aspect of the view proposed (more is to come in the sequel).<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Another author I very much agree with is Matthias Risse (2012a, 2012b), who talks about "pluralist internationalism" (2012a, 193 ff.).

If you need a brief characterisation of multiculturalism, here is one coming from Nathan Glazer: "Multiculturalism, then, is a term that describes one particular way of responding to ethnic diversity. 'It is a position that rejects assimilation and the "melting pot" image as an imposition of the dominant culture, and instead prefers such metaphors as the "salad bowl" or the "glorious mosaic," in which each ethnic and racial element in the population maintains its distinctiveness" (1997, p. 10).

In the sequel, we shall follow relatively simple heuristics in order to briefly sketch the cosmo-multiculturalist perspective on global politics. We start from extant multiculturalist program(s), listing the generally accepted requirements of multiculturalism and then continue from these relatively well-established suggestions to the cosmopolitan perspective. Along the way, we point to the differences in framework, the statist as against the cosmopolitan one. We shall take the requirement of multicultural solidarity from Banting and Kymlicka, (2003), (noting that similar requirements are present generally in the multiculturalist literature), and sketch the main lines of cosmopolitan extension of them. This will yield simple requirements on cosmopolitan institutional structure; Kymlicka, the leading multiculturalist thinker, might agree with this line of thought. For him, multiculturalism goes with liberal nationhood, the wider genus prominently including multiculturalism, and with cosmopolitan norms as well.

"As against those who see cosmopolitanism and liberal nationhood as inherently in tension, I want to argue that one conception of the nature and function of cosmopolitan norms is precisely to promote (a tamed form of) liberal nationhood, and that this conception is conceptually coherent, politically feasible, and morally progressive" (Kymlicka, 2006, p. 133).

So, we shall try to imagine global institutional structure(s) that will allow the global implementation of measures similar to those listed in the canonical multiculturalist program (e.g., Banting & Kymlicka, 2003).

We shall be counting with variations in geographical distance and levels of size. First, we shall discuss proximate groups, either immediately connected or separated by a small intermediary distance. The proximate-immediate groups are mutual neighbours, say within a town (Roma and Slovenians in a town in Slovenia), or groups from neighbouring regions (say neighbours from Slovenia and Hungary, or, more narrowly, Štajerska and Hrvatsko Zagorje). Others are the proximate non-

immediate collectives (say those of Slovenia and Serbia, with Croatia in between). Then we pass to more global distances and to distant communities, like Slovenia and Afghanistan (with the possibility of Afghan refugees coming to Slovenia).

In all cases, we shall distinguish the levels of size. First, micro-structures like town and village, then mezzo-structures like sub-state and state (e.g., Istria, Styria, Slovenia), and finally, the quite different macro-structural level especially relevant for cosmopolitanism, say the trans-state, continental or sub-continental EU level, and then intercontinental connections within the global whole.

## **2.2 Openings: proximal and distal**

Let us start, very briefly, with a multicultural scheme for proximal opening. The central case here are present-day sub-state national groups. The issues are classical for multiculturalism, and there are no big new issues for cosmopolitanism, except for the fading of the state-level, which stops being dominant and may lose its importance to a large extent! If you need an example, consider the local wider area, encompassing Slovenia, Austria, Croatia, Hungary, and Italy, and areas in Slovenia bordering each of these.

So, consider the usual multicultural demands (from Kymlicka & Banting) at the mezzo-level of sub-state communities:

- 1. Federal or quasi-federal territorial autonomy for any given group.

Hungarians in the Slovenian region bordering Hungary, the Prekmurje, should be given some territorial autonomy; the same for Slovenians living in Hungary region bordering Slovenia.

- 2. Official language status, either in the region or nationally

Hungarian should be one of the official languages in the bordering region, the multiculturalists claim.

- 3. guarantees of representation in the central government or in Constitutional Courts

- 4. public funding of minority language at universities/schools/ media

This, for instance, is implemented in Slovenia as far as elementary schools go; the big issue would be to have a subject at the University taught in Hungarian.

All these demands should be implementable within a wider transnational or cosmopolitan structure; interestingly, the first steps in this direction have already been taken within the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. But in a more cosmopolitan setting, the arrangements would be more radical. Take federal or quasi-federal territorial autonomy; here, of course, in a cosmopolitan context, the area in question is more strongly “sub-regionalised,” and the state plays a minor role.

Or take no. 3, guarantees of representation in the central government or in Constitutional Courts. In the most demanding cosmopolitan variant, the group, say Hungarians in Prekmurje, would have their representations at a every higher level: of the “state,” of the continental union, of the global world council. Similarly with courts, at all levels. Multiculturalists also mention “constitutional or parliamentary affirmation of “multinationalism,” and that would in principle be implemented at each level, in a way much richer within a cosmopolitan structure than it is in the present-day statist or even trans-statist (say EU) framework! Interesting issues arise with another multicultural demand, which is according international personality to the relevant groups or regions, for instance, allowing the sub-state region to sit on international bodies, sign treaties, or have their own Olympic team; for instance, our micro-region of Slovenian Styria might have its own Olympic team, the Central European region encompassing Slovenia, Austria and Italy might have another Olympic team, and the EU a third one (Borstner has asked what about the patriotism of the fans; how do we multiply the fan clubs in order to have one for the group at each level?). Doesn’t this demand too many instances of ‘international personality’? The answer might concentrate on the plasticity of belonging; perhaps we don’t need one Olympic team for our micro-region of Slovenian Styria, or for the Central European region; a lesser number of such teams might do as well. So much for proximal openings.

We now move on to the much more challenging group of demands, having to do with distal opening and with truly cosmopolitan multiculturalism. The crucial dramatic difference has to do with global distances of the relevant groups. Consider

any mezzo-regional contact at a great distance, for instance, the Slovenian Primorska (or Styria) accepting Pashtoon refugees from Afghanistan. Note the often dramatic importance of interaction and the relevance of proximisation offered by phenomena like migrations and pandemics. The crucial matter for the cosmopolitan approach is the availability of an institutional structure covering global distances. As Simon Caney in his highly relevant (2009), already quoted, the paper proposes:

“/.../ in order to realize certain principles of justice and to ensure the successful functioning of political institutions, we need to have a certain kind of supportive political culture. Neither principles of justice nor political institutions are self-supporting. Ideals of justice and the institutions that uphold them need, therefore, to be undergirded by some social support, and require a culture of cooperation and compliance” (Caney, 2009, p. 25).

“A cosmopolitan political culture would, I believe, include support for cosmopolitan *principles of justice* (such as, say, civil liberties and a global difference principle), cosmopolitan *policies* (such as, say, the eradication of tariffs employed by developed countries) and cosmopolitan *institutions* (such as, say, a strengthened International Labour Organization)” (Caney, 2009, p. 26).<sup>6</sup>

Let us go back to multicultural demands and consider the way they can be extended on the global scale. The crucial matters concerned the services offered. For constitutional, legislative, or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism, at the central and/or regional and municipal levels, the cosmopolitans should clearly say at exactly how many levels this is to be implemented. For instance, to illustrate this with the Afghan-Slovenian example, the issue concerns the existence of a government ministry or secretariat or advisory board to consult with ethnic communities, and/or of a minimal supra-state ministry (say a union of neighbouring countries, like Slovenia, Hungary, Austria and Croatia), or a relevant body of the EU, or a possible inter-continental, Euro-Asian one. How many levels are needed? We

---

<sup>6</sup> Here is more: A cosmopolitan political culture is, then, a culture that supports cosmopolitan principles, policies, and political institutions. Note here that this does not require abandoning local commitments or ties. A cosmopolitan political culture is compatible with persons' having attachments to state or sub-state, or transnational communities. (Caney, 2009, p. 27)

I believe, however, that although such a culture is incompatible with some cultural traditions it does, nonetheless, accommodate a tremendous amount of cultural variety. It would, moreover, sanction a number of the demands made on behalf of cultural groups. (Ibid.)

suggest that in the general form this might be the central problem of the shape of multicultural-cosmopolitan institutional structure!

Consider other cases of the enhanced hospitality to guests from distant countries. What about the adoption of multiculturalism in school curriculum? Home country kids learn about foreign countries and their cultures. But there is a problem of pluralism. Should they learn about Afghan culture, then the Pakistani one, the Iranian one, and so on? The obvious solution would be a more general one, for instance that our kids learn a lot about Muslim and Arab-inspired culture. And then, if needed, also learn about the particular culture of the most numerous immigrants (Pashtuns, in our example). What about exemptions from dress-codes, Sunday-closing legislation etc.? The same with the media: what is needed is the inclusion of ethnic representation/sensitivity in the mandate of public media or media licensing. Once the guests are here, we face the need for allowing dual citizenship, or some other form of dual basic belonging, the funding of ethnic group organisations or activities, the funding of bilingual education or mother-tongue instruction and affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups.

Some authors propose measures that go halfway in the direction of cosmopolitan solidarity (thanks go again to Friderik “Fridi” Klampfer for drawing my attention to the title to be mentioned here). *Dissent Magazine*, has, in the Winter of 2017 edition, an article by Atossa Araxia Abrahamian entitled “An Economist’s Case for Open Borders,” telling its readers about an interesting proposal: “Amid today’s xenophobic tide, economist Branko Milanovic has made a controversial case for opening the borders – but without offering migrants full rights as citizens. Would such an arrangement reduce inequality, or only exacerbate the problems that have brought us to this point?” How good are such solutions?

However, we have to go back to the general issues. In this general context, the most discussed issue raises the following question: what about elements of the immigrant culture in conflict with human rights? (Danilo Šuster and Bojan Borstner have raised it immediately, in the discussion of the presentation, and I thank them). As Simon Caney puts it: “Protecting cultures should be rejected when, and because, those cultures do not further people’s well-being (the well-being constraint).” (Caney, 2009, p. 23)

To summarise, we need a crucial widening of multicultural arrangement, a global cultural network that would enable and support it. Cosmopolitans urgently have to develop an answer of how multiculturalism would work within a truly cosmopolitan, global network. They should analyse the relevant plurality of levels, combined with the relative unimportance of the state level, plus the plurality of reaches-impacts from one culture to another on the global scale.

### 3 The road to the goal

#### 3.1 The general directions

We shall not discuss here in any detail the issue of feasibility, much discussed by Klampfer in the discussion of this paper. We shall just very briefly indicate that with the recent processes of migration and pandemics, some general directions have been sketched in the official international document. It seems to us that the road to distal opening is there, and it brings proximation in its wake.

The need to accept and treat migrants in a hospitable, and in this sense, cosmopolitan way is already enshrined in international documents, and some of its aspects are even being implemented in practice. Here are two examples, a compact and a court decision.

First, *The Marrakech global compact* that derives the relevant duties from the human rights obligations, and notes that “refugees and migrants are entitled to the same universal human rights and fundamental freedoms,” with refugees enjoying “the specific international protection” (Objective 4, here “O” will stand for “Objective”). It requires “availability and flexibility of pathways for regular migration” (O.5); a requirement that now sounds like a far-away ideal for the future. And acceptance involves bringing together families that have been separated (Marrakech, O.7, e, f), the opposite of what was done to Mexican immigrant families by the Trump administration in December 2018. It requires further search for missing migrants (O.8), and declares war on smugglers (O.9, 10). Finally, it demands certainty and predictability in migration, of crucial importance to both sides in the encounter, the refugees and the border controls (and allows detention only as an exceptional and short-term measure).

The Marrakech Compact seems to suggest this option. It encourages all sides to do the following: “(19) Create conditions for migrants and diasporas to fully contribute to sustainable development in all countries. The following remark in the Compact can illustrate the way it sees the ways for this objective to be realised (the present text keeps the letters marking each paragraph):

e) Develop targeted support programmes and financial products that facilitate migrant and diaspora investments and entrepreneurship, including by providing administrative and legal support in business creation, granting seed capital-matching, establish diaspora bonds and diaspora development funds, investment funds, and organize dedicated trade fairs.

Consider first, the preparation for inclusion; here, offering decent work to refugees is the *conditio sine qua non*. This third set of duties seems to open a dramatic dilemma for more leftist-oriented intellectuals: very often, poor newcomers compete with the poor or low middle-class workers in the host countries. If we want to keep the hardly earned levels of lives the host country workers have, how do we deal with the massive competition of the newcomers? The dilemma is often discussed in the literature; it was also expressed in a wonderful talk by Philippe van Parijs, entitled “Just Migration, Within and Into Europe,” on January 18, 2019.

The Marrakech Compact is very much on the pro-active side of the dilemma, as can be seen from the following quotations:

- (18) Invest in skills development and facilitate mutual recognition of skills, qualifications and competencies.
- And it assumes that all of the following is needed for implementing the human rights of migrants!
- 19) Create conditions for migrants and diasporas to fully contribute to sustainable development in all countries.

In other words, those who wish to stay in countries like Slovenia or Croatia should be allowed to stay (and there should be a quota for each member-state). In the longer term, staying should involve opportunities for work and training. Also, refugee culture should be accommodated as much as possible (in elements that do not threaten elementary human rights). Note that our tradition contains sufficiently

many multicultural features (the presence of Islam, for instance, in countries of former Yugoslavia) that might serve as a bridge.

Finally, our second example that suggests respect for the principles is already there. For instance, recently, the former immigration minister in Denmark Inger Støjberg was sentenced to two months' incarceration after being found by a court to have illegally ordered the separations of married migrant couples in which at least one person was underage. (New York Times, Dec. 13, 2021). She was also voted out of parliament after her conviction and impeachment.

In short, the roads to the cosmopolitan multicultural structure are there; they should be taken and not avoided.

### 3.2 The “existential” dimension: cosmopolitanism as a philosophy for life

Until now we have been following the mainstream line of discussion of cosmopolitanism in present-day theoretical literature, which concentrates upon its political features. Now we turn briefly to its other aspect, central in the work of Kotnik and famously put forward in philosophical tradition, starting with Cynics and Stoics and proceeding in our times all the way to thinkers like Martha Nussbaum – the aspect of cosmopolitanism as a way of life. To quote a present-day proponent of the approach, David T. Hansen, “Cosmopolitanism constitutes an orientation for life” (Hansen, 2013, p. 45). And he talks of “the tradition of philosophy known as the art of living (Hansen, 2010, p. 5).<sup>7</sup> It nicely fits with the question of what it means to be cosmopolitan here and now. My colleague Marin Beroš uses in this context the verbal-conceptual contrast between “Cosmopolites” and “Cosmoanthropos.”<sup>8</sup> He reminds the reader of J.J. Rousseau and the fact that “his educational goal was *not to create good citizens, but good humans*,” and then asks the crucial question: “Should we be more interested in making cosmo-humans and not cosmo-citizens?”, to which he gives a positive answer.

---

<sup>7</sup> See also David T. Hansen (2013).

<sup>8</sup> Marin Beroš (2021) *Cosmopolites or Cosmoanthropos? – Questioning the Educational Needs of Cosmopolitan Society*, ppt. presentation; a paper is in preparation.

To put it briefly, there is a strange disjunction governing the present-day philosophical writing about cosmopolitanism. The main authors like Held, Moellendorf, Pogge, and Cabrera systematically avoid the issue we are talking about here, namely what it is to be cosmopolitan here and now, and what role cosmopolitanism can play in the course of human life. The latter issue is discussed by authors interested in cosmopolitan education, like Nussbaum, Hansen, Pappastephanou, and others. To paraphrase Marianna Pappastephanou, ordinarily, cosmopolitanism is taken to be a way of life and a kind of selfhood (2021).<sup>9</sup> The two groups seem not to communicate much with each other, and the resulting writings document a dramatic disjunction between the view of cosmopolitanism as a general moral-political doctrine and cosmopolitanism as a way of life. We want to avoid this disjunction, so we have chosen to conclude the book by turning to the latter and connecting it with our moral-political view of the shape of cosmopolitanism that fits our time. So, how should we address the duality?

Bear in mind the way we characterised cosmopolitanism, both morally and politically, stressing the relevance of connections that go beyond state borders. Now, what can transform the attitude of an individual into a cosmopolitan attitude? The simplest and most direct way is that the individual explicitly accepts the basic tenets as formulated in the literature. But what about non-explicit, non-reflected attitudes that go in the same direction?

On the non-reflective level, the cosmopolitan attitudes would be the ones of sympathy for the non-co-national and for the stranger, readiness to help, and the like. Proposals along these lines can be found in recent literature on cosmopolitan education (see for instance, Amy Stornaiuolo, T. Philip Nichols, 2019, 11ff.). Such attitudes would go well with “official” cosmopolitan political doctrines, in the same way in which primitive, spontaneous nationalism goes well with doctrinal nationalism.

---

<sup>9</sup> And here are a few further references by the same author: M. Pappastephanou (ed.). (2016), M. Pappastephanou (2005; 2011).

Attempts to answer the question of here-and-now cosmopolitanism should take this continuity seriously. This will help us to see cosmopolitanism's relevance for human actions and everyday life that authors like Nussbaum stress as central.<sup>10</sup> Our approach to the present-day political scene suggests an understanding of cosmopolitanism articulated along the contrast we stressed in our approach, in particular in chapter Six. We talked on the one hand about immediate help, and on the other about the need to ameliorate the more distant situation, acting on distant causes of present-day troubles. All these elements point to cosmopolitanism as a way of life. Let us then follow the same structure here.

We first look at cosmopolitan attitudes towards more distal matters. Let me distinguish more passive, "reactive" attitudes, from the pro-active engagement, and briefly address both kinds.

Start with general, traditionally philosophical matters. The authors writing about "the education of the *kosmon polites*" – to use the phrase due to one of the best among them, namely Martha Nussbaum (1997, p. 62) – count as cosmopolitan the attitudes of respect for others as humans and for other ways of living, interest in multiculturalism, diversity, and cultural pluralism that goes together with pursuit and maintenance of peaceful interaction and acknowledgement of the universality of certain basic human needs.<sup>11</sup>

Nussbaum herself goes further and links this interest with the Socratic picture of reflective, examined life:

"The education of the *kosmon polites* is thus closely connected to Socratic inquiry and the goal of an examined life. For attaining membership in the world community entails a willingness to doubt the goodness of one's own way and to enter into the give-and-take of critical argument about ethical and political choices. By an increasingly refined exchange of both experience and argument, participants in such arguments should gradually take on the ability to distinguish, within their own traditions, what is parochial from what may be commended as a norm for others,

---

<sup>10</sup> For instance, Matthew J. Hayden writes: The primary characteristics of cosmopolitanism are, on the one hand, largely behavioural pathways indicating how to live with other people and, on the other hand, actions by and through which to live with other people. (Hayden, 2012, p. 49).

<sup>11</sup> Kleingeld, Pauline. (1999), Kleingeld, Pauline, and Eric Brown. "Cosmopolitanism." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Matthew J. Hayden (2012).

what is arbitrary and unjustified from that which may be justified by reasoned argument” (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 62).

So much about the general picture. Where does it fit our story of contemporary political situations, namely our view of the demands of the new playground, with its explosion of populism, the crisis of migration and pandemics, and the like? Well, one should look at the public sphere and consider both the attitudes of “private” individuals towards the relevant demands figuring in the public sphere and the attitudes of individuals engaged in the sphere.

We have situated the cosmopolitan orientation in relation to the new playground by dividing the demands of the new situation: on the one hand, the proximal, Samaritan imperative of helping the needy foreigners at our doors, and on the other, the importance of interest in distant situations, geared to prevent the causes of the proximal crisis. The pressing issue of prevention of the causes of unwanted migration, most spectacularly of violence in countries of origin, clearly shows the need for such distally oriented cosmopolitan activity; we noted that violence can be prevented only by international control that can be implemented by a more tightly organised international community.

Distinguish again more passive, “reactive” attitudes from the pro-active engagement. A symptom of cosmopolitan orientation common to both might be the following: the care invested by the individual to a given problem is at least somewhat proportional to the weight of the problem itself, and not only to its vicinity to the individual. I might be worried about the effects of climate change on my native country, Croatia, and on the maritime region where I live. The cosmopolitan attitude would involve my caring as well for its effects on Greenland, at least in some proportion to the actual force of the effect, the proportion not being annulled by the distance from Croatia to Greenland.

Now to the political sphere. One can manifest one’s cosmopolitanism simply by voting for a more cosmopolitan candidate on the home scene, preferring media which show more interest and kindness in global matters, etc.

Of course, it is easier to recognise proactive interest in distant global matters in the cases of actual public behaviour and engagement, say public support of global solutions to the new playground problems (and of course, globally oriented

measures, of UN and similar agents), as well as in wider personal activism. Let me start with activism. A very clear case is the one of Greta Thunberg:

“You have stolen my dreams and my childhood with your empty words. And yet I’m one of the lucky ones. People are suffering. People are dying. Entire ecosystems are collapsing. We are in the beginning of a mass extinction, and all you can talk about is money and fairy tales of eternal economic growth. How dare you!”

Next, let me point to activities in media and public communication and allow me to mention two examples from my region, worthy of being popularised among the intellectual public. First, the Slovenian journalist Boštjan Videmšek, now 45 years old, who has spent years in the most dangerous areas in the Middle East, systematically informing Slovenian newspaper readers of the sufferings of ordinary people in this region.<sup>12</sup>

I would say he is the most cosmopolitan journalist from our wider region. On the side of filmmakers, let me mention Nadina Maličbegović, a Bosnian documentary maker combining local and global matters. In her wonderful movie “Go Game,” created for Al Jazeera in 2019, for example, she tells the story of a large Afghan family staying in an awful refugee camp in Bosnia and trying to smuggle themselves into Croatia and continue towards Germany.

The next type of cosmopolitan activity to be mentioned concerns political activism, which is essential for present-day public life. We have noted, for instance, that many cosmopolitan projects led by the UN crucially depend on cooperation of NGOs; and indeed a lot of work done by the latter is done by individual activists. The typical scenario is the one characterising the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize for 2020. One candidate, the winning one, indeed, was the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP), but among the candidates there was also Greta Thunberg. (Note that in 2014 the Prize was awarded to Malala, another impressive activist, fighting for global rights of women to get education.)

---

<sup>12</sup> You can learn about his achievements by looking at a volume of his reportages translated into English, *21st Century Conflicts: Remnants of War(s) – Field Report from Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, DR Congo, Somalia and Sudan*, Bookbaby, New York, 2012.

Each of the global problems we mentioned earlier in the book has been prompting relevant activism. We just mentioned climate change (and we could have also pointed to Attenborough's recent movie as an example of global ecological activism), but the wider issues of distribution, of various other goods, from material goods to health, public goods and work and work opportunities, together with closely connected issues of severe poverty (in the present and future generations), of exploitation and the like, have inspired a BUJICU of activism; each of the tokens of such activism deserves to be seen as being cosmopolitan.

Similarly, the issues of conflict and violence, including prominently war and terrorism have inspired cosmopolitan pacifist reactions; for the recent reaction see the Papal encyclical, *Fratelli tutti*, released at the beginning of October 2020. Again, close to the UN initiatives, non-governmental human rights activism has been flourishing these years, in conjunction with the fight against global discrimination (including gender-focused kind), racism, and mistreatment of cultural and religious minorities.

Let me illustrate. Take the paradigm work of sophisticated cosmopolitan doctrine, *The Oxford Handbook of Global Justice*, edited by Thom Brooks in 2020. Here are some titles. Carol C. Gould writes about "Motivating Solidarity with Distant Others: Empathic Politics, Responsibility, and the Problem of Global Justice." It is easy to think of ordinary public activities motivating solidarity with distant others; we propose to label them as cosmopolitan as their sophisticated counterpart, who wrote the chapter, is.

Nicole Hassoun has a chapter titled "Aiding the Poor in Present and Future Generations: Some Reflections on a Simple Model." Aiding the poor strangers in one's generation should be seen as cosmopolitan as writing positively about it, as intellectuals like Hassoun do.

Alison M. Jaggar defends "Global Gender Justice." If this is a theoretical idea, any practical act in the same direction, done with some global motivation, and every practical disposition thus to act should count as cosmopolitan.

Even close to our topic, Kok-Chor Tan writes about “Personal Responsibility and Global Injustice.” Well, personal responsibility as such really does exist, and targets each person of the specified kind. I will leave other chapter titles from the book for another occasion.

We have to take a step further. What about concrete activities, implementing the central cosmopolitan ideals? We have talked about the duties required on the new playground marked by migration, pandemic, and populist hysteria. In chapter Six, we listed duties of immediate help, acceptance, and integration – calling them “Samaritan,” in order to contrast them with duties tied to more distant situations.

Acts of immediate help can be, and often are, cosmopolitan in spirit. They are not literally cosmopolitan in the sense of being related to transnational institutions, but they are cosmopolitan in being motivated in the right way. Helping an Afghan refugee implies treating a non-compatriot from a distant country as “one of us,” to a certain extent. I hope that we have, in chapter six, sufficiently illustrated this cosmopolitan aspect of “trans-national” help directed to the present and spatially close strangers.

But we need to make a distinction. Let us start with an example. Suppose Helen is aiding a poor stranger from her generation, thinking, say:

“Poor woman, she is not one of us, she doesn’t even speak my language. But I still want to help her, and, even worse, I would do the same if ten such poor, homeless foreigners come and ask.”

Helen’s motivation might be purely sympathetic-humanitarian, without any important connection to the fact that the woman is a foreigner. This is the minimal relevant motivation, not-yet-cosmopolitan, but close to the cosmopolitan one.<sup>13</sup> The next, moderately cosmopolitan motivation would be to act out of sympathy specifically for a stranger: “She is not one of us, so I want to help her since foreigners need and deserve help.”

---

<sup>13</sup> Thanks go to Viktor Ivanković and Tamara Crnko on insisting on this distinction in a discussion.

Finally, the strongly cosmopolitan motivation might be to act out of the feeling of duty, specifically to help foreigners. Kant's remarks about the foreigner having a right to hospitality might be pointing to such a duty. And this is a suitable first step towards manifesting "the ability to see oneself as human beings bound to all other human beings." (Nussbaum, 1997, p. 10)

Here, however, we prefer to point to duties to the foreigners, as crucial for the cosmopolitan way of life. Let me remind the reader of a few kinds of relevant "Samaritan" duties. Start with providing food, drinks, warmth, and the like. Distinguish the minimal, non-interfering, but also not personally helping attitude, from participation in actual helping, all the way to organising help, financially supporting it and the like. Ironically, these attitudes and activities are often not seen as "cosmopolitan," with cosmopolitanism being more associated with high, somewhat snobbish cultural concerns. But the irony turns against the ironist – helping strangers in need is often the most cosmopolitan activity one can engage in.

Very urgent related and analogous duties concern health care. Physical needs are numerous and clearly demanding. Additional needs come from psychological trauma, for instance post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), common to men and women who are coming from war-ridden countries. The recent challenge of pandemics has made some of the issues even more dramatic. The politicians are warning the relevant organisations that "Asylum procedures have to be open and in place even during the pandemic situation, as in COVID and it can't be justified to not process the requests for protection."<sup>14</sup> Medical help for individuals in such circumstances is even more urgent.

Considered now immigrants and refugees, and the cosmopolitan duties we have towards them, mentioned or alluded to in Marrakech Compact. First, the duty of accepting them. Next, we noted that once migrants have entered a safe country to stay, similar, but more complex demands enter the scene. It is not just letting migrants in but accepting them within one's society. Again, helping them in this direction is a truly cosmopolitan activity.

---

<sup>14</sup> Interview of Drahoslav Štefánek, Special Representative of the Secretary General of The Council of Europe on Migration and Refugees, available at <https://www.coe.int/en/web/portal/covid-19-migrants-refugees-and-asylum>

But is this characterisation correct? Let me develop my terminological remark from above. Imagine that Jane, a local head of a restaurant is happy to give a job to the foreigner in need, since she thinks that immigrants should be helped and given a chance for a decent life. In ordinary parlance, one would not describe Jane as being “cosmopolitan.” The ordinary parlance prefers the meaning of “cosmopolitan” tied to higher, more culture-oriented attitudes. But this is not the meaning relevant to our context. Given the way we characterised cosmopolitanism, Jane’s action certainly is cosmopolitan.

Here is the next step. The Marrakech Compact mentions the task of offering decent work to refugees. Note that this set of duties seems to open a dramatic dilemma for cosmopolitans, since very often, poor newcomers compete with the poor or low middle-class workers in the host countries. We hope that the dilemma is not unsolvable, that indeed for the last few decades the immigrants have been really responding to a demand for labour generated by host countries’ companies and families. Of course, variations are significant: my home country, Croatia, needed chefs and waiters for a longer time, but with the COVID epidemic the main need is for medical nurses; chefs and waiters are jobless or almost jobless in times of lockdown.

A wider need is the need for integration, ideally with retaining portions of the original culture important for one’s identity and self-concept. The person who is ready to offer help in integration, at the micro-level of everyday interaction, would be acting in a cosmopolitan manner. Again, we should keep in mind our understanding of being cosmopolitan. According to it, there are cosmopolitan attitudes on the non-reflective level that would go well with “official” cosmopolitan political doctrines and should be counted as cosmopolitan, analogously to non-reflective pro-nationalist attitudes that are classified as manifesting nationalism even in the absence of any doctrinal manifestation.

In short, we hope that our view of cosmopolitan tasks in the present-day situation goes further than the traditional one, offers a helpful account of the present-day most urgent tasks of cosmopolitanism as a way of life, and thus connects the two faces of cosmopolitanism, the political and the existential one. Kotnik wrote nicely about the latter in his “Thought Experiments in teaching: TE as a suppositional real story,” so I gladly dedicate the present paper to him!

## 4 Conclusion

In teaching philosophy to future philosophy teachers, Kotnik has been discussing urgent political issues, and, among others, expressing attitudes in favour of migrants and refugees; in this respect, he was promoting cosmopolitan education of future educators.

Here, we address the two faces of cosmopolitan attitudes, quite forgotten in the literature on cosmopolitanism in general, but present in the work on cosmopolitan education. The first face is the one of theory, moral and political, the second is the “existential” face, the promotion of cosmopolitanism as an existential attitude. The paper starts with a sketch of a multiculturalist perspective on cosmopolitanism, motivated by normative requirements of solidarity in the face of diversity. It points to the need for a truly cosmopolitan institutional structure. Multiculturalism can be, and probably should be, extended to a global, cosmopolitan scale, since, to paraphrase Kymlicka, a function of cosmopolitan norms is precisely to promote multi-cultural interests; there is no deep conflict between the two components, so this conception is conceptually coherent, politically feasible, and morally progressive. And this is a burning task for political philosophy raising interesting methodological demands on cosmopolitan philosophizing.

The paper next discusses the ties between the general and more existential demands, questioning the isolationism of the mainstream theoretical cosmopolitan literature, which totally abstracts from the other, existential face. In the course of discussion, it also refers to the issues of Slovenian reactions to the refugee problem, thus continuing Kotnik’s engagement with topics close to him and to his and our students.

## References

- Archibugi, D. (2005). “The Language of Democracy: Vernacular or Esperanto? A Comparison between the Multiculturalist and Cosmopolitan Perspectives,” *Political studies*, 53(3), 537–555.
- Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt, H. (1968). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.
- Banting, K. and Kymlicka, W. (2003). “Do multiculturalism policies erode the welfare state?” In P. Van Parijs (ed.), *Cultural Diversity Versus Economic Solidarity: Is There a Tension?* (227–284). De Boeck, Francqui library.
- Beroš, M. (2016). “Cosmopolitan Identity – historical origins and contemporary relevance.” *Tabula: časopis Filozofskog fakulteta, Sveučilište Jurja Dobrića u Puli*, 14, 197–211.

- Brunkhorst, H. (2005). *Solidarity from Civic Friendship to a Global Legal Community*. The MIT Press (Engl. 2005, German 2002).
- Caney, S. (2009). "Cosmopolitanism, Culture and Well-Being: A Cosmopolitan Perspective on Multiculturalism." In N. Holtug, K. Lippert-Rasmussen and S. Lagaard (eds.), *Nationalism and Multiculturalism in a World of Immigration* (21–52). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Derrida, J. (2005). *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. Routledge.
- Glazer, N. (1997). *We Are All Multiculturalists Now*. Harvard University Press.
- Hansen, D. (2010). "Cosmopolitanism and Education: A View." *Teachers College Record*, 112(1), 1–30.
- Hansen, D. (2013). "Cosmopolitanism as a philosophy for life in our time." *Encounters in Theory and History of Education*, 14, 35–47.
- Kotnik, R. (2017). "Thought Experiments in Teaching: TE as a Suppositional Real Story." In B. Borstner and S. Gartner (eds.), *Thought Experiments between Nature and Society: A Festschrift for Nenad Mišćević* (390–405). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Kleingeld, P. and Brown, E. (2019). "Cosmopolitanism." In E. N. Zalta (ed.), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/>
- Chandran, K. (2004). "Nationalism and multiculturalism." In G. F. Gaus and C. Kukathas (eds.), *Handbook of political theory* (250–264), Sage.
- Kymlicka, W. (2001). *Politics in the Vernacular: Nationalism, Multiculturalism, and Citizenship*. Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, W. (2006). "Liberal Nationhood and Cosmopolitan Justice." In Benhabib, S., Post, R. (eds.), *Another Cosmopolitanism*. Oxford University Press, pp. 128–144.
- Kymlicka, W. and Walker, K. (eds.) (2012). *Rooted Cosmopolitanism: Canada and the World*. UBC Press.
- Mišćević, N. (2001). *Nationalism and Beyond, Introducing Moral Debate about Values*. CEU Press.
- Papastephanou, M. (2021). Cosmopolitanism and the Philosophy of Education. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Retrieved: <https://oxfordre.com/education/display/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-1270?sessionid=D50C0310296CCA7D60421669BBE272BB>
- Papastephanou, M., (ed.) (2016). *Cosmopolitanism: Educational, Philosophical and Historical Perspectives*. Springer.
- Papastephanou, M. (2017). Cosmopolitan dice recast, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 49(14), 1338–1350.
- Papastephanou, M. (2011). "The 'Cosmopolitan' Self Does her Homework." *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 45(4), 597–612.
- Papastephanou, M. (2005). "Globalisation, Globalism and Cosmopolitanism as an Educational Ideal." *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37(4), 533–551.
- Risse, M. (2012a). *Global political philosophy*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Risse, M. (2012b). *Global justice*. Princeton University Press.
- Stornaiuolo, A. and Nichols, T. P. (2019). "Cosmopolitanism and Education." In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.252
- Turnberg, G. (2019). »Transcript: Greta Thurnberg,s Speech At The U.N. Climate Action Summit. Retreived: <https://www.npr.org/2019/09/23/763452863/transcript-greta-thunbergs-speech-at-the-u-n-climate-action-summit>
- Waldron, J. (1992). "Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternative." *Journal of Law Reform*, 25(3). 751–793.

