Valida Repovac Nikšić[1]

University of Sarajevo
Faculty of Political Science

Amila Ždralović[2]

University of Sarajevo
Faculty of Law

Cosmopolitan perspective in the work of Zygmunt Bauman

Abstract

The theoretical legacy of Zygmunt Bauman is an inexhaustible source of inspiration for sociological analysis, particularly bearing in mind the scope of his work and the diverse range of modern day problems that this British-Polish author dealt with. The first part of this article examines the question of personal identity in liquid modernity, which is the starting point of Bauman's work. Similar to some other authors, Bauman discusses the paradox of the individual who is not free in an individualized society. Bauman's diagnosis carries pessimistic features which in some places correspond to insights developed in classical sociology. Bauman makes occasional and sporadic incursions into the pitfalls of conservative thought, particularly in relation to the dichotomies of individual versus community, individualism versus togetherness, and egoism versus solidarity. However, it seems that the author manages to skilfully avoid the inherent theoretical traps of sociology, turning towards cosmopolitan theory. The second part of this article presents the thesis that Bauman's thought is in fact cosmopolitan, especially bearing in mind his final public appearances and writings. This argument is based in his description of global society that is simultaneously integrating and developing, and dramatically disintegrating and regressing. Bauman writes about violent killings and expulsions of people in the 21st century and their inability to find refuge in the Western and democratic world that promotes human

---

[1] Doctor of Sociological Sciences, assistant professor, valida.repovac.niksic@fpn.unsa.ba
[2] Doctor of Sociological Sciences, assistant professor, a.zdralovic@pfsa.unsa.ba

rights. Recalling the crucial cosmopolitan principles of solidarity and hospitality, Bauman makes an appeal to progressive forces to consolidate and work on opening and reaffirming the "cosmopolitan condition" of contemporary society.

Keywords: *contemporary sociology, identity, new cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitan condition, dialogue*

Introduction

The times that followed the fall of Communism and the end of the Cold War, although promising to be different due to various positive effects of globalisation, actually added further complexity to reality and relationships. This is most apparent in the domains of economy[3], culture, politics and neoliberal ideology. Social sciences and politics are dominated by liberal rhetoric of universalism, tolerance, human rights. But the practice is completely different. We witness atomisation, alienation, inequality and poverty that generate ethnic nationalisms (post-colonial, post-socialist), interconfessional conflicts, intolerance, wars, new "imperial wars"[4], "21st century walls" that countries erect around themselves[5], revolutions[6], terrorism, racism, neo-fascism. Today's intellectuals therefore have a major responsibility to contemplate this modern society, this integrated/disintegrated phenomenon that survives on its inherent ambivalence and paradoxes.

This "world vulnerability"[7] calls for finding a path (a way out) to a safe and peaceful world. In understanding the world as it is in all its complexity, the current social and political thought, predominantly critical and left-oriented,

---

[3] German sociologist Ulrich Beck calls the primary, dominant economic form of global integration "globalism" and differentiates it from the more comprehensive globalisation.

[4] Robert Fine, British sociologist and author of the 2007 book *Cosmopolitanism*, presents similar features of the modern world in the introductory chapters of the book. Robert Fine, Professor Emeritus at the Warwick University and one of the leading European scientists, places the concept of cosmopolitanism at the centre of social research. Robert Fine greatly relies on the works of Hana Arendt, analysing, inter alia, the phenomenon of modern antisemitism.

[5] 21st century walls, new fortifications and "waning sovereignties" are topics studied by the author Wendy Brown in her 2010 book *Walled States, Waning Sovereignty*. Wendy Brown was born in 1955. She is a professor at the Department of Political Sciences at the University of California, Berkeley. Brown's work focuses on the field of critical theory and draws on the ideas of the Frankfurt School, Karl Marx and Michel Foucault.

[6] Early 21st century revolutions and Arab Spring, also the bloodshed in Syria and Yemen.

[7] See: CheikhMbackeGueye, Late Stoic Cosmopolitanism – Foundations and Relevance, Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag WINTER. 2006.

rightly asks whether now, at the start of the 21st century, we are even further removed from the Kantian ideal of eternal peace or on the path towards overcoming antagonisms and evil.

On the other hand, modern society is characterised by development of new technologies and communications and generally greater mobility, all of which positively impact our lives. Still, greater mobility and easier networking regardless of physical distance is accompanied by dissolution of closed and fixed identities and by interpersonal relationships that are superficial, sporadic and short-lived. The first part of this paper analyses contemporary world problems with special focus on Bauman's analysis of the issue of identity in liquid modernity. This analysis allows for identification of cosmopolitan theory as a possible answer to contemporary world problems as well as theoretical aporiae arising from the liberalism versus communitarianism debate. The second part of the paper presents the main concepts of Bauman's cosmopolitan theory and points to its correspondences and correlations with similar theoretical discourses.

1. Search for identity in the postmodern condition

The political theory of liberalism, inseparable from the idea of autonomy of the individual, sets the theoretical foundation for conception of the modern democratic political structure of the state and the new political culture which favours the value of freedom. In 18th century France, the formula of liberalism - *laissez faire, laissez passer* was the motto of revolutionary opposition to state interventionism and creation of political and economic conditions for free market competition. With this, the theoretical concept that was initially guided by noble ideals and a desire to create a better world where each individual can become autonomous, has ultimately created a competition arena where the individual can easily loose dignity and has relieved the state of the responsibility to create conditions that lead to social justice. Such social and political results, reminiscent on many counts of Hobbes' initial state, are described by MacPherson as specific proprietary individualism[8] that creates a stable social structure which implies both social stratification and differentiation networks and individual socialisation processes directed towards continuous further acquisition.

[8] Further details in: Crawford Brough Macpherson, Politička teorija posjedničkog liberalizma [The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism], Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Socijalističke omladine Hrvatske, 1981.

Theoreticians who continue to insist on the *laissez faire* principle interpret and reject objections to this model as unfounded, however they do point to a partly justified concern for the autonomy of the individual. For example, Mises starts from the premise that the debate was unduly reduced to the dilemma between conscious planning and a mechanicalforcesdriven free market. The author claims that the focus of the problem should not be on planning as such, but rather on the question of who is doing the planning; i.e. Mises believes that "The issue is not automatism versus conscious action; it is autonomous action of each individual versus the exclusive action of the government. It is freedom versus government omnipotence."[9]*Laissez faire*, according to this author, does not mean letting soulless mechanical forces operate but rather letting each individual choose how he/she wants to cooperate in the social division of labour and what the entrepreneurs should produce.[10]

Such and similar critiques of state interventionism and planning reflect a spirit of freedom which ultimately reduces freedom to economic freedom and individual autonomy to egoistic individualism. This creates a particular form of neolibertarian theory thatdetermines specific economic and legal mechanisms that affect individuals' daily lives, their social position, as well as their level of aspiration. The issue with neolibertarian views on relationships within the political community is the fact that they start from the postulate that individuals exist as abstract selves in and of themselves, and that their thus disembodied nature is immune to the effects of different social and historical circumstances.

As Durkheim noted, the society can never be just a mechanical sum of individual consciousnesses wholly separate and independent of each other, but rather remains a natural fact and a whole whose essence lies in its collective thinking.[11] From such classic sociological theoretical frameworks arises the conclusion that individual consciousness is always guided by external action of a specific collective consciousness. Or, as Durkheim puts it, human wants are "always linked to external movements"[12]. It follows that the pure form of personal identity assumed in the liberal concept of abstract self does not exist as such and that personal identity is always socialised. Still, it should be

---

[9] Ludwig von Mises, Human Action: A Treatise on Economics, Auburn, Alabama: Ludwig Von Mises Institute, 1968, p. 726.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Emile Durkheim, "Zajednica i društvo po Tenisu" ["An Analysis of Ferdinand Tönnies"], in: *Emil Dirkem 1858 – 2008*, Dušan Marinković, (ed.), Novi Sad: Vojvođanska sociološka asocijacija / Mediteran Publishing, 2008, p. 73.-79.

[12] Emile Durkheim, O podeli društvenog rada [The Division of Labour in Society], Beograd: Prosveta, 1972, p. 77.

noted that these conclusions do not include the claim that individuals cannot have individual concepts of good orpersonal value systems that may even be opposed to the collective good and values. But from Durkheim's works we can draw a thesis that the theoretically envisagedform of personal identity is possible only under hypothetical circumstances in whichcollective thinking does not exist. The real world always presupposes different forms of socialisation which serve as frameworks for development of personal identities that are fluid and always under construction. This continuous transformation of identity as the base problem of sociological thought gains a particularly theoretically innovative and inspirational note in the Bauman's concept of "liquid modernity". As the author suggests in *Conversations with Benedetto Vecchi*, answers to modern identity problems should not be sought with the founders of modern sociology becausethe circumstances of the postmodern society are largely different to those of the modern society.[13]

Namely, Bauman very skilfully discerns finetheoretical nuances between these two types of society through concepts of solid and liquid modernity. The author needs this differentiation to describe the postmodern society in which "conditions in which its constituents act change too fast to allow actions to consolidate into habits and routines"[14]. In the new environment of liquid modernity, identity is no longer consistent but is continually constructed and assembled in a synaesthesia of experiences, choices, decisions, and even chance. Bauman describes postmodern society as "an individualized, privatized version of modernity, with the burden of pattern-weaving and the responsibility for failure falling primarily on the individual's shoulders"[15]. On the other hand, the earlier modernistic notion of identity that Bauman metaphorically interprets as a pilgrimage, was focused on the question of "how to construct an identity and keep it solid and stable", while in the postmodernity the focus shifts to "how to avoid fixation and keep the options open"[16].

"The catchword of modernity was creation; the catchword of postmodernity is recycling"[17], concludes Bauman. The world of postmodernity is not hospitable to the pilgrim, who represents a metaphor for the modernity task of identity creation. The world of pilgrims "must be orderly, determined, predictable, ensured; but above all, it must be a kind of world in which footprints

---

[13] Zygmunt Bauman, Identity: Conversations with Benedetto Vecchi, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004, p. 24-25.

[14] Zygmunt Bauman, Fluidniživot[Fluid Life], Novi Sad: Mediterran publishing, 2009, p. 9.

[15] Zygmunt Bauman, Liquid Modernity, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006, p. 7-8.

[16] Zygmunt Bauman, From Pilgrim to Tourist - or a Short History of Identity, in: Hall, Stuart&Gay, Paul Du (eds.) *Questions of Identity*, London: Sage Publications, 2003, p. 18.

[17] Ibid, p. 18.

are engraved for good, so that the trace and the record of past travels are kept and preserved"[18]. The pilgrim has a clear path and a clearly constructed goal towards which he moves, while the postmodern world tends to reject fixation and keep different options open. Again using metaphor, Bauman defines four life strategies of postmodernity as the stroller, the vagabond, the tourist and the player.

"All four intertwining and interpenetrating postmodern life strategies have in common that they tend to render human relations fragmentary [...] and discontinuous; they are all up in arms against 'strings attached' and long-lasting consequences, and militate against the construction of lasting networks of mutual duties and obligations. They all favour and promote a distance between the individual and the Other and cast the Other primarily as the object of aesthetic, not moral, evaluation; as a matter of taste, not responsibility. In the effect, they cast individual autonomy in opposition to moral (as well as all the other) responsibilities and remove huge areas of human interaction, even the most intimate among them, from moral judgement (a process remarkably similar in its consequences to bureaucratically promoted adiaphorization)".[19]

The assumption of authenticity is the postmodern de(con)struction of pre-set, pre-tailored identities as imperatives of what we are or should be. What we are collapses as a consistent whole and grows into continuous identity-building and effort that never leads to a stable form. Even temporary achievement does not offer any guarantee of permanence and stability.

If any consistency survives in this fluidity, it is the individuals' need for freedom and security. The "road to identity" is described by Bauman as "a running battle and an interminable struggle between the desire for freedom and the need for security".[20] The search thus becomes aporic. Various differentiation mechanisms externally narrow down the options for the individual. Margins of society are filled with those who are not in a position to choose their identities but are forced to accept predetermined identities. Marginalized positions, which should not be reduced solely to poor economic standing but should rather be interpreted in a wider context of various exclusion basis, further determine the loss of both safety and freedom.

"At one pole of the emergent global hierarchy are those who can compose and decompose their identities more or less at will, drawing from the uncommonly large, planet-wide pool of offers. At the other pole are crowded those whose access to identity choice has been barred, people who are given no say

---

[18] Ibid, p. 23.

[19] Ibid, p. 33.

[20] Zygmunt Bauman, „Fluidni život" [Fluid Life], Mediterran publishing, Novi Sad, 2009, p. 42.

in deciding their preferences and who in the end are burdened with identities enforced and imposed *by others*; identities which they themselves resent but are not allowed to shed and cannot manage to get rid of. Stereotyping, humiliating, dehumanizing, stigmatizing identities...".[21]

So, on the one pole are those that have still not entered liquid modernity, those unable to construct their identity and simply imposed an identity by others, while on the other pole are those able to freely choose and design their identity. Different types of exclusion are recognised by Bauman as the basis for easy-to-spot cases of social polarisation, deepening inequality and unjust distribution of power[22]. Still, Bauman notes that the majority is confined somewhere between these two poles and their freedom to choose and design, due to a lack of consistency, security and ability to plan for the long term, is always to some extent mixed with fear. From this it can be concluded that the freedom to be authentic, which is always temporary and uncertain, implies entering a zone of insecurity.

"The search for identity is the ongoing struggle to arrest or slow down the flow, to solidify the fluid, to give form to the formless. We struggle to deny or at least to cover up the awesome fluidity just below the thin wrapping of the form; we try to avert our eyes from sights which they cannot pierce or take in. Yet far from slowing the flow, let alone stopping it, identities are more like the spots of crust hardening time and again on the top of volcanic lava which melt and dissolve again before they have time to cool and set. So there is need for another trial, and another - and they can be attempted only by clinging desperately to things solid and tangible and thus promising duration, whether or not they fit or belong together and whether or not they give ground for expecting that they will stay together once put together"[23].

In the postmodern world there is a set of specific circumstances arising from external forces and coincidences that may put certain individuals in less favourable positions or place them in situations out of their control, resulting in unequal initial chances and opportunities. Uncertainty of any position causes insecurity.

"The present-day uncertainty is a powerful individualizing force. It divides instead of uniting, and since there is no telling who will wake up the next day in what division, the idea of 'common interests' grows ever more nebulous and loses all pragmatic value."[24]

---

[21] Zygmunt Bauman, Identity: Conversations with Benedetto Vecchi, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004, p. 38.
[22] Ibid, p. 41.
[23] Zygmunt Bauman, „Liquid Modernity", Cambridge Polity Press, 2006., p. 82-83.
[24] Zygmunt Bauman, "Liquid Modernity", Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006, p 148.

In our fluid postmodern life freedom is defined by the consumer culture and all interpersonal relations are fragmented, sporadic and lack continuity. Bauman's diagnoses of our consumer society in some places take a tone that is characteristic of critical theory of society. In his book *Fluid Life*, Bauman describes modern society of consumption-based economy as a society that is based on "a promise of fulfilment of human wants" and the promise remains alluring for as long as there is "doubt that the want is still not truly and completely satisfied".[25]Unsatisfiedwants and anticipation of new wants are recognised in Bauman's analysis as drivers of consumption-based economy.

The concept of consumerism completes the story of identity in the postmodern world. Specifically, the market continuously maintains a desire for something through versatile product placements and an inexhaustible range of choices. Inspired by Bauman's text, in a wider context we can draw a conclusion that the market primarily reproduces wants and demands which should be feasible in a free market society. Herbert Marcuse simplifies and illustrates the consumer as someone who, in addition to the right ones, also has wrong needs; specifically, those needs "imposed on the individuum by special social interests in its suppression: needs that perpetuate hard labour, aggression, misery and injustice"[26]. On the other hand, the *laissez faire* concept, according to authors such as Ludwig von Mises, means allowing the individual to act but also to independently assess which needs are real and which are false, wrong and imposed[27]. Concern over whether an individual is able to choose independently is rightly recognised by Mises in the assumed 'superhuman' who will make the choice for the individual[28].

On the one end, Mises ignores sociological aspects and views the society as a set of individuals, presuming that they are equipped with the necessary capacities to make choices in the totality of what makes their sphere of life. On the other end, Marcuse starts from the domination of society over the individual and builds a critique of consumeristic and conformist aspects of the consumer society culture developed within capitalism as the social system. Works of not only Marcuse but also other authors reveal a socialisation of narcissistic character of that abstract self which is the starting basis of free market advocates.

---

[25] Zygmunt Bauman, Fluidni život[Fluid Life], Novi Sad: Mediterran publishing, 2009, p. 99.
[26] Herbert Marcuse, Čovjek jedne dimenzije [One Dimensional Man], Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša, 1968, p. 24.
[27] Ludwig von Mises, „Human Action: A Treatise on Economics", Auburn-Alabama: Ludwig Von Mises Institute, 1968, p. 727.
[28] Ibid, p. 726-727.

Zygmunt Bauman's theory avoids the extremes of classic theories. Regardless of its similarity to critical theory of society, its outcome is not a universal concept and authoritarian imposition of universal moral principles such as in, for example, Habermas' theory of communicative action. On the other hand, this theoretical discourse successfully avoids and recognises as a characteristic of liquid modernity those tendencies that view market freedom as the end of the story of freedom. Bauman recognises "individualisation, dissolution of ethical context, weakening authorities, their large numbers, and the lack of one spiritual authority that would cancel out other voices" as the "big danger" of liquid postmodernity.[29] However, on the other hand, he sees a big opportunity in postmodernity because it breaks down universal codes of ethics, the implementation and general acceptance of which depend on disciplining the individual.

"But, on the other hand, postmodernity presents a big opportunity. Because our lives were once ruled by a code of ethics that presumed general acceptance. But this was not about morality, it was about conformism. Moral upbringing based on a code of ethics intended to make the man obedient. While in fact morality is a state of chronic insecurity, as my teacher Emanuel Levinas used to say. And I agree. Because morality is not based on being faithful to a code but on being responsible for other people. I am moral to the extent that I am aware of that responsibility. Of the fact that what I do impacts the destiny of another".[30]

Bauman's theoretical insights find a specific way out from socio-political troubles facing the contemporaryworld and the related theoretical discrepancies arising from the still ongoing debate between liberalism and communitarianism. However, in reading his insights we encounter several problems. First, his approach objects to any form of labelling and classification along any lines, schools or teachings. Second, Bauman's approach is not a constructivist one that would present a complete system, and therefore cannot be presented in a diagram or explained from a single perspective. And third, Bauman often writes his sociological theory in a philosophical and poetic manuscript that allows him to embrace various mutually intertwined problems of the modern-day world. Regardless of these difficulties in reading Bauman's theory, in

---

[29] Zygmunt Bauman, "I am not a preacher, I am a diagnostician" [„Boimysięwolności, marzymy o wspólnocie"], Conversation published in:*Magazyn ŚwiątecznyGazetaWyborcza*, 18.1.2013.Text available at:http://wyborcza.pl/magazyn/1,124059,13259382,Boimy_sie_wolnosci__marzymy_o_wspolnocie.html**.** For the purposes of this paper we used the translation by Tanja Miletić-Oručević, available at: http://www.tacno.net/novosti/zygmunt-bauman-nisam-propovjednik-ja-sam-dijagnosticar/
[30] Ibid.

addition to pessimistic diagnoses they offer theoretical alternatives for overcoming postmodern world problems and a hope that some of the security that was sacrificed for freedom in liquid modernity can be restored.

The dichotomy of freedom versus security in Bauman's works is accompanied by the dichotomy of individual versus community. Community was what ensured the individual's security in solid modernity. Security within a community was possible due to emotional connections between individuals and their care for each other. However, the foundation of community life was the culture, which implies common value systems and a strict internal hierarchy. The individual in a community is not responsible for his/her life, but is also not free to search for his/her own concept of a good life. By belonging to a community, as was often essentially predetermined, the individual is given a set of blueprints for the concept and fills it with content, i.e. designs his/her life and 'makes' choices within the given blueprint.

Various critical discourses of contemporary society are becoming increasingly temptingin a time where critique of liberalism is ageneral arena for both theoretical and daily political debate, due to the fact that they are guided by ideas and ideals of community, solidarity and care for others. However, these theories are problematic with regard to the alternatives they offer. They always conceal some form of totalitarianism and *a priori* stifle the hard-won ideals of autonomy and freedom. However, the criticism that is characteristic of and close to Bauman is very precious in relation to the possible transformation of individualism and its de facto actualisation. Bauman offers this transformation in his theoretical discourse on cosmopolitanism.

Bauman set the foundations of his cosmopolitan theory in his earlier discussions on globalisation. Globalisation is imminent, and for Bauman it is not a matter of how to stop it but rather how to control it and how to turn it into an opportunity to create a better world:

"Globalization has now reached the point of no return. We are all dependent on each other, and the only choice we have is between mutually assuring each other's vulnerability and mutually assuring our shared security. Bluntly: to swim together or to sink together. I believe that for the first time in human history everybody's self-interests and ethical principles of mutual respect and care point in the same direction and demand the same strategy. From a curse, globalization may yet turn into a blessing: 'humanity' never had better chance!"[31]

Contemporary criticisms of the liberal concept of individualism draw inspiration from Aristotle's theses on the sociability of man,who can self-actual-

---

[31] Zygmunt Bauman, Identity: Conversations with Benedetto Vecchi, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004, p. 88.

iseonly in a community with others. It is paradoxical that this discourse uses criticism of autonomous individuals acting on egoistical interests to derive a thesis about autonomy of social groups. The theoretical battleground for ideals of solidarity and care for others within a specific social group or political community (but not for those with a sharedcollective identity) sacrificed the autonomy and freedom of the individual. Bauman's concept of cosmopolitanism is a utopian effort to 'preserve' free, autonomous and authentic individuals but also to equip them with the cosmopolitan capacity to care for others.

2. Cosmopolitanism as an opportunity

In late August 2015, Zygmunt Bauman gave an opening address at the international conference of the European Sociological Association (ESA 2015) titled "Differences, Inequalities and Sociological Imagination", held in Prague. His presentation on the topic "Out of control and running wild; or (recent) history of modern inequality" very precisely dissected the problems of today's global society. Reminding of all the aspects of a world integrated by globalisation, Bauman pointed out the problems and the reality of its deep and fundamental division. His presentation carried a tone of honest concern and appealed to a great need for solidarity amongst people. Although Bauman did not directly refer to the concept of cosmopolitanism, the atmosphere of the speech was within the cosmopolitan theoretical framework. In May of next year he held a lecture in Sweden on the topic "Cosmopolitanism and challenges of our time". In this period he wrote a book (one of his last publications) *Strangers at Our Door*, which is analysed in the second part of this paper and, in the authors' opinion, represents concrete evidence that the thought of Zygmunt Bauman can be classified as what contemporary social and political theory calls "new cosmopolitanism". It should be noted that these most recent writings and public lectures were also a synthesis of sorts of the author's opus.

Introduction of the concept of cosmopolitanism was Bauman's intellectual reaction to the wave of refugees and migrants that has swept across the world (and especially the European continent) in the last three years. The migrant crisis provoked a negative 'reaction' from the 'civilised hosts'. Once again people faced problems as old as the world we live in; fear and rejection of those who are different, foreign, unknown. This situation, in addition to presenting politicians with challenges, brought back adilemma known since Ancient Greek philosophy - that of "hospitality to a stranger". Even without

the recent wave of migrants, this issue resurfaced in social and political theory in the early 1990's in response to the need to address modern globalisation phenomena (economic, political and cultural integration of the world, mass migrations, weakening sovereignty of nation states). Many thinkers reached for the Ancient Greek concept of cosmopolitanism, modified it to fit modern circumstances and named it "new cosmopolitanism". Some of them, particularly those most referenced in this paper, are SeylaBenhabib, Kwame Anthony Appiah, Ulrich Beck, Wendy Brown and Paul Gilroy.

Searching for an answer on how to avoid this new emergence of xenophobia, fascism and racism in the host-stranger dialectic, Bauman also offers a cosmopolitan perspective. In *Strangers at Our Door*, Bauman refers to Appiah and Beck. We intentionally introduce these additional authors into the analysis in order to demonstrate the similarity between their views and Bauman's. To precisely analyse and demonstrate the thesis that Bauman synthesised his thought within the cosmopolitan theoretical framework, we must briefly revisit the etymology of the concept and the principles of Greek cosmopolitanism to which Bauman himself refers, and link his deliberations with eminent contemporarythinkers who returned Kantian thought to the modern scientific discourse, the discourse of "new cosmopolitanism".

The Ancient Greek word *kosmopolitês* (cosmopolitan, citizen of the world) derives from Ancient Greek *"kozmos"* (order, universe, world as an ordered whole) and *"politês"* (citizen, [one] of a city or state)and is widely used throughout the entire history of social and political thought. The first Greek philosopher to use the word *kosmopolitês* was Diogenes (Greek for "born of Zeus", philosopher from Synope in Asia Minor, 404-323 BC) also known as Dog, founder of Cynic philosophy who called himself a citizen of the world.[32] Interpretations tell us that Diogenes of Synope thus implied his allegiance and loyalty to a power higher than that of the polis (city state), the harsh criticism of which was his life's mission. The Dictionary of Philosophy offers the following definition:

"Cosmopolitanism (from Ancient Greek), teaching or understanding of man as a citizen of the world; view that all people have value as participants in a single universal world or community rather than a narrowly defined nation. Cosmopolitanism was initially advocated by Cynics, and later by Stoics. Later, through imperialism and universalism of the Roman Empire (and equalization of all peoples as Roman subjects), cosmopolitanism gains momentum,

---

[32] We owe most of our knowledge about the life of Diogenes of Synope to Diogenes Laertius, historian of Greek philosophy and biographer of Greek philosophers who lived (presumably) in the 3rd century BC and authored the *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*,but of whose life we know very little.

supported by the Roman Catholic Church (expansion of Christianity). With the development of humanities and tolerance (17th and 18th century), the enlightenment form of cosmopolitanism develops and continues through the French Revolution (and ideas of *liberté, égalité, fraternité*), and in the 19th century takes the form of internationalism carried on by the proletariat;...[33]

The modern definition describes cosmopolitanism as a "way of being in the globalised world".[34] Most authors define cosmopolitanism as an appropriate and dignified approach to other/different, or more generally as tolerance of ethnic, cultural, national, political and other differences. The description of the term leads to a conclusion that cosmopolitanism is a concept laden with dichotomy[35], a particular form of tension that advocates respect for difference and singularity, as well as for equality (sameness). Furthermore, cosmopolitanism is often presented as a utopian concept[36], the utopia being the belief that it can become a part of social and political practice although, according to this source, today's megapolises (such as London, New York, Paris, Istanbul, etc.) embody many elements and values of cosmopolitan ideals.[37]

The sharpest critic of new cosmopolitanism is Paul Gilroy, who believes that cosmopolitanism, manipulated by nationalistic ideas and instrumentalised for the purposes of colonial conquest and economic exploitation, failed

---

[33] Vladimir Filipović, Filozofijski rječnik *(Dictionary of Philosophy)*, Zagreb: Nakladni Zavod Matice Hrvatske, 1989, p. 181.

[34] Ian Buchanan, Oxford Dictionary of Critical Theory, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010, p.99.

[35] This refers to the dichotomy between *cosmos* and *polis*. In an interesting work from this period, Gustavo Lins Ribeiro deconstructs the Ancient Greek term kozmopolis and points to the contradiction between the meaning of *kozmos* as the universal order and *polis* as the singular order. The tension that exists within thus constructed term can be genealogically traced from Ancient Greece to the modern-day globalised world and the interplay of integratory forces pulling in one direction and disintegratory (nationalist) forces striving to preserve the nation-state. Globalism itself today carries the same dilemma, whether homogenous external forces can coexist with heterogenous and local ones. According to Riberio, the honest cosmopolitan answer would be that the global and the local depend on each other and that recognition of this interdependence is necessary for their harmonic coexistence, blending and development. Also, German sociologist Ulrich Beck in his book *Cosmopolitan Vision* describes cosmopolitanism as an idea that merges two opposing, constantly questioned, world views. These worlds are intertwined and in this way mutually support and stabilise one another. The dichotomy inherent in cosmopolitanism is an "essential and inseparable" part of the concept. For further details please see: UrlichBeck, The Cosmopolitan Vision, UK: Polity Press, 2006, p. 45, and alsoLins Gustavo Riberio, What is Cosmopolitanism? International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences (4): 2842-45. London: Elsevier, 2001.

[36] Ian Buchanan, Oxford Dictionary of Critical Theory, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010, p. 99.

[37] See: Saskia Sassen, Gubitak kontrole? Suverenitet u doba globalizacije [Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalisation], Beograd: Beogradski krug, 2004.

to be what it essentially is, or what it should promote - "coexistence of differences", "planetary wealth", "right to be human". Unfortunately, economic cosmopolitanism, followed by political and cultural cosmopolitanism, instead 'gave birth' to the "racial relationship".[38] Cosmopolitanism was modified and for most inhabitants of Planet Earth, especially the subdued ones, became "opposed cosmopolitanism".[39] Imperial politics of mighty Western countries abused it to "civilise hostile foreigners" and "Others". Therefore, the idea of a "spontaneous culture of coexistence"[40] is the most realistic one. This idea actually involves cohabitation and interaction processes which contribute to multiculturalism 'inconspicuously' becoming the norm of daily social life, particularly in large urban centres around the world. Through "cosmopolitan coexistence", Gilroy tries to 'save' both multiculturalism and cosmopolitism and also to warn of the disease of racism. He thinks that the first step is to reject the category of identity as a central concept in social and political theories, as it has proven to be a dangerous approach in analysing and understanding race, ethnicity, nation, politics.[41] "Cosmopolitan coexistence", mobility, development of technology and communications, generally globalisation as radical "openness", contribute on a daily basis to the absurdity of existence of closed, fixed, embodied identities.

The backbone of Bauman's book *Strangers at Our Door* are the classical principles of Stoic cosmopolitanism brought to new cosmopolitanism through Kant. We will quickly recount the most important of these, also referenced by Bauman. The cosmopolitan principle of *oikeiôsis* consists of two levels: the first level is self-awareness as a universal human quality, and the second level is altruism, awareness of the existence of Others and openness to them. *Oikeiôsis* or adjustment isinextricable, it is the essence of rational beings and carries with it moral implications. This principle is inherent to living beings as a sense of self-awareness and need for adjustment. Stoics use *oikeiôsis* to justify the social dimension and define moral tasks necessary to construct a social community.[42] Furthermore, according to Stoics, reason is the main principle of the universal moral community of people who share everyday political life and the same destiny. Reason is most of all the ability to make moral choices, and is vastly important. Men and women, slaves and free

---

[38] Paul Gilroy, Postcolonial Melancholia, New York: Columbia University Press, 2005, p. 29.
[39] ibid. 58.
[40] In the same way that coexistence at the local level is used as a substitute category for multiculturalism, on the global level Gilroy substitutes globalisation with the concept of "planetary". According to him, unlike globalisation, planetary suggests both contingency and movement.
[41] Paul Gilroy, Postcolonial Melancholia, New York: Columbia University Press, 2005, p. XV.
[42] Cheikh Mbacke Gueye, Late Stoic Cosmopolitanism – Foundations and Relevance, Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag WINTER, 2006, p. 32.

men, rich and poor, all have equal value because they all are rational beings. Reason, Stoics believe, makes us fellow citizens and equals.[43] The principle of "hospitality to a stranger" holds a central place in Ancient Greek cosmopolitan philosophy. Cicero debates about the extent to which politics of a bounded community contribute to harmful separation of mankind by labelling those that do not belong to the same community as foreigners and enemies. In their harsh criticism of war, Stoics indicate the forms of international power (arbiters or institutions) whose role would be to resolve conflicts, impose restraint on communities' aggressive tendencies and to guarantee humane treatment of prisoners of war. Emperor Aurelius writes that instead of conquest and killing it is necessary to enter the minds of others, to attempt to understand their lives and establish dialogue that will lead to familiarisation.[44]

Although mass migrations are nothing new, and although human beings are essentially nomadic, the present migration crisis (as characterised by the West) caused a "morality panic". Bauman analyses this xenophobic reaction of some politicians and citizens of developed Western liberal democracies to the arrival of refugees and economic migrants from parts of the world impacted by various tragedies. The hypocrisy of their 'surprise' lies in the fact that the developed world certainly played a role in creating this wave of migrants from 'ruined countries' searching for some semblance of a dignified existence. Primarily through predatory neoliberal ideology, market globalisation based on injustice, and particularly through ambivalent ideological role in the destabilisation of the Middle East and questionable military invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan. This contemporary context again posed the timeless questions of our reason, morals, our self-awareness and altruism towards other citizens of the planet.[45]

Recent international population movements result primarily from global social and economic transformations. Economic insecurity of the neoliberal reality has led to fragmentation and dissolution of societies and has forced the abandoned individual to seek self-preservation. Beck's "global society of risk" is a "society of performance"[46] in which the individual is completely abandoned, alienated, left to its own devices in a predatory competition and struggle for existence, writes Bauman. In addition to economic disturbances, failed society (societies) also resulted from an erosion of territorial and polit-

---

[43] Garrett Wallace Brown and David Held (eds.), The Cosmopolitanism Reader. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010.

[44] Martha Nussbaum, Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism, Journal of Political Philosophy, 1, 1997, p. 1–25.

[45] Zygmunt Bauman, Strangers at Our Door, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016, p. 14.

[46] ibid, p. 58.

ical sovereignty of nation states, studied, as mentioned earlier, by the political theorist Wendy Brown. Today we have a globalised, highly technologically developed, urbanised and individualised society which suffers the plagues of nationalism, xenophobia, fascism, and new racism.[47] It is obvious that global tendencies based on the neoliberal ideology have created the insecurity of modern-day life and a permanent presence of fear. Uncertain future is further reflected in distrust among people, particularly towards those we do not know. Bauman writes that refugees and migrants are the messengers of the fragility of our lives. Since we are powerless against the powers of globalisation, if nothing else, we can turn this anger and resentment against them. The same fear (of cheap labour, for example) is felt by both the precariat and the wealthiest, and this lack of trust between people is an indicator of the current crisis of mankind.[48]

Politicians were the ones that reaped the biggest benefits from the complexity of the current situation, as they saw their chance in populist rhetoric based on the fear of arrival of 'barbarians'. They gradually introduced into the public discourse terms such as "securitization" instead of "security", which Bauman sees as fully intentional and ambivalent semantics.[49] This "charmed circle" (as Wendy Brown calls it)[50] of fear of migration, securitization of borders, terrorist groups, where, as this author notes, migrants are generally equated to terrorists, produces an ongoing state of emergency. The threat is not just to the state but also its subjects (citizens). In this, politicians are deliberately concealing other, more significant threats, claim both Brown and Bauman. They are concealing the fact that the global market is so deregulated that deregulation of labour market and increased labour flexibility contributes to frail social positions and unstable identity, further generating an intense feeling of existential insecurity (precariat).[51] Populist leaders and their governments profit from the uncertain future of their citizens, while "fight against terrorism" serves to legitimise their power and "return self-respect to the nation".[52] Such policy (politics) of the West (ab)uses the migration issue by insisting on security threats, thus feeding and promoting terrorists (through anti-Islamic sentiment, discrimination, public wrath).

Anxiety experienced by most of the US middle class is actually fear of poverty caused by economic existential uncertainty (jobs relocated to Asia or

---

[47] ibid. p. 63-64.
[48] ibid. p. 16-18.
[49] ibid. 35
[50] Wendy Brown, Walled States, Waning Sovereignty, New York: Zone Books, 2010, p. 107-133.
[51] Zygmunt Bauman, Strangers at Our Door, Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016, p. 14.
[52] ibid. 30.

taken by illegal workers). Donald Trump (white supremacist) used this sentiment in his primordially racist politics of fight against corporate elites (of which he himself is a part) and enemies-migrants-terrorists. He turned fear of the unknown to an official politics of fear of 'savages', one that manipulates its subjects and their ability to make rational distinctions.

Bauman insists that the only way out of this situation is to establish direct communication between hosts and migrants in order to create mutual understanding. The tendency to "securitize" migration issues is completely wrong. The solution is to accept, rather than reject[53] and find guilty in the absence of a crime. Social exclusion is the main source of radicalisation of young Muslims in Europe, says Bauman. The solution is therefore in social investment, social inclusion and integration. The solution lies in Gadamer's fusions of horizons, or Appiah's "cosmopolitan world of dialogue".[54]

In offering his perspective on solutions to these problems, Bauman supports the thesis presented by German sociologist Ulrich Beck that we can live the "cosmopolitan condition" today, we just need to become aware. According to Beck, cosmopolitanism of the "second modernity" became an undeniable part of daily life, something concealed that crept on its own into lives and reality. He calls this sociological phenomenon "banal cosmopolitanism"[55] and uses it to prove that the present is becoming cosmopolitan. Banal cosmopolitanism arises primarily with the expansion of consumer society. Globalisation aspects are also numerous. Global products, informatisation, technologisation and mass media are penetrating and linking social structures at different levels. Banal cosmopolitanism is a feature of the ever-growing "unconscious interdependence". However, although this type of cosmopolitanism exists in all pores of social and political life, sociological imagination remains quite restrictedwithin the boundaries of local, national, known, safe. Beck makes a distinction between philosophy and sociology (which he considers practice), i.e. between cosmopolitanism[56] and "cosmopolitanisation of reality".[57]

According to Beck, "new cosmopolitanism" is not something just for intellectual elites and opinions. Cosmopolitanisation of reality covertly impos-

---

[53] ibid. 43.

[54] Kwame Anthony Appiah, The Ethics of Identity, New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 2007, p. 267-272.

[55] For more details please see: Michael Billig, Banalni nacionalizam [Banal Nationalism], Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek, 2009.

[56] Beck discerns between cosmopolitanism in its Kantian sense and cosmopolitanisation as a responsibility (task) and solidarity to establish order in the world.

[57] On the other hand, Beck's cosmopolitanisation frequently implies "banal cosmopolitanisation".

es itself. Banal cosmopolitanism is invisibly infiltrating the world of nation states and transforming it from the inside out. Beck explains that this is "deformed cosmopolitanism", which is not a product of enlightenment but rather a by-product of postmodern existence. It could also be called "cosmopolitan realism"[58], or awareness of differences between latent and inconspicuous, banal cosmopolitanisation, and the cosmopolitan view.

Bauman's solutions follow Kant and his modern interpreters. It is therefore necessary to return to the path to eternal peace, in which Kant introduces the new concept of cosmopolitan law by making it a third sphere of public law, supplementing constitutional/state and international law in order to secure and guarantee the rights of individuals/citizens as well as states. Cosmopolitan law – *iuscosmopoliticum* is set above and between state law and international law.[59] Components of the cosmopolitan law matrix are moral values of the human race, global civil society and universal justice. Kant, under the assumption that states are based on a republican system and internationally legally formalised in a federation of free states, introduces and adds a third area of the law often in literature called "the right to hospitality", a concept extensively studied by the author SeylaBenhabib.[60]

Although Bauman does not refer to Benhabib, her cosmopolitan perspective inspired by Kant's philosophy and based on the third article of *Perpetual Peace* – universal right to hospitality, from which she develops a theory of migrations, borders and sovereignty, is very similar to Bauman's conclusions. Benhabib exhibits specific sensitivity to problems faced by refugees and exiles, those that did not leave their homes voluntarily, and advocates for states' moral obligation and responsibility for these groups. In expanding Kant's idea of the right to hospitality, Benhabib believes that it cannot have a time limit. She converts Kant's one-off visit of a benevolent traveller to a possibility of a long-term stay. According to her theory of "some other cosmopolitanism", the state must not send refugees back if their safety cannot be guaranteed in their country of origin. Main challenges for states with regard to citizenship lie in their capacity to solve the issue of immigrants and refugees.[61]

---

[58] Ulrich Beck, The Cosmopolitan Vision, UK: Polity Press, 2006, p. 19-20.

[59] ibid. 45-46.

[60] Modern cosmopolitanism theorist Seyla Benhabib was born in 1950 in Istanbul. Her thoughts on cosmopolitanism represent a continuation and expansion of Kant's third article of the essay Perpetual Peace, in which he introduces the concept of "cosmopolitan law" or "right to hospitality". Relying on discursive ethics, she is one of the leadingAmerican theoreticians and a follower of the German philosopher Jurgen Habermas.

[61] Seyla Benhabib, The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents, and Citizens. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2004. &Benhabib, Seyla. Another Cosmopolitanism. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2008.

Conclusion

The complex picture of the modern world is made of societies that are alike but also different and divided along different features that define their identities as either close or opposite. This diversity calls for getting to know one another in order to overcome conflict and evil and establish cooperation and good. Throughout history, differences crystallised into two types of relationships: cooperation and conflict. At the same time, by confronting evil in order to achieve good, human thought resulted in ideas that do not find evil in different/unlike, and actually came to the opposite conclusion. Since, throughout history, encounters with different always invoked unknown and fear, its elements, after becoming recognised as markings of groups that form the human society known as tribes, ethnicities, peoples, nations, races, religious groups, etc., became more interesting and determined by interests. Early recognisability of many identities produced over the last centuries ideas of contact and cooperation, irrespective of differences, in order to embody the idea of man as a universal being free to inherit the world – the whole world with everything in it.

Politicians, authorities and states profit from the refugee crisis. The "migration problem" is placed on the pedestal of public discourse and serves populist right-wing power-grabbing objectives very well. With the help of today's media that mainly seek the spectacle of the moment, even a spectacle tragedy of children's lifeless bodies strewn across resort beaches, politicians, according to Bauman, use the "migration problem" to divert attention away from citizens' fundamental problems such as the precariat, unemployment, deep poverty, absence of welfare and healthcare programmes, environmental issues, etc. Erecting walls (of wire, concrete and other) represents a symbol of their "concern for their own citizens" who, again due to fear of different and unknown, forget their daily worries and deal with the outside enemy, further closing the charmed circle. Similarly to Bauman, Wendy Brown explains the symbolism of walls in the 21st century.

Although cosmopolitanism stands out as an adequate answer to theoretical discrepancies, we must question the reality of practical implementation of this discourse. Theoretical and practical areas where specific (primarily legal and economic) mechanisms are designed always embrace in the form of postulates (often tacitly and even without clear intent) certain concepts from the sociological and philosophical discourse. For example, the welfare state was preceded by theories of social liberalism; neolibertarian economic

policies apparent in Reagan's US politics or in Margaret Thatcher's politics in Great Britain were preceded by redefining liberalism and abandoning the welfare state; specific mechanisms of predominant protection of collective rights (such as in BiH, for example) were preceded by various versions of communitarian theories.

These very reasons make the task faced by sociology today a more serious and difficult one. This does not mean that we do not need new, perhaps at first glance even utopian views of the world, but we also need a dose of caution that would still not prevent us from creating new and different designs of the totality of social relationships. With regard to the cosmopolitan concept, three issues inevitably stand out and pose a challenge primarily for sociology.

Firstly, there isunderstandableconcern over whether we can build socio-political interpretations of justice, and therefore derive basic principles of living in a political community, within a cosmopolitan discourse? On the one hand, cosmopolitan discourse certainly makes a stable platform for international politics and law because it implies agreement about the mostessentialprinciples, however in the domain of national law things become more complex and we enter a space where different social relations need to be normed and we can hardly expect agreement from all affected by such norms.

Secondly, there is the problem of how to equip individuals with the cosmopolitan capacity of care for others. We will avoid here the classic philosophical/sociological analyses of human nature and the question of whether man even has a natural propensity to care for others. Like Hayek, we will assume the possibility that welfare of others can be made a goal as "part of normal human nature" and "one of the main conditions for their happiness", however on this theoretical trail we will leave open the question of general altruism.[62] According to Hayek, individuals are only able to take responsibility for people whose circumstances they know and to whom they are attached, and one of the "basic rights and duties of a free man is to decide which and whose needs seem the most important".[63]

And, thirdly, how to equip individuals with the capacity for solidarity and care for others? We could follow the tried and tested recipes and shift the focus to the process of socialisation and education. However, these recipes for indoctrination and disciplining have already demonstrated and proven their troublesome nature.

However, all three objections stated in the form of theses do not mean that we should give up on the cosmopolitan idea, because its potential can be seen

---

[62] Friedrich August von Hayek, *Poredak slobode* [The Constitution of Liberty], Novi Sad: Global Book, 1998.
[63] Ibid.

in the reduction to a small number of commonly agreed issues, as opposed todispersalacross all spheres of life. In this we should also remain critical of what is generally agreed, because in the world of liquid modernity we should always count on continuous and rapid change of attitude and different, other choices. Ultimately, in one interview even Bauman answered the question "What would be good for society?", with: "Society that never holds itself as good enough, which watches over injustice, suffering and pain, this society remains yet uneasy".[64]

Literature

Appiah, Kwame Anthony. The Ethics of Identity. New Jersey: Princeton University Press. 2007.

Bauman, Zygmunt. Strangers at Our Door. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2016.

Bauman,Zygmunt."I am not a preacher, I am a diagnostician" [„Boimysięwolności, marzymy o wspólnocie"], Conversation published in:*Magazyn ŚwiątecznyGazetaWyborcza*, 18.1.2013.Text available at:http://wyborcza.pl/magazyn/1,124059,13259382,Boimy_sie_wolnosci__marzymy_o_wspolnocie.html.For the purposes of this paper we used the translation by Tanja Miletić-Oručević, available at: http://www.tacno.net/novosti/zygmunt-bauman-nisam-propovjednik-ja-sam-dijagnosticar/

Bauman, Zygmunt. Fluidni život [Fluid Life]. Novi Sad: Mediterran publishing. 2009.

Bauman, Zygmunt. „Kad ljud ipostanu otpad" ["Wenn Menschen zuAbfall warden"]. In: DejanAnčić (ed.) Fragmenta Philosophica I, Loznica: Karpos, 2007.

Bauman, Zygmunt. Liquid Modernity. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2006.

Bauman, Zygmunt. Identity: Conversations with Benedetto Vecchi. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2004.

Bauman, Zygmunt. "From Pilgrim to Tourist - or a Short History of Identity". In: Hall, Stuart&Gay, Paul Du (eds.) Questions of Identity. London: Sage Publications. 2003.

Beck, Ulrich. The Cosmopolitan Vision. UK: Polity Press. 2006.

Benhabib, Seyla. Another Cosmopolitanism. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2008.

---

[64] Zygmunt Bauman, „Kad ljudipostanu otpad", In: DejanAnčić (ed.) *Fragmenta Philosophica I*, Loznica. Karpos, 2007. p. 201-202.

Benhabib, Seyla. The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents, and Citizens. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2004.

Billig, Michael. Banalninacionalizam[Banal Nationalism]. Beograd: Biblioteka XX vek, 2009.

Brock, Gilian, and Brighouse, Harry (eds.). The Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2005.

Brown, Garrett Wallace, and Held, David (eds). The Cosmopolitanism Reader. Cambridge: Polity Press. 2010.

Brown, Wendy. Walled States, Waning Sovereignty. New York: Zone Books. 2010.

Buchanan, Ian. Oxford Dictionary of Critical Theory. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2010.

Derrida, Jacques. On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness. London, New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group. 2001.

Durkheim, Emile. „ZajednicaidruštvopoTenisu" ["An Analysis of Ferdinand Tönnies"]. In: Marinković, Dušan (ed.) Emil Dirkem 1858 – 2008. Novi Sad: Vojvođanska sociološka asocijacija / Mediteran Publishing. 2008.

Durkheim, Emile. O podelidruštvenograda [The Division of Labor in Society]. Beograd: Prosveta. 1972.

Filipović, Vladimir. Filozofijskiriječnik [Dictionary of Philosophy]. Zagreb: Nakladni Zavod Matice Hrvatske. 1989.

Fine, Robert. Cosmopolitanism. New York: Routledge. 2007.

Gilroy, Paul. Postcolonial Melancholia. New York: Columbia University Press. 2005.

Gueye, CheikhMbacke. Late Stoic Cosmopolitanism – Foundations and Relevance. Heidelberg: Universitatsverlag WINTER. 2006.

Hayek, Friedrich August von. Poredakslobode[The Constitution of Liberty]. Novi Sad: Global Book. 1998.

Laertius, Diogenes. Životiimišljenjaistaknutihfilozofa[Lives of Eminent Philosophers]. Beograd: Beogradskiizdavačko-grafičkizavod. 1979.

Macpherson, Crawford Brough. Političkateorijaposjedničkogliberalizma [The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism]. Zagreb: Centar društvenih djelatnosti Socijalističke omladine Hrvatske. 1981.

Marcuse, Herbert. Čovjek jedne dimenzije [One Dimensional Man]. Sarajevo: Veselin Masleša. 1968.

Mises, Ludwig von. Human Action: A Treatise on Economics. Auburn-Alabama: Ludwig Von Mises Institute. 1968.

Nussbaum, Martha. 1997. Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism. Journal of Political Philosophy. 1. 1–25.

Ribeiro, Gustavo Lins. What is Cosmopolitanism? International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences (4): 2842-45. London: Elsevier. 2001.

Sassen, Saskia. Gubitak kontrole? Suverenitet u doba globalizacije [Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalisation]. Beograd: Beogradski krug. 2004.