

## **Position Paper – Cultural Aspects of Urbanity, Gender and Migration**

**Zuzana Révészová**

**Workshop 2 – Daniel Chernilo**

**18.10.2012**

### **Cosmopolitanism and the critique of methodological nationalism**

For the workshop preparation, I have chosen the cosmopolitanism branch of the prescribed literature. Reading on cosmopolitanism is quiet an issue in social sciences today. The set reading concerned about the globalization set of the society (mostly viewed in Europe) by Jürgen Habermas and the epistemological discussion on how to approach the social reality differently (by the rest of the authors). The authors lead the discussion on the need of promoting a new paradigm in social sciences on different levels (as there is no consensus on the result and reasons of cosmopolitanism in social sciences, not even in sociology).

The discussion is mostly concerned on the orientation of the concepts when studying social reality. The sociology overcomes a transformation and is no more a nation-state society study. However, there are different views on the result and paradigmatic approach that should be a hegemony in these days social science. Some authors have set their theories to too ideal prophecy – like Habermas and Beck. It is visible that their tradition of doing social science is paradigmatically different already. It sets a group of utopian visions that are set to be their hopes to the future. Revealing themselves public in the manifestos pushing Europe to become a society by creating the same public sphere (Habermas). In their view, I would say it is a common discourse and cultural background they would like to settle in the society to build the narrative in the public sphere rather than understanding the scientific explanation of the changes in society (if this sounds too sharp, it should not, because I still believe they are right and the creation of European public sphere is a need, but in a way, they have to do that because of the feeling of the fathers of Europe).

On the other hand, the three authors, from a different generation and discourse present a critical review on the grounds of methodological cosmopolitanism. I very much appreciate this approach of resetting the cultural background of the science itself and taking the thoughts back to its origins – which is mostly to Kantian universalism and the enlightenment revolution of the thinking which stayed similar to the contemporary times. However, the empirical turn is about to be presented as well, because the philosophical implications and thoughts of the ideal situation in the science are followed by this methodological philosophy, but still stay aside from showing how can be something as cosmopolitan science implemented.

Huge transformation, however, should follow after the epistemological tactique is more or less in the consensus of the applying actors. I think that cosmopolitanization of the science would

come with the cosmopolitanization of the science as institution and the scientists themselves. It is therefore a vicious circle to overcome by some point of escape.

I cannot really contribute to the discussion on the philosophical level of changing an approach of understanding the society. I would only support the need of cosmopolitan science in the reasons of the cosmopolitanization of society as a discursive change and a narrative for the common identity (as I mentioned it in the Habermas-Beck case). However, it should not be an aerial mansion, changing the sociological approach to the ideology of our times. Certain need of objectivity of the science should be hold and the realistic expectation of the possibilities of the scientists as humans.

### Cosmopolitanism

1. Habermas, J. (2001) *The postnational constellation*, Cambridge: Polity Press. Chapter 4.
2. Beck, U. and Sznaider, N. (2006) 'Unpacking cosmopolitanism for the social sciences: A research agenda', *British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 1-23.
3. Turner, B. (2006) 'Classical sociology and cosmopolitanism: A critical defence of the social', *British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 133-55.
4. Fine, R. (2007) *Cosmopolitanism*, London: Routledge. Preface and Chapter 1.
5. Chernilo, D. (2012) 'Cosmopolitanism and the question of universalism', in Delanty, G. (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies*, London, Routledge: 47-59.