

- Robertson, Roland (1987a) 'Globalization and Societal Modernization: A Note on Japan and Japanese Religion', *Sociological Analysis* 47(S), 35-43.
- Robertson, Roland (1987b) 'Globalization Theory and Civilization Analysis', *Comparative Civilizations Review* 17: 20-30.
- Robertson, Roland and Lechner, Frank (1985) 'Modernization, Globalization and the Problem of Culture in World System Theory', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 2(3): 103-18.
- Smith, Anthony (1986) *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sternhell, Zeev (1983) *Ni droite ni gauche: L'idéologie fasciste en France*. Paris: Seuil.
- Tiryakian, Edward and Nevitte, Neil (1985) 'Nationalism and Modernity', pp. 57-86 in Edward Tiryakian and Ronald Rogowski (eds), *New Nationalisms of the Developed West*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Weber, Max (1946) *From Max Weber*, ed. Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, Max (1968) *Economy and Society*, three volumes. New York: Bedminster Press.

Johann Arnason teaches Sociology at La Trobe University, Bundoora, Victoria, Australia.

in *Journal of American Studies* 1990

## Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture

Ulf Hannerz

There is now a world culture, but we had better make sure that we understand what this means. It is marked by an organization of diversity rather than by a replication of uniformity. No total homogenization of systems of meaning and expression has occurred, nor does it appear likely that there will be one any time soon. But the world has become one network of social relationships, and between its different regions there is a flow of meanings as well as of people and goods.<sup>1</sup>

The world culture is created through the increasing interconnectedness of varied local cultures, as well as through the development of cultures without a clear anchorage in any one territory. These are all becoming sub-cultures, as it were, within the wider whole; cultures which are in important ways better understood in the context of their cultural surroundings than in isolation. But to this global interconnected diversity people can relate in different ways. For one thing, there are cosmopolitans, and there are locals.

The cosmopolitan-local distinction has been a part of the sociological vocabulary for close to half a century now, since Robert Merton (1957: 387ff.) developed it out of a study, during the Second World War, of 'patterns of influence' in a small town on the eastern seaboard of the United States. At that time (and certainly in that place), the distinction could hardly be set in anything but a national context. The cosmopolitans of the town were those who thought and who lived their lives within the structure of the nation rather than purely within the structure of the locality. Since then, the scale of culture and social structure has grown, so that what was cosmopolitan in the early 1940s may be counted as a moderate form of localism by now. 'Today it is international integration that determines universality, while national culture has an air of provincialism', the Hungarian author George Konrad writes in his *Anit-politics* (1984: 209).

*Theory, Culture & Society* (SAGE, London, Newbury Park and New Delhi), Vol. 7 (1990), 237-251

What follows is above all an exploration of cosmopolitanism as a perspective, a state of mind, or — to take a more processual view — a mode of managing meaning. I shall not concern myself here with patterns of influence, and not so very much with locals. The point of view of the latter I will touch upon mostly for purposes of contrast. My purpose is not so much to come up with a definition of the true cosmopolitan, although I may have an opinion on that as well, but merely to point to some of the issues involved.

#### The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Orientation and Competence

We often use the term 'cosmopolitan' rather loosely, to describe just about anybody who moves about in the world. But of such people, some would seem more cosmopolitan than others, and others again hardly cosmopolitan at all. I have before me an old cutting from the *International Herald Tribune* (16 October 1985) about travel and trade (the latter fairly often illicit) between Lagos and London. The article quotes reports by flight attendants on the route, claiming that Lagos market women board London-bound planes with loose-fitting gowns, which enable them to travel with dried fish tied to their thighs and upper arms. The dried fish is presumably sold to their countrymen in London; on the return trip, the women carry similarly concealed bundles of frozen fish sticks, dried milk, and baby clothes, all of which are in great demand in Lagos. London is a consumer's (or middleman's) paradise for Nigerians. About 1 percent of the passengers on the London-bound flights have excess baggage, and about 30 percent of those travelling in the opposite direction.

Is this cosmopolitanism? In my opinion, no; the shopping trips of Lagosian traders and smugglers hardly go beyond the horizons of urban Nigerian culture, as it now is. The fish sticks and the baby clothes hardly alter structures of meaning more than marginally. And much of that involvement with a wider world which is characteristic of contemporary lives is of this kind, largely a matter of assimilating items of some distant provenience into a fundamentally local culture.

Historically we have been used to think of cultures as distinctive structures of meaning and meaningful form usually closely linked to territories, and of individuals as self-evidently linked to particular such cultures. The underlying assumption here is that culture flows mostly in face-to-face relationships, and that people do not move

around much. Such an assumption serves us well enough in delineating the local as an ideal type.

Yet as collective phenomena cultures are by definition linked primarily to interactions and social relationships, and only indirectly and without logical necessity to particular areas in physical space. The less social relationships are confined within territorial boundaries, the less so is also culture; and in our time especially, we can contrast in gross terms those cultures which are territorially defined (in terms of nations, regions, or localities) with those which are carried as collective structures of meaning by networks more extended in space, transnational or even global. This contrast, too — but not it alone — suggests that cultures, rather than being easily separated from one another as the hard-edged pieces in a mosaic, tend to overlap and mingle. While we understand them to be differently located in the social structure of the world, we also realize that the boundaries we draw around them are frequently rather arbitrary.

Anyway, such a view of the present in cultural terms may help us identify the cosmopolitan. The perspective of the cosmopolitan must entail relationships to a plurality of cultures understood as distinctive entities. (And the more the better; cosmopolitans should ideally be foxes rather than hedgehogs.)<sup>2</sup> But furthermore, cosmopolitanism in a stricter sense includes a stance toward diversity itself, toward the coexistence of cultures in the individual experience. A more genuine cosmopolitanism is first of all an orientation, a willingness to engage with the Other. It is an intellectual and aesthetic stance of openness toward divergent cultural experiences, a search for contrasts rather than uniformity. To become acquainted with more cultures is to turn into an *aficionado*, to view them as art works. At the same time, however, cosmopolitanism can be a matter of competence, and competence of both a generalized and a more specialized kind. There is the aspect of a state of readiness, a personal ability to make one's way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting. And there is cultural competence in the stricter sense of the term, a built-up skill in manoeuvring more or less expertly with a particular system of meanings and meaningful forms.

In its concern with the Other, cosmopolitanism thus becomes a matter of varieties and levels. Cosmopolitans can be dilettantes as well as connoisseurs, and are often both, at different times.<sup>3</sup> But the

Alex  
Jfr Bourdieu's  
holder of  
"Sophisticated"  
indef

willingness to become involved with the Other, and the concern with achieving competence in cultures which are initially alien, relate to considerations of self as well. Cosmopolitanism often has a narcissistic streak; the self is constructed in the space where cultures mirror one another.

Competence with regard to alien cultures itself entails a sense of mastery, as an aspect of the self. One's understandings have expanded, a little more of the world is somehow under control. Yet there is a curious, apparently paradoxical interplay between mastery and surrender here. It may be one kind of cosmopolitanism where the individual picks from other cultures only those pieces which suit himself. In the long term, this is likely to be the way a cosmopolitan constructs his own unique personal perspective out of an idiosyncratic collection of experiences. But such selectivity can operate in the short term, situationally, as well. In another mode, however, the cosmopolitan does not make invidious distinctions among the particular elements of the alien culture in order to admit some of them into his repertoire and refuse others; he does not negotiate with the other culture but accepts it as a package deal. Even this surrender, however, is a part of the sense of mastery. The cosmopolitan's surrender to the alien culture implies personal autonomy vis-à-vis the culture where he originated. He has his obvious competence with regard to it, but he can choose to disengage from it. He possesses it, it does not possess him. Cosmopolitanism becomes protean. Some would eat cockroaches to prove the point, others need only eat escargots. Whichever is required, the principle is that the more clearly the alien culture contrasts with the culture of origin, the more at least parts of the former would even be seen with revulsion through the lense of the latter, the more conspicuously is surrender abroad a form of mastery at home.

Yet the surrender is of course only conditional. The cosmopolitan may embrace the alien culture, but he does not become committed to it. All the time he knows where the exit is.

### Cosmopolitanism and the Varieties of Mobility

Of course, cosmopolitans are usually somewhat footloose, on the move in the world. Among the several cultures with which they are engaged, at least one is presumably of the territorial kind, a culture encompassing the round of everyday life in a community. The perspective of the cosmopolitan may indeed be composed only from experiences of different cultures of this kind, as his biography

includes periods of stays in different places. But he may also be involved with one culture, and possibly but not usually more, of that other kind which is carried by a transnational network rather than by a territory. It is really the growth and proliferation of such cultures and social networks in the present period that generates more cosmopolitans now than there have been at any other time.

But being on the move, I have already argued, is not enough to turn one into a cosmopolitan, and we must not confuse the latter with other kinds of travellers. Are tourists, exiles, and expatriates cosmopolitans, and when not, why not?

In her novel *The Accidental Tourist* (1985), Anne Tyler has a main character who makes his living churning out travel books for anti-cosmopolitans, people (mostly business travellers) who would rather not have left home; people who are locals at heart.<sup>4</sup> These are travel guides for Americans who would want to know what restaurants in Tokyo offer Sweet'n'Low, which hotel in Madrid has king-size Beauty-rest mattresses, and whether there is a Taco Bell in Mexico City.

Another contemporary writer, Paul Theroux (1986: 133), continuously occupied with themes of journeys and the cosmopolitan experience, comments that many people travel for the purpose of 'home plus' — Spain is home plus sunshine, India is home plus servants, Africa is home plus elephants and lions. And for some, of course, travel is ideally home plus more and better business. There is no general openness here to a somewhat unpredictable variety of experiences; the benefits of mobility are strictly regulated. Such travel is not for cosmopolitans, and does little to create cosmopolitans.

Much present-day tourism is of this kind. People engage in it specifically to go to another place, so the cosmopolitanism that could potentially be involved would be that of combinations of territorially based cultures. But the 'plus' often has nothing whatsoever to do with alien systems of meaning, and a lot to do with facts of nature, such as nice beaches. Yet this is not the only reason why cosmopolitans nowadays loathe tourists, and especially loathe being taken for tourists.

<sup>\*</sup> Cosmopolitans tend to want to immerse themselves in other cultures, or in any case be free to do so. They want to be participants, or at least do not want to be too readily identifiable within a crowd of participants, that is, of locals in their home territory. They want to be able to sneak backstage rather than being confined to the

*Bodilypaing*

frontstage areas. Tourists are not participants; tourism is largely a spectator sport. Even if they want to become involved and in that sense have a cosmopolitan orientation, tourists are assumed to be incompetent. They are too likely to make a nuisance of themselves. The local, and the cosmopolitan, can spot them from a mile away. Locals evolve particular ways of handling tourists, keeping a distance from them, not necessarily exploiting them but not admitting them into local reciprocities either. Not least because cosmopolitanism is an uncertain practice, again and again balancing at the edge of competence, the cosmopolitan keeps running the risk of being taken for a tourist by locals whose experience make them apply this label increasingly routinely. And this could ruin many of the pleasures of cosmopolitanism, as well as pose a threat to the cosmopolitan sense of self.

The exile, also shifted directly from one territorial culture to another, is often no real cosmopolitan either, for his involvement with a culture away from his homeland is something that has been forced on him. At best, life in another country is home plus safety, or home plus freedom, but often it is just not home at all. He is surrounded by the foreign culture but does not often immerse himself in it. Sometimes his imperfections as a cosmopolitan may be the opposite of those of the tourist: he may reluctantly build up a competence, but he does not enjoy it. Exile, Edward Said has argued, is an unhealable rift, a discontinuous state of being, a jealous state:

With very little to possess, you hold on to what you have with aggressive defensiveness. What you achieve in exile is precisely what you have no wish to share, and it is in the drawing of lines around you and your compatriots that the least attractive aspects of being an exile emerge: an exaggerated sense of group solidarity as well as a passionate hostility toward outsiders, even those who may in fact be in the same predicament as you. (Said, 1984: 51)

The French intellectuals who escaped to New York during the Second World War, as portrayed by Ruitkoff and Scott (1983), were mostly exiles of this sort. Their New York, with its own academy and its own revue, was a sanctuary where they sustained the notion that France and civilization were just about interchangeable terms. Among them, nonetheless, were individuals who seized the opportunity to explore the city with all their senses. Claude Lévi-Strauss (1985: 258ff.), in a charming memoir included in *The View from Afar*, has described his New York, of antique shops, department

stores, ethnic villages, museums of everything from art to natural history, and a Chinese opera performing under the first arch of the Brooklyn Bridge.

So now and then exiles can be cosmopolitans; but most of them are not. Most ordinary labour migrants do not become cosmopolitans either. For them going away may be, ideally, home plus higher income; often the involvement with another culture is not a fringe benefit but a necessary cost, to be kept as low as possible. A surrogate home is again created with the help of compatriots, in whose circle one becomes encapsulated.

The concept of the expatriate may be that which we will most readily associate with cosmopolitanism. Expatriates (or ex-patriates) are people who have chosen to live abroad for some period, and who know when they are there that they can go home when it suits them. Not that all expatriates are living models of cosmopolitanism; colonialists were also expatriates, and mostly they abhorred 'going native'. But these are people who can afford to experiment, who do not stand to lose a treasured but threatened, unprotected sense of self. We often think of them as people of independent (even if modest) means, for whom openness to new experiences is a vocation, or people who can take along their work more or less where it pleases them; writers and painters in Paris between the wars are perhaps the archetypes. Nevertheless, the contemporary expatriate is rather more likely to be an organization man; so here I come back to the transnational cultures, and the networks and institutions which provide their social frameworks.

#### Transnational Cultures Today

The historian James Field (1971), surveying the development in question over a longer period, writes of 'Transnationalism and the New Tribe', but one may as well identify a number of different tribes, as the people involved form rather separate sets of social relationships, and as the specialized contents of these cultures are of many kinds. Transnational cultures today tend to be more or less clearcut occupational cultures and are often tied to transnational job markets. George Konrad emphasizes the transnational culture of intellectuals:

The global flow of information proceeds on many different technical and institutional levels, but on all levels the intellectuals are the ones who know most about one another across the frontiers, who keep in touch with one another, and who feel that they are one another's allies . . .

We may describe as transnational those intellectuals who are at home in the cultures of other peoples as well as their own. They keep track of what is happening in various places. They have special ties to those countries where they have lived, they have friends all over the world, they hop across the sea to discuss something with their colleagues; they fly to visit one another as easily as their counterparts two hundred years ago rode over to the next town to exchange ideas. (1984: 208-9)

Yet there are transnational cultures also of bureaucrats, politicians, and business people and of journalists and diplomats, and various others (see e.g. Sauvant, 1976). Perhaps the only transnational culture in decline is that of hereditary royalty. These cultures become transnational both as the individuals involved make quick forays from a home base to many other places — for a few hours or days in a week, for a few weeks here and there in a year — and as they shift their bases for longer periods within their lives. Wherever they go, they find others who will interact with them in the terms of specialized but collectively held understandings.

Because of the transnational cultures, a large number of people are nowadays systematically and directly involved with more than one culture. In human history, the direct movement between territorial cultures has often been accidental, a freak occurrence in biographies; if not an expression of sheer personal idiosyncrasy, then a result of war, political upheaval or repression, ecological disaster.

But the transnational and the territorial cultures of the world are entangled with one another in manifold ways. Some transnational cultures are more insulated from local practices than others; that of diplomacy as compared with that of commerce, for example. The transnational cultures are also as wholes usually more marked by some territorial culture than by others. Most of them are in different ways extensions or transformations of the cultures of western Europe and North America. If even the transnational cultures have to have physical centres somewhere, places in which, or from where, their particular meanings are produced and disseminated with particular intensity, or places to which people travel in order to interact in their terms, this is where such centres tend to be located. But even away from these centres, the institutions of the transnational cultures tend to be organized so as to make people from western Europe and North America feel as much at home as possible (by using their languages, for one thing). In both ways, the organization of world culture through centre-periphery relationships is made evident.

It is a consequence of this that western Europeans and North Americans can encapsulate themselves culturally, and basically remain metropolitan locals instead of becoming cosmopolitans, not only by staying at home in their territorial cultures. Like Ann Tyler's 'accidental tourists', they can also do so, to a fairly high degree if not completely, in many of the transnational cultures. For those who are not western Europeans or North Americans, or who do not spend their everyday lives elsewhere in occidental cultural enclaves, involvement with one of the transnational cultures is more likely in itself to be a distinctive cultural experience.

The real significance of the growth of the transnational cultures, however, is often not the new cultural experience that they themselves can offer people — for it is frequently rather restricted in scope and depth — but their mediating possibilities. The transnational cultures are bridgeheads for entry into other territorial cultures. Instead of remaining within them, one can use the mobility connected with them to make contact with the meanings of other rounds of life, and gradually incorporate this experience into one's personal perspective.

#### Cosmopolitanism and Cultures of Critical Discourse

The readiness to seize such opportunities and cosmopolitanize is no doubt often a very personal character trait. On the other hand, different transnational cultures may also relate in different ways to these opportunities. Here and there, and probably especially where the occupational practices themselves are not well insulated from the cultures of varied local settings, the development of competences in alien cultures has appeared too important to be left to chance and to personal whim; in the last few decades, we have seen the rapid growth of a culture shock prevention industry. Cross-cultural training programmes have been developed to inculcate sensitivity, basic *savoir faire*, and perhaps an appreciation of those other cultures which are of special strategic importance to one's goals (from the occidental point of view, particularly those of Japan and the oil-rich Arab world). There is also a burgeoning do-it-yourself literature in this field.<sup>5</sup> Sceptics, of course, may dismiss these programmes and this literature as a 'quick cosmopolitan fix'. They would be inclined to doubt that course work for a couple of days or weeks, or a characteristically unsubtle handbook genre, can substitute for the personal journey of discovery. And they may be committed to the notion that cosmopolitans, as such, should be self-made men.

Some transnational cultures, on the other hand, may have a kind of built-in relationship to that type of openness and striving toward mastery that I have referred to above. George Konrad, in the statement which I have already quoted, proposes that intellectuals have a particular predilection toward making themselves at home in other cultures. This is more true in some instances than others; the French academia in its New York exile, we have seen, tended to keep to itself. Nonetheless, it may be worth considering the possibility that there is some kind of affinity between cosmopolitanism and the culture of intellectuals.

When locals were influential, Robert Merton (1957: 400) found in his classic study, their influence rested not so much on what they knew as on whom they knew. Cosmopolitans, in contrast, based whatever influence they had on a knowledge less tied to particular others, or to the unique community setting. They came equipped with special knowledge, and they could leave and take it with them without devaluing it.

Not surprisingly, there has been more attention given to such people recently.<sup>6</sup> They are 'the new class', people with credentials, decontextualized cultural capital. Within this broad social category some would distinguish, as Alvin Gouldner (1979) has done, between intelligentsia and intellectuals. This is hardly necessary for my purposes here; in any case, according to Gouldner, they share a 'culture of critical discourse'.

Certainly these are a type of people who now stand a particularly good chance of becoming involved with the transnational cultures. Their decontextualized knowledge can be quickly and shiftingly recontextualized in a series of different settings. (Which is not to say that the transnational cultures consist of nothing but such knowledge — they may well evolve their own particularisms as well, of the kind which are elsewhere the special resource of locals: biographical knowledge of individuals, anecdotal knowledge of events and even of the constellations of locales which form the settings of these cultures.) What they carry, however, is not just special knowledge, but also that overall orientation toward structures of meaning to which the notion of the 'culture of critical discourse' refers. This orientation, according to Gouldner's (1979: 28ff.) description, is reflexive, problematizing, concerned with metacommunication; I would also describe it as generally expansionist in its management of meaning. It pushes on relentlessly in its analysis of the order of ideas, striving toward explicitness where

common sense, as a contrasting mode of meaning management, might come to rest comfortably with the tacit, the ambiguous, and the contradictory.<sup>7</sup> In the end, it strives toward mastery.

Obviously it cannot be argued that such an orientation to structures of meaning is in any way likely to show a particularly close fit with those alien cultures in themselves which the cosmopolitan desires to explore. These are probably as full of contradictions, ambiguities, and tendencies toward inertia as any other local culture, including that in which the cosmopolitan himself originates. Yet as a mode of approach, it seems to include much of that openness and drive toward greater competence which I have suggested is also characteristic of cosmopolitanism. It is not a way of becoming a local, but rather of simulating local knowledge.

The special relationship between intellectuals and cosmopolitanism, if there is one, could also be described in another way, hardly unrelated to what I have just said. Intellectuals in the narrower sense are involved in a particular way with what we might see as the centre-periphery relationships of culture itself. Kadushin (1974: 6), in his study of American intellectuals, has suggested that each culture has certain central 'value concepts' which give meaning to experience and action, and that most members of society manipulate these concepts easily enough because they tend to be defined essentially in their concrete applications rather than through abstract formulations. Intellectuals, however, have the special task of finding the relationship between value concepts, and tracing the application of these concepts over time. Such concepts, Kadushin notes, are for example 'rights of man', 'justice', or 'freedom of speech'.

In their enquiries, the intellectuals traffic between the core of culture and the peripheral, ephemeral facts of everyday life. If they are vocationally in the habit of doing so, they would appear to have an advantageous point of departure for explorations of other cultures as well, when the opportunity of cosmopolitanism presents itself. And this advantage is surely not lost when different cultures in fact turn out to have central value concepts in common; George Konrad's transnational intellectuals, forming alliances across frontiers, tend to get together precisely over such shared concerns.

**The Cosmopolitan at Home**

This has mostly been a sketch of the cosmopolitan abroad. Much of the time, even cosmopolitans are actually at home. Yet what does that mean in their case?

Perhaps real cosmopolitans, after they have taken out membership in that category, are never quite at home again. In the way real locals can be. Home is taken-for-grantedness, but after their perspectives have been irreversibly affected by the experience of the alien and the distant, cosmopolitans may not view either the seasons of the year or the minor rituals of everyday life as absolutely natural, obvious, and necessary. There may be a feeling of detachment, perhaps irritation with those committed to the local common sense and unaware of its arbitrariness. Or perhaps the cosmopolitan makes 'home' as well one of his several sources of personal meaning, not so different from the others which are further away; or he is pleased with his ability both to surrender to and master this one as well.

Or home is really home, but in a special way; a constant reminder of a pre-cosmopolitan past, a privileged site of nostalgia. This is where once things seemed fairly simple and straightforward. Or it is again really home, a comfortable place of familiar faces, where one's competence is undisputed and where one does not have to prove it to either oneself or others, but where for much the same reasons there is some risk of boredom.

At home, for most cosmopolitans, most others are locals. This is true in the great majority of territorially based cultures. Conversely, for most of these locals, the cosmopolitan is someone a little unusual, one of us and yet not quite one of us. Someone to be respected for his experiences, possibly, but equally possibly not somebody to be trusted as a matter of course. Trust tends to be a matter of shared perspectives, of 'I know, and I know that you know, and I know that you know that I know'. And this formula for the social organization of meaning does not necessarily apply to the relationship between local and cosmopolitan.

Some cosmopolitans are more adept at making it apply again. 'Wenn jemand eine Reise tut, dann kann er 'was erzählen', the saying goes, and there are those who make a speciality out of letting others know what they have come across in distant places. So the cosmopolitan can to some extent be channelled into the local; and precisely because these are on the whole separate spheres the cosmopolitan can become a broker, an entrepreneur who makes a profit. Yet there is a danger that such attempts to make the alien easily accessible only succeeds in trivializing it, and thereby betraying its nature and the character of the real first-hand encounter. So in a

way the more purely cosmopolitan attitude may be to let separate things be separate.

Despite all this, home is not necessarily a place where cosmopolitanism is in exile. It is natural that in the contemporary world many local settings are increasingly characterized by cultural diversity. Those of cosmopolitan inclinations may make selective use of their habits to maintain their expansive orientation toward the wider world. Other cosmopolitans may be there, whether they in their turn are at home or abroad, and strangers of other than cosmopolitan orientations. Apart from the face-to-face encounters, there are the media — both those intended for local consumption, although they speak of what is distant, and those which are really part of other cultures, like foreign books and films. What McLuhan once described as the implosive power of the media may now make just about everybody a little more cosmopolitan. And one may in the end ask whether it is now even possible to become a cosmopolitan without going away at all.

**Conclusion: the Dependence of Cosmopolitans on Locals, and their Shared Interests**

To repeat, there is now one world culture. All the variously distributed structures of meaning and expression are becoming inter-related, somehow, somewhere. People like the cosmopolitans have a special part in bringing about a degree of coherence, and because they have this part they have received closer attention here. If there were only locals in the world, world culture would be no more than the sum of its separate parts.

As things are now, on the other hand, it is no longer so easy to conform to the ideal type of a local. Some people, like exiles or migrant workers, are indeed taken away from the territorial bases of their local culture, but try to encapsulate themselves within some approximation of it; yet it is a greater number who, even staying home, find their local cultures less pervasive, less to be taken for granted, less clearly bounded toward the outside. If that other kind of world culture were ever to come about, through a terminal process of global homogenization, locals would become extinct; or, seen differently, through the involvement with the one existing culture, everybody would be the same kind of local, at the global level.

Here, however, today's cosmopolitans and locals have common

interests in the survival of cultural diversity. For the latter, diversity itself, as a matter of personal access to varied cultures, may be of little intrinsic interest. It just so happens that this is the principle which allows all locals to stick to their respective cultures. For the cosmopolitans, in contrast, there is value in diversity as such, but they are not likely to get it, in anything like the present form, unless other people are allowed to carve out special niches for their cultures, and keep them. Which is to say that there can be no cosmopolitans without locals.

### Notes

1. The first version of this paper was presented at the First International Conference on the Olympics and East/West and South/North Cultural Exchanges in the World System, in Seoul, Korea, 17-19 August 1987. The paper has been prepared as part of the project 'The World System of Culture' in the Department of Social Anthropology, University of Stockholm. The project has been supported by the Swedish Research Council for the Humanities and Social Sciences (HSFR).
2. Anthropologists are thus not necessarily very cosmopolitan; many of them are one-tribe people. On hedgehogs and foxes, see Berlin (1979).
3. The dilettant, remember, is 'one who delights'; someone whose curiosity takes him a bit beyond ordinary knowledge, although in a gentlemanly way he refrains from becoming a specialist (cf. Lynes, 1966).
4. There is, of course, also a film based on this novel.
5. See for example the volume *Do's and Taboos Around the World*, issued by the Parker Pen Company, which describes its goals:

Ideally, this book will help each world traveler grow little invisible antennae that will sense incoming messages about cultural differences and nuances. An appreciation and understanding of these differences will prevent embarrassment, unhappiness, and failure. In fact, learning through travel about these cultural differences can be both challenging and fun. (Axtell, 1985: foreword)

6. See also for example Randall Collins's (1979: 60ff.) contrast between 'indigenous' and 'formal' production of culture.

7. On common sense, see for example Geertz (1975), and Bourdieu's (1977: 164ff.) discussion of the 'doxic mode'.

### References

- Axtell, Roger E. (1985) *Do's and Taboos Around the World*. New York: Wiley.  
 Berlin, Isaiah (1978) *Russian Thinkers*. New York: Viking.  
 Bourdieu, Pierre (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
 Collins, Randall (1979) *The Credential Society*. New York: Academic Press.  
 Field, James A., Jr. (1971) 'Transnationalism and the New Tribe', *International Organization* 25: 353-62.

- Geertz, Clifford (1975) 'Common Sense as a Cultural System', *Antioch Review* 33: 5-26.  
 Gouldner, Alvin W. (1979) *The Future of the Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class*. London: Macmillan.  
 Katsushin, Charles (1974) *The American Intellectual Elite*. Boston: Little, Brown.  
 Konrad, George (1984) *Antipolitics*. San Diego and New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.  
 Lévi-Strauss, Claude (1985) *The View from Afar*. New York: Basic Books.  
 Lynes, Russell (1966) *Confessions of a Dilettante*. New York: Harper & Row.  
 Merton, Robert K. (1957) *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.  
 Rutkoff, Peter M., and Scott, William B. (1983) 'The French in New York: Resistance and Structure', *Social Research* 50: 185-214.  
 Said, Edward W. (1984) 'The Mind of Winter: Reflections on Life in Exile', *Harper's Magazine* (September): 49-55.  
 Sauvaut, Karl P., (1976) 'The Potential of Multinational Enterprises as Vehicles for the Transmission of Business Culture', in Karl P. Sauvaut and Farid G. Lavipour (eds), *Controlling Multinational Enterprises*. Boulder, CO: Westview.  
 Theroux, Paul (1986) *Surprise with Seamonsters*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.  
 Tyler, Anne (1985) *The Accidental Tourist*. New York: Knopf.

Ulf Hannerz is head of the Department of Social Anthropology at the University of Stockholm. He is author of *Exploring the City: Inquiries Toward an Urban Anthropology* (Columbia University Press, 1980).