THE TOURIST AND THE MIGRANT – TWO FACES OF THE 21ST CENTURY COSMOPOLITANISM

Marin Beroš

Assistant professor, PhD, Institute of Social Sciences "Ivo Pilar"
mberos@pilar.hr

Abstract

It is no big secret that in our world of great economic inequalities, belonging to some political communities is just more valuable than belonging to others. And this divide is exactly what differentiates contemporary "unwoken" cosmopolitans into two categories – the tourist and the migrant. In a certain way, both of those ideal figures embody cosmopolitan values of earlier times, as they are "transgressing" the political borders of communities. Although both the tourist and the migrant with their transgressions are helping the intercommunal exchange and understanding between the peoples, their societal acceptance is wildly different. While tourists are rarely unwelcomed, mainly because they do not interact profoundly with domestic population as they intend to return to their point of origin, migrants with their wish for "deeper connections" are viewed with suspicion, if not outright hatred. And this difference strongly puts into question the principle of hospitality, which is, following the work of Immanuel Kant, considered a basic building block of modern cosmopolitan theory. Finally, this paper will try to make case that for the true cosmopolitan ideals to take hold, there is a need for a reformulation of the current idea of hospitality, from the one based on the economy towards the one based on humanistic ideals. And this need is especially more pressing considering the turn of events provoked by the global pandemic, which are strengthening and slowly closing the borders between our countries and each other.

Keywords: tourism, migration, cosmopolitanism, hospitality

1. The Cosmopolitan "New Normal"

The year 2020 was certainly a difficult year. On top of all the problems global society was already facing (ecological deterioration, wars, famine, migrations…) we had, and unfortunately, we still have a global pandemic on our hands. Also, as we are still not nearing its end, although the vaccination and promises of experimental medicines do provide some hope in that regard, we do not know how this "world-wide quarantine" will affect our societies in the long run. We are sensing there will be a significant change in the way we work, provide and receive education, in the way we entertain ourselves, but this is probably just the top of a long list. Profound societal change will arrive later, and it is hard to predict anything at this point.

Still, one thing that we may be sure of – whatever was its source, the COVID-19 pandemic is a consequence of globalisation, of intensification and multiplication of our contacts with the world. Globalisation as phenomenon is certainly not a new occurrence, although its theoretical inquiry started in 1980's when the societal changes which it provoked just could not be ignored anymore. As a term it was first used by scholars such as Roland Robertson, who started to address this topic more extensively in the early 1980s. According to him, the basic way we could describe globalization is as "the compression of the world and the intensification of the consciousness of the world as a whole."(Robertson, 1998, p.8) In addition to this insight, Robertson is important for globalization theory because of the popularization of the term "glocalization" which he uses to express the paradoxical effects of globalization on local communities. The concept itself gained momentum in academic circles during the 1980s and became increasingly present in the public discourse during the 1990s. The current proliferation of globalization debates is probably something more than a passing trend. The popularity of the term itself clearly indicates the widespread intuition that the social relations of our time have taken on a significant new characteristic.

The emergence of globalization theory also helped in the revival of an ancient philosophical idea, the idea of cosmopolitanism. Observing the effects of globalization, theorists seem to have felt the growing need to philosophically answer new questions regarding the global human connectedness, in which the concept that called for world unity two millennia ago was the most appropriate. Still, it should be noted that the renewed scientific interest in the idea of cosmopolitanism may be just an attempt at ideological justification, that is, giving a theoretical basis to the process of globalization.

2.   History of Cosmopolitanism

The idea of cosmopolitanism has a long and complex history. The person who is regarded as being the world's first cosmopolitan is Diogenes of Sinope, founder of Cynic school of philosophical thought (Diogenus Laertius, 2018). Apparently, he was the first who claimed to be a cosmopolitan, although his intention was quite different from the cosmopolitans we know today – he was just venting his frustration with the laws of ancient poleis. Still, his idea has taken hold, and the Stoic philosophical school used it to create a full concept of human unity, owing to our shared ability in the use of reason, through which we recognize and respect the natural law that pervades the cosmos. The consequence of this viewpoint was that all people participated in reason and therefore should be respected equally. It is still an idea that is not easy to follow in everyday life, but it was extremely difficult to endorse it in the world which societal foundation rested on slavery. Nevertheless, this teaching had a profound influence on the emerging religion, Christianity, in which it transformed into the concept of

dignity, that is, the recognition and appreciation of the divine in every human being. In turn, this concept influenced the development of the theory of natural law, which finally had a significant impact on the shaping as well as the recognition of basic human rights in the twentieth century.

Early cosmopolitanism is usually understood as a certain moral outlook on the world, but after a long period of the "obscurity" of the theme, at the end of 18th century the idea received a new political dimension, to which the main influence was the work of German philosopher Immanuel Kant. He addressed the subject of cosmopolitanism in "Perpetual Peace", an essay on achieving a lasting peace (which were at that time quite popular in Europe), but he also addressed it in the essay "Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Purpose", as well as in certain parts of the book "Metaphysics of Morals".

Kant's intentions in writing the "Perpetual Peace" were to prevent the Hobbesian natural state of relations between states, and in this intent he used an already existing cosmopolitan ethical ideal to shape a new form of social contract at the interstate level (Kant, 1991). In order to achieve perpetual peace (to which he quips, that it hopefully will not be the peace of a graveyard) it was necessary to envisage a new type of law, which Kant calls the cosmopolitan law. Also, it is significant to note that cosmopolitan law is something more than international law – it includes the rights of states in their relations with each other (as international law does), but it also includes the rights of states and individuals in their legal relations with each other.

Another important aspect of Kant's cosmopolitanism is his understanding of hospitality. To explain it, we must go back to ''Perpetual Peace" in which he offers six preliminary articles that aspire to reduce the possibility of war but taken on their own they cannot establish a lasting peace; and three definitive articles, which in turn lead to a lasting peace. These three definitive articles propose that every country should have a republican constitution, that every country should participate in the *foedus pacificum* (the league of peace) and that cosmopolitan right based on universal hospitality must be instituted. The alliance of states that Kant proposes should be a voluntary coalition, which main purpose is securing world peace, that is, in turn, beneficial for the realization of all inherent human capabilities. For our current topic, the third definitive article of "Perpetual Peace" is most important - *"Cosmopolitan right shall be limited to the conditions of universal hospitality"*(Kant, 1991, p.105). In Kant's opinion, hospitality and cosmopolitanism are deeply interlinked.

3. Hospitality

Of course, the idea of hospitality was not Kant's invention, its practice was important for human societies much before his time. As Aristotle noted, humans are by their nature social animals, and they need to accept the others in their homes, their cities, their societies, as this is the only way we can reach the full potential as

a species. "One who is incapable of sharing, or who is in need of nothing through being self-sufficient is no part of a city, and so is either a beast or a god."(Aristotle, 2013) Furthermore, our society in which we arrive by birth did not suddenly appear fully formed, by an act of God or a twist of fate, it was product of acts of concessions between the different types of life that we, as humans, lead. From these concessions between "the farmers" and "the herders", developed a series of customs that formalized our inherent gregariousness. Of these early customs, we are most familiar with Ancient Greek *xenia*, as we have plenty of its examples in both of Homer's epics. *Xenia* was usually understood as generosity and courtesy shown to the travellers from the homeowner, but of course, this duty was reciprocal. Furthermore, to understand why *xenia* was so well respected, it should be noted that in Ancient Greece a right to hospitality was protected by Zeus, and its neglect provoked his wrath. Still, as the historian Gabriel Herman in his work "Ritualised Friendship & the Greek City" remarks, *xenia* (which he translates as "guest friendship") is a custom that was respected only in the higher classes of Hellenic society, and especially during the Homeric times (Herman, 1987). With the rise of polis as a political institution other types of connections emerged (such as between compatriots) and "guest-friendship" became viewed as something inappropriate, or even treacherous, especially in wartime. Obligations to our compatriots and states now carry more weight than to our "guest-friends".

Today, hospitality is usually understood along the line of the friendly and generous reception and entertainment of guests, visitors or strangers. It is quite correct definition, but it does not even begin to explain why the issue of hospitality has achieved such importance in our modern, globalized lives. There are at least two major reasons - the first one is that hospitality has become a global business model, as worldwide travel and tourism are highly dependent on it; and the second and even more pressing reason are migrations. Whether those migrations are economic or humanitarian, legal or illegal, they always raise the questions of accepting "the other into our home".

4.   "Unwoken" Cosmopolitanism

Our contemporary cosmopolitan theory mainly follows the path that Kant has traced. Its highest goal is the establishment of a just political arrangement of the world which would allow every individual to fully develop its inherent capabilities. As most of the modern authors agree that kind of arrangement needs to be founded on democratic principles, in modern cosmopolitanism this idea is closely related to the idea of democracy. Consequently, through their close connection and mutual influence a new scientific field was formed – cosmopolitics, which discusses the possibilities of achieving the global democracy.

However, cosmopolitics is a theoretical approach to cosmopolitanism, it is a "top-down" approach to the idea, formed and promoted through scientific inquiry and institutions of higher education, whether in philosophy, politics or history. In the world we live in, there are also cosmopolitan practices which are not theoretically informed, and yet we cannot deny them their cross-border, transgressive character. Two of the phenomena that create this type of intuitive, uninformed, "unwoken" cosmopolitanism in the 21ˢᵗ century are migrations and tourism.

Although the people traveled across the world from the beginning of time, the tourism that we know today finds its start in the Grand Tours of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in which aristocratic youth (mostly English) travelled across the Europe in a sort of "cultural pilgrimage". Its main intention was educational, as the young aristocrat visited Paris, Rome, Athens and other cultural sites before finishing his studies. He also did it with the support of a servant and under the tutelage of a personal scholar, whose presence ensured not just educational guidance, but also the acceptance of aristocratic worldview. Eventually, Industrial revolution transformed the practice of Grand Tours in a manner that it started to attract wider strata of society, and the character of Tours changed from scholarly pursuits to the more hedonistic ones.

Second important phase in the development of tourism is the work of a gentleman called Thomas Cook (who was later in his pursuits joined with his son John Cook), inventor of guided tours and founder of the first tourist agency in 1841. His work made him a pioneer of "popular tourism", making the traveling much easier for lower classes of society, first through Britain, and later through Europe and the world. Nevertheless, his concern was not only the rising British bourgeoisie, as he also provided custom built and luxurious tourist experiences for international high society, making him in some contexts almost a commercial extension of the British Empire (Jafari and Xiao, 2016). It should also be noted that tourist handbooks bearing his company's name are still popular reading throughout the world.

Finally, we are in the last phase of tourism, international mass tourism, which started after the Second World War, with the invention of paid holidays for workers. Tourism is now firmly established as an industry, and the tourists are found and welcomed everywhere, but on one predisposition – that they have money. Money is also the main differentiating factor between what are usually considered "good" and "bad" tourists.

Today, tourism is probably best described by a definition accepted by several organizations (Eurostat, OECD, WTO, and UN Statistics Division) according to which tourism includes all activities arising from travel and stay of persons outside their usual environment for no more than one year, and for which they would not receive any compensation in the place of visit (Jafari and Xiao, 2016). The tourist is of course, a visitor, a person who engages in the act of "tourism", traveling the world in the pursuit of everything else than monetary gain.

Considering migration, it is a phenomenon that is even older, and yet it shares strong similarities with tourism, as they both are dependent on human mobility. The migrants also cross the borders and encounter different communities, but their motivation is not leisure or boredom, their motivation is necessity. In a certain sense, the migrant is the exact (cosmopolitan) opposite of the tourist – they both are transitory, they do not fully belong to their current location.

Furthermore, it should be noted that in modern times the countries of immigration are the ones which decide on the status of the migrant. They make a distinction between those who are fleeing calamity, whether it is natural (earthquake, flood, drought) or manmade (war, famine, environmental disaster), and those that are "simply" wishing to have better chances in life as, "cosmo-lottery" has placed them in the less fortunate parts of the world. Nevertheless, this distinction is quite possibly not a true distinction, as the person who cannot provide for a sustenance is in similar mortal danger as the one who has bullets flying over their heads.

Of course, although this distinction is debatable, it does make a difference in the acceptance of migrants into local communities, as generally they are not accepted in the same way or the extent that the tourists are. It is certainly no secret that in the world of great economic inequality, belonging to some political communities is worth more than belonging to other. Consequently, the multitudes that find themselves stationed on the "wrong side" of the border, often in their quest for a better life abandon the documents that could link them with the countries of birth and become the stateless persons in hope that they will be provided with hospitality on the other side of the border by recognition of at least one affiliation — those to a universal community of human beings. In a that sense, migrants become the truest cosmopolitans of the 21st century, virtually belonging to no city, no country, no state, except the *kosmos*.

Conclusion

As we can see, the idea of hospitality is highly important for both of our examples of modern "unwoken" cosmopolitanism. Furthermore, we should note that connection of the hospitality with cosmopolitanism is a very old one. Although it became fully formed in the Enlightenment period, its roots can be found in the Antiquity. Why did those two concepts merge? It seems the reason behind this connection was that they both share the same qualities, they both are transgressive, as they do not conform to the boundaries of existing communities, but they go beyond the local attachments, acknowledging the human in Other.

Although both types of "unwoken" cosmopolitanism rely heavily on the concept of hospitality, there are differences in their status. And the main difference follows from a simple source – money. Tourist usually has it, migrant does not. Furthermore, both tourist and migrant cross the borders and engage the domestic population, but they do it in significantly different ways. Their cultural exchanges are of a different

order, of a different intensity. Tourist can usually expect the hospitality of domestic population. And the reason behind this is because the tourist does not deeply interact with that population, his stay is not permanent. Also, tourist in his/her exchanges usually stays at the superficial level, interacting with a façade of domestic culture, totally at the mercy of the host and what that host is willing to provide him/her. From this relationship, hospitality (although it might be sincere) develops into industry – of fulfilling the wants of the foreigners in the exchange for monetary gain.

Migrant on the other hand demands a different exchange. He/she demands a (semi)permanent residence – a shelter, food and probably work. Something that domestic population is not always too eager to provide. They are not viewed as a people in distress, but beggars, so low in the social status that they have no dignity and receive no honour. But still, it does not mean that the world is inhospitable to the migrant, and he/she will be permanently turned down at the border. The hospitality he/she receives is of a more covert kind. Every historical era had mixed communities in which immigrants and domestic residents coexisted but always had a complex relationship between them. Immigrants would not "come over" if there was no need for them, and yet their arrival needs to be made as hard as possible to "sieve" the worthiest candidates. This was valid for the Ancient Athens and Rome and their citizenship statuses for the foreigners, metics and peregrines, and this is also true in our time for EU and USA with their citizenship laws and Green card policies. It resembles a child's game, but unfortunately it is a "game" in a most terrible sense, as those formalised tacit procedures oftentimes cost migrants their lives.

Is there a way of overcoming these problems? Is there a way to decrease this "human wave"? Migrations are not unique development of our globalized times, in fact, as every historian is aware of, they are the building blocks of new civilizations. If we look for the solutions in the anthropology, are the migrations we are witnessing just repetition of the perennial conflict between the sedentary and migratory population? Is there a way to change it? New technologies do provide new solutions. Owing to the global pandemic and digital transformations of the industry, in the public discourse there is an increasing talk on "digital nomads", people who are residing in the different country than their employer. This "remote work" may be a way to redistribute the wealth across the globe more equally, but for now, this development still bears marks of another imperial exploitation – the people born in developed countries still have the advantage. They may not live in nicer places of the world, but they certainly live in parts of the world with better educational and employment opportunities, and this is still "the only game in town".

Finally, what can we gather from this comparison of different types of grassroots, "unwoken" cosmopolitanisms? Existence and experiences of migrants demand from us to consider the concept of hospitality in a different way than it is done in the connection to the tourism. It asks us to find the humanity in the Other, not material gain. Therefore, we need to reformulate the concept of hospitality according to

humanistic and not economic ideal. If that does not happen, cosmopolitanism as an idea of the unity of human race, founded on the moral equality, has no chance of succeeding.

References:

1. Aristotle (2013). *Politics*. University of Chicago Press
2. Diogenes Laertius (2018). *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Oxford University Press
3. Herman, G. (1987). *Ritualised Friendship & the Greek City*. Cambridge University Press
4. Jafari, J., Xiao, H. (eds.). (2016). *Encyclopaedia of Tourism*. Springer Reference
5. Kant, I. (1991). *Political Writings*. Cambridge University Press
6. Robertson, R. (1998). *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture*. Sage Publications