❧ Introduction ❧

CAROLINE HUMPHREY AND VERA SKVIRSKAJA

This book is about the kind of cosmopolitanism found – or not found – in cities. It arose from a perception that many great cities, from Bukhara in Central Asia to Venice in Europe, once famous for being cosmopolitan places, are no longer so in the twenty-first century, or at least not in the same way as before. Discussing this, we arrived at the tentative notion of the 'post-cosmopolitan' city that is explored in this volume. Our book first of all draws attention to the fact that the inhabitants of many contemporary cities, diverse as they are, share at least one thing: a sense that something precious has been lost, or sidelined, and that other less generous relations have taken their place. We do not carry out a sustained investigation of the worldwide causes of recent transformations in great cities in general, which would involve an inevitably complex analysis of different concatenations of political and economic forces such as new forms of capitalism, globalisation, the emergence of nation states from former federations, migration, changes in work patterns, and so forth, and has been the subject of a large literature. Rather, we concentrate on particular cities with a history of vibrant combination of many cultures; we describe the way in which cosmopolitanism was practised and sustained in them, the hostility it nevertheless often had to contend with, and the fragility of cosmopolitanism in recent years. The main part of the book then focuses on an anthropological study of the new kinds of relations that are being formed today in more nationalistic contexts. We hope thus to draw attention to an important trend in present-day urban life in many parts of the world, but also to illuminate precisely what the changes are in the quality of relations in these places.

To begin we explain what we mean by the cosmopolitan city. In contrast to some sociological approaches that equate cosmopolitanism with globalisation in the form of cultural commodities, languages, (im)migrants, diaspora networks and dual citizenships, etc. (e.g. Beck 2002, 2008), we avoid such a straightforward conflation. Historically, the presence of social multiplicity in a given place, although a necessary precondition, does not by itself imply or lead to cosmopolitanism. We agree with Vertovec and Cohen that there are many varieties of cosmopolitanism, or, as they put it, several

'windows' through which relations between 'us' and the 'other' are articulated in urban settings (2002: 2). Nevertheless, the term must always imply a capacity for openness, an appreciation of others and an ability to stand outside the givens of one's own community. The research undertaken for this book suggests that this does not simply arise from particular cultural dispositions or the pragmatic requirements of trade regimes (for example), but crucially can also be encouraged, imposed and enforced by particular political practices and ideologies.[1] All the cities that are discussed in this volume share the situation of having been incorporated into political regimes (imperial, colonial, socialist, authoritarian) that in one way or another imposed their own kind of cosmopolitanism.

Cities offer a privileged vantage point from which to investigate people's coexistence with difference – they are places for face-to-face contact of great diversity and intensity that produce friction and conflict as well as accommodation. Imperial expansions, conquests, movement of populations and long-distance trade shaped cities in Europe and Asia as meeting points of different cultures, religions and tongues. Empires, such as the Russian, Ottoman, British, and Hapsburg, and subsequent multinational regimes (notably the USSR), facilitated the emergence of cosmopolitanism not only by re-locating populations to cities and designing divisions of labour there for imperial purposes, but also by providing ideas of unity along with laws and protected spaces regulating inter-communal coexistence. Historically, we observe that the enforced character of such urban coexistence, setting down and regulating lives cheek-by-jowl with others, was not a barrier to benign inter-relations, although such an observation goes against the classical Kantian version of cosmopolitanism, according to which the 'cosmopolite' is a citizen of the world by virtue of transcending state structures (Kant 1991). Even if citizens did not buy into imperial unifying ideologies, they often created everyday cosmopolitanisms *faute de mieux*, which have to be accounted for by different theories. It is telling that with the end of empires and authoritarian regimes, when people were free to leave these cities – which they did in great numbers, notably in the 1990s – they jettisoned the previous unheralded cosmopolitan relations often without much thought, only to look back on them years later with nostalgia. For in the nation-states that succeeded the 'empires', or to which these people emigrated, be they post-colonial, Western or post-socialist, narratives emphasising the city's experience as a crossroads of cultures, peoples and religions are not a matter of prime concern. Both policies and 'memories' of the past are construed first and foremost around nations. The old, practical rationales ('we just had to get along with them') have less and less purchase as cities are bleached of their former diversity. Indeed, as the places of the emigrating 'minorities' were often taken up by mass in-movement of rural

people from the national 'majority', earlier cosmopolitan links to a great extent evaporated or were swamped by a central indifference, or even hostility, to people seen as others.

That said, the broad picture thus outlined, of cosmopolitan cities in multinational states succeeded by largely mono-ethnic cities in nation-states, is a radical oversimplification. The nation-state rhetoric may claim hegemony in countries like Ukraine or Greece (see chapters 2, 3 and 7), but in our era of ever-greater interconnectedness the cosmopolitan pasts of 'world cities' and smaller towns have been brought back to fantasy life and enhanced as contemporary cultural commodities. They appear in the local literary market for nostalgia, in tourist hype and travel writings, often trying to give an impression of urban continuity and working in contradistinction both to national mythologies and to the complex, harsh (often not cosmopolitan) reality of history and present-day life in the city. This singling out and objectification of 'our traditional cosmopolitanism' as a thing of value finds its place among the complex processes of globalisation that affect the mid-size cities studied here.

Transnational activities and 'global assemblages' such as international banking, microchip technology, trade and its regulation, cultural borrowing, science, international standards of tourism, or accountancy regimes are spreading to previously separated regions (Ong and Collier 2005), and it is not just world cities like London, New York or Tokyo that can claim the status of global city (Mayaram 2009: 6–7). Perhaps the 'cosmopolitanism' upheld today as a common and desirable urban brand is an epiphenomenon of the desire to participate in global practices that are often seen as inevitable and necessary. Thus even if nation-states and cities attempt to put the brakes on globalising processes such as migration and informal trade (Appadurai 1990; Humphrey and Skvirskaja 2009), it is widely argued that the city's position as a bounded territory within a nation-state has become blurred (Donald et al. 2008). Instead, the city is increasingly seen as a hub or a node in global networks and processes that effectively remove it from its national context and undermine its national loyalties. Nowadays we often read that urban solidarities and engagement with outsiders and global actors tend to supersede national allegiance (see, for example, Appadurai 2003; Sassen 1999, 2000), and that the homogeneity and idea of exclusive oppositions endorsed by national ideologies are destabilised by the internal diversity of de-territorialised places and by the 'place-polygamy' of their inhabitants (Beck 2002: 19–27).

Our studies, however, only partially bear out these generalisations. The point can be made by comparing the material in the chapters to follow with the observations made by Richard Sennett (2008), who argues that, with changes to capitalism, urbanists' understanding of cosmopolitanism has

changed radically from the early twentieth century to the present. In the past, migrants to a city such as Berlin, as studied by Simmel in 1908, were seen as unknown and strange; these people had a provoking quality, a 'force of alterity', and thus cosmopolitanism for urbanists of the time was about the notion of being engaged by the puzzling attraction of the unknown. The tension here was with the ever-greater solidity and rigidification of capitalist enterprise. Sennett argues that this dialectic between alterity and rigidity is unravelling itself in the present-day city. Globalisation in terms of labour and capital flows is insufficient to account for the radical change in capitalism itself and its new subjectivities: because of risk taking in which one does not know the outcomes, and groups of workers happy to take on short-term single tasks, previously rigid structures have been replaced by a new flexibility. In this situation, the presidents of the top corporations in New York, for example, have little civic or political engagement with the city and the groups of specialist employees have scant interest in temporary co-workers or neighbourhoods. The dialectic has become one of flexibility and indifference (2008: 42–47). In the cities we studied, however, the kind of high-end globalised capitalism described by Sennett is merely a thin upper layer, in some places vanishingly small, and in any case the revolution in consciousness does not seem to have taken place. Many people who are forced to be flexible, such as Ukrainian merchant seamen who have to work on contracts for international companies, nevertheless have a life ashore 'at home' in Odessa, while highly mobile Afghan businessmen who have experience of serial migration are still constrained by the decision-making power of their family patriarch in Afghanistan (see chapter 3). As others have pointed out, globalisation can be anchored in places, encouraging the fusion of cultural forms, hence 'glocalisation' (Robertson 1995). 'Rooted cosmopolitanism' (Appiah 1998), in which self-declared cosmopolitans state their allegiance and sense of belonging to their home(s), is not compatible with Sennett's idea of flexible workers nor with Zygmunt Bauman's uncommitted subjects of 'liquid modernity' – an incompatibility that reflects real differences in the world.

In Sennett's diagnosis, cosmopolitanism drops away when the 'churning instability of capitalism produces a standardized environment' and non-interaction becomes a guarantor of public order (2008: 47). He is right that there has to be some intensity to local social interaction for cosmopolitanism to be possible. But what ideas can be brought to bear when we are faced with another, more complex reality than Sennett's futuristic vision, when the 'indifference' or (mere) 'tolerance' that is indeed prevalent in many post-cosmopolitan cities cannot be seen as an epiphenomenon of hyper-modern flexibility? It may indeed be difficult to discern cosmopolitan interactions in these cases, but interestingly perhaps they can be traced

– morphed into different forms than before, located in unexpected parts of the city, or etiolated into vulnerable skeins, as the chapters by Skvirskaja and Marsden show. At this point let us think again about how cosmopolitanism actually works in cities.

Derrida (2001) conceived of the cosmopolitan city as a place of hospitality where a non-indifference to the 'other', a positive welcome rather than mere tolerance, operates as a norm of sociality. But the ethics of actual hospitality, as Derrida continues, does not presuppose that the cosmopolitan city is a melting pot where difference/foreignness poses no limitations on inter-cultural interactions. A boundless universal hospitality, an empathetic identification with humanity as a whole (see also Nussbaum 1996), must always be incompatible with the limits embedded in human institutions (e.g. the law, the state) in which any given example of cosmopolitanism is always embedded. Historians and sociologists have shown that, as an actually existing phenomenon, cosmopolitanism is conditioned by various political, social and cultural limitations (Pollock et al. 2000, Cheah and Robbins 1998).

For example, in his discussion of a provincial multiethnic town in Galicia, the historian Redlich describes the specific dynamics of cohabitation among different ethnic communities (Jews, Poles and Ukrainians) as living 'together and apart at the same time' (2002: 164). Although each group tended to keep to itself, during the periods of relative stability (in this case in the early twentieth century and again in the interwar period) there were also joint celebrations of distinctly ethnic events, sharing of public spaces and common participation in urban institutions. Proficiency in other groups' languages was also taken for granted. Many elements of this urban 'togetherness' – the cosmopolitan modality of living in one place – were annihilated by interethnic hostility and/or indifference during the periods when the town experienced the disintegration of previous political frameworks. Others elements, like the practical skill of speaking many tongues, gradually became obsolete when the old ethnic communities were either exterminated during, or moved away after, the Second World War.

It is the delicate balance of 'living together and apart' that this book seeks to elucidate. Once the balance is destroyed, the cosmopolitan relations within a city can cease to exist, giving way not merely to the ethics of 'tolerance'/indifference but sometimes to rabid xenophobia and violence. Appadurai (2000) has called such a process 'decosmopolitanisation' in his study of the global city Bombay. In this 'cosmopolis of commerce', the growing contradiction posed by global wealth and local poverty, together with the national encouragement of religious exclusivity in urban spaces, resulted in violent riots in the early 1990s. The city's diversity, its status as a centre of trade, finance and tourism remained in place, but the riots marked the

end of a cosmopolitan city, Bombay, and the emergence of a more intolerant, xenophobic city, Mumbai, in its place. Caroline Humphrey's study of a comparable port city, Odessa, in this volume also charts the descent of a cosmopolitan environment into violence. But taking a longer historical view than Appadurai, she is also able to show how violence may recur repeatedly in the same city, to describe its social character in crowds, and to investigate how surges of hostility broke into the periods and spaces created by a number of different kinds of cosmopolitan moralities present during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is because this chapter attempts to theorise the co-presence of cosmopolitanism and its opposite, ethnic violence, in the same city over time that we have given it extra space in this volume.

Whereas 'decosmopolitanisation' in Appadurai's analysis refers to the process whereby nationalism brings about the complete disintegration of the urban social fabric into mutually hostile groups, the idea of the post-cosmopolitan city that we advance here implies a certain incompleteness embedded even in radical shifts and designates a wider range of processes and experiences that challenge the concept of multiethnic 'togetherness'. It allows us to reach beyond habitual analytical oppositions between cosmopolitanism and nationalism that run the risk of oversimplifying the complex ways in which urban reality is construed in everyday life and intertwined with ideologies. It indicates that, as with any 'post' phenomenon, including those marked by critical ruptures in social and political structures (e.g. post-socialism or post-colonialism), some cosmopolitan sensibilities, dispositions and affiliations can linger on. In other words, we take into account both the legacy of past cosmopolitanisms and the manifestations of ethnic tensions and nationalisms; cosmopolitanism can survive in 'the post' although it may take new forms, come to occupy different social spaces, be pushed to the margins and be overshadowed by indifferent tolerance. We argue that these new forms have a special quality of relating to the past in cities like those studied here, which everyone acknowledges to have been historically cosmopolitan in character. Hence these forms differ from the ad hoc 'multiculturalism' encouraged in many western countries after mass immigration, and it is also poorly described by the 'new cosmopolitanism' (Hollinger 2008: 230–33), a generalising attempt to reconcile the primal need for belonging with a blanket engagement with human diversity. In the post-cosmopolitan city earlier links and boundaries are not forgotten; cosmopolitanism can shrink and attenuate, it can also mutate and transform into nostalgia for a city that is no more.

Coexisting and successive dynamics in the life of cities

The practice of non-interaction marked, among other things, by low levels of violence, poses a problem for cosmopolitanism (Sennett 2008), for while it safeguards peaceful cohabitation, it also inhibits a wide range of engagements and attachments. In discussions of urban coexistence, however, it is not the mutual turning of backs but intercommunal and interconfessional violence that has commonly been seen as the antithesis of cosmopolitanism par excellence. Many accounts focus on 'crowd mentalities', while psychoanalytical approaches have been widely used to explain conflicting underlying human dispositions, such as an inclination towards racist violence, people's difficulty in living with diversity – be it diversity of ideas or peoples (see, for example, Kristeva 1991) – or the need for inclusivity, even when it entails great personal risk.[2] Contributors to this volume have not engaged with such psychological arguments; instead they have focused on how diverse processes in the city – migration, national and religious revivals, globalised tourism, the dispositions of marginalised minorities and rural incomers – impact on urban sociality and aesthetics.

The volume opens with a chapter by Humphrey that, while acknowledging the antithetical character of generous interactions with others (cosmopolitanism) and violence against them, notes that both phenomena are urban assemblages whose recruitment, social content and dynamics can be studied together, and which have variously advanced and retreated in relation to one another over time in the same city. While these theoretical concerns establish a broader analytical background for other discussions in this volume, Humphrey's case study deals with the city of Odessa during the last few decades of the Russian Empire. At the time, the city was famed for its vibrant diversity, multinational mercantile elite, lively café society and cosmopolitan milieux. Yet, it was also a site of recurrent pogroms throughout its imperial history and 1905 saw the most violent attack against Jews in the whole of Russia. Drawing on Tarde's idea of imitation-cum-repetition and his analysis of 'crowds' and 'publics', as well as Deleuze's discussion of 'molecular multiplicities', Humphrey shows how both pogrom mobs and cosmopolitan networks (e.g. Freemasons, socialist revolutionary movements, trading networks) were dynamic, temporary assemblages that moved across social boundaries. The two were to some extent reactions to one another and kept reappearing at different historical junctures.

This historical example of repetitive violence and amicable sociality across ethnic, religious and class divisions, which were sometimes co-present and sometimes mutually displacing, suggests that pogroms and cosmopolitanism should be understood as temporary patterns of relations. In retrospect, Humphrey argues, it is possible to see Odessa as a 'post-

cosmopolitan' city after its very first pogrom in the early nineteenth century – and it was repeatedly so, as various cosmopolitan networks were successively shattered by pogroms over the decades. But if pogroms were repetitive, recursive and stasis inducing, the cosmopolitan networks that formed again and again were different. They moved with the times, linked to new trading opportunities, fashions, changing moral sensibilities, or the effect(s) that swept through the city via music and cinema in the period before the Russian revolution. This perspective, which draws attention to the place- and time-specific character of urban assemblages, is relevant also to the new kinds of cosmopolitan sensibilities and attachments that have emerged (and vanished) since then, during the Soviet period and after. The sharpest blow occurred during the late 1940s when Stalin's 'anti-cosmopolitan' campaign directly assaulted the day-to-day multiethnic life in work places and institutions (Humphrey 2004). Although Odessa today is a world away from pogroms or public attacks on cosmopolitanism, many people there have nevertheless found new ways of privatising their living spaces or of withdrawing from engagements with those who are seen as 'foreign' in some unaccustomed way (see chapter 4 and 6 for similar phenomena in Tbilisi and Venice).

The history of Thessalonica (Salonika) is, interestingly, comparable with that of Odessa, for both were port cities with large Jewish populations and were distinctive enclaves within huge and sprawling empires. Hatziprokopiou, in his chapter on Thessalonica, traces temporary and shifting patterns of urban relations from the late nineteenth century until the present. He explores a series of contradictions and dynamics related to the city's cosmopolitan history and those that have structured urban diversity more recently. During the late Ottoman rule, which was associated with the flourishing of commerce and cosmopolitanism in Mediterranean port cities, relations with difference were nonetheless regulated by socio-spatial segregation based on religious affiliation; meanwhile, the formally recognised religious 'communities' (Muslim, Christian and Jews) were heterogeneous groups in terms of mother tongues, origins, occupations and class. The Ottoman style cosmopolitanism was first challenged, albeit unsuccessfully, by the class-based solidarity propagated by the early labour movement, and was later ousted by competing nationalisms in the city and beyond.

A succession of dramatic events (the great fire of 1917, the exchange of populations and emigration of Muslim inhabitants, the Second World War and the annihilation of the city's Jews in camps) delivered devastating blows to the remnants of Thessalonica's cosmopolitanism. Its memory has been evoked only recently to deal with the increasing flows of foreign migrants to the city and to endorse calls for European 'multiculturalism' currently in vogue. These evocations of 'traditional' cosmopolitanism have not, however,

made the nationalist, Hellenic agenda in the city less dominant politically. The point is that these uneasy 'partners' are themselves in contradiction with processes of homogenising urban development and competition in a globalising economy. It is precisely these active aspirations and rhetoric, Hatziprokopiou suggests, that have turned Thessalonica into a post-cosmopolitan city, a city once more acutely aware of its heterogeneity, past and present, and still somehow 'stuck' in parochial nationalism.

Yet, in the post-cosmopolitan city, cosmopolitanism does not have to be reduced only to the awareness and reconstructions (e.g. in media, literature, art and architecture) of the past or to the political intentions of some limited social circles. In her chapter, Skvirskaja looks at the ways in which cosmopolitanism is sustained at the margins of mainstream, Slav, post-Soviet Odessa. Here, as in present-day Thessalonica, a city divested of its former diversity (both that of the Tsarist era described by Humphrey and the Soviet implantations of workers from all over the USSR) indulges in public and nostalgic commemorations of its 'unique' cosmopolitan outlook, including the mixed Odessan language and vibrant street life. Focusing on recent, mainly post-Soviet, Afghan immigrants and local old-timers, Ukrainian Gypsies, as representing different modalities of exclusion from the city's wider circles of sociality, she investigates what kinds of coexistence strategies proliferate among these minority groups.

Negative racial stereotypes of the Gypsies inherited from the Soviet epoch have merged in the contemporary city with negative attitudes towards 'dark-skinned', and especially Muslim, newcomers. Although these xenophobic impulses are, more often than not, kept in check by public and official appeals to Odessa's historical tolerance, they play an important role in the minorities' view of themselves in the city. While wider society can resort to frigid tolerance as a mode of engagement with difference and can 'afford' to be simply ignorant about the ways of its different members, groups on the social margins do not have such a choice. Instead, Afghan and Gypsy communities practice what Skvirskaja calls 'endogamous' and 'selective' kinds of cosmopolitanism, both of which constitute a stock of integral and highly valued cultural skills. In this way, the minorities' cultural skills contribute to Odessa's post-cosmopolitan repertoire of practices.

In many post-Soviet cities there is a widespread nostalgic identification of the socialist era with a certain rough and ready ethnic equality, companionship in hardship, and the sociability of illicit practices, and the demise of all this – conducive to an everyday cosmopolitanism, along with the officially sanctioned Soviet internationalism – tends to be regretted today. But in his chapter on Warsaw Murawski picks up a different chronology of cosmopolitan imagination. He argues in chapter 5 that the cosmopolitan era is identified with the pre-war Polish national state, with its free inter-re-

lations with France and Western Europe. Meanwhile the Soviet-dominated period is seen as oppressively homogenising, to be resisted and then gladly jettisoned and replaced by a 'renewed', and yet in fact more global, cosmopolitanism today. Two points can be drawn from this case: first, that what counts as 'cosmopolitan' varies in different loci with distinctive perspectives on what otherwise might seem like a shared socialist history. Secondly, as the chapter is largely concerned with architecture and architects, we see the relevance of the idea of the 'assemblage' (Humphrey, in this volume; Ong and Collier 2005) as a network of techniques, abilities and values that exists within a city but cannot possibly comprise all of it. Murawski documents how '(Polish) cosmopolitan' architectural styles, i.e. those inspired by pre-War international modernism, were used to contest the officially approved, heavy pseudo-Baroque of Stalinist architecture (which, if one put on a different pair of glasses, could itself be seen as 'cosmopolitan' within a certain Soviet paradigm). As the chapter then shows in its discussion of the recent buildings by international design stars, globalisation is not accepted with open arms, and architecture continues to be a battleground associated with cherished visions of what it means to be both Polish and cosmopolitan.

Migration and minorities

This raises a more general question about the place of minorities and migration in the configuration of the post-cosmopolitan city. Our initial inspiration for this study arose from our earlier ethnographic research on coexistence in the post-Soviet cities of Bukhara and Odessa. Today these cities have very different cultural and economic profiles and are located within different political regimes. But they also have many things in common: both were important commercial centres in the pre-Soviet period; and different ethnic-religious communities comprised the building blocks of the urban economy. At present, both have inherited the (vanishing) legacy of Soviet internationalism and are situated in new nation-states that promote cultural homogenisation, both have experienced mass emigration of the city's core ethnic groups (Jews, Russians and Tatars in Bukhara; Jews, Germans, Greeks in Odessa) to their 'countries of origin' or the USA.

At the same time, both cities have experienced significant inflows of migrants from the surrounding impoverished countryside, together with a trickle from abroad. Even though the cities can boast the presence of a diverse population (and statistics are often used to claim that a multiethnic plural society is an ongoing key feature of the city in question), the new diversity constitutes only a thin layer around a largely homogenous majority. The complex interplay of ideological and demographic changes (especially

top-down nationalism, new religious loyalties and continuing out-migration) could not but modify the dynamics of urban relations and sharpen perceptions of difference. Some long-standing urbanites have developed 'diasporic' sensibilities at home, suddenly perceiving themselves as a 'minority' surrounded by a homogenous mass of new urban dwellers. According to this vision, it is the authentic city, its language and modus operandi that have been 'moved' abroad (Skvirskaja 2010). Newcomers from the rural hinterlands are seen as alien to the urban habitus with its open, cosmopolitan spirit (Skvirskaja and Humphrey 2007), and neither newcomers nor native urbanites have

Figure 0.1. 'Hey! We know all these faces'. Poster of an exhibition illustrating an idealised image of cosmopolitan Odessa. Odessa 2006. Photo by Vera Skvirskaja.

been enthusiastic about the flows of foreign traders, transnational migrants and refugees.[3] These processes of immigration and emigration are not, of course, independent of the ideological changes in the new nation-states and beyond, and taken together they undermine the old cosmopolitan ways.

Several contributors to this volume focus specifically on the social effects of international and internal migration in post-Soviet cities. Sapritsky (chapter 2) discusses the largely simultaneous processes of mass Jewish emigration from Odessa and the entry of Jewish international organisations and emissaries whose efforts and economic means are aimed at helping the remaining Jewish inhabitants as well as the growing trend of return migration. The story of Odessa's distinctiveness owes a great deal to its Jewry, and, especially during the Soviet period, being Jewish in Odessa was nothing like being 'the Other' – the alien face of modernity (see Chaudhuri 2009). Jewish visibility – in language, faces, jokes, etc. – was integral to the character of the city. Sapritsky analyses how this 'ordinariness' has been undermined by the new religious and political formations created by various connections to overseas diasporas. Old local models of Jewish identification, informed by the cosmopolitan orientation and idealised internationalist practices of the Soviet regime, have been confronted with foreign models of Jewishness. Although many remaining Odessan Jews perceive the foreign models as isolating and narrowing, these more exclusive forms of Jewishness have taken root in the city. The paradox of the situation is that although the majority of Odessan Jews left the city, the small present-day Jewish community appears to be far more visible and distinct than its Soviet counterpart, and this very visibility and distinction tends to contribute to new forms of social exclusion.

Chapters by Marsden and Frederiksen that deal respectively with Dushanbe, the capital of Tajikistan, and Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia, focus on the ways in which conflicts, negotiations and transformations in the urban forms of diversity are not only processes that take place between social groups, but also within individual selves. In Dushanbe, people talk about the ongoing effects of Tajikistan's civil war on their society, something that shapes the multivalent and complex strategies through which they seek to negotiate city life. In the 1990s many Russians and others fled Tajikistan fearing employment discrimination on political, linguistic and religious grounds. The situation, however, was more complex that this implies, and different takes on what it meant to be a Muslim became important markers of internal diversity. Marsden explores the perspectives of rural-urban migrants who might easily be assumed to be the key agents behind the degeneration of the previously more open and versatile kinds of urban subjectivities. He argues that 'rural migrants' have diverse origins and orientations: while some reflect critically on state-derived discourses of national culture and hardened forms of identity, others endorse them.

Tbilisi is yet another city that is represented officially as traditionally cosmopolitan. Yet the city's historical situation as a trading route between Europe and the Central Asia inflected inter-ethnic relations in different ways at different times. Today, what might look from the outside like cosmopolitan influences – Chinese traders, international NGOs, oil consultants – are often viewed as unwelcome intrusions. Frederiksen contrasts these contestations with the image of pre-Soviet Tbilisi as the thriving 'gate' between East and West. And the new hostility to incomers also contrasts with the sentiments of belonging to the supra-national geopolitical realm of the Soviet period. While the authorities highlight the old cosmopolitan atmosphere in Tbilisi, urban dwellers are more inclined to recall the Soviet heritage and they therefore tend to accept various peoples from the former USSR (as distinct from 'foreigners') as the natural parts of the city. Frederiksen suggests that in a city that has lost much of its ethnic diversity, all that remains is at best a type of 'encapsulated' cosmopolitanism – i.e. pertaining in this case only to post-Soviet compatriots. The long-standing inhabitants of Tbilisi seem to privilege links with Russians in particular, despite the ongoing military clashes and ideological wars with Russia.

Rapid changes in urban population due to the mass emigration of native minority residents are a common feature of many post-Soviet cities, but similar processes also take place elsewhere. Kostylo, in chapter 6, discusses the case of Venice, which has been experiencing an exodus of the native population in the last few decades. Just like 'native' Odessans, the Venetians were never an autochthonous population but emerged as an urban population with a strong identity and its own dialect as a result of cultural mixing. Motivated by economic considerations native Venetians have recently moved en masse to the mainland. Kostylo argues that mass tourism and flows of transnational capital – the key sources of the city's prosperity – are at the same time what have brought about the demise of Venetian culture and its cosmopolitan orientation. From the point of view of the remaining Venetians, foreigners are taking over the city: they are taking over local trade and they are the ones who can afford to live in the city. The cosmopolitan façade of the city, famous not only for its splendid architecture but also for high profile international events such as the contemporary arts Biennale and film festivals, barely disguises the polarisation of a city split between a small inward-looking community of Venetians, tourists and wealthy transnational elites. Kostylo describes how the ghetto that had been in itself a quasi-cosmopolitan enclave, as it was inhabited by Jews from different places with diverse traditions, is today transformed into a tourist attraction. With distant echoes of the situation in Odessa, the ghetto is now run by foreign orthodox Jews.

Conclusion

Of all the cities studied in this volume, Odessa is the only one that resembled for a brief period Derrida's cosmopolitan ideal. Built on the site of a fort abandoned by the Ottomans, it was founded as the hospitable City of Refuge that welcomed all incomers – runaway serfs, Greek and Italian merchants, German homesteaders, French aristocrats, religious dissidents and diverse refugees of revolutionary bent. The openness and harmony that prevailed under the first governorships could not, and did not, last. This book shows how in other Eurasian cities too, cosmopolitan formations were sustained for a period, only to shrivel up or collapse altogether at times when they were shouldered aside by other, harsh and exclusivist social forces or abandoned by the people who had kept them alive. The present time seems to be such an epoch. The 1990s–2000s have seen mass movements of people abandoning cosmopolitan cities in search for national identities and economic advancement, or running away from their old homes in fear – a dread or premonition, not unrelated to historical experience – that these places would no longer be cosmopolitan and they would be the ones to suffer. The cascading effect of out-migration has left huge gaps in cities from Venice to Dushanbe, for although the apartments were rapidly filled it was not by the same kind of people. Villagers, tourists, new hoteliers and businesspeople, NGO representatives, traders from all corners of the world may not be quite like the Sennett/Bauman 'flexible capitalist subjects', but all the same none of them know or care about the niceties of the former cosmopolitan interactions. Just as a mere settler in London does not make a Londoner, let alone a Cockney, similarly an inhabitant of Odessa does not make an Odessit. Yet this sense that cities have their native denizens, and that their way of life encodes a relaxed openness that should be treasured, has not vanished; and at the same time at least some of the old timers and newcomers are creating their own – even if 'selective', 'encapsulated' or 'endogamous' – types of cosmopolitanism. This book aims to describe the kinds of diverse assemblages that have arisen in post-cosmopolitan cities and that are symptomatic of the state of the city at a particular historical juncture.

Notes

1. See for example Isin's (2009) discussion on the Ottoman Empire and Humphrey (2004) on the Soviet case. That is not to say that ideology and political will alone can secure a cosmopolitan society; see also Lefebvre (1996) for an analysis of this situation.

2.   For a concise outline of this argument and an elaboration on 'visceral cosmopolitanism' see Nava (2007).
3.   Humphrey, Marsden and Skvirskaja (2009) and Skvirskaja (2010).

References

Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. 'Disjuncture and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy', in M. Featherstone (ed.), *Global Culture*. London, pp. 295–310.

———. 2000. 'Spectral Housing and Urban Cleansing: Notes on Millennial Mumbai', *Public Culture* 12(3): 627–51.

———. 2003. 'Sovereignty without Territoriality: Notes for a Postnational Geography', in S.M. Low and D. Lawrence-Zuniga (eds), *The Anthropology of Place and Space*. Oxford, pp. 337–50.

Appiah, Kwame A. 1998. 'Cosmopolitan Patriots', in P, Cheah and B. Robbins (eds), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis and London, pp. 91–114.

Beck, U. 2002. 'The Cosmopolitan Society and Its Enemies', *Theory, Culture and Society* 19(1–2): 17–44.

———. 2008. 'The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology in the Second Age of Modernity', in S. Vertovec and R. Cohen (eds), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context, and Practice*. Oxford, pp. 61–85.

Chaudhuri, A. 2009. 'Cosmopolitanism's Alien Face', *New Left Review* 55, Jan/Feb: 89–108.

Cheah, Pheng and Bruce Robbins (eds). 1998. *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis and London.

Derrida, J. 2001. *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. New York and London.

Donald, Stephanie, Eleonore Kofman and Catherine Kevin. 2008. 'Introduction: Processes of Cosmopolitanism and Parochialism', in S. Donald, E. Kofman and C. Kevin (eds), *Branding Cities: Cosmopolitanism, Parochialism, and Social Change*. New York and London, pp. 1–13.

Hollinger, David A. 2008. 'Not Universalists, not Pluralists: the New Cosmopolitans find their own way', in S. Vertovec and R. Cohen (eds), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context, and Practice*. Oxford, pp. 227–35.

Humphrey, C. 2004. 'Cosmopolitanism and *Kosmopolitizm* in the Political Life of Soviet Citizens', *Focaal: European Journal of Anthropology* 44: 138–54.

Humphrey, C., Magnus Marsden and Vera Skvirskaja. 2009. 'Cosmopolitanism and the City: Interaction and co-existence in Bukhara, Uzbekistan', in Sh. Mayaram (ed.), *The Other Global City*. New York and London, pp. 202–32.

Humphrey, C. and V. Skvirskaja. 2009. 'Trading Places: Post-Socialist Container Markets and the City', *Focaal* 55: 61–73.

Isin, Engin F. 2009. 'Beneficence and Difference Ottoman *Awqaf* and "Other" Subjects', in Sh. Mayaram (ed.), *The Other Global City*. New York and London, pp. 35–53.

Kant, Immanuel. 1991. 'Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch', in H. Reiss (ed.), *Kant: Political Writings*. Cambridge, pp. 93–130.

Kristeva, J. 1991. *Strangers to Ourselves*, trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York.

Lefebvre, H. 1996. *Writings on Cities*, selected, translated and introduced by Eleonore Kofman and Elizabeth Lebas. Oxford.

Mayaram, Shail. 2009. 'Introduction: Rereading Global Cities: Topographies of an Alternative Cosmopolitanism in Asia', in Sh. Mayaram (ed.), *The Other Global City*. New York and London, pp. 1–34.

Nava, M. 2007. *Visceral Cosmopolitanism. Gender, Culture and the Normalisation of Difference*. Oxford.

Nussbaum, M.C. 1996. *For Love of Country*, ed. J. Cohen. Boston.

Ong, Aihwa and Stephen J. Collier (eds). 2005. *Global Assemblages: Technology, Politics and Ethics as Anthropological Problems*. New York and London.

Pollock, Sh., H. Bhabha, C. Breckenridge and D. Chakrabarty. 2000. 'Cosmopolitanisms', *Public Culture* 12(3): 577–89.

Redlich, Sh. 2002. *Together and Apart in Brzezany. Poles, Jews, and Ukrainians, 1919-1945*. Bloomington and Indianapolis.

Robertson, Roland. 1995. 'Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity', in M. Featherstone, S. Lash and R. Robertson (eds), *Global Maternities*. London, pp. 25–44.

Sassen, Sakia. 1999. 'Globalisation and the Formation of Claims', in J. Copjec and M. Sorkin (eds), *Giving Grounds. The Politics of Propinquity*. London and New York, pp. 86–105.

———. 2000. 'New Frontiers Facing Urban Sociology at the Millennium', *British Journal of Sociology* 51(1): 143–60.

Sennett, Richard. 2008. 'Cosmopolitanism and the Social Experience of Cities', in S. Vertovec and R. Cohen (eds), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context, and Practice*. Oxford, pp. 42–47.

Skvirskaja, V. 2010. 'New Diaspora in a Post-Soviet City: Transformation in Experiences of Belonging in Odessa, Ukraine', *Studies of Ethnicity and Nationalism* 10(1): 76–91.

Skvirskaja, V. and C. Humphrey. 2007. 'Odessa: skol'zskii gorod i uskol'zaiushchii kosmopolitizm', *Acta Eurasica* 1(35): 87–116.

Vertovec, S. and R. Cohen. 2002. 'Introduction', in *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context, and Practice*. Oxford, pp. 1–24.