Introduction: Understanding Digital Cosmopolitanism in Terms of Materiality and Postmigration

Fergal Lenehan and Roman Lietz

Cosmopolitanism is a varied and flexible concept and has the potential to help scholars, we argue, in new and interesting ways. This relates especially to the conception of the relationship between human beings, their cultural contexts, and the wider communicative world. The potential innovation from the use of the cosmopolitanism term may be seen in a number of aspects; in relation to the theoretical re-thinking of the internet as a global and connecting technology, in terms of analyzing those who use the internet and how this usage may result in personal and cultural change, while the cosmopolitanism discourse also helps scholars when theorizing about the online spaces of encounter and the myriad of digital connections contained in, and possible with, digital technologies. But Digital Cosmopolitanism is really best viewed and theorized, we also argue, when viewed additionally in terms of materiality and ubiquitous mobility and migration. Materiality is understood here as represented by the postdigital debate regarding the materiality-digitality dichotomy which has lately fed into discussions regarding platformization, and ubiquitous mobility and migration, as represented especially by the concept of postmigration and newer interdisciplinary approaches, such as Digital Migration Studies and Digital Diaspora.

Cosmopolitanism and the Growth of Adjectival Cosmopolitanisms

Cosmopolitanism is a long-established set of discourses with roots in ancient Greece, generally linked to Diogenes and the Cynic movement (Nussbaum, 2019: 2). The term cosmopolitanism comes from κόσμος (*kosmos)* i.e. "world" or "universe" and πολίτης (*polites)* meaning "citizen". Thus, early forms of cosmopolitanism may be seen as a conscious rejection of available identity scripts in favour of being a "citizen of the world". During the enlightenment in Europe in the 18th century, cosmopolitanism re-appeared and was conceptualized by a number of philosophers, most notably Immanuel Kant (Nussbaum, 2019: 2). Enlightenment forms of cosmopolitanism have often been criticized as actually harbouring a type of dom-

ineering European, or Western, universalism (Delanty 2009: 18). Newer studies, however, have unearthed what Go (2013: 208) has termed "an array of non-Western cosmopolitanisms."

Cosmopolitanism discourses have remained varied and diverse. According to Holten (2009: 3), the study of cosmopolitanism threatens to "become overburdened with so many disparate elements and implications" that it at times comes close to "incoherent chaos". Yet, at the centre of this – potential – intellectual chaos there remains a consistent conceptualization of a cultural opening to the wider world which may be seen as a thread running through all cosmopolitanism discourses. This sense of cultural opening is, of course, conceptualized very differently in an array of contexts. Cosmopolitanism has also been theorized in ideological terms as a "direct counterpart to racism and ethnic nationalism" (Ritter, 2023: 5); although others have also suggested the existence of an actually racist (alter-)cosmopolitanism, with a decidedly darker and exclusivist cultural opening at its centre (Lenehan, 2022: 22–24).

Cosmopolitanism undoubtedly became a fashionable term in academic discussions in the 1990s (Neilson 1999: 2; and Calhoun 2017: 190). Calhoun (2017: 190) believes that the volume of cosmopolitanism literature exploded in this period for three contextual reasons: The fall of communism and the spread of democracy; the "growing recognition" that people around the world are joined in a "common community of fate", linked by global issues such as climate change; and because of globalization which "calls forth cosmopolitanism" resulting in, he believes, a "host of different patterns of interconnection." It is interesting, and perhaps an oversight, that Calhoun does not explicitly mention digitality and the internet in his reasoning here. Academic discussion in the 1990s was also marked by a rush to develop a vast array of what Harvey (2015: 50) calls "adjectival cosmopolitanisms". Holten (2009: 212–216) indeed counts a total of 144 adjectival cosmopolitanisms in academic circulation which he calls "instances of cosmopolitanism" (Holten, 2009: 212), from "Abject" to "Working Class" cosmopolitanism via e.g. "Islamic" and "Post-Universalist" cosmopolitanism. Holten's list of adjectival cosmopolitanisms – from 2009, it must be stated – also does not contain any form of cosmopolitanism linked to information technologies, such as "Virtual" or "Digital" Cosmopolitanism, which were at this stage still to be fully theorized. Digital Cosmopolitanism may, thus, be seen as an adjectival cosmopolitanism which has acquired a degree of sustainability.

Macro-Categorizations of Cosmopolitanism

There have also been a number of macro-categorizations of cosmopolitanism, which have generally been oriented towards a three-way categorization. Calhoun (2017: 191) clusters cosmopolitanisms into a style orientation, a universal ethics, and a cosmopolitanism that deals with growing connections; Delanty (2006: 28) writes of a

moral, political and cultural cosmopolitanism; while Harvey (2015: 50–51) also perceives three macro-categories, namely a moral philosophy tradition, a rights orientation which comes he believes from sociology, anthropology and political science, and a cosmopolitanism espoused by what he calls "the cultural studies crowd" who celebrate "hybridity" (Harvey, 2015: 51). Differing slightly, Ritter (2023: 5–6) decides on a four-way macro-categorization, writing of moral, political, cultural, and economic cosmopolitanisms.

All of these macro-categorizations retain a degree of validity and may be seen as discursive antidotes to Holton's (2009: 3) warnings of the "incoherent chaos" surrounding the cosmopolitanism discussion. We also suggest that cosmopolitanism discourses may be usefully grouped around three macro-categories. This categorization is chosen as it is clearly mappable onto the scholarly literature surrounding the digital, which will also lead into the macro-categorization of Digital Cosmopolitanisms.

Political-Philosophical Cosmopolitanism

The first grouping consists of a cosmopolitanism centred on political-philosophical discussions, which is often ethically and/or morally-based with a normative critique and, at times, even contains visions of possible world institutions (see e.g. Nussbaum, 2019; Kumar Giri, 2018; Hahn, 2017; Costa, 2016; Cavallar, 2015; Warf, 2012; Appiah, 2007). This elite philosophical strand was clearly dominant for many years, and for all intents and purposes, *was* cosmopolitanism for many scholars and non-scholars alike. Holten (2009: 2) notes how the concept has been re-thought in a variety of scholarly contexts and prised away from "the grasp of philosophers."

Cultural Mixing and Solidarity Beyond the National

A more descriptive and wider perspective, drawn from sociology but also history, has examined lived forms of cultural mixing and solidarity beyond the national. Here cosmopolitanism appears as "a practice, a cultural form", "a 'way of being in the world'" (Sluga & Horne, 2010: 370), and a series of "behaviours, [and] social habits" (Jacob, 2006: 4). Historical studies, especially, have examined an array of solidarities beyond or before the national, giving rise to an array of adjectival cosmopolitanisms, for example "Catholic cosmopolitanism" (Albrecht, 2005: 354), "Protestant cosmopolitanism" (Riches, 2013), "Muslim cosmopolitanism" (Alavi, 2015), "Confucian cosmopolitanism" (Park & Han, 2014: 187), and "coloured cosmopolitanism" [sic] (Slate, 2012). It is important to note here also the project of a cosmopolitan sociol-

ogy, as initiated and theorized by, especially, Ulrich Beck (2002; 2011) and Beck and Sznaider (2010).

Critical and Processual Cosmopolitanism

Lastly, a cultural studies and social theory approach has drawn partly on both normative-philosophical and descriptive approaches and is often conceived in terms of a critical cosmopolitanism and/or as processual, and often views cosmopolitanism either in terms of transformation, or in relation to complex multi-layered connections from "below". Rabinow (1986: 258) has written of a cosmopolitanism which conceives of both a "specifity" [sic] of experience coupled with "a worldwide macro-interdependency encompassing any local particularity." Delanty (2006: 25, 27) writes of a critical cosmopolitanism seen in terms of "social processes" and based on "moments of world openness" arising from the encounter of the "local with the global." Holliday (2020: 44), building on Delanty, has viewed critical cosmopolitanism in terms of a cultural studies-inspired decentring; "a hidden, alternative, 'vernacular', local cosmopolitanism." Delanty (2008: 218, 219) has further theorized a processual cosmopolitanism, seeing it as referring to a "transformation in self-understanding as the result of engagement with others over issues of global significance", as a "self-problematization and as learning from the other". While all three of our macro-categories of cosmopolitanism may be seen as clearly mappable onto the digital context, processual and critical cosmopolitan understandings have probably achieved most resonance in the scholarly digital cosmopolitanism discussion, and are linked clearly to debates which look to bring together discussions surrounding migrancy and digitality.

At this stage it is appropriate to discuss a number of related theoretical concepts which, we argue, should accompany the contemporary digital cosmopolitanism concept, here especially the concepts of postmigration and postdigitality.

Postmigration

The term "postmigration" (derived from "postmigrant" and the "postmigrant society") has gained in popularity primarily in the German-speaking world. The first use of the term occurred at the end of the 2000s and outside of academic discourse by the theatre director Shermin Langhoff (Espahangizi, 2016). Langhoff refused to simply speak of "migration" and the "migrant" and sought to give "an artistic expression to the new social realities that have emerged as a result of the different immigration movements in Germany" (Epahangizi, 2016).

In the following years, the German social scientist Naika Foroutan in particular embraced the term and theorized it. According to her, viewing a society as "postmigrant" is intended to shift the focus away from aspects of "migrancy", which are often viewed as deficient. The dichotomy of either "successful" or "failed integration" should also be resolved and viewed in a more nuanced way (Foroutan, 2015). Integration in the postmigrant society will no longer be a one-sided adaptation effort by migrants (Mecheril, 2014); in any case, the clear distinction between "migrant" and "non-migrant" lifeworlds has become obsolete.

At the same time, in the Anglophone context, discourses surrounding the term "superdiversity" have gained in popularity (Vertovec, 2007), which – comparable to the concept of postmigration – looks to reimagine the "old" notion of diversity and emphasizes that society does not diversify along homogeneous groups, but a "diversification of diversity" has been taking place for a long time (Vertovec, 2007: 1024–1026) in which essentialist ideas concerning "foreigners" and "locals" are no longer valid (Blommaert and Rampton, 2011: 2–4).

Instead – and this is one thing that the concepts of *superdiversity* and *postmigrancy* undoubtedly have in common – it is important to recognize that acculturation processes and (multiple) affiliations are ambiguous, dynamic and hybrid, and that all members of society equally, not just newcomers, are called upon to integrate in a society (Foroutan, 2015). Foroutan (2019: 60) points out that tension inevitably arises here, especially when changes in society are denied and not recognized as a "constitutive component of the social order".[1] Thus, in today's postmigrant societies, new alliances exist alongside antagonisms and a polarization of society around the migration issue may also be viewed as having taken place.

Espahangizi (2016) describes the post-migration discourse as a "self-empowerment process of the […] second generation", who have often had to fight individual and collective battles for recognition, respect and participation. The generalized and wider diversity of societies has so far mostly been neglected in the "migration discourse" – another parallel seen between postmigration and superdiversity. Society as a whole, and not just the parts that concern newcomers, is structured by the experience of migration, and society as a whole is transformed on a social and cultural level (Tsianos & Karakayali, 2014).

Making a comparison with the conceptualization of *postcolonialism*, Foroutan (2019: 51) explains that the discourse regarding the *postmigrant* society should question and renegotiate power asymmetries and dominance structures. These structures are adapted according to the (postmigrant) reality: Resources, permeability, basic beliefs, etc. are subsequently re-negotiated, which leads to defensive reactions and distributional struggles (Foroutan, 2015). The postmigrant society undergoes a processual transformation, which will result in a new social structure

1 All translations by the authors, except where stated.

(Foroutan, 2019: 52). Accordingly, a postmigrant perspective triggers the empirical-analytical question: "What changes after migration?" (Foroutan 2019: 54). The "post" in "postmigration" does not mean that the age of migration is over; it describes a society "after migration" (Yildiz & Hill, 2014). Thus, the term "post" retains a similar meaning to the post of "postdigitality", as discussed in the next section.

Postdigitality

The area of postdigitality has theorized the relationship between the digital and the material. In 1998 Negroponte was already suggesting that the digital would soon be noticed by "its absence, not its presence", while two years later Cascone (2000) was the first person to use the term "post-digital". While not actually using the term post-digital, Stalder (2019: 18) views any material/immaterial dichotomy critically, suggesting that the immaterial is not without materiality and that any such dichotomy remains foolhardy. As Warf (2021: 1) suggests, "the dichotomies of off-line/on-line do not do justice to the diverse ways in which the 'real' and virtual worlds are interpenetrated."

The term postdigital does not signify a world without computers and the internet, but the opposite in fact (Schmitt, 2021: 7). Cramer (2014: 13) sees the "post" in "postdigital" as denoting a "continuation" rather than a rupture, while the postdigital also refers to how computation becomes "experiential, spatial and materialized in its implementation", part of the "texture of life" (Berry & Dieter, 2015: 3). Recent discussions have viewed the postdigital in terms of a critical understanding of technology's pervasion of the social (Jandrić et al., 2018) – not least its re-ordering of the physical world (Levinson, 2019: 15) – and a complete "rejection of binaries" (Sinclair & Hayes, 2019: 130). For Knox (2019: 358) the term postdigital is an attempt to outline what is indeed "new" regarding our relationship to the digital but also highlights the ways that digital technologies are "embedded in, and entangled with, existing social practices and economic and political systems."

Thus, the lifeworlds in which various (human) actors exist have become entangled with ubiquitous digitalization (Conti et al., 2024), which means that lifeworlds have also become entangled within a variety of economic, political and social systems that help to actually mould lifeworlds. These systems are structured and communicated via the digital architecture of the platform, and the discourse surrounding platforms has become central to internet studies, as the platform has become the *dominating* architectural structure of the internet, including both the web and mobile apps. Indeed, in the past decade, "studies have demonstrated the structural changes that platforms are bringing to economies and societies around the world – a process that has been termed platformization" (Chen et al., 2024: 1). Poell et al. (2019: 6) have also suggested a cultural perspective on platformization which views it

in relation to "the reorganisation of cultural practice and imaginations around platforms". Thus, platformization is an inherently postdigital process, and platformization and postdigitality should be seen, it is argued, as theoretical bedfellows: It is now impossible to think of one without the other.

Digital Migration Studies

Postmigration and postdigitality, however, do not exist in a vacuum and scholars have already sought to combine notions surrounding migration and digitality. In the 1990s, scholars such as Arjun Appadurai (1996, quoted in Leurs & Prabhakar, 2018: 247) had already argued that: "Electronic mediation and mass migration are shaping the contemporary world." A variety of terms were used to couch this bringing together of migration and digitalization. Diminescu (2008) introduced the concept of "connected migrants". This term emerged in order to "conceptualise the post-internet experiences of migrants, pushing beyond binary notions of one's 'home' or 'host' country and instead, considering migrant's increasingly digitally mediated experiences" (Moran, 2022: 2). With the suggestion of several further neologisms – e.g. "e-diasporas", "mediatized migrants", "smart refugees", "digital deportability" and "migrant polymedia" – the topic was engaged with further (Leurs & Prabhakar, 2018: 248), but a central and widely accepted conceptual foundation was still lacking. From circa 2015, scholars from fields such as Migration Studies, (Digital) Anthropology, Media Studies, Diaspora Studies and Postcolonial Studies began labelling the field connecting digitality and migration as "Digital Migration Studies" in order to "unpack the impact of digital technologies on culture and identity as well as shaping these technologies in practice by migrants" (Candidatu & Ponzanesi, 2022: 2). At that time, with the increased migration of 2015, the phenomenon was examined in a more focused manner, and "Digital Migration Studies" was seen as an "umbrella term to refer to the study of migration in relation to digital technologies" (Leurs & Ponzanesi, 2024: 18).

Uniquely, and for the first time in history, the smartphone was seen to play an essential role in all phases of migration and integration: This is evident in preparing, in self-organization and overcoming challenges along the way, in developing the key skills for acculturation and integration at the destination, and in establishing and maintaining "virtual intimacy" with relatives and friends (Moran, 2022: 1, 9–10). Internet usage plays a key role in participation at a local level at all layers of integration: structural, social, cultural and identificatory (Lietz & Loska, 2024). As Leurs and Prabhakar (2018: 247) summarize: "While migration remains one of the most challenging life experiences one could face – which technology cannot magically solve – the increasing global adoption of information and communication technologies (ICTs) has altered a variety of migration dynamics." According to Leurs and

Ponzanesi (2024: 17), "people on the move mediate their being and belonging in increasing conditions of datafication and digitization." The full infrastructure of the internet, especially social media, is "used to shape the transnationally connected, and locally situated, social worlds in which migrants live their everyday lives".

Digital Diaspora

The sub-field of "Digital Diaspora" has also appeared: This describes "modern day, highly digitalized, transnational networking among migrants" (Laguerre, 2010, quoted in Moran, 2022: 11). Diaspora Studies is a fruitful field, especially for empirical studies on the communication and acculturation practices of (post-)migrants. Indeed, the term "diaspora" also applies to the (post)digital world, especially since "diaspora" has always been the expression of a deterritorialized community (Hepp, 2009: 37). Of course, we must acknowledge the "paradox in studying digital diasporas" (Candidatu et al., 2022: 40), as when we look to understand and deconstruct diasporas, we simultaneously call forth a fixed structure that, according to the logic of a superdiverse and postmigrant society, does not actually exist. Certainly, historically migrants have always used media (letters, newspapers, radio, satellite television and the telephone), "however, in recent years, both the scale and types of migration and digital networking have drastically changed" (Leurs & Prabhakar, 2018: 247). Bozdag and Möller (2015: 338), as well as Candidatu et al. (2019), outline the brief history of the digital diaspora, from the negotiation and communalization of media content in the 1990s, to the advent of social media. Since its first conceptualization, the digital diaspora has been seen as an entity that "reproduces imaginaries of belonging, creating virtual connections between the 'home' and the 'homeland' where migrants can forge and sustain multi-stranded social relations" (Moran, 2022: 11). The digital diaspora, thus, acquires the function of an "imagined community […] that seeks to reproduce cultural norms outside the homeland, in a simultaneous attempt to build new hybrid spaces of belonging" (Candidatu & Ponzanesi, 2022 :4).

Controversies in a Postdigital and Postmigrant World

Emerging digital diasporas expand and transform agency in the digital age (Nedelcu, 2018). At the same time, they also reinforce struggles for resources, access to social institutions (e.g. representation in politics and the media), visibility and recognition that are characteristic of postmigrant debates. These negotiations are increasingly taking place online and are often not just superficially debates about or rejections of migration, but rather defence mechanisms against changing

realities, against hybridization, plurality and, especially, the cultural opening at the centre of *every* kind of cosmopolitanism. Wölfer and Foroutan (2021) write of "plurality resistance": A not insignificant part of the population is simply not able to cope with the increasing complexity of society and longs for clear categories in the attribution of people and occurrences (Forotuan, 2019: 115). Frustration is sometimes left unfiltered and expressed on social media and this constellation of feelings and digital strategies are at times motivated by authoritarianism and a direct refusal of plurality and cosmopolitanism (Strick, 2021).

Macro-Categorizations of Digital Cosmopolitanisms

Parallel to these discussions on postmigrancy, postdigitality and Digital Migration Studies/Digital Diaspora have been an array of dispersed attempts to bring the cosmopolitanism discussion together with debates surrounding digitality. Disentangling the various forms of Digital Cosmopolitanism is not an easy task as many texts incorporate various aspects of the cosmopolitanism discourse. We argue, however, that the categorization suggested above may be mapped successfully onto the scholarly literature which already exists, and which brings the digital and cosmopolitanism together; and which needs to be thought further and also consciously connected with questions of both materiality and migration, with the postdigital and postmigrant discourses.

1) Political-Philosophical Digital Cosmopolitanism

Many digital cosmopolitan texts engage with this phenomenon from what may be called a political-philosophical perspective, or at least from a perspective in which a normative critique is coupled with a visionary element which looks to re-imagine the internet, often from a cosmopolitan perspective. Some authors, on the other hand, argue that digital technologies need to be decoupled from a western-dominated form of cosmopolitanism. Material aspects, in a variety of manners, are often central here but are rarely very explicitly commented on.

Connolly (2000) and Ess (2001) were the first authors to bring together concepts of cosmopolitanism with arguments relating to the internet from a political-philosophical perspective. Ess (2001: 18) is here especially influential and suggests that internet technologies come embedded with a type of ethno-centric cosmopolitanism, as the online world remains U.S.-dominated and not culturally neutral, arguing ultimately for a cultural-digital education which may, he believes, provide the middle ground for the global internet, beyond the dichotomies of global-local and utopian-dystopian (Ess, 2001: 27). Ess does not foresee here the emergence of alternative internet architectures, not least that of China, and the problems which may come

when the internet becomes intertwined with forms of authoritarianism rather than a western, and cosmopolitan, idea of democracy. Combining digital anthropological case studies with normative critique, Srinivasan (2017) similarly argues for what he calls the "provincialization" of the internet and its distancing from a western-dominated cosmopolitanism. Steeped in cyber-utopian thought, Castells (2004: 39–40) argues that the global network society, brought about by internet technology, will result in a type of cosmopolitanism beyond the philosophical dreams of abstract philosophical cosmopolitan thinkers – namely a practical, everyday diversity which will bring about the end of the ancestral fear of the other. Similarly to Ess, authoritarianism does not make an appearance in Castells' internet vision.

Zuckermann (2015) was the first author to write explicitly of "Digital Cosmopolitanism" as a distinct adjectival cosmopolitanism and he presents a clear thesis regarding how the internet may be rethought and re-wired in a more cosmopolitan direction, meaning here an ambivalent sense of world opening. For Zuckermann (2015: 69–78) homophily – the love of the same – has become a major problem on the internet, creating what he calls the sub-discipline of Echo Chamber Studies. Instead, the digital realm needs to be re-adjusted from a cyberutopian perspective, initiating a real Digital Cosmopolitanism, with a new orientation towards transparent translation, bridge figures and an engineered serendipity central to this re-imagining of the internet in which the digital realm becomes a real force for a global cultural opening (Zuckermann, 2015: 163–211). As ever with utopian-inspired thinking, it is easy to criticize Zuckermann on grounds of practicality – or lack thereof. But democracy and even the nation-state were of course also once 18th century utopian follies – until circumstances and very concrete actions turned them into realities. In a similar vein, Stiegler (2016: 162) dwells on the ownership of the internet and believes this should be non-corporate, allowing for a new cosmopolitanism and a new "Republic of the Digital". Lambert (2019) sees the internet in terms of as a dialectic between intimacy and cosmopolitanism, which could also be seen perhaps as a slightly differently theorized homophily/cosmopolitanism dichotomy. He (Lambert, 2019: 307) calls for experimentation on new algorithms that "focus on enabling enduring cosmopolitan sociality"; also thus a cosmopolitan re-wiring, of sorts, of the internet.

2) Digital Cosmopolitans and Digital Solidarity, Beyond the National

A number of texts have looked to measure and describe internet users in relation to cosmopolitanism, using a variety of social scientific methods, but especially survey and interview methodologies. Such approaches generally see cosmopolitanism as a generalized cultural openness and as the ideological 'other' to nationalisms of various kinds. Thus, Lindell (2014a) has investigated the cosmopolitanism of digital natives, while Lietz and Lenehan (2022) have examined what they call "cosmopolitan tweeters". Some quantitatively approached empirical studies have also been under-

taken which have examined a large volume of data in relation to cosmopolitanism and internet usage (Katz-Gerro et al. 2024; and Verboord, 2017). Other studies have centred on digitality in relation to other adjectival cosmopolitanisms, such as Consumer Cosmopolitanism (Emontspool & Woodward, 2018) and Aesthetico-Cultural Cosmopolitanism (Cicchelli & Octobre, 2018); indeed both of these texts are marked by the logic of a postmigrant society, even if this not clearly expressed, using this language, by the authors. Critique points here in terms of this orientation include the ambiguities in relation to what exactly cosmopolitanism is in this context, how it may manifest itself in human agents and, how, exactly, this is to be measured. These are criticisms which the authors are, generally, acutely aware of.

Digital Cosmopolitanism has also been understood as a form of digital solidarity beyond the confines of localized cultural groupings. While historically-based studies of cosmopolitanism have investigated a vast array of cosmopolitan solidarities beyond the national, solidarity-oriented studies are still emerging in the area of Digital Cosmopolitanism. Texts have engaged with this form of Digital Cosmopolitanism from both a theoretical and a Media Studies perspective which has been qualitative and analytical rather than quantitatively-empirical. Stalder (2013), while not using the term Digital Cosmopolitanism, has written an important study of digital solidarity. Narayan (2013) has engaged with the (then) emerging discourse on virtual/digital cosmopolitanism (not deciding on which term to use) when discussing what the author calls "clickable solidarity". Yang and Lin Pang (2023) have examined live streamers in a border area of China and Myanmar, while Kwok-Leung Chan et al. (2023) have engaged with Korean-Hong Kong solidarity in a social media context, innovatively engaging with the area of Meme Studies. Elkins (2019) has analyzed what he calls "algorithmic cosmopolitanism" as a type of rhetorical marketing strategy, which platforms – he examines Netflix and Spotify – use to situate their platform-imperialist dominance in a positive light, looking to legitimize their globally-expanding businesses as cosmopolitan rather than faceless and mathematical. Digital solidarity-based cosmopolitanism is definitely an emerging area of study. But is it really necessary, and does it help the research approach, to couch transnational solidarity in the language of cosmopolitanism?

3) Critical and Processual Digital Cosmopolitanism

This form of Digital Cosmopolitanism is very much informed by debates taking place in Cultural Studies, Social Theory, Postcolonial Studies and, especially, Migration Studies. There is also a large degree of cross-over evident here with the wide and interdisciplinary areas of Digital Diaspora Studies and Digital Migration Studies. This orientation has a decidedly theoretical focus but has also ventured into more empirical spaces, at least viewed from a hermeneutic Cultural Studies perspective. Postcolonial and processual understandings of a critical cosmopolitanism – as a form of

contact with the "other" leading to self-reflection and cultural change, not only in a European context and to be seen in non-elite contexts – have been very influential here.

McEwan and Sobré-Denton (2011) use the term "Virtual Cosmopolitanism" but see it actually as a potentially elite and exclusive phenomenon. They view cosmopolitanism itself as a concept which has often been "critiqued as elitist", while "the notion of 'virtual cosmopolitans' extends that critique as ability to access virtual spaces could be viewed as inherently privileged" (McEwan & Sobré-Denton, 2011: 253). Sobré-Denton (2016) has developed the term Virtual Cosmopolitanism further in relation to social media. Discussing three activist, grass-roots social media case studies, she sees "virtual cosmopolitanism as a space for social justice and intercultural activism" and is defined as "global intercultural concerns bringing together local and rooted activist networks through social media" (Sobré-Denton, 2016: 1718), and Virtual Cosmopolitanism can provide a "global/local bridgework for transnational and trans-local social movements" (Sobré-Denton, 2016: 1720). Lindell (2014b: 74–75), on the other hand, writes of a digitally "mediated cosmopolitanism" and of the "cosmopolitan agency" of internet technologies.

Leurs and Ponzanesi (2018: 6) connect the discourse of Digital Cosmopolitanism explicitly with the area of Digital Migration Studies. The concept of cosmopolitanism from below, drawn from postcolonialism, is centred as digitally-connected migrants exist, they argue, in networked and co-constructed multi-layered worlds between the global and the local, in an attempt to theoretically overcome the dichotomy of the global and the local (Leurs & Ponzanesi, 2018: 11–12). The incorporation of the postmigrant discussion could help in this theorization, not least in relation to changing power flows. Other authors see Digital Cosmopolitanism as intertwined with postdigitality, even if they do not use these exact terms. Hall (2019: 406) argues that the internet enables the "discursive construction of distinctive cultural and political types of critical cosmopolitanism." The author critiques virtual cosmopolitanism which, he believes, sets up the virtual in opposition to the "real" (Hall, 2019: 407), and it is argued that the internet facilitates a type of soft cultural cosmopolitanism which can become hard and meaningful – i.e. linked to material processes, such as political demonstrations – in the discursive construction of transnational networks and in the symbolic-imaginative construction of political communities (Hall, 2019: 410–414). These theoretical musings have added greatly to the discourse, but also come with a large degree of abstraction.

There are further examples of Digital Migration Studies, Digital Diaspora Studies, and Digital Cosmopolitanism coming together. For Ponzanesi (2020: 1) this may be viewed in terms of "shared imaginaries on the move", while for Machirori (2024: 135), in relation to a specific and theorized African Digital Cosmopolitanism, this has to do more with the ability to "distribute worlding experiences created by digital publics and counterpublics who re-centre discursive power." Ponzanesi (2020:

3) also critiques the term Virtual Cosmopolitanism, as the word "virtual" was "often used in early debates on cyberspace and the utopian idea of an online world as separated/different from offline worlds" whereas, she argues, "the digital is a more contemporary definition that breaks down the boundaries between offline and online, and posits digital practices as embedded in everyday life." Thus, the author interestingly brings together here the Digital Cosmopolitanism discourse with diaspora and questions of materiality. But does the term digital really communicate an embeddedness in everyday life? The postdigital discussion, summarized above, would suggest this is not actually the case and a combining of the Digital Cosmopolitanism discourse with this discussion, and the linked and emerging area of platformization, is surely apposite. Ponzanesi (2020: 4) also suggests that Digital Cosmopolitanism is not just the "potential of new technologies to create connections", but also to "create bias, othering, and classifications" – an important centring, thus, also of the darker aspects of cosmopolitanism.

The Present Volume

The present volume is based on selected papers presented at the Second ReDICo (Researching Digital Interculturality Co-operatively) Online-Conference held from 26 June to 7 July 2023, which was dedicated to the topic: "Cosmopolitanism in a Postdigital, Postmigrant Europe, and Beyond". The volume is divided into three sections: "Theoretical and Methodological Reflections", "Media and the Frameworks of Learning", and "Analyzing Online Discourses". Each section engages with (digital) cosmopolitanism and either/or postdigitality and postmigration from a variety of disciplinary perspectives, while also arguing from a multiplicity of culturally-embedded academic traditions.

The "Theoretical and Methodological Reflections" commence with Gerard Delanty's chapter, which is situated within the area of social theory. Delanty's principal interest is in how socio-cultural changes play out and where cosmopolitanism is to be situated in relation to this. He argues for the location of the postdigital in a wider and more sociological framework, while also emphasizing the importance of structural change when thinking about cultural change. For Delanty, theories of postdigitality but also of postmigrancy only really make sense in the context of a wider theory of social change. Delanty concludes by suggesting that generational opposition could form the bulwark of social conflict in western democratic societies of the future.

Fergal Lenehan offers some reflections on internet histories and how they may be rethought in relation to platformization and cosmopolitanism. He suggests the establishment of new Critical Internet Histories, while he also believes that the internet should be viewed as a patchwork of (often competing) platforms. Bringing

together methodological aspects drawn from internet histories and internet theory, he argues that platformization represents the postdigital transformation of the life-world, while internet histories may also be written from a perspective oriented towards the critical junctures of platformization, which would also examine the shifting contexts of postdigital cosmopolitanism. He suggests, ultimately, that media history and internet histories represent histories of interculturality via technical and digital means.

Simon Pistor commences his chapter with a history of the idea of cosmopolitanism from, largely, a political theoretical and philosophical perspective. He argues that the history and contemporary use of the term cosmopolitanism need to be combined in order to assess the theoretical and practical plausibility of the concept. He juxtaposes cultural, constitutional and contestory cosmopolitanisms with accounts from social theory and claims that those who utilize the concept need to reconsider its social dimensions, not least in relation to the context of potentially ubiquitous digital news and social media. He concludes by discussing solidarity-based cosmopolitan conscious-raising as an appropriate direction in a global, digital world.

Emilian Franco's contribution to this volume retains a bridging function between the theoretical and methodological reflections of the first section and the more empirical chapters which follow. The author reflects on the results gleamed from an ethnographic study he conducted, while this discussion remains embedded in a wide-ranging theoretical reflection relating to cosmopolitanism and digitality, exploring more specifically the intersection of cosmopolitanism and technological development in the Brazilian AI research community, focusing on the Center for Artificial Intelligence (C4AI) in São Paulo. Based on interviews with key researchers, the chapter delves into the sociotechnical imaginaries that shape the development of Brazilian AI, revealing a distinct form of compulsory cosmopolitanism that emerges from the (perceived and factual) peripheral status of Brazilian AI research in the global field.

The second section "Media and the Frameworks of Learning" commences with the contribution from media and communications scholar Alexa Robertson. The notion of communication rights is informed by a cosmopolitan worldview: The right to access information, to participate in public communication, to be heard and understood, and the right to privacy apply equally to people everywhere, according to UNESCO. While both the philosophical-regulatory discourse on communication rights and the scholarly discourse on changes in the journalist-audience relationship tend to be couched in general and sometimes universal language, this does not fit easily with new postdigital, empirical realities on the ground, the chapter suggests. Informed by the experiences of journalists reporting on unequal conditions from a global perspective, and tech activists concerned about developments in communication technology and what they might mean for people living in places where liberal

notions of rights are not a taken-for-granted starting point, the sort of journalism that might contribute to a cosmopolitan outlook has to do with understanding – narrative knowledge – as opposed to information, it is argued.

Maria Rieder, Marta Giralt, Stephanie O'Riordan, Galia Xiomara Agudelo and Isolde Quirante, in their contribution, also engage with print and digital media in the postdigital context of a society that has experienced migration and is shaped by this experience, and discuss how media representation can promote a cosmopolitan mindset. Based on an Irish case study, they argue that the underrepresentation and almost complete absence of representation of migratory minority communities is evident and – when represented – minorities are depicted in terms of a marked differentiation from what is seen as uniquely Irish. The authors also introduce the Limerick-based 'Tell Your Own Story' project, which aims to provide a space in local media for diverse identities and voices with an emphasis on transcultural aspects. Such a project, the authors suggest, can help in the spread of a cosmopolitan mindset in the postdigital context, where cosmopolitanism is seen as a general cultural openness and a willingness to engage with the other, and may help to mitigate the social imbalances of representation.

Bernd Meyer and Roman Lietz, in their chapter, engage with the everyday postdigital reality of communication via language translation apps on mobile phones. They argue that the cosmopolitan promise of translation apps, at least as depicted in the advertisements of the companies – such as Google – which produce them, remains an oversimplification. While such advertisements generally represent Western elites holidaying in a jolly manner among docile, non-Western peoples, the reality of translation app usage is actually one marked by a (postdigital) cosmopolitanism from below and the lifeworlds of migrants, refugees and non-elite travellers, as the authors show via a literature review. They conclude that language apps may indeed be extremely helpful in multilingual contexts where members of society would otherwise be excluded from access to information but remain, essentially, also problematic, inadequate and simply not available for many language combinations. Trained on written language, language apps are often deficient when it comes to the complexity of oral communication.

Jennifer Bartelheim and Milene Mendes de Oliveira's contribution deals with Virtual Exchange (VE). More specifically, they examine the intercultural online game *Megacities* and ask whether it may be seen as an example of a transnational VE project, and whether it aligns with postdigital cosmopolitan ideals. Their study is based on the analysis of two datasets: the task descriptions from the game itself and student reflection reports. The analysis of the reflection reports unveils four major learning outcomes, they argue: Appreciation for difference, a critical examination of the self, appreciation for English as a lingua franca (ELF), and dealing with difficulties, which align essentially with transnational approaches to VE. They conclude that these outcomes are also compatible with some descriptions of postdigital cos-

mopolitanism which centre on a processual-based change in self-understanding and an increased sense of sensitivity towards cultural others.

Nick Ludwig, in his chapter, also deals with postdigital cosmopolitanism and brings this concept together with discourses relating to the facilitation and evaluation of experiential learning in a postdigital context. The chapter begins by exploring how the entangled manifestations of materiality and digitality cause uncertainty and what postdigital cosmopolitanism has to offer as a response. The discussion then introduces the facilitating of cosmopolitanism via experiential learning in a postdigital environment as a new didactic approach in the field of cosmopolitan learning. From there the analysis presents virtual action learning as a methodology for investigating the facilitation of postdigital cosmopolitanism via experiential learning. The chapter yields insights especially for researchers and educators interested in facilitating and evaluating experiential learning via digital means as well as for scholars interested in the practice and facilitation of postdigital cosmopolitanism.

The final section of the volume "Analyzing Online Discourses" commences with the chapter by Alina Jugenheimer. Utilizing Ulrich Beck's concept of cosmopolitanization and bringing it together with Fergal Lenehan's notion of postdigital cosmopolitanism, the contribution deals with constructions of threat in (extreme) right-wing online discourses on the German-language, right-catholic website Kath.net, and how threat constructions may actually be sustained and reinforced due to the (quasi-)cosmopolitan context. These supposed threats include feminism and gender discourses, abortion, immigration and birth rates. The author argues that emancipatory processes appear as an even greater threat, as they enable legal access to abortion, the disturbance of biological and traditional gender roles and ideas of family, which, in such discourses, aggravates the threat to the (white, Christian) "Volk", thus reinforcing existing uncertainties and enabling right-wing online narratives to appear especially efficacious.

In her contribution, Carmen Pereyra examines the discourse surrounding an article that appeared in *The Washington Post* during the 2022 Football World Cup, entitled: "Why doesn't Argentina have more Black players?" and which aroused an extensive discussion on the platform Twitter/X. The chapter discusses how Argentine online imaginings of nationhood have parallelled historical imaginings of the Argentine nation and have oscillated from a cosmopolitan, freedom-based, (quasi-)postmigrant and diverse type of Argentine nationality to a nationalist, essentialist conception oriented towards "Whiteness". For weeks, Argentine Twitter users went from direct attacks on the author of the article – mostly accusing her of being ignorant of Argentina's racial reality, denying the prevailing "White Narrative" that the article sought to point out – to sarcastic mockery and, finally, to the accusation of academic colonialism. Carmen Pereyra argues that a societal paradox is present in this collection of more than 5,000 tweets: 'Argentine society',

as reflected in this discourse, perceives itself as post-migratory and post-race, while simultaneously perpetuating a racist and colonial imaginary through the enduring myth of the 'crisol de razas' (melting pot).

Roman Lietz and Carmen Pereyra, in their chapter, examine links between social media postings, international football fandom and ideas of cosmpolitanism. They use qualitative methods to examine a corpus of 12,907 social media comments, from YouTube, Twitter/X and Instagram, which document the unexpected football-based sense of fraternity which developed digitally between football fans from Bangladesh and Argentina during, especially, the 2022 World Cup. This discussion is interwoven with the colonial-historical background of both countries, not least their relationships with Britain and the unlikely history of Argentine-Bangladeshi friendship, and is theoretically underpinned by concepts drawn especially from digital cosmopolitanism while also remaining embedded in the postdigitality discourse. They argue, ultimately, that this corpus represents a cross-country online fandom which may be seen as a type of banal solidarity-based expression of digital cosmopolitanism.

Yolanda López García's chapter explores the construction of narratives surrounding Europeanness, skin colour, and multilingualism of the public Instagram account @the_whitexicans and discusses how dominant imaginaries of coloniality and Mexicanness are reconfigured in what she calls the "postdigital field of action". Engaging in netnographic, thematic and hermeneutic analysis, she argues that the neologism whitexican and the narratives linked to it on Instagram may be viewed as E-maginaries, a type of emerging digital imaginary which contributes to the changing of collective meanings. Ultimately, she concludes, this discourse and its imagining of both a cosmopolitan and essentialized type of Europeanness reveals socialized categories that highlight various forms of discrimination which are typical for plural societies, including racism, despite discursive arguments suggesting a Mexican quasi-postmigrant reality.

Luisa Conti's chapter addresses polarization, misinformation, and the erosion of social cohesion by examining dynamics within digital spaces that reinforce anti-cosmopolitan attitudes. Utilizing a multimodal approach that combines netnography with expereintial hermeneutics, she explores the Facebook page of the German newspaper *Bild*, focusing on news posts that stimulate discussions arousing anti-cosmopolitan sentiments. The analysis reveals a convivial atmosphere characterizing these spaces, where Othering practices foster easy consensus, facilitating community building, a sense of belonging, and the internalization of anti-cosmopolitan sentiments. She argues that the central distorted imaginary may be seen as a fundamental error, as it creates a scenario in which the (national) "imagined community" is perceived as endangered, thus undermining the foundations of society by legitimizing a disregard for the constitutional principles of pluralistic democracy.

References

Alavi, S. (2015). *Muslim Cosmopolitanism in the Age of Empire*. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press.

Albrecht, A. (2005). *Kosmopolitismus: Weltbürgerdiskurse in Literatur, Philosophie und Publizistik um 1800*. Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Appiah, K. A. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. London: Penguin.

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

Beck, U (2011). Cosmopolitanism as Imagined Communities of Global Risk. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 55(10): 1346–1361.

Beck, U. & Sznaider, N. (2010). Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda. *The British Journal of Sociology,* 61(1): 381–403.

Berry, D. M., & Dieter, M. (2015). Thinking Postdigital Aesthetics: Art, Computation and Design. In Berry, D. M. & Dieter, M. (Eds.), *Postdigital Aesthetics: Art, Computation and Design*. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1–11.

Blommaert, J. & Rampton, B. (2011). Language and Superdiversity. *Diversities,* 13(2), 1–20.

Bozdağ, Ç & Möller, J. (2015). Transkulturalität, Migration und Diaspora. In Hepp, A., Krotz, F., Lingenberg, S., & Wimmer, J. (Eds.), *Handbuch Cultural Studies und Medienanalyse*. Wiesbaden: Springer, 333–342.

Calhoun, C. (2017). A Cosmopolitanism of Connections. In Robbins, B. & Horta, P.L. (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms*. New York: University Press, 189–200.

Candidatu, L., Leurs, K., & Ponzanesi, S. (2019). Digital Diasporas: Beyond the Buzzword – Toward a Relational Understanding of Mobility and Connectivity. In Tsagarousianou, R. & Retis, J. (Eds.), *The Handbook of Diasporas, Media and Culture.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 33–47.

Candidatu, L. & Ponzanesi, S. (2022). Digital Diasporas: Staying with the Trouble. *Communication, Culture and Critique*, 00(2022): 1–18.

Cascone, K. (2000). The Aesthetics of Failure: "Post-Digital" Tendencies in Contemporary Computer Music. *Computer Music Journal,* 24(4): 12–18.

Castells, M. (2004). Informationalism, Networks and the Network Society: A Theoretical Blueprint.Network Society: A Theoretical Blueprint. In Castells, M, *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Cheltenham, UK & Northhampton, MA: Edward Elgar, 3–45.

Cavallar, G. (2015). *Kant's Embedded Cosmopolitanism*. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter.

Chen, J, van Doorn, N., Grohmann, R., Pollio, A., & Soriano, C. (2024). Introducing Platforms & Society. *Platforms & Society*, 1–2.

Cicchelli, V., & Octobre, S. (2018). From Shahrukh Khan to Shakira: Reflections on Aesthetico-Cultural Cosmopolitanism Among Young French People. In Kumar Giri, A. (Ed.), *Beyond Cosmopolitanism: Towards Planetary Transfromations*. London, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 377–388.

Connolly, W. E. (2000). Speed, Concentric Circles and Cosmopolitanism. *Political Theory*, 28 (5): 596–618.

Conti, L., Lenehan, F. & Lietz, R. (2024). Posdigitality as Lifeworld Hybridity: A Discursive Essay. In: Popa, L. & Goorts, R. (Eds.), *Cultural Identities in a Global World: Reframing Cultural Hybridity*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 87–98.

Costa, M. V. (2016). Cosmopolitanism as a Corrective Virtue. *Ethical Theory and Practice*, 19 (4): 999–1013.

Cramer, F. (2014). What is Post-Digital? *A Peer Reviewed Journal about Postdigitality*, 3(1): 10–24.

Delanty, G. (2009). *The Cosmopolitan Imagination: The Renewal of Critical Social Theory*. Cambridge: University Press.

Delanty, G. (2008). The Cosmopolitan Imagination. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, 82/83: 217–230.

Delanty, G. (2006). The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 57(1): 25–47.

Diminescu, D. (2008). The Connected Migrant: An Epistemological Manifesto. *Social Science Information*, 47(4): 565–579.

Elkins, E. (2019). Algorithmic Cosmopolitanism: On the Global Claims of Digital Entertainment Platforms. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 36(4): 376–389.

Emontspool, J., & Woodward, I. (2018). (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanism, Markets, and Consumption: A Critical Global Perspective*. New York & London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Espahangizi, K. (2016). Das #Postmigrantische ist kein Kind der Akademie. *Geschichte der Gegenwart*. 12 June 2016. https://geschichtedergegenwart.ch/das-postmigrantische-kein-kind-der-akademie/ ; 6.9.2022.

Ess, C. (2001). Introduction: What's Culture got to do With it? Cultural Collisions in the Electronic Global Village, Creative Interferences, and the Rise of Culturally-Mediated Computing. In Ess, C. (Ed.), *Culture, Technology and Communication: Towards an Intercultural Global Village*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1–50.

Foroutan, N. (2015). Die postmigrantische Gesellschaft. *Bundeszentrale für Politische Bildung*. 20 April 2015. https://www.bpb.de/themen/migration-integration/kurzdossiers/205190/die-postmigrantische-gesellschaft/; 8.9.2022.

Foroutan, N. (2019). *Die postmigrantische Gesellschaft. Ein Versprechen der pluralen Demokratie.* transcript, Bielefeld.

Go, J. (2013). Fanon's Post-Colonial Cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Social Theory*, 16(2): 208–225.

Hahn, H. 2017. *Politischer Kosmopolitismus: Praktikabilität, Verantwortung, Menschenrechte*. Berlin & Boston: de Gruyter.

Hall, O. (2019). The Internet and Cosmopolitanism. In Delanty, G. (Ed.), *Routledge International Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies*. London & New York: Routledge, 406–418.

Harvey, D. (2015). What do we do With Cosmopolitanism? In Glick Schiller, N. & Irving, A. (Eds.), *Whose Cosmopolitanism? Critical Perspectives, Relationalities and Discontents*. Oxford & New York: Berghahn Books, 49–56.

Hill, M. & Yildiz, E. (2018). *Postmigrantische Visionen. Erfahrungen, Ideen, Reflexionen*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Holliday, A. (2020). Culture, Communication, Context and Power. In Jackson, J. (Ed.), *Routledge Handbook of Language and Intercultural Communication*. London: Routledge, 39–52.

Holten, R. J. (2009). *Cosmopolitanisms: New Thinking and New Directions*. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jacob, M. C. (2006). *Strangers Nowhere in the World: Cosmopolitanism in Early Modern Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jandrić, P., Knox, J., Besley, T., Ryberg, T., Suoranta, J. & Hayes, S. (2018). Postdigital Science and Education. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 50(10): 893–899.

Katz-Gerro, T., Janssen, S., Yodovich, N., Verboord, M., & Llonch-Andreu, J. (2024). Cosmopolitanism in Contemporary European Societies: Mapping and Comparing Different Types of Openness Across Europe. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 32(1): 187–202.

Knox, J. (2019). What Does the 'Postdigital' Mean for Education? Three Critical Perspectives on the Digital with Implications for Educational Research and Practice. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1(2): 357–370.

Kumar Giri, A. (2018). Cosmopolitanism and Beyond: Towards Planetary Realisations. In Kumar Giri, A. (Ed.), *Beyond Cosmopolitanism: Towards Planetary Transformations*. London & New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 13–32.

Kwok-Leung Chan., S., Lim, W.-T., Lee, G.-H., & Wong, N.-C. (2023). The Eye4HK Meme and the Construction of an Injustice Frame. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 15(2): 33–47.

Laguerre, M. (2010). Digital Diaspora: Definition and Models. In Alonso, A., & Oiarzabal, P. (Eds.) *Diasporas in the New Media Age: Identity Politics and Community*. Reno: University of Nevada Press, 49–64.

Lambert, A. (2019). Intimacy, Cosmopolitanism and Digital Media: A Research Manifesto. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 25(3): 300–311.

Lenehan, F. (2022). Digital Cosmopolitan Flows in the Lifeworld: Categorizing the Labyrinth of Postdigital Cosmopolitanism. *Interculture Journal: Online Zeitschrift für Interkulturelle Studien*, 21(36): 13–33.

Leurs, K. & Prabhakar, M. (2018). Doing Digital Migration Studies: Methodological Considerations for an Emerging Research Focus. In Zapata-Barrero, R. & Yalaz, E. (Eds), *Qualitative Research in European Migration Studies*. IMISCOE Research Series. Cham: Springer, 247–266.

Leurs, K., & Ponzanesi, S. (2018). Connected Migrants: Encapsulation and Cosmopolitanism. *Popular Communication: The International Journal of Media and Culture*, 16(1): 4–20.

Leurs, K. & Ponzanesi, S. (2024). (Eds.), *Doing Digital Migration Studies*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Levinson, P. (2019). Needed: A "Post-Post" Formulation. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1(1): 14–16.

Lietz, R., & Lenehan, F. (2022). Tweeting the World a Better Place: Motivation and the Values Underpinning the Creation of a Digital Cosmpolitan Persona. *Persona Studies* 8(3): 17–34.

Lietz, R., & Loska, M. (2024). Does Integration Still Take Place 'at the Local Level'? Challenging a German Integrations Paradigm in a Postdigital World. In Conti, L. & Lenehan, F. (Eds.), *Lifewide Learning in Postdigital Societies: Shedding Light on Emerging Culturalities*. Bielefeld: transcript, 131–146.

Lindell, J. (2014 a). A Methodological Intervention in Cosmopolitan Research: Cosmopolitan Dispositions Among Digital Natives. *Sociological Research Online*, 19(3) (no page numbers). DOI: 10.5153/sro.3418.

Lindell, J. (2014 b). *Cosmopolitanism in a Mediatized World: The Social Stratification of Global Orientations*. Karlstad University, PhD Thesis.

Machirori, F. (2024). An Exploration of African Digital Cosmopolitanism. In Leurs, K, & Ponzanesi, S. (Eds.), *Doing Digital Migration Studies: Theories and Practices of the Everyday.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 133–152.

McEwan, B., & Sobré-Denton, M. (2011). Virtual Cosmopolitanism: Constructing Third Cultures and Transmitting Social and Cultural Capital Through Social Media. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*, 4 (4): 252–258.

Mecheril, P. (2014). Was ist das X im Postmigrantischen? *Sub/urban*, 2(3): 107–112. https://zeitschrift-suburban.de/sys/index.php/suburban/article/view/150/253 ; 8.9.2022.

Moran, Claire (2022). The Connected Migrant – A Scoping Review. T*he International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies.*, 0(0): 1–20.

Narayan, B. (2013). From Everyday Information Behaviours to Clickable Solidarity in a Place Called Social Media. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 5 (3): 31–53.

Negroponte, N. (1998). Beyond Digital. *Wired*. Dec. 6. URL: https://web.media.mit.edu/~nicholas/Wired/WIRED6-12.html: 21 February 2021.

Neilson, B. (1999). *On the New Cosmopolitanism*. https://www.westernsydney.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/365745/Neilson_OnNewCosmopolitianism_ICS_Pre-Print_Final.pdf, 1–14.

Nussbaum, M. (2019). *The Cosmopolitan Tradition: A Noble but Flawed Idea*. London & Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Park, Y.-D. & Han, S.-J. (2014). Another Cosmopolitanism: A Critical Reconstruction of the Neo-Confucian Conception of Tianxiaweigong in the Age of Global Risks. *Development and Society*, 43(2): 185–206.

Poell, T., Nieborg, D. & van Dijck, J. (2019). Platformisation. *Internet Policy Review: Journal on Internet Regulation*, 8(4): 1–13.

Ponzanesi, S. (2020). Digital Cosmopolitanism: Notes from the Underground. *Global Perspectives,* 1(1): 1–13.

Rabinow, P. (1986). Representations and Social Facts: Modernity and Post-Modernity in Anthropology. In Clifford, J. & Marcus, G. E. (Eds.), *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley, Los Angeles & London: University of California Press, 234–261.

Riches, D. (2013). *Protestant Cosmopolitanism and Diplomatic Culture: Brandenburg-Swedish Relations in the Seventeenth Century*. Leiden: Brill.

Ritter, C. (2023). Understanding Cosmopolitanism: A Morphological Approach. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2023.2275040

Schmitt, P. (2021). *Postdigital: Medienkritik im 21. Jahrhundert*. Hamburg: Meiner.

Sinclair, C., & Hayes, S. (2019). Between the Post and the Com-Post: Examining the Postdigital "Work" of a Prefix. *Postdigital Science and Education*, 1(1): 119–31.

Slate, N. (2012). *Coloured Cosmopolitanism: The Shared Struggle for Freedom in the United States and India*. Cambridge, MA & London: Harvard University Press.

Sluga, G. & Horne, J. (2010). Cosmopolitanism: Its Pasts and Practices. *Journal of World History*, 21(3): 369–373.

Sobré-Denton, M. (2016). Virtual Intercultural Bridgework: Social Media, Virtual Cosmopolitanism, and Activist Community-Building. *New Media and Society*, 18(8): 1715–1731.

Srinivasan, R. (2017). *Whose Global Village? Rethinking how Technology Shapes our World*. New York: New York University Press.

Stalder, F. (2013). *Digital Solidarity*. Lüneburg: Mute Books.

Stalder, F. (2019). *Kultur der Digitalität*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Stiegler, B. (2016). The Digital, Education, and Cosmopolitanism. *Representations*, 134: 157–164.

Strick, Simon (2021). *Rechte Gefühle*. Bielefeld: transcript.

Tsianos, V. & Karakayali, J. (2014). Rassismus und Repräsentationspolitik in der Postmigrantischen Gesellschaft. *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 64(13-14): 33–39.

Verboord, M. (2017). Internet Usage and Cosmopolitanism in Europe: A Multilevel Analysis. *Information, Communication & Society,* 20(3): 460–481. DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2016.1187193

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6): 1024–1054.

Warf, B. (2012). Nationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Geographical Imaginations. *Geographical Review*, 102(3): 271–292.

Warf, B. (2021). Introduction. In Warf, B. (Ed.), *Geographies of the Internet*. London: Routledge, 1–15.

Wölfer, R. & Foroutan, N. (2022). Plurality resistance: Effects on Intergroup Relations and the Mediating Role of Stereotypes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 87: 42–50.

Yang, M., & Lin Pang, C. (2023). Strategic Cosmopolitanism: Chinese Female Jadeite Live Streamers in Ruili. *Cosmopolitan Civil Societies: An Interdisciplinary Journal* 15.3: 61–72.

Zuckermann, E. (2015). *Digital Cosmopolitans: Why we Think the Internet Connects, why it Doesn't, and how to Rewire it*. New York & London: Norton.