HH

Veröffentlicht mit Unterstützung des Forschungsrates, der Fakultät für Kulturwissenschaften und des Instituts für Medien- und Kommunikationswissenschaft der Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.ddb.de abrufbar.

Matthias Wieser / Elena Pilipets (Hrsg.)
Medienkultur als kritische Gesellschaftsanalyse. Festschrift für Rainer Winter
Alltag, Medien und Kultur, Band 18
Köln: Halem, 2021

Die Reihe *Alltag, Medien und Kultur* wurde 2007 von Prof. Dr. Lothar Mikos gegründet. Die aktuellen Herausgeber sind Hon. Prof. Joachim von Gottberg, Prof. Dr. Lothar Mikos, Prof. Dr. Elizabeth Prommer und Prof. Dr. Claudia Wegener.

ISSN: 1864-4058

ISBN (Print): 978-3-86962-521-8
ISBN (PDF): 978-3-86962-522-5

Den Herbert von Halem Verlag erreichen Sie auch im Internet unter http://www.halem-verlag.de
E-Mail: info@halem-verlag.de

SATZ: Herbert von Halem Verlag
LEKTORAT: Imke Hirschmann
DRUCK: docupoint GmbH, Magdeburg
GESTALTUNG: Claudia Ott Grafischer Entwurf, Düsseldorf
COVERFOTO: Lina Yatsen / unsplash

ALLTAG, MEDIEN UND KULTUR

Matthias Wieser / Elena Pilipets (Hrsg.)

Medienkultur als kritische Gesellschaftsanalyse

Festschrift für Rainer Winter

HERBERT VON HALEM VERLAG

Inhalt

MIKE FEATHERSTONE

Reflections on Aesthetic Cosmopolitanism

Discussions of globalization have remained high on the academic agenda for the last thirty years or so.[1] There is the awareness that we increasingly share common forms of technology, infrastructure and knowledge that give rise to similar practices in finance, business, law, industrial production, administration, education, research and consumption. There is the tantalizing prospect that we are moving towards a global culture, which builds on these common forms of integration. For some these processes are seen as necessary steps towards a global state, that would eventually be able to monopolize violence and taxation to produce a more peaceful integrated and regulated world – the prospect of realizing the cosmopolitan dreams of Immanuel Kant and his successors. Yet every step in this direction also seems to produce de-globalizing reactions that summon up a resurgence of nationalism and cultural protectionism. At the same time, it would seem impossible to curtail the stream of images of other cultures that rapidly flood around the world through various traditional and new social media screen culture forms. Images that proliferate within consumer culture: in advertisements, the packaging of goods and in adorning the retail consumption space interiors and the external cityscapes. A mass of images (both still and animated), with vivid colours and high-resolution eye-catching content. Images of exotic tourist destinations, luxury com-

1 This article is a revised and extended version of the published Foreword to *Aesthetic Cosmopolitanism and Global Culture,* edited by Vincenzo Cicchelli, Sylvie Octobre and Viviane Riegel (Leiden, London: Brill 2020).

fort, romance and beautiful bodies, that threaten to overlay and double the everyday mundane reality with a hyper-real simulational world. This is one sense in which we can speak of an extending ›aestheticization of everyday life‹ (FEATHERSTONE 2007: 5).

The notion of ›aesthetic cosmopolitanism‹, is a relatively new term that needs to be treated with some caution if it is to establish its place in the academic conceptual repertoire. For the term to become productive, it needs to demonstrate how it is grounded in the practices of social and cultural life. Its capacity to go beyond existing terminology has to be argued, and the linkage to cosmopolitanism ›on the ground‹ in a wide range of contexts in different parts of the world has to be justified. While the two terms in the pairing ›aesthetic cosmopolitanism‹ are well established, it would be reassuring to think there was some historical dynamic at which the new conjunction work pushes forward: with increasing aesthetic reflexivity replacing instrumental economic calculation. As yet, it is hard to find evidence for this type of epochal stage logic, which some wanted to see as propelling us into postmodern fluid societies. Especially at a time of decline in real wages, increasing impoverishment and debt in the middle and lower reaches of the population of many countries. Indeed, while some welcome cosmopolitan identification with the other and increased receptivity to alterity, there has also been a notable reaction on the part of the radical right to the very idea of a common humanity. For the followers of right-wing populism, cosmopolitan sentiments are to be reviled as cultural goodwill, with openness to others seen as part of the problem of a broken social order that can only be repaired by rebuilding the walls around the nation-state.

It is well known that the term ›cosmopolitan‹ has a long history, going back in the Western tradition at least as far as the Stoics in Ancient Greece and Rome, with the cynic Diogenes credited as the first to have asserted ›I am a citizen of the world.‹ Yet the Greek term ›cosmos‹ also means nature, which suggests that one becomes not just a citizen of the world but of the universe (STADE 2007). Clearly, such an impossible identification has to be gestural. It points outwards, suggesting a detachment, a view from beyond that transcends our current concerns and preoccupations. A position defined as much by what it is against: the situated, alleged narrow-minded local provincial. We find a similar ambition in Diderot's entry on ›cosmopolitan‹ in the *Encyclopédie*, where we are told a cosmopolitan is »a man who is a stranger nowhere,« someone who prefers »my family to myself,

my country to my family and the human species to my country« (cited in CASAS KLAUSEN 2016: 124).

This suggests it could be useful to move away from absolutes and universals and think of cosmopolitanization more as a process: something unstable, a gradation without an endpoint. It points to the way we discover more about the social and cultural worlds outside our accustomed frame of reference, but also to the way we discover more about nature – not just here on earth from the micro particle level up to the macro level of the earth's magnetic fields, but also the cosmos, the surrounding universe in all its vastness. All have become pulled into our sphere of relevance through scientific investigation. This type of knowledge can help relativize the human and lead to a post-human identification with not just other species, but a wide range of animate and inanimate forms of life. Cosmopolitanism, then, is an impulse and ambition that casts outwards beyond our current situation and limited human concerns. It is generated alongside globalization and the prospect of a global culture, but it gains impetus through the ethical ideal of solidarities and identifications beyond the familiar. Religion is clearly important here, with many of the world religions having cosmopolitan ambitions. As John Dunn suggests, the spread of cosmopolitan imaginations has occurred in many parts of the world (HAN 2019). Palestine, for example, experienced a range of ethnic and other conflicts immediately before the Christian era. Yet the imaginative shift it underwent was not alone sufficient to bring about social change, rather it needed to become married to Greek intellectual culture and gain significant support from within the political culture of the Roman Empire to establish an institutional platform to make the cosmopolitan dream of universal brotherhood begin to seem possible.

This brings us to the question of the carriers – the people in social life with ideal and material interests who find the adoption of cosmopolitan orientations and dispositions attractive and useful. For someone like Ulrich Beck (2002; MYTHEN 2018) we are all in the process of becoming cosmopolitan as we all live under the shadow of expanding global risks, such as climate change, which sharpens our sense of human limits and the dangers of having to act under conditions of unknowability. In this it connects back to the European Enlightenment tradition of which Diderot and the Encyclopaedia project were important components. Beck (2002) proposes a cosmopolitan sociology, with a shift of focus to the global level to open up ›methodological cosmopolitanism‹ to overcome the limitations

of ›methodological nationalism.‹ This plea resonated in some places outside the West, such as Korea, where the notion of cosmopolitanism is seen as embodying practical political potential (HAN et al. 2016; HAN 2019). Yet, as mentioned earlier, the resurgence of nationalism and authoritarian populism in many parts of the world, along with the manipulative use of social media and ›deepfake‹ news, are significant countertrends. In addition, there are concerns about the grounding of Beck's project in the German tradition and European philosophical thought. This links to Beck's alleged condemnation of multiculturalism and inability to come to terms with Western colonial history (BHAMBRA 2015).[2] The call for ›cosmopolitan solidarity‹ on the part of Ulrich Beck and his followers (HAN 2016), with its anticipation of the global citizen who is yet to come, then, can take on a quasi-religious mantle, which can amount to little more than an ethics of goodwill. The danger is that this vision could be seen as the idealist project of a ›community of the wise‹ very much rooted in the European tradition, with minimal acknowledgement of other cultural formations.[3]

The cosmopolitan vision, then, runs into difficulties dealing with multiculturalism, as its stronger identification with humanity has the danger of greater abstraction and detachment from living cultures. Yet there are also problems with the opposite impulse that can occur if the detachment is merely a temporary step, before re-immersion in a new set of cultural differences that are regarded as fascinating, indeed compelling, in their own right. The contemplation of cultural differences, then, does not necessarily summon up ethical questions about how to act and live together. Ethics can give way to aesthetics, or even an ethic of aesthetics (MAFFESOLI 1991). The affective charge of difference can become the prime attractor. This opens the way to aesthetic cosmopolitanism and consumer culture.

2 At the same time others, such as Homi Bhabha (2018) have latched on to the concept of cosmopolitan memory to emphasize the ways in which the disenchantment with national memory can give way to ›anxieties about the Other's suffering‹ that generate ›a double time-frame memory‹ – one that attempts to enunciate the testimony of the past while also striving to possess the freedoms of the future. A cosmopolitan memory that is an ›anxious ethics of anticipation,‹ which can foster action.

3 There are attempts to think through cosmopolitanism outside the European tradition. Han et al. (2016) have explored the Confucian not of *Tianxia* (all under heaven). Buddhist thought with its focus on interconnected humanity along with the Islamic notion of *ummah* can also be seen as containing cosmopolitan impulses (FEATHERSTONE 2001).

As the global economy becomes increasingly interlinked, more people move around the world, and, as Appadurai (1990) remarked, we have increased flows of money, goods, technologies and images too. The local supermarket shelves are full of goods from around the world. If we switch on television, there are celebrity chefs travelling to distant parts of the world to prepare authentic local dishes. This confronts us with what Ulrich Beck (2002) refers to as ›banal cosmopolitanism.‹ Consumer culture, which is central to the global economy, offers an expanding world of goods and experiences, providing a constant flow of differences that can lead to a ›banal aestheticization‹ too. Everything there can be brought here: either placed in front of us as material goods or sent to us as immaterial screen images. Whether the goods are seen as foreign, exotic or aestheticized is a complex question.[4] Yet this fascination is not particularly new, as the long history of the luxury trade indicates. It became central to modernity with its intensified global exchanges as Simmel's (1991) analysis of the Berlin Trade Exhibition 1896 reminds us. The world fairs that proliferated in the second half of the nineteenth century provided vast assemblages of goods from around the world, along with technological inventions and simulations of exotic cultural treasures and wonders. Arising at approximately the same time, department stores also accentuated the display of a vast array of goods. The ›dream world‹ settings created by the new strata of cultural intermediaries trained in the industrial arts and commercial design accentuated the aesthetic quality of goods, in which meanings and associations became transferred and elided (TAMARI 2006).[5]

At the same time aestheticization processes can lead to excitement and over-stimulation. Simmel (1991: 119) speaks of the way in which the

4 There are those who dispute whether there is actually greater cosmopolitan consciousness of the different origins of goods and experiences. This revolves around the extent to which they are taken in and incorporated into the existing culture (spaghetti becomes seen as American). Friedman (1999), for example, argues that many cultural specialists and intellectuals today identify with non-Western others. Yet this cosmopolitan attitude and openness to mixing may not have sufficient relevance and disconnect with the actual experiences of significant sectors of the population (see discussion in FEATHERSTONE 2001). The strong division of opinion in the case of Brexit in the UK, or the election of Donald Trump in the USA, both point to the difficulty of determining identifications.

5 This can be illustrated by the way in which the London department store Selfridges in 1911 featured a performance of *Scheherazade*, with its *Arabian Nights* theme, that inspired new fashions and décor with women revelling in the seductive atmosphere and colourful exotic costumes aspects of which penetrated into everyday wear (e.g. the turban) (NAVA 2002).

most heterogeneous products »crowded together in close proximity paralyses the senses« to the extent that the »countless fragmentary rich impressions« fail to register. He speaks of overstimulated and tired nerves, something that is also highlighted in his discussion of the blasé attitude as a self-protective reaction to the speed and intensity of shocks and new sensations in the modern metropolis (SIMMEL 1997a). Walter Benjamin (1999, 2010; BUCK-MORSS 1992) also refers to the daily shocks of the modern world in the street crowds, amusement parks and entertainment areas, which mimic the shell-shock of modern warfare. With the deadening of the senses, there is an inability to generate sense-memories, leading to an impoverishment of experience.[6] The blocking of sense reactions impairs the potential for aesthetic experience: aesthetics gives way to anaesthetics. This whole process provides raw material for artistic capture and became a preoccupation within various modernist artistic movements such as Expressionism (FRISBY 2001; FEATHERSTONE forthcoming). A related concern in some currents of contemporary art has been to seek to attune or retune, the affective sensory apparatus to become more open to a wider range of sense-impressions from the shifting aesthetic disorder of urban life. Our capacity for aesthetic judgement becomes extended to incorporate more and more things and sensations from everyday life that would formerly have been excluded; we develop the capacity to appreciate ›ugly beauty‹.

This suggests that it is possible to conceive of a series of aestheticization processes with swings between bodily sensations and more formed recollections (some of the latter being decanted into various formal and informal artistic media: painting, music, literature, poetry etc.) or newer ones that include photography and different modes of dissemination (selfies, photoshopping, animation, emoticons, etc. on social media). Some of the sensations of urban life may, then, not coalesce into experiences that can be recollected in memory; they remain on a more inchoate affective level, the level of atmosphere, mood and phantasmagoric effects. Yet for some this whole process provides the fertile ground for artistic experimentation: they are open to being appropriated and channelled into art forms. Available for capture through more flexible forms nearer to the life form, to the immediacy and intensity of the life process.

6 There are some similarities here to Stiegler's (2014) notion of symbolic misery.

Simmel and Benjamin's perspectives on aestheticization process in urban life and screen culture take us away from the polished and finished products of the aesthetic imagination that reside in galleries, museums, department stores and exhibitions, to focus on aesthetics in the making and its process of formation from sensations and perceptions as it emerges from the life process. Yet this is a process where the speed of switching and scoping, the zooming in and out, the rapid cutting and similar techniques that we find in many contemporary movies, shorts, music videos, advertisements and clips are becoming the norm in new media platforms and social media, all now increasingly visible 24/7 on mobile devices and urban screens (CRARY 2013). This also relates to the ›hallucinatory simulational world,‹ ›the floating world of signs and images,‹ generally encountered under conditions of distraction, that Baudrillard (1983) outlines. Consumer culture, then, furthers the aestheticization of everyday life (FEATHERSTONE 2007: 5). Yet this can lead to an-aestheticization: the drive to aestheticize commodities and endless construction of aesthetic models and publicity, along with the intensity of the image flow, can lead to aesthetic banality and the exhaustion of the aesthetic sensibility (SASSATELLI 2002; FEATHERSTONE 2007). For Baudrillard, to counter this process, we need to retreat back to the original sensory meaning of aesthetics. He asks us to go beneath art to the level of its formation in embodied sensations: »To reinvent sensation as passion somehow, aesthesis, the aesthetic of the sensible and not of the sensational!« (cited in SASSATELLI 2002: 530; FEATHERSTONE 2014).

It is of course possible to leave behind the city streets and screen culture by withdrawing to the interior to construct one's own worlds, or different sub-universes of meaning. The aestheticization of the home as occurred with art nouveau, or the culture of dandies in the late nineteenth century, can be seen as part of an aesthetic education, which required considerable discipline and skill to produce refined aesthetic environments (WILLIAMS 1982). This involved a series of practices, some of which become institutionalized. There are two forms to be mentioned here. The first is the cultivation of aesthetic sensibilities in relation to good taste, the learning process to enjoy luxuries and fine things. To appreciate fine wines, perfume, gourmet food, well-crafted furniture, jewellery and objets d'art involves the training of the senses (cf. LATOUR 2004a on perfume). But it also involves the knowledge of the object's relative value, the place the item occupies in the field or table of related things. For the connoisseur the enjoyment is doubled, not just the taste of the wine but the knowledge that it is a rare year

from a fine chateau that occupies a significant place in the classification. In some cases, the classifier may attain maestro status through her or his capacity to demonstrate that she/he possesses extraordinary judgement of taste, manifest in her/his ability to reform the classification. There is no shortage of people who seek to acquire the expertise and spend their free time in accumulating the necessary training of the senses, along with knowledge of the classification history and back catalogue, to ultimately gain more refined aesthetic sensibilities. A sizeable leisure and tourist sector has developed to cater for and stimulate the demand.

The second form is more institutionally structured and covers the traditional arts, including learning to play musical instruments, forms of craftsmanship and design skills, often with examinations and grading. In Japan there are the za arts, which includes flower arranging, poetry, calligraphy, tea ceremony etc., each with its elaborate system of grading, certification and progression that offers the prospect of eventually becoming a master. This field has been described as an ›aesthetic public sphere‹ by Ikegami (2005; FEATHERSTONE 2007: 147-181), a notion that sharply differs from the European public sphere described by Habermas. But it could be argued that as part of the successive waves of globalization and modernity over the last two to three centuries we have not only seen the expansion of the public sphere in many parts of the world but of the cultural sphere too (FEATHERSTONE 1995: 15-33). This process has entailed the expansion of cultural occupations – cultural specialists, intermediaries and media people, including the ›precariat‹ working in cultural industries (GILL/PRATT 2008). A process involving not only the accumulation of cultural capital and expertise but also a diffusion of aesthetic sensibilities and skills amongst a broader and expanding public. It has encouraged cultural innovation, experimentation and exploration, which are congruent with the quest for the new and the exotic, propelled by the avant-garde impulses that crossover between both consumer culture and the cultural sphere.

Yet can cultural specialists and intermediaries be characterized as the archetypical cosmopolitans? For some the answer is negative with Zygmunt Bauman (2008) referring to the super-rich as the ›true cosmopolitans‹ (FEATHERSTONE 2013). Their capacity to be welcomed and granted residence, citizenship and tax-free status and even legal immunity in a wide range of desirable locations around the world enables them to enjoy a highly mobile pattern of work and lifestyle. They are cosmopolitan in the sense that they are not anchored to a specific state-society in any meaningful sense,

though this is not to suggest that their identifications are with humanity or that they are actively building a global public sphere. Rather, they identify with neither the nation-state nor the global. Instead, they focus on the celebration of the talent and achievements of ›self-made‹ individuals, who deserves all they can get. There is little sense of noblesse oblige or commitment to their fellows in this neoliberal orientation.

At the same time, they have ample capacity and resources to become involved as buyers, dealers, collectors or patrons in the art and cultural sectors, which can also be profitable financially. They can sample the aesthetic pleasures and cultural differences of travel and also save time and discomfort through their command of personal transport (private jet, yachts, etc.). In many ways, their work and lifestyle enable not only greater personal mobility but also greater choice: life can become more episodic and lived as a series of adventures, sampling cultural experiences. Simmel (1997b) remarked that the adventure through its circumscribed episodic nature provides a form in which life is lived with greater intensity and is therefore not only more dramatic but more aestheticizing too. This capacity for mobility and switching also goes beyond the spatial dimension. It has also been suggested that today's elites are becoming educated to become ›flexians,‹ people who have learned to develop the dispositions that make them more capable of easily relating to people from different social and cultural backgrounds (CALETRIO 2012). A marked contrast to the formality, good manners, ›gentleman code‹ and social distance, generally maintained in previous aristocratic circles – cf. Khan's (2011) account of a New York elite boarding school. The new elites and burgeoning rich enjoy considerable prestige through their accelerating capacity to accumulate wealth, property and power; indeed, they are presented as cultural leaders living out the lifestyle ideals that are venerated in many parts of the media and consumer culture. They become cultural heroes who enjoy a way of life that involves the veneration for creative project work, quest for new experiences and flexibility and thus draws on many similar dispositions to those of the artist, intellectual or bohemian.[7] The distance between commerce and culture, aestheticizing and cosmopolitan impulses continues

7 Indeed, despite the assumption of initial tensions and oppositions, there are many inflections and cross-overs between the bohemian and the bourgeois down over the last century and a half (CURRID 2009; LLOYD 2010) before the atmosphere of artistic and bohemian districts became seen as a marketable commodity for so-called ›creative cities.‹

to narrow. Yet both cosmopolitanism and aesthetics have been invested with a good deal of hope in their potential to deliver something more: to point towards more enlightened social relationships and a better world. As concepts they came out of a particular time and place: how are we to assess the potential of aesthetic cosmopolitanism today?

Concluding remarks

Aesthetic cosmopolitanism opens up a number of agendas that could potentially take us beyond global consumer culture. Ulrich Beck's, of course, focused on the dark side of contemporary consumer culture, the hidden consequences of our banal cosmopolitanism, as we consume goods from all corners of the world, with the resultant costs of pollution, waste and accumulating risks. A new active cosmopolitanism for Beck was therefore a necessary step to control global risks and explore alternatives (cf. HAN 2016). Yet Beck has been taken to task for formulating cosmopolitanism in too narrow a manner, which leaves him open to the criticism of cultural goodwill, an unrealistic idealistic projection, in which other parties are too readily assumed to be tolerant partners willing to enter into dialogue. For Bruno Latour (2004b) Beck's cosmopolitan vision assumes a knowable cosmos, ›one cosmos‹, which embrace everything, including the great number of nonhuman entities, that facilitate human action. Unfortunately, the conditions for the humanism and ›mononaturalism‹ that sustain this vision are disappearing. Instead, we could better conceive the cosmos by what William James refers to as the ›pluriverse‹, something which is essentially plural, incomplete, whose elements are incompatible and antagonistic.[8] This suggests we should add ›multinaturalism‹, to our more accustomed ›multiculturalism‹ and refuse the comfort of false communalities. Not one world and cosmos, but many contradictory ontologies and competing cosmologies. The metaphor of dialogue becomes suspect, as it is not a question of intercultural dialogue, or Greek city-state agora public politics with assumptions of ›give and take‹ amongst parties

8 James Joyce notion of ›chaosmos‹ as discussed in *Finnegan's Wake* and Deleuze and Guattari's concept of ›chaosmos‹, plus Guattari's (1995) book *Chaosmosis*, all point to the development of new paradigms that favour the spontaneous springing up of new forms, the open unfolding chaosmos, beyond the ordered common cosmos (see WEBER 2004).

granted relative equality. Rather, as Isabelle Stengers (2011) argues, we need a switch in terminology from cosmopolitanism to cosmopolitics, to go beyond translating other value and diverse cultures into homogenised cleaned-up purified concepts, which nicely fit into our world. Instead, we need to acknowledge dissensus and incompatible ontologies – not a common ordered world, but a blend of order and disorder, common and uncommon cultures. This is not a world of easy-going cultural goodwill and nice people who know what we mean and readily accept common ground rules. Rather, it is one which requires concerted diplomatic work to find some temporary point of co-existence between irreconcilable values and worlds (see also CONWAY 2019; WATSON 2011).

But what does this mean for aesthetics? As mentioned above, if consumer culture aestheticization processes have been spread around the world, then the corollary to banal cosmopolitanism, pace Beck, is banal aestheticization. On one level, consumer culture aestheticization with its proliferation of signs and images can lead to overload, a numbing anaestheticization. Yet on another level, it can also be argued, there is some process of training or refinement of the aesthetic sensibility: as people encounter a wider range of phenomena that are subjected to aesthetic formation as they move through consumer culture spaces and imagery, they can potentially develop a more nuanced and tolerant ›aesthetic eye‹ open to reconsider phenomena that fall under previously unacceptable categories, such as ugly beauty. The capacity to discover hidden beauty in the banal detritus of consumer culture, which also becomes rapidly taken up and played-back to us by the consumer culture image-making apparatus, with its legions of artistic and cultural intermediaries ever on the look-out to generate ever new angles on the world. But it also points back to more formal steps to develop and institutionalize an aesthetic education in previous eras and cultures. A process, which is by no means confined to the commodity form and contemporary consumer culture, given the existence in pre-Tokugawa Japan, of wabi-sabi ›poverty aesthetics‹ developed by Sen no Rikyu, and various forms of Zen Buddhism (IKEGAMI 2005; ODIN 2018), in which initiates are trained to acquire a refined sensibility capable of detecting evanescent beauty everywhere. This points us towards aesthetic education, the capacity to train the senses and cultivate an aesthetic sensibility.

Schiller's (1967) *Aesthetic Education* proved to be an important work in the exploration of the potential for aesthetic experience to have a civilizing and educative function. Aesthetic experiences could take us beyond sen-

suous appetite to moral fulfilment, enlarge our way of thinking and give a greater sense of wholeness to affirm our sense of humanity. The cultivation of a disinterested free appreciation of pure appearance, distances us from the pressures of everyday life: we can enjoy greater freedom and the capacity to play (KIMBALL 2001). Schiller's concerns still resonate, as we find in Gayatri Spivak's (2012) book *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization*. For Spivak aesthetic education is still about training the imagination and creativity, but it has to address the current global condition. This involves the need to go beyond the aesthetic legacy of the Enlightenment, to rethink our current moment using the resources of Antonio Gramsci to address the wider global educational, intellectual and ethical issues, along with Gregory Bateson who emphasised the ›double bind‹, a condition afflicting those who are both enriched and impoverished by ›trans-contextual gifts‹. An aesthetic education, then, become a better way for the »displacement of belief onto the terrain of the imagination,« to engage in a form of play and discovery (SPIVAK 2012: 10).

Yet in an age where creativity and imagination are endlessly invoked – the media constantly venerate creatives, creative cities, creative industries, creative technologies, etc. – the question of the scope and nature of an aesthetic education, is still a highly problematic topic, given the formal processes of allegedly superior learning, taste and morality it connotes. Interesting in this context is the work of Deleuze and Guattari on aesthetics, especially Guattari's efforts in *Chaosmosis* (1995) and *The Three Ecologies* (2000) to develop a new aesthetic paradigm concerned with the production of subjectivity as an aesthetics of existence. Guattari (2000: 24) is searching for »antidotes to mass-media and telematic standardization, the conformism of fashion the manipulation of opinion by advertising, surveys etc.« The aim is to undermine the general aestheticization of everyday life, to experiment with new ethico-aesthetic creative life practices (BRUNNER et al. 2012; O'SULLIVAN 2010). The new ways of operating will be more like those of artists, who seek to continually reinvent their lives. There are clear connections here with the project of the later Foucault to explore the aesthetics of existence, the care of the self and parrhesia (BRUNNER et al. 2012; FEATHERSTONE 2019b). This also relates to the broader question of forming a life, of how and whether a life can be created from within (FEATHERSTONE 2019a). If some become excited by the potential of cosmopolitanism to become a global project, others could well see the aesthetic paradigm as equally significant. Yet in the same manner that cosmopoli-

tanism can give way to an enlarged more problematic cosmopolitics, who is to say that the aesthetic paradigm, will not prove to be equally unruly and difficult to confine.

References

APPADURAI, ARJUN (1990): Disjunction and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 7 (2-3), pp. 295-310.

BAUDRILLARD, JEAN (1983): *Simulations*. New York: Semiotext(e).

BAUMAN, ZYGMUNT (2008): *Does Ethics have a Chance in a World of Consumers?* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

BECK, ULRICH (2002): The Cosmopolitan Society and its Enemies. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (1-2), pp. 17-44.

BENJAMIN, WALTER (1999): *The Arcades Project*. Cambridge/MA: Harvard University Press.

BENJAMIN, WALTER (2010): The Work of Art in the Age of Its Technological Reproducibility. Translated by Michael W. Jennings. In: *Grey Room* 39, pp. 11-38.

BHABHA, HOMI K. (2018): Cosmopolitanism: Reflections at the Commemoration of Ulrich Beck, 30 October 2015. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 35 (7-8), pp. 131-140.

BHAMBRA, GURMINDER K. (2015): ›Whither Europe?‹ Postcolonial versus Neocolonial Cosmopolitanism. In: *Interventions* 18 (2), pp. 187-202.

BRUNNER, CHRISTOPH; ROBERTO NIGRO; GERALD RAUNIG (2012): Towards a New Aesthetic Paradigm. Ethico-Aesthetics and the Aesthetics of Existence in Foucault and Guattari. In: *Radar: Musac's Journal of Art and Thought* 1.

BUCK-MORSS, SUSAN (1992): Aesthetics and Anaesthetics. Walter Benjamin's Artwork Essay Reconsidered. In: *October* 62, pp. 3-41.

CALETRIO, JAVIER (2012): Global Elites, Privilege and Mobilities in Post-Organised Capitalism. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 29 (2), pp. 135-149.

CASAS KLAUSEN, JIMMY (2016): *Fugitive Rousseau. Slavery, Primitivism, and Political Freedom*. New York: Fordham University Press.

CONWAY, PHILIP (2019): The Folds of Coexistence: Towards a Diplomatic Political Ontology, between Difference and Contradiction. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 37(3).

CRARY, JONATHAN (2013): *24/7: Terminal Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep*. London: Verso Books.

CURRID, ELIZABETH (2009): Bohemia as Subculture: »Bohemia« as Industry. In: *Journal of Planning Literature* 23 (4), pp. 368-382.

FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (1995): *Undoing Culture: Globalization, Postmodernism and Identity*. London: Sage.

FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (2001): Globalization Processes. Postnational Flows, Identity Formation and Cultural Space. In: ELIEZER, BEN-RAFAEL; STERNBERG, YITZHAK (eds.): *Identity, Culture and Globalization*. International Institute of Sociology and Brill Academic Press, pp. 483-526.

FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (2007): *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. 2nd Edition. London: Sage.

FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (2013): Super-Rich Lifestyles. In: BIRTCHNELL, THOMAS; CALETRÍO, JAVIER (eds.): *Elite Mobilities*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge, pp. 99-135.

FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (2014): Luxury, Consumer Culture and Sumptuary Dynamics. In: *Luxury* 1 (1), pp. 47-69.

FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (2018): Consumer Culture and its Futures: Dreams and Consequences. In: KRASTEVA-BLAGOEVA, EVGENIA (ed.): *Approaching Consumer Culture: Global Flows and Local Contexts*. Basel: Springer Nature, pp. 1-46.

FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (2019a): Forming a Life and Learning to Live with the Ageing Process. In: CASTRO, GISELA (ed.): *Communication, Culture and Modes of Ageing*. São Paulo: Editora Sulina (in Portuguese).

FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (2019b): *Postmedia, Data and the City.* Paper presented to the Symposium on Postmedia, Tokyo University of the Arts, Tokyo, December 2019.

FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (forthcoming): Urban Aestheticization Processes. Cityscape, Landscape and Image. In: GIANNAKOPOULOU, GEORGIA; GILLOCH, GRAEME (eds.): *The Detective of Modernity. Essays on the Work of David Frisby*. London: Routledge.

FRIEDMAN, JONATHAN (1999): The Hybridization of Roots and the Abhorrence of the Bush. In: FEATHERSTONE, MIKE; LASH, SCOTT (eds.): *Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World*. London: Sage, pp. 230-256.

FRISBY, DAVID (2001): *Streetscapes of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

GILL, ROSALIND; PRATT, ANDY (2008): In the Social Factory? Immaterial Labour, Precariousness and Cultural Work. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 25 (7-8), pp. 1-30.

GUATTARI, FÉLIX (1995): *Chaosmosis*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
GUATTARI, FÉLIX (2000): *The Three Ecologies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
HAN, SANG-JIN (2016): The Legacy of Ulrich Beck in Asia: An Introduction. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 33 (7-8), pp. 253-256.
HAN, SANG-JIN; YOUNG-HEE, SHIM; YOUNG-DO, PARK (2016): Cosmopolitan Sociology and Confucian Worldview: Beck's Theory in East Asia. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 33 (7-8), pp. 281-290.
HAN, SANG-JIN (2019): From Catastrophe to Metamorphosis. A Look at the Korean Peninsula through the Eyes of Kim Dae-jung, Dialogue with John Dunn. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 36 (7-8), pp. 293-311.
IKEGAMI, EIKO (2005): *Bonds of Civility*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
KHAN, SHAMUS RAHMAN (2011): *Privilege. The Making of an Adolescent Elite at St. Paul's School*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
KIMBALL, ROGER (2001): *Schiller's Aesthetic Education*: New Criterion, March 2001.
LATOUR, BRUNO (2004a): How to Talk about the Body? The Normative Dimension of Science Studies. In: *Body & Society* 10 (2-3), pp. 205-229.
LATOUR, BRUNO (2004b): Whose cosmos, which cosmopolitics? Comments on the Peace Terms of Ulrich Beck. In: *Common Knowledge* 10:3.
LLOYD, RICHARD (2010): *Neo-Bohemia. Art and Commerce in the Postindustrial City*. London: Routledge.
MAFFESOLI, MICHEL (1991): The Ethic of Aesthetics. In: *Theory Culture & Society* 8 (1), pp. 7-20.
MYTHEN, GABE (2018): Exploring the Theory of Metamorphosis. In Dialogue with Ulrich Beck. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 35 (7-8), pp. 173-188.
NAVA, MICA (2002): Cosmopolitan Modernity. Everyday Imaginaries and the Register of Difference. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 19 (1-2), pp. 81-99.
ODIN, STEVE (2018): *Tragic Beauty in Whitehead and Japanese Aesthetics*. New York: Lexington Books.
O'SULLIVAN, SIMON (2010): Guattari's Aesthetic Paradigm: From the Folding of the Finite/Infinite Relation to Shizoanalytic Metamodelisation. In: *Deleuze Studies* 4(2), pp. 256-286

SASSATELLI, MONICA (2002): An Interview with Jean Baudrillard. Europe, Globalization and the Destiny of Culture. In: *European Journal of Social Theory* 5 (4), pp. 521-530.

SCHILLER, FRIEDRICH (1967): *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

SEHGAL, MELANIE (2018): Aesthetic Concerns, Philosophical Fabulations: The Importance of a New Aesthetic Paradigm. In: *SubStance* 47(1).

SIMMEL, GEORG (1991): The Berlin Trade Exhibition. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 8 (3), pp. 119-123.

SIMMEL, GEORG (1997a): The Metropolis and Mental Life. In: FRISBY, DAVID; FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (eds.): *Simmel on Culture*. London: Sage, pp. 174-186.

SIMMEL, GEORG (1997b): The Adventure. In: FRISBY, DAVID; FEATHERSTONE, MIKE (eds.): *Simmel on Culture*. London: Sage, pp. 221-232.

SPIVAK, GAYATRI (2012): *An Aesthetic Education in the Era of Globalization*. Cambridge/MA: Harvard University Press.

STADE, RONALD (2007): Cosmos and Polis, Past and Present. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 24 (7-8), pp. 283-285.

STENGERS, ISABELLE (2011): *Cosmopolitics*. 2 Vols. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

STIEGLER, BERNARD (2014): *Symbolic Misery. The Hyperindustrial Epoch*. Cambridge: Polity.

TAMARI, TOMOKO (2006): The Rise of the Department Store and the Aestheticization of Everyday Life in Early Twentieth Century Japan. In: *International Journal of Japanese Sociology* 15 (1), pp. 99-118.

WATSON, MATTHEW C. (2011): Cosmopolitics and the Subaltern: Problematizing Latours Idea of the Commons. In: *Theory, Culture & Society* 28(3).

WEBER, MICHEL (2004): Introduction. In: WEBER, MICHEL (ed.): *After Whitehead: Escher on Process Metaphysics*. Frankfurt/M., Lancaster: Ontos Verlag.

WILLIAMS, ROSALIND (1982): *Dream Worlds. Mass Consumption in Late Nineteenth Century France*. Berkeley/CA: University of California Press.