Chapter 14
The Structural Misrecognition of Migrants as a Critical Cosmopolitan Moment

Zuzana Uhde

Abstract Transnational migrants and their struggles have become central for rethinking cosmopolitanism from below. This chapter builds on the theoretical and empirical arguments of the critical cosmopolitan perspective and proposals for methodological cosmopolitanism, which shifts the angle from which the social sciences look at social reality. Who is regarded as a relevant social actor to put forth cosmopolitan claims is crucial. Nevertheless, the author suggests that equally important is what struggles are taken into consideration. She suggests that cosmopolitan critical social theory can be usefully oriented by the concept of recognition toward the experiences of harms and wrongs as pre-political motivations for social struggles and the related articulation of claims. Migrants' lived critique is an expression of their struggles against structural misrecognition that is mediated by the geopolitics of borders and the structures of global capitalism, and the claims they voice that arise from these struggles need to be taken into consideration in the process of articulating cosmopolitan norms. In the first part of the chapter, the author offers a critical explanation of the geopolitics of borders within capitalist globalization in order to outline the social relations and practices that bring about the structural misrecognition of forced transnational migrants. In the second part, she examines the lived critique of forced transnational migrants through the concept of recognition. She argues that while forced transnational migrants do not necessarily share a cosmopolitan consciousness, they can be defined as cosmopolitan actors if conceptualized as a structural group. In the concluding part, she compares the viewpoint of migrants' lived critique with that of organized migrant protests that have obtained political visibility but may provide only partial foundations for cosmopolitan critical social theory. She suggests that the claims arising from migrants' lived critique expand the normative horizons of cosmopolitan imaginaries to include a more radical critique of global capitalism. In this sense, it engages in struggles also for the benefit of those who do not migrate.

Z. Uhde (✉)
The Czech Academy of Sciences, Institute of Sociology, Prague, Czech Republic
e-mail: zuzana.uhde@soc.cas.cz

G. Schweiger (ed.), *Migration, Recognition and Critical Theory*, Studies in Global Justice 21, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72732-1_14

Keywords Cosmopolitan critical theory · Migrants' lived critique · Forced transnational migration · Global capitalism recognition

14.1 Introduction

The idea of cosmopolitanism has in recent years gained renewed attention, especially within the Anglo-American tradition of political thought since the 1990s. This discussion of cosmopolitanism has, however, largely taken place from the dominant perspective of liberal-normative political theory. Its version of moral and political cosmopolitanism offers "cosmopolitanism from above," which is based on individualist and universalist foundations and is uncritically defined from a position of power (Ingram 2013; Sager 2019). The liberal-cosmopolitan focus on individuals as citizens of the world reflects the lifestyle of a mobile transnational elite, but it does not sufficiently challenge the geopolitical hierarchies embedded in global capitalism. However, the new millennium also ushered in an array of critical perspectives on cosmopolitanism (Delanty 2009; Beck 2006; Pieterse 2006; Kurasawa 2004, etc.). Transnational migrants and their struggles have become central in a rethinking of cosmopolitanism from below (Sager 2018; Caraus and Paris 2019; Eze 2017). Who gets to be regarded as a relevant social actor who can put forth cosmopolitan claims is indeed key. Nevertheless, I suggest that equally important is what struggles are taken into consideration. To pay exclusive attention to traditional forms of political protest (demonstrations, marches, campaigns, etc.) omits from the research focus a substantial part of protest in society. The pre-political everyday struggles for recognition expressed in the lived critique of migrants need to be taken into consideration in the process of articulating cosmopolitan claims.

Many organized migrant protests demand the right to entry and to unconditional recognition as equal moral beings entitled to equal rights. In the current political climate, these seem like radical or even utopian demands. Moreover, under the social conditions of severe existential suffering and social distress, organized migrant protests tend to focus more on goals that are achievable in the here and now. Nevertheless, ultimately, they may reaffirm the cognitive bias of methodological nationalism and an institutional and legal framework defined around the nation-state from which migrants were excluded in the first place.[1] The scope of their claims is often confined to seeking the universal validity of demands for open borders and equal rights. However, given the current global power hierarchies and the structurally unequal inclusion of world macro-regions into global capitalism, open

[1] The book on migrants' protests edited by Tamara Caraus and Elena Paris (2019) presents several examples of migrant activism that from their very foundations do not challenge the institution of the nation-state as the authority defining the dividing line between inclusion and exclusion, such as Sans-Papier, the Dreamers, A Day Without Us marches, etc.

borders reinforce and reproduce existing vulnerabilities and the subordinate inclusion of marginalized migrants as disposable cheap labor. The open borders within the EU Schengen zone shed a clear light on this dynamic, which gained public visibility when interior EU borders were abruptly closed to stop the spread of COVID-19. As a result of the anti-pandemic measures, wealthier EU countries have faced a shortage of care workers and seasonal agricultural workers, most of whom come from central and eastern European countries, and this has exposed the mechanism by which freedom of movement acts as an essential tool for exploiting the mobility of circular migrants, pushing down wages, and extracting more profit. The illusion of a borderless Europe is built on formalized paths for a subtle combination of inclusion of EU migrant workers through access to labor market and their exclusion from some social and labor rights protection. The borders are open for people to cross as though there were no borders, but the structural positioning of different European regions and member states in the EU macro-regional arrangement and the ways in which they are integrated into the global economy serve to maintain the everyday power that borders have to categorize people and reproduce the existing geopolitical hegemony. Open borders for human mobility do not mean a borderless world.

Achille Mbembe argues that we are experiencing an intensification of the fundamental dialectics of opening and closure, that is to say, of globalization and deglobalization tendencies, which are aggravated by the global character of the capitalist form of social relations (Mbembe 2018). Amidst the global interconnection and mobility of capital, goods, and privileged groups, border controls are being increasingly outsourced and externalized in order to avoid the political responsibility for racialized border violence and in order to shrink the category of migrants allowed to enter to the smallest group possible. At the same time, migration management has become a highly profitable enterprise. The global security market is one of the fastest-growing industrial sectors, boosting capitalist globalization despite current nationalist tendencies. Transnational migration is an inherent part of the global economy, and the current forced migration (in a broader sense which I will explain later) is in some respects a direct and foreseeable and in other respects an unintended consequence of late-modern capitalist modernity. Local conflicts and political, economic, social, or ecological hardships are co-produced by transnational practices, and globally produced risks have localized impacts. From the perspective of methodological nationalism, migration is regarded as a problematic deviation from the norm. In contrast, adopting the perspective of methodological cosmopolitanism shifts the angle from which we look at social reality and foregrounds the struggles of transnational migrants.

In this chapter, I build on the theoretical and empirical arguments of critical cosmopolitanism, which situates transnational migrants as the quintessential cosmopolitan subjects. In the first part of the chapter, I offer a critical explanation of the geopolitics of borders within capitalist globalization. The goal is to outline the social relations and practices that lead to the structural misrecognition of forced transnational migrants. In the second part, I focus on the contribution of the critical theory of recognition and examine the lived critique of transnational migrants. I

present the argument that, while marginalized migrants do not necessarily share a cosmopolitan consciousness, they can be defined as cosmopolitan actors if conceptualized as a structural group. In the concluding part, I compare the viewpoint of migrants' lived critique with that of organized migrant protests. Organized migrant protests have attained some level of visibility but may provide only partial or distorted foundations for cosmopolitan critical social theory, as they are impeded by a receiving state bias and a need to translate their claims into the geopolitically biased language of the migration agenda.[2] I then outline the contours of the cosmopolitan critical theory of recognition. I suggest that embedding cosmopolitan critical social theory in the migrants' everyday struggles for recognition serves to expand the normative horizons of cosmopolitan imaginaries beyond freedom of movement and respect for migrants' human rights.

14.2 The Geopolitics of Borders and Global Capitalism

The system of global capitalism requires opening of borders for the flow of capital, goods, and the transnational capitalist class. However, it also requires the enforcement of borders, which are used to ensure that the impacts of proliferating crises and globally produced risks remain localized and to extract profit through legal offshoring practices or illicit financial flows.[3] Global capitalism requires borders that are porous and fading and at the same time reified and exclusionary. These dual bordering processes also involve the differentiated categorization of people and their transnational mobility regime. Transnational professionals and the transnational capitalist class embody the ideal of freedom of movement. The categorization of transnational migrants into political migrants (toward whom states have some responsibility to provide protection) and economic migrants (who are left subject to the benevolence of individual states) is then necessary in order to reconcile the inherent contradictions of capitalist globalization and its accompanying liberal narrative: to uphold the ideal of freedom of movement and human rights within escalated global inequalities

[2] Migration is one of the examples that reveal the co-optation and neoliberal reframing of human rights. Aleksandra Ålund and Carl-Ulrik Schierup (2018) analyzed the evolution of the Global Forum for Migration and Development and pointed to the strategies of the selective inclusion of human rights arguments as signs of their pacification and co-optation. They argue that it is manifested in a shift from migrant labor rights toward moral migrant rights and by the marginalization of labor unions. However, the mobilization of moral arguments shifts attention to protection and partial improvement of migrant conditions at the expense of migrants' claims for global social justice and of systemic changes of the structures producing forced migration (see also Likić-Brborić 2018).

[3] Offshoring practices and illicit financial flows are regarded as a fundamental accompanying effect of global capitalism. However, its premise is not a borderless world but a selectively bordered world. Borders make it possible to establish different legal jurisdictions, which allows mobile capital to escape public control. While the state is no longer the main organizing principle, it is still the executive power and enabler of global capitalism (Robinson 2014).

mobility has to be controlled, and some categories of people must be classified as a threat. Even the agenda for refugees' protection is defensive. It maintains the problematic distinction between political refugees and economic migrants in order to preserve the limited protection of refugees, which is now recognized in the international legal order, but this opens the door to a deterioration of the human rights regime as it pertains to transnational migrants in general as a result of the externalization of so-called border management in an effort to stop "economic migrants." Borders become a space of the violation of rights, the responsibility for which states try to avoid by externalizing and outsourcing border controls through bilateral agreements and the involvement of private companies. Julia Schulze Wessel argues that in these "externalized border zones," migrants become the rightless persons described by Arendt, and are so despite the development of international protections for refugees since the Second World War (Wessel 2016: 54). The need to absorb some migrants – as border controls can never be fully executed and in some cases entitlement to asylum protection is undeniable – meets a demand for cheap labor in some sectors of the labor market in wealthier countries (mainly in the fields of care and agriculture), in what Branka Likić-Brborić identifies as a "neoliberal reframing" of migrant protection and the "'developmental approach' to the problems of refugees." She shows that this weakens the protection of refugees as it introduces a business-run model of finding niches in the transnational labor market for refugees and repositioning them as "weakly protected economic migrants" (Likić-Brborić 2018: 771).

In Europe, economic migration is symbolically represented by the figure of the African migrant, who is presented as a threat to the European way of life and the socioeconomic standards of the middle and poorer classes.[4] Economic migration is depoliticized as an isolated problem that needs to be controlled and managed. The manufacturing of a culture of fear of migrants and moral panic mobilizes the racial category of blackness, which is a product of transatlantic modernity shaped through colonial expansions and the advent of capitalism and reshaped through global capitalism (Mbembe 2017; Quijano 2000; De Genova 2018). Based on a historical analysis of the formation of global power structures and economic dominance through colonial expansion, in which Europe has emerged as a dominant geopolitical identity as opposed to racially classified "non-Europeans" – Indians, blacks, mestizos, and yellow – Aníbal Quijano identifies the "coloniality of power" as a pervasive system for classifying the world population, determining the division of world resources, the social relations of capital, and production of knowledge that continues to shape the current geopolitical landscape in the era after colonial empires (Quijano 2000). Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatsheni (2013) has further developed the notion of the "coloniality of power" to analyze the position of the African macro-region within the current global capitalist system by showing different stages of Euro-American dominance over the African macro-region, from colonialism and the

[4]As only 2% of all migrants living in Europe in 2017 came from Africa (UN 2017), this media representation sheds a clear light on the racial formation of "European" whiteness built in opposition to the blackness as a product of colonial expansions and as an inherent part of modernity.

strategies of colonial rule, the Cold War split of Africa soaked in violence, to the neoliberal turn which uses coloniality to advance structural adjustment programs, and the geopolitical War on Terror. These histories have determined the ways in which the African macro-region has been incorporated into the capitalist global economy. It is important to take this perspective into account to understand the structural sources of contemporary migration from and within Africa. It also, however, sheds light on the representation of African migrants and echoes Chinua Achebe's 1975 analysis of the racism in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (Achebe 2016). Achebe showed that the principal problem for Conrad arose when black Africans left their designated place as savages and claimed recognition as equal moral beings. Achebe argues that it is this claim for the recognition of Africans outside Africa that generates difficulties, fears, and resistance. We can see the same sentiments behind the political slogan "we must help migrants in their country of origin," which reveals the underlying racist resentment against recognizing Africans as equal human beings the moment they move from the role and place that has been defined for them. Thus, what is called migration management is in reality a manifestation of the coloniality of power and its structural violence, exploitation, and dispossession. In this context, Achille Mbembe has highlighted that the language of security and border management is a translation of the racialized violence of the current geopolitics of mobility (Mbembe 2018).

Migration management is increasingly tied to the enforcement of borders through securitization, militarization, and outsourcing and is defined by the interests of the wealthier "receiving" states. However, migration management is still part of the dynamics of global capitalism, even though it is premised on the existence of borders and nation-states' claims to territorial sovereignty. It focuses on controlling human mobility in order to keep the global structures of power intact and to preserve the transnational practices that benefit some macro-regions but impoverish others. The statist rhetoric is also instrumental to the unleashing of immense resources from public budgets and from migrants as well. While originally the term "migration industry" was used to describe a network of different actors assisting migrants and often taking advantage of their vulnerable position, Ninna Nyberg Sørensen and Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen have expanded the meaning of migration industry to include both the facilitation of migration and its control. They "define the migration industry as encompassing not only the service providers facilitating migration, but equally 'control providers' such as private contractors performing immigration checks, operating detention centers and/or carrying out forced returns" (Gammeltoft-Hansen and Nyberg Sørensen 2013: 6). They identify different actors within the migration industry: transnational corporations, which are mainly involved in the externalization of border controls and the criminalization of migration; the agencies that facilitate legal migration; the smaller businesses that assist migrants; the illegal networks involved in smuggling or human trafficking; and the NGOs and humanitarian organizations that may be involved for nonprofit reasons but are still part of the industry, some of which advocate on behalf of migrants, while others work to legitimize governments' restrictive and securitization lenses (Gammeltoft-Hansen and Nyberg Sørensen 2013: 10–12). We can add to

this list also some governments in countries that host large numbers of refugees and use this fact as a source of foreign financial capital through humanitarian assistance. Hosting refugees is clearly a heavy financial burden for poorer countries, but it can also facilitate the influx of investment negotiated by governments, to boost the local formal and informal economy.[5] These networks serve to embed transnational migration in the system of capitalist globalization, while the growing commodification of migration ties it up in complex ways with global capital. First, global capital benefits from the economic order that produces the structural sources of transnational migration, and second, it benefits from the political responses to migration through the privatization and outsourcing of a migration management in that it pours huge investments into the securitization and militarization of border controls.[6] Moreover, new surveillance technologies applied in humanitarian assistance for refugees reinforce the power of borders to categorize people and serve as a way of testing and developing new biopolitics based on big data and digital surveillance (Lemberg-Pedersen and Haioty 2020). The dynamics of this can best be grasped with the concept of a "global border industrial complex." While the migration industry comprises a wide variety of actors, including small-scale enterprises and the shadow economy, I understand the global border industrial complex to refer to the network of powerful individuals and transnational corporations that are linked to governments' migration and security policies and funds but that also have ties to the global financial capital.[7] The global financial capital makes use of borders to shuffle off both responsibilities for social reproduction of the local labor force and responsibilities arising from its role in a production of global risks. Some forms of borders are profitable for transnational economic practices and global capital as they facilitate various illicit financial flows, such as tax evasion, trade mis-invoicing, capital flight, and also the ever-rising profits generated by border management. The complex refers to the connection between different industries and global financial

[5] Globally, the vast majority of refugee, according to the conventional definition of the term, are hosted by developing countries. In 2018, under the common understanding of the term, there were 25.9 million international refugees, 3.5 million asylum-seekers, and 41.3 million internally displaced people, 84% of whom lived in developing countries, while 33% were being hosted in the least developed countries worldwide (UNHCR 2019).

[6] While the global migration agenda operates in a nation-state-centered institutional framework, which takes the perspective of the state and its claim to territorial sovereignty as a starting point, non-state actors are increasingly influencing the discursive framing of human mobility and migration policies (Likić-Brborić 2018; Betts 2013). Moreover, the enforcement of migration management requires an elaborate system of surveillance of human mobility, militarized border controls, and deportation channels. On the surface, it seems that the security and military industries respond to the states' demand. However, Martin Lemberg-Pedersen shows how in subtle ways private security companies under the guise of expert consultancy became the key actors in formulating the EU's border control policies (Lemberg-Pedersen 2013; Lemberg-Pedersen et al. 2020).

[7] The report More Than a Wall by Todd Miller analyses the emergence and functioning of the border industrial complex in the USA (Miller 2019). However, despite focusing on border enforcement, the complex is not strictly tied to an institution of the nation-state as the involved transnational corporations and transnational financial actors operate globally.

capital that forms networks and lobby groups tied to local, national, and supranational political institutions.

A conventional understanding of migration distinguishes between forced migration as a reaction to political repression, violence, and other disasters and economic (or labor) migration motivated by the search for a better life or for a temporary solution by which to access economic resources. The migration of transnational professionals is usually regarded as a separate issue. However, the distinction between forced and economic migration falsely assumes that while the first group has no other option but to migrate, the other group freely decides to leave its country of origin. Even though migration is a decision migrants actively make as part of their coping strategies, it is not a decision that is made free from structural constraints, and life in migration is a continuation of their struggles against injustice and misrecognition. Such a depoliticized approach to economic migration ignores the embeddedness of economic and social factors in the global economy: local problems are connected to transnational practices through direct and unintended consequences. Raúl Delgado Wise has expanded the concept of forced migration beyond the conventional understanding that refers to refugees, asylum-seekers, and internally displaced people and argues that the dynamics of global capitalism produce structural conditions in which "migration has essentially become a forced population displacement." In his view, forced migration specifically includes migration due to violence, conflicts, and catastrophes; human trafficking; dispossession, exclusion, and unemployment; and deportations (Delgado Wise 2018: 750–751). So-called economic migration is a form of forced migration. But not all migrating people are forced migrants. When I speak about transnational migrants, I refer specifically to groups of migrants who are to various degrees forced to leave for different reasons largely linked to global structural injustice. The distinction then lies rather between people who cross borders in response to different kinds of conflict and hardship and people who are in an advantaged position because of their skills and economic, social, or political status and who have access to a significantly more flexible transnational mobility regime.

The global border industrial complex fuels the nation-state-centered securitization and enforcement of borders, which is simultaneously driving dual bordering processes. It comprises a variety of actors, who make use of borders, not only the geographical but also the symbolic ones between "us" and "them," but also in different ways circumvent them. We can analyze the internal structure of the global border industrial complex through the prism of the four fractions of the transnational capitalist class proposed by Leslie Sklair (2003) which is key to understanding the relation between the state and other actors in today's form of capitalist globalization.[8] Through the migration industry and the global border industrial

[8] Leslie Sklair (2003) redefined the classic definition of the capitalist class based on ownership of the means of production to include other forms of capital besides economic, i.e., political, knowledge, and cultural capital. According to Sklair, the transnational capitalist class today includes not only the owners of the major corporations and the managers who run them (the corporate fraction) but also globalizing politicians and bureaucrats at the international, national, and local levels who

complex, the contemporary politics of transnational migration is inherently connected to transnational networks of capital accumulation and the institutional workings of global capitalism, and this is the case even though global capitalism is usually seen as defying borders and the industry is based on the reproduction of the concept of borders – both geographical (although not necessarily nation-state borders) and symbolic. By enforcing an ostensible solution to migration driven by the crises of global social polarization and ecological unsustainability that global capitalism has generated (Robinson 2014; Sklair 2002), global capital uses borders to delay the crisis of overaccumulation by opening new markets of outsourced and privatized border control. The bordering processes selectively target marginalized migrants as racialized subjects. They do not target the mobility of capital or globally privileged classes.

Jan Nederveen Pieterse (2006) calls this capitalist cosmopolitanism,[9] which rests on the coloniality of power (Quijano 2000; Ndlovu-Gatsheni 2013). I will refer to the current globalizing social reality as capitalist globalization or global capitalism and reserve the term "cosmopolitanism" for critical and normative thinking. Against the backdrop of a critical analysis of capitalist globalization, it is only possible to start examining different cosmopolitan practices that break free from the ideological bias of Euro-American-centrism and seek instead to challenge global socioeconomic and political structures with a practical interest in emancipation. Critical cosmopolitanism (Sager 2018; Beck 2006; Fine 2007; Delanty 2009) has been variously termed "emancipatory cosmopolitanism" (Pieterse 2006), "cosmopolitanism from below" (Kurasawa 2004), "local cosmopolitanism" (Chan 2018), "transversal cosmopolitanism" (Hosseini et al. 2016), or "abject cosmopolitanism" (Nyers 2003). The common denominator is that it is regarded as a process of continuous redefinition and a search for a balance between a universal conception of humanity and solidarity, on the one hand, and local bonds, on the other hand, and its aim is to direct specific attention to marginalized actors and their ongoing struggles, which constitute what Ulrich Beck (2006) calls the really existing processes of cosmopolitanization. Robert Fine argues that cosmopolitanism is not a ready-made idea; rather, it is a research agenda that develops a perspective that seeks to address an existing social reality that he calls the age of cosmopolitanism, in which the chances for a cosmopolitan future are open though not yet fully realized (Fine 2007).

---

align with global capital (the state fraction), professionals in the global labor market (the technical fraction), and actors in control of the media (the consumerist fraction) (Sklair 2003: 17–23).

[9] Beck (2006) calls it the false cosmopolitanism of a transnational capitalist class and global elites, who merely instrumentalize cosmopolitan arguments to reproduce and consolidate the current geopolitical and economic arrangements on a global scale.

14.3 Forced Transnational Migrants as Cosmopolitan Actors

To overcome the shortcomings of the mainstream social sciences, Beck proposes applying the analytical perspective of methodological cosmopolitanism as opposed to methodological nationalism[10] (Beck 2006; Beck and Sznaider 2006). In the social sciences, methodological cosmopolitanism focuses on the global interactions that bring about new forms of sociability and transform the role of nation-states and forms of transnational economic, political, and cultural practices, and on their unintended consequences and associated global risks. Sandro Mezzadra's and Brett Neilson's (2013) methodological proposal to understand borders not only in their geographic sense but also as an epistemic perspective and apply it to study the "proliferation of borders" and the changing dialectic between inclusion and exclusion, or between opening and closure, that structure the relation between political power and global capital is an angle of analysis conducive to methodological cosmopolitanism. In line with the methodology of critical theory, Beck argues that the social sciences must focus on the really existing processes of cosmopolitanization – on the emerging cosmopolitan tendencies in transnational forms of life, practices, norms, and institutions – and search for actors' cosmopolitan critiques as the necessary first step toward any normative proposal for cosmopolitan political arrangement. However, from the perspective of methodological cosmopolitanism, it is also possible to examine the local and national dynamics in their social complexity and in a dialectic relationship with the evolving cosmopolitan social reality. Methodological cosmopolitanism does not preordain the subject of research interest but rather the analytical starting points from which a particular issue is explored. Transnational migration cannot be fully understood within the prevailing paradigm, which approaches global relations through the world's political division into nation-states. We can even postulate that the cognitive bias of methodological nationalism is a form of epistemic misrecognition of migrants. While transnational migration practices constitute really existing processes of cosmopolitanization in that they challenge the legitimacy of borders as a means of categorizing people, to argue that transnational migrants – before they are organized into collective struggles and movements – are indeed cosmopolitan actors is a proposition that requires further substantiation. Gerard Delanty (2009) notes that a cosmopolitan imagination involves more than the transnationalization and pluralization of the forms of life. He argues that it is a reflexive and internalized openness to the world, the result of a hermeneutic and cognitive process of learning that transforms one's identity and

[10] Although methodological nationalism is presented as a neutral approach, it is based on concealed ideological assumptions that have to do with the territorial sovereignty of nation-states and the conceptualization of society as a social unit that overlaps with the territory of the modern nation-state. As a result, it operates with a naturalized idea of nation-state and borders. The cognitive bias of methodological nationalism dominates in real politics and also in the social sciences, migration studies, and political theory. It distorts the view of the social reality of migration with a receiving state bias and a predominant focus on immigration, which frames migration as a problematic deviation from the norm (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2002; Sager 2018; Castles 2010).

one's outlook on others. A cosmopolitan imagination refers to a reflexive critique and the normative horizon of ideas about alternative society and actors' claims for justice. Alex Sager argues that "it is not that individual migrants conceive themselves as or necessarily are cosmopolitan actors. Migrants are diverse with many wishing to join national communities. Nonetheless, the act of migrating, whatever the intention, is a *de facto* cosmopolitan act, causing a ripple or a rupture in the national fabric" (Sager 2019: 176). The act of migration is not usually a conscious act of resistance and may not necessarily lead to the emergence of a cosmopolitan consciousness. However, the experience of arbitrariness and the wrongs of borders that exclude some based on their place of birth and include others based on their political, economic, or social status transforms migrants' subjectivity and perspective. The experience of misrecognition opens the way for critical intuition.

Theories of recognition generally draw on the argument that individuals owe their personal integrity to intersubjective relations with others, which are, however, often mediated by institutionalized forms of interactions. The aim of critical theory is to expose, using a critical imagination, the emancipatory and normative potential of certain elements of reality that are grounded in existentially experienced conflicts between ideals and practice as forms of injustice. These existentially experienced harms can be approached through the concept of recognition. Actors' subjective experiences of misrecognition entail an emancipatory potential as pre-political motivations for social struggles and claim-making. In a contextualized and critical explanation of these social struggles, critical theory then articulates actors' claims for expanding normative horizons so as to close the gap between ideals and practice (Young 1990, 2011; Fraser and Honneth 2003; Hrubec 2012). According to Honneth, recognition order arises out of the historical process of struggles against misrecognition and the related articulation of claims for reformulating the normative principles that govern society or a specific sphere of society – intimate, legal, and economic spheres as three historically institutionalized but not discrete spheres (Honneth in Fraser and Honneth 2003). However, focusing only on the psychological aspects of individuals' needs for recognition in intersubjective relations with others does not provide explanations on which basis it would be possible to conceptualize collective protest and actors' claims without presupposing their shared identity and collective consciousness. Consequently, without presupposing a collective subject, it is not possible to conceptualize misrecognition as a systemic and institutionalized process. This is also Nancy Fraser's argument against Honneth's theory of recognition. She argues that in order to identify institutionalized subordination without presupposing a shared collective identity, the concept of recognition needs to be reformulated as a matter of social status and not a psychological relation to others and the self (Fraser in Fraser and Honneth 2003). However, Honneth argues that her status model of recognition not only limits recognition to the cultural sphere, but by bracketing out subjective experiences, it also limits recognition struggles to existing social movements and organized political protests. He makes a valid point against Fraser's curtailed understanding of recognition; however, Fraser's critique of undue emphasis on psychological identity cannot be entirely overlooked. Moreover, Honneth's approach is premised on methodological nationalism, as

Fraser and others have critically pointed out. David Ingram (2018) expanded Honneth-inspired critical theory of recognition in order to engage with global injustice. However, he still approaches the issue of migration with an overly static understanding of people's need for recognition and a sense of belonging tied to a person's place of origin and a person's presential attachment. I will argue later that under more favorable social and economic conditions, an identity of belonging can be reconstructed in a transnational or cosmopolitan way. Marek Hrubec (2013) proposes a more apposite Honneth-inspired approach that develops the perspective of recognition at the global level, taking into account the everyday struggles of the global poor as a critical response to contemporary global interactions. In my view, Marek Hrubec and Iris M. Young present approaches by which critical theory can conceptualize a collective subject of social change without essentializing the group's identity while still including not yet politically articulated struggles against misrecognition and their claims for global justice. I will build on Young's theory in order to articulate forced transnational migrants' lived critique of global structural injustice.

Iris M. Young argues that critical theory's "normative reflection arises from hearing a cry of suffering or distress, or feeling distress oneself" (Young 1990: 5). Even though her empirical reference points are acting and experiencing subjects, she works with an analytical framework that focuses on group differences not for the sake of identity politics but to scrutinize repressive social structures, their modes of reproduction, and their material, political, or cultural effects. Young differentiates between cultural and structural groups (Young 2000). While cultural groups are brought together by language, everyday practices, forms of sociability, and aesthetic or religious conventions, which offer their members certain means of shared expression and communication and create an environment of mutual affinity, structural groups are related to material or psychological aspects and social status. According to Young, "a structural social group is a collection of persons who are similarly positioned in interactive and institutional relations that condition their opportunities and life prospects" (Young 2000: 97). Examples of the structural differences described by Young include relations constituted on the basis of gender, "race," class, sexuality, and disability. These categories refer to "a particular form of social positioning of lived bodies," a specific structural link between institutional conditions, individual life possibilities, and their realization (Young 2005: 22). The ways of coming to terms with these structures are therefore changeable. These categories do not refer to an individual identity which is always unique, but specify the conditions in which individual identity forms.

Although migration is often discussed in terms of intercultural interactions, differences between migrants' and the majority's cultural norms and practices, or the conflicting policy goals of assimilation, inclusion, and exclusion, these perspectives appear less important if the prime focus is on structural injustice. According to Young, cultural differences become a political issue if they are, as they often are, linked to structural inequalities and structurally embedded misrecognition. She stresses that many situations presented as cultural conflicts are actually sociopolitical or economic conflicts because they are based on contests over territory, resources,

decision-making power, or positions in the division of labor. The bulk of the research in migration studies focuses on identity formation and their material social forms (e.g., remittances, transnational networks, transnational forms of families and other social relations, transnational diasporas), emphasizing differences between groups of migrants diversely positioned with respect to their cultural or ethnic background and country of origin. There are differences between diverse groups of migrants; however, their structural position tends to produce similar outcomes. I suggest that it is important not to lose sight of the fact that forced transnational migrants share a specific position in social structures and institutionalized relations that makes them vulnerable to marginalization, exploitation, violence, material and social suffering, and psychosocial harm, and which constrain their ability to fulfill and develop their capacities, express their opinions or experiences, and participate in defining the conditions of their lives (Uhde 2019; Pinzani 2019). If we understand their structural position as a defining characteristic, it exposes the inadequacy of the distinction between political and economic migrants. They form a structural group of people who do not share a collective identity but are all exposed to structural misrecognition mediated by the geopolitics of borders and the structures of global capitalism. While forced transnational migrants face the injustice of repressive border policies, unjust or missing international laws, border violence, and the harmful actions of diverse actors in the migration industry and the global border industrial complex, Young's concept of structural injustice[11] makes it possible to trace also injustice in the structural sources of migration, the historically constituted geopolitical order that has culminated in the current global capitalism that rests on the coloniality of power.

While forced transnational migrants' everyday struggles for recognition are seemingly only individual, if we see them as a structural group, their experiences of misrecognition become structurally generalizable. A cosmopolitan critical social theory can then articulate the collective features of these struggles and their generalizable claims for justice. It overcomes the individualist bias of liberal cosmopolitan theories. To articulate the normative reflection rooted in these struggles, it is important to look at migration as a process that starts with the migrants' decision to leave but continues throughout their lives as they continue being labeled migrants, with a range of economic, political, and cultural consequences. The circumstances that force migrants to leave are transnational in their scope as they are part of a globally entangled world, yet there is a lack of transnational and global institutions through which people from disadvantaged regions can claim their rights. Migration is often a forced choice in response to land grabbing and dispossession, the conflicts and violence that are linked in one way or another to geopolitics and the interests of global capital, exploitation, a lack of development, ecological disasters, etc. Yet it is usually falsely interpreted as the exclusive result of internal state dynamics

[11] Young argues that "structural injustice is a kind of moral wrong distinct from the wrongful action of an individual agent or the repressive policies of a state. Structural injustice occurs as a consequence of many individuals and institutions acting in pursuit of their particular goals and interests, for the most part within the limits of accepted rules and norms" (Young 2011: 52).

(corruption, failed state, etc.) or civil and ethnic conflicts. However, this problematic understanding of local conflicts is only possible through the prism of methodological nationalism.[12] Migration is a survival strategy or an active take on life; it is, in other words, a struggle for recognition. Migrants are compelled to manipulate available resources and legal options or use illegal means in order to navigate in the system and cross borders. When they reach a destination, their struggle against structural misrecognition continues, as they are treated as second-class people and denied access to rights and their social contribution is systemically diminished. Transnational migrants develop a myriad of everyday strategies to circumvent legal limitations, reclaim respect, and rebuild their lives, and some of these strategies are classified as illegal. All these little everyday struggles are an expression of transnational migrants' "lived critique."

This perspective on migrants' everyday struggles echoes James Scott's concept of "weapons of the weak," through which he made visible everyday acts of resistance and non-confrontational protest as a form of class struggle (Scott 1985). For cosmopolitan critical social theory, the psychosocial needs for recognition are relevant as a motivational driver of migrants' lived critique and not as an end in itself. Through lived critique, forced transnational migrants express their claims, which question the legitimacy of frames of reference for migration laws that are centered on the perspective of nation-states, in which they are caught up, and the existing global economic system. A normative reflection of their lived critique points out to their demands to extend the scope of recognition beyond the nation-state – not only in terms of including now excluded groups (open borders) but also in terms of redefining the normative principles of recognition in a way that would transform global economic and geopolitical structures (the right to development). In other words, their lived critique is an expression not only of their struggle for legal recognition but also, and more importantly, of their more fundamental struggle for social recognition, which demands a radical restructuring of the global capitalist mode of production and its logic of accumulation. José A. Zamora convincingly argues that ignoring this aspect is a common denominator of liberal theories of global justice, usually proposing some form of global redistribution. However, it does not address the core of the problem as "sustaining [capitalist] accumulation today requires forms of expropriation and looting that cause population flight and massive displacement" (Zamora 2019: 88). The mobility of forced transnational migrants is part of the really existing processes of cosmopolitanization. Even though migrants do not necessarily internalize a collective cosmopolitan consciousness in a normative sense, their lived critique is not merely an individual expression of psychosocial harm, nor does it represent conformity with the normative horizon of *inter*national

[12] Alison J. Ayers has criticized the concept of civil war, which, according to her, is not only ideologically convenient but also "rests upon the highly problematic conception of the state as a reified entity, with interests and capabilities analytically separate from the totality of global social relations within which states inhere" (Ayers 2010: 155). However, the causes of such economic or political conflicts are historically embedded in global geopolitics – a colonial past, the geopolitics of the Cold War, or the subsequent War on Terror – and are exacerbated by today's global capitalism.

social reality. A structural group of forced transnational migrants constitutes a collective subject of cosmopolitanism. However, when pre-political claims are being translated into an organized protest and activism, they may be adjusted to fit the mainstream political referential framework in order to be heard, or they may be tailored to conform to short-term political goals. Traditional forms of political protest (demonstrations, marches, strikes, blockades, campaigns, etc.) and confrontational collective actions often take place at borders, in detention centers, or in destination countries, and this hampers abilities to maintain a holistic perspective on migration as a process. Moreover, the visibility of these protests is generally obscured by the receiving-state bias of, in most cases, the Euro-American part of the world, even though about half of all migrants globally stay outside of these macro-regions.[13]

14.4 From Lived Critique to Critical Cosmopolitanism

Although methodological nationalism is still a prevailing perspective in the social sciences, many critical scholars now argue that to access the critical and transformative potential of transnational migration, it is necessary to abandon the vantage point of 'receiving' states and set out instead from the standpoint of migrants as mobile subjects. However, I argue that in order to do so, the critical cosmopolitan perspective cannot conceptualize migrants' struggles solely in terms of organized movements and political collectives. The majority of protests that gain visibility are already located in destination states or at their borders, and their claims to be granted access or to achieve the legalization of their status often outweigh the more radical claims that arise from migrants' lived critique and that are sometimes present at the beginning when they come together to form an organized political collective. Thus, equating migrant protests with organized political protests is a distortion that results from receiving state bias. Tamara Caraus and Elena Paris note that: "Remaining within methodological nationalism, scholars cannot but observe the so-called paradox of migrant protests: migrants formulate radical claims such as 'No One is Illegal' and end up asking for legalization in a certain nation-state, thus reconfirming the very institutions that they contest." And they go on to argue "that the failure is not only of migrant activism. Migrant activism experiences this paradox also because there is no alternative, non-statist, institutionalized way of addressing their claims" (Caraus and Paris 2019: 10). They are right in pointing out that the goal of these movements to improve the situation of its participants foreordains them to forfeit certain more radical claims that under current conditions cannot be realized in the short term. They suggest that theories need to provide an outline and

[13] Out of the total number of 258 million "international" migrants worldwide in 2017, about 30% (78 million) were living in Europe and 21% in North America. Moreover, intracontinental migration prevails over intercontinental migration mobility. For example, in 2017, 67% of all European migrants remained in Europe, while 53% of all African migrants were in Africa (UN 2017).

conceptual tools for thinking about and institutionalizing a world beyond borders. However, I propose that first and foremost critical cosmopolitan theories have to broaden the understanding of political protest to include migrants' lived critique and their everyday critical intuition.

Social theories often fail to see forced transnational migrants as political actors unless they collectively organize. This is the case of the otherwise inspiring book edited by Tamara Caraus and Elena Paris on migrant protests and their radical cosmopolitics (Caraus and Paris 2019) or Ariadna Estévez's account of migrant protests as a response to the denial of recognition, where it is only in violent action and conflicts that she identifies migrants' struggles for recognition (Estévez 2012). But this is also the case of accounts that focus on nontraditional migrant protests, such as lip-sewing (Bargu 2017). Among these protests, probably the most radical in terms of transgressing the nation-state framework and articulating cosmopolitan claims beyond borders are the *No Borders*[14] movement and *No One Is Illegal (NOII).*[15] Frédéric Mégret (2019: 32) distinguishes three kinds of cosmopolitan claims present in migrants' protests: "a cosmopolitanism of law and human rights" (equal treatment for migrants), "a cosmopolitanism of inclusion and hospitality" (the right to be included), and "a cosmopolitanism of freedom of borders" (the right to migrate). He argues that *No Borders* and *No One Is Illegal* put forth the third claim for open borders. Both movements are against border controls and against categorizing migrants according to a different legal status, which is seen as a means to divide, control, and exclude some categories. The first of the two movements is anchored more in the anarchist tradition and the second in the socialist tradition. The manifestos of both movements criticize global capitalism as the source of the structural relations that cause most human mobility. NOII also criticizes the conditions under which migrants are included in the social welfare, labor market, etc., thus including the argument not only of open borders but also under what conditions. However, the primary focus of both movements is on abolishing border controls and questioning the legitimacy of borders. In the end, even these movements run the risk of adopting the mainstream referential framework that treats migration as a legal issue. As radical as their claim for open borders is, it softens the critique of global capitalism as an inseparable aspect of the critique of the situation of forced transnational migrants. In other words, it approaches borders only in their territorial sense and overlooks how global capitalism, which rests on the coloniality of power, creates symbolic and economic derivations of borders within one location and globally. Open territorial borders do not necessarily overcome the problem of the subordinate inclusion of individuals who have little choice other than to give in to being exploited in a wealthier country, when that is still an improvement in their situation compared to the lack of opportunities in poorer countries. Development is then reduced to an individual strategy (also through remittances, etc.).

[14] http://noborders.org.uk/news/no-borders-manifesto

[15] http://www.tacticalmediafiles.net/articles/3238/No-One-is-Illegal_-Manifesto;jsessionid=7BF90D89B801E0BE84C525FEA7FAEF7F

I argue that the migrants' lived critique advances cosmopolitan claims, and it is an important task of cosmopolitan critical social theory to articulate these claims. Firstly, it targets global capitalism through a critical reflection of the structural conditions people face before migration, the critique of which is an inherent part of their lived critique because structural exploitation, dispossession, violence, and oppression by global capitalist forces are at the roots of the existentially experienced harm and misrecognition that precedes their decision to migrate. After experiencing the activities of transnational corporations or the effects of structural adjustment policies firsthand, these people have critical intuition about the wrongs of global capitalist forces. They may blame their governments for some wrongs and for not taking action to address problems, but on their migration route, they also piece together a broader picture of the system that condemns them to a position as outcasts, and they develop an everyday global awareness. In the organized migrant protests that take place in destination countries, this aspect of migrants' lived critique is sidelined. Migration is a form of struggle against misrecognition which manifests as the lack of the right not to migrate (right to development). Secondly, their lived critique also targets the worldview of bordered communities, which contradicts their lived experience of social struggles against circumstances that are transnational in scope and force them to migrate, and it targets the lack of transnational institutions through which they could effectively claim remedies and their rights. This second aspect of migrants' lived critique that targets and challenges the nation-state-centered legal and institutional framework in which they are required to mold their lives is much more pronounced. Moreover, while organized protests challenge the moral legitimacy of the claim for nation-state sovereignty over borders, the vantage point of migrants' lived critique sheds light on transnational capitalist practices, which in most states (except global powers) effectively vanquish their chances of exercising their sovereignty, and this exposes the ideal of sovereignty as a weakening concept. I argue that the claims that arise from migrants' lived critique expand the normative horizons of cosmopolitan imaginaries to include a more radical critique of global capitalism. In this sense, their lived critique works also to benefit others who do not migrate.

This is, of course, not to say that we should disregard migrants' organized political protests. Rather, it means that these protests cannot be our only empirical referential points. Migrants' organized protests are practically and epistemically courageous projects. In order to dispel the risk of migrant protests being assimilated within an inclusion claim, Sager argues that, unlike other marginalized groups' social protests, it is not possible to fully co-opt migrants' protests into a nation-state narrative because "migrant exclusion from the nation-state is necessary, not contingent." He goes on to state that "the migrant is defined as an outsider or stranger; gaining full membership depends on effacing one's identity as a migrant" (Sager 2019: 179). However, in my view, he overstates the subversive power of the identity of the migrant. Although migrants challenge the national narrative, the figure of the migrant can be fully included based on meritocratic arguments, and the reference to one's identity is not sufficient as the state can include within its borders a multitude identities of belonging. I recall Young's argument that identity is always the specific

and exclusive characteristic of an individual, and as such, it is not a basis on which it is possible to articulate collective political claims (Young 2000). The subversive power lies rather in the existentially experienced harms that are caused by the structural misrecognition of forced transnational migrants, which is what motivates critical reflection and resistance. A migrant who is a member of the elite group of transnational mobile professionals does not necessarily challenge the power of borders to exclude and categorize people. In this respect, while the figure of the African migrant is associated with the label of economic migrant, Afropolitans as a symbolic representation of African modernity experience some racially motivated misrecognition; they also enjoy some privileges as a mobile African elite. The concept of Afropolitanism emerged under the influence of the 1990's cosmopolitan discourse. Mbembe talks about Afropolitanism as "a way of being in the world," characterized by cultural hybridizations and cross-border circulations, and Afropolitans are seen as new African migrants.[16] On the one hand, this image is clearly connected to an elite transnational mobility regime, and in this sense, it is an element of neoliberal political economy and global consumerist culture, with a false aspiration to cosmopolitanism (Kasanda 2018). On the other hand, it shows how one's belonging and the psychosocial need for recognition is not necessarily tied to one's original location and can be reconfigured under favorable economic and sociocultural conditions into cosmopolitan belonging while retaining a partial attachment to a specific political community or culture. These illustrations echo Beck's view that the really existing processes of cosmopolitanization do not necessarily lead to a positive cosmopolitan arrangement. They bring about critical reflexivity, global awareness, and a sense of belonging, which can, nevertheless, still be in the tow of capitalist globalization and its sharpening inequalities.

At the same time, not all claims and expectations put forth by forced transnational migrants as cosmopolitan actors are justified. To make such a distinction, we need a theoretical articulation of the normative criteria for critique, articulated from the position of methodological cosmopolitanism. Transnational migrants' claims are usually disregarded on the basis of categorizations and boundaries that seem legitimate only from the perspective of methodological nationalism. But there is a need for a cosmopolitan justification of limitations of the rights of other groups.[17] In this sense, it is not legitimate to deny equal rights and social recognition of some groups based on arbitrariness of their place of birth, but it is also not legitimate to claim the inclusion of some groups of migrants deliberately on the condition that

[16] Achille Mbembe's essay on Afropolitanism was published in 2005 and is available at http://africultures.com/afropolitanisme-4248/

[17] I leave aside the discussion on overall norms of global justice. In this chapter, I focus only on one aspect of global justice which requires radically altering global economic and geopolitical structures. Today's configuration of borders brings about structural misrecognition of forced transnational migrants not only in terms of limiting their mobility but also, and perhaps more pressingly as it concerns majority of people who do not migrate, in terms of limiting their self-development in places they are forced to leave as the borders are functional for global capital to escape taxation, regulation, and public control.

other groups of migrants are excluded.[18] This implies that the construction of distinct categories of deserving migrants (refugees) and undeserving migrants (economic migrants) is not defensible from the perspective of the theory of global justice, which is grounded in the concept of recognition, even though such categorization is legally codified today. While some groups of migrants are more vulnerable and may need special protection, this should not be contingent on the general exclusion of others who are able-bodied adults but in a perhaps less life-threatening situation. However, critical cosmopolitanism does not require that all values are universally shared but rather an openness to others and reflexive merging of universalism with particular solidarities and local bonds (cf. Turégano 2019). Claims arising from the lived critique of forced transnational migrants are not an absolute criterion of global justice, but they present a vector that the theorizing of global justice needs to follow. To take seriously the migrants' lived critique means to acknowledge that the critique of global capitalism precedes the critique of mobility restrictions.[19] Forced transnational migrants make visible the destructive impacts of global capitalism and bring them to the doorstep in wealthier countries. But not everyone affected by these impacts migrates. Open borders will not remedy these structural injustices without the global regulation of capital and structural changes.

Critical cosmopolitanism is empirically embedded in these really existing processes of cosmopolitanization and the lived critique of forced transnational migrants as cosmopolitan actors who foreground the need for a structural critique of global capitalism. This approach thus crucially differs from liberal cosmopolitanism, which is based on an abstraction that not only hides the particularistic foundations of a universalism that is defined from a position of geopolitical power but also presupposes a global capitalist order as a taken-for-granted institutional framework for political cosmopolitan proposals (usually involving some form of redistribution). In contrast, cosmopolitan critical social theory formulates normative reflections of global justice from the vantage point of collective social subjects defined by actors' positions within global social structures. While it questions the overly individualist foundations of liberal cosmopolitan theories, it places the emphasis on individuals' psychosocial needs for belonging and recognition in intersubjective relations in order to understand pre-political social struggles and interpret the normative claims they give rise to. Forced transnational migrants are not the only marginalized cosmopolitan actors, but as a structural group, they make acutely visible the inherent contradictions and failures of global capitalism and reveal how borders operate to maintain global structural injustice.

[18] Arguments for inclusion can be made gradually, but the exclusion of others should not form the foundational logic of the argument.

[19] However, it is important to point out that there may be very different motives and foundations behind the political argument "to help migrants in their home country." Even the concept of the "root causes" of migration gets distorted in political debates, usually patching up manifestations (such as poverty or unemployment) of deeper structural problems.

14.5 Conclusion

Critical cosmopolitanism is not a normative prescriptive theory. It is a response to an unjust global geopolitical order that is trying to find cosmopolitan (global) remedies to global problems. The normative dimension of critical cosmopolitanism can be empirically embedded in and oriented by the concept of recognition, which foregrounds the experiences of harms and wrongs that motivate everyday struggles against misrecognition. The concept of recognition directs attention at the prepolitical claims expressed through migrants' lived critique. This critique includes not only a critique of repressive migration law but also of the structural conditions that define migrants' lives before the decision to migrate. A normative reflection of migrants' lived critique calls attention to their demands to extend and redefine the normative principles of recognition in a way that would transform structures of global capitalism that rests on the coloniality of power. Since most people's interpersonal relations in late-modern capitalist societies are mediated through institutionalized interactions, most misrecognition arises from interactions between people and institutions or people representing these institutions. It is important to mention that forced transnational migrants face misrecognition from action by many actors within the migration industry and the global border industrial complex and from the direct consequences of the law, but they also face misrecognition as a result of the global structural injustice that arises from an institutionalized global order that systematically benefits global capital, the transnational capitalist class, and elite groups scattered around the world as well as selected global macro-regions and their inhabitants (although to a different degree). In many respects, the selective inclusion of migrants as second-class people and a precarious labor force not only works to maintain global capitalism, but it also serves as a way of giving moral legitimacy to the principle of meritocracy the system presumably rests on. However, amending migration law and opening borders would not eliminate all forms of structural misrecognition of forced transnational migrants, even though it would substantially improve today's brutal and alarming situation.

Organized migrant protests by their very nature act to confront the immediately harmful and brutal effects of immigration laws, detention centers, border controls, and the consequences of their externalization and outsourcing. But, as I argued, these protests do not necessarily represent the full scope of the lived critique of forced transnational migrants as a structural group, i.e., a group of people who are similarly positioned within the social structure and are forced to migrate in response to the direct or indirect consequences of the logic of capitalist accumulation and the transnational relations of production. Cosmopolitan critical social theory needs to go a step further if it is to keep up with the premise that the emancipatory potential of the really existing processes of cosmopolitanization should be taken as its empirical referential point.[20] I suggest that focusing on migrants' lived critique as an

[20] In the next step, cosmopolitan critical theory needs to elaborate an institutional proposal for putting these normative claims in practice. In my view, Iris M. Young's (2011) model of differentiated global political responsibility is a fruitful starting point.

expression of their struggles against structural misrecognition, which starts before the decision to migrate is made, moves cosmopolitan critical social theory in this direction. Although not all migrants' claims are legitimate, the goal is to analytically distill progressive cosmopolitan normative claims arising from these everyday struggles and grasp their emancipatory cosmopolitan moment.

References

Achebe, Chinua. 2016. An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's Heart of Darkness. *The Massachusetts Review* 57 (1): 14–27.

Ålund, Aleksandra, and Carl-Ulrik Schierup. 2018. Making or Unmaking a Movement? Challenges for Civic Activism in the Global Governance of Migration. *Globalizations* 15 (6): 809–823.

Ayers, Alison J. 2010. Sudan's Uncivil War: The Global-Historical Constitution of Political Violence. *Review of African Political Economy* 37 (124): 153–171.

Bargu, Banu. 2017. The Silent Exception: Hunger Striking and Lip-Sewing. *Law, Culture and the Humanities*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1743872117709684.

Beck, Ulrich. 2006. *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity.

Beck, Ulrich, and Natan Sznaider. 2006. Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda. *The British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 1–23.

Betts, Alexander. 2013. The Migration Industry in Global Migration Governance. In *The Migration Industry and the Commercialization of International Migration*, ed. Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen and Ninna Nyberg Sørensen, 45–63. New York: Routledge.

Caraus, Tamara, and Elena Paris, eds. 2019. *Migration, Protest Movements and the Politics of Resistance. A Radical Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*. Routledge.

Castles, Stephen. 2010. Understanding Global Migration: A Social Transformation Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36 (10): 1565–1586.

De Genova, Nicholas. 2018. The 'Migrant Crisis' as Racial Crisis: Do Black Lives Matter in Europe? *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41 (10): 1765–1782.

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

Delgado Wise, Raúl. 2018. Is There a Space for Counterhegemonic Participation? Civil Society in the Global Governance of Migration. *Globalization* 15 (6): 746–761.

Chan, Stephen. 2018. The problematic Non-Western Cosmopolitanism in Africa Today: Grappling with a Modernity Outside History. *Human Affairs* 28: 351–366. https://doi.org/10.1515/humaff-2018-0029.

Estévez, Ariadna. 2012. *Human Rights, Migration, and Social Conflict. Toward a Decolonized Global Justice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Eze, Michael Onyebuchi. 2017. I am Because You Are: Cosmopolitanism in the Age of Xenophobia. *Philosophical Papers* 46 (1): 85–109. https://doi.org/10.1080/05568641.2017.1295617.

Fine, Robert. 2007. *Cosmopolitanism*. Oxon: Routledge.

Fraser, Nancy, and Axe I. Honneth. 2003. *Redistribution or Recognition? A Political-Philosophical Exchange*. London and New York: Verso.

Gammeltoft-Hansen, Thomas, and Nyberg Sørensen, Ninna, ed. 2013. *The Migration Industry and the Commercialization of International Migration*. New York: Routledge.

Hosseini, S.A. Hamed, Berry K. Gills, and James Goodman. 2016. Toward Transversal Cosmopolitanism: Understanding Alternative Praxes in the Global Field of Transformative Movements. *Globalizations* 14 (5): 667–684. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2016.1217619.

Hrubec, Marek. 2012. Authoritarian Versus Critical Theory. *International Critical Thought* 2 (4): 431–444.

———. 2013. An Articulation of Extra-Territorial Recognition. In *Global Justice and the Politics of Recognition*, ed. Tony Burns, 271–295. New York: Palgrave.

Ingram, David. 2018. *World Crisis and Underdevelopment. A Critical Theory of Poverty, Agency, and Coercion*. Cambridge University Press.
Ingram, James D. 2013. *Radical Cosmopolitics. The Ethics and Politics of Democratic Universalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Kasanda, Albert. 2018. *Contemporary African Social and Political Philosophy. Trends, Debates and Challenges*. London and New York: Routledge.
Kurasawa, Fuyuki. 2004. A Cosmopolitanism from Below: Alternative Globalization and the Creation of a Solidarity Without Bounds. *European Journal of Sociology* 45 (2): 233–255. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003975604001444.
Lemberg-Pedersen, Martin. 2013. Private Security Companies and the European Borderscapes. In *The Migration Industry and the Commercialization of International Migration*, ed. Thomas Gammeltoft-Hansen and Ninna Nyberg Sørensen, 152–172. New York: Routledge.
Lemberg-Pedersen, M., and E. Haioty. 2020. Re-Assembling the Surveillable Refugee Body in the Era of Data-Craving. *Citizenship Studies* 24 (5): 607–624. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2020.1784641.
Lemberg-Pedersen, M., J. Rübner Hansen, and O. Joel Halpern. 2020. *The Political Economy of Entry Governance*, AdMiGov Paper D1.3. Copenhagen: Aalborg University. http://admigov.eu/upload/Deliverable_D13_Lemberg-Pedersen_The_Political_Economy_of_Entry_Governance.pdf. Accessed 23 Feb 2020.
Likić-Brborić, Branka. 2018. Global Migration Governance, Civil Society and the Paradoxes of Sustainability. *Globalizations* 15 (6): 762–778.
Mbembe, Achille. 2017. *Critique of Black Reason*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
———. 2018. *The Idea of Borderless World*. Lecture at the University of Augsburg, Germany, May 9, 2018. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cUAcfDkLAx4.
Mégret, Frédéric. 2019. Migrant Protests as a Form of Civil Disobedience: Which Cosmopolitanism? In *Migration, Protest Movements and the Politics of Resistance. A Radical Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, ed. Tamara Caraus and Elena Paris, 29–50. Routledge.
Mezzadra, Sandro, and Brett Neilson. 2013. *Border as Method, or, the Multiplication of Labor*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
Miller, Todd. 2019. *More Than a Wall. Corporate Profiteering and the Militarization of US Borders*. Transnational Institute. Available at: https://www.tni.org/files/publication-downloads/more-than-a-wall-report.pdf
Ndlovu-Gatsheni, Sabelo J. 2013. The Entrapment of Africa Within the Global Colonial Matrices of Power. Eurocentrism, Coloniality, and Deimperialization in the Twenty-First Century. *Journal of Developing Societies* 29 (4): 331–353. https://doi.org/10.1177/0169796X13503195.
Nyers, Peter. 2003. Abject Cosmopolitanism: The Politics of Protection in the Anti-Deportation Movement. *Third World Quarterly* 24 (6): 1069–1093. https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590310001630071.
Pinzani, Alessandro. 2019. Migration and Social Suffering. In *Challenging the Borders of Justice in the Age of Migrations*, ed. Juan Carlos Velasco and Maria Caterina La Barbera, 139–156. Springer.
Robinson, William I. 2014. *Global Capitalism and the Crisis of Humanity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Sager, Alexander. 2018. *Towards a Cosmopolitan Ethics of Mobility. The Migrant's-Eye View of the World*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
———. 2019. Reclaiming Cosmopolitanism Through Migrant Protest. In *Migration, Protest Movements and the Politics of Resistance. A Radical Political Philosophy of Cosmopolitanism*, ed. Tamara Caraus and Elena Paris, 171–185. Routledge.
Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak. Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
Sklair, Leslie. 2003. *The Transnational Capitalist Class*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Turégano, Isabel. 2019. Ethical Dimensions of Migrant Policies: A Critical Cosmopolitan Perspective. In *Challenging the Borders of Justice in the Age of Migration*, ed. Juan Carlos Velasco and Maria Caterina La Barbera, 95–116. Springer.

Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 2006. Emancipatory Cosmopolitanism: Towards an Agenda. *Development and Change* 37 (6): 1247–1257.

Quijano, Aníbal. 2000. Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America. *Nepantla* 1 (3): 533–580.

Uhde, Z. 2019. Claims for Global Justice: Migration as Lived Critique of Injustice. In *Challenging the Borders of Justice in the Age of Migrations*, ed. Juan Carlos Velasco and MariaCaterina La Barbera, 183–204. Springer.

UN. 2017. *International Migration Report* [highlights]. New York: OSN. http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationreport/docs/MigrationReport2017_Highlights.pdf.

UNHCR. 2019. *Global Trends. Forced Displacement in 2018*. UNHCR. https://www.unhcr.org/statistics/unhcrstats/5d08d7ee7/unhcr-global-trends-2018.html

Wessel, Schulze Julia. 2016. On Border Subjects: Rethinking the Figure of the Refugee and the Undocumented Migrant. *Constellations* 23 (1): 46–57.

Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick Schiller. 2002. Methodological nationalism and beyond nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks* 2 (4): 301–334.

Young, Iris M. 1990. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

———. 2000. *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2005. Lived Bodies vs. Gender: Reflections on Social Structure and Subjectivity. In *On Female Body Experience: Throwing Like a Girl and Other Essays*, ed. Iris M. Young, 12–26. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

———. 2011. *Responsibility for Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Zamora, José A. 2019. Human Mobility and Borders: The Limits of Global Justice. In *Challenging the Borders of Justice in the Age of Migrations*, ed. Juan Carlos Velasco and MariaCaterina La Barbera, 73–92. Springer.