

THE HISTORY OF CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY

General Editor: Alan D. Schrift

1. Kant, Kantianism, and Idealism: The Origins of Continental Philosophy
Edited by Thomas Nenon
2. Nineteenth-Century Philosophy:
Revolutionary Responses to the Existing Order
Edited by Alan D. Schrift and Daniel Conway
3. The New Century: Bergsonism, Phenomenology, and
Responses to Modern Science
Edited by Keith Ansell-Pearson and Alan D. Schrift
4. Phenomenology: Responses and Developments
Edited by Leonard Lawlor
5. Critical Theory to Structuralism: Philosophy, Politics,
and the Human Sciences
Edited by David Ingram
6. Poststructuralism and Critical Theory's Second Generation
Edited by Alan D. Schrift
7. After Poststructuralism: Transitions and Transformations
Edited by Rosi Braidotti
8. Emerging Trends in Continental Philosophy
Edited by Todd May

THE HISTORY OF
CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY

General Editor: Alan D. Schrift



VOLUME 8

EMERGING TRENDS IN
CONTINENTAL PHILOSOPHY

Edited by Todd May

ACUMEN

7. European citizenship: a postnationalist perspective ROSI BRAIDOTTI	127
8. Postcolonialism, postorientalism, postoccidentalism: the past that never went away and the future that never arrived EDUARDO MENDIETA	149
9. Continental philosophy and the environment JONATHAN MASKIT	173
10. Rethinking the new world order: responses to globalization/American hegemony TODD MAY	193
<i>Chronology</i>	209
<i>Bibliography</i>	229
<i>Index</i>	243

SERIES PREFACE

"Continental philosophy" is itself a contested concept. For some, it is understood to be any philosophy after 1780 originating on the European continent (Germany, France, Italy, etc.). Such an understanding would make Georg von Wright or Rudolf Carnap – respectively, a Finnish-born philosopher of language and a German-born logician who taught for many years in the US – a "continental philosopher," an interpretation neither they nor their followers would easily accept. For others, "continental philosophy" refers to a style of philosophizing, one more attentive to the world of experience and less focused on a rigorous analysis of concepts or linguistic usage. In this and the accompanying seven volumes in this series, "continental philosophy" will be understood *historically* as a tradition that has its roots in several different ways of approaching and responding to Immanuel Kant's critical philosophy, a tradition that takes its definitive form at the beginning of the twentieth century as the phenomenological tradition, with its modern roots in the work of Edmund Husserl. As such, continental philosophy emerges as a tradition distinct from the tradition that has identified itself as "analytic" or "Anglo-American," and that locates its own origins in the logical analyses and philosophy of language of Gottlob Frege. Whether or not there is in fact a sharp divergence between the work of Husserl and Frege is itself a contested question, but what cannot be contested is that two distinct historical traditions emerged early in the twentieth century from these traditions' respective interpretations of Husserl (and Heidegger) and Frege (and Russell). The aim of this history of continental philosophy is to trace the developments in one of these traditions from its roots in Kant and his contemporaries through to its most recent manifestations. Together, these volumes present a coherent and comprehensive account of the continental philosophical tradition

EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP: A POSTNATIONALIST PERSPECTIVE

Rosi Braidotti

This essay argues that the establishment of the European Union as a constitutional, political, and cultural project, and, more specifically, the enlargement of the European Union to include former Eastern bloc countries after 1989, constitute a break in the scholarship about Europe as a philosophical concept. This claim does not imply any causal connection between the events, but rather draws new analytic categories, which I will outline and explore in this essay.

The starting premise is that the classical scholarship on the philosophical idea of Europe had settled on the consensus that it coincides with the universalizing powers of self-reflexive reason. This idea, formulated in the eighteenth century and canonized by Hegel's philosophy of history, transforms Europe into a universal attribute of the mind that can lend its quality to any object. The self-reflexivity at stake in this definition of Europe was reasserted by Edmund Husserl in the 1930s as a "historical teleology of the infinite goals of reason."¹ This self-aggrandizing vision assumes that Europe is not just a geopolitical location, but rather a concept unfolding through space and time, which can be applicable anytime and anywhere, provided the essential criteria are met. Europe announces itself as the site of origin of critical reason and self-reflexivity. Equal only to itself, Europe as universal consciousness therefore transcends its specificity or, rather, posits the power of transcendence as its distinctive characteristic and universalism as its particularity. This makes Eurocentrism into more than just a contingent matter of attitude: it is a structural element of

1. Edmund Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1970), 299.

philosophical thought, which is also embedded in both theory and institutional and pedagogical practices.

I will focus on two features of this Eurocentric paradigm. The first is a universal claim about the structure, value, and function of reason. The second is the importance of the dialectics of self and other or the binary logic of identity and otherness as the motor for the formation of subjectivity. Central to this universalistic posture and its binary logic is the notion of "difference" as pejoration. Subjectivity is equated with consciousness, universal rationality, and self-regulating ethical behavior, whereas Otherness is defined as its negative and specular counterpart. Insofar as difference spells inferiority, it acquires both essentialist and lethal connotations for people who get branded as "others." These are sexualized, racialized, and naturalized others, who are reduced to the status of disposable bodies. Because their history in Europe has been one of lethal exclusions and fatal disqualifications, they raise issues of both power and exclusion and the need for ethical accountability.

This universalistic self-image has been challenged and displaced by alternative visions of the philosophical status of Europe.² These challenges are both internal to philosophy as a corporate discourse with a formidable institutional history and external to it. The internal interrogation line is drawn along the debate about the "crisis of reason" that has occurred since the early days of poststructuralism between its proponents and opponents. The external fault line is drawn by intersecting critiques developed by radical epistemologies such as feminism, environmentalism, and postcolonial, race, and critical legal theories. They are formulated as a response to concrete world-historical events, such as colonialism, fascism, and communist totalitarianism, which exemplify the atrocities that were committed in the name of Europe's universal civilizing mission. These historical events are set off against the self-aggrandizing narratives derived from the Enlightenment. What emerges from this juxtaposition is a variety of new critical and creative modes of addressing the question of Europe as philosophy.

The European Union as the immediate social and political context in which these competing views emerge adds to their political and ethical urgency. It also sets the arena for a contested debate about what kind of political, moral, and legal entity Europe is in the process of becoming. This essay aims at providing an overview of the main trends of thought in this debate.

Before going any further, however, some careful distinctions need to be made between perspectives situated within the European continent itself and the terms of the debate within the Anglo-American world. I find it especially important to

take distance from the often polemical tone the notion of Europe has acquired in US academic debates centered on French philosophy, especially on issues related to humanism, postmodernism, and relativism. A clear example is Martha Nussbaum's influential statement in *Cultivating Humanity* in favor of two interlocked ideas that pertain to the classical paradigm of European thought: first, an unquestionable appeal to the authority of the history of European philosophy since Greek antiquity; second, the notion that the exercise of philosophical reason is a moral enterprise. This moral universalism concretely results in the liberal American translation of classical European humanism into elitist ideals about higher education, citizenship, and political participation. These beliefs in turn support a transhistorical and ethnocentric civilizational reading of this discipline as a universalistic discourse that is structurally antithetical to any localized, situated perspectives, which are reduced to relativism.

The philosophical opposition to this traditional view confirms the Eurocentric universalistic paradigm, albeit by negation. Recent critiques of the explicit racism of the great continental philosophers are conceived as deconstructions of this Eurocentric and masculinist bias in the teaching of the history of philosophy. Robert Bernasconi's critical analysis of the racist elements within philosophy contests the equation of continental philosophy with Europe as a geographical and historical entity.³ It rather needs to be extended to include the multiple ethnic others and foreign influences that have nurtured and fueled continental thought. Bernasconi argues also that the institutional racism of philosophy is such that there is hardly any work on the history of African philosophical traditions and the contribution they have made to the discipline. It is therefore urgent to compose alternative, non-Europe-based histories of continental philosophy as a transnational enterprise.

These critiques exemplify a trend that is also alive in European thought today. The operative words here are "situated perspectives." Both the critique of ahistorical Eurocentrism and the quest for alternative genealogies of thought express a form of ethical and political accountability that requires adequate understandings of one's embedded and embodied perspectives. Michel Foucault's cartographies of power provide a conceptual and methodological example of this approach, as do the feminist politics of locations as situated knowledges and Gilles Deleuze's concept of radical immanence. For all these thinkers, to stress the situated structure of philosophical knowledge also means to recognize its partial or limited nature. The immediate consequence of this acknowledgment is both ethical and methodological. It requires a specific form of accountability for the production of philosophical ideas. The critiques of both universalism

² Some of these alternative visions are discussed by Eduardo Mendieta in "Postcolonialism, Postorientalism, Postoccidentalism," in this volume.

³ See Bernasconi's "Introduction," in Robert Bernasconi and Sybil Cook (eds), *Race and Racism in Continental Philosophy* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2003).

and of liberal individualism are fundamental starting-points to rethink the interconnection between the self and society in an accountable manner. This nondualistic situated ethics accounts in a nonrelativistic manner for the complex power mechanisms at play in the enunciation of scientific discourse.

For philosophers situated in Europe today, the European Union project has to do with the sobering experience of taking stock of our specific location. The opposite of the grandiose and aggressive universalism of the past, this is a situated and accountable perspective. Daniel Cohn-Bendit recently stated that for this European project to work, we must start from the assumption that Europe is the specific periphery where we live and that we must take responsibility for it.⁴ Imagining anything else would be a repetition of that flight into abstraction for which our culture is (in)famous.

As a consequence, the working definition of Europe adopted in this essay takes a firm and critical distance from the Eurocentric universalism that is taken for granted in the dominant philosophical debates in North America, both by its supporters and by its opponents. I argue that as a result of the European Unification project, but also as a factor that sustains it, the philosophical question about Europe is no longer that of identity, but rather the process of rupture from and transformation of its imperial and undemocratic past. In other words, it is not about who Europeans are, but about what they are capable of becoming. Europe has to become the site of self-criticism and self-transformation on the basis of the hard-won lessons of its rich, dramatic, and complex history. Europe today stands for the ethical obligation to be accountable for its past history and the long shadow it casts on its present politics. In this respect, the political project of the European Union marks a radical redefinition of Europe's relationship to its outside, or its constitutive others. Insofar as this project is ongoing, it is both contested and fraught with internal contradictions. It follows, then, that the consensus about the displacement of the old universalizing notion of Europe produces a range of options regarding the alternatives. That philosophical consensus itself, however, is beyond dispute.

1. THE EUROPEAN UNION AS NEW DISCURSIVE FRAME

Historically, the project of the European Union originates in the defeat of fascism and Nazism after the Second World War and is grounded in antifascism, antinationalism, and antimilitarism. The life and work of one of the initiators

of the project of European federation – Altiero Spinelli – testifies to this.⁵ In the context of the Cold War, however, the new European Community also functioned as a showcase of Western superiority and streamlined the reconstruction of Europe's war-torn economy. The moral and political bankruptcy of European "civilization" was exemplified by the Holocaust, perpetuated against the Jewish and Roma populations, among others, as well as the persecution of homosexuals, communists, and other groups of people by the Nazi and fascist regimes. The legacy of racism, extermination, and violence of European history comes under criticism in the second half of the twentieth century, first in the aftermath of fascism and subsequently as a commentary on the atrocities of communism. The continental Europe that emerged from the war was philosophically impoverished. As a result of Nazi persecution of Jewish intellectuals, the loss was human first and foremost, but some philosophical ideas also perished. Marxism and psychoanalysis were the critical theories that Nazism violently eradicated. The Cold War, which kept Europe and the world split and dichotomized, and demonized Marxism, did not facilitate the resurgence of those critical theories in the continent where they had originated. Their re-implantation back into Europe entailed a self-critical discussion about the role of totalitarian thought in European cultural, political, and intellectual history that took place within the Frankfurt School, the Yugoslav school of Marxism, and the Italian brand of "Euro-communism," as well as within French philosophy, which acted as a regenerator of a self-reflexive and critical continental philosophy of the subject in the post-Second World War period.

It is significant in this respect that the French poststructuralists reappraised the very thinkers – Marx and Freud – whom the Nazis had banned. Unlike the structuralists, who also returned to Marx and Freud, they focused as well on the other totalitarian movement of the twentieth century and analyzed the limitations and the horrors of communism. This generation, however, also rescued the transformative potential of Marx's own philosophical texts against the political conservatism of the institutions that controlled Marxist (and psychoanalytic) dogma. In their view, the crux of the problem was the universalizing theory of the subject that is implicit in these theories: under the cover of historical materialism, or of the unconscious, the subject of critical European theory preserved a unitary, hegemonic, and teleological place as the motor of human history. Accountability for European history therefore took the form of unhinging the subject from unitarian identities, freeing it respectively from the dictatorship of a libido dominated by Oedipal jealousy, and from the linearity of a historical *telos* that had married reason to the revolution, both of them vowing violence.

4. See Daniel Cohn-Bendit, "Transit Discussion," *Newsletter of the Institute for Human Sciences* 50 (June–August 1995), 1–4.

5. Altiero Spinelli, *Diario europeo* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 1992).

A third historical element that affected the critique of the old idea of Europe is colonialism. The persistence of the colonial question in the work of the post-structuralists is visible: they rejected Eurocentrism and the classical definition of European identity in terms of humanism, rationality, and the universal. They stressed instead the need to open it up to the "others within" in such a way as to relocate diversity as a structural component of European subjectivity. Best expressed in Julia Kristeva's idea of becoming "strangers to ourselves,"⁶ this deconstructed vision of the European subject is active also in Hélène Cixous's⁷ and Jacques Derrida's reappraisal of their Algerian Jewish roots. Other significant contributions that point strongly in this direction are: Gayatri Spivak's⁸ vocal advocacy of new postcolonial subjects that asserts the noncentrality of European hegemony; Deleuze's critique of majoritarian European languages;⁹ Massimo Cacciari's work on Europe as an archipelago open to the influence of other cultures;¹⁰ Gianni Vattimo's reflections on Europe, Christianity and secularity;¹¹ and Foucault's involvement in the Iranian revolution.

To conclude, the philosophical generation that proclaimed the "death of man" was simultaneously antifascist, anticolonialist, postcommunist, and post-humanist. They also redefined the philosophical status of the notion of Europe accordingly.

II. THREE BRANDS OF PHILOSOPHICAL EUROSCHEPTICISM

Three varieties of Euroskeptical have appeared that also contain vocal elements of doubt about the possibility of redefining Europe as a nonethnocentric.

6. See Julia Kristeva, *Strangers to Ourselves*, Leon S. Roudiez (trans.) (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991).
7. See Hélène Cixous, "Mon Algèriance," *Les Inrockuptibles* 115 (August 20, 1997), 70. Published in English as "My Algeriance, in Other Words, to Depart not to Arrive from Algeria," *Tri-Quarterly* 100 (Fall 1997).
8. See Gayatri C. Spivak, *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics* (London: Methuen, 1987).
9. See Gilles Deleuze, "Les Intellectuels et le pouvoir: Entretien Michel Foucault-Gilles Deleuze," *L'Arc* 49 (1972), published in English as "Intellectuals and Power," Donald F. Bouchard and Sherry Simon (trans.), in *Language, Counter-memory, Practice*, Donald F. Bouchard (ed.) (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1973); *Spinoza et le problème de l'expression* (Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1968), published in English as *Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza*, Martin Joughin (trans.) (New York: Zone Books, 1990); and Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, "1227: Treatise on Nomadology - The War Machine," in *A Thousand Plateaus*, Brian Massumi (trans.) (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1980).
10. See Massimo Cacciari, *Geo-politica dell'Europa* (Milan: Adelphi, 1994) and *L'arcipelago* (Milan: Adelphi, 1997).
11. See Gianni Vattimo, *After Christianity*, Luce D'Isanto (trans.) (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

multileveled concept in today's world. They have developed accordingly into different forms of Euroskepticism.

Politically, on the Continent, the opposition to the European Union is led by the nationalistic center and the authoritarian Right, which is both xenophobic and in denial of the legacy of fascism. As Stuart Hall put it, the great resistance against the European Union, as well as the American suspicion of it, is a defensive response to a process that aims at overcoming the idea of European national states.¹² The short-range effect of this process is a nationalist wave of paranoia and xenophobic fears, which is simultaneously anti-European Union and racist. Thus, the expansion of European boundaries coincides with the resurgence of micro-nationalist borders and fictional ethnicities at all levels in Europe today. Unification coexists with the closing down of borders: the common European citizenship and the common currency coexist with increasing internal fragmentation and regionalism; a new, allegedly postnationalist, identity coexists with the return of xenophobia, racism, and anti-Semitism.

Strong opposition to the European Union is also voiced, however, by the nostalgic Left, which seems to miss the topological foundations for international working-class solidarity and refuses accountability for the political violence of communist regimes the world over. The cosmopolitan tradition of socialism militates against the European dimension. This results in the paradox of making the far Left as Euroskeptical as the far Right.

The critique of Eurocentrism by race and postcolonial theory is also negative about Europe's transformative potential for self-renewal through ethical and political accountability. This Euroskepticism is best expressed by Gayatri Spivak, who turns the tables on the deconstruction of ethnocentrism in *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*. Spivak suggests that this high level of self-reflexivity is merely Europe's exacerbated expression of its discursive hegemony, recast in a weakened mode of decentered subjectivity. For Spivak the "crisis" of European identity has become the preferred *modus vivendi* of continental philosophers and their chosen manner of silencing the vocal minorities that crowd the margins of the globalized world.

I find all three brands of Euroskepticism unconvincing and therefore do not share their cynical dismissal of critiques of Eurocentrism by European philosophers. On the contrary, contemporary continental philosophy has taken apart the notion of Europe, so as to expose its internal fractures. This high degree of complexity highlights one of the central features of the globalized condition,

12. See, for example, Stuart Hall, "Minimal Selves," in *Identity - The Real Me: Postmodernism and the Question of Identity*, Homi K. Bhabha (ed.) (London: JCA Documents, 1987), and "Cultural Identity and Diaspora," in *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, J. Rutherford (ed.) (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990).

namely, the inadequacy of simple binary thinking. How to think the simultaneity of potentially contradictory social effects is the question. The response to this challenge is neither the exaltation of neo-universalism under the aegis of American liberal education, nor the retreat into negativity and relativism. It rather consists in new forms of situated European accountability.

III. SUBJECTIVITY REVISITED: ON EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP

The primary effects of the unification project and of globalization on the philosophical notion of Europe concern ethical subjectivity and citizenship. The classical model that linked citizenship to belonging to a territory and a community – a nation-state and a culture – and opposed it to a condition of statelessness, is no longer adequate. De-linking the three basic units that compose citizenship – the ethnic origin or place of birth; the nationality or bond to a nation-state; and the legal structure or actual citizenship – sets the conditions for both the radical transformations that are needed in European subjectivity, and the greatest opposition to them. These three factors are disaggregated and disarticulated from each other and become rearranged in a number of interesting ways.

First, let me both acknowledge and then immediately leave aside the neoliberal side of this process, which is exclusively concerned with the defense of advanced capitalism. Insofar as free movement of workers and capital is a central feature of the global economy, deregulated capitalism promotes constant flows and displacements. The problem with this position is twofold: first, it restricts free mobility to capital and data; second, the speed of circulation is such that capitalism erodes its own foundations and thus undermines the nation-state, devastates the environment, and wastes human lives. For these reasons, neoliberalism is not very innovative as a philosophical project. As I stated at the start of this essay, the philosophically interesting projects combine a focused attention on situated practices with ethical accountability in their social analyses of transnational capitalism. Consequently the effects of the globalized and so-called “flexible” labor market, including the de-linking of ethnicity and nationality from citizenship, have to be analyzed in terms of the power differentials and the patterns of exclusion and discrimination they entail.¹³ Similarly, the rebundling of entitlements and benefits in packages of new citizenship rights has to be analyzed as political processes.

There is a further problem: The neoliberal definition of the European Union as a global capitalist power expresses a reactive tendency toward a sovereign sense of the Union. This is also known as the “Fortress Europe” syndrome, and has been extensively criticized in that it entails the belief in an ethnically pure Europe. The question of ethnic purity is the germ of Eurofascism and runs the risk of producing a European form of apartheid.¹⁴ Present-day Europe is struggling with alternative models of citizenship at a time of increasing social exclusion, racism, and xenophobia. That the new inclusive sense of citizenship and the tendency toward a reactionary, fortress mentality coexist makes European citizenship into one of the most contested areas of political and social philosophy. A disaggregated idea of citizenship emerges from the current European Union situation: as a bundle of rights and benefits that can accommodate both nationals and migrants. This project aims to accommodate cultural and ethnic diversity without undermining European liberal democracies, the benefits of the European welfare state, and the universal idea of individual human rights. Let me examine some significant examples of this transformative project.

IV. TRANSNATIONAL EUROPEAN CITIZENS

Etiennne Balbar's¹⁵ redefinition of the concept of European citizenship plays a foundational role in the shift of paradigm about Europe as a philosophical idea.¹⁶ Balbar is the most eminent representative of the Spinozist democratic tradition that has proved so influential in shaping continental political philosophy.¹⁷ The main feature of this school of thought is the definition of the subject not in terms of autonomy and individual rights. The emphasis falls instead on

14. Etiennne Balbar, *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*, James Swenson (trans.) (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004).

15. Etiennne Balbar (1942–; born in Avallon, France) studied philosophy at the École Normale Supérieure with Louis Althusser (1960–65) and at the Sorbonne in Paris, received his PhD in philosophy from the University of Nijmegen (1987), and his habilitation from the University of Paris I (1993). He began his long career at the University of Paris in 1969, eventually serving as Professor of Political Philosophy at the University of Paris X–Nanterre from 1993 until his retirement in 2002. Currently, he is Emeritus Professor of Moral and Political Philosophy at Nanterre and Distinguished Professor of Humanities at the University of California, Irvine. In addition to his other works cited elsewhere in this essay, his most important works include: *Reading Capital* (with Louis Althusser; 1965), *Masses, Classes, Ideas* (1994), *The Philosophy of Marx* (1995), *Spinoza and Politics* (1998), and *Citoyen Sujet, Essais d'anthropologie philosophique* (forthcoming).

16. See Etiennne Balbar, *We, the People of Europe? and Politics and the Other Scene*, Christine Jones et al. (trans.) (London: Verso, 2002).

17. For a discussion of French and Italian Spinozism, see the essay by Simon Duffy in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 7*.

13. See my *Metamorphoses* (Cambridge: Polity, 2002) and *Transpositions: On Nomadic Ethics* (Cambridge: Polity, 2006).

multilayered flows of forces that express a subject's quest for freedom through the understanding of the condition (both positive and negative) of one's specific power locations.

Balibar's democratic project starts from the necessity to learn the lesson of the great human tragedies engendered by European history in the twentieth century. This systematic disregard of human rights makes it imperative to learn and re-elaborate the historical memory with renewed ethical urgency. The learning process, according to Balibar, starts from the recognition of the legacy of fascism and of colonialism and proceeds to take in the effects of Europe's global expansion throughout the whole planet. This process of hybridization forces the recognition of the structural importance of Otherness on the constitution of the European subject. This ongoing learning process simultaneously defeats Eurocentrism and elevates the marginal epistemologies of postcolonial and gender theories to a higher philosophical status.

Balibar takes on critically the idea of the universal power of the law and reminds us that rights are the results of historical struggles and contestations, not of deduction from preexisting general principles. Although the new constitution of the European Union shows both supranational elements and cosmopolitan anticipations, Balibar argues that European citizenship needs to be redefined in transnational terms that draw the hard lessons of the past and meet the complexities of the global age. The point for Balibar is neither to relink nationhood and citizenship by transposing them to a supranational level, nor to declare them obsolete. The point is to turn the question of the European political subject and of citizenship into a process, a work-in-progress. The self-evidence that accompanies so much contemporary cultural racism has to be lifted out of this debate. It is a question of redefining community, belonging, and power mechanisms of exclusion.

The process of the European Union is taken as both part of the global economy and an attempt to move beyond the essentialist grounds on which European nationalism has prospered. Balibar redefines Europe as a transnational space of mediation and transformation. This new European identity is internally differentiated and hence nonunitary and committed to transcultural hybrid exchanges. It is a situated perspective based on multiple border crossings, on confrontations with shifting frontiers and borders, and on a deep commitment to pacifism and human rights.

A more militant version of this position has been developed by another neo-Spinozist political philosopher: Antonio Negri, who developed with Michael Hardt the theory of the necessity of the political project of the European Union as an antidote to the sovereign power of the United States. The European Left has reacted with energy to the historical evidence of the dislocation of European supremacy and the coming of a belligerent American empire. Marxist

philosophers, however, have been slow to understand the nondialectical and schizophrenic nature of advanced capitalism, as was articulated, for example in Deleuze and Félix Guattari's two volumes of *Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Anti-Oedipus* and *A Thousand Plateaus*. In both *Empire* and *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, Hardt and Negri combine a monistic Spinozist political economy with a post-Marxian brand of materialist analysis of labor conditions under advanced capitalism. The productive space of becoming-revolutionary is located in the notion of the politically mobilized multitude as the motor of world resistance. The European Social Forum¹⁸ is a good example of a social movement that expresses the democratic mobilization by the people themselves against the hegemony of imperial power.

In terms of European citizenship this means that the constitutive power lies with the people, or the multitude, which has the power to resist state sovereignty and to redefine the public sphere. Peace, multilateral international relations, and multilevel constitutional arrangements are the key features of the Europe of multitudes.

V. COSMOPOLITANISM REVISITED

Considering the complex power relations and internal fractures induced by the globalization process and the European Union, the relevance of contemporary cosmopolitanism as political philosophy, as an ethics of human empathy, and a constitutional and institutional design is thrown open for questioning. And so are its links with its classical and modern predecessors.

Jürgen Habermas's work, in *The Postnational Constellation*, on the universal value of republican institutions and the emphasis on rational argumentation as the precondition for social justice and democratic governance are relevant to the question of Europe.¹⁹ It is also predictable, in keeping with his philosophical agenda centered on rational cosmopolitanism and communicative ethics. Habermas has defended the novelty and relevance of the European Union as a political and philosophical factor in what he calls the postnational constellation. Contrary to the brutal instrumentalism of unbridled capitalism on the

18. The European Social Forum is an annual conference held by members of the alter-globalization movement (also known as the Global Justice Movement), which emerged from the World Social Forum and follows its charter of principles. It aims to allow social movements, trade unions, nongovernmental organizations, refugees, peace groups, anti-imperialist groups, and anarchist and environmental movements to come together and discuss themes linked to major European and global issues.

*19. For a detailed discussion of Habermas, see the essay by Christopher F. Zurn in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 6*.

one hand and the Schmittian belligerency of the US on the other, Europe can and, according to Habermas, should become the political incarnation of a moral community that lives by the normative ideals of Kantian neocosmopolitanism. This means the rule by law, not by force, and the principles of hospitality, not of hostility. Habermas calls for a serious European constitution, that is to say, Europe as a political project that would involve the consolidation of a European public sphere that might strengthen the shared political culture of European democracies and welfare states.

Habermas explores the key philosophical issues raised by the event of the European Union: the security of the rule of law; the sovereignty of the territorial state; collective identity and the democratic legitimacy of the nation-state. The focus of Habermas's argument is the critique of the intolerance, xenophobia, and racism that accompany the structural changes in the postnational constellation. This deficit in democratic procedures is as problematic morally as it is urgent politically. The ethnically mixed and multicultural structure of postnational societies exemplifies the de-linking of nationality and cultural identity from citizenship and the workings of the state, which causes both discomfort and great opportunities. Habermas's point is that "to the degree that this decoupling of political culture from majority culture succeeds, the solidarity of citizens is shifted onto the more abstract foundation of a constitutional patriotism."²⁰ This results in renewing the sense of civil solidarity and of a universalism sensitive to difference. Against the postmodernists and the liberals alike, who, for diametrically opposed reasons refuse universally binding values, Habermas argues that the only way to meet the challenges of the postnational condition is to renew democracy through the framework of the European Union. Egalitarian universalism and constitutional patriotism in a postnational democracy remain the ideal.

Following Habermas, in her recent work on European citizenship, Seyla Benhabib²¹ interrogates critically the disjunction between the concepts of nation, the state, and cultural identity. Solidly grounded in her theory of communicative ethics, Benhabib works toward the elaboration of new rules of global democracy within a multicultural horizon. A self-professed Kantian cosmopolitan, Benhabib argues forcefully that "democratic citizenship can be exercised across national boundaries and in transnational contexts" and defends the European Union accordingly.²² She is especially keen to demonstrate that the distinction between national minority and ethnic group does very little to determine

whether an identity/difference-driven movement is democratic. In its current phase, cosmopolitanism has emerged as the dominant progressive ethos of the globalized world in that it is expected to neutralize the potential conflicts of heterogeneous and fast-changing globalized societies.

More critical thinkers within the poststructuralist tradition, however, challenge this view and investigate the notion that neutralization of differences may not be the most effective way of dealing with contemporary societies. Considering the history of difference as pejoration, this approach runs the risk moreover of perpetuating traditional forms of exclusion and disqualification. What is absolutely clear in a poststructuralist perspective is that the universalistic assumption of one common measure of norms and values based on reason, which is constitutive of classical cosmopolitanism, is untenable nowadays. Diverse forms of thinking pan-human belonging and ethical interconnection are both available and necessary; starting, for instance, from pacifism. Politically, cosmopolitanism promises the end of wars and the dawn of an age of perpetual peace through global trade, "global civil society," and governance. The recent escalation of wars on terror, however, challenges these premises. Important political, normative, and policy implications are involved in this debate between those promoting cosmopolitanism and those who see a return to a new form of warmongering imperialism.

Derrida strikes his own note on the cosmopolitan issue.²³ Starting from the primacy of the Self-Other relation and also from its paradoxical nature, he emphasizes the impossibility for any culture to be self-evident in the sense of coinciding with itself – and with ideals of cultural sameness. Derrida argues that the Other is constitutive of the Self and acts as an irreducible element of otherness within, as an internal fracture or endless differentiation within, which cannot and must not be resolved. In light of its long history of universal posturing, Europe today, argues Derrida, has a moral obligation to turn the question of its identity into the contemplation of the limits of its universality. Simultaneously a very old culture and younger than ever – because it does not quite exist yet – the European Union offers new modes of interrogating theaporetic relationship that ties Self to Other in a productive spiral of contradictions. Neither reducible to the old mastery as a centralizing, hegemonic power, nor dispersed into endless regional and sub-cultural fragments, Europe has to become an event, a process, a self-reflexive contemplation of its own finitude.

20. Jürgen Habermas, *The Postnational Constellation* (Cambridge: Polity, 2001), 74.

21. Benhabib's work is discussed in the essay on "Third Generation Critical Theory" by Amy Allen in *The History of Continental Philosophy: Volume 7*.

22. See Seyla Benhabib, *Another Cosmopolitanism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

23. Seyla Benhabib, *The Claims of Culture* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002), 183.

24. See, in particular, Jacques Derrida, *The Other Heading: Reflections on Today's Europe*, Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas (trans.) (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2002) and *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes (trans.) (New York: Routledge, 2001).

Faithful to his ethical project, Derrida outlines a list of ethical obligations that Europe must undertake toward its others and hence toward itself. These include: the critique of totalitarianism; the rejection of racism and xenophobia; the duty of hospitality and openness to strangers; and a commitment to democracy as an unfinished project that is still to come and hence requires all our collective dedication. Contemporary cosmopolitanism, for Derrida, must respect these ethical rules and adopt a political stance that implements them.

VI. PLANETARY SELF-REFLEXIVITY

Derrida's contribution to the European debate is not the only one, however, to support a transformative kind of cosmopolitanism. Starting from the definition of Europe as an endless adventure of the human spirit and a process of self-question, for instance, Zygmunt Bauman's²⁵ reflections on Europe connect to his criticism of the project of modernity. Bauman acknowledges that the modern age has reached an aporetic moral condition by having functioned under the twin banners of universality and steady-state-bound foundations; the worst examples of which are revolutionary violence and totalitarianism.²⁶ These threaten the common good and undermine the autonomous responsibility of the moral self, while proclaiming loudly the need for clear and stable values. Lamenting the facile association of the postmodern era with moral relativism, Bauman stresses instead the specific ethical challenge represented by postmodernity. This can be summed up as an increased degree of self-examination, the loss of the grandiose illusions that drove modernity to excess, and a renewed sense of sobriety in setting social and moral goals. Postmodernity is modernity without illusions.

25. Zygmunt Bauman (1925–) was born to nonpracticing Jewish parents in Poznan, Poland. In 1939, after the Nazi invasion, he escaped to the Soviet Union with his family. After the war, Bauman returned to Poland and studied sociology and philosophy at the University of Warsaw. He completed his MA in 1954 and became a lecturer in Warsaw, where he remained until 1968. After completing his habilitation, in 1962 he was appointed to the Chair in Social Sciences at the University of Warsaw. In 1968, the anti-Semitic campaign led by the Polish government forced Bauman out of his job and out of the country. Having had to give up Polish citizenship to be allowed to leave, he first went to Israel to teach at Tel Aviv University, before accepting a Chair in Sociology at the University of Leeds, where he is currently an Emeritus Professor. Bauman's published work extends to approximately thirty books and well over a hundred articles. In addition to his other works cited elsewhere in this essay, his most important works include: *Between Class and Elite: The Evolution of the British Labour Movement – A Sociological Study* (1972), *Modernity and The Holocaust* (1989), *Thinking Sociologically: An Introduction for Everyone* (1990), and *Globalization: The Human Consequences* (1998).

26. Zygmunt Bauman, *Postmodern Ethics* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1993).

This sobering loss of illusions is crucial for the process of redefining Europe as a philosophical notion. The civilizing mission formulated in the eighteenth century was betrayed, or rather fulfilled perversely, by modernization narrowly defined as an economic process. Challenging the Kantian equation of moral and legal norms, Bauman stresses the gratuitousness, the lack of self-interest, and hence the profoundly nonrational nature of many moral choices that are made for the good of the world. This essential gratuitousness defeats the logic of means-end, the economist calculations of gains and profits, which is so central to mainstream morality. Bauman's postmodern ethical project stresses instead the primacy of ethics over politics in the constitution of the subject through the rediscovery of a sense of historical accountability. He also attacks the universalizing claims of state powers and the nationalist ideologies that invent traditions and claim territories to real or fictional nation-states. Bauman is equally scathing, however, regarding the neoliberalism of the many self-appointed prophets who capitalize on nationalism and other forms of cultural essentialism. Instead of such cast-iron convictions on newly reinvented foundations, he calls for a vision of Europe in line with Balibar's assertion of the need to re-elaborate critically its own past. The new planetary mission that Europe has to share in entails the criticism of narrow-minded self-interests, intolerance, and rejection of otherness. Symbolic of this closure of the European mind is the fate of migrants, refugees, and asylum-seekers, all of whom bear the brunt of xenophobia in contemporary Europe.

The emphasis on the need to reinvent humanity and planetary values while avoiding the pitfalls of Eurocentrism is central to this project. It entails the ability to learn again from one's own mistakes, but also from the rest of the world.²⁷ Europe has mellowed into an acceptance of a renewed Kantian model of perpetual peace, in opposition to the aggressive Hobbesian project pursued by the US. The European Union is thus mature enough for a self-critical planetary role as the ethical and political subject that has already undergone intense self-scrutiny and has therefore elaborated a new form of cosmopolitanism free of ethnic nationalism.

An analogous project has emerged within Paul Gilroy's²⁸ work *Against Race* on colonialism and fascism, racism and anti-Semitism. The continuity between

27. Zygmunt Bauman, *Europe, An Unfinished Adventure* (Cambridge: Polity, 2004), 69.

28. Paul Gilroy (1956–) was born in the East End of London to Guyanese and English parents, graduated in American Literature at Sussex University in 1978, and received his PhD in Sociology at Birmingham University in 1986 with Stuart Hall. He taught at South Bank University, Essex University, and Goldsmiths College before leaving London to take up a tenured post at Yale University, where he was Professor of Sociology and African American Studies. In 2005 he was appointed as the first holder of the Anthony Giddens Professorship in Social Theory at the London School of Economics. In addition to his works cited in this essay,

these atrocious aspects of European history lies at the heart of Gilroy's case about the coextensivity of European discourses of modernization and racialized discourses and practices of exclusion. Like most postcolonial and race theorists, Gilroy stresses the murderous charge that "difference" has assumed in European history, and hence also the complicity of rationality with domination and terror. Gilroy, however, strikes a radically neohumanist note. He considers colonialism and fascism as a betrayal of the European ideal of the Enlightenment, which he is determined to defend, and thus he holds Europeans accountable for their ethical and political failings. Racism splits common humanity and disengages whites from any ethical sensibility, reducing them to an infra-human moral status. It also reduces nonwhites to a subhuman ontological status that exposes them to murderous violence. Taking a strong stand against the return of fundamentalist appeals to ethnic differences by a variety of white, black, Serbian, Rwandan, Texan, and other nationalists, Gilroy denounces these "micro-fascisms" as the epidemics of our globalized times. He locates the site of the ethical transformation in the critique of each nationalistic category, starting from the Eurocentric ones, not in the assertion of any dominant one. He sets up diasporic mobility and the transcultural interconnections against the forces of nationalism. This is a theory of mixture, hybridity, and cosmopolitanism that is resolutely nonracial. Against the enduring power of nation-states, Gilroy posits instead the affirmative politics of transversal movements, such as antislavery, feminism, *Médecins sans Frontières*, and the like. He refers to this ideal as "planetary humanism," defined as a "postracial and post anthropological version of what it means to be human" in the age of biopolitics and genetic power.²⁹

Gilroy's cosmopolitan neohumanism is a strategic postracial and inclusive neouniversalism. It suggests the possibility of a "distinctive ecology of belonging" that would recompose the relationship between self, territory, individuality, and society through multiple connections.³⁰ Planetary humanism marks a social and also symbolic recomposition of one's relationship to space, time, and community. It turns hybridity into an ecophilosophical notion. The challenge is not to return to fixed identities, clear boundaries, and an allegedly pure past, but rather to grab the opportunities offered by the cultural intermixture already available within our own postindustrial ethno/gender landscapes, so as to create yet unknown possibilities for bonding and community building.

Non-Western humanists point out the complicity between European enlightened humanism on the one hand and colonial conquest and exploitation on the

other and call for a more inclusive sense of humanism. For instance, the black feminist theorist Patricia Hill Collins reconnects to the tradition of Ubuntu, or African humanism and African-American spirituality.³¹ Drucilla Cornell argues along similar lines.³² Supported by a dialogical system and informed by the notion of care as a collective responsibility for one's community, Afro-centric humanism has become a resource for all who want to resist the attrition and devastation of a process of modernization that is hastily assimilated to coercive Europeanization. Another significant development in the same area is the decolonization strand of the "postcontinental philosophy" movement. This refers to critical theories inspired mostly by Fanon and Sartre, which reject the deconstructive approach to race and ethnicity issues and embrace instead a robust expression of the specific forms of subjectivity developed by those who inhabit the margins, interstices, and diasporic spaces of modernity. These dehumanized others are the agents of powerful epistemic, symbolic, and material decolonizations.³³

VII. THE BECOMING-MINORITARIAN OF EUROPE

Another radical position inspired by Deleuze and Guattari's political philosophy argues that the new global context provides the ground for a significant relocation of the notion of Europe as a nomadic and nonethnocentric project. Insofar as it unsettles dominant European identity, the European Union marks a process of becoming-minor of the masterful European subject and engenders more inclusive subject-positions.

In this philosophical paradigm, the post-Eurocentric condition combines nomadic subjectivity with flexible citizenship. The starting-point is the rejection of the myth of unitary visions of the subject and essentialized notions of European cultural homogeneity. European history at any point in time provides ample evidence of ethnic hybridity through waves of migration and the continuing presence of Jewish and Muslim citizens, which challenges the identification of Europe with Christianity. Nonetheless, the myth of cultural

31. Patricia Hill Collins, *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment* (New York: Routledge, 1991).

32. Drucilla Cornell, "The Ubuntu Project with Stellenbosch University" (2002), www.fche.org/index.php?id=281 (accessed December 2009).

33. See, for instance, Walter D. Mignolo, "Philosophy and the Colonial Difference?"; Gracia, "Ethnic Labels and Philosophy: The Case of Latin American Philosophy"; and Mendicita, "Is There Latin-American Philosophy?" all in *Philosophy Today* 43 (1999). Selected Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy Supplement "Extending the Horizons of Continental Philosophy," L. Alcoff and W. Brogan (eds.); and Nelson Maldonado-Torres, "Césaire's Gift and the Decolonial Turn," *Radical Philosophy Review* 9(2) (2006).

his other major works include *The Black Atlantic* (1993) and *After Empire* (2004) (published in the US as *Postcolonial Melancholia*).

29. Paul Gilroy, *Against Race* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000), 15.

30. *Ibid.*, 55.

homogeneity is crucial to the tale of European nationalism. In our era, these myths are being exposed and exploded into questions related to entitlement and agency. Thus, the European Union is faced with the issue: can one be European and Black or Muslim? Gilroy's work on black British subjectivity is indicative of the problem of how European citizenship and blackness emerge as contested issues.³⁴ However, whiteness is also called into play. Being the norm, whiteness is invisible, as if natural, whereas black, of course, is always marked off as a color. The effect of this structured invisibility is that it masks itself off into a "colorless multicoloredness." White contains all other colors and reduces them to social and symbolic visibility. Giving a specific location, historical grounding, and accountability to antiracist whites is one of the aims of critical whiteness theory. The process of becoming-minoritarian or nomadic constructs subjects that are in transit within different identity-formations, but, at the same time, sufficiently anchored to a historical legacy to accept responsibility for it.

A multiply located, nonunitary subject-position and a rhizomic politics of relations are also recommended by the Deleuzian philosopher Edouard Glissant.³⁵ He develops an effective rhizomatic poetics and politics, taking as point of reference the historical experience and the specific location of Africans and West Indians caught in the transatlantic slave trade. Glissant foregrounds the importance of memory and the productivity of mixity as the centerpieces of his theory of Relation.³⁶ He argues that even an experience as devastating as slavery produces specific forms of knowledge and subjectivization that transcend the burden of the negative. Glissant actively expresses the becoming-minoritarian or becoming-rhizomatic of blacks, Creoles, descendants of slaves, and colonized peoples. This is described as a spiritual but also logistical shift in the structure of the subject in the direction of openness toward both self and other.

Glissant's position includes a sharp critique of Eurocentrism, which is based on the ontology of sameness or the rule of One. This includes a

34. Paul Gilroy, *Ain't no Black in the Union Jack* (London: Hutchinson, 1987).

35. Edouard Glissant (1928–) was born in Sainte-Marie, Martinique and left for Paris in 1946. He studied ethnography, history, and philosophy at the Sorbonne, where he received his doctorate. Together with Paul Niger, he established in 1959 the separatist political party "Front Antillo-Guyanais pour l'Autonomie," as a result of which he was barred from leaving France between 1961 and 1965. He returned to Martinique in 1965 and founded the Institut Martiniquais d'études, as well as *Acama*, a social theory journal. He now divides his time between Martinique, Paris, and New York, where he has been visiting professor of French literature at CUNY since 1995. As a philosopher, writer, poet and literary critic, Glissant is one of the most influential figures in Caribbean thought and cultural theory, the preeminent critic of the Negritude school and father-figure of the Créolite movement, which emphasizes hybridity as the bedrock of identity and a "creolized" approach to textuality.

36. See Edouard Glissant, *Poetics of Relation*, Betsy Wing (trans.) (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1997).

dualistic relationship with the rest of humanity. There exists a dominant mode of nomadism in Western culture, in the form of epic journeys of discovery, which find their historical apogee in colonialism. The power of sameness in the West is best described in terms of monolingualism, or the illusion of a single cultural and linguistic root. Glissant, in a very Deleuzian mode, plays the rhizome against the root and advocates global polylinguism. This includes the deconstruction of the hubris of European master cultures and the arrogance with which they consider their languages as the voice of humanity. This universalistic pretense is one of the mechanisms supporting colonialism. It also entails the reappraisal of minor languages, dialects, and hybrids, in a phenomenon that Glissant describes as creolization.

Glissant offers a striking example of the poetics of relation in his analysis of how, in the Caribbean colonized territories, the French colonists spoke their own homegrown dialects – Norman or Breton – rather than the high and noble language of the French nation. It is this bastardized language that mingles with that of the local population, creating a crossover between two distinct but analogous forms of linguistic nonpurity. Creolization, therefore, cuts both ways and marks the becoming-minoritarian of the former master languages.

VIII. ON FLEXIBLE EUROPEAN CITIZENSHIP

I want to relate this nomadic sense of identity to the political notion of flexible citizenship. A radical restructuring of European identity as postnationalistic can be concretely translated into a set of "flexible forms of citizenship" that would allow for all "others" – all kinds of hybrid citizens – to acquire legal status in what would otherwise deserve the label "Fortress Europe." This would involve dismantling the us-them binary in such a way as to account for the undoing of a strong and fixed notion of European citizenship in favor of a functionally differentiated network of affiliations and loyalties. These could materialize and exemplify, for the citizens of the member states of the European Union, the disconnection of the three elements discussed above: ethnicity, nationality, and citizenship. According to Ulrich Preuss, such a European notion of citizenship, disengaged from national foundations, lays the ground for a new kind of civil society, beyond the boundaries of any single nation-state. Because such a notion of "alienage" would become an integral part of citizenship in the European Union, Preuss argues that all European citizens would end up being "privileged foreigners."³⁷ In other words, they would function together without reference

37. Ulrich K. Preuss, "Two Challenges to European Citizenship," *Political Studies* 44 (1996), 551.

to a centralized and homogeneous sphere of political power.³⁸ Potentially, this notion of citizenship could therefore lead to a new concept of politics, which would no longer be bound to the nation-state. This is a pragmatic way to develop the progressive potential of the European Union, and also of accounting for the effects of globalization on us all. These effects boil down to one central idea: the end of pure and steady identities, and a consequent emphasis on creolization, hybridization, a multicultural Europe, within which "new" Europeans can take their place alongside their constitutive others.

The project of a nomadic understanding of European citizenship is a historical chance for Europeans to become more situated and more knowledgeable of their own history and hence more self-critical. Nietzsche argued that many Europeans no longer felt at home in Europe.³⁹ At the dawn of the third millennium, many want to argue that those who do not identify with the dominant and heroic reading of Europe are ideally suited to the task of reframing Europe. This starts by making it accountable for a history in which fascism, imperialism, and domination have played a central role. Nomadic European subjects can lay the postnationalist foundations for a multilayered and flexible practice of European citizenship in the frame of the new European Union.

IX. CONCLUSION: TOWARD A NEW EUROPEAN SOCIAL IMAGINARY

Communities are also imaginary institutions made of affects and desires. Nations are, to a large extent, imaginary tales, which project a reassuring but nonetheless illusory sense of unity over the disjointed, fragmented, and often incoherent range of internal regional and cultural differences that make up a national identity. The project of developing a range of possible postnationalist, transnational, nomadic subject-positions and equivalent forms of citizenship is related to the process of dis-identification from established, nation-bound identities. Balibar argues that dis-identification is the key to democratic politics in that it implies openness toward the other.⁴⁰ This is one of the key elements of the learning process that can lead to a positive and affirmative relocation of European identities. It is important to stress both the need for an adequate European social imaginary for this kind of subject-position, and the difficulties involved in developing this. There is no denying that such an enterprise involves

a large sense of loss and is not without pain; no process of consciousness-raising can ever be without pain.

What is lacking is a social imaginary that adequately reflects the social realities and the lived experience of a postnationalist sense of European identity. Europeans need to develop adequate, positive representations of the new trans-European condition that they inhabit on the continent. This lack of the social imaginary both feeds on and supports the resistance to the European political project. More work is also therefore needed on the role of contemporary global media in both colonizing and stimulating the social imaginary of global cultures. At least some of the difficulty is due to the lack of a specifically European public debate and low involvement by the very intellectuals who represent it, although the lack of vision on the part of European political leaders does not help the situation.

The acknowledgment of a shortage in the collective imaginary of contemporary European social and political philosophy includes humble and sincere accountability for the complex historical aspects of European culture and its problematic legacy. Donna Haraway sums up admirably this mixture of affects:

Shaped as an insider and an outsider to the hegemonic power and discourses of my European and North American legacies, I remember that anti-Semitism and misogyny intensified in the Renaissance and the Scientific Revolution of early modern Europe, that racism and colonialism flourished in the traveling habits of the cosmopolitan Enlightenment and that the intensified misery of billions of men and women seems organically rooted in the freedoms of transnational capitalism and technoscience. But I also remember the dreams and achievements of contingent freedoms; situated knowledges and relief of suffering that are inextricable from this contaminated triple historical heritage. I remain a child of the Scientific Revolution, the Enlightenment and technoscience.⁴¹

The progressive and liberatory potential of this process of situated accountability is equally proportional to the imaginary and political efforts it requires of its participants. The recognition of the new multilayered, transcultural, post-nationalist, and nomadic idea of Europe is also the premise for the collective development of a new relationship with collective memory. It paves the way for multiple and alternative ecologies of belonging. This kind of embodied genealogical accountability is a major contribution to the philosophical discussions

38. Ulrich K. Preuss, "Problems of a Concept of European Citizenship," *European Law Journal* 1(3) (1995), 280.

39. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), pt 8, "Peoples and Fatherlands."

40. Balibar, *We, the People of Europe?*, 68-9.

41. Donna Haraway, *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium. FemaleMan™_Meets_Oncomouse™. Feminism and Technoscience* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 3.

about Europe. Through the pain of loss and dis-enchantment, "post-Eurocentric Europeans" on both sides of the transatlantic divide are moving continental philosophy into the global era by finding enough creativity and moral stamina to confront the mixed legacy of their history and work toward becoming "just" Europeans.

8

POSTCOLONIALISM, POSTORIENTALISM,

POSTOCCIDENTALISM:

THE PAST THAT NEVER WENT AWAY AND

THE FUTURE THAT NEVER ARRIVED

Eduardo Mendieta

One of the central contentions of so-called continental philosophy is that in order to properly philosophize one must do the history of philosophy, or in other words, that to philosophize is to think through the history of philosophy. In turn, to do the history of philosophy requires a philosophical insight into what gives coherence, unity, and rationality to that history. History, for a philosophical analysis of philosophy's history, is not just the narration of a sequence of personalities and their thinking, but the insight into the necessity and dependence of their thinking as a narrative.¹ To philosophize, in the continental philosophy tradition, demands both a philosophical understanding of history, and an insight into the way in which that history informs and conditions philosophy. The background assumption for such a view is that there is a fundamental interdependence between reason, that is *logos*, and history, that is human activity in time. This entwining of reason and history achieved its highest expression in the thinking of Hegel.² Postcolonial, as well as postorientalist and postoccidental, theory carries this fundamental insight of continental philosophy to the outer limits of its conceptual reach. Postcolonial, postorientalist, and postoccidental thinking are all unequivocally legitimate children of continental thinking, and faithful servants of its most important insights. The contributions

1. See Jorge J. E. Gracia, *Philosophy and Its History: Issues in Philosophical Historiography* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1992) and Richard Rorty, "The Historiography of Philosophy: Four Genres," in *Truth and Progress: Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 3 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

2. See Jürgen Habermas, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*, Frederick Lawrence (trans.) (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1987), lecture II: "Hegel's Concept of