

The colors of Cosmopolis

Diana Sfetlana Stoica

West University of Timisoara, Romania

Abstract: How are the fact of blackness, or the Global South's claimed or deconstructed marginality, or the color-blind discourse seen in the key of perceptions on the cosmopolitanism, as suggested by Appiah? A series of post-colonial authors focused on the knowledge production or the fact of blackness as having given a new impetus to the discourse on the deconstruction of the Moral Self, in the last decades.

Harnessing the fact of blackness as counter-argument for the marginality, while considering the actual effects of color-blind discourse on the definition of the Self, the debate proposed is focused on the elements that blackness, marginality and cosmopolitanism have in common, from a philosophical and also very pragmatic political perspective.

Through this analysis, the aim is to argue on the importance, if any, of colors and on their possible meanings outside the visual arts, in the *cosmopolis*, namely the world of debates and relations. The qualitative approach of some relevant discourses is preferred and the methodology is the holistic critical view over writings of key thinkers that influenced the "coming out of Africa" from the marginality it was condemned to, as a symbol of Global South's deconstruction.

The recall to a debate based on the fact of blackness, the marginality and color-blindness, even if done in the interpretative lens of an European observer, is an attempt to define new paths towards the re-ordering of colored discourses on the Self and its beyond.

Keywords: colors, Self, Other, difference, cosmopolis.

1. Introduction

This paper is a result of a multidirectional analysis of the global change perspectives and cosmopolitanism in the post-colonialist discourse. These changes were valued under the lens of the *development* cliché, the term being considered western or Eurocentric (Sachs 1992; Esteva 1992; Crush 1995; Cowen & Shenton 1996; Pieterse 1998; Pieterse 2010), even though the approach would like to bring forth African standpoints on the subject. It is the purpose of this paper to support the views contributing to the deconstruction of some discourses around cosmopolitanism, from the point of view of African development studies and philosophy.

Therefore, the principal aim of the qualitative analysis herein is suggested by the development studies, as a point of departure to a pragmatic view on cosmopolitanism, allowing the questioning of it from perspectives of postcolonial politics, discourse and practice, in outward division of views and assumptions (Creswell 2009, 11). This direction was encouraged by the fact that development means more than a status, seemingly fixed in concept throughout the Cold War and post-Cold War history of thought, with reference to its opposition, namely the underdevelopment that created it (Rodney 1973; Rapley 2007; Pieterse 2010). It also refers to the movement or the progress of a natural process. In this process alternative destructions and renewals are constantly possible (Cowen & Shenton 1996), encompassing several facets of the Self's becoming in a circular ever return to it, as suggested by Derrida in his reading of Robinson Crusoe's invention of the wheel (Naas 2015, 99-100).

The actions of talking about and analyzing the cosmopolitanism in this manner might, themselves, have a base in the need to maintain, due to practical needs, a certain critical reading of development, so as to actually keep it alive despite its deconstructions.

From the first readings of development, early in the eighteenth century, the integration of „history with cosmopolitan intent” in the official or less official doctrines of development has been sustained. This would have started with Kant's essay of 1784, „Idea for a universal history with cosmopolitan intent” (Cowen & Shenton 1996, x). Actively three centuries later¹, following a Derridean decon-

structivist suggestion of reversing structure's hierarchies (Vitale 2018, 31), it would be relevant to debate on „cosmopolis with historical intent". It means accepting there are limitations to the european's view on the history, meanwhile the *cosmopolis*, seen as a cosmopolitan system of thought might have gained the possibility to continually re-read and re-write its development history, supported by a „new tribe" of cosmopolitan intellectuals (Crush 1995, 54).

As a consequence, besides considering the specific structuralist² hierarchies inside this „tribe", whose contours were traced in the postcolonial discourse (Wa Thiong' O 1981), talking about cosmopolitanism from the position of the development thinker would mean putting emphasize on a sort of perception of perceptions. With this opportunity and also research goal, the present is an alternative, combined, approach to differences of universality, in the conceptualization repository of Appiah (2005a).

Taking inspiration from Appiah's idea on cosmopolitanism, whose functioning is based on the communication between people who do not have to share the same culture, because they are different and welcome their difference (Appiah 2005, 258), the suggestion would be to consider this type of difference subsumed to a hypothetical category of color, rejecting any possible reference to the mere color of the skin.

The development studies seem to have not included, in a sufficient manner yet, the significance of colors in the discourse of Self's becoming, in the *cosmopolis*. If there was a reference to diversity, it did not emphasize color in the chromatics of its meaning, but rather continued and accentuated the *black and white* color marginal classical binaries, signified by the interaction between image and power on a global scale (Pieterse 1992, 235). However, there was a relevance and a first critical look on the issue of cosmopolitanism made by postcolonial writers concentrating on the Western thought's effects on the perceptions that the colonial westerners had on the objectified colonized, nevertheless on concepts like but not limited to skin color, geographic determinism, the inferiority of other races, the birth of development after the underdevelopment as named by president Truman (Sachs 1992, 4) and the perspectives of Global South's so-called development.

Focusing on Appiah's work and not only, herein the blackness-whiteness construction's deconstruction analysis is assumed, by allowing the emergence of a new concept of *cosmopolis's* colors, from which to identify the *fact of color*, by questioning what blackness (as fact, essence or reaction), marginality (as centeredness or periphery-ness) and cosmopolitanism could have in common. To define the proposed concept, direct connections between the colors (or differences) and development, or change-progress, should be clearly defined.

Finally, the present reflection constitutes a small glossary of deconstruction conclusions as notes to a more ample grounded theory on the facts of the reality and the communication of identity, in a contextual universal difference, such as the cosmopolitanism.

The ideas in this paper were introduced at the *Cosmopolitanism and World Citizenship International Conference*, organized online, by London Interdisciplinary Research Institute, University of Birbeck, on May, the 16th 2020, and the promise was to deepen ideas of Kwame Anthony Appiah on the purpose.

2. Naming the fact of color. Space, Subject and Process

The metaphor of color is the expression of a difference between individuals, groups, cultures, societies, from a socio-humanistic perspective. This difference does not referred to nuances, and is thus not meant to simply re-assert the uniqueness of the individual, of the group, culture and society, as this is not the scope. It is referred to actual different positions in the spectrum of light (or knowledge), positions that are floating, flexible and temporary, notifying the opposites, complementary or combined representations of the Self.

The representations of the Self would refer to images rather than the perception of one subject on the own Self. It is agreed that any subject might produce a discourse that gives birth to the other, transferring the subject on a different position, as in the case of an aquarelle displaced on a color palette, that could touch and get mixed with another aquarelle, naturally (as a consequence of events) or by force of external intervention. In the narrative of colors on the palette, the most evident and simple example would be the representation related

to the affiliation to one nation, nationalism being the classical, logical opposition to cosmopolitanism.

Any process meant to exalt the Self under the form of nationalism would diminish cosmopolitanism, by extension of an Etienne Balibar's theory (Mohanram & Rajan 1995, 172). From an African philosophical perspective, this nationalism-cosmopolitanism relation is one of false hierarchy, due to equal project dimensions acting beyond the selves and the families, but also due to equal questioning in reference to the global or the local issue, or participatory debates they caused (Appiah 2005, 239). Besides, the falsity of this hierarchy is revealed by the colonial struggle aiming to bring together nationalism with cosmopolitanism (Masolo 2004, 496). In an African context, the idea of nationalism would question the centeredness or periphery-ness of the Self, since it means self-discovery (Lumumba-Kasongo 1999, 95). The Self in issue does not only refer to a physical person in the society and the way he/she defines himself/herself in relation to others by naming his/her national membership, but also as group or culture whose *raison d'être* is to create and give reaction to a particular set of needs that are, or should become common to those whose membership was acclaimed.

The definition of the marginal character of a subject would go beyond its linguistic meaning. It would represent the tendency of inclusion in a superior category and as a consequence, the opportunity to occupy a central ontological position in this other category, whether at the center or at the periphery of it. This metaphor is symbolized by Ernest Gellner's romantic view on the map of the world before nationalism, imagined as a painting of Kokoshka, where there is no clear pattern in detail, though there is for a whole picture (Gellner 1983, 139). In this view, the points that can't give pattern to the details are the subjects, having a central ontological position on the map due to the importance of each detail they create for the whole, but being situated wherever, at the center or at the periphery of this whole. Thus marginality, the representation of the mentioned marginal character of a subject, requires the interpretation of space, whether space is considered the locus of an individual's self-defining, a locus of a group's identification occupying a limited area, virtually or not a locus of a nation-state having an established territory, or even that one of a group of states allowing for

regional power-knowledge symbolic influences to come into being and challenge the inner and exterior equilibriums of other similar groups (e.g. the BRICS³ vs. the floating and an ever differently sized group of greatest and most developed western-type economies⁴).

With regard to the same interdependency details have with the whole and while expressing the marginal character of a subject, besides the positioning at the center or at the periphery of the world, as important significant for cosmopolitanism, Derrida suggested that, considering Kant's conceptualization of cosmopolitanism based on universal hospitality (Derrida 2005, 19), there are many Selves and Others gathering in a virtual space of exchange on hospitality, each one having to consider being a host and a guest at some time.

In the construction of the present discourse, being a host or a guest is a matter of *fact of difference*, pictorially imagined like a *fact of color*. This presumes already a kind of difference given by a contiguous (physical or virtual) unity of marginality, due to which Appiah goes on and reconsiders the fact of sharing the world as Strangers, with Strangers (Appiah 2006). Returning to Gellner's artistic imagination of the world before nationalism and the concept of cosmopolitanism from a realistic international relations point of view, the map of the world would necessarily represent a big painting of states with the same function (to construct the world), but different capabilities (given by blurred details and their position on the whole), as in the waltzian structuralism (Donnelly 2005, 35).

Whether it is about subjects as individuals, states or groups, at this first level of discourse, colors of the cosmopolis are manifestations of a tendency to marginality, seen as sharing (or functioning) and capability, in reference to positions held or occupied in a certain space of final higher definition of the subject, i.e. the Self. Such positions held or occupied are a matter of complex combinations, taking into account the collective identity's proclivity to „go imperial“, dominating people of other identities as well as other Identities, with their formula of shaping individuality and distinctiveness (Appiah 1994, 134).

In analyzing a formula of individuality and distinctiveness shaping, the relations between the core and the periphery are controlled by the perception the periphery has, that the core would necessarily dominate (Burchill 2005, 62). This was inspired by the history of the neo-colonial rule, during which “identity” and

“differentiation” are represented in the relations between Africans and Europeans, with “identity” signifying the similarity of social and political institutions, but “differentiation”, their specificity or adaptability to the context (Mandami 1996, 7). Hence, there is a thick border line between viewing cosmopolitanism as signifying the marginal character of a subject dependent to positioning on an ontological map and the nature of sharing of identity and the capability to differentiation it presumes. According to Appiah, variety is not something to value no matter what (Appiah 2005, 268).

Using the metaphor of combination, colors are imagined as subjects in mobility, in hybridization, in evolutionary adaptation and bearing thinkable returns, as in the metaphor of Robinson’s Crusoe wheel, which was in the attention of Derrida. Hence, the *fact of color* is only a fact, i.e. an act of phenomenological essence or a fact of spacial, or rather virtual membership, whether the membership was chosen by the individual or not. Because it might be true that “*The accident of where one is born is just that, an accident*” (Nussbaum 2019, 75), but in the case of nations, cultures, groups, the individual has the possibility to decide the creation or integration in them and nationalism is not accidental (Gellner 1983, 56). On a second level of the discourse, marginality, as the spacial parameter, is overlooked in order to give voice to the facts of identity, or subjectivity. The identity vectors cosmopolitanism, in a new conceptualization as deconstruction and juxtaposition of opposites, assuming the rejection of non-colors, on which Franz Fanon gave us a hint, back in the fifties (Fanon, 1952/2008, 6):

I believe that the fact of the juxtaposition of the white and black races has created a massive psycho existential complex. I hope by analyzing it to destroy it.

Thinking of the color combination metaphor and Appiah’s “go imperial” of the identities, nonetheless to the existential complex revealed by the juxtaposition of the white and black races assumed by Fanon, with regard to the colonial past and the postcolonial revival of its discourse, the metaphor of color in the

cosmopolis bears a deconstruction on its own essence. This happens because of the two elements of the identity: the recognition and the imposition, between which Appiah could not find any bright-line (Appiah 2005, 110).

Actually, Fanon (1952), reminding Hegel's paradigm on the recognition of the selves as mutually recognizing each other (Fanon 2008, 169), had tried to assess the fact of a non-universal subjectivity, based on the contradictions and actions it implied. Facts are actions or movements of not only the Self, but also the Other and there is no possibility to dismiss the reality of imposition between the first on the latter, no matter the role the Self or the Other were playing in the hospitality's bias of cosmopolitanism, as hosts and guests.

A central point of this issue of roles, transposed into cosmopolitan attitude, would be the very odd distinction between the Other and the Stranger, from a more general category of the Other. The notion of the "stranger" is imperative for the cosmopolitanism of Appiah, that is founded on the moral status of political strangers (Appiah 2005, 219). On this distinction between the Other and the Stranger hovers the doubts of Derrida when talking about *hostipitality* as inference to *hospitality*, which would be the right the strangers have to enjoy hospitality wherever they go (Derrida 2000; Critchley & Kearney 2005, xii). Such inference would be articulated by the common linguistic family of the terms *hospitality* and *hostility*.

For Derrida (1995) hospitality is not just an ethic, but the culture itself (Derrida 2005, 16). Subjects are taught to give hospitality or not. In the cosmopolitan paradigm of Appiah, however, giving hospitality in a home of everywhere or anywhere shows the cynical hostility of an invitation to a home that does not exist, practically (Appiah 2005, 218). According to Kant the right to be welcomed with hospitality was even more neatly subsumed to the right of the stranger not to be treated with hostility (Derrida 2000, 21). However, in self-identification discourses, like the discourse of blackness, or his predecessor, the Négritude, the fact of being an Other and not simply a Stranger meant the probability of the Other to benefit from hospitality with hostility from the culture it was assimilated in.

As a consequence of this subjectivity of the Other and the necessary *hostipitality*, whose meaning should hereby be enlarged, the partial

cosmopolitanism of Appiah founded on the decision of defending humanity or, on the contrary, the nationalistic rejection of strangers (Lenz & Dallmann 2005a, 7), is completed by the idea of W.E.B. Du Bois on cosmopolitanism, as very close to freedom in the conceptualization of Mill (Appiah 2005a, 39). Observing in Mill's freedom an important issue for Du Bois, namely the idea that for different persons, different conditions of spiritual development are necessary (Appiah 2005a, 40), allows Appiah to value the contribution of Du Bois to the cosmopolitan thinking. The latter supported the *cosmopolitan nationalism*, by being culturally, methodologically and ethically oriented to assert single subjectivity, and in the context of his perspectives, that one of the Negro, or the Idea of Negro (Appiah 2005a, 26). Nevertheless, the assertion of "the Negro" was made in relation to a world of colors that were not denied, rather observed, analyzed, taken as place of recognition, with the purpose to dodge imposition from it.

From a Western geo-political point of view, the observations and analysis of human variety gave birth to the creation of race, nations and ethnic groups as set of "peoples" (individualities) who became subjects to justified material and political inequalities (Flint & Taylor 2018, 41). Achille Mbembé highlights that race is a consequence of loss, separation, extermination (Mbembé 2017, 34), so a domination of identity, with the form of shaping individuality and distinctiveness, this time valued in a positive manner. In fact, Du Bois was positive for the "preservation of races" (Foner 1970, 79), and considered "the Negro" a seventh son, after the Egyptian, the Indian, the Greek, the Roman, the Teutonian and Mongolian (Appiah 2005a, 23), meanwhile sharing the "pan"- wise view.

Returning to Fanon's non-universalism and cosmopolitanism, characterized as "neoliberal confusion" (Bernasconi 2011, 90), Fanon seems to be more ontologically historical when questioning the universalism through the emergence of the subject from oppositions. Renouncing to one's blackness (an emergence of subjectivity, before all) means for him becoming white (Fanon 2008(1952), 9), which would show that evolution has a particular direction, from black to white (Sardar 2008, xiii). Thus, it seems Fanon emphasised the privilege of a primordial black, as an act of recognition, up to imagining that gaining a

whiter status means evolution, but also an imposition. Nonetheless, this would allow for the idea of in-between-ers.

The line between recognition and imposition was seen by Fanon, but not by Appiah. Moreover, considering Fanon's acts of rationalization of the white and black world, with no in-between prospect (although in-between-ers), since "an Anti-Semite is inevitably an anti-Negro" (Fanon 1952 (2008), 92), shows that the contextualized facts of subjectivity (as the emergence of the subject, taking him out of the marginality, the re-positioning of it, the objectification of it in a postcolonial reading) are to be seen as facts of color in a cosmopolitan perspective, in order to deconstruct the false horizons Pieterse referred to in his book: "White on black. Images of Africa and Blacks in Western Popular Culture" (1992).

The idea of *facts of subjectivity* would finally imply the definition of a socialization process able to create the referred identities/subjectivities (Habermas 1994, 113), but without making them able to take part of any world ranking, despite the systemic suggestion on this (Wallerstein 2004, 39). Naturally different like objects of consciousness (as well as recognition), the facts of subjectivity may be conceptualized as facts of color, departing from the model of a fact of blackness, that, in its original form, should have had no conscious racial grounds (Mbembé 2017, 42). But, despite the impositional character of the socialization, between persuasive and persuaded subjects who felt and lived „inbred racial guilt“, subsumed to the fact of blackness as described in Fanon's „Black Skin, White Masks" (Caute 1970, 5), the differentiation and consciousness contained the recognition proposal. The same as in the Négritude movement, which inspired the concept of the fact of blackness.

Inevitably continuous, the socialization process reflects the history of ongoing creative processes of self-identification, whose subject, the individual, was objectified. Hence, the most social thing is precisely the cultivation of individuality, according to interpretations of Mill (Appiah 2005, 211). Cosmopolitanism would be an ideal in the West (Appiah 2005, 218), but also an argument that the world is shaped by racism and moving beyond the racism would mean moving beyond current racial identities (Appiah 1994, 55).

Therefore it could be concluded that, the coming out of the objectification which was possible also due to racist gaze (as in the discourse of blackness), as actual discourse and intent, through moving beyond the racism, would mean not only moving beyond the facts of blackness, but also returning to a sort of marginality that had been deconstructed for a long time. The paradox is well underlined by Appiah when discussing on the dignity of a Black, which would require the self-recognition of that Black, in the register of allowing assumptions on a long-debated natural difference between races, which was dismissed on the same self-recognition and self-confidence need of the Self (individual, group, community) to impose its discourse on the Other (of the same dimension).

In this aporia of difference, the debate is about what should or should not be reflected, expressing one's tolerance that should be shown to differences suggested by racism and one's respect that ought not to be shown in reference to them (Gutman 1994, 21). Since, the main purpose of naming the race without a race, i.e. without its significance, would be in line with Charles Taylor's assertion: „Everyone should be recognized for his or her unique identity.” (Taylor 1994, 38). In fact, not seeing differences would be in itself unfair for those who defended them and recognized them, the imposition being evident from the part of hegemonic or superior Others. This was also asserted considering the difference-blind society inhumane and highly discriminatory (Taylor 1994, 43). Showing respect to the differences means, on the contrary, putting much emphasis on them, something that would produce the same effect, recognition preceding new imposition.

While discussing the construction and recognition of identities, the tolerance and respect, but, most importantly, the context-sensitive ways a system of rights should be updated in order to allow non-discriminatory discourse for the definition of each and every subject or Self (Habermas 1994, 116), social studies might seem open to welcome a notion such as the fact of color, based on the discourse of *cosmopolis's* colors encompassing the fact of differentiation.

The fact of differentiation includes, therefore: the problem of identification –recognition-imposition based on the summary discussion above; the subject - as an object of this identification; the process related to the identification-objectification; and the problem of authenticity. For Appiah, who opposes Taylor

(who, after all, positioned himself or was positioned on the part of a communitarian view, although would have said that „it is based on who I am that I develop my identity”), the creation of identity was a process in the process of socialization (Appiah 1994, 134), directed by concepts and practices of school, religion, state, society and mediated by the family.

This is being shared in development studies by the paradigm of different boundaries of clan, tribe, language, region, culture, civilization, empire, religion, state, nation, race, ethnicity, centrism (Pieterse 2001, 234), whose deconstruction, paradoxically, would be necessary in order to assert the cosmopolitanism itself. In order to correct this, Appiah comments the problem of authenticity, focused on the spatial aspect of the identification. Namely, in a more narrative line, since people are the creation of themselves, based on a decision they take in this direction, this decision is necessarily limited by the context, the options that they are given to decide, by culture or society (Appiah, 1994, p 155). Authenticity should reflect, in this discourse, not the real or virtual space of definition of the self, or the realization of the socialization process, but the neutral space of corrections and adjustments necessary while identification is in progress, including all struggles carried in this intent.

3. Conclusions and further discussions on the fact of color

Calling on Sartre's „antiracist-racism” Appiah highlights the dangers of turning the power points and replace the race difference abolitionism with indifference about it, thus disrespecting the difference (Appiah 1994, 163).

From the perspective of development and images of power, differences were relative to the observer also, depending on the cultural background and intercultural communication with the culture whose difference was recognized (Pieterse 1992, 50-51). Because, apart from the space, the subject and the process, the difference in the object could become a difference in the subject. The consciousness of the subject on the extent and type of his cultural difference would be, therefore, the first necessary thing in order to define the respect to the difference, without seeing it as a racial one.

The *fact of color* would finally be the fact of knowing and constructing the difference meanwhile deconstructing the object of it. The *fact of color* would try to propose a paradigm shift on racism, discrimination, but also color-blindness based on the sort of essence-less recognized differentiations. It would be like a lion's construction of his difference from a rabbit, based on the courage that defines his character, meanwhile deconstructing courage in the context of the relationship between subjects (predator/courageous vs. victim/fearful), who were objectified for the sake of the comparison.

Looking at recent European or American no-global, anti-migratory movements, besides tendencies to block, reduce and control the migration (e.g. Hungarian Viktor Orban's politics, President Trump migration policies, Italian Lega Nord discourse, some of the Gillet Jaunes's arguments), the question to be answered is, aren't all people in some sort of a „fact” that characterize the fact of color?

Both oppositions that people of color face in the modernist discourse (positionality, power, political and social configurations), or in the postmodernist discourse (the discourse of difference, representation of the Other) in a critical perspective on multiculturalism (Gordon 1995, 59) could be faced by those who were not considered of color, thanks to the position of their speaking or reading, even transmitting the knowledge on the Other.

Hence, the new subject of color is created in the aftermath of the Postcolonialist thinker's rise, in the light of Africanist/Orientalist self-justification discourse, despite the criticism on the replication of colonial-type mappings. Appiah's characterization of the Postcolonialists as „relatively small, Western-style, Western-trained group of writers and thinkers, who mediate the trade in cultural commodities of world capitalism at the periphery” (Appiah 1991, 348) is often and correctly cited in this regard. Therefore, this new subject of color should be as peripheral as the discourse it comes from. In this, since periphery usually justifies the existence of a center or a unique reference, despite the differences it sees, denies, or unifies, the universality could be newly emphasized.

Since Pieterse (Pieterse 1998, 2010), Raffer & Singer (Raffer & Singer 2001, 54) or Agugua (Akanle & Adesina 2018, 45) have linked the concept of center-periphery to the theory of unequal exchanges, a certain universal logic to defend

the idea of cosmopolis would not be possible. Though, due to equal justifications that come from the same root, for example, the discrimination (which in a black/white register becomes positive/negative in reference to a territory), the center and periphery tend to coincide and deconstruct marginality.

Following the example of the lion and the rabbit, the fact of color is based on positionality and interconnection. In this process, the power games themselves justify the colorfulness of discourse, dialogues, politics, economy, or shortly, each domain of the social life. The very fact of seeing these games and participating in them stands for the process of authorizing the Self. Then, it is justified the demand if “Is not the de-authorizing of the self-locked into the privilege of cosmopolitanism?” (Mohanram & Rajan 1995, 113).

In reference to the power games, seen at the international level, not only between states but also between positioned knowledge, academies, corporations neo-colonizing regions, the hegemony was typically the expression of a claiming of purity. Taking inspiration from Jan Nederveen Pieterse, who asserted that this claim of purity was a claim to power that applied to all status boundaries, so not limiting the discourse to nation, ethnicity or race (Pieterse 2001, 228), means actually that universality is a pre-condition of the self-definition.

Being universal would mean being colorful in the sense that color-blindness would contrast the system of individual rights created in inter-subjectivity (Habermas 1994, 113). Seen on the spectrum of light, from the fact of blackness to the contextual fact of whiteness, the *fact of color* should be viewed and theorized, using these four concepts of space, subject, process and difference. These are also elements necessary to assert that colorful thinking is needed, in order to keep cosmopolitanism alive.

Color-blindness was not appreciated by the so-called people of color, as also professor Stephen Small highlighted in his discourse at the AfroEuropeans Conference in Lisbon, in 2019, meaning, therefore, that existence of facts is not negated, but rather underlined for the nostalgia of struggles for further recognition. These struggles needed to have, and still need to have a position on the stage of history's thinking, as emblematic for the decolonization of the minds (Wa Thiong'O 1981). Although the notion of color, in public debate, is still very delicate, the *fact of color* that includes it is necessary in order to assure the

continuity of the Self, beyond time, space and dislocation, in accordance to readings of Mbembé on the discourse of Edward Willian Blyden (Mbembé 2017, 34).

Moreover, the *fact of color* would help deconstruct the imposition of Western values and the „founding narrative of the Western consciousness of Blackness” (Mbembé 2017, 28), criticizing the phenomenological perception of the Other based on the Self, who is at the center of meanings, although trying to narrow the possibilities of the Other to become central to our meanings, as in replication of a colonial gaze. Grounded on difference, the *fact of color* is the expression of a locus for the politics of humanity acclaimed by Achille Mbembé, as a “politics of the similar”, based on the sharing of differences (Mbembé 2017, 178), as suggested by Appiah, as well. Exploring the notion of cosmopolitanism in comparison with that one of nationalism, moreover exposing the subject to frequent alternative from the meanings of individuality to that one of system (nation, group, culture), the arguments in this paper converge to the creation of an alternative to concepts of color, race, ethnicity, culture, unifying them under the umbrella of a *fact of color*, or later on, a *fact of subjectivity* and a *fact of differentiation*.

The argumentation follows a direction indicated by Appiah whose works on cosmopolitanism were fundamental for the understanding and acceptance of diversity, but not restricted to it. The point of departure of the arguments being the marginal character of the subject, the space, subject and the process, the most important conclusion from where the debate should go on is that, in the perspective of these reflections, cosmopolitanism represents the image in the mirror of different but not functionally differentiated nationalisms. On the other hand, the world would be described as a set of colors that exist and have to continue to exist in their positive capability to show differences and their functional necessary similarities.

Notes

1. I mean that we are already in the started third century after.
2. Using a general expression to reflect the language-oriented model of thinking of and questioning the reality, that inspired structuralism and post-structuralism.
3. The group of emerging economies, as defined by Jim O'Neill: Brasil, Russia, India, China, South-Africa.
4. For example, USA, Canada, France, Germany, and Japan.

References

- Akanle, Olayinka, and Jìmí Olálékan Adésinà. 2018. Introduction: The Development of Africa: Issues, Diagnoses and Prognoses. In *Development of Africa*, eds. Akanle, Olayinka and Jìmí Olálékan Adésinà, 1-8. Springer International Publishing AG.
- Appiah, A. K. 2007. *Cosmopolitanism. Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York, USA: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2007a. Ethics in a world of strangers: W. E. B. Du Bois and the spirit of cosmopolitanism. In *Justice, Governance, Cosmopolitanism, and the Politics of Difference Reconfigurations in a Transnational World*, eds. Kwame Anthony Appiah, Seyla Benhabib, Iris Marion Young, Nancy Fraser, 15-45. Berlin, Germany: Engelbert Habekost.
- Appiah, K. Anthony. 1994. Identity, authenticity, survival: Multicultural societies and social reproduction. In *Multiculturalism: examining the politics of recognition*, ed. Amy Gutmann, 149-164. New Jersey, USA: Princeton University Press.

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 1991. Is the post-in postmodernism the post-in postcolonial? *Critical inquiry* 17(2): 336-357.
- Appiah, Anthony. 1994. Race, culture, identity: Misunderstood connections. San Diego, California: The Tanner lecture of human values.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 2005. *The Ethics of Identity*. New Jersey, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bernasconi, Robert. 2011. The Great White Error and the Great Black Mirage: Frantz Fanon's Critical Philosophy of Race. In *Living Fanon*, eds. Franz Fanon and Nigel G. Gibson, 85-92. New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burchill, Scott. 2005. Liberalism. In *Theories of International Relations Third edition*, eds. Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit and Jacqui True, 55-83. New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Caute, David. 1970. *Frantz Fanon*. Vol. 1. Seghers. New York, USA: The Viking Press Inc.
- Cowen, Michael, and Robert W. Shenton. 1996. *Doctrines of development*. USA and Canada: Routledge, Taylor & Francis.
- Creswell, John W. 2009. *Research design: Qualitative and mixed methods approaches*. London and Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Critchley, Simon, and Richard Kearney. 2005. Preface to *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, by Jacques Derrida. trans. Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes. New York: Routledge.
- Crush, Jonathan. 2005. Introduction: imagining development. In *Power of development*, ed. Jonathan Crush, 17-38. USA and Canada: Routledge Taylor and Francis.
- Derrida, Jacques. 2000. Hostipitality. *Angelaki: Journal of Theoretical Humanities* 5(3): 3-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09697250020034706>

- Derrida, Jacques. 2005. On Forgiveness. In *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. Trans. Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes. New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis.
- Donnelly, Jack. 2005. Realism. In *Theories of International Relations Third edition*, eds. Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit, and Jacqui True, 29-54. New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Esteva, Gustavo. 1992. Development In *The Development Dictionary–A guide to knowledge as power*, ed. Wolfgang Sachs. London: Zed Books.
- Fanon, Frantz. 2008. *Black skin, white masks*. London, UK: Pluto Press.
- Flint, Colin and Peter J. Taylor. 2018. *Political geography. World economy, nation-state and locality*. Seventh Edition. Oxon, USA: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- Foner, Philip, ed. 1970. *W. E. B. DuBois speaks, speeches and addresses. 1890-1910*. 2 vols. New York: Pathfinder Press 1.
- Gellner, Ernest. 1983. *Nations and nationalism*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited.
- Gordon, Beverly. 1995. The Fringe Dwellers: African American Women Scholars in the Postmodern Era. In *Critical multiculturalism: Uncommon voices in a common struggle*. eds. Kanpol, Barry and Peter McLaren, 59-88. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Gutmann, Amy. 1994. Introduction. In *Multiculturalism: examining the politics of recognition*, ed. Amy Gutmann, 3-25. New Jersey, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 1994. Struggles for Recognition in the Democratic Constitutional State. In *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*, ed. Amy Gutmann, 107-148. New Jersey, USA: Princeton University Press.

- Kunibert, Raffer, and Hans W. Singer. 2001. *The Economic North-South Divide: Six Decades of Unequal Development*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Lumumba-Kasongo, Tukumbi. 1999. *The dynamics of economic and political relations between Africa and foreign powers: A study in international relations*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Mamdani, Mahmood, ed. 1996. *Citizen and subject: Contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism*. West Sussex, UK: Princeton University Press.
- Masolo, D. A. 2004. "Western and African Communitarianism. A Comparison" in *Companion to African Philosophy*, ed. Kwasi Wiredu, 483-498. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Mbembé, Achille. "Critique of black reason" Trans. Laurent Dubois, Durham and London, UK: Duke University Press (2017).
- Naas, Michael. 2014. *The End of the World and Other Teachable Moments: Jacques Derrida's Final Seminar*. New York, USA: Fordham University Press.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 2019. *The cosmopolitan tradition: A noble but flawed ideal*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 2010. *Development theory*. London, UK: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Pieterse, J. Nederveen. 2008. Hybridity, so what? The Anti-hybridity Backlash and the Riddles of Recognition 2. *Interculturas/Translitteraturas*, 67-105. Arco/ Libros. <https://cris.maastrichtuniversity.nl/en/publications/hybridity-so-what-the-anti-hybridity-backlash-and-the-riddles-of->
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 1998. My paradigm or yours? Alternative development, post-development, reflexive development. *Development and change* 29(2): 343-373. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-7660.00081>
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen. 1992. *White on black: Images of Africa and blacks in western popular culture*. New Haven: Yale UP.

- Rajan, Gita, and Radhika Mohanram. eds. 1995. *Postcolonial Discourse and Changing Cultural Contexts: Theory and Criticism*. Westport, Connecticut and London, UK: Greenwood Press.
- Rapley, John. 2007. *Understanding Development: Theory and Practice in the Third World*. Colorado, USA: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- Rodney, Walter. 1973. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. London UK: Bogle-L'Ouverture Publications.
- Sardar, Ziauddin. 2008. Foreword to: Frantz Fanon. In *Black skin, white masks* ()
- Taylor, Charles. 1994. The politics of recognition. In *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*, ed. Amy Gutmann, 25-74. New Jersey, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Vitale, Francesco. 2018. *Biodeconstruction: Jacques Derrida and the life sciences*, trans. Mauro Senatore. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel Maurice. 2004. *World-systems analysis: An introduction*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Wa Thiong'o, Ngũgĩ. 1981. *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Harare, Zimbabwe: Zimbabwe Publishing House (Pvt.) Ltd.