Mediterranean Cosmopolitanism and its Contemporary Revivals: a Critical Approach

Nora Lafi

▶ To cite this version:

Nora Lafi. Mediterranean Cosmopolitanism and its Contemporary Revivals: a Critical Approach. New Geographies (Journal of the Harvard University Graduate School of Design), 2013, The Mediterranean (Antonio Petrov ed.) (5), p.325-333. halshs-00825628

HAL Id: halshs-00825628
https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00825628

Submitted on 24 May 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

New Geographies 05
The Mediterranean

53 Worlds, Regions, Cities, and Architectures
Antonio Petrov

59 The Sea of Scales and Segments
Interview with Hashim Sarkis and Michael Herzfeld
Naor Ben-Yehoyada

81 The Mediterranean, A New Imaginary
Adrian Lahoud

101 Braudel's Donkey
Historians and the Mediterranean as a Political Project
Wouter Vanstiphout

111 Mediterranean Cultural Identities Seen through the "Western" Gaze
Shifting Geographical Imaginations of Athens
Lila Leontidou

123 A Means to Practical Ends
The Hydrometrics of Peter Fend
Timothy Ivison

135 Space, Memory, Rhythm, and Time
Constructing a Mediterranean Archive
Iain Chambers

145 **Beyond "Mediterraneanism"**
A View from Cultural Anthropology
Henk Driessen

153 **The Maghreb**
A Laboratory of New Migrations
Michel Peraldi

165 **The Mediterranean as Expansionist Theater**
The Case of Atlantropa
Peter Christensen

179 **A Mediterranean Photodossier**
Bas Princen

195 **A Geography of Lines**
Breaching the Walls of the Mediterranean Port City
Jarrad Morgan

201 **Topographic Potentials**
Revisiting the Valley Cross-Section
Fadi Masoud

209 **The New Colossus**
Of Islands and Origins
Andrew McGee

215 **Is the Mediterranean Urban?**
Neil Brenner, Nikos Katsikis

235 **Challenges to Urbanity in Contemporary Mediterranean Metropolises**
New Urban Forms, Dynamics, Boundaries and Tensions
Denis Bocquet

245 **Middle Sea City**
The Med Net Atlas Project
Mosè Ricci

255 **The Island Paradigm and the Mediterranean**
Stefania Staniscia

265 **Ex-Murus**
Escaping Gaze
Karim Basbous

273 **North versus South**
The Mediterranean and the Histories of Modern Architecture
Michelangelo Sabatino

285 **Rewriting the Mediterranean City**
Geography of Transformation
Ludovico Micara

303 **Between Mobility and Control**
The Mediterranean at the Borders of Europe
Lorenzo Pezzani

315 **Algeria's Colonial Geography**
Shifting Visions of Mediterranean Space
Muriam Haleh Davis

325 **Mediterranean Cosmopolitanism and its Contemporary Revivals**
A Critical Approach
Nora Lafi

Mediterranean Cosmopolitanism and its Contemporary Revivals
A Critical Approach
Nora Lafi

The idea of cosmopolitanism today is often an exercise in regressive nostalgia, harking back to a time when Muslims and Jews, or Greeks and Turks, lived together in Mediterranean cities, mostly within the Ottoman Empire. The link between what is perceived as a form of cosmopolitanism and the philosophical idea of cosmopolitanism that developed in Europe during the age of Enlightenment is, however, often indistinct, and the only certainty is that this era concluded with the emergence of a new world order, composed of nationalisms and colonialisms.

In this essay, I argue that, in spite of the difficulty of articulating cosmopolitanism in distinction with the cosmopolitan idea developed in European philosophy — a theoretical obstacle on which many readings of the actual content of the cosmopolitan idea have foundered — the Ottoman experience of governance of diversity represented a form of cosmopolitanism. I will try to compare this manifestation with its possible equivalents on the Northern shores of the Mediterranean and consider the substance of various contemporary revivals. I propose here to examine how this feature of Ottoman imperial belonging — with of course its fundamental limits and lasting ambiguities — was confronted with a form of modernity that challenged not only cosmopolitanism as a constructed form of coexistence and shared governance but also urban diversity. On the basis of such reflections, I try, in the final part of the essay, to critically examine contemporary revivals of the notion, arguing that, although such revivals sometimes using the imagery, rhetoric, and vocabulary of cosmopolitanism, they rarely encompass a genuine cosmopolitan dimension, in the sense of participatory governance of diversity in which different groups have access to the civic sphere.

The difficulty when studying cosmopolitanism in Mediterranean cities is that the notion is often held prisoner to two implicit referential horizons: the European concept of cosmopolitanism as developed in philosophy, and the situation of some cities of the region in which diversity was a fundamental fact. Reflecting on the notion without clearing the effects of such possible misunderstandings is a source of confusion, the relationship between, let us say, Kant and colonial Alexandria being difficult to absorb in a single theoretical package. That is why it is important to clear both sides of this implicit horizon before trying to examine another situation, the imperial Ottoman regime, in light of the concept of cosmopolitanism.

Understanding if and why the philosophical concept of cosmopolitanism has relevance in the Mediterranean urban context is indeed a prerequisite, as is addressing the ambiguities of what is often perceived as a kind of cosmopolitan golden age. This journey through the history of the notion of cosmopolitanism seems necessary to avoid the dangers of Eurocentrism, anachronism, and confusion between the presence of a diverse population and the existence of a civic sphere allowing minorities to participate in urban governance. The aim is also to take

part in contemporary debates about cosmopolitanism (Vertovec and Cohen 2003, Breckenridge 2002), using the urban Ottoman regime case study as an alternative to existing visions of the notion and as a way to go beyond the theoretical dichotomy between philosophy and the description of post-Ottoman colonial societies.

Cosmopolitanism in Philosophy and the Governance of Urban Diversity: A Legacy of Confusion

The first use of the term cosmopolitanism comes from the Cynic tradition in ancient Greece. The concept was later used by Stoics and is, in its very essence, a Mediterranean idea. It matured with the decline of the model of the Greek city and its form of governance, which had been promoted in the entire ancient world. At the time of the imperial domination of Alexander, the Cynics introduced the idea of an egalitarian morality, based on the individual and his right to access governance for what he is and not for the group he belongs to. The Stoics developed the idea of the world as a big city, with citizens of the world being given the rights that citizens had in Greek cities.

Lisa Hill, in an attempt to examine the relevance in present debates on citizenship of the Greek cosmopolitan philosophy and its Roman imperial interpretations, illustrated the relationship between the Stoic moment and ideas of republic, government, and cosmopolitanism (Hill 2000). Cosmopolitanism as a concept was an answer to the limits of citizenship in a Mediterranean world where diversity was common. It was from the beginning a notion situated at the articulation between the government of the world and its differences and urban government, with of course the specificity that the Greek city was not limited to an urban reality and that reflections on imperial citizenship in Roman times was by definition global. After a series of reforms the Roman Empire acquired, at the scale of imperial citizenship, a certain cosmopolitan dimension, as people from the entire Mediterranean were progressively granted access to the civic sphere (Mathisen 2006). Ancient cosmopolitanism — with of course its limits, such as the presence of slaves, prisoners of war, and people without rights, and of course the issue of gender — refers to the political and civic sphere, and not only to the presence of a diverse population.

This ancient concept of cosmopolitanism has also been elaborated in the context of Hellenistic philosophy — Socratic, Stoic, and Epicurean (Brown 2012). Some cities of the ancient Greek world were known for the diversity of their populations, and it is believed that the development of the notion in philosophy has something to do with the adaptation of the Greek city, as a political form giving exclusive rights only to its native citizens (generally a narrow group) to such diversity. The problem was how to give access to the urban civic sphere to Greek merchants from the wider Greek world living in port cities, and sometimes even to merchants from other Mediterranean horizons. Delos is the most studied among these port cities; it is presented as an emporium open to people from the entire Mediterranean (Malacrino 2007).

Cosmopolitanism having been used and reinterpreted throughout history, this Greek origin of the term is to be remembered, as along with some founding ambiguities, such as the difficult articulation between urban citizenship and imperial citizenship, both realities encompassing significant limits. What seems most interesting, however, is to discuss the evolution of the meaning of the concept from the Greek idea of government of the world as an extended city (the political entity) and to a certain extent of the city (the urban reality) as a little-world, a microcosm, to the social situation of Mediterranean towns 1,000 years later, and to present debates about world governance, urban governance, and life in the cities.

But for the sake of this discussion, an understanding of what happened to the notion in between is necessary: cosmopolitanism today is not just a metaphor of what it was in ancient times, for the concept was deeply re-elaborated in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Debates today can't simply rely on a theoretical bridge between cities of the Mediterranean in the nineteenth or twentieth century and Delos in Hellenistic times. In a way, cosmopolitanism became less Mediterranean when European philosophers began to appropriate it and accommodate it to debates of a different kind. The fact that the history of the concept now relates mostly to European political philosophy must be taken into account in discussions about the Mediterranean nature of urban diversity. Taking this approach is not the promotion of a possible Eurocentric vision but instead represents a clarification of the renewed origins and connotations of a concept whose circulation is at the center of present discussions.

From the beginning, the cosmopolitan idea included a tension between the universal and the individual, between the idea of the possible coexistence of different identities of the individual and a need for an egalitarian-individualist attitude of indifference regarding men as citizens of the world or as participating entities in social life, including urban life. The concept of cosmopolitanism is also born at the intersection of ethics and the concrete governance of diversity. During the European Enlightenment, the concept was reinterpreted, mostly in the context of German philosophical debates, far from the practice of governance of diversity in Mediterranean cities. That is why an examination of its pertinence today cannot do without a renewed discussion of Kant's ideas on cosmopolitanism, world government, and the role of the individual in society (Slomp 2005, Pojman 2005, Nussbaum 1997). Martine Prange also illustrated how until Nietzsche at least, Kantian cosmopolitanism was a reference for a new definition of the concept (Prange 2007).

This new cosmopolitanism, taking various forms until the nineteenth century, was key in the definition of the Eu-

ropean self in philosophy and in the maturation of modern political thought in Europe, in the context of the emergence of the national idea (Rosenfeld 2002). Throughout its journey in European philosophy, cosmopolitanism became an argument in discussions about the ontological dimension of nations and about the relationship between ethnicity and nation building. The later second circulation of the concept of cosmopolitanism must be read in the context of the nineteenth-and-twentieth-century exchange of ideas between Europe and the Middle East, in a new complex relationship in which many things had changed and ideas such as Orientalism, influence, imperialism, and Eurocentricism had become key. The new philosophy of cosmopolitanism was a mirror, sometimes absorbing, of the growing nationalism (Meineke 1970, Bowden 2003). This has to be remembered when studying the stakes of nationalism in Europe and the Mediterranean and the challenge to diversity that they represented.

From the tension during the French Revolution and its impact on nation building and the promotion of universal values (Dédéyan 1976) to the ambiguity generated by considerations of race and ethnicity in European nation-building processes (Gikandi 2002, Holton 2002), discussions on cosmopolitanism have since the nineteenth century been characterized by a new dimension: they expose the philosophical ambiguity of the European process of nation building and a definition of citizenship based on an often ethnicized vision of the self. Such discussions became matters of even greater relevance when this tradition was confronted with diversity and complexity in a region that had experienced a different path toward the governance of diversity, and where the impact of the European tradition was accompanied by domination and colonialism. The effect of the new European conception of cosmopolitanism on the Mediterranean not a mere revival of ancient philosophical ideals but rather part of a more complex process of reading societies that had been subjected to domination.

The fact that cosmopolitanism as a concept became multilayered in this period must thus be kept in mind before making any further use of it. As Terry Cochran argues, there is indeed a linguistic economy of cosmopolitanism in present debates that has to be made explicit (Cochran 1999). And it is sometimes difficult to be sure that various people using the concept are in fact dealing with the same thing. Pheng Cheah's warnings might be very useful in this regard. He doesn't believe in one of the first assumptions made by many users of the concept of cosmopolitanism — that is, that there would be something to understand in the relationship between cosmopolitanism as an Enlightenment idea and cosmopolitanism as a tool to analyze societies with a component of diversity: "Any contemporary revival of cosmopolitanism must take a critical distance from the older style cosmopolitanism of philosophical modernity" (Cheah 1997). For him, what he calls "ancestor cosmopolitanism" is something else entirely. But then, his aim is to confront contemporary societies with the modern idea of the nation and its roots, as if cosmopolitanism as a theoretical creation for the contemporary world was only indirectly related to its ancestor.

One of the aims of the present essay, based on an examination of the Ottoman urban situation, is instead to explore the possibility of a more complex relationship. Of course, the nature of the concept has changed, but as part of a phenomenon that is precisely the one under study: the evolution of the idea of nation in Europe and the impact of the spread toward the East and the South of such a conception in the context of a biased modernity. For Cheah, "The history of colonialism has disproven Kant's benign view of the unifying power of international commerce" (Cheah 1999; see also Cheah and Robbins 1998), and for him, contemporary reflections on cosmopolitanism are aimed at explaining what he calls the present neocolonial globalization, so the discussion seems closed. But one could argue that, to the contrary, it offers a good basis for discussion, though commerce and global exchanges are not the right focus and that instead, the urban governance of diversity in Mediterranean cities might be. We'll see here that the Ottoman case might suggest at least partially reopening this discussion. As for the responsibility of universalism in imperialism, the discussion is also open, as arguments by Pratap Bhanu Mehta illustrate (Bhanu Mehta 2000).

Cheah also contradicts the various theories on hybridity, such as developed by Bhabha and Clifford, and their use of the cosmopolitan context: "I argue that the accounts of radical cosmopolitan agency offered by hybridity theory obscure the material dynamics of nationalism in neo-colonial globalization" (Cheah 1997). For him, contemporary cosmopolitanism is a constant renegotiation of the postcolonial nation-state, in the framework of complex forces of both resistance and accommodation. But for the historian, the impression is that in Cheah's account, several steps are missing. The sequence "Kant, colonial, postcolonial" cannot be more satisfactory than the "diversity equals cosmopolitanism" postulate, and situations like the old regime Ottoman might help clarify the picture and reevaluate the concept.

The Ottoman Old Regime Urban Form of Cosmopolitanism

Studies on Mediterranean cosmopolitanism have mostly focused on the situation in port cities of the Ottoman Empire (or formerly Ottoman, in some cases): Alexandria, Izmir, Salonica, and Beirut, for example (Driessen 2005). But most of these studies do consider the Ottoman form of cosmopolitanism only at the moment of its impact with modernity, nationalisms, and European colonialism. Robert Ilbert's study on Alexandria, which remains the most valuable book in Mediterranean cosmopolitanism studies, focuses, for example, on the period of reforms of the Ottoman old regime and the creation of new municipal institutions in which not only confessional communities (Greek, Jews) were represented, but also European merchants and entrepreneurs (Ilbert 1996). Cosmopolitanism, conceived as participation in urban politics extended to minorities (if only the notables), was ephemeral in such cities. Reimer has underlined how this situation could also be seen as a

colonial bridgehead (Reimer 1997).

The common feature of such cosmopolitan situations, during the time of the Ottoman reforms of the 1850s to 1900s, is formalized access to the reformed municipal institutions for notables from various communities, and in many cases for foreign merchants (Lafi 2005). From Beirut (Hanssen 2005) to Izmir (Georgelin 2005) and Salonica (Darques 2000), the cosmopolitan situation in such cities is rather ambiguous, however, if its consideration begins only in the middle of the nineteenth century. Such a perspective, though fascinating for understanding the logics at work in late Ottoman cities and the nature of Ottoman urban modernity, has the drawback of viewing cosmopolitanism only in the context of a relationship between an "oriental" society in the process of modernization and influxes seen as coming from Europe. In this situation, the late Ottoman cosmopolitanism is ambiguous by nature (Fuhrman 2003).

Recent studies on late Ottoman urban societies have shown that modernity was not the mere importation of solutions from Europe into a vacuum, but rather the modernization — in the framework of a rational imperial Ottoman project, with expertise found on the international scene, and sometimes bought on the international market — of a complex existing situation of old regime urban governance. What I argue here is that the understanding of this Ottoman urban old regime is also a way of exiting the impasse of cosmopolitanism seen only in its late Ottoman form, an instant before its colonial and/or national negation. Outside of the ephemeral and ambiguous late Ottoman moment, modernity in Mediterranean cities promoted segregation and separation and not cosmopolitanism, from French-occupied Algiers to ethnically homogenized Salonica or Izmir. The Ottoman old regime instead had been in many cases a negotiated form of urban balance based on the coexistence of communities.

One must of course not have a naïve or irenicist vision of this social form: it was not democracy, but an old regime unequal in its very nature and organizing different layers of inequalities; it was not general harmony but rather a constantly renegotiated balance, with moments of crisis and sometimes violence. But it was also an expression of plural civic participation in urban governance, in the context of an empire that granted the general framework for these local urban declensions of the *Pax Ottomana*. This framework was progressively built on different heritages, among which the imperial Byzantine, itself related to Roman roots, and the Islamic are the most relevant. In a medieval Islamic context, the governance of diversity had been dealt with both at the theoretical philosophical level and at the level of the practical organization of daily life in cities. The issue of the regime of difference has been treated in medieval Islamic philosophy by authors such as al-Farabi, with his *al-madîna al-fâdila* — the ideal city (Muhsin 2001) — or Ibn Khaldun (Baali 1988). They proposed visions of urban society in which the Greek philosophical heritage, local traditions, and of course the precepts of Islam were combined to make an original creation, which contributed to framing urban governance in the Middle East.

Minorities were granted access to the urban sphere through the authorization of communal representation, the participation in guilds, and the right to petition. Among the central notions in Islamic medieval thought, the *Hisba,* or good governance, integrated such dimensions. Representatives of communal institutions were generally inserted, though often with a minor role, into the institutions of urban government. This scheme was extended by the Ottomans and made part of the general functioning of the Empire. On the basis of the medieval Islamic heritage and the Byzantine imperial heritage, confessional communities were granted the right to have local councils, of which the notables were members. Such institutions did not only deal with religious communal affairs — Jewish, Armenian, Greek Orthodox, for example, according to the city — but also had fiscal, judicial, and urban jurisdictions. The chief of each community was a generally a member of the council of the notables of the city, the form and composition of which was a result of negotiations with the empire. This system can be seen as a form of cosmopolitanism, as diversity was not only a demographic fact but was translated into a system of governance. Of course Muslims had a dominant position, and not all public offices were open to members of all communities. But such communities were recognized as collective civic bodies and were granted access to the urban and imperial civic sphere. Even nomads and the Roma in the Balkans were given a collective civic existence.

The petitioning system in the Ottoman Empire, during the old regime, was also more than an appeal against bad administration: it was an institutionalized dialogue between individuals or collective bodies (communal or professional) and the empire. There was an administrative system established to handle petitions, and most decisions in the empire were taken in response to a petition (Lafi 2011). Another hint of the existence of a form of cosmopolitanism in old regime Ottoman cities is the fact that the urban habitat was not fully segregated, and people from different communities had common daily lives and even common civic activities. There were of course quarters with a given communal identity, from the Greek quarters in Istanbul to the Jewish quarters in Tripoli or the different neighborhoods of Sarajevo (Gudelj 2007). But in all cities there were also mixed quarters, and in many cities, guilds could also be multi-confessional. And it was not rare, as the archives of the office of petitions in Istanbul illustrate, to have "notables" from different communities sign common petitions to the empire, embodying in this process a single civic body.

Cities of the empire were also the theater of the development of a kind a cosmopolitanism of the subaltern (Bayat 2010), as daily life was made of common experiences between people from various communities and as mobilization often happened according to shared needs and claims. All of these features, which participated in the negotiated construction of a kind of Ottoman *Pax Urbana,* were of course subject to growing tensions with the decline of the empire and with the impact of nationalisms and the modern definitions of politics, participation, and citizenship. But they constitute, from the fifteenth to the early nineteenth centuries, an original feature of cosmopolitan coexistence and governance. The specific characteristics,

as locally negotiated with the empire (an entity that recent historiography invites us to read not as merely external but entangled with local societies) differed from city to city, just as layers of historical heritage and the local population composition differed. The Ottoman equilibrium, as in all old regime societies, was also regularly challenged, either by external events or internal rebels, or even more often by an alliance between both. Cosmopolitanism in Ottoman cities was in no way a perfect world, but an old regime configuration in which diversity, and inequality, were accommodated by (limited) participation and negotiation.

The existence of this system prompts a comparison with what happened in cities of the Northern shore of the Mediterranean in the early modern period. In places where the construction of kingdoms encouraged ethnic and religious homogenization, urban cosmopolitanism, which had medieval roots there too, had little chance to survive. And indeed, Ottoman Salonica, Tunis, Algiers, or Istanbul became safe havens for Jewish refugees from Christian Spain. In only a few European cities a certain form of urban cosmopolitanism — here again seen as the possibility of access to the civic sphere for minorities, and not just toleration of their existence — seems to have developed (Bottin and Calabi 1999). It is the case in Venice, a city-state that managed to avoid empires and kingdoms, and whose main source of wealth was commerce with the orient. In Venice, Jews, Muslims (Bosnians, Turks, Tunisians, Albanians), and non-Catholic Christians (Greeks, Armenians, Albanians) were granted the right to petition and designate the representatives of their communities, who were allowed to negotiate affairs regarding the community with the authorities of the Republic (Pedani 2010). In 1575 the Fondaco dei Turchi was created on the model of the institutions of the Jewish community. Such communal institutions had mandates much broader than the organization of confessional life. It was also the case in Livorno, a Tuscan harbor city where Mediterranean Jews were invited to settle by the Florentine power. Historical studies have illustrated how Jewish merchants in this city took part in a form of cosmopolitan urban governance (Fettah 2003, LoRomer 1987). But in many other cities of Europe, such developments were limited.

As for the Ottoman Empire, the modernization of the old regime did not include the development of an innovative tool for the generalization of equality without the explosion of the common civic sphere. Given growing frictions between Ottoman urban societies, nationalisms of various sorts, and European influence and colonialism, situations of cosmopolitanism disappeared in most cities.

Contemporary Urban Cosmopolitan Revivals: Between Place Marketing and Inauthenticity

In present-day Mediterranean cities, cosmopolitanism, with diverse specific meanings, is again a word that carries positive connotations. It is often used in the context of strategies of place marketing, presented as a fashionable feature of global cities of the region. It rarely, however, signals a new form of political cosmopolitanism, in which minorities would be associated with urban government and the general governance framework would reflect a common civic sphere shared by members of various minorities. This idea of cosmopolitanism is more a form of coexistence of people of diverse origins, sometimes with positive effects on the image of the cities, than a mode of cosmopolitan urban government and governance of diversity. Indeed, Mediterranean cities are struggling with the limits of their models of integration and participation: from the *banlieues* of Marseille to the Roma camps of Naples, the neighborhoods with a dense migrant population in Athens or Barcelona, the Arab neighborhoods of Haifa or Jaffa, the camps of Palestinian refugees in Beirut or the camps of African migrants in Tripoli — all situations being diverse in their nature but sharing the common feature of exposing the limits of the cosmopolitan political sphere.

Cities of the Mediterranean exhibit more shortcomings in cosmopolitan governance than innovative and harmonious solutions. Very often, of course, local situations depend more on the ambiguities of state policies and even on geopolitical stakes than on the urban political ideal. But in spite of the broad diffusion of municipal democracy (though not all Mediterranean cities are part of this municipal democratic sphere), and in spite of the opening of this municipal democracy to migrants or their children or to members of minorities in many cities of the region, the Mediterranean does not seem to be the place for the construction of a new cosmopolitan ideal, in the philosophical and political science meaning of the term. The new Mediterranean cosmopolitanism we often hear about is definitely not mainly made of a general participation in urban affairs, which would reflect the diversity of urban societies. It is more a matter of urban identity, culture, marketing, and sometimes hiding (more or less deliberately) situations of exclusion. This new form of Mediterranean cosmopolitanism is characterized by extreme contradictions: the fashionable surface sometimes tells narratives that strongly contrast with the general context.

This is the case, for example, in Alexandria, a city that was until the 1950s an example of cosmopolitan society, though with many internal contradictions related to the colonial nature of cosmopolitan rule (Reimer 1997). Since the 1990s, the city has been the object of a program of cultural revitalization with strong cosmopolitan accents. Cosmopolitanism in Alexandria even became the focus of a marketing strategy (Starr 2005). But the paradox is that in this former cosmopolitan city, Greeks and Jews have mostly disappeared due to the tensions of the late twentieth century and the impact of decolonization, nationalism, and Zionism on urban coexistence. Alexandria is now a stronghold of radical Islam, a fact that does not prevent the city from playing on the image of a cosmopolitan past. This cosmopolitan myth has little to do with the actual evolution of the local urban society, in which sectarian polarization is stronger than ever (Iskander 2012) and urban space is marked by tensions that are in many respects a negation of cosmopolitanism (Tadroz 2011).

In post Civil War Beirut, cosmopolitanism is also, since 1990s, the theme of the construction of place market-

ing. The reconstruction of the city played on the image of a cosmopolitan city center, albeit in the context of polarized sectarian politics (Nagel 2002). Cosmopolitanism was both an object of real-estate marketing for developers and a brand to be sold to investors and visitors. Speculation, evictions, and corruption were also part of the process (Adwan 2004). Cosmopolitanism largely functioned as an accessory to gentrification and to the privatization of public space, with little echo in the governance sphere, where sectarian politics continued to divide communities. In another way, however, Beirut might be, in spite of all these limits, one of the rare Mediterranean cities where diversity is still part of the governance pact, and political alliances between sectarian parties, beyond their sometimes caricatural and ambiguous nature, might be a form of social consensus.

In Istanbul too, cosmopolitanism has been a key word in recent narratives of the city's cultural revival (Asu and Robins 2010, Thelen 2008). But in a city where profound demographic changes, with a massive immigration from Anatolia, and the Turkish national idea have both deeply challenged the very concept and reality of cosmopolitanism, the contradictions within the present revival of something that Benton Jay Komins called a "depopulated cosmopolitanism" (Komins 2002) are strong. This revival, made of both Islamist discourses on diversity, which often model themselves on a vision of the Ottoman past (Yavuz 1998), and cultural expressions of a fashionable Istanbul made of art galleries, discos, bars, and gay neighborhoods (Öktem 2008) — two cosmopolitan expressions with little in common (Potuoğlu-Cook 2006) — also takes place in the context of often unresolved questions on the relationship between the nation and the heritage of diversity (Mills 2008). The opening of the ruling Islamist party toward Greek and Armenian minorities can be interpreted as both a challenge to the Turkish idea of nation and a revival of an Islamic vision of tolerance, but also as a political maneuver with few consequences for daily patterns of interaction (Ter-Matevosyan 2010). Incidents during the Istanbul Cultural Capital of Europe 2010 season, when radical Islamists raided art galleries where alcohol was being served during *vernissages*, also illustrate the limits of coexistence in Istanbul between a cosmopolitan cultural elite and other trends on the local political and social scene, as well as the tensions that gentrification with a cosmopolitan image bring to popular neighborhoods (Pehlivan 2011).

In Marseille, cosmopolitanism has also been used as a tool of cultural marketing during the last ten years, with a process of Mediterraneanization of several major cultural projects, and in general of the narrative of the city (Bullen 2012). From the project of a Museum of the Civilizations of Europe and the Mediterranean (Bromberger 2007) to the content of the season of Marseille as the Cultural Capital of Europe 2013, Marseille has been using the Mediterranean as a brand for its own urban positioning, a process that has led some scholars to call Marseille's Mediterranean an "artificial product" (Gastaut 2003). In a city with a very diverse population, with serious issues of segregation and postcolonialism (Nasiali 2012), the cosmopolitan idea of the Mediterranean has nothing to do with local governance of diversity; it is rather a marketing product aimed at bringing back investors to a harbor city that has experienced a serious decline since the end of the colonial era.

In Salonica, present uses of the cosmopolitan past are also strategic. They developed on the occasion of its turn as the Cultural Capital of Europe in 1997, in the context of the emergence of a postnationalist narrative of the city's past. But they tend to focus on a static vision of the multicultural past, with little opening toward the multicultural present (Hatziprokopiou 2012). Even if the architectural heritage of the Ottoman past has been better protected, and if the Jewish history of the city has received renewed attention, one cannot say that this new vision of cosmopolitanism is really cosmopolite.

In Israel too, appropriations of the Mediterranean identity have been criticized as examples of place marketing with strong ideological inconsistencies, rather than expressions of what would be a postnationalist (or post-Zionist, in that case) form of cosmopolitanism (Locke 2009). In Tel Aviv/Jaffa, such contradictions have been denounced in real-estate projects whose narratives are intercultural and seek to develop the idea of a cosmopolitan city, but in reality often segregate populations and reinforce not only gentrification but the eviction of Arab populations (Goldhaber 2010). It is a process that Hadar Livne has called the creation of a "mythical Mediterranean space" made of Orientalist fake authenticity and provoking the "devalorization and erasure of the local urban space and its long neglected Arab population, and consequently in the creation of an alienated, exclusive Jewish gated community which ignores its social and physical surroundings" (Livne 2008). In such a process, cosmopolitanism is often used a marketing tool that masks practices of eviction (with strong colonial connotations), resulting in a reinforcement of the ethnic homogenization of the urban space. The situation in Haifa, where cosmopolitanism tends to be reduced to a folkloric vision of the orient (Kallus and Kolodney 2010) and has nothing to do with the invention of a new cosmopolitan governance, is comparable.

Such cosmopolitan façades have also been denounced in Morocco, and specifically the city of Marrakesh, where the vision of a cosmopolitan society tends to be limited to the attraction of foreign investors on the real-estate market and results in a violent gentrification of urban space, with a clear postcolonial dimension (Escher et al. 2001). The positive effect on the cosmopolitan scene of the return of Moroccan Jews, now mostly French, does not seem to have consequences for the true cosmopolitan dimension and seems to be part of a broader phenomenon of eviction of the poor under the effect of gentrification and control of the real-estate market by foreign investors.

Mediterranean cities do not seem to be places sponsoring the invention of a new cosmopolitan ideal. The present situation, in which uses of cosmopolitanism are more often ideological decoys than genuine innovations in terms of governance of diversity, draws on a limited vision of the cosmopolitan past of some cities of the region. They also often relate to rewritings of the narratives of nationalism and colonization. What is selected is the presence,

and sometimes coexistence, of various communities, but rarely the model of a governance of diversity that, in some situations, was innovative (but of course should not be mythologized). Both new forms of diversity in Mediterranean cities (Meijer 1999), resulting from new migrations and the persistence of old injustices and segregations, call for the invention of a new Mediterranean cosmopolitanism, of which migrants to Mediterranean cities of Europe, Roma minorities from Naples to Istanbul, Chinese migrants in Algiers, or Sub-Saharan African migrants in Tripoli could be the beneficiaries. But until now, the effects of globalization on Mediterranean cities and on the uses and interpretations of the cosmopolitan idea have supported trends toward segregation rather than incentives for a true cosmopolitan revival, which would be something more than empty Ottoman (or sometimes Habsburg, per Ballinger 2003) imperial nostalgia or a caricatural and folkloristic vision of the past. But at least in debates about cosmopolitanism in other regions of the world (Cartier 1999), the Mediterranean can be used for the contrasted richness of its cosmopolitan history: a first step, perhaps, toward the invention of a new model.

References:

Adwan, Charles. 2004. "Corruption in Reconstruction: The Cost of 'National Consensus' in Post-War Lebanon." Center for International Private Enterprise.

Asu, Aksoy, and Kevin Robins. 2010. "Changing Urban Cultural Governance in Istanbul: The Beyoglu Plan."*KPY Working Paper 1*.

Baali, Fuad. 1988. *Society, State, and Urbanism: Ibn Khaldun's Political Thought*. Albany: State University of New York Press. 175.

Ballinger, P. 2003. "Imperial Nostalgia: Mythologizing Habsburg Trieste." *Journal of Modern Italian Studies* 8: 84–101.

Bayat, Asef. 2010. *Life as Politics: How Ordinary People Change the Middle East*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 304.

Bhanu Mehta, Bratap. 2000. "Cosmopolitanism and the Circle of Reason." *Political Theory* 28-5: 619–639.

Bottin, Hervé, and Donatella Calabi, eds. 1999. *Les étrangers dans la ville*. Paris: MSH. 486.

Bowden, B. 2003. "Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism: Irreconcilable Differences or Possible Bedfellows?" *National Identities* 5: 235–249.

Breckenridge, Carol. 2002. *Cosmopolitanism*. Durham: Duke University Press. 241.

Bromberger, Christian. 2007. "D'un musée… l'autre." *Etnografica* 11-2 : 407–420.

Brown, Eric. 2012. "Hellenistic Cosmopolitanism." In Marie-Louse Gill and Pierre Pellegrin, eds. *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*. London: Wiley. 549–558.

Bullen, Claire. 2012. "Marseille, ville méditerranéenne? Les enjeux de pouvoir dans la construction des identités urbaines.' *Rives Méditerranéennes* 42: 157–171.

Cartier, Carolyn. 1999. "Cosmopolitics and the Maritime World City." *Geographical Review* 99-2: 278–289.

Cheah, Pheng. 1997. "Given culture: Rethinking Cosmopolitical Freedom in Transnationalism." *Boundary* 2: 157–197.

Cheah, Pheng, and Bruce Robbins, eds. 1998. *Cosmopolitics: Thinking Beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. 385.

Cochran, Terry. 1999. "The Linguistic Economy of the Cosmopolitical." *Boundary* 26-2: 59–72.

Darques, Régis. 2000. *Salonique au XXe siècle: de la cité ottomane à la métropole grecque*. Paris: CNRS. 390.

Dédéyan, Charles. 1976. *Le cosmopolitisme européen sous la Révolution et l'Empire*. Paris: SEES. 641.

Driessen, Henk. 2005. "Mediterranean Port Cities: Cosmopolitanism Reconsidered." *History and Anthropology* 16: 129–141.

Escher, Anton, Sandra Petermann, and Brigitte Clos. 2001. "Gentrification in der Medina von Marrakech." *GR*: 24–31.

Fettah, Samuel. 2003. « Le cosmopolitisme livournais: représentations et institutions (XVIIe-XIXe s.). » *Cahiers de la Méditerranée* 67.

Fuhrmann, Malte. 2003. «Cosmopolitan Imperialists and the Ottoman Port Cities: Conflicting Logics in the Urban Social Fabric." *Cahiers de la Méditerranée* 2003, 67.

Gastaut, Yvan. 2003. « Marseille cosmopolite après les décolonisations : un enjeu identitaire. » *Cahiers de la Méditerranée* 2003, 67.

Georgelin, Hervé. 2005. *La fin de Smyrne: du cosmopolitisme aux nationalismes*. Paris: CNRS. 254.

Gikandi, Simon. 2002. "Race and Cosmopolitanism." *American Literary History* 14: 593–615.

Goldhaber, Ravit. 2010. "The 'Jaffa Slope Project': An Analysis of 'Jaffaesque' Narratives in the New Millenium." *Makan: Adalah's Journal for Land, Planning and Justice* 2: 47–69.

Gudelj, Jasenka. 2007. "Sarajevo, la città cosmopolita 'alla turca.'" *Città & Storia* 2-1: 33–44.

Hanssen, Jens. 2005. *Fin de Siècle Beirut: The Making of an Ottoman Provincial Capital*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 340.

Hatziprokopiou, Panos. 2012. "Haunted by the Past and the Ambivalences of the Present: Immigrations and Thessalonica's Second Path to Cosmopolitanism." In Caroline Humphrey and Vera Skvirskaja, eds. *Post-Cosmopolitan Cities: Explorations of Urban Coexistence*. New York, Oxford: Berghahn. 194–216.

Hill, Lisa. 2000. "The Two Republicae of the Roman Stoics: Can a Cosmopolite Be a Patriot?" *Citizenship Studies* 4: 65–79.

Holton, R. G. 2002. "Cosmopolitanism or Cosmopolitanisms? The Universal Races Congress of 1911." *Global Networks: A Journal of Transnational Affairs* 2: 153–170.

Ilbert, Robert. 1996. *Alexandrie 1830–1930: Histoire d'une communauté citadine*. Cairo: IFAO. 879.

Iskander, Elizabeth. *Sectarian Conflict in Egypt. Coptic Media, Identity, and Representation*. London: Routledge. 227.

Kallus, Rachel, and Ziva Kolodney. 2010. "Politics of Urban Space in an Ethno-Nationally Contested City: Negotiating (Co)Existence in Wadi Nisnas." *Journal of Urban Design* 15-3: 403–422.

Komins, Benton Jay. 2002. "Depopulated Cosmopolitanism: The Culture of Integration, Concealment, and Evacuation in Istanbul." *Comparative Literature Studies* 39-4, 360–385.

Lafi, Nora, ed. 2005. *Municipalités méditerranéennes: les réformes municipales ottomanes au miroir d'une histoire comparée*. Berlin: Schwarz. 365.

Lafi, Nora. 2011. "Petitions and Accommodating Urban Change in the Ottoman Empire." In *Istanbul as Seen from a Distance: Centre and Provinces in the Ottoman Empire*. Elisabeth Özdalga, Sait Özervarlı, and Feryal Tansuğ, eds. Istanbul: Swedish Research Institute. 73–82.

Livne, Hadar. 2008. "Being There and Away: Globalization and Gentrification in Andromeda Hill Project, Jaffa, Israel." *Territorio* 47: 150–158.

LoRomer, David. 1987. *Merchants and Reform in Livorno*. Berkeley: UCLA. 389.

Malacrino, C. 2007. "Cosmopolitismo e architettura a Delo in età ellenistica." *Città e Storia* 2-1: 11–32.

Mathisen, Ralf. 2006. "Peregrini, Barbari, and Cives Romani: Concept of Citizenship and the Legal Identity of Barbarians in the Later Roman Empire." American Historical Review 111-4: 1011–1040.

Meijer, Roel. 1999. *Cosmopolitanism, Identity, and Authenticity in the Middle East*. Richmond: Curzon. 196.

Meinecke, Friedrich. 1970. *Cosmopolitanism and the National State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 403.

Mills, Amy. 2008. "The Place of Locality for Identity in the Nation: Minority Narratives of Cosmopolitan Istanbul." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 40-3: 383–401.

Muhsin, Mahdi. 2001. *Alfarabi and the Foundation of Islamic Political Philosophy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 264.

Nagel, C. 2002. "Reconstructing Space, Re-Creating Memory: Sectarian Politics and Urban Development in Post-War Beirut." *Political Geography* 21-5: 717–725.

Nasiali, Minayo. 2012. "Ordering the Disorderly Slum: 'Standardizing' Quality of Life in Marseille Tenements and Bidonvilles." *Journal of Urban History* 38-6: 1021–1035.

Nocke, Alexandra. 2009. *The Place of the Mediterranean in Contemporary Israeli Identity*. Leiden: Brill. 298.

Nussbaum, M.C. 1997. "Kant and Stoic Cosmopolitanism." *Journal of Political Philosophy* 5: 1–25.

Öktem, Kerem. 2008. "Another Struggle: Sexual Identity Politics in Unsettled Turkey." Middle East Research and Information Project.

Pedani, Maria Pia. 2010. *Venezia Porte d'Oriente*. Bologna: Il Mulino. 350.

Pehlivan, Behice. 2011. "Rethinking Gentrification: The Analysis of Artistic Space and Violence in Istanbul." Masters thesis, Central European University, Budapest, 37.

Pojman, Louis. 2005. "Kant's Perpetual Peace and Cosmopolitanism." *Journal of Social Philosophy* 36: 62–71.

Potuoğlu-Cook, Öykü. 2006. "Beyond the Glitter: Belly Dance and Neoliberal Gentrification in Istanbul." *Cultural Anthropology* 21-4: 633–660.
Prange, Martine. 2007. "Cosmopolitan Road to Culture and the Festival Road to Humanity: The Cosmopolitan Praxis of Nietzsche's Good European againt Kantian Cosmopolitanism." *Ethical Perspectives* 14-3: 269–286.
Reimer, Michael. 1997. *Colonial Bridgehead: Government and Society in Alexandria (1807–1882)*. Cairo: AUP. 251.
Rosenfeld, S. 2002. "Citizens of Nowhere in Particular: Cosmopolitanism, Writing, and Political Engagement in Eighteenth-Century Europe." *National Identities* 4: 25–43.
Slomp, Gabriella. 2005. "Kant's Critique of Hobbes: Sovereignty and Cosmopolitanism." *Contemporary Political Philosophy* 4, 83–85.
Starr, Deborah. 2005. "Recuperating Cosmopolitan Alexandria: Circulation of Narratives and Narratives of Circulation." *Cities* 22-3: 217–228.
Tadroz, Mariz. 2011. "A State of Sectarian Denial." Middle East Research and Information Project.
Ter-Matevosyan, Varham. 2010. "The Armenian Community and the AK Party: Finding Trust under the Crescent." *Insight Turkey* 12-4: 93–111.
Thelen, Sibylle. 2008. *Istanbul, Stadt under Strom*. Freiburg: Herder. 192.
Vertovec, Steven, and Robin Cohen, eds. 2003. *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 314.
Yavuz, Hakan. 1998. "Turkish Identity and Foreign Policy in Flux: The Rise of Neo-Ottomanism." *Critique: Critical Middle Eastern Studies* 12-7: 19–41.