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Preface.

The Roma and Sinti people, often better known as gypsies, have interested me for quite some time. Their nomadic lifestyle seems to be a unique feature when it comes to the other people living within the borders of the European Union. It took little time for me to decide that the Roma and Sinti people and lifestyle should be the main focus for my master thesis’ research. When I made up my mind about studying the Roma and Sinti, it quickly became clear that cosmopolitanism provided the best theoretical window for founding my thesis research and report. During my master studies in Nijmegen, quite a few theoretical windows on social sciences were presented during different course lectures. For me, cosmopolitanism stood out, since it really seemed to touch some important characteristics of the Roma and Sinti lifestyle. Needless to say, I decided to combine the existing theory on cosmopolitanism with the Roma and Sinti people, with the goal to contribute to contemporary cosmopolitan theory.

Overall, the experience of conducting my thesis research was quite exciting. I got in touch with several NGO’s concerning Roma and Sinti well-being and through them I got to conduct very useful interviews. As I saw it, speaking with people from the Roma and Sinti community was the best way to gain a better understanding on how cosmopolitanism fits within their lifestyle and cultural background. What I did not expect was an initial turn down that some people gave me, when I tried to contact them for an interview. When I pushed through, it became clear that most of them were not expecting an ordinary student, but more so some kind of newspaper journalist, looking for Roma and Sinti people to talk about stereotypes and stigmas, such as ‘gypsies being baby-kidnappers’. This experience has taught me that pushing through and being clear about your intentions towards your possible interviewee is very important. If you are not well-prepared before you start making phone-calls or sending e-mails you will not get your interview. Of course this was heavily emphasized during our Preparing the Master Thesis lectures, but in my experience with the Roma and Sinti people, preparation on the contents of relevant theories et cetera was not the most important. I did not have to ‘show’ them that I had read about their history and cultural identity. In this case, being well prepared meant that I was able to show my contacts that I was not looking for a sensational story on poverty, illiteracy or criminality; topics that most often haunt the Roma and Sinti people all over the world. I would like to think that, when it comes to studying a group of people who are stigmatised and looked down upon, showing that you are critically aware of these haunting stigmas is most important. At first I was quite nervous before contacting my interviewees, but it became more and more obvious that there was absolutely no need to feel this way. In fact, the Roma and Sinti people appear to be way more decent and hospitable then most people (‘native Dutch’) I know.

Although my interviews went well and were very instructive, the writing process of this report showed to be more of a challenge. Putting up a decent literature review was not as easy as I hoped. Cosmopolitanism appears to be quite an open-ended book and different writers use and interpret this concept in different ways. Finding my own way grasping this concept took some time, but I would like to think that this report offers complementary insights to the existing theories. Of course, my thanks go out to the Roma and Sinti people. Especially the people that I interviewed but also the Roma and Sinti people in general for being a useful study when it comes to shedding some new light on contemporary cosmopolitan theory. Next to that I would sincerely like to thank my supervisor for his time and understanding. I hope you will enjoy this report and hopefully it will provide some new ideas to think about, for you and for the cosmopolitan debate.

Sep Botermans
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Chapter 1. Introduction.

1.1 Project Background.

Let us start with two statements, the first being that Roma and Sinti people live scattered all over the world. The second is that cosmopolitan theory has been around and debated for over hundreds of years. Trying to relate the Roma and Sinti people to cosmopolitan theory demands in-depth study of both the existing ideas on cosmopolitanism and the cultural characteristics of the Roma and Sinti people. This is exactly what the core of my research project has been. Also, I wanted to bring the European Union to the discussion, since the EU is often seen as the most cosmopolitan political structure in the political world of today, and also, it inhabits the greater part of all Roma and Sinti people (from now on the European Union will be referred to as the EU). During my master studies in Nijmegen; the ‘Europe: Governance, Borders and Identities’ programme, a lot of time has been spend on thinking and talking about the EU. In the lectures and debates we had, most of the questions or problems that were posed, concerned as one might rightfully expect the fields of governance, borders and identities. Much is written about the nature and characteristics of the EU. One thing is for sure: the EU evokes strong critical debates amongst many social scientists. Most often, these debates are about the changing meaning and functions of the EU’s internal and external borders, new and still emerging forms of cross-border governance and the need for a national identity, that many inhabitants of the EU member-states share, despite their supposable blurring nation-state borders.

In case of this research project, the EU has been evaluated for its degree of cosmopolitan ideals and characteristics. In line with this, the main question was to what extent you could say that we live in a cosmopolitan EU. There are several scientists who have written about this question. As one might argue, fading borders will evidently mean a growth of the cosmopolitan world. That being a world where everybody inhabits the same planet, living within a local community on a daily basis, but even more within a borderless, global community of human ideals. Sadly perhaps, this assumption appears to be too easy. Common xenophobia, and the rise of neo-nationalism that occurs in many EU member-states at this time, are two examples of social phenomena that fire back against the growth of a cosmopolitan world. After reading this report, it will become clear to what extent you could relate cosmopolitan ideas to both the Roma and Sinti people and the EU. Needless to say, the research project that preceded this report started off with an extensive literature study.

1.2 Research Question.

This report is formed around three key-concepts. The first being cosmopolitanism, representing the theoretical perspective that has been studied. The second key-concept is the Roma and Sinti people and lifestyle. The third is the EU. The following research question has been derived from these three concepts:

To what extent does the cosmopolitan lifestyle of the Roma and Sinti people harmonize with the cosmopolitan reality of the European Union and its member-states?

In line with this research question, the main objective within this report is to shed a new light on the cosmopolitan debate, using the Roma and Sinti people as an example. It will become clear that they show a great deal of authentic cosmopolitanism within their history and cultural identity. This is why the research question says 'cosmopolitan lifestyle'. Within this report, lifestyle can be defined as a way of life that reflects the attitudes and values of a person or group.
Also, this report will come to show more and more about the differences between cosmopolitan characteristics of the Roma and Sinti people on the one hand, and those of the EU on the other hand. To put more meaning to these statements I have formulated the hypothesis below.

‘The cosmopolitan aspects of Roma and Sinti lifestyle are not likely to concur well with the cosmopolitan reality of the European Union. Top-down cosmopolitanism of the EU does not agree with the grassroots cosmopolitanism of the Roma and Sinti population. (Neo) nationalism and (re)bordering processes within the EU’s individual member-states are expected to lie at the heart of this ‘cosmopolitan clash’. The Roma and Sinti people provide a unique case to complement the existing ideas and concepts on cosmopolitanism, since they form a nation, with a unique cultural identity, a flag of their own, but do not carry any ambition to form a bordered nation-state of their own. The concepts of globalization, politics, nationalism multiculturalism, which often seem relevant within theories on cosmopolitanism, have no meaning when it comes to the case of the Roma and Sinti people. Perhaps they are ‘true’ cosmopolitans, in the way the Stoics would like to see it…’

One might rightfully note that the hypothesis above is no hypothesis at all, but more so a conclusion that should be found at the end of this report. Here, I would like to say that I chose to formulate the hypothesis this particular way, because of its report-covering content. The first two sentences represent the clear-cut hypothesis; The cosmopolitan aspects of Roma and Sinti lifestyle are not likely to concur well with the cosmopolitan reality of the European Union. Top-down cosmopolitanism of the EU does not agree with the grassroots cosmopolitanism of the Roma and Sinti population, in line with the central question. The rest is there to give an idea of where the content of this report will come to. To end this paragraph and to benefit relaxed reading, from now on the Roma and Sinti people will be referred to as Roma. This simplification is justifiable because of the fact that both groups of people are part of the Roma community (Gheorghe & Mirga, 2001). In the Netherlands a distinction has been made between the Roma and Sinti families, which can be explained from a historical perspective (Nieuwenhuizen, 2004). This report will provide further elaboration on Roma history later on. The title of this report reads Roma and Sinti instead of Roma, since the fieldwork that preceded this report was done within the Netherlands.

1.3 Research Methods.

The research project that preceded this report was divided into two parts. The first part was filled by a literature study. This literature study was focused on books and articles dealing with cosmopolitanism, the Roma lifestyle and the cosmopolitan characteristics of the EU, in line with this reports’ three key-concepts mentioned in paragraph above. When combined, the results of these three sub-studies should make it possible to formulate an answer to the research question.

The second, empirical part of the research project was filled by conducting in-depth interviews with Roma in the Netherlands. This part of the research project was much more about gaining a better understanding of the Roma lifestyle, as well as their perspective on cosmopolitanism and related topics, such as nationalism and multiculturalism. Also, the Roma point of view towards the EU was important for the empirical part of this research project, and proved to be very interesting. Here, I would like to say that it is a shame that there are only very little Roma writers active in the arenas of social science and (Euro) politics. Later on, this report will provide further elaboration on both the contents of the in-depth interviews, as well as the interview results.

After my fieldwork of interviewing Roma I returned to the results of the literature studies. This way it became possible to accurately place the Roma within the existing theories on cosmopolitanism, and also to pinpoint the differences between Roma cosmopolitanism and EU
cosmopolitanism. In this case, in-depth interviewing proved to be the best way to collect empirical data, because of the fact that the Roma voice is almost completely absent on paper. Here, it is important to note that Roma culture is characterized by storytelling and not story writing. During my fieldwork it became clear that a large majority of the Roma living in the EU do not know how to write. Since they often do not attend primary school, especially outside the countries of Western-Europe, and do not have a cultural background of the written word, very little is known about their values and beliefs. Like mentioned earlier, the process of interviewing was very instructive and it put forth response worth thinking over.

1.4 Social and Scientific Relevance.

This paragraph will explain the social and scientific relevance of this research report. As it is with any type of research project it is very important to thoroughly think about these aspects. Here, I would like to say that in my opinion the social relevance of the research project is the most important, especially within the field of social sciences. A blunt statement perhaps, but for me this way of prioritising ensures an outcome of research results that are aimed at triggering a debate that focuses on improving certain social events or phenomena, and not for the greater part on abstract theory. In line with this, this report will deal with its social relevance first.

1.4.1 Social Relevance.
The social problem that has triggered me to set up this research project comes down to the powerlessness that the Roma have to deal with. For as long as they migrate over Europe and the rest of the world, they are being looked down upon. The Roma are most often seen as unwanted guests, bringing disease and criminality with them wherever they go. Because of this, the Roma often have to struggle with social exclusion and extreme poverty with poverty-related problems such as bad living conditions and health problems. This of course is a serious problem, especially when you bear to mind that the Roma, with approximately 10-12 million people, sum up to be the largest and most wide-spread minority group living within the EU (Rose, 2006).

Focusing this research on the Roma, using their lifestyle characteristics to complement scientific thoughts and theories on cosmopolitanism and perhaps even criticise the cosmopolitan condition of the EU, will bring them into the picture in a positive way. Instead of a sensational or dramatic newspaper article, or an earnest EU-Roma policy paper, this report will set the Roma in a different light. Perhaps for the first time, the Roma will be set as an example, embodying the true cosmopolitan or world-citizen. In my opinion this is exactly what makes this research project useful and very important. If the dominant train of thought towards the Roma would improve, their livelihoods are more likely to better. If the fear and negative stigmas would make place for integration and understanding, the social exclusion would stop to exist. In line with this, the Roma would be able to have easier access to a better life, supported by employment, decent living places (campsites or houses), health care and perhaps even education.

My hopes are aimed at delivering a research report that urges people to include the Roma in their arguments, especially when those arguments are about the qualities and shortcomings of contemporary cosmopolitan theory or about problems related to EU geopolitics. I am glad to say that at this time more and more people within scientific, political and social arenas, in and outside the EU, are working on improving the Roma position within all layers of society. I had the pleasure to talk with a few of them right here in the Netherlands and my goal is to surprise them with this report.
1.4.2 Scientific Relevance.
Although I would like to put more emphasis on the social relevance of this report, its scientific relevance is worth mentioning for sure. The theoretical backbone of this report is formed by the concept of cosmopolitanism. The next chapter will deal with this concept extensively. At this point, discussing this report’s scientific relevance, it is important to present the Roma lifestyle as a complement to contemporary cosmopolitan theory. When you break down the literature on cosmopolitanism, you will see that its concept is often criticised for being an utopian and unrealistic ideology, or as a concept that could only be put into practice through the powerful actors in our world, whether those are embodied by the relatively wealthy people, who are able to move freely over our world without any social or physical borders and economic restraints, the decision makers in the arena of international politics, or an elite of intellectuals. In this report the emphasis will be put on evident bottom-up or grassroots cosmopolitanism, using the Roma as an example. Their history and lifestyle characteristics will provide the debate on cosmopolitanism and contemporary cosmopolitan realities with new thoughts.

As the theory on cosmopolitanism will be reviewed in this report’s next chapter, it will become clear that the ideas on what cosmopolitanism exactly is, how to conceptualise it, and where to find it, are very diverse. Concepts such as borders or boundaries, multiculturalism, racism, nationalism, identity, globalisation and (international) politics are most often part of the theoretical context, when thinking about cosmopolitanism in our present-day world. I would like to suggest that the Roma case makes it possible to define authentic cosmopolitanism from below within this present-day context, without stripping the ideological core of moral values of classic cosmopolitan. When focusing on the Roma, there is no need to search for separate cosmopolitan qualities. They might well be the real deal, so to speak, living a nomadic life as true world-citizens, authentically without concerning themselves with a national identity, cultural differences, or political structures. When it comes to the scientific relevance of this research report, my aim is to bring the Roma to the scientific debate on the contemporary meaning of grassroots cosmopolitanism. Perhaps they have been overlooked for too long.

1.5 Readers Guide.
To end this introduction I have set up a short readers guide. Chapter 1. Introduction has dealt with the foundation of this research report; the project background, the research question with the main objective, the use of research methods and the projects’ social and scientific relevance. Chapter 2. Theory on Cosmopolitanism will elaborate further on the meaning and content of both classic and contemporary cosmopolitan theories. This chapter will provide a theoretical framework on cosmopolitanism, analysing different thoughts on the concept through a literature review. Chapter 3. Roma Lifestyle focuses on Roma history and ‘statelessness’. After that, a short overview of my fieldwork experiences, and the topic-list that was used as the basis for my interviews, are part of this chapter’s contents. In the end, based on the interview results, it will become clear what particular characteristics make the Roma a valuable group of people when thinking about the meaning of (contemporary) cosmopolitanism. Chapter 4. Cosmopolitanism and the EU will analyse the degree of cosmopolitan characteristics of the EU. Here, it will become evident that, despite the fact that the EU is often seen as an example of a cosmopolitan polity-in-the-making, there is also an un-cosmopolitan European reality to be seen. Chapter 5. Conclusion will be the last chapter of this report. Here, the aim will be to come to a conclusive answer to the research question. At the end of this report the research bibliography, several appendices and an executive summary are included.
Chapter 2. Theory on Cosmopolitanism.

This chapter will focus on the ideas and debates on cosmopolitanism within the arenas of philosophy and social sciences. As mentioned earlier, people have been thinking about the concept of cosmopolitanism for hundreds of years. Therefore, the first paragraph will focus on classic cosmopolitanism. Chronologically, it will start off with the Stoics; the inventors of cosmopolitanism. Thereafter, Kant’s ideas on cosmopolitanism will be dealt with. The second paragraph will elaborate further on contemporary cosmopolitanism. It will become clear that many social scientists are still at work to put meaning to this concept. Different writers are breaking down cosmopolitanism in different ways. At the end, this chapter will provide the necessary theoretical foundation in order for us to start matching the concept of cosmopolitanism to the Roma case, as well as the EU as we know it today, in this report’s following chapters.

2.1 Classic Cosmopolitanism.

Let us start off with taking a closer look at the word ‘cosmopolitan’, taking the ism away from cosmopolitanism. This very word is derived from the ancient Greek word ‘kosmopolitês’, which can be literally translated to ‘citizen of the world’. The word cosmopolitan is used to describe a wide variety of ideas within moral, social and political philosophy. People have been thinking about the use of the cosmopolitan concept for hundreds of years. The traditional definition and core of the cosmopolitan concept is the idea that all human beings, regardless of their political affiliation, do (or at least can) belong to a single community. As one might expect, there are numerous versions of cosmopolitanism in use. These are putting their focus on different aspects of society, for example political institutions, moral relationships, shared markets or on the way cosmopolitanism is part of a particular cultural expression. In short, cosmopolitanism was introduced as a challenge to commonly recognized attachments to both a particular local state and the related cultural identity (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006).

2.1.1 The Stoics.

As we will slowly progress to the understanding of contemporary cosmopolitanism, there are two broad, classical accounts of cosmopolitanism to bear in mind; Stoic cosmopolitanism and Kantian cosmopolitanism (Held, 2002). The Stoics were the first to put meaning to the cosmopolitan concept. Their main goal was to replace the central role of the ‘polis’ in ancient political thought with that of the ‘cosmos’, in which humankind could live in harmony. The Stoics saw themselves as cosmopolitans and stated that each human being lives in a local community on a day-to-day basis, but also within a much wider community of human ideals, aspirations and argument. In line with this, they put strong emphasis on the equal worth of reason and humanity for all human beings. When it comes to problem-solving of any nature, the Stoics stated that the focus should be on what is common to all people, all citizens of the world, so that collective problems can be dealt with better. This was a critique on the common sectional approach to problem-solving that only focused on a local community, bordered by its own political system. An important note is that this collective problem-solving does not mean that people should let go of local concerns, such as affiliations to family and friends within the particular community, region or country that they live in. The bottom line of Stoic cosmopolitanism is that people should understand that they are citizens of the world and thus part of a worldwide community. In line with this, their most important duties are to humanity as a whole, since any kind of development benefits all. With this statement, the Stoics are the founders of cosmopolitanism as we know it today. Two of their arguments strengthening the concept of cosmopolitanism are still very useful in our time. The first is that all human beings
inhabit the same world and are born as members of certain polities only by accident. The second is that the boundaries of polities, or nation-state borders as they are in our time, are most often the result of war and violence. In line with this, moral worth should not be specified by the yardstick of a single political community (Held, 2002). To summarize, the basic idea of traditional, classic cosmopolitanism is the idea that every human being is a citizen of the world and owes a duty, above all, to a worldwide community of human beings (Nussbaum, 1996).

2.1.2 Kant and the 18th Century.

After the Stoics another conception of cosmopolitanism was introduced during the Enlightenment in the 18th century, since the term ‘weltbürger’, also literally translated as ‘world citizen’, became one of the key terms of this period in time. Kant has been the biggest contributor to cosmopolitan thought during the Enlightenment period. Just like the Stoic cosmopolitanism, the concept of the weltbürger also emphasizes the idea that all human beings are part of global community; a cosmopolitan society. One of Kant’s main ideas was that human beings are able to step out of their positions within the social and political arena of their local communities. As a result, they would be able to enter a wider world of free reasoning, without the constraints of local political authority. This is what Kant called a ‘cosmopolitan right’, a right that all human beings have and should be able to make use of. Kant’s cosmopolitan right transcends the particular claims of nations and states and extends to a universal community (Cheah, 1998), much like Stoic cosmopolitanism. Also, this cosmopolitan right brings the duty to learn to tolerate and respect other human beings, living outside of your local community. Kant states that this feeling of respect is needed in order for all human beings to coexist peacefully. In the end, Kant speaks about a universal system of cosmo-political governance in which the freedom of each human being underpins the freedom of all others. In line with this, Kant strongly rejects colonialism (Held, 2002). Also, moral cosmopolitans of the Enlightenment period, like Kant, heavily emphasized the fundamental equality of all humans and thus also rejected slavery and feudal hierarchy.

As one might rightfully note, the Stoic (and later) the Kantian cosmopolitanisms drew a very idealistic picture of the way the global community could look, if the people would follow their theories. An open world, filled with respect and equal worth for all its inhabitants or even a perfect civil union of mankind (Cheah, 2006). Logically, not all early modern and Enlightenment thinkers felt the same way when it comes to the concept of cosmopolitanism. The first critiques emerged alongside early modern law theory. Erasmus of Rotterdam, a well-known writer of that time, did emphasize the unity of humankind over its division into different nations, by arguing that all human beings are destined by nature to be sociable and to live in harmony. In line with this, Erasmus put a lot of emphasis on the importance of national and religious tolerance within society. He and his ‘compatriots’, the term Erasmus used with regard to like-minded people, could rightfully be expected to provide a gateway to a new kind of cosmopolitanism that would emerge from his early modern natural law theory. Quite the opposite happened within the arena of early modern theorists. Many of them stated that all human beings share some fundamental natural characteristics indeed, but these are not focused on being sociable and living in harmony. More so, all human beings share a fundamental striving for self-preservation.

The critique posed towards Erasmus stated that the universality of this striving does not mean it will become something that unites all individuals in a universal community. Although this critique was understood widespread, there were still some factors that linked early modern natural law theory to cosmopolitan theory. The most important factor was another theory coming from the arena of natural law studies. This theory agreed with the fact that nature had implanted the striving for self-preservation in all human beings, but in addition also a form of sociability; ‘fellow-feeling’. This universal human characteristic was thought of to unite all individuals in a
worldwide community. Another factor that linked early modern natural law theory to cosmopolitan theory lies in the fact that at that time, natural law theory was often linked to social contract theory. Social contract theory was aimed at explaining how and why human beings form states and political boundaries to strengthen social order and thus most social contract theorists were doing their analyses and writing focused on the level of the state, not on international relations. The fact that the natural law theory provided scientists with the idea that all human beings share sociable characteristics, urged social contract theorists to broaden their view beyond state borders. This way, early modern natural law theory could also be linked to cosmopolitanism (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006). One might rightfully say that Erasmus did succeed in joining natural law theory and cosmopolitanism in one debate. By doing so, Erasmus’ theory did put some new use to Stoic cosmopolitan theory and urged natural and social scientists to think about cosmopolitanism from a different point of view.

As said earlier in this paragraph, Kant has been the main contributor to cosmopolitan thought during the Enlightenment. Apart from Kant, there was a bigger philosophical resurgence of cosmopolitanism to be seen during the Enlightenment. This resurgence could be explained by several factors. The first one was the increasing rise of capitalism along with worldwide trade. The second has been the great expenditure of many empires whose reach started to extend all over the globe more and more. Another factor that explains the resurgence of cosmopolitanism at that time were the increasing number of voyages around the world, organised to facilitate anthropological discoveries. One last explanatory factor was the emergence of a notion of universal human rights. Amongst intellectuals, these factors combined resulted in the feeling that belonging to a trans-national ‘republic of letters’, a borderless world of philosophical thinking and writing, without the constraints of censorship that was inherent to the majority to state polities at that time, should be more significant than belonging to the philosophical arena of one particular political state. Here, intellectuals started to adopt the cosmopolitan perspective more and more. From a historical perspective, the 1789 declaration of human rights provides us with the first actual concept that had grown out of the popular cosmopolitan styles of thinking and in fact reinforced them in turn (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006).

When it comes to cosmopolitanism in the 18th century, it is important to note that this term was most often used to indicate a degree of open-mindedness and impartiality, and not as a label for actual philosophical theory. At this time, a cosmopolitan represented an individual who was not subservient to a particular religious or political authority and not biased by cultural prejudice. The cosmopolitan was an individual that was able and liked to travel, was part of a network of international contacts or simply felt at home anywhere. These uses of the term cosmopolitanism explained the dictionary definition of a ‘man of no fixed abode, or a man who is a stranger nowhere’. In short, you could say that the main characteristic of 18th century cosmopolitanism is the philosophical idea that it is more important to belong to a worldwide community of thinkers and writers instead of belonging to a bounded nation. As one might expect, this statement was heavily critiqued. Most often, the core of this critique boiled down to the statement that ‘it is better to be proud of one’s nation than to have none’, as Johann Georg Schlosser puts it in his poem; Der Kosmopolit. As one might expect, most 18th century defenders of cosmopolitanism disagreed with this critique since it implied a form of ‘ultra-individualism’. On the contrary, they thought of cosmopolitanism in a very Stoic-like way; as a way to reach the positive moral ideal of a universal human community. Also, the defenders of cosmopolitanism did not regard the ideal of a universal human community as a threat to the more particular attachment of patriotism (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006).

In addition to moral forms of cosmopolitan thought, the 18th century also shows the emergence of political and economic forms of cosmopolitan theory. When looking at the political
cosmopolitanism of that time, you can see a close relation with theory on international relations. This political cosmopolitanism started the debate on the role of one particular state as a part of the worldwide mosaic of other states. As Kleingeld & Brown state in their 2006 article, the most radical 18th century political cosmopolitan was Anacharsis Cloots. Cloots advocated the abolition of all existing states and instead, the establishment of a single world state under which all human beings would be subsumed directly. His first argument drew on the general structure of social contract theory. Cloots stated that if it is in the general interest for everyone to submit to the authority of a particular state that enforces laws and provides security, as was the common thought at that time, then this argument applies to everyone worldwide. Hence, it justifies the establishment of a worldwide ‘republic of united individuals’, not a mosaic of different states amongst each other. Cloots’ second argument states that sovereignty should reside with the people, not with states. Cloots advocated a world in which there would be only one sovereign body, and that being the human race as a whole.

Without a doubt, Cloots ideas on political cosmopolitanism were much more extreme than those of Kant. Next to thoughts on moral cosmopolitanism, mentioned earlier in this paragraph, Kant also introduced a concept in the nature of political cosmopolitanism; the so-called ‘league of nations’. In his main work; Perpetual Peace (1795), Kant argues that worldwide peace and harmony is only possible when states are organized internally according to republican principles, they are organized externally in a voluntary league for the sake of maintaining peace, and they respect the human rights not only of their own citizens, but also those of foreigners. Also, Kant argues that the league of states should not have any coercive military powers for three reasons. First, coercive military powers as a concept strongly contradict with the concept of internal sovereignty of states. Second, these would pose a threat to individual freedoms already established within separate states, especially if the federal authority was to be less respectful of human rights than its member states. Kant’s third argument against coercive military powers for the league of states says that it would simply reduce the chance of potential member states actually joining (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006). As one might expect, Kant’s league of states was critiqued. Critics, such as Fichte, put another meaning to the concept of sovereignty; seeing it as layered from states to a federal level. Fichte stated that states should transfer part of their sovereignty to the federal level, but only the part that concerns the external relations to other states. State sovereignty concerning the internal affairs should be retained (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006). Although Kant has been critiqued in different ways, his vision on the concept of cosmopolitanism remains the single most important philosophical source for contemporary normative theories of international relations, including accounts of global civil society (Cheah, 1998).

Next to moral and political thoughts on cosmopolitanism, the 18th century also showed the emergence of an economic form of cosmopolitan theory. Anti-mercantilists, such as Adam Smith and Dietrich H. Hegewisch, lie at the heart of this economic cosmopolitanism, by advocating freer worldwide trade regulations. Their goal was to diminish the influence of politics within trade. In line with this, their ideal was a world in which tariffs and other foreign trade restrictions are absent; a world in which a free market, not governing agencies, takes care of peoples needs. Economic cosmopolitans at that time stated that it is more advantageous for all its citizens, if a state would import those goods that are more expensive to produce domestically. Also, they stated that the common assumption that one state will benefit, if other states are not able to export certain goods, is not just. Alternatively, economic cosmopolitans stated that the abolition of protectionism would benefit all, since the exporting states would gain from their exports, thus reach a higher level of income and a higher standard of living. This in return, would make them better trading partners, since the increase in income would enable them to import more as well. Economic cosmopolitans were convinced that liberalizing trade worldwide would significantly
diminish the importance of state governments. At that time, governmental agencies mainly focused on state economy and state safety. Since war would be in no one’s interest in the ideal global market, economic cosmopolitans would think of state governments as becoming less and less important the freer the global market would get (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006).

2.1.3 The 19th and 20th Centuries.
During the 19th and 20th centuries, Enlightenment cosmopolitanism has continued to be a source of debate amongst social, political and economical thinkers. During the 19th century, economic globalisation really started to set off, and provoked some fierce reactions coming from two of the most notable writers of that time, Marx and Engels. They saw cosmopolitanism as an ideological reflection of capitalism. Market capitalism was seen as inherently expansive and breaking the bounds of the nation-state system, as evidenced by the fact that both production processes and consumption were moving overseas (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006). Marx and Engels criticized this capitalist globalisation and argued against the elite ideology of a free market economic cosmopolitanism, since this very process was seen as the cause for the misery of the working class, even as the cause for the actual existence of the proletariat. As they state in their most famous work; the Manifesto, the bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country (Harvey, 2000). Although Marx and Engels showed a great deal of critique towards capitalist globalisation and linked the strand of economic cosmopolitanism to this, they did state that the working class; the proletariat, in every country has common interests. Their Manifesto ends with emphasizing the urge for all proletarians of all countries to unite. This, combined with their ideal of a class-less society, as well as an expected withering away of state politics after the proletariat’s revolution, embodies a form of cosmopolitanism of its own (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006). Although economic cosmopolitanism and Marxist cosmopolitanism might share some of the same universalising qualities, they are completely different when it comes to meaning and focus. I would like to say that it might well be possible to use cosmopolitanism in every aspect of society, whether it concerns trade or social (in)equality. As many writers on this concept state, there lies a danger with this widespread use of cosmopolitanism; it will become harder and harder to make it a practical concept; one that could be defined clearly and has unique criticizing qualities towards other ‘isms’ and ideologies. Although cosmopolitanism might provide social scientists and everybody else with a convenient tool to put particular ideas or feelings on paper, during its history it gained more and more nuances and sub-strands, which might have led to the fact that nowadays anyone, except for some racists, accepts it (Pogge, 2002). After all, who does not see the benefits of a free and equal world?

During the 19th and 20th centuries cosmopolitanism continued to be a source of debate and inspiration. The attempts to create (world) peace at that time, mainly after the First and Second World Wars, were inspired by Kant’s peace proposal as he described in his book Perpetual Peace, and resulted in the formation of the League of Nations as it existed in the early 20th century and the structure of the United Nations as we know it today. Here, an important note is that one essential feature of Kant’s peace plan was not implemented, namely the abolition of standing armies. Next to the debate on world peace, Kant’s ideas on cosmopolitanism, in this case his conception of cosmopolitan law, also influenced the debate on international law. This resulted in the establishment of the International Criminal Court; the ICC. The ICC cut through the shield of state sovereignty and all individuals became the bearers of certain rights under international law. Even the social core of classic cosmopolitanism, the idea that all human beings are part of a universal community of human ideals proved to be worth of concretisation. 19th and 20th century moral philosophers insisted that everybody has a duty to aid fellow human beings in need, regardless of citizenship status. More and more international relief efforts, such as the International Red Cross, came into life in order to reduce human suffering, without regard to
particular nationalities. In line with this, cosmopolitan moralists continued to use classic cosmopolitan ideals as an argument to oppose other inequalities, such as apartheid and slavery, and to enhance the emancipation of women (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006). Here, I would like to put emphasis on the positive qualities of moral cosmopolitanism. History shows us that the thinkers on cosmopolitanism brought about several positive social institutions and developments, and in my opinion this makes cosmopolitanism, based on its ideals, a concept of importance amongst social scientists and philosophers. The next paragraph will deal with contemporary cosmopolitanism, reviewing the literature and debates on this concept from the late 20th century onwards.

2.2 Contemporary Cosmopolitanism.

Without a doubt cosmopolitanism, as it is debated today, has a long history in philosophical thought. Within this paragraph, we will take a closer look at its contemporary meaning. Light will be shed on several recent ideas on this concept. As a result, it will become possible to analyse how we can fit both the Roma and the EU in a cosmopolitan framework in the next two chapters. After that, we will be able to put our finger on the ‘cosmopolitan clash’ between these two cosmopolitanisms.

Contemporary cosmopolitanism does not have one clear-cut definition. Rather, there are many ideas on what cosmopolitanism is and how it could be interpreted. This is explained easily by its history, because in the first instance, the concept of cosmopolitanism arose as a metaphor for a way of life and not literal guise (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006). In line with this, different writers at this time deal with cosmopolitanism in different ways. As Pollock, Bhabha, Breckenridge and Chakrabarty state in their paper *Cosmopolitanisms* (2000):

‘Cosmopolitanism comprises some of today’s most challenging problems of academic analysis and political practice, especially when analysis and practice are seen as a conjoint activity. For one thing, cosmopolitanism is not some known entity existing in the world, with a clear genealogy from the Stoics to Immanuel Kant, that simply awaits more detailed description at the hands of scholarship. We are not exactly certain what it is, and figuring out why this is so and what cosmopolitanism may be raises difficult conceptual questions…Cosmopolitanism may be a project whose conceptual content and pragmatic character are not only as yet unspecified but also must always escape positive and definite specification, precisely because specifying cosmopolitanism positively and definitely is an uncosmopolitan thing to do. The indeterminacy of how to achieve a cosmopolitan political practice feeds back into the problem of academic analysis…’

Although the lack of a definite conceptualisation of cosmopolitanism could be seen as a reason to put an end to the cosmopolitan debate, it also provides scientists and politicians with an instrument to formulate new or improved social theories and perhaps even political practices.

When you are debating on cosmopolitanism at this time, you will stumble upon three closely related key-concepts that gain a lot of interest in our contemporary world: nationalism, globalisation, and multiculturalism (Pollock et al., 2000). Nationalism because it is often said to be the opposite of cosmopolitanism, globalisation because it refers to the ever growing interconnectedness that characterizes our world, and multiculturalism because it refers to the fact that we all inhabit a social world that embodies different people with different cultural backgrounds. I would like to argue that a ‘true cosmopolitan’ is able to forget about these three concepts. Although dozens of books have been written about each of these concepts and they form the backbone of hundreds of academic debates, a cosmopolitan should be able to put his or her focus elsewhere, and deal with certain social phenomena without the constraints of the concepts above. On a day to day basis, I have the feeling that these concepts are outdated, perhaps even useless. Why is it that anytime I encounter aspects of different cultures, I automatically start to think about the pros and cons of the multicultural society? And why do I
start thinking about the geographically uneven distribution of our globalizing virtual world every
time I check my e-mail? And why am I getting irritated every time I have to wait in line at the
passport control of any given airport? A citizen of the world, which we actually all are and always
have been, is not supposed to wander about the above questions. Perhaps Pollock and colleagues
are right when they suggest that we already are and always have been cosmopolitans, though we
may not always have known it…

Without a doubt, the moral characteristics of classic cosmopolitanism; boiling down to the
notion that every individual owes a duty to a universal community of human ideals, are worth
using in debates on social problems worldwide. In line with this, one could make the argument
that the concept of cosmopolitanism is just as important to politics. Hence, the concept of
cosmopolitanism should be embraced further in thinking about the proper form of globalisation
and global governance, because globalisation has become ‘the big idea of our times’, as David Held
states at the beginning of his paper Cosmopolitanism: Ideas, Realities and Deficits (2002). Within this
paper, Held describes contemporary cosmopolitanism and defines the concept by outlining three
key elements. In short, these three key elements are:

1. The ultimate units of moral concern are individual human beings, not states or other
   particular forms of human association.
2. The status of equal worth should be acknowledged by everyone, and
3. Each individual should enjoy the impartial treatment of their claims; treatment based on
   principles upon which all could act.

In line with these formulated key elements, contemporary cosmopolitanism according to Held
embodies a moral frame of reference; his view on the concept of cosmopolitanism could be
described as moral-political, as he is one of the advocates of a global cosmopolitan democracy
(Kleingeld & Brown, 2006).

Another viewpoint towards contemporary cosmopolitanism introduces the notion of

cosmopolitanism from below. In his paper The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and
Critical Cosmopolitanism (2000), Walter Mignolo assumes that ‘globalisation is a set of designs to manage
the world while cosmopolitanism is a set of projects toward planetary conviviality.’ Here, Mignolo introduces a
concept of critical cosmopolitanism. The main argument of Mignolo is that cosmopolitanism is
linked to human rights and democracy; thus also moral-political cosmopolitanism, but

cosmopolitanism should not provide us with ideological blueprints or master plans to be
imposed worldwide. Instead, critical and dialogic cosmopolitanism should lead to diversity as a
universal project. Mignolo states that a particular global design of a proper world community
results from a specific local history. In line with this, he criticizes Kant, who stated that England
and France were the most civilized nations on earth at his time. Here, Kant is being criticized for
his apparent imperial view towards grading particular nation-states. This proves that Kant was
also influenced by local qualities and ‘dominated’ by the concepts of nations and states. In line
with this, Mignolo argues that states and other bordered human institutions should not be
forgotten about in the critical cosmopolitan debate. As a complement to critical cosmopolitanism
he introduces the notion of ‘border thinking’. Since there have always been, and always will be,
borders or frontiers that are part of our lives, whether they are based on religion, ideology,
nationality or ethnicity, we need to critically think about how we deal with them. Hence, border
thinking becomes more and more important, especially in our current globalizing and inherently
interconnecting world. Mignolo puts a lot of emphasis on geographic diversity. In line with this,
Mignolo concludes his paper with expressing the need for a globalisation from below, with
critical border thinking as the main instrument, where diversity becomes the universal
cosmopolitan project. Mignolo ends his paper with two sentences worth quoting:

‘Diversality can be imagined as a new medievalism, a pluricentric world built on the ruins of ancient, non-
Western cultures and civilizations with the debris of Western civilization. A cosmopolitanism that only connects
from the centre of the large circle outward, and leaves the outer places disconnected from each outer, would be a cosmopolitanism from above, like Victoria’s and Kant’s cosmopolitanism..., and like the implications of human rights discourse, according to which only one philosophy has it ‘right’.

Most thinkers and writers on cosmopolitanism of this time agree with the idea that the concept of nationalism appears to be losing interest, and that it is often being replaced with the concept of globalisation in the debate on socio-economic and governance issues. As Pheng Cheah sums up in his paper *The Cosmopolitan* – *Today* (1998):

>?Many argue that the accelerated pace of economic globalisation – the intensification of international trade, fiscal and technology transfers, and labour migration, and the consolidation of a genuinely global mode of production through subcontracting – in ‘advanced post-Fordist’ or ‘late capitalism’, the transnationalization of military command structures through NATO, and the rise of global hybrid cultures from modern mass migration, consumerism, and mass communications in the past two decades have combined to create an interdependent world in which the nation-state faces imminent obsolescence as a viable economic unit, a politically sovereign territory, and a bounded cultural sphere.‘

Cheah points to the ironic case of U.S. nationalism, where U.S. officials put on a non-national mask, representing the world trade liberalisation champion or the number one international human rights protector. All in all, nationalism is criticized because of its pathological nature and its link to racist ideologies, xenophobia and genocidal wars. In line with this, nationalism is often seen as a mode of consciousness and the nation-state as an institution that is undesirable and outdated. The question remains however, whether there is an alternative to the concept of a world made up by nation-states; an alternative that is already existent and capable of being realized (Cheah, 1998).

At our time, cosmopolitanism has grown out of its role as an intellectual ethos. More and more it is becoming an institutionally embedded global political consciousness. From a moral point of view, I would like to say that this is a positive development, since moral cosmopolitanism; cosmopolitan ethics, puts a lot of focus on human well-being. One important question though, concerning a global cosmopolitan political sphere, is whether the world as we know it today is interconnected enough to form institutions that have a worldwide regulatory reach and provide a global, instead of a national, form of solidarity (Cheah, 2006). Stoic and Kantian cosmopolitanism continue to be sources of inspiration, but our world does not correspond with Kant’s pre-nationalist cosmopolitan ideas. In our ‘post-Kantian’ world, nationalism as a concept has developed into a force to be reckoned with when thinking about cosmopolitanism, and although processes of globalisation seem to overrule the importance of the nation-state, the concept of the nation-state often still provides us with a feeling of belonging. In line with this, the debate on contemporary cosmopolitanism(s) focuses on the evident rise of transnational networks of global cities, post-national social formations created by global migrant flows and the revival of the idea for a Kantian cosmopolitan democracy, like advocated by Jürgen Harbernas in his paper *Kant’s Idea of Perpetual Peace, with the Benefit of Two Hundred Years’ Hindsight* (1997). Yet still the arguments advocating a new cosmopolitan order fail to deal with the persistence of nationalism as a powerful normative force (Cheah, 2006). One might rightfully acknowledge that our globalizing world does not inherently result in the disappearance of nationalism and nation-states. There are many examples of opposite trends to be seen right here in the EU; boiling down to growing right-wing political movements that are reviving nationalist feelings in many countries that share EU membership. In my case, being a citizen of the Netherlands, Geert Wilders embodies the number one right-wing advocate of the Dutch nation-state, reviving and emphasizing the importance of the Dutch identity and protecting it from unwanted guests; dangers that are trying to infiltrate into our nation by crossing our nation-state borders.

It is safe to say that on the one hand nationalism is contested, but far from gone in the social and geographical world of this time, and, on the other hand, ongoing processes of globalisation are
forcing us to think beyond our nation-state borders. In line with this, the contemporary debate on cosmopolitanism is focused on relating cosmopolitan ideas to the heavily studied and debated concepts of nationalism, transnationalism, patriotism, democracy, internationalism and global governance, though there are different ideas on how to give place to cosmopolitanism in between them. Based on the available literature on this debate until now, on may also rightfully conclude that there is no definite way to put cosmopolitanism into practice, although many writers continue to express a certain need for a moral-political form of worldwide cosmopolitan governance that is in need of further development.

Towards the end of this chapter, it will continue to become clear that conceptualising cosmopolitanism at this time is done in different ways. Because of this, I tend to get the feeling more and more that cosmopolitanism might well be too much of an idealistic philosophy, and that it is impossible to implement this in our political world; a world that is fragmented not only by different nation-states, but also by differences in cultural beliefs, economic strength and political power. Although contemporary cosmopolitan literature always incorporates the Stoic and/or Kantian ideals of an equal and free world, there appears to be an undeniable obligation to find ways to place these ideals in a very un-cosmopolitan reality, so to speak. I would like to argue that contemporary cosmopolitanism is a very open-minded and social ideology, just as its classic introducers imply, and that it is a good thing that cosmopolitan ideals are being put on the table of the debate on international relations and good governance, but that, sadly, it is most likely to become an actual practice of some sort if certain political and/or economic powers are expected to benefit from it. All citizens of the world enjoying Kant’s cosmopolitan right should be the actual state of affairs, but, as I see it, the ever present differences between the powerful and powerless, whether they are embodied by nations, economies, cultures or individual human beings, make a full-fledged cosmopolitan global order an impossible goal to achieve. As history shows us, power relations are very unlikely to even out and the powerful are not likely to give up their particular powers for a greater good. In line with this, it becomes clear why cosmopolitanism is often seen as some sort of elite lifestyle, and has been criticized from various sub-strands in social science, for instance the critique coming from feminism - that it is embedded in a masculine society - or the critique coming from Marxism and communism, which describes cosmopolitanism as a front to exercise global capitalism, using the free market as a concept that benefits all. The question still remains how we could use cosmopolitanism as a framework to develop global governance. Here, I would like to emphasize that cosmopolitanism can always be a useful source of inspiration, no matter how naïve or utopian it may seem. Although criticizing its shortcomings is nothing but a good thing, it would be a shame to set it aside, as something only to be read about in history books. Hence, I am glad to say that at this day cosmopolitanism still provides many thinkers and writers with the challenge to refine its meaning and conceptualise it for the world we live in today.

One possible way of refining the concept of cosmopolitanism within the present day context is addressing several degrees of cosmopolitanism; from extreme to moderate to minimal. As Robert Audi suggests in his paper Nationalism, Patriotism, and Cosmopolitanism in an Age of Globalization (2009), cosmopolitanism and nationalism, both in qualified forms from extreme to minimal, may show overlap. Audi also emphasizes that patriotism, simply the love for one’s country, is distinct from nationalism, and that patriotism may well be compatible with certain kinds of cosmopolitanism. One might state that the notion that there are degrees of both nationalism and cosmopolitanism speaks for itself, but exploring this notion further might provide better understanding of both concepts at this time. Audi states that the contrast between nationalism and cosmopolitanism applies in various domains of human life; one could be more nationalist when it comes to, for instance, economic matters, but more cosmopolitan in other domains, for instance public health care. Although many people that are thinking about the debate on
cosmopolitanism vs. nationalism feel the need to position themselves somewhere on the continuum in between, Audi suggests that, when it comes to developing a position on institutional policies, we should consider one domain at a time. Every time we position ourselves towards a certain event in our world we are able to set our priority on either the interests of the nation, or the interests of human well-being; nationalism or cosmopolitanism. Although this ability to prioritise nationalism over cosmopolitanism and vice versa for different domains of human life seems to ignore the authentic content of the cosmopolitan ideology, it fits well with the way cosmopolitanism is practiced at this time. One of Audi’s strong arguments comes with his statement that, from an ethic point of view, nationalism does not always result in wrong-doing. As Audi puts it: ‘Giving some degree of priority to one’s own culture or, for that matter, one’s own technology, need not oppose optimal promotion of human interests. It may be quite consonant with doing that in a way sanctioned by good ethics. This is not to deny that giving preference to things characteristic of one’s own country just because they are characteristic of it is generally a bad thing and may rise to wrong-doing.’

Audi concludes his paper with stating that extreme nationalism pays no attention to obligations of beneficence toward other peoples. Of course, this is soaked by patriotism and it embodies the absolute opposite of the cosmopolitan ideal, but, as Audi cleverly suggests, globalisation invites us to rethink the histories and characteristics of the nation-states that we live in, and we may actually need some form of patriotism for optimal flourishing. Needless to say, a form of patriotism that is ‘morally justifiable…one leavened by loyalty to the community of all peoples.’

Another way of conceptualising cosmopolitanism is to redefine its concept into different cosmopolitan views. In their paper Cosmopolitanism (2006), Pauline Kleingeld and Eric Brown formulate a taxonomy of contemporary cosmopolitanism. They state that there are multiple perspectives that could be called cosmopolitan. All cosmopolitan perspectives argue that there is a particular community among all human beings, regardless of social and/or political affiliation, but these communities could be very different. Some thinkers and writers focus on the universal community of moral concern, while others conceptualise the universal community by focusing on certain political institutions, cultural expressions, or economic markets. Just like Audi’s subdivision of cosmopolitanism into different degrees, and his suggestion that cosmopolitanism does not always have to rule out nationalism, a taxonomy like this provides us with a bigger toolkit, so to speak, when we are trying to give place to cosmopolitanism in our present-day world. Within their article, Kleingeld and Brown provide an overview of what these cosmopolitan sub-strands mean. The first that is dealt with is moral cosmopolitanism, the most common sub-strand of cosmopolitanism, as it strongly resembles the core ideas of classic cosmopolitanism by putting a lot of emphasis on the universal duty to respect and promote human rights and justice. Here, Held’s three key elements that make up contemporary cosmopolitanism, as dealt with earlier in this paragraph, come into place.

In line with the ideas of Audi, one could distinguish moderate forms of contemporary moral cosmopolitanism from stricter forms. Strict moral cosmopolitans live by Stoic and Kantian principles, so to speak, and deny the notion that the duty of providing aid to those in need increases in strength when those in need are embodied by locals or ‘compatriots’ (people coming from one’s own country). More moderate moral cosmopolitans on the other hand, agree with the idea that everyone has a duty to provide aid when needed, but also argue that everyone has special duties towards their neighbouring community or compatriots, since life on a daily basis is embedded in a specific local and national context. As one might rightfully expect, the core of anti-cosmopolitanism boils down to the idea that all obligations of an individual are to his or her compatriots. Within anti-cosmopolitanism the idea that we are all obliged to help those in need within our universal community of human ideals is absent.

As Kleingeld and Brown state, moral cosmopolitanism sometimes leads to political cosmopolitanism, as thinkers and writers start developing ideas on how to implement certain
moral cosmopolitan values into the political world as we know it today. Contemporary political cosmopolitans can be divided into three schools:

1. Those that advocate a centralized world state,
2. Those that favour a federal system with a comprehensive global body, and
3. Those that prefer specific political institutions, which focus on particular concerns, such as war crimes and environmental preservation.

Here, it is important to note that Kant, most often embodying the biggest source of inspiration for theorists that are advocating the formation of a centralized world state, did argue for a universal cosmopolitan order, but did not seek to create a world state, as is often suggested. A cosmopolitan federation according to Kant does not require the total disappearance of nation-states, but merely a revision of state sovereignty (Brown, 2005). In the case of contemporary political cosmopolitanism, anti-cosmopolitanism shows strong scepticism towards the development of all international political institutions, whether these are concerned with one border crossing problem of some sort, or are aimed at forming a world state.

The third cosmopolitan sub-strand is found in contemporary cultural cosmopolitanism. As Kleingeld and Brown point out, cultural cosmopolitanism gets a lot of attention within recent philosophical literature because of the current disputes over the concept of multiculturalism in educational curricula and resurgent nationalisms. The cultural cosmopolitan positions itself in between these disputes by strongly rejecting exclusive attachments to any parochial culture. Hence, a cultural cosmopolitan encourages the multicultural society and, of course, rejects strong nationalism. In line with this, the cultural cosmopolitan is wary about strong ‘rights to culture’, respecting the rights of minority cultures, which are often politically powerless in today’s world, but rejecting the right to unconditional national self-determination. When it comes to cultural cosmopolitanism, anti-cosmopolitans are often embodied by liberal nationalists, as they strongly value a right to national self-determination. An important note that Kleingeld and Brown make in respect to cultural cosmopolitanism, is that it can understand the need of people for particular cultural attachments to, for instance, a particular nation (to a moderate extent). The main argument is that cultural cosmopolitanism opposes the idea that a certain degree of a cultural attachment implies that cultural identity should be defined by a bounded, homogeneous subset of cultural resources.

The last of Kleingeld and Brown’s distinguished cosmopolitan sub-strands is economic cosmopolitanism. As it started to develop in the 18th century, the core idea of economic cosmopolitanism has not really changed over time. The contemporary economic cosmopolitan argues that all human beings are ought to cultivate a single global economic market, characterized by free trade and a minimum of political involvement. Economic cosmopolitanism is widely criticised in the arena of philosophical cosmopolitans, since it is often seen as a great deal of the cause for the ever existing international economic inequality. Advocates of economic cosmopolitanism are mainly to be found among liberal economists and political leaders of the relatively rich countries in our world. Over the last few decades, as a result of the end of the Cold War and the continuously increasing reach of the market economy, a clear intensification of the debate on the desirability of a global market can be seen.

Obviously, contemporary cosmopolitanism has grown into a concept that represents a considerable variety of descriptive uses, political discourses and levels of concern. In line with this, Steven Vertovec and Robin Cohen have placed the variety in usage of the concept of cosmopolitanism under six rubrics, as they outline within their book *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice* (2002). Vertovec and Cohen argue that there are six perspectives on contemporary cosmopolitanism that could be subdivided; cosmopolitanism as:

1. A socio-cultural condition,
2. A kind of philosophy or worldview,
3. A political project towards building transnational institutions,
4. A political project for recognizing multiple identities,
5. An attitudinal or dispositional orientation, and
6. A mode of practice or competence.

As I see it, Vertovec and Cohen’s perspectives on contemporary cosmopolitanism provide a very useful tool for understanding the concept and the ways different thinkers and writers put it to use at this time. Hence, the following will elaborate further on each one of them.

Cosmopolitanism could be considered a socio-cultural condition; a socio-cultural condition that, as a result of several aspects of our globalizing world, mainly the relative ease and cheapness of transportation across ‘long’ distances, mass tourism, large-scale migration, multiculturalism world cities, and the development of telecommunications, refers to an emergent global, hybrid and ‘rootless’ cosmopolitan culture. By its advocates, this cosmopolitan culture is considered as valuable for its cultural creativity and its political challenges concerning various ethnocentric, racialized, gendered and national narratives. As one might expect, there are also critics that fear the emerging of a culture of mass consumerism and standardized mass commodities that will come to overrule local and national identities.

This chapter’s content has dealt with cosmopolitanism as a philosophy or worldview extensively. As I see it, the scientific debate on cosmopolitanism is fed most often by the concept’s philosophical arguments. Vertovec and Cohen seem to agree with this statement. Whether social scientists are debating the question on what or who could be called cosmopolitan in the ‘real’ world at this time, or developing ideas on how cosmopolitanism could be concretized as legal and governmental institutions that are awaiting establishment in an age of globalization, the moral philosophy of classic cosmopolitanism always appears to be the main source of inspiration.

As Vertovec and Cohen point out, the moral values of cosmopolitanism, combined with a global perspective, can be said to lie at the heart of actual political initiatives. Nothing new perhaps, but as Vertovec and Cohen argue, cosmopolitanism in this case refers to a layer of governance that constitutes a limitation on the sovereignty of states, but does constitute a state itself. Here, the desirable role of the nation-state in comparison to a broader scale of governance is being thought over. Social scientists, that are making use of the perspective of cosmopolitanism as a political project towards building transnational institutions, often use the United Nations and the EU as examples, because of the fact that in these respective cases certain kinds of democratic activity have been moved towards a larger scale beyond the politics of a particular nation-state government. Important critique towards this cosmopolitan perspective is that it only embodies cosmopolitanism from above, in the form of politically powerful international organizations, and cooperative agreements between states. Although, in this case, the emergence of more and more transnational social movements does offer a complement to top-down political cosmopolitanism, critics are in doubt if a global civil society, founded on a universal set of moral values and a common political agenda, will ever become reality. They argue that there are simply too many differences in power and interests within this world’s population.

The fourth perspective that Vertovec and Cohen formulate refers to those that make use of cosmopolitanism as a way to emphasize the notion that an individual is likely to be a member of multiple communities, not only concerned with the political agenda at the global level, as advocates of cosmopolitanism sometimes imply with the notion of world-citizenship, but more so with other, more downscale, forms of attachment. Hence, cosmopolitanism as a political project for recognizing multiple identities encourages human beings to have multiple affiliations. Over the last two decades, this perspective on cosmopolitanism has been advocated by many
thinkers and writers that concern themselves with the question on what the meaning and desirability of traditional nation-state sovereignty is, in a world that gets increasingly interconnected. Their main focus is on the further development of legitimate political authority that is disconnected from its traditional anchor in fixed borders and delimited territories that are most often imposed by our worldwide history of a nation-state based governmental system. Instead, political authority should find its roots among diverse forms, and diverse scales, of human associations, from cities and other sub-national regions, to nation-states, and wider regional or global networks. As one might expect, patriotic nationalists will keep a highly critical stance towards this perspective on cosmopolitanism, even though this perspective is highly nuanced and could not be considered as anti-nationalist.

Vertovec and Cohen’s fifth perspective on contemporary cosmopolitanism embodies its concept as an attitude; a state of mind. Here, cosmopolitanism is seen as a mode of engaging with the world, and as something that could become part of one’s personal identity. Cosmopolitanism as an attitude embodies one’s orientation on a plurality of cultures and a willingness to relate to, or engage with, those human beings that are rooted in other cultural backgrounds. Hence, cosmopolitanism as an attitudinal or dispositional orientation represents an appreciation of cultural diversity. As I see it, this perspective on cosmopolitanism represents human-beings as being capable of interacting with others that could be considered ‘different’ in a positive manner. In reality however, many individuals do not appear to have this capability, which explains the widespread feelings of ethnic hatred, xenophobia, and the notion of counter-culturalism, that are highly relevant in our present-day world. As it will become evidently clear later in this report, the Roma can relate to all three of these issues. Although I highly appreciate the idea of cosmopolitanism as an attitude, it is important to note that it requires some sense of global belonging. In line with this, Vertovec and Cohen state that such an attitude is largely acquired through experience, especially travel. Therefore, I would like to argue that criticizing people that appear to lack this particular attitude is inherently arrogant, and that it would reaffirm the elite status of cosmopolitan philosophy.

The last perspective that Vertovec and Cohen have outlined, views cosmopolitanism as mode of practice or competence. In this case, cosmopolitanism is considered as a skill; one that could be developed individually. This skill represents a personal ability to make one’s way into other cultures, through looking, listening, and by learning how to deal with particular cultural norms and values. Here, the cosmopolitan has a personal cultural identity, which is the result of various personal encounters with different cultural beliefs. Although I would like to urge everyone to work on their ‘cosmopolitan skills’, it remains the question whether the exploration of other cultures will lead to greater tolerance towards those that could somehow be considered different, or even alien, in a particular local or national society. It seems as if cultural exploration is not exclusively aimed at the further development of one’s own personal cultural identity, but also at looking for ‘flaws’ among those cultures that are not considered welcome within a particular society. I would like to suggest that, especially if one predominantly relates to a national cultural identity, cultural exploration could also be aimed at reaffirming certain stereotypes if one is not honestly open-minded, but instead looking for predefined cultural characteristics that are argued to be unwanted.

All in all it is safe to state that at this day, cosmopolitanism, traditionally embodying a moral-political frame of mind, is continuously renewed by a considerable amount of social scientists and philosophers, as it is concerned with many aspects of human life. Also, one should acknowledge that the debate on how we should relate cosmopolitanism to concepts of the nation-state, globalization et cetera is very much alive and ongoing.
To quote the beginning of David Held’s recent paper *Restructuring Global Governance: Cosmopolitanism, Democracy and the Global Order* (2009):

‘Cosmopolitanism is concerned to disclose the ethical, cultural and legal basis of political order in a world where political communities and states matter, but not only and exclusively… While states are hugely important vehicles to aid the delivery of effective public recognition, equal liberty and social justice, they should not be thought of as ontologically privileged. They can be judged by how far they deliver these public goods and how far they fail; for the history of states is marked, of course, not just by phases of bad leadership and corruption but also by the most brutal episodes. A Cosmopolitanism relevant to our global age must take this as a starting point, and build an ethically sound and politically robust conception of the proper basis of political community, and of the relations among countries.’

In my opinion, this quotation shows a severe frustration towards all the states that make up our world. Again, Held urges us to start seeing the downsides of our current nation-state world system, and emphasises the need for cosmopolitan thought within the debate on global governance. In line with this, Held introduces a new set of principles that express the values of his contemporary cosmopolitanism. As they are ordered in his paper these principles are:

1. Equal worth and dignity,
2. Active agency,
3. Personal responsibility and accountability,
4. Consent,
5. Collective decision-making about public issues through voting procedures,
6. Inclusiveness and subsidiarity,
7. Avoidance of serious harm and
8. Sustainability.

Held explains the meaning of these principles by dividing them into three groups. Principles 1-3 set down the fundamental organisational features of the cosmopolitan moral universe. They refer to the ideas that every human being is a subject of equal moral concern, that every human being is capable of acting autonomously with respect to making choices, and that the claims of every human being affected in some way should be taken equally into account. In this context, personal responsibility argues that everyone has to be aware of the consequences of their actions, so that they do not restrict the choices of others. Principles 4-6 form the basis of translating individually initiated activity more broadly, into frameworks of action and regulation that have been collectively agreed upon. Principles 7 and 8 form a framework for prioritising urgent needs and resource conservation; a moral framework for focusing public policy on those who are in need the most, and ensuring that public policy does not destroy irreplaceable resources.

Held cleverly predicts an objection towards his set of cosmopolitan principles; one that argues ‘that given the plurality of interpretive positions in this world, it is unwise to construct a political standpoint which depends upon overarching principles, for it is doubtful that a bridge can be built between ‘the many particular wills and ‘the general will’’. In response to this, Held argues that the principles of contemporary cosmopolitanism sum up to be the conditions of taking cultural diversity seriously. Hence, cosmopolitanism acknowledges a plurality of values and a diversity of moral conceptions of the good. In line with this, Held states that only polities that acknowledge the equal status of all persons can ensure a structure of political action that enables individuals to move freely as equal agents. Although I get the feeling that Held is vainly trying to define a moral-political framework of contemporary cosmopolitanism that could actually be implemented on a global scale, he continues to innovatively bring the social and humane qualities of cosmopolitan thought to light. Also, Held provides us with an interesting thought on our current global order that seems to offer hope for cosmopolitans, as he ends his paper with the statement that the policy packages that have set the agenda of global governance over the last decade, concerned mainly with global economy and security (referring to the global ‘war on terrorism’), are failing. As Held seems to argue, the growing number of critiques and a widespread feeling of unease towards the current
global political agenda are creating a political opening for a new, perhaps cosmopolitan, structure to redefine global governance. In line with this, Held points to the faltering of unilateralism in US foreign policy, uncertainty over the role of the EU in global affairs, the global trade crisis, growing confidence of emerging countries in the global economic arena, such as Brazil, and the unsettled relations between the Islam and the West. Also, our global world has to deal with an increasing number of global challenges, varying from border-crossing ecological problems to conflict prevention, and these challenges will keep growing in number and severity. Inherently, our global world is getting interconnected more and more, whether nation-state politicians see this as desirable or not. Held suggests we use the political opening in the global political order to implement a moral cosmopolitanism, one that relates to his set of cosmopolitan principles, as the philosophical basis for global governance, and that we start to use a renewed cosmopolitan form of global governance to deal with this world’s global and universal challenges. Although Held appears to conclude his paper in a moderate cosmopolitan manner; as a cosmopolitan that does not aim at the abolition of all nation-state borders, he states that in a world of universal challenges and overlapping communities, all human beings need to be not just citizens of their immediate political communities, but also of global political networks that have impact upon their lives. People would be enjoying multiple citizenships. Perhaps the notion of multiple citizenships embodies the first step towards a true cosmopolitan global society?

In my opinion, Held’s recent idea of an opening in the global political order, providing a doorway for cosmopolitan thought into global politics, sounds very appealing. Contemporary moral-political cosmopolitanism is characterized by a philosophy of equality and open-mindedness, much like its classic predecessors, that I think many individuals can sympathise, though I still get the feeling that this doorway will be blocked by other, more powerful, concepts at work in our present world. I would like to agree with Held’s statement that our global political world, a world that has become entwined by international relations on different bases, from trade relations to international development aid programs, more and more, is in need of a new global political agenda, but the recent revival of nationalism seems to contradict the possibility for cosmopolitanism to start thriving, so to speak. My own experiences within the social world show that many people right here in the Netherlands, one of the wealthiest countries in the world, show a great deal of fear towards those living outside our borders and (often explicitly) oppose the notion that we should aid those in need, especially if those in need live at the other end of the world. I would like to think that in cases like these, nationalist feelings are much stronger then cosmopolitan feelings. If our nation does not obviously benefit from, for instance, development aid, then why are we spending so much time and money on it, especially when there are people living on an income that is nothing but the bare minimum right here? And why should we welcome immigrants into our county if they have to offer nothing else than poverty, and are likely to get involved in a circuit of criminality? Questions like these are proof of tendencies towards nationalist feelings and appear to be very common in the contemporary Western world. This statement will become more evident when we will start looking at the Roma population in the EU. Also, I would like to argue that often asked questions like these reaffirm the notion that cosmopolitanism embodies an ideology of an intellectual elite; one that is predominantly irrelevant in this world’s social reality.

Most thinkers and writers that are concerning themselves with contemporary cosmopolitanism agree with the idea that cosmopolitanism in its authentic meaning comes down to a philosophical picture of an ideal world, a world that could be considered possible or impossible, as well as desirable or undesirable. At this time, it is agreed upon that this picture does correspond with the realities of our globalizing world to only very little extent. Well known examples of international institutions that focus on a universal ethic of what is ‘good’, of which the ICC and the Red Cross are two examples, are highly valued for their moral characteristics by human beings all over
the globe; moral characteristics that seem to fit perfectly within the classic cosmopolitan ideal. As it seems, advocates of cosmopolitanism therefore feel a strong urge to develop ideas on how we could make our world more cosmopolitan, after all, if the ethics of moral cosmopolitanism appear to be acknowledged and appreciated on such a large scale, why not continue their development so that they can all be practiced at the global level in the nearby future? Here, it is important to note that the need for a global ethics has been expressed explicitly for hundreds of years. Classic religious and philosophical teachings, cosmopolitanism being (only) one of them, have always subscribed to this need. Hence, the fact that a global ethics agenda gains more and more international political and media attention at our time, does not mean that it is a simple outgrowth of ongoing processes of globalisation (Dallmayr, 2003). This note provides an important addition to the idea that perhaps we already are and always have been cosmopolitans. Then why are we not living in a cosmopolitan world at this very day? Here, I would like to note that cosmopolitanism has never become a reality. Perhaps much like communism, which ideological basis of moral values and beliefs also provides us with a picture that can be used as a source of inspiration to improve our current globalizing world on a variety of political, economic and social aspects, cosmopolitanism is an unrealistic picture of the world to aspire after. History shows many critiques towards the cosmopolitan train of thought that could be interpreted as true or false by every human being in different ways. One thing is for sure: throughout its history cosmopolitanism did not prove to be the natural way to go, so to speak. In line with this, I would like to end this paragraph on contemporary cosmopolitanism with two conclusions, whereas the second is embodied by the content of Robert Fine’s paper *Taking the 'Ism' Out of Cosmopolitanism* (2003).

Cosmopolitanism remains hard to specify. Although there are recent ideas on how to conceptualise its concept in our present-day world, it seems to remain a highly normative philosophy, and its present discourses appear to be referring to a utopian world, characterized by universal equality and tolerance. In line with this, cosmopolitanism could easily be considered as an ‘armchair philosophy’ (Skrbis, Kendall & Woodward, 2004). Although I can acknowledge this critique, the world as we know it today, increasingly interconnecting and filled with socio-economic, cultural and political inequalities, challenges those who concern themselves with this world to make use of a cosmopolitan perspective when they decide to deal with them. Cosmopolitanism provides a frame of mind, based on a clear set of moral values, which enables us to put particular undesired global phenomena under critical evaluation. It goes without saying that cosmopolitanism does not embody the only proper way of how human life should be organised, but I would like to argue that its ideology, and especially its moral qualities, are without a doubt worth debating on within both the scientific and political arenas of our present-day world.

‘Radical intellectuals like to think of themselves as living in a critical moment of history and playing a pivotal role in its outcome. The protagonists of the new cosmopolitanism are no exception…They too quickly discard the core concepts of the social sciences because of their national associations…Too quickly stigmatise nationalism as one-sidedly negative and elevate cosmopolitanism into an ideal…(Fine, 2003)’.

Fine’s statements, as the quotation above shows, heavily criticise the arrogance some (perhaps many) cosmopolitan philosophers appear to suffer from. In this respect, I would like to argue that critiques towards cosmopolitanism are always highly desirable, as they ensure constructive evaluation of its contemporary philosophical, scientific and perhaps even political concepts, but also that cosmopolitanism should not be inherently linked to complex philosophy and a top-down scope. Perhaps the case of the Roma, evidently representing a group of people that shows a great deal of authentic cosmopolitanism in their lifestyle, as will become clearer later in this report, could strengthen my argument and strip cosmopolitanism of the elite status that it is often criticised for.
Chapter 3. Roma Lifestyle.

This chapter will focus on the Roma lifestyle. By dealing with the Roma history and cultural identity we will come to see how we can bring the Roma and cosmopolitanism together. It will become clear that the Roma people are true cosmopolitans; true world-citizens. Although they are often discriminated and thus have to deal with severe difficulties getting by and travelling around, a cosmopolitan lifestyle is in their blood. This chapter will start off with an overview of Roma history. After that, the statelessness of the Roma will be dealt with. Towards the end, this chapter will come to a definition of Roma cosmopolitanism. Putting the idea of Roma cosmopolitanism on paper will give us the possibility to start comparing it to cosmopolitan theory, both classic and contemporary, and the cosmopolitan condition, so to speak, of the present-day EU. Next to results from a literature study, this chapter will also incorporate the results from my fieldwork, in order to come to a well-founded idea on what makes the Roma true cosmopolitans.

3.1 Roma History.

There is no absolute certainty about where the Roma people originate from. Yet, the dominant idea is that they originate from northern India. As a nomadic group of people, they first set foot on European territory in the 14th century. The map in figure 1 gives a visual representation of the Roma migration flows in time. As you can see, the Roma had been all over Europe by the 15th century. Here, an important note is that they have been a minority ever since, in every European country as we know it today (Nieuwenhuizen, 2004).

Figure 1: Roma Migration History.
At the beginning of the 15th century, the nomadic newcomers were referred to in several ways. In most countries they were called Gypsies or Gitanos, since they were said to originate from Egypt. Later in the 15th century, the term Zigoiner was coined in Germany as another name for the Roma. At first, these newcomers were welcomed in a positive way. As one might expect, this did not last long and from the beginning of the 16th century, governments started to act more and more repressive against the Roma. Soon they were to be stigmatised as outlaws, spies or beggars. At that point on the timeline of European history, the structural social exclusion of the Roma started to form itself. The Roma were no longer welcome in Western Europe. Those that had already build up livelihoods for themselves, were scared off. In order to explain the distinction between Roma and Sinti in the Netherlands, we need to look at Roma history specific to the Netherlands. Here, in the period of 1755 till 1868, the governmental agencies of that time were convinced that there were no Gypsy families living on Dutch territory. They were convinced that all people carrying Roma origins had left the country, but this was not the case. Apparently, one particular group of nomadic newcomers that had migrated into the Netherlands well before 1868, were never considered as Gypsies, and hence they were never perceived as a threat to society, even though they shared the exact same ethnic and cultural background as the Roma families that were actually chased away. This particular group of people was referred to as the Sinti. Because of this misconception, the Sinti families have a longer history as inhabitants of the Netherlands then the Roma, and the Roma-Sinti subdivision continued to exist until this day (Nieuwenhuizen, 2004).

It did not take long for all the Roma in Europe to become the victims of severe stigmatisation and discrimination. They were considered pariahs, and hence, they were forced to deal with rejection and targeted by assimilationist policies. They were haunted with such deeply rooted and negative stereotypes that continued to justify society’s hostility towards them, right until this very day (Gheorghe & Mirga, 2001). One well-known extreme example of this rejection is to be found in the fact that half a million Roma were systematically exterminated in Nazi-occupied Europe during the Second World War. As one might expect, the Holocaust is burned deep in the collective memory of the Roma (Rose, 2006). In the course of Roma history, a lack of reciprocity and social exclusion on the one hand and their defensive mechanism of clinging to an exclusive and traditional identity have led to severe segregation and marginalisation of the Roma community all over Europe and the rest of the world. A history of inhumane physical, social and economic living conditions has been the result (Gheorghe & Mirga, 2001).

Throughout their history, the Roma were often considered as a counter-cultural community; a group of people that, from a state perspective, contests and even rejects the norms and values of society. This very notion explains the numerous attempts that have been undertaken among multiple European countries to harshly assimilate the Roma (Gheorghe & Mirga, 2001). A historical review of state policies towards the Roma reveals a strong security-oriented bias; though there are differences in method, most policies have shared the basic aim of controlling Roma populations, populations that were considered alien, untrustworthy and destabilizing (Guglielmo & Waters, 2005). Roma assimilation can still be found on the policy agendas of many European states at this very day. The existence of these assimilation policies can be explained through the ever existing lack of understanding and fear that practically all governmental agencies have towards the Roma community and its culture. As opposed to most other minorities, which are targeted with policy plans that are more numerous, more humane and inherently less aggressive, the Roma have always been victimised by public and political ignorance. As a result, the Roma are only approached when things seem to have gone too far, most often only when people coming from the Roma community are, from a governmental point of view, evidently plaguing society with acts of criminality (Rodrigues, 2006). It appears as if little people know that in recent Roma history, say the last two decades, issues like severe human rights violation and
extreme poverty are present on a daily basis (Rose, 2006). Here, the fact that the Roma community embodies Europe’s largest minority is worth mentioning again. Thus, although the Roma sum up to be a numerous group of people, one to be reckoned with, (recent) history shows that Roma life has always moved on at the outskirts of society.

One might rightfully acknowledge that the history of the Roma community is not a glorious one, as it is marked by discrimination, exclusion and poor livelihoods. Despite these ever present issues, recent history shows an ethnic awakening and political mobilization within the Roma community. Since the collapse of communism in Central and Eastern Europe, the Roma community started to politically involve itself actively at both the national and European level. In line with this, Roma NGO’s were established and members of a newly emerging Roma political elite started to make sure that the interests of the Roma community were acknowledged by the important European organizations, such as the EU, the Council of Europe, and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), as well as the legislative bodies and governments of separate European states. By this political engagement, the Roma were entering a new phase of their history (Gheorghe & Mirga, 2001). The strengthening of their political voice, and ensuring a healthy dose of social recognition among all European nation-states, is a process that continues to occupy representatives of the Roma community at this very day. Let us hope that it results in better livelihoods for the Roma community in the nearby future.

3.2 A Nation without a State.

The Roma community is often considered to form a nation without an actual state. In this respect, as there is the notion of a ‘Roma Diaspora’ (Kovats, 2001), they sometimes are compared with the Jews, especially due to the fact that both communities share the same historical characteristics of geographical dispersion and continuously being victimised by severe discrimination, exclusion, and of course the Holocaust. Here, there is one crucial difference between both communities that needs to be emphasised; as many representatives of this world’s Jewish community argue for the establishment of a geographically embedded Jewish nation-state, the Roma community has never outspoken such a statement. Although one might expect that the Roma people also carry the ambition to establish a nation-state of their own, discussing this notion with Roma people, as I did during the fieldwork that preceded this report, shows that they do not feel the need to form a Roma state.

Although the Roma community is often considered as a nation, and it has been suggested to establish a Roma national status at the level of intergovernmental bodies, and to establish a ‘Roma seat’ at the European Parliament and the United Nations just as they are given to nation-state governments (Goldston, 2001), it is important to note that there is no such thing as a Roma nationality. The Roma are first and foremost citizens of a given country and carry its respective nationality (Gheorghe & Mirga, 2001). In line with this, most nation-state governments see the Roma as a national minority that, in addition to the national culture of the majority, also cultivate their own cultural identity (Rose, 2006). I would argue that it is more suited to consider the Roma as ethnic minorities, as this would put more emphasis on the fact that the Roma do have ethnic characteristics that are unique to them, both physically visible and embedded in their cultural identity, but as Guglielmo and Waters (2005) note, categorising the Roma community as an ethnic minority increases the risk of relegating the Roma to a secondary minority status with less preferential treatment. Hence, the perception of a Roma ethnic minority often provokes discrimination and exclusion and explains the often sceptical stance towards ‘Roma policies’ among the Roma community. This scepticism is highly understandable, as it is safe to say that the Roma policies that have been formed by EU governing institutions, and among its separate member-states, over the last few decades, do not appear to have achieved the goals that were set,
as the Roma community to a large extent, mainly among the Central and Eastern European countries, still has to deal with extreme discrimination and inhumane livelihoods.

3.3 Roma Cosmopolitanism.

In order to gain better understanding of the Roma lifestyle and their viewpoint on cosmopolitanism, as well as concepts related to this, such as nationalism and governmental politics, I conducted in-depth interviews with Roma and Sinti people that are living in the Netherlands. These interviews may be considered as both highly qualitative and explorative, from a methodological point of view. As I mentioned earlier, conducting interviews among the Dutch Roma and Sinti population proved to be very interesting, because of the fact that there are practically no Roma writers active in the field of social sciences and thus very little literature, written with the use of a Roma-lens, can be found in academic libraries. The main aim within this paragraph will be to put the Roma perspective on cosmopolitanism, and other concepts of relevance, on paper. First, this paragraph will deal in short with the ways I got in contact with my first interviewees. After all, this has been the start of the fieldwork that preceded this report.

3.3.1 Getting in Touch.

Getting in touch with Roma people proved to be more challenging than I initially expected. My first objective was to explore what organizations that are established in the Netherlands, have something to do with the Roma people. After some internet research I found out that, within the Netherlands, there are two acknowledged NGO’s that are concerned with the Roma community and its well-being. The first that I contacted for getting in touch with the Roma is called the ‘Foundation for Roma Emancipation’. The second is called ‘Foundation for Sinti and Roma’. After interviewing respectively their chairman; Gjunler Abdula and chairwoman; Lala Weiss, and telling them about the aim of my research, the above foundations proved to be a gateway towards more interviewees, as both are well connected among the Dutch Roma community. Here, it is interesting to mention that Lala Weiss, as the chairwoman of the Foundation for Sinti and Roma, was highly sceptical towards my intentions at first and initially turned me down for an interview appointment. For her, it was not obvious that my research was aimed at trying to link the Roma people to the theories on cosmopolitanism, and that my intentions with the interview results were nothing but to gain a better understanding of the Roma cultural identity. Instead, she automatically saw me for a newspaper journalist, looking for a sensational story on Roma stereotypes and comments on the, at that time, recent attacks on Roma campsites by an extreme right-wing movement in Italy, which got a lot of media attention. Later, it became clear that I was actually the first student ever to set foot in her office for an open and hardly pre-programmed conversation. In line with this, I can understand her reserve when it comes to calls for an interview. Especially because of the fact, that Lala Weiss could be considered to be the best known television-face and spokeswoman representing the Dutch Roma and Sinti community.

Next to the people I interviewed via both Gjunler Abdula and Lala Weiss, I visited two Roma and Sinti music and culture festivals; The Gypsy Road Show in Breda, and the International Gypsy Festival in Tilburg. Here, it was fairly easy to speak with even more Roma and Sinti men and women, though it was interesting to see that approaching my respondents-to-be with a pen and a clipboard in my hands, as I did at first, was not the best way to go. Here, I was told that this often evokes thoughts that are similar to those Lala Weiss had, when I first contacted her. In other words: again I was initially thought of as being a newspaper journalist looking for respondents on a few standardized questions, and hence, an unwanted guest, so to speak.
3.3.2 The Topic-List.
The fieldwork that preceded this report consisted of conducting in-depth interviews with people from the Dutch Roma and Sinti community. In order to make sure these interviews would not be forced into a particular direction, and to make sure that there would be enough space for my respondents to add or emphasize particular notes, I conducted them based on a topic-list. The topics that were considered important to the contents of the interviews have been derived from the results of my literature study. In sum, the topics of interest are:

1. Roma cultural identity and its moral values and beliefs,
2. World-citizenship and the ability to move freely over the world,
3. The Roma perspective on nation-states and nation-state borders,
4. The Roma perspective on globalization,
5. The Roma perspective on nationalism and the feeling of belonging,
6. The Roma perspective on multiculturalism and tolerance,
7. The Roma perspective on EU governance, and
8. The nearby future of the Roma community within the EU.

The first two topics are concerned with getting a better understanding of Roma ethnicity and its unique cultural characteristics. Needless to say, talking about cultural norms and values with members from the Roma community generates the most useful information. Because there is hardly any literature available about Roma ethnicity and culture, there is no other way than incorporating these topics in an interview, in order to gain a decent understanding on these topics.

Topics 3 - 6 are formulated in order to get a better understanding of the Roma perspective on four topics that are highly relevant within the debate on what cosmopolitanism means, and where it can be seen in our present-day world. In line with these topics, I have asked my respondents about the possible ambitions of establishing a Roma nation-state, Roma politics, and the way the Roma live alongside other, often dominant, cultural identities on a daily basis.

The last two topics are concerned with the situation of the Roma within the EU of this time. In line with these two topics, I asked my respondents about their arguments – pros and cons – towards the EU, and the current Roma policies that are the result of EU initiatives. Also, I wanted to discuss the way these European Roma policies work out in reality; whether they are bettering the Roma integration and livelihoods. In the end, I asked my respondents to think about the nearby future, and if they think the development of more dedicated European policies aimed at the Roma community and its marginalized position among EU member-states will provide a brighter future.

3.3.3 Interview Results: An understanding of Roma Cosmopolitanism.
Roma cosmopolitanism appears to entail a lot of classic cosmopolitan values that show great resemblance to the ideas and moral philosophy of the Stoics and Kant. Within this paragraph, I will deal with Roma cosmopolitanism in line with the topic-list, as explained in the previous paragraph. The goal is to put the Roma perspective on paper, and become able to conceptualise Roma cosmopolitanism.

The Roma take great care of their cultural identity. At home, they speak with one another in their own language; Romani. Also, they make sure that their children know all about the traditional Roma myths and their romantic tales about living a nomadic life. Most of the respondents that I visited at home had the Roma flag hanging on the wall, at a central place in the living room. Without a doubt, the Roma people are well aware of their particular cultural traits and cherish them.
Considering cosmopolitanism as the need to abandon one’s attachment to a particular nation-state appears to only be relevant when one’s history is marked by this attachment. This is evidently not the case for the Roma, which makes them a unique complement to the debate on cosmopolitanism. Although they are often said to form a stateless nation, they themselves experience this statelessness as nothing but normal. As I was told, the Roma do not carry any ambitions towards forming a nation-state of their own, as the establishment of a geographically implanted and bordered territory of state sovereignty would inherently call for the need of governmental agencies, as well as military force to protect the nation-state borders. Both politics and military force, know little interest within Roma values. The Roma have always been reluctant to live their lives on the basis of formulated law and governmental policy. Instead, they have always lived their lives according to certain social and moral beliefs. As I was told, the Roma give very high priority to looking out for each other. If somebody is in need of help, all activities will be set aside to provide aid, a way of prioritising that shows strong resemblance to Stoic and Kantian cosmopolitanism.

Hospitality is also highly prioritised within Roma culture. Anyone; whether a member of the family, a friend, or even a total stranger is able to feel welcome and respected within the Roma community. Roma social values insist on treating everybody with the same amount of respect and understanding, also if a particular individual does not share the same cultural background. In line with this, the Roma provide a good example of cosmopolitanism as a state of mind. Although they tend to cling to a Roma cultural identity, I was told that this is a highly differentiated form of cultural identity. Since the Roma have lived scattered all over Europe and the rest of the world for hundreds of years, their cultural identity should not be considered homogeneous. Combined with the fact that the Roma do not have a history of the written word, and thus their cultural identity is largely embedded in storytelling, from generation on to the next generation, the Roma community shows internal nuances when it comes to particular cultural traits. Apparently, the Roma have been putting cosmopolitanism, if perceived as a skill, in practice for hundreds of years. Although sharing the same history of origins, and the possession of a shared set of stories that form the basis for Roma moral values, the Roma have altered and renewed their cultural identities as a result of different local cultural contexts. As I was told, the media often portrays the Roma as a socially excluded part of European society. Although this has been the state of affairs for a very long time now, the Roma should not be held responsible for this. From a historical perspective, the Roma explored the grounds of Europe in small caravans and have always wanted to live in harmony with those on their path. The fact that they form a marginalized and socially excluded group of people right now is nothing but the result of being the victims of severe discrimination and hostile governmental policies for hundreds of years.

When discussing world-citizenship with my respondents, a few interesting ideas came to light. First, the Roma do represent world-citizens in a very explicit way. The Roma traditionally consider our world as one single territory, where all human-beings are supposed to live in harmony with each other and respect the earth. As they deliberately have never related to nation-state attachments and fixed territorial borders, they might well sum up to be the only community that could be considered as real world-citizens. Hence, the Roma live without borders. Although they experience the influence of - mainly ethnic - borders on a daily basis, and have done so throughout their existence, the Roma do not want to engage themselves with the establishment of their own borders, which brings me to a second point of interest. I got quite some critique towards Dutch society. As was suggested by several of the respondents, Dutch society is presented by its political leaders as a society of open-mindedness and a global perspective, but yet in daily life there seems to be a dominant not-in-my-backyard attitude towards non-Dutch cultural identities. Hence, many Roma people, also living within the supposedly social and world
oriented context of Dutch society, experience strong social and cultural borders on a daily basis. As the Roma argue, all borders that divide up our world could be abandoned. Whether they are the containers of nation-state territories or cultural fear, borders always represent a particular line of division; one that has the function of a semi-permeable membrane and thus inherently represents a human establishment. As the Roma argue, human-beings should not concern themselves with the concept of a world that is subdivided by borders at a variety of levels. As they see it, borders represent nothing but an instrument to either include or exclude particular parts of our physical, social, economic, and cultural world, and therefore should not be the focus of further or renewed development. Instead, human focus should be on how all of us could live in harmony, as they suggest, by putting strong emphasis on the moral values of helping those in need, and accepting all human-beings as equals, within the world we live in.

As most of us live in a world where we can relate to the concept of nation-states, the Roma do not. As many advocates of cosmopolitanism argue, the nation-state has always been the highest level of political power, to put it simply. In the age of our globalizing world however, nation-states appear to slowly move particular parts of governmental issues to a greater level. In respect to this, there is a lot of talk on concepts such as post-nationalism, internationalism and transnationalism. Although the nation-state does not share the same role and meaning, among these three concepts, it does not appear to lose its power at all when it comes to the case of the Roma. For the Roma, the nation-state, particularly its territorial borders, could definitely not be considered as fading away. Especially the revival of nationalist feelings, and reestablishment of a particular national identity, among many EU countries at this time, makes of nation-states a force to be reckoned with, within daily life of the Roma. As many of my respondents argue, nationalism revives the borders of nation-states in such a way that immigration and integration policies become more and more strict, and thus it becomes more and more difficult for the Roma to move to other living grounds. Also, many of my respondents express a great deal of fear towards nationalism, as it inherently leads to discrimination. Here, the recent initiatives of Nicolas Sarkozy and the Czech National Party to systematically deport all illegal Roma out of respectively France and Czechoslovakia, provides a good example. Note that ‘illegal’ only refers to the fact that those Roma people had not officially been allowed to live on both territories. Without a doubt, the political institutions of the nation-state still have enormous power when it comes to deciding who can and can not live on their particular bordered territory.

Initiatives like Sarkozy’s are very actual and recent within the present-day EU, and they are the actual result of nation-state governmental policies. As the Roma argue, globalization, and EU integration at a smaller geographical level, should lead to the emerging of a borderless world; a world where the importance and political power of the nation-state would truly disappear and people would really be able to move around freely. But as they see it, globalization mainly is an economic process, not a process of the actual opening-up of borders, as nation-states base their immigration laws for the greater part based on economic criteria. Here, the idea of immigration policy that materializes human-beings comes into place. On the one hand, wealthy people, powerful corporations and academics are indeed able to enjoy the freedom to move around as they wish, but on the other hand, the Roma are constrained to do so by nation-state governments, as those governments formulate strict, mainly financial and educational, demands towards potential newcomers. As the Roma often have to deal with very poor financial means, and a lack of politically acknowledged educational references, they experience imprisonment by the nation-state. Although my interviewees consider themselves lucky to live on Dutch territory, as they are able to enjoy reasonable living standards here in the Netherlands and discrimination does not haunt them as much as it would in most other countries, they all express a strong feeling of unease towards the fact that the Roma people are most often not able to practice their traditional nomadic lifestyle, due to the immigration demands that most nation-states pose.
In line with the above, one may rightfully acknowledge that the Roma community is not always tolerated among the EU member-states. On the grounds of poor economic strength and poor education, they are the victims of contemporary national deportation policies. A harsh truth, as I see it. To top it off, the rise of neo-nationalism and extreme right-wing political movements among many EU member-states strengthens the ethnic intolerance towards the Roma community. As an example, just a few years ago, several Roma camps were set on fire by extreme right-wing nationalists in Italy. From a Roma perspective, actions like this are impossible to explain. The moral values embodying tolerance towards one another and the respect towards other cultural identities do not seem to get a high priority among all human-beings, as they get among the Roma community.

Although the political agenda of the EU does embody several initiatives aimed at Roma integration and the bettering of Roma livelihoods all over the EU, they do not appear to be successful. Discussing this statement with my respondents brought an interesting fact to light. It seems as if most of them, apart from the employees of the Roma NGO’s, have practically no idea on their specific goals and ways of achievement. In other words: many Roma people do not know what is going on, and concerning them, at the European level of government. Although politics and concepts of governance have never gotten any attention within Roma culture and lifestyle throughout their history, all of my respondents evidently agreed to the notion that Roma political activity, both on the national and European level, is needed in order to make an end to their socially excluded position, and poor livelihoods, within the European community. The next paragraph will shed more light on the status of Roma political engagement.

To conclude this paragraph on Roma cosmopolitanism, and in line with Vertovec and Cohen’s (2002) sub-division of cosmopolitan perspective, it is safe to say that the Roma culture embodies a worldview that closely relates to the classic philosophy of cosmopolitanism. Their human-oriented moral values and profound respect towards all human-beings makes them true cosmopolitans. Also, their long history as stateless nomads, thinking beyond the containers of nation-state borders, makes the Roma a unique case within the EU, when it comes to the cosmopolitan state of mind. The Roma prove to be true grassroots cosmopolitans.

3.4 Roma in the EU.

As a prelude to the next chapter, where the concept of EU cosmopolitanism will be dealt with, this paragraph will provide more insight in the current state of affairs concerning the European Roma community. Here, the Roma minority status, the socio-economic problems that relate to their community, and the emerging Roma political engagement, will be dealt with.

The Roma that are living among the EU member-states always have to deal with a minority status, whether they are considered as national or ethnic minorities. The evident disadvantages of the Roma community, exclusion, poverty and so on, throughout the EU appear to point to common limitations of the separate nation-states in solving these. As Martin Kovats explains in his paper Opportunities and Challenges – EU Enlargement and the Roma/Gypsy Diaspora (2001), a transnational, European form of governance should be aimed at solving the Roma problems. Kovats argues that although the Roma situation has been acknowledged as a European issue in 1993, treating them as a specific political entity is likely to obscure the considerable diversity among Roma communities and their circumstances within different EU member-states, and hence lack in effectiveness. As I see it, the general top-down scope of European Roma policies, is the cause for this, and it makes the need for bottom-up Roma governance extra important. Especially in the Eastern European countries, there is very little Roma political activity, despite the fact that all respective nation-state governments do incorporate Roma problems into their
political agenda (Kovats, 2001). Especially here, the lack of Roma political activity could be considered as a serious problem, given the fact that the Roma communities in the Eastern European countries can sum up to account for 11% of a country’s population (Macedonia). As the figures 2 and 3 in the appendices show, the countries in Eastern Europe inhabit an enormous amount of Roma. This combined with the fact that problems such as poverty, unemployment, and little primary school enrolment are pressing within these countries, as table 2 in the appendices shows, reaffirms the need for effective problem solving. Probably the most important questions right now are how to successfully deal with these issues? And what balance is needed between on the one hand EU intervention, and on the other hand national, or perhaps sub-national, intervention?

As Gheorghe and Mirga (2001) rightfully note, it is important to see that public discourse on the Roma embodies a strong heritage of the past. The ever existing stereotypes and stigmas of the Roma are often used as a basis and justification of public attitudes towards the Roma, as well as the specific Roma policies. As a result, the cultural characteristics of the Roma are forgotten about, and hence the Roma are solely seen as a social or economic problem; outcasts of society without particular cultural or ethnic roots. The Roma are often only part of a nation-state’s focus when it comes to separate categories of social problems, such as poverty, unemployment, criminality, deteriorating living conditions and so on. Since the Roma often suffer from all of these social and economic problems, they are in need of wider policies, integrating all of these problems and focusing on the roots of their marginal position within society, not only on the visible assets.

Incorporating specific Roma policies, viewing them as an ethnic group with a unique lifestyle and cultural identity, in European or national action plans of inclusion is very important. Everyone concerned with the European Roma situation appears to agree with this notion, but in case of the Roma the socio-economic problems are both universal throughout the EU, as well as established in very different national contexts. As de Schutter and Verstichel (2005) argue, this explains, to large extent, the fact that at our day the Roma are often still living excluded from society. As they argue, there are too many discrepancies between both EU and nation-state legislation. Although the European Commission implemented the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin in the year 2000, not all nation-states deal with the Roma perceiving them as an ethnic group, and hence the Roma community remains ethnically and culturally segregated. In line with this, de Schutter and Verstichel emphasise the need for further development of a clear and transparent relation between both levels of legislation. As they argue, the ongoing systematic exclusion and segregation of the Roma is morally unjustifiable. I could not agree more. Hence, we should start developing improved forms of European legislation in such a way that there are no more loopholes for states, corporations, or individuals to legally justify the Roma social exclusion. As de Schutter and Verstichel cleverly suggest, the law is a powerful tool, and it is our responsibility to use it for the benefit of all human-beings equally, also the Roma. Figure 4 in the appendices shows the most recent flyer on Roma inclusion, as formulated by EU officials. As it says literally on the front, the 10 common basic principles for Roma inclusion represent a legally non-binding political declaration. However, Member States have shown their commitment to basing future initiatives on these principles. I would like to argue that this commitment is meaningless, as the Roma are victimized by discrimination and exclusion on a daily basis. I would like to urge the Anti Discrimination Unit of the European Commission to start establishing legally binding measures.

So far, I’ve argued for both the need for Roma-specific policy plans, acknowledging them as an ethnic group with particular cultural traits and needs, and the renovation of EU legislation, making it impossible to justify the Roma exclusion among the EU member-states. The last thing
that is needed is a stronger political voice of the Roma themselves. Although they are engaging with politics more and more, especially among the Western European countries, the Roma most often follow the lead of their respective state in dealing with the Roma problems (Gheorghe & Mirga, 2001). In line with this, there livelihoods in terms of employment, education and economic strength might slowly better, but this does not automatically mean that the Roma will become a socially included and integrated part of their particular national society and the EU as a whole. As I see it, the Roma need to strengthen their cross-boundary links, unite themselves across the EU member-states, and become able to make sure that all EU citizens know about their cultural identity and moral values. Only then, the stereotypes, stigmas, and negative media attention might end their existence, and only then the Roma will be truly treated as equals. Here, I do not argue for a Roma revolution, as this is an absolute impossibility given their degree of political and economic powerlessness within the European context, but I would like to emphasise the importance of systematically changing the dominant public discourse throughout the EU as a whole. Therefore, I sincerely hope that those who politically represent the Roma among the separate EU member-states join forces and collectively gain more political power at both the governmental levels of the EU, and their particular nation-states.

To end this paragraph, I would like to formulate two possible future scenarios for the Roma population in the EU that I think are interesting to think over, based on the possible Roma futures as formulated by James Goldston, the legal director of the European Roma Rights Centre, in his article A Future for Roma Rights (2001)? The first possible scenario is that the Roma continue to be one of the poorest, most powerless people of the EU. Within this scenario, there will be no visible livelihood improvement in the near future. The growing of right-wing politics at the nation-state level, which is visible in a lot of EU countries at this time, would lie at the heart of this scenario. Even extreme right-wing political ideology, reaching levels of neo-Nazism, is increasing all over the EU. From this kind of political perspective, the Roma are labelled as a ‘social problem’; society’s outcasts, implying that they have only themselves to blame for their marginalization and poor livelihood. Within the EU of present-day, it will be a necessity for both the EU and national governments to have the political will to form adequate Roma policy, or else, the systematic discrimination and acts of violence towards the Roma community will become more severe, and this first future scenario may become reality over the next decade.

The second possible future scenario would be more in line with the idea of a cosmopolitan Europe. Within this scenario, the EU succeeds in truly integrating all different nation-states and cultural backgrounds within its territory. Feelings of nationalism, mechanisms of othering and exclusion, discrimination and eventually the internal nation-state borders would actually disappear. Here, we will see an authentic cosmopolitan Europe, where everyone enjoys equal possibilities and care, and the cosmopolitan lifestyle of the Roma people would fit well within the reality of the EU as a whole. Although I can highly appreciate this future scenario, I think it will never become reality. The increase of nationalist feelings over the last decade certainly implies a contrasting future for the EU and the people living in it. In respect to both scenarios, one thing is for sure: the Roma community still has considerable time to pass before their livelihoods would be equal to those of EU standards, if one is confident that this is actually going to become reality.
Chapter 4. Cosmopolitanism and the EU.

The main question that will be dealt with in this chapter is to what extent cosmopolitanism is present, in the EU. In other words, are there any characteristics of cosmopolitanism to be seen in respect to the EU, and, if so, where are they to be found? At the time I was in high school, my teachers in geography and civics started to tell us about the EU. I remember vividly that I thought the EU was something new; an organisation of nations and states, combining them into one big country characterized by free movement of people and goods. At that time I thought of the concept of one Europe as something that would grow towards a global level, resulting in an open and free world without war and social-economic inequalities. Little did I know about the fact that this is not the actual case. I guess I was being naive. This chapter will focus on the EU and its degree of cosmopolitan characteristics. It will become clear that the EU does not fit well within the classic cosmopolitan ideals of the Stoics and Kant. There are strong discrepancies between the ideals of moral cosmopolitanism and the ‘cosmopolitan’ realities of the EU. The ever existing minority status of the Roma people that are living within the EU, fed by their poor livelihoods and social exclusion, as dealt with in the previous chapter, strongly supports these discrepancies.

4.1 Cosmopolitan Ambitions.

The EU already has been described as the first international organization with cosmopolitan credentials. Yet the EU itself never invokes cosmopolitanism in its deliberations on citizenship, civil society or European identity, and cosmopolitanism is not part of the self-identity of the EU. Simplified, this means that the EU is often interpreted as a cosmopolitan polity-in-the-making by social scientists at this time, mainly because of its capacity for transnationalized decision making, but EU institutions and their policy makers never mention the concept of cosmopolitanism in their official discourse (Rumford, 2008). Still, social scientists keep arguing that the EU, along with the legal and political institutions that have evolved since its founding, constitutes something like a post-national order and that the EU acts as an example, even a normative and practical source, for cosmopolitan innovations in the nearby future (Brown, 2010). In line with this, it is interesting to note that a considerable proportion of present-day EU citizens consider themselves as what could be called cosmopolitan (Pichler, 2008). As a result, it is common to see reference to Kant’s ideas on political cosmopolitanism within the debates on what the cosmopolitan degree of the EU is and what it should become; a Kantian cosmopolitan federation of independent states (Brown, 2010). One might say that there are great cosmopolitan ambitions to be found within the scientific and philosophical arenas of the EU at this very moment, but what do they mean and why are all of the citizens of the EU still living within the context of nation-state borders?

4.2 Cosmopolitan Realities.

One might rightfully say that the idealistic concepts of Stoic and Kantian cosmopolitanism do not correspond well with the cosmopolitan reality of the EU. We could say that the EU does show some Kantian qualities, namely when it comes to the foundation international human rights and law, but when it comes to Kant’s concept of cosmopolitan right, as dealt with in this reports chapter on cosmopolitan theory, the EU does not live up to the ideal picture (Brown, 2010). The lack of tolerance towards different groups of people, based on religion or ethnicity, that is present in the greater part of today’s EU member-states, embodies an important issue that makes it practically impossible for a true cosmopolitan EU to evolve. If the EU should become a cosmopolitan community, it has to guarantee the coexistence of different ethnic, religious and
political forms of life across national borders based on the principle of cosmopolitan open-mindedness and tolerance (Beck & Grande, 2007). Sadly, this cosmopolitan tolerance remains a characteristic of a European utopia. The question which is in desperate need of an answer does not appear to be an easy one; why does the cosmopolitan reality of the present-day EU not correspond with the cosmopolitan ambitions of its academics?

4.2.1 The Economic Union.

Although it is safe to say that the EU as we know it today represents the world’s most advanced post-national constellation of states, it is risky for political and social scientists to automatically use it as a case study when they are studying or even developing models of supranational, perhaps even global, governance. As one might expect, many scientists make use of a cosmopolitan lens when they think about the EU and its possibilities for evolving into the Kantian world of universal egalitarianism; a world in which all people are treated as equals on religious, political, economic, social and cultural grounds. In reality however, the EU as we know it slowly evolved out of a functional, largely economic project to a more complex political enterprise. It is important to note that this European political framework, which started with the establishment of the Maastricht Treaty, was focused mainly on strengthening the internal market and next to that, introduced a status of EU citizenship. The concept of EU citizenship was not aimed at replacing national citizenship, but only to complement it and, by doing so, enhance the legitimacy of the European elites in Brussels as well as promote a stronger European identity towards the rest of the world (Horvath, 2009). I would like to emphasize that the EU does not show a history of moral cosmopolitanism, but mainly economic cosmopolitan characteristics. Hence, it is important to thoroughly think about the cosmopolitan lens that is used when scientists or politicians are debating on the EU. Although it is claimed that EU citizenship provides equal access to the individual-based legal status of union citizenship (Horvath, 2009) the question remains whether this form of equality has the biggest priority on the European cosmopolitan agenda. As David Harvey states in his paper *Cosmopolitanism and the Banality of Geographical Evils* (2000), cosmopolitanism regained interest during the late 20th century, because of a desperate need to ensure global economic, ecological and political security in the face of an out-of-control free-market liberalism. In line with this, Harvey argues that at this time cosmopolitanism has acquired so many nuances and meanings, that is has become hard to see what a particular concept of cosmopolitanism is aimed at; managing a transnational market, protecting international political and economic interests, or critically rethinking our worlds geography in terms of socio-economic inequalities. In case of the EU, I would like to argue that its cosmopolitan characteristics still are predominantly focused on an economic agenda. The recent political debate on a possible North-South division amongst the member states of the European Monetary Union, introducing two kinds of Euro currency in order to ensure economic health, strengthens this statement.

4.2.2 Nationalism.

Nationalism poses the opposite of cosmopolitanism. Although, as Robert Audi (2009) suggests, nationalism and cosmopolitanism do not have to exclude each other, most often nationalists and cosmopolitans are in strong disagreement. Since the late 1980’s, an increase in ethnic conflict among many European countries has revived the public perspective on nationalism. Different ethnic communities, being either dominant or formed by separatist minorities, respectively argued for national sovereignty or national self-determination (Kaufmann, 2003). Again, it is important to note that the Roma community never has and never will argue for national self-determination, but also, it is important to note that nationalism, and the feeling of predominantly carrying a national identity, is far from gone among the current ‘European population’. Table 1 on the next page, as copied from Florian Pichler’s paper *How Real is Cosmopolitanism in Europe* (2008), embodies part of the outcome from the 64.2 edition of the Eurobarometer; resulting
from a 2005 survey among approximately 1000 respondents from each of the EU member-states, as well as Turkey, Croatia and Northern Cyprus, that was set up by the European Commission. Although one should not consider this table as something conclusive, it does provide a useful tool for showing that within the EU of this time, personal identification at predominantly a national level, instead of a European or world-level, is fairly dominant. It shows that national citizenship most often precedes or even excludes the notion of European citizenship, let alone world citizenship.

Table 1: European self-views; the nation, Europe, and the world (N=28,929).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In the near future, do you see yourself as...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European and nationality</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality and European</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality only</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Do you ever think of yourself as not only a national but also European? Does this happen...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>And do you ever think of yourself as a citizen of the world? Does this happen...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the EU does still embody an institution that is formed by a mosaic of nation-states that enjoy sovereignty to a large extent, more and more transnational, and hence to be considered cosmopolitan, governmental initiatives and NGO’s that focus on particular human interests both at the European level and beyond, are established. As Chris Rumford suggests in his article *Cosmopolitanism and Europe; Towards a new EU studies agenda* (2005), Europeans; EU citizens, are having to re-orient themselves in a post-Western, post-national, and post-welfare state Europe, and also develop an open stance towards the rest of the world. The question remains to what extent this re-orientation will actually happen among the populations of all EU member-states and will become part of the dominant train of thought. As I see it, nationalism among EU member-states - which could be considered as extreme patriotic nationalism more and more, as reaffirmed by the numerous newspaper articles written on the revival of extreme right-wing political movements and ethnicity based violence over the last few years - remains to be a highly relevant constraint for cosmopolitanism, as seen from any perspective (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002), to develop further.
4.2.3 Changing Borders.

The political geography of Europe has, for centuries, been based around the borders of its nation-states. The ability of the nation-state to control its territory and police its borders has been essential to the practices of war and diplomacy, the legitimacy of governments, immigration policies and trade. But processes of globalization and EU integration have transformed the borders of Europe and the nation-states within it. While globalization theorists tend to posit an opening up of borders...the changed nature of the border is often left unexamined and it is assumed that borders have simply disappeared (Spruce, 2007).

Although the internal nation-state borders of the EU could be considered as fading lines, borderwork is still highly relevant within the EU of this time. As Chris Rumford suggests in his paper Europe’s Cosmopolitan Borders (2008), the EU’s traditional nation-state borders are being replaced by, as he suggests, cosmopolitan borders. Control over bordering and re-bordering is no longer solely in the hands of nation-state governments. Bordering processes for one have been passed upwards, to the larger scale of the EU. Frontex, a regulatory body designed to coordinate the operational cooperation between EU member-states when it comes to ensuring border security, has been the result of this up-scaling. Contemporary bordering processes have also shifted downwards. Not only towards sub-national regional and urban levels, but also towards a wide range of societal actors; interest groups, citizens, enterprises and so on. As Rumford suggests, at this time, the most important questions are concerned with who is in charge of particular bordering processes and what a particular border might be established for to protect.

Rumford, among many other social scientists, puts a lot of emphasis on the variety of borders. Borders are not only established to represent a physical line around the territories of nation-states. There are also social, cultural, economic, communicational and educational borders that influence our daily lives. Each type of border could be opened up or fortified. Hence, borders can be processed in such a way that they either reduce or facilitate cross-border mobility. In line with this, it is always important to evaluate why particular borders exist within their particular context and how these are put to use. Hence, ‘Borderwork’, embodies a very powerful tool in order to either facilitate a point of access for that what is considered welcome, or pose a barrier against that what is not welcome. In my opinion, it is of the highest importance to realize that, despite a notion of nation-state borders changing into cosmopolitan borders, there will always be relatively powerful people at work in bordering and re-bordering processes. As I see it, in order to either cross, or facilitate a particular border, one has to have some kind of feature that is absent on the other side of that border. In case of the Roma people, which are powerless in respect to practically all types of borders, as they are widely discriminated, often live in extreme poverty, and often do not enjoy education, this concept of cosmopolitan borders does not inherently mean that it will become easier to cross them. Also, in respect to the Roma case, I would like to note that the apparent fading of the internal nation-state borders of the EU, does not automatically mean that it will become easier to revive their traditional nomadic way of life, as their relative powerlessness in total has resulted in a widespread inability to mobilize themselves at all.

4.2.4 A Cosmopolitan Elite.

In line with the paragraph above, I would like to argue that cosmopolitanism in practice, still inherently requires one’s relative powerful position within society, whether political, economic, cultural, or intellectual. Although the EU as we know it today does show some cosmopolitan qualities, of which their desirability can be debated on, its potential probably remains yet to be realized, and hence the EU should not be considered as a cosmopolitan society. Younger people, the better educated, and people in managerial occupations are more likely to see themselves as Europeans or world-citizens. Also, populations or the richer countries are more likely to consider themselves cosmopolitan (Pichler, 2008); respectively intellectual and economic elites.
It appears as if EU cosmopolitanism is not able to get rid of its elite status. The idea of popular sovereignty does not harmonize with the current power-relations in the EU, as its principle appears to be transformed into international law agreements that are implemented based on a top-down scope (Eriksen, 2005). Although parts of nation-state sovereignty have been replaced by governing agencies that can be considered cosmopolitan, and there are non-governmental initiatives that show parts of a moral cosmopolitan ideal, the political agenda of the present-day EU does not seem to incorporate a cosmopolitan perspective (Rumford, 2005). I would like to suggest that the EU could indeed be used to set as an example of a cosmopolitan polity-in-the-making, if its governing agencies start to actively embrace the ideas on how we could conceptualise cosmopolitanism, and how we could put its moral-political philosophy into actual practice.
Chapter 5. Conclusion.

The Roma community represents a group of people like no other. A nomadic existence lies at the heart of their cultural history, as they have been migrating all over Europe and the rest of the world for centuries. They represent a group of true grassroots cosmopolitans, as they live without borders in the broadest sense of the word. Not only the borders of nation-states are left aside in Roma culture, but also social and cultural borders. Their social values ensure everyone, apart from cultural background, enjoys equal treatment and those who are in need, are guaranteed to receive special care. Within the EU of present-day, such moral cosmopolitan values do not correspond with reality. Within the context of the EU, cosmopolitan ideals and ambitions are in constant battle with the concepts of nationalism, globalization, bordering and governance. Next to that, EU cosmopolitanism is characterized by merely top-down ambitions of supranational European government agencies, representing both political and intellectual elites. As a result, there is a lot of uncertainty about how to successfully deal with the Roma people, and the socio-economic problems that haunt them, at the level of the nation-state, which still is the most decisive political organ within the EU of this time. For the Roma people, this means that their most often - marginalized social and economic position within society is still existent. The question on how to deal with these problems does not come with an obvious answer. EU based policy plans on the improvement of the Roma livelihoods seem to work out for just an insignificant amount, and the local or national initiatives also have little positive results. To get out of their position of Europe’s outcasts, the Roma community will need to organize their scattered and locally differentiated communities across the territory of the EU and they will have to form a strong, common political agenda. Although politics are no part of traditional Roma culture, this is probably the only way to make themselves heard and eventually better their political, social and economic position as Europe’s largest ethnic minority group. Also, the EU should increase its focus on the development of supranational legislation, in such a way that the discrimination and social segregation of the Roma people can be put to an end among its member-states.

Despite the fact that the Roma often live at the margins of society, they do provide us with an inspiring set of cultural beliefs that prove the actual existence of the classic cosmopolitan train of thought. Hence, the Roma case provides us with a tool to strip cosmopolitanism of its elite status. Cosmopolitanism should no longer be considered as an armchair philosophy, as its core values are embedded in the Roma world-perspective. As migration is part of their traditional lifestyle, and not merely driven by an economic agenda, the Roma have always engaged with other cultures across our world. Although the Roma do feel a strong attachment to their own ethnic and cultural identity, the concept of multiculturalism has no meaning to them, as all human-beings are welcomed into their community in an equal manner, no matter how they look or what they believe. Besides that, the Roma community shows considerable cultural differentiation, which reaffirms their open-mindedness; although they all prioritise the essence of morality and social values in the same way, cultural renewal and its ‘fine-tuning’ to a particular social context, has never been a source of reluctance. I would like to argue that the concept of multiculturalism originates from a society where people started (d)evaluating others for their particular cultural beliefs; a society formed by a mosaic of nation-states and nationalist feelings. If one lives by a predominantly national feeling of belonging, encounters with new cultures could easily be perceived as dangerous. Xenophobia and the increasingly protectionist forms of nation-state immigration laws within the present-day EU seem to underpin this statement. For the Roma, the concept of nationalism is also meaningless. They have never had any ambitions towards establishing a nation-state of their own, as this would inherently call for the need of an
army and the establishment of a governmental order. The Roma perspectives on both the military and politics are very instructive, as they argue that both have no practical use if everyone would encounter one another with the right dose of respect and tolerance. After all, we are all citizens of the same world right?

As the Roma do not occupy themselves with so-called borderwork, they also provide us with a useful tool to pose an important comment of critique towards the EU. Here, I would like to argue that processes of (re)bordering are most often aimed at excluding ‘things’, whether those things are embodied by particular countries, for instance Turkey, people, for instance African immigrants looking for a job within the territory of the EU, or even religions, as at this time many EU member-states are closing their national and social borders for Muslims. As I see it, these processes of (re)bordering are evidently blocking the way for a cosmopolitan society to become reality, which is a pity, because I would argue that a cosmopolitan society; a Roma-cosmopolitan society, where everyone is able to live by their own beliefs in a world that regulates itself on the basis of mutual respect and tolerance, appeals to everyone. Perhaps I am being naïve again. It appears as if the need for people to accumulate power, and prioritise their own interests above all, most often is the natural order of human-beings. Perhaps the sceptical early natural law theorists were right.

In line with the above, I think the moral core of cosmopolitanism will never become reality. Although I highly appreciate the attempts of implementable conceptualisation by its advocates, I think the notion that we are all citizens of the same global world will never become the dominant train of thought. I can see that it might be useful to subdivide cosmopolitanism into different concepts - from a state of mind to a particular skill -, or relate them to separate aspects of human life - from economy to politics -, in order to get a better understanding of our globalizing world, but I do think its essence embodies an unrealistic and utopian world perspective. Although I do understand the debates on apparent economic cosmopolitanism, and the emerging of cultural cosmopolitanism, I do not see a future for moral-political cosmopolitanism. I would like to hope for the opposite, and witness the rise of David Held’s democratic global order, as a compromise between our complex world where governance floats around on an extreme multitude of governmental, social, and physical levels, and the ‘Roma world’, where there appears to be no need for politics.

To put a conclusive end to this report, it is time to revisit the central question:

To what extent does the cosmopolitan lifestyle of the Roma and Sinti people harmonize with the cosmopolitan reality of the European Union and its member-states?

The hypothesis, as formulated in chapter 1, seems to be right on the dime. The cosmopolitan lifestyle of Europe’s Roma (and Sinti) population does not harmonize well with the cosmopolitan reality of the EU and its member-states. Indeed, the EU could be perceived as a cosmopolitan polity-in-the-making, by focusing on its developments in a common supranational form of governance and the status of its open market, but without a doubt, its member-states’ governments conflict with the ideals of moral cosmopolitanism. I would like to argue that the Roma community represents the actual ideal of European, and even cosmopolitan, citizenship. Therefore, it is a real shame that they are being imprisoned by the mosaic of nation-states, and victimized by the inconvenient outcomes of nationalism, at this very day. In line with this, I think it is important to make an example of the Roma community in the debate on both contemporary cosmopolitan theory, and the development of new and improved European governmental and legal institutions. Perhaps, the Roma example will provide us with the tool to permanently eradicate the inhumane and un-cosmopolitan characteristics of our present-day EU, and gain a better understanding of the reality of moral grassroots cosmopolitanism.
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Figure 3: Roma Population Percentages. Retrieved from: www.migrationinformation.org (2010)
Table 2: Roma Population, Poverty, Unemployment & Education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Total population (official, million)</th>
<th>Roma population</th>
<th>% of Roma living in households below $4.30 per day (PPP)</th>
<th>% of Roma living in households below $2.15 per day (PPP)</th>
<th>Unemployment rate (%)</th>
<th>Enrolment rate (%)</th>
<th>Literacy rate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1,261</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia &amp; Herzegovina</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>4,486</td>
<td>4,000-5,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>11,746</td>
<td>100,000-300,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>189,964</td>
<td>550,000-600,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>5,300-6,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macedonia</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>53,879</td>
<td>220,000-260,000</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>536,140</td>
<td>1,800,000-2,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>108,400</td>
<td>450,000-500,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>89,920</td>
<td>350,000-360,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. EU Flyer on Roma Inclusion.

The 10 Common Basic Principles for Roma Inclusion

These principles aim at guiding the EU institutions and Member States when they design and implement new policies or projects for Roma inclusion.

They represent a legally non-binding political declaration. However, Member States have shown their commitment to having future initiatives on these principles:

1. Constructive, pragmatic and non-discriminatory policies
2. Explicit but not exclusive targeting
3. Inter-cultural approach
4. Aiming for the mainstream
5. Awareness of the gender dimension
6. Transfer of evidence-based policies
7. Use of Community Instruments
8. Involvement of regional and local authorities
9. Involvement of civil society
10. Active participation of the Roma

Some of the Principles are on issues that are well-established, while others are very innovative, such as:

- “Explicit but not exclusive targeting” which, instead of singling out the Roma as a distinct group, aims at improving the living standards and environment of all those living in similar conditions.

- The “inter-cultural approach,” which stresses that both the Roma and mainstream society have much to learn from each other and that inter-cultural learning and skills deserve to be promoted alongside combating prejudices and stereotypes.

- “Aiming for the mainstream” which emphasizes that policies should support the Roma to participate fully in mainstream society, rather than developing separate Roma settlements or labour markets.

Facts and Figures

The Roma are one of the biggest ethnic minorities in the EU. An estimated 10-12 million Roma live in different Member States, often in difficult situations. According to a recent survey* which asked the Roma about their experiences:

- Half of all the Roma questioned had been discriminated against at least once in the previous year.
- Of those who have been discriminated against, each person experienced on average 11 incidents of discrimination over a 12-month period.
- 69% of the Roma questioned consider that discrimination on the basis of someone’s ethnic or immigrant background is widespread in their country.


Legislation

The EU’s power to combat discrimination is based on Article 19 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union.

Since 2000, Member States have agreed a number of pieces of legislation which provide important rights for the Roma:

- The Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC), which was adopted in 2000, prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race or ethnic origin in the workplace as well as in other areas of life such as education, social protection, healthcare and access to goods and services.

- The Framework Decision on combating racism and xenophobia (2008/111/EC), which was agreed in 2008, provides an approximation of the laws and regulations which Member States should follow for offences involving racism and xenophobia.

- The Directive on the right to move and reside freely within the EU (2004/38/EC), which was adopted in 2004, guarantees that all citizens have the right of free movement throughout the EU, that they are working or seeking employment, studying, or are self-sufficient or retired.

Funding

The European Commission’s approach regarding Roma issues is explicit but not exclusive. Roma inclusion is not dealt with separately from mainstream EU activities, but instead special attention is paid to the particular situation of the Roma within all EU policies and instruments which aim at improving the economic situation, health, living conditions, employment opportunities, cultural understanding and education of all Europeans.
Summary.

Social and political theorists are continuously debating the meaning and conceptualisation of contemporary cosmopolitanism. Distinctions have been made between political, moral, economic, and cultural cosmopolitanism. Also, it has been suggested that cosmopolitanism could be perceived and put to use in several ways; form cosmopolitanism as a state of mind to a skill that could be trained. For sure, cosmopolitanism does not stick to one definite concept...

Often times, social and political theorists use the European Union as an example in the debate on cosmopolitan realities and how cosmopolitanism should be conceptualised as a framework for governmental practice. Although the EU does show some cosmopolitan qualities as a supranational governmental institution, one should remain critical towards its cosmopolitan achievements. As an in-depth study on the European Roma community shows, there is also an evident lack of moral-political cosmopolitanism to be seen in the context of the EU. It is important to realize that the separate member-states still embody the governments with the most decisive power. Hence, the EU does not represent a full-fledged cosmopolitan society.

It will become clear that the Roma show a great deal of cosmopolitan philosophy in their culture and lifestyle. I would like to argue that the Roma community is set as an example for ‘real’ cosmopolitanism before the EU. The Roma represent authentic grassroots cosmopolitanism, in stead of a top-down form of cosmopolitan initiatives, as formulated by Europe’s political and intellectual elites. One should acknowledge that there is a discrepancy to be seen between the cosmopolitan ambitions and possibilities of the EU, and the European reality of Roma exclusion and marginalization.

If we use the Roma community and their unique cultural traits and moral values as a source of inspiration, the debate on contemporary cosmopolitanism may well reset its focus from establishing EU-like institutions, on more pressing issues, such as discrimination and the many inequalities that exist within our world’s society; issues that should be considered unjustifiable from a moral cosmopolitan perspective.