

SOME CONTEMPORARY CRITICAL COSMOPOLITANISMS
AND ANTHROPOLOGY

Ruth Fitzgerald¹

BOOKS REVIEWED:

COSMOPOLITANISM AND THE LEGACIES OF DISSENT

Edited by Tamara Caraus and Camil Parvu

Florence: Taylor and Francis, 2014, 304 pp.

ISBN 9781317645023 (hardback)

ISBN 9781315761381 (ebook)

WE THE COSMOPOLITANS. MORAL AND EXISTENTIAL CONDITIONS
OF BEING HUMAN

Edited by Lisette Josephides and Alexandra Hall

Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2014, 186 pp.

ISBN 9781782382768 (hardback)

ISBN 9782782382775 (institutional ebook)

WHOSE COSMOPOLITANISM? CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES, RELATIONALITIES
AND DISCONTENTS

Edited by Nina Glick Schiller and Andrew Irving

Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2015, 253 pp.

ISBN 9781782384458 (hardback)

ISBN 9781782384465 (ebook)

COSMOPOLITANISM AND TRANSLATION: INVESTIGATIONS INTO THE
EXPERIENCE OF THE FOREIGN

By Esperança Bielsa

New York: Routledge, 2016, 188 pp.

ISBN 9781138946385 (hardback)

ISBN 9781138946392 (paperback)

ISBN 9781315670843 (ebook)

In keeping with the topic of this special issue on peripheral cosmopolitanisms, the books chosen for this review have been selected with an eye to their critical rather than mainstream visions of the cosmopolitan. Thus these texts speak to some of the recent themes in the cosmopolitan literature that are typified by efforts to resist overly utopian or homogenising readings of cosmopolitanism in favour of exploring its partial, contested and aspirational nature. An additional task has been to trace within these newer sources, their references and explanations of what it is that is currently understood as a distinctly 'anthropological' approach to critical cosmopolitanisms.

Even a decade ago, the cosmopolitan literatures were so extensive that well respected compendiums and 'short guides to...' routinely set up caveats around the extraordinary size and proliferation of material within this subject area (Rovisco and Nowicka 2013). The interest continues and the task to explain cosmopolitanisms becomes somewhat daunting, and so I have chosen two helpful but relatively recently published accounts of particularly 'anthropological' studies of the cosmopolitan against which to reflect the critical cosmopolitan texts reviewed in this essay. First, in relation to the manner in which cosmopolitan ideas and practices can arise within subaltern groups and be localised or rooted into specific historical and social contexts are the non-elite and oxy-moron depictions of cosmopolitanism well delineated by Werbner (2008) in her widely cited edited collection of essays linking cosmopolitan theory and anthropology. One of the findings of this review essay is the confirmation of the ways in which Werbner's earlier work continues to inspire and authorise critical approaches to cosmopolitanisms.

Another less frequently cited collection on anthropological approaches to the cosmopolitan is the edited special issue of *Social Anthropology* by Huon Wardle (2010). Several authors featured in this earlier work continue to appear in the newer collections reviewed for this essay and demonstrate a sustained interest in the topic. Wardle, in the introduction to his special issue, defines an 'anthropological' approach to cosmopolitanism by slicing off a theoretical anthropology engaged with the concept of the cosmopolitan from ethnographic understandings of the cosmopolitan. Such a separation of method from theory will be attractive to some readers but will also be contestable to many others. It denies the constant intertwining of theories and methods, and the dialectic between smaller empirical and larger scale social science theorising, which make the selected texts in this review such dynamic reads. Alternative schools would argue that theoretically informed ethnographies are a characteristic epistemological marker of contemporary anthropological discourses (Hammersley and Atkinson 2007, Okely 2012, Wolcott 2008). Clearly, other anthropologists

have interrogated the cosmopolitan before the texts that I have chosen for my baseline. For example, Kuper (1994) is such an example and in a much earlier time frame, for New Zealand anthropologists, Te Rangi Hiroa and Makareti Papakura in the early twentieth century were living exemplars of a cosmopolitan anthropology. But my focus for this review is very contained. How are the selected texts for this review testing, extending and deepening our contemporary anthropological understandings of the cosmopolitan?

Perhaps on a slightly contrary note to my stated purpose, my review begins by considering the political science collection entitled *Cosmopolitanism and the Legacies of Dissent*. I do this because the editors expressly select Werbner's (2008) collection of anthropological writing as the closest body of knowledge to their own. The editors of this work, Caraus and Parvu are Romanian scholars of political science who have written several individual works on the topic of cosmopolitanism prior to this coedited volume of essays. Caraus in particular has been particularly prolific moving on to produce a further two new edited collections (with two different co-editors) that explore postfoundational cosmopolitanism (Caraus and Lazea 2015; Caraus and Paris 2016).

Based in a disciplinary box of political science (although there is a contribution to the collection from one sociologist), the *Legacies of Dissent* sets out to explore the cosmopolitan potential of a variety of forms of dissent that contest, question and challenge political regimes and other institutionalised forms of power. The cosmopolitan potential of the various forms of dissent lies in their capacity to share broader meanings of a better and more just social arrangement. Their work then is well aligned with critical cosmopolitanisms by recognising plurality of dissenting views within any particular cosmopolitan-styled approach to a better society and by rejecting as illusory the aim of a consensus between disparate groups, or the overruling of such outcomes by an elite and well educated few. Their work draws on anthropological understandings of cosmopolitanism as 'new' cosmopolitanism, 'post colonial' or 'vernacular'. Although they share an interest in practice and action rather than ideas, their proposed 'cosmopolitanism of dissent' differs from the new anthropological cosmopolitanism because it is not a dialectical process. There is no resultant synthesis of the tensions between local and global, or elite or subaltern. Instead, they understand dissent as a process that seeks the complete rejection of unjust power. This perception of a dialectic at work in critical anthropological theorising of the cosmopolitan is also characteristic of anthropological approaches in two of the other review texts. For the contributing political scientists in this collection, the editors leave up to each contributor the definition of the type of cosmopolitanism with which they engage and so each author wrestles with

a different approach and definitional starting point.

For some of the articles, the text remains focussed on philosophical concepts of more relevance to political scientists. However the arguments may still interest many anthropologists, such as Rozpedowski's study of the tensions between European Union legislation in response to changing demographics of membership of the European Union with respect to various religious expressions, and Arneil's careful discussion of a theory of global citizenship based on human rights as practice and as shared fate. The most refreshing readings come from engagements with theorists who are more well known within rather than outside of their countries. One example is the call by Popa to rediscover analyses of the work of Soviet East European dissidents, such as Havel's study of 1950s Czechoslovakia and Hungary and 1970s Solidarity Poland. In this volume, Popa (p.31- 45) values Havel's concept of agonistic realism and his rejection of ideology in order to avoid nationalist political projects. Popa specifically proposes Havel's work in contrast to Nussbaum's (1996) and Appiah's (2005) grounded cosmopolitan concerns over the dangers of nationalism. Popa argues that the latter author's works reify a static and ahistorical model of human nature and 'undercut their critique of nationalism' (p.32). This is not perhaps a reading of their work that all would take. It is perhaps one that lacks an ethnographic feel for the self-changing required in getting to know one another as the basis of cosmopolitanism moral values, in Appiah's case, or in acquiring an education, in Nussbaum's case. Even so, there is much in these and other discussions within the book to interest anthropologists. Discussions of San Suu Kyi, Gandhi and Tagore, Martin Luther King, Nelson Mandela are fascinating for their focus on the lifetime achievements of these dissidents and civil disobedience performers. Likewise, the third section of the book which explores cosmopolitanism from the perspective of global resistance movements has some interestingly detailed study of several resistance movements. For example, Calabrese's chapters on the NO TAV movement in the Piedmont Valley in northern Italy explores a decade-long movement to reject the imposition of a rapid transit system through their communities. The *valsusini* of the region found themselves to be a political community because of the consciousness widening qualities of their practices of resistance (an exercise in cosmopolitan imagining) rather than through any shared albeit strongly localised adherence to a 'not in my backyard' resistance. Their orientation to the proposed TAV railway was instead 'not in anyone's backyard' (p.207). Parvu's discussion of the prefigurative politics of Occupy Wall Street is another chapter that is of direct interest as he argues to understand it as a spectacularly successful example of the cosmopolitanism of dissent.

The strength of the work (its clearly defined object of study on three particular strands of dissent within the diffuse and complex meanings of dissent namely as dissidence, as civil disobedience and as global resistance) becomes its weakness at various points. For example, at the time of writing, subsequent to the supremacy of Brexit voters in pushing the United Kingdom outwards from the European Union, we see an example of what is in part at least a popular anti-globalisation dissent manifesting through the ‘mostly just’ means of a democratic referendum and achieving very significant social change despite the wider citizenry being quite sharply divided in terms of the project. The carefully devised compartments upon which the collection is based then fall apart as what people are dissenting against, ie. totalitarian regimes, an ordinarily just society, or global governance, become very difficult to cleanly disentangle. For an alternative reading of dissent against global governance the edited collection by Theodossopoulos and Kirtsglou (2010) makes for anthropologically more satisfying reading, providing context and complexity to expressions of discontent. In fairness this is, of course, because the contributors are able to devote the entirety of the introduction and conclusion to just this one topic. Caraus and Parvu, in contrast, have carved out a really ambitious topic. With appropriate caveats, they argue that their work shows that cosmopolitanism affords a new vocabulary for people in opposition, cosmopolitan ideas can provide practical instruments of resistance as well as building bridges between different dissenting communities, and finally that as activists and dissenters share their knowledge of cosmopolitanism it becomes a lingua franca in which the language of rights operates as symbol as well as a norm. In these senses, they regard a cosmopolitanism of dissent as powerfully enabling of social change. Their collection is of interest to readers with an anthropological background, for generalists because of the fame of many of the subjects being studied, and for specialists it has a direct and immediate value to political anthropology.

The collection by Josephides and Hall (2014), *We the cosmopolitans*, is, in contrast, a deeply anthropological discussion of the nature and theorising of cosmopolitanism from a strongly phenomenological perspective. A useful bridge between this collection and the preceding one is the chapter by Eriksen which discusses the variety of local and international responses in Denmark to the cartoons of the prophet Mohammed. These were first published in a small provincial newspaper but with ramifications reaching out around the world for the next five weeks or so – including demonstrations and even deaths. Eriksen successfully argues that political scientists view cosmopolitanism as a concept in a rather sceptical view – citing concerns with its potential to become a ‘shared global language’ (p.136) that obliterates differences, and also the lack of congruence between abstracted aims of a universal human rights and local

examples of inhuman treatment. (The first book reviewed in this essay could be used as an example of such an approach). Anthropological studies of cosmopolitanism, Eriksen argues instead, focus on the everyday discourses and practices of cosmopolitanism (p.137). His chapter concludes by emphasising anthropology's contributions to studies of cosmopolitanism as studies of ongoing solidarity demonstrated by shared human practices from the bottom up to achieve social change. One of the issues that Eriksen and the preceding collection also raise is the proliferation of literature and disciplinary approaches to cosmopolitanisms. As Hall, citing Hart, eloquently sums it up in her conclusion to the entire collection, 'Ethnography shares with great literature the capacity to achieve universality through going deeply into particular personalities, relations and places' (Hall 2004, 446). This is the approach that marks Josephides and Hall's entire collection and suggests an excellent goal for anthropology's engagement with cosmopolitanism.

Marc Schiltz' chapter exploring the cosmopolitan in early encounters between Lyons Missionaries and West African rulers prioritises, in his analysis, the philosophical dimensions of a cosmopolitan sociality. That such a task is both political and critical is evidenced in his reference to Taussig's (1993) discussion of mimesis to understand how, in attempting to copy the other, we risk changing our realities. As Schiltz terms it – his work explores the imperilment of the self that is 'the liability of [a cosmopolitan] hospitality' (p.113). Reaching out across difference for the Catholic Missionaries as well as for the African rulers they encountered entailed, for each party, the risks of losing one's own identity and influence as related secondary historical accounts suggest for the protagonists in Schiltz' chapter. Anne Gronseth's chapter on experiences of pain amongst Tamil refugees living in a remote Norwegian fishing village also shows the capacity for solidarity in the face of community disdain and catastrophic experiences of displacement. Her account offers a sort of lived micropolitics of embodied cosmopolitanism between dissimilar outcasts in the Arctic community as they share a sense of shared 'mutuality and ...emotional moral inclusion' (p.91) through the recognition of each others' suffering. Hall's chapter on the fragile bonds of connection between asylum seekers and their guards in a United Kingdom detention centre provides a fresh and convincing exploration of such potential for politicised sociality and resistance (albeit fleeting) across the taken for granted hierarchies of power within such zones of exclusion. Like most of the other chapters (such as Rapport on orderlies and his idea of 'mutual guesthood' [p.64] as a model of cosmopolitan social relations that allow the individual the space and time for self fulfilment), the focus is on the moral connections that can be made when social relations contain elements of both mutuality and vulnerability. This moral experience forms

the basis for a cosmopolitan encounter. The chapter also succeeds (along with the previously mentioned chapter by Eriksen) in highlighting how anthropology's central concerns with 'contingency, context and practice' (p.74) provide convincing accounts of the complexity and ambiguities of social life that lie closer to its lived experience than the more abstracted philosophical and homogenising sociological accounts of the cosmopolitan. The cumulative effect of this series of ethnographic vignettes of contemporary social life in which varied people respect and tolerate rather than flatten out difference, argues for the political and critical value of such ethnographies of cosmopolitanism. They demonstrate that even fleeting experiences of such morally charged social relationships may bring more tolerant and human worlds into being, providing hope in a jaded population as they do so. Whether these glimpses of hope are enough to sustain a wider critical and political response to these ethical dilemmas or whether such moments of self recognition in the other fall back into the individualised subjectivities associated with phenomenology is less clear. The book most certainly succeeds at the level of deepening anthropological theorising of the cosmopolitan and does so, for the most part, by the use of theoretically informed ethnographies.

In writing this section of the essay I note that I have doggedly woven a story line from the last chapter of the book (Josephides and Hall 2014) onwards towards the first. Ironically I read in the preface to this collection that a reviewer had suggested reversing the order of the conclusion and the introduction and with this I wholeheartedly agree. Let me turn now to my *last* but the editors' *first* chapter of the collection that is written by Ronald Stade and champions a focus on 'the self and the world' as a specifically anthropological contribution to cosmopolitan theorising. He rejects what he perceives to be a contemporary bias towards sociological definitions of cosmopolitanism in contemporary ethnographies and uses the technique of five short vignettes of the cosmopolitan that reveal its different meanings over time and disciplinary space. For example, the culturally specific meaning of the cosmopolitan in Diogenes time was more about experiencing one's animal nature (p.31) in order to challenge the social conventions of one's local world. For Kant, Stade argues cosmopolitanism was the declaration that all inhabitants of the earth had a right to move across its surface albeit in tension with the demands and jurisdictions of national borders. Simmel's writing is another area that has been productive of meanings of the cosmopolitan—this time as associated with social fantasies of foreignness in which 'the stranger is from somewhere else even if she was born and raised next door' (Stade 2014, 34 citing Simmel 1908). The consequences of this idea have been problematic in anthropology according to Stade as the cosmopolitan has tended to be understood as an aloof and

elite member of the upper or middle classes or as a certain social type. He is unconvinced by the democratising efforts of Werbner and others to argue for a vernacular cosmopolitanism suggesting that much of this work falls back into typologies of locals and cosmopolitans – a claim which he chooses not to illustrate with example, relying instead upon his opening statement that his chapter is aporetic in its argument. Stade invites us to engage with a meaning of cosmopolitanism closer to its original meaning of the cultivation of one's own strangeness and liberation from stifling orthodoxies. Such a pathway he suggests offers new research topics into cultural and social estrangement that do not reify the social and instead explore how people come to be alienated rather than how they engage across differences. One hopes that his hinted new methodologies for such a research agenda do not involve the excruciatingly detailed and publicly shared Riechian psychoanalytical therapies which he describes in great detail and from which he argues some of the constituents of the German Red Army Faction emerged. Very open ended, abutted together rather than argued, this chapter which is initially a frustrating read becomes oddly satisfying after reading many of the others. To have read Stade's argument that the frequently cited 'citizen of the world' definition of a cosmopolitan lacks any careful translation back to the Diogene's social context of citizenship is a fascinating insight. The introduction to the collection offers more of the same. What on first impression, and approached from the conventional manuscript ordering, seemed a dry typological exegesis of cosmopolitanism appears (after reading the other chapters) an insightful opportunity to think about the material within the collection and how to use these approaches and meanings of cosmopolitanism in future anthropological works. Perhaps because the weight of description and example has already been borne by the individual chapters, this chapter (when read last) convinces the audience that a kernel of political engagement might indeed exist within these falteringly spasmodic experiences of the strangeness of oneself in others. Josephides' use of Kristeva's (1991) discussion of the Freudian strangeness within ourselves is a valuable elucidation of that key theme of the collection the relationship between self and world. The phenomenological approach to cosmopolitanism that the collection creates is a deepening of the foundational work by Werbner (2008) in identifying cosmopolitanism in a particularly 'ethnographic manner' as forms of political life written of not as abstractions but as particular lived experiences. Specifically, this collection explores how taken for granted practices of kindness, experiences of shared pain and empathy can have political as well as aesthetic and moral implications.

The next collection that I overview by Schiller and Irving (2015) continues in the critical vein of the preceding works and is the result of a lengthy col-

laborative discussion from the Research Institute for Cosmopolitan Culture (RICC) at the University of Manchester, UK. A cross disciplinary group, the introduction notes that the most difficult aspect of the resulting conversations, of which the book is only one output, has been the disciplinary divides between the various members. Anthropologists within the group were noted for their focus on methodology and lived experience while those working within cultural and media studies observed with concern the lack of reflexivity concerning certain conceptual repertoires of the social sciences. The resultant collection is clearly evidence that these contradictions were overcome to produce a work that explores frailties, tensions and possibilities of a critical and situated cosmopolitanism. One is struck immediately by the common threads between this and the preceding collection for the editors note on page six that the collection will 'explore the social processes and complex moral shifts that are necessary for moments of mutual recognition and relationality to emerge or be denied within social and cultural contexts'. Even so the tones of the two texts are significantly different – a finding reflected even in the naming of the volumes – the confident embracing of a 'we' versus the hesitant scepticism behind the querying 'who'.

Organisationally, the book is laid out in two parts. Part One contains the 'provocations' which are very short essays debating, from various disciplinary perspectives, the possibilities and challenges of cosmopolitanism as an emancipatory project. Written with passion, the pieces are critical of the utopian assumptions, colonial entanglements and 'negative genealogy' (p.8) of the concept. Even so they continue to engage with it albeit with a degree of 'uncertainty, uneasiness and ambivalence' (p.8). Of all the provocations, the writing by Schiller is most upbeat as she draws on an anthropology of relationality as the underpinning for a cosmopolitan vision that explores the communal experience of living in variously situated experiences of social power. Her approach is reminiscent of feminist intersectionality theory.

Part Two consists of ten chapters that are based on original research by the RICC members. Collectively, the chapters discuss specific examples of a processual and situated cosmopolitanism drawing on examples around encounters and landscapes, cinema and the social imagination, and conflict and aspirations for its resolution. I have chosen to comment in more detail on four chapters from this section because of the individual author's allegiance to an 'anthropological' disciplinary background. Two of these chapters (by Sen and by Reeves) deal with a variety of empirically derived grounded understandings of the cosmopolitan in both expansive and constraining meanings. Sen's study of Tibetan refugees in Dharamsala provides vignettes of the numerous

antagonisms and accommodations between different elements of both the refugee and the Indian host societies (along with tourists, non-government organisation (NGO) workers and others). The most interesting finding was how the Tibetan community makes cosmopolitan links directly between the parochial and the global without the need for intermediary national institutions (p.99). Reeves explores another exotic location – the Kyrgyzstan-Uzbekistan border – with a similarly complicated and positioned array of grounded cosmopolitans. This time they are interacting with universalising NGO notions of global harmony to be achieved through strategies of ‘preventive development’. Preventive development is a programme fostering friendly cross-border cooperation and sociality that is intended to defuse ethnic tensions before they escalate. The tone of the chapter is rather bleak, for the NGOs are disbanded, conflicts intensify and Reeves concludes by reflecting on the problem of translating cosmopolitan principles into policy and the necessity to examine cosmopolitics against the backdrop of political formations within the state. By focussing on the need for cosmopolitan openness to others, Reeves argues the programme unintentionally created and then highlighted a presumed insularity and intolerance that then needed to be overcome. Both chapters fall closely into Wardle’s (2010) typographies of ‘ethnographies of cosmopolitanisms’ and they are well worth reading.

The chapters by Schiller and also by Irving take a deeper view of cosmopolitanism and extend anthropological thinking around the issue. Schiller’s chapter argues for the value of a new approach to migration studies that she terms ‘diasporic cosmopolitanism’. The term attempts to conceptually overcome the dichotomous approaches of previous migration studies in which migrants are understood as perpetual strangers to their hosts. In keeping with the previous collection, the solidarities achieved are fleeting and partial across local and transnational loyalties. Her work complicates notions of the migrant to include stigmatised postmigration generations. She also notes the contradictory ways in which the urban poor can be simultaneously ostracised and displaced while also contributing significantly to those socialising experiences that make big cities ‘liveable’ through urban regeneration processes. The chapter crystallises around a study of a group of various refugees living in Manchester who met together for a project exploring climate change (along with teaching video and interviewing techniques). Schiller attributes the success of the group to the orientation of the city infrastructure towards a vision of migrants that was not essentialised to their diasporic communities. The city infrastructure was also willing to invest a small amount of money in refugees as people open to engaging with others. Her work suggests that ethnographic studies of ‘when and how diasporic cosmopolitanism emerges within city-making projects’ (p.116)

have a positive value for humankind by providing information about exactly what sort of institutional space works well to enhance interconnectedness at a global level between otherwise strangers. The last chapter on which I will comment is Andrew Irving's writing on 'Language Expression and Cosmopolitan Experience'. This chapter is a real delight on several counts, not the least of which is the elegance and lucidity of his writing style. Its ethnographic method is delicately poised on a shared conversation by two participants about their thoughts and memories as they traverse aspects of the public domain of Montreal which in turn provokes them to recall certain key experiences of migration-influenced selfhood. The participants take turns to question each other and to reflect on and to photograph those elements of the city that resonate most with their experiences of being a variety of forms of 'other'. The spare transcription of snippets of these conversations and accompanying photographs provide us as readers with that varied and fleeting sense of shifting inter-subjective solidarity of the human condition that the entire collection aims to speak toward. The point of the collection is fully achieved within this single carefully crafted chapter.

The final book to be discussed in this essay is actually a sociological work but it engages with a topic that is relevant to all anthropologists – the act of translation. Bielsa argues that translation is central to the 'new cosmopolitanism' in its sense of a cosmopolitan social reality and also of cosmopolitanism as a methodology (p.1). In Bielsa's own field of translation studies, she argues that methodological cosmopolitanism with its 'new' or 'critical' style rejects a global universalism in favour of a variety of contemporary modernities and their associated tensions and conflicts. This is entirely congruent with anthropological engagements on the topic too and for translation studies it has created a shift away from nationalist studies of translation towards the study of 'translation's crucial intervention in mediating transnational communication flows' (p.5). As such, translation becomes key to the creation of international literary space, localising globalised commercial information and the production of global news. Or as Beck has noted, it is one of two foundational arts of the cosmopolitan experience, the other being bridge-building (p.6). Translation then is necessary both to communicate with the 'other' in our glocalised homes and as part of a collaborative global response to risks, but also it is part of the cosmopolitan 'imagination'. The issue that troubles Bielsa is the thought that while translation is central to these cosmopolitan projects it is rarely theorised adequately and often treated as a transparent process – although risky encounters with Babelish.com should be alerting Generation X to this at least. In her introductory chapter she discusses a sociology of translation and suggests some appropriate framings for its complexity could be 'faithfulness' or 'treason', and 'domesticat-

ing' or 'foreignising' (pp.9–10). The point being that naïve understandings of translation as neutral, mechanical, technique; impedes the critical cosmopolitan project by making the foreign falsely familiar and homogenises the earth through stripping context from the translation in order to do so. Under the section 'Living in translation', Bielsa develops the motif of the stranger as the test of adequacy *of* and capacity *for* acts of translation, and she goes on in chapters two and three to consider the stranger in relation to cosmopolitanism. She notes, for example, that the reception of strangers marks the openness of an attempt at cosmopolitanism and also that the privileged experiences of the stranger as 'foreign' can provide a leverage for political engagements. She also considers how the self reflection of a stranger explores the cosmopolitan imaginary and so by considering the stranger analytically, one can prioritise individual lived experiences of the cosmopolitan. The book then has a great deal in common with the preceding collections discussed and part one of the book (*The Stranger*) is important reading for any anthropological student of cosmopolitanism given the recurring and very fruitful motif of the stranger as vehicle for understanding the anthropologist's presence (Agar 1980). The remaining three sections of the work deal with world literature, the translation of sociology and a cosmopolitan perspective on news translation. Each section contains a detailed case study of translation as examples of these phenomena. The work is innovative, interesting, well written and I recommend the book for the clarity of presentation of these aspects of translation to critical cosmopolitan theory. At the same moment the work is somewhat troubling for an anthropological audience. Anthropology is referenced in this work but in the context of its supposed neglect of the topic of translation as a discipline. This comment is difficult to sustain empirically (see Bohannan 2003 [1961]; Hanks and Severi 2014; Keesing 1985; Rubel and Rosman 2003; Shore 2005) and even more so if we consider the four field approach to anthropology which incorporates sociolinguistics and is popularised within the United States. Furthermore, a great deal of Bielsa's discussions of cosmopolitan methodologies for sociology in the second section of part three uses the work of anthropologists (Crapanzano, Turner) and social science ethnographers with interdisciplinary readerships (Atkinson). This is in part the inevitable outcome of her definition of a sociological methodology as ethnographies of comparison. Since ethnography is such a shared methodological component of both anthropology and sociology, this section of her argument for a strictly *sociological* analysis of translation, is difficult to read with any conviction; although her further point that an analysis of translation has been missing from sociology (p.118) may have merit, given the heavy borrowings from anthropology. The extended discussion (p.121) of the Gerth and Mills translators' notes to their collection of Weber's essays is a most informative example of the key relevance of a theory

of translation when reading social theory. Her points on this topic are very well made. Bielsa also makes use of Bourdieu as a sociologist and Wacquant as a contemporary author querying flattened translations of his work. Both of these excellent writers have a home in the anthropological cannon as well and there is much that could be said for the need for a new monograph that explores anthropologies in translation.

This brings me to my last point, that anthropologists have, in recent decades, been hesitant and perhaps even ineffective at engaging publicly with the translation of our own disciplinary knowledge (Waterston and Vesperi 2009). In my own subfield of medical anthropology and kinship two of the most well received references in my undergraduate classes are written by journalists (Fadiman 1997 and Martin 2015) who translate often outdated anthropological theorising into contemporary exciting contexts. Anthropology has much to contribute to critical cosmopolitanisms both in theory and in practice, in its day to day lived experiences, and in its associated political projects, through its continued engagement in cultural translation as a practice of the discipline, and as projects of individual and collective living. That one of the anthropological collections for this review needed to be read in reverse of published order to best capture its immediacy and insight suggests that we need to engage even further in translating our findings across to a world that benefits from our sensitivity to difference and our welcome engagement with it. It also might have something to do with how Bielsa (p.116) could define an ‘anthropological approach to translation’ by drawing on Asad’s critique of Gellner’s functionalism – a tactic that then has the odd effect of presenting contemporary anthropology as though it is ‘stuck’ in the 1950s – admirable decade though it was. Drawing back even further into the discipline’s history this section also features a long extract from Lévi Strauss in order to argue for a continuing absence (*sic*) in anthropological writing of the marginal position of the native interpreter to the anthropologist as translator (p.117).

Bielsa’s writing provides a serious intellectual nudge for anthropologists in general to pay far more attention to ‘foreignising’ translations of our own discipline – an approach that could also help us in the current funding climate that cold shoulders the Humanities in general. Anthropological scholarship provides the empirical evidence to reject flattened translations of our discipline’s capacity to sustain those deep pools of philosophical reflection that inspire hospitality to others, positive engagements with difference, and a commitment to the shared and intricately linked human (and non-human) condition. And while some diehard theorists remain, from this quick study of recent examples of anthropological writing on critical cosmopolitanisms, it seems that

Werbner's (2008) vision of rooted, dialectical and ethnographic studies of the cosmopolitan are still in favour. While the focus is perhaps even more so on alienation and contestation within that cosmopolitan vision, the aspirational hope that however fleeting, human political connections can be found through shared recognition of ourselves within the other during experiences of suffering and exclusion remains. Anthropologists' political task, according to these recent texts, is to be present to translate it.

In closing, I commend each one of these texts as a worthwhile addition to higher level undergraduate student reading lists in anthropology and in the Humanities in general. That some of these texts provoke critical discussion of anthropology's distinctive role in the exploration of critical cosmopolitanisms is evidence of the intellectually stimulating field of humanities scholarship in general, and is something to be embraced and engaged with rather than avoided.

NOTES

- 1 Ruth Fitzgerald is a medical anthropologist and works as an Associate Professor within the Department of Anthropology at the University of Otago where she teaches in the undergraduate and post graduate programmes. She was recently awarded the Te Rangi Hiroa Medal for medical anthropology by the Royal Society of New Zealand and is Chair of *Sites* Editorial Board and Australasian Editor for the journal *Teaching Anthropology*. Her research interests include moral reasoning around human reproductive decision-making, ideologies of health and embodiment, oral health and the cultural meanings of new biomedical technologies. She publishes in a variety of journals including *Human Reproduction*, *Medical Anthropology Quarterly*, *Medical Anthropology*, *Sociology of Health and Illness*, *Sites*, *Cultural Anthropology*, *New Genetics and Society* and *Social Science and Medicine*.

Email: ruth.fitzgerald@otago.ac.nz

REFERENCES

- Agar, Michael H. 1980. *The Professional Stranger: An Informal Introduction to Ethnography*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Academic Press.
- Appiah, Kwame A. 2005. *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bohannon, Laura. 2003 (1961). 'Shakespeare in the Bush'. In *Conformity and*

Conflict: Readings in Cultural Anthropology, edited by James P. Spradley and David W. McCurdy, 23–32. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Caraus, Tamara and Dan Lazear, eds. 2015. *Cosmopolitanism with Foundations?* Bucharest, Romania: Zeta Books.

Caraus, Tamara and Elena Paris, eds. 2016. *Re-grounding Cosmopolitanism. Towards a Post-Foundational Cosmopolitanism*. New York and London: Routledge.

Fadiman, A. 1997. *The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down*. New York: Macmillan Publishers.

Hanks, William F., and Carlo Severi. 2014. 'Translating Worlds. The Epistemological Space of Translation'. *Hau Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4 (2): no page nos. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.14318/hau4.2.001>.

Hammersley, Martyn, and Paul Atkinson. 2007. *Ethnography: Principles and Practice* London: Routledge.

Keessing, Roger. 1985. 'Conventional metaphors and anthropological metaphysics: The problematic of cultural translation'. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 41 (2): 201–17.

Kristeva, Julia. 1991. *Strangers to Ourselves*, translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kuper, Adam. 1994. 'Culture, Identity and the Project of a Cosmopolitan Anthropology'. *Man (New Series)* 29 (3):537–554. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2804342>.

Martin, Wednesday. 2015. *Primates of Park Avenue: A Memoir*. New York, London: Simon and Schuster.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 1996. 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism'. In *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, edited by Joshua Cohen, 3–20. Boston: Beacon.

Okely, Judith. 2012. *Anthropological Practice: Fieldwork and the Ethnographic Method*. London and New York: Berg.

- Rovisco, Maria, and Magdalena Nowicka, eds. 2013. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Cosmopolitanism*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing.
- Rubel, Paula , and Abraham Rosman, eds. 2003. *Translating Cultures. Perspectives on Translation and Anthropology*. Oxford, New York: Berg.
- Shore, Cris. 2005. 'All in the Translation: Interpreting the EU Constitution'. *Sites* 2 (2):10–32.
- Taussig, Michael. 1993. *Mimesis and Alterity: A Peculiar History of the Senses*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Theodossopoulos, D., and E. Kirtsglou, eds. 2010. *United in Discontent: Local Responses to Cosmopolitanism and Globalisation*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Wardle, Huon. 2010. 'Introduction. A cosmopolitan anthropology?' *Social Anthropology* 18 (4):381–388. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-8676.2010.00120.x>.
- Waterston, Alisse, and Maria Vesperi, eds. 2009. *Anthropology off the Shelf: Anthropologists on Writing*. Malden MA: Wiley Blackwell.
- Werbner, Pnina, ed. 2008. *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism. Rooted, Feminist and Vernacular Perspectives*. London, Oxford: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wolcott, Harry. 2008. *Ethnography: A Way of Seeing* (2nd Edition). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.