Indigenous Cosmopolitans

Transnational and Transcultural Indigeneity in the Twenty-First Century

EDITED BY MAXIMILIAN C. FORTE

Introduction: Indigeneities and Cosmopolitanisms

Maximilian C. Forte

Immersed as we are in both contemporary popular media, long traditions in anthropology, and an international indigenous rights discourse that furnishes depictions of indigenous peoples as rooted in place, who are cut off yet simultaneously suffering from a modernity that is only now supposedly encroaching their territories and ways of life, then we might understandably gain an ambient sense of indigenous peoples as culturally stuck to themselves, existing for themselves and unto themselves. Heightening this misperception is the long-standing figure of the "real Indian." In North America and the Caribbean, where the concept of "real Indians" is popular and prominent, the dominant notion of real indigeneity is that it must be racially unmixed, culturally undiluted, geographically remote, and materially impoverished. Now consider instead these mundane snapshots of contemporary indigenous life: indigenous arts and crafts in an urban souvenir shop sold to European tourists; indigenous migrant laborers moving between Mexico and California; indigenous philosophies of universal humanism; indigenous peoples in the mainstream media; indigenous performers in Paris; indigenous-led development programs; international indigenous organizations; pan-Indianism; and, the powwow, coming to a city near you—already there in fact, since urban Indian centers in the United States have spearheaded the resurgence and diffusion of the powwow (Nagel, 1995, p. 954). All of these snapshots of spheres of indigenous life in the twenty-first century show us some of the new landmarks in the territory referred to as "indigenous." But why are they significant, and in what terms?

While attachments to local places, the centrality of images of a native homeland, and struggles to protect territory or regain lost lands remain central features of contemporary indigenous politics and identifications, we are told from commentators in numerous quarters that the world in which indigenous

peoples live and interact has changed considerably, enough to supposedly cast ways of being and becoming indigenous in a new light. However, the world indigenous peoples have known, from the time they became classed as "indigenous" due to the very fact of invasion and colonization by Europeans, has been a world that presumably has always been changing. Reinterpretations of the allegedly "new" ways of being and becoming indigenous have pushed some of us to understand the fact that indigenous peoples were never locked away in bounded places: Nicholas Thomas argued:

> ... while postmodernists have suddenly decided that we need to talk about cosmopolitanism and globalization, even in the eighteenth century many [Pacific] islanders had stepped outside their own societies and obtained vantage points upon their customary practices: their discourses if not their cultures were translocal and transposed. (1992, p. 218)

Thus, on top of the contemporary snapshots above, we could have added much older ones from centuries ago: indigenous peoples without a conception of "race" who deliberately adopted and assimilated others, long-distance exchanges by canoe, the development of regional lingua francas, marriage outside the group, and so forth. Still, one can certainly argue that while indigenous peoples frequently raided, traded, married, and migrated across considerable distances in the centuries before European colonization, the ruptures wrought by colonial conquests added a far broader dimension to the supra-local activities of indigenous peoples. Indigenous peoples are, as we must remember, the "legatees ... of the world's longest and most fraught engagement with globalization in its harshest forms, colonialism" (Pollock, 2002, p. 46). In addition, the changes that are often loosely referred to as "globalization" have rapidly multiplied and expanded in recent decades—so not everything is either so new, or so old, that debates about indigenous representation in anthropology can be quickly quelled.

We enter the dispute between the stereotyped images of the rooted indigene versus the transcendent globe-trotting cosmopolitan by posing the following four questions: What happens to indigenous culture and identity when being in the "original place" is no longer possible or even necessary? Does displacement, moving beyond one's original place, mean that indigeneity (being indigenous) vanishes or is diminished? How is being and becoming indigenous, experienced and practiced along translocal pathways? How are new philosophies and politics of indigenous identification (indigenism) constructed in new, translocal settings?

In addressing these questions the contributors to this volume seek to develop our understandings of cosmopolitanism, transnationalism, transculturation, and related processes and experiences of what others refer to as social and cultural globalization, as not spelling an end to ways of being and becoming indigenous. Instead, indigeneity is reengaged with wider fields, finding

newer ways of being established and projected, and acquiring new representational facets. In this collection the authors bring several ethnographic case studies to bear on issues of indigenous rootedness and displacement, raising questions about indigenous traditions of being transposed and translocal, of local roots articulated through transnational routes, and the ways that transnational cultural and material resources are sometimes used to bolster the foundations of indigenous identity and community. The focus of this collection is on contemporary indigenous experiences and case studies situated in Canada, the United States, Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean, but crossing many other borders as well. One of our aims is to debate any perceived antimony between indigeneity and cosmopolitanism, while highlighting the differences between the concepts, their overlaps, their mutually determining/eroding boundaries, and the prospects for new ways of conceptualizing these in relation to one another. The second aim involves the question of how cosmopolitanism relates to transnationalism in our understandings of indigenous cosmopolitans, while building on a small but significant corpus of contemporary research of varying relevance (i.e., Clifford, 1997; Coates, 2004; de la Cadena & Starn, 2007; Deloria, 2006; Sissons, 2005). The more theoretical and philosophical treatments are left for the next section.

Cosmopolitans and Cosmopolitanisms: Pluralizing the Field

Cosmopolitanism, conventionally speaking, is the travel partner of a number of concepts that limit the centrality of nationalism and other forms of particularism (see Cheah, 2006). As a conceptual travel partner, however, cosmopolitanism is understood as distinct from "globalization," which more often than not is equated with the spread of free market economics, free trade, free capital movement, and deregulation (Beck, 2004). While anthropologists struggled for years to gain ground for understandings of globalization as a bundle of cultural phenomena, it is evident that some feel that the battle has been lost, that globalization will always be more likely to be understood across disciplines and in the public arena as a euphemism for the spread of neo-liberal capitalism. Cosmopolitanism, on the other hand, provides safer and less contested ground for highlighting the cultural dynamics of what might otherwise have been understood as globalization. "Cosmopolitanization," as distinct from neo-liberal globalization, can be understood as:

> ... a multidimensional process that has irrevocably changed the historical "nature" of social worlds and the status of individual countries within those worlds. It involves the formation of multiple loyalties, the spread of various transnational lifestyles, the rise of nonstate political actors (from Amnesty International to the World Trade Organization), and the development of global protest movements against (neo-liberal)

globalism and for a different (cosmopolitan) globalization involving the worldwide recognition of human rights, workers' rights, global protection of the environment, an end to poverty, and so on. (Beck, 2004, p. 136)

The classic philosophical usage of the term "cosmopolitanism" was premised on the idea of a "citizen of the universe," which is not the same as utter rootlessness—a realization that will then become very important for anthropological studies of multiple, local cosmopolitans. Instead, what is imagined in the classic usage is "a universal circle of belonging that involves the transcendence of the particularistic and blindly given ties of kinship and country," a universalism of reason, rather than rootless nomadism (Cheah, 2006, p. 487). Yet "universal reason" is now too much of an abstraction that is more familiar in its Eurocentric groundings, or in the pretensions to universal representability and omniscience associated with monotheistic religions that emerged from the so-called high civilizations.

Not surprisingly, what Cheah calls proponents of a "new cosmopolitanism" attempt to dissociate cosmopolitanism from abstract, even theological notions of "universal reason," instead preferring to look for cosmopolitanism in "a variety of actually existing practical stances that are provisional and can lead to strategic alliances and networks that cross territorial and political borders" (2006, p. 491). The new cosmopolitanism consists of a synthesis of three theses: 1) that cultural and political solidarity and agency are no longer restricted to the national arena; 2) the globalization of political networks; and, 3) the formation of a "cosmopolitan consciousness" involving an "expansive form of solidarity" beyond territorial borders (Cheah, 2006, p. 491). The problem that this synthesis presents is that it tends to privilege the political over the cultural, whereas contributions to this volume tend to keep those two in balance.

Already the field of cosmopolitanism in anthropology has become one of plural and diverse cosmopolitanisms, with multiple definitions of what is cosmopolitan, and going well beyond classic Greek and Kantian origins even while doing little to indicate how cosmopolitanism in anthropology differs from related concepts of transnationalism and transculturation. There is a problem right here in fact, in getting past "the macronarrative of Western civilization," where "everything imaginable began in Greece" (Mignolo, 2002, p. 162). As a group in this volume we write against hegemonic stories of modernity that suppress coloniality and its production of differences on a planetary scale. Indeed, modern cosmopolitanism owes little to ancient Greeks. It is rooted in a different beginning: "the emergence of the Atlantic commercial circuit in the sixteenth century that linked the Spanish Crown with capitalist entrepreneurs from Genoa, with Christian missionaries, with Amerindian elites, and with African slaves" (Mignolo, 2002, p. 162). If we get past Greece, we also need to get past Immanuel Kant. Tributes to Kantian cosmopolitanism

often leave out Kant's unvarnished racism, his classification of peoples according to skin color, moral character, and presumed industriousness (or lack thereof), usually reserving the best attributes for Europeans, the worst for Amerindians and Africans, as seen in full force in the second part of his Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View (Mignolo, 2002, p. 171).

What about anthropology today? As observed from his own initial survey, Alex Hall noted that, "Cosmopolitanism can be applied to so many phenomena that the clarity of the term can be lost" (2006, p. 25). Hall observes that cosmopolitanism can imply the political, moral, or aesthetic transcendence of local boundaries, as well as openness to difference while acknowledging what all humans have in common. However, he cautions, cosmopolitan ideals can be vulnerable to the critique that the elite articulation of such ideals is "a guise for the detrimental effects of neo-liberalism and the perpetuation of elite Western dominance" (Hall, 2006, p. 25). Indeed, some would argue that it is best not to define the term cosmopolitanism by some arbitrary moral qualities (such as openness to the world, empathy, etc.), which could lead us to dividing up the world into the good and the pure (the cosmopolitans) versus the bad, the recalcitrant, and the hostile (the noncosmopolitans, ignorant locals), which would be problematic for anthropology, according to de l'Estoile (2006), and most contributors to this volume agree. Instead, a better route might be to define cosmopolitanism by how people create and use transnational networks, that is, finding cosmopolitanism in "an impulse to knowledge that is shared with others, a striving to transcend partiality that is itself partial" (Robbins, 1992, p. 181). What anthropological work can also do to counter elite appropriations of cosmopolitanism is to highlight "emerging cosmopolitan empathies, attitudes, and encounters in unexpected places and among marginal people" (Hall, 2006, p. 25).

Aiding in the anthropological exploration of diverse and different cosmopolitans is the fact that whatever cosmopolitanism was thought to be, it has become fragmented into multiple contending conceptualizations. There is the spatial definition where the cosmopolitan is someone who moves across global space; the social definition of the stranger who never really belongs to any community; the political definition of a "citizen of the world" whose rights are liberal democratic and individualist ones supported by international institutions;1 the structural definition of the class position of the cosmopolitan; the moral definition, featuring someone who shows solidarity with strangers; and, the essentialist definition: "We are all cosmopolitan because every individual human being is naturally endowed with certain capabilities and rights that take precedence over any system of symbolic classification" (Rapport & Stade, 2007, pp. 232–233). Having surveyed a wide body of literature on cosmopolitanism, Rapport and Stade note that with the plural definitions also comes an understanding that cosmopolitans are to be found everywhere in the world

and in the literature, where we can encounter phrases such as: "'cosmopolitans and locals' ..., 'pre-modern and modern cosmopolitans' ..., 'working-class cosmopolitans' ..., 'Caribbean cosmopolitans' ..., 'Chinese cosmopolitans' ..., 'cosmopolitan patriots' ..., 'plural discrepant cosmopolitanisms' ..., and 'cosmopolitan cityscapes'" (2007, p. 223). Indigenous cosmopolitans must now be added to the list.

Vernacular and Everyday Cosmopolitanization

Indeed, indigenous cosmopolitans had better be included, for as Sichone (2006) argues, cosmopolitanism can no longer be understood simply as a Western discourse. We will find more evidence of cosmopolitan attitudes and practices in remote African villages and congested urban slums than among European elites, Sichone argues, pointing to examples of impoverished women in South Africa who take in and care for migrants and refugees from neighboring countries, while xenophobia runs rampant in Europe. These women, Sichone explains, "live their cosmopolitanism by welcoming the world." In contrast, European capitalist elites, far from demonstrating any devotion to the interests of humanity as a whole, appear to be far from cosmopolitan: particularistic, self-absorbed, introverted, and greedy. Of course, that argument can be made only if we disagree with de l'Estoile, and move into moral notions of cosmopolitanism, which also involves a narrowing of the field of possible definitions on which Sichone's argument implicitly and intuitively relies.

Understanding that there are multiple cosmopolitanisms and cosmopolitanizations is a crucial point for anthropology (Werbner, 2006, p. 497). The idea of "discrepant" cosmopolitanisms (Clifford, 1992, p. 108) indicating that there are many, different, cosmopolitan practices, histories, and worldviews, leads us to explore the so-called marginal cosmopolitanisms, or "vernacular cosmopolitanism" (Bhabha, 1996, pp. 195–196). This opens us to the realization that indigenous cosmopolitans can be both rooted and routed, nonelite yet nonparochial, provincial without being isolated, internationalized without being de-localized. One could make a broader point here too, that "the vernacular localizes the cosmopolitan as part of its own self-constitution ... often unwittingly relocalizing what the cosmopolitan borrowed from it in the first place" (Pollock, 2002, p. 39).

The point is that the idea of "indigenous cosmopolitans" is part of a growing understanding of vernacular cosmopolitanism, that is, real-life, actually lived, everyday practice rooted in specific cultural formations. Vernacular cosmopolitanism, even more than what is called "new cosmopolitanism," is an attempt "to come to terms with the conjunctural elements of postcolonial and precolonial forms of cosmopolitanism and travel, while probing the concep-

tual boundaries of cosmopolitanism and its usefulness as an analytic concept" (Werbner, 2006, pp. 496–497). Similarly, Beck's conceptualization of "everyday or banal cosmopolitanism" and "actually existing cosmopolitanization" is very useful for framing the analytical-empirical cosmopolitanism at the heart of most of the studies comprising this volume, as distinct from entirely normative and philosophical approaches (Beck, 2004, pp. 131–133; see also Gidwani, 2006, on the related idea of "subaltern cosmopolitanism").

In this analytical and descriptive frame the focus is on the "growing interdependence and interconnection of social actors across national boundaries, more often than not as a side effect of actions that are not meant to be 'cosmopolitan' in the normative sense" (Beck, 2004, p. 131). Action across borders, a heightened sense of the relativity of one's own social position and culture in a global setting, and interconnections between actors in diverse locations, lead us to an awareness of "cosmopolitanization"—meaning "latent cosmopolitanisms, unconscious cosmopolitanisms, passive cosmopolitanisms, which shape reality as a side effect of world trade or global dangers" (Beck, 2004, pp. 131, 134).

Cosmopolitanism and Otherness

If there is a plea embodied by this volume, it is that we need to bring the cosmos back into cosmopolitanism, to paraphrase Latour (2004, p. 456). Cosmopolitanism is not about a "universal culture" of sameness, as Beck argues, but is instead about "recognition of the otherness of the other, beyond the false understanding associated with territoriality and homogenization" (2004, p. 143). What I consider to be an eloquent articulation of cosmopolitanism as respect for otherness comes from Ronald Stade who invites us to reconcile the "project of a cosmopolitan anthropology with an ontology that is mindful of the social nature of the self," by turning "the universal figure of Everyone into a someone, in particular into someone else, that is, into an other" (Rapport & Stade, 2007, p. 228). Stade's argument, following Emmanuel Lévinas, is that we recognize that "otherness is a primordial human experience" (Rapport & Stade, 2007, p. 229). Stade reflects on the tension between anthropos (all humans) and ethnos (specific "peoples"), between cosmos (global commonality) and polis (everyday, localized diversity)—but he notes that clearly polis is a foundational element of the cosmopolitan and without it cosmopolitanism is simply "cosmic," without roots, divorced, and disembedded from actual human practice. Most of the authors in this volume focus on how the cosmos is arrived at or explored through the indigenous polis, by taking empirical and analytical approaches to the particularities and contexts of practice. This is what we sought to offer, that if there is anything meaningful, practical, and concrete about

cosmopolitanism, then indigenous peoples would know a thing or two about it. We thus contribute to satisfying demands that some urge upon us: "The scholarly project of accumulating instances of cosmopolitanism from around the globe could help us make the point that the concept is neither a Western invention nor a Western privilege" (Robbins, 1992, p. 182), and thus far it is the indigenous cosmopolitan that is absent from the literature on cosmopolitanism (which is itself a rather curious statement about cosmopolitanist writings). Yet, this book is not driven by a need to "include" the indigenous, for reasons we share with Mignolo (2002, p. 174): "inclusion doesn't seem to be the solution to cosmopolitanism any longer, insofar as it presupposes that the agency that establishes the inclusion is itself beyond inclusion: 'he' being already within the frame from which it is possible to think 'inclusion.'"

One of the philosophers whose work has spearheaded the cosmopolitan project is Kwame Anthony Appiah (2005, 2006). In a 1997 article deliberately titled in paradoxical terms, "Cosmopolitan Patriots," one that is cherished by a number of the contributors to this volume, Appiah argues that while humanism is consistent with the desire for "global homogeneity," that is not what cosmopolitanism is about. Instead, "The cosmopolitan also celebrates the fact that there are different local human ways of being" (Appiah, 1997, p. 621). Appiah makes the case for the figure of the "cosmopolitan patriot," arguing that there is no point in roots if you cannot take them with you, and here he asks (and answers) questions that are especially pertinent to our collective study:

> Where, in other words, would all the diversity we cosmopolitans celebrate come from in a world where there were only cosmopolitans? The answer is straightforward: the cosmopolitan patriot can entertain the possibility of a world in which everyone is a rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of one's own, with its own cultural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different places that are home to other, different people. (Appiah, 1997, p. 618)

At the same time, in line with what some have called the "new cosmopolitans" (in Vertovec & Cohen, 2002), we do not see adherence to traditions, localities, ancestry, and so forth, as expressions of either hatred or petty self-interest. The broader point of the volume is that today "silenced and marginalized voices are bringing themselves into the conversation of cosmopolitan projects, rather than waiting to be included" (Mignolo, 2002, p. 174).

Indigenous Cosmopolitans

The authors contributing to this volume investigate cosmopolitanism as both rooted in and routed through particular settings. In the case of my chapter on

the Caribbean, the "people of the sea" is more than just metaphor—it is a context of local and regional cosmopolitan practice that extends centuries back in time and circulates around an actual sea. Within that setting, that historical and contemporary social and cultural context, I speak of the cases of five specific actors ranging from a Trinidadian, self-identified as Carib, with indigenous ancestry on both sides of her parentage, who resides abroad and blogs as both a nationalist and universal aboriginalist; a shaman, traveler, musician, and eco-tour guide all bundled together in one person; a Carib chief who learns the discourse of international indigenism through personal networks of exchange and travel; to the crew of a canoe, sailing to reunite disparate Carib communities across the region, but filming the event for eventual broadcast on the BBC and PBS. Perhaps the figure that caused the most controversy with reviewers is that of the blogger, Guanaguanare, with her dedication to promoting the idea of a universal aboriginality that is decoupled from territory/property, someone who, as Appiah stated above, values her roots as something that she can take with her in moving abroad.

Craig Proulx's chapter on Aboriginal hip hop in Canada, with comparisons drawn from Aboriginal Australia, moves between rural and urban, between reservation and city and back again, in a loop of relocation and translation. Like myself and other contributors, Proulx examines the changing forms of expressing and living aboriginality, disputing notions of authenticity that fix into place the aboriginal and that take place-centered orientations of indigenous affiliation as "the sine qua non of indigeneity," because these circumscribe our understandings of indigeneity on the move. His chapter thus presents a challenge to researchers: to move away from a reserve-centric focus just as many Aboriginals in Canada have had to move, and in moving this does not necessarily mean "leaving behind." As Proulx explains, these Aboriginal Canadian hip hoppers are "rooted cosmopolitans," and indigeneity is not premised on either immobility or remoteness. In the process he introduces us to the culturally and politically charged ways that hip hop facilitates and accompanies the translation of aboriginal cultures in urban arenas: "Hip hop's sense of style helps update the performance of tradition. Hip hop is the means through which traditions can be understood, reworked, re-presented, and thereby made relevant to youth accustomed to non-Aboriginal informational delivery systems." He explains how hip hop can enable a pan-Aboriginal reconstitution and re-presentation of de-territorialized traditions, and shows us how the characters in his story are "cosmopolitan in their knowledge of their worlds, the outer worlds that impinge upon them, how they are changed by them, and how they can change them."

Carolyn Butler-Palmer's focus is on the work of Canadian photojournalist, painter, and hereditary Kwagiutl carver David Neel, who shows us how "cosmopolitan" evokes a sense of both cultural connectedness and mobility. One

of his creations is simultaneously a depiction of a Kwagiutl tale and a reference to the four sacred directions of Thai Buddhism. He himself relocated to Thailand. In some ways David Neel puts into practice what Guanaguanare calls for in the first chapter of the volume. In contrast with James Clifford's sense of cosmopolitanism, which seems to be the consequence of any sort of human migration, Butler-Palmer reserves the term "to map movement that also manifests an ethic of cross-cultural engagement." Her approach to cosmopolitanism is one that consists of three components: mobility, morality, and multiplicity. Neel's work evinces a moral humanism, very similar to Guanaguanare's, and from an indigenous standpoint, using motifs of indigenous provenance that are outwardly embracing of all humanity, disclosing "an ethic of human relations based on the recognition of differences, the movement toward others, and a resulting sense of balance." Butler-Palmer's description of the role of color in Neel's work is meant to show the complementarity of the local and cosmopolitan, much like Guanaguanare's metaphor of the Catáhua tree.

Arthur Mason's chapter is one of a subgroup in the volume that deals with tourism, a powerful processual context for the exchange of culture, focusing specifically on "heritage work" on Kodiak Island, Alaska, an exchange that occurs through a complex interplay of history, migration, politics, and economics. Such heritage work, he argues, "assists in the wider reorganization of spatial and temporal rhythms necessary for legitimizing new social orders, identities, and communal action at the local level." Following Clifford, Mason notes that heritage work responds to demands that originate both inside and outside indigenous communities. Heritage work brings to bear an entire infrastructure laden with cosmopolitan possibilities: "The very technologies and forms of identity and heritage making in Alaska are shifting, and are now linked to the larger American political landscape, capitalism, scientific authority, and state intervention, as well as to local sentimentality, and in the case of the Alutiiq, preservation of ancestral authority." Alaska appears as a crossroads of cultures, with Inuit, Anglo-Americans, and Russian-Native Creoles, a situation that makes it similar to the Caribbean. We see how school museums perform a function of integrating the mindsets of Kodiak children into larger imaginings of an outside world, specifically the United States, distant yet present, creating and participating in a new symbolic order, with attendant changes in language, and in conceptualizations of time and space. Paradoxically, and this is the other side of the cosmopolitan process, the Kodiak experience with "modernity" both inspired and provided the material resources for "reindigenization." When U.S. government negotiations with Alaska Natives over land claims began, the following transformation occurred: "Aware of the potential economic gain, social honor, and modernizing role from participating in the process, Kodiak's leaders who previously had defined themselves through their Russian American ancestry began to identify themselves through

their Native ancestry." Indeed, it is a very significant reality of indigenous cosmopolitanism that some of the symbolic and material resources for indigeneity can be derived from the wider world outside of the immediate setting, reworked locally, and indigenized. Mason points us in the direction of what might be a fundamental realization: that there really can be no indigeneity without cosmopolitanism, and vice versa (see Stade and Appiah as discussed in the preceding sections).

Frans Schryer, like Mason, follows arts and crafts, development schemes, and complex political economic transformations in his discussion of Mexican Nahua indigeneity, again a confluence of forces that is highly productive of cosmopolitanism. Schryer devotes substantial attention to the work of indigenous leaders in building a movement of opposition to the building of a dam. He shows us how the local promotion of indigenous leaders occurs via transnational networking, leaders who may outlast the organizations they initially represented, and who promote emblematic, standardizing symbols of indigeneity even if they themselves may have little grounding in the culture that they represent, in ways reminiscent of Brysk (1996), in parallel to the first chapter's discussion of a Carib leader's engagement in transnational indigenous networks. In addition to political activism, Schryer shows how arts and crafts markets plug the Nahuas into regional and world economies, and specifically that of tourism. Nahua self-representation is now painted across a global canvas, and through broadened fields of interaction, especially when marked by conflict; what Schryer shows is that representations of indigenous as Other can be sharpened, rather than diminishing the content of indigenous alterity. Schryer also explains what he calls the process of "inverse cosmopolitanism," whereby Nahua migrants to the U.S. reproduce "a strong local identity and village endogamy," thus rerooting themselves through foreign routes. In the U.S. some Nahuas even become "Aztec."

In their chapter, Julie-Ann Tomiak and Donna Patrick focus on urban Inuit in Canada. This is an interesting case study which, although it parallels some of the material on migrations in the chapters by Mason and Schryer, points to something different: a domestic indigenous transnationalism, internal cosmopolitanism, where "urban Inuit space is created and used as sites where Inuit from a wide range of historical-geographical trajectories come together." Here the cosmopolitan process comes into play in relations between both longer-term urban Inuit and relatives back home, up north, and new Inuit arrivals to the city, specifically Ottawa, the Canadian capital. In this case, urban Inuit community centers become the arena for a dynamic interaction that still privileges Inuit place, even if seemingly out of place.

Robin Maria DeLugan also examines migration showing us how "by exchanging homelands in Mexico, Central, and South America for distant destinations, native people challenge stereotypes that their identity is inextricably

rooted to place of origin." DeLugan describes and analyzes how mutual recognition is formed among native people from across the continent, gathered in U.S. urban centers such as San Francisco, a recognition that they share common and related historical conditions and cultural affinities—a cosmopolitanism across and among indigenes that in some ways echoes one of the messages in the Tomiak and Patrick chapter, as well as the first chapter. Here we are dealing with the creation of a hemispheric indigenous identity, "a collective identity that is based on an inclusive and cosmopolitan view of human being and belonging in the world." In some respects, DeLugan takes previous work on "urban supratribalism" (cf. Cornell, 1988) a big step forward by considering this migratory and hemispheric context. The analytic scope of the chapter is ambitious, for DeLugan proclaims that what we are witnessing is a transnational indigenous parallel of the "Black Atlantic," referencing but not restrained by locality. Clearly, DeLugan is pushing forward the theme of "vernacular cosmopolitanism," as discussed in preceding sections, a cosmopolitanism that emerges not from the privileged centers of world power, but in spite of them, from the margins. Similarly, she endorses Appiah's concept of "rooted cosmopolitans," where indigenous communities do not just have a past, they also have a future. Contrary to liberal neo-Kantianism, DeLugan argues that "Indigenous cosmopolitanism with its simultaneous emphasis on rootedness and universality ... understands that differences can co-exist in a framework of universal relatedness."

Linda Scarangella's fascinating chapter, focusing on traveling Indian shows in places such as Euro Disney in Paris, brings back in the tourism theme that is prevalent in this volume (especially in the chapters by Mason and Schryer), except that in this case the travelers are indigenous, and they perform indigeneity both for foreign audiences and for themselves. While noting that there is considerable disagreement among anthropologists as to what cosmopolitanism refers to, Scarangella observes that it is commonly "presumed that indigenous people are the Others linked to locality that cosmopolitans engage with, not cosmopolitan themselves." Rapport will later back up Scarangella for rightly understanding what is not just commonly presumed, but formally defined. For Scarangella, "cosmopolitan" is to be used in its broadest sense as consisting of mobility, recognition of interconnectedness, openness toward cultural difference, and engagement with Others, a formulation that is similar to Butler-Palmer's. Scarangella disagrees with the view that indigenous persons performing in places of spectacle, putting on cultural displays for foreign gazers, are simply part of an "exploitative commercial enterprise." Such a story "does not completely explain Native performers' experiences of identity or why they participate in these spectacular spaces." In such performative spaces, Native performers have an occasion to reflect on the meanings of their cultural identity. Moreover, Native performers "connect to

both tribal and broader indigenous or pan-Indian identities in this transnational space," with the performers coming from different First Nations and maintaining their local identities through both performances and personal acts. The act of traveling itself signifies breaking a barrier, "moving beyond local and tribal identity to a broader sense of being indigenous." In her analysis, Scarangella subscribes to Ulrich Beck's idea of the dialogic imagination in cosmopolitanism, showing us that the performers are reflexive in comparing, reflecting, articulating, and reworking their ideas of indigeneity. Like Proulx in this volume, Scarangella finds value in the simultaneous combination of the rooted and the routed: "Local roots are articulated in transnational spaces, and transnational spaces generate occasions for the expression of a broader indigenous identity that includes while it transcends local and tribal expressions." Like DeLugan, her chapter also speaks of the formation of a transnational, supratribal pan-Indianism. As noted previously, Scarangella, like Mason, points us to a significant realization of the connection between indigeneity and cosmopolitanism: "Being and becoming indigenous today may very well mean engaging in cosmopolitanism, or at least transnational and translocal lifestyles." The performance of a pan-Indian indigeneity in a transcultural and translocal space facilitates cosmopolitanism, Scarangella argues, "where performers and the public engage with cultural difference, and where performers seek to increase cultural understanding."

The concluding chapter by Nigel Rapport, one of the most prominent anthropologists to carry forward the cosmopolitan agenda in anthropology (see Rapport, 2006, 2007), from a methodological individualist and Kantian perspective, is somewhat of an "odd man out" in the collection, and following a cosmopolitan ethic was included for that reason as well. As a prominent cosmopolitanist writer, Rapport was asked to read and comment on all of the chapters, while delivering his own inputs. He comments on the experience of travel, central to most of the chapters, and argues that moving away from or between homes and "experiencing change" is something "practiced by many and possessing consequences for all; with the result that it becomes neither easy nor wise to attempt to demarcate or differentiate, in any absolute way, between 'hosts' and 'guests.'" Who is "at home" is, for Rapport, more of a matter of the nature and purpose of particular exchanges, rather than "absolute identities." Rapport is well aware that the most common definitions of cosmopolitanism, represented by our dictionaries, often contrast the cosmopolite with the native, local, or indigene. Instead, Rapport invites us to consider cosmopolitanism more as a "habit of mind," one that is post-national in particular. Rapport's provocation is to use the figure of "the Jew," given how "the Jew" has been "typified by arch nationalists as something of an anti-indigene, an anti-local, an anti-patriot, the perennial pariah, the floating outsider, lacking loyalty to place, untrustworthy and thus potentially a criminal," a provoca-

tion because this history can be "a terribly sober reminder of what can happen with studies of indigeneity that read ideologies of fear of the world into indigenous lifeworlds." From "the Jew" as historic metaphor, Rapport takes us to meet actual, living Jews, in a bar in Newfoundland, Canada. In the process of presenting his very intriguing, engaging, and challenging analysis of persons and conversations in the bar, Rapport shares some critical insights about indigeneity and cosmopolitanism: "Actually existing cosmopolitanism was varied, plural and polythetic [following Robbins]: actually existing indigeneity could be expected to be likewise." Rapport is prescribing cosmopolitanism with a specific angle here, the post-nationalist one, which is not necessarily post-indigenous (Guanaguanare in the first chapter possesses a complexity that transcends even this, however: she is indigenous, nationalist, and universalist, seen as a continuum rather than a snake's pit of contradictions.) In prescribing post-nationalism Rapport argues, "One need not imagine the absolute overcoming of localism or even chauvinism so much as their ironization. Absolute notions of identity are made contingent by their being contextualized alongside others: one of a number of identities that contest for space in the same place; one of a number of identities to which the same individuals contract a belonging."

If there could possibly be one single lesson (there are in fact many) that this volume wishes to impress upon readers, it is this: that the indigene and the cosmopolite should not only no longer be seen as incongruous and contradictory, in reality they are one and the same. However, one lesson not to be taken away from this collection is that by proclaiming that the indigene is cosmopolitan, we have thus added a dignity and respectability that the indigene might not have possessed otherwise.

Notes

1   Ironically, while the individual and notions of individual human rights are privileged in liberal neo-Kantian discourse of cosmopolitanism, this does not transcend either nationalism or the nation-state. As Turner (2002, p. 50) explained very lucidly: "Nation-state citizenship and nationalist ideology have been, in the modern world, powerful agencies for creating individual identities. Modern notions of social rights have defined citizenship as primarily a political and juridical category relating to liberal individualism. This juridical identity of citizens has evolved according to the larger political context, because citizenship has necessarily been constructed within a definite political community, namely the nation-state ... citizenship-building was also, and necessarily, nation-building. The creation of the institutions of citizenship in legal, political, and social terms was also the construction of a national framework of membership within the administrative structures of the state."