Environmental Cosmopolitans: Introduction

Ben Campbell

Cosmopolitanism has become a rediscovered conceptual frontier within the social sciences. It has emerged in the space for relational thinking about contemporary movements of people and ideas beyond old societal boundaries, as an alternative to the homogenizing implications carried by globalization. It forefronts new cross-territorial contexts of encounter attending to samenesses and differences among people, places, and the nonhuman, presenting new kinds of translocal issues for anthropologists of the environment. While cosmopolitanism draws historically on aspects of Enlightenment universalist rationalism, current applications of the term forefront an empathy and respect for other people's cultures and values. This is frequently drawn into a distinction between "normative" and "cultural" cosmopolitanisms. The first Kantian sense involves a context-transcendent level of ethical principles with general validity, while the second is about taking cognizance of difference and invokes some positive tolerance of multiplicity and appreciation of others. In both cases there is a sense of a projected "ethical horizon" (Werbner 2008).

Multiple acting subjects are faced with taking account of each others' differences and commonalities in culturally cosmopolitan environments, confronting serial sets of interests, fields of responsibility, and kinds of knowledge. Yet this creative traffic is often submerged in debates over pressing environmental concerns such as climate change, which deal with requirements for a normative politics of the cosmos, driven by science's exposure of the carbon footprints of collective cultural practices of consumption. Discrepant cosmopolitan problematics therefore transect a number of actual processes and ways of organizing knowledge of people and the environment. In this collection on environmental cosmopolitans, we see the work of anthropologists in a range of locales interrogating the value of a cosmopolitan frame of enquiry in the ways in which people are resituating themselves, and diverse others, in their environmental contingencies and horizons.

In this introduction I discuss some general cosmopolitan issues and examine their uptake in the following articles. Three key themes emerge out of this process that demonstrate the value of cosmopolitan perspectives on translocal phenomena in environmental anthropology.¹ First is the extent to which the concept of “the environment” has translated across cultural contexts to speak to local conditions, as well as local structures of power and meaning. Second is the phenomenon of translocal agents of globalization. These include corporate institutions, among which the examples of Coca-Cola, Monsanto, and the UNESCO Man and Biosphere programme are discussed here, but other traveling agents also draw attention, such as the images of wildlife and places circulating in global spheres of consumption. The third theme concerns attempts to accommodate cultural diversity within the politics of environmental protection. Here, the relativist notion that different cultures have distinct perceptions of the nonhuman world receives validation, but policy, science, or monetary valuation stand as context-transcendent positions for apprehending generality.

Cosmopolitanism of One World

‘Normative’ versions of environmental cosmopolitanism advocate a translocally applicable set of minimal rules that will enable cultural differences to be overcome in the common interest of saving the planet and its biodiversity. The global environment figures as a single entity threatened by myriad human influences, only salvageable if discrete, culturally circumscribed values are overcome by internationally negotiated norms of behavior. This is what Stengers describes as a “universal neutral key, valid for all” (2003: 995).

Rather than a tolerance of differences, the environmental One Earth prism very often generates a monistic imperative that displaces the diversity of situated human practice to prioritize a singular bedrock of biophysical truth. Modern environmental knowledge depends on viewing the world as external to humanity and amenable to factual representation, but this possibility of knowledge simultaneously underscores contemporary discussion of desirable patterns of human-environmental relations and aligns with cultural projects of human utility and analogy. The coordinates of value and analogy making cannot be assumed to translate across the intentional networks that make them compelling in local contexts. Knowledge exchange, interpretations of events, and configurations of rulers, citizens, and scientists have

in modern times made, through undeniably social processes, this entity of the environment we can now bring to mind in speaking of the nonhuman world (Grove 1995; Hajer 1996; Rutherford 1999). Yet it is apprehendable as a compelling domain of fact external to human construct and cultural value. The resulting cosmology of a culturally unhitched domain of fact “out there” shapes and hinders possibilities for environmental cosmopolitan thinking. Descola (2005) has provided a convincing account of the cosmological twin birth of “naturalism” and human exceptionalism in early modern times. Bringing nonhuman others into rapport with the ethical horizons of loquacious bipedal primates has tended to be ridiculed from within the perspective of modernity. Nature, or nonhuman others, cannot speak. Claims for ethical symmetry founder on analogical or metaphorical pretensions. An excellent example of this anomalous, almost taboo, ethical divide can be found in Coetzee’s (1999) fictional character Elizabeth Costello, who compares the fate of livestock in industrial farming to victims of the Holocaust.

In this collection, by contrast, the ethical wiring of naturalism is unplugged. The points of ethical contiguity between people and tigers in the Sundarbans is discussed by Jalais, highlighting the shared experiences of both in the politics of displacement in the saline and cantankerous-making mangrove environment. And reflecting the alienation sensed by northerners, desirous of more authentic relationships with the environment than bequeathed them by naturalism, Johnson and Clisby describe their search for refashioning possibilities for ecofriendly lifestyles in adapting to peasant rhythms in Costa Rica. Guneratne subtly shows how colonial naturalism in Sri Lanka came to be first appropriated by the Anglophone elite but was later brought into more litigious confrontation with processes of modernization on the island, as the toxic environment of contemporary life displaced detached concern for wildlife.

Outside the dominance of Western naturalism, more minoritarian environmentalisms can be seen actively resisting the global extension of forces for environmental and agricultural transformation and governance. These minoritarian movements stress that uniqueness of place, and the kinds of interactions, relations of dependence, and intergenerational care people have in respect to particular locales are points of commonality shared between people facing similar experiences of globalization. The contributions by Williams and by Raman analyze such movements in the contexts of France and India, respectively. What are the criteria for recognition of cosmopolitan qualities among such

different social phenomena? “Cosmopolitan” is a term sometimes used to hierarchize perspectives on environmental affairs as being of general or particular relevance. Martinez-Alier (2002: 207) criticizes the localizing containment of South Asian environmental-social movements in the way in which they are perceived from global positions to be purely regional phenomena. O’Neill (2005) distinguishes such “thin” moral languages of environmentalism from “thick” versions, which enable the valorization of situated ethical accounts without necessarily diminishing their general importance. Williams and Raman both reveal the relevance of the local to the general in addressing the erasure of the local in the wake of translocal actors such as Monsanto and Coca-Cola, and in neither case is it Descola’s naturalist environment of the nonhuman other that provides a basis for social mobilization. As Williams puts it, anti-GM activists are not aiming for a transcendence of the local, and they hold a “cosmopolitan vision of the world, one that actually enables and nourishes ideas of the local, of the national, of cultural diversity” (this volume, 130). In contrast to the multinationals’ privatization of the “biological commons,” the protestors of Larzac in France claim to defend the “heritage of the world” against its transformation.

The Enlightenment ideas of universal humanity and human exceptionalism now translate normatively into a species-specific disposition to effect ecological harm (e.g., anthropogenic climate change), yet this disguises the very different impacts effected by modes of technology, surplus accumulation, and ethical norms in relation to nonhumans. The difference anthropology can make is to look at abstractions such as Nature and Humanity through cultural history and to challenge the epistemic coordinates of anthropocentrism in order to recognize actors, qualities, and relationships in terms of their mutual constitution in actual places.

Cosmopolitanism of Many Cultures

For much of the twentieth century the concept of culture provided ethnographically oriented anthropology with a formally nonjudgmental means of describing human diversity. The relativism intrinsic to this operation corroded substantially with the twin processes of poststructural doubt over the devices we use to represent cultures, and of course globalization, which brought in train new dialectics of locatedness with the after-effects of jet-propelled passenger flows. Diasporas and their

imaginations of home coincide with the consumption of culture in the mode of heritage and tourism, bringing new contexts in which cultures become objectified. The ontological status of culture shifted, as Friedman (forthcoming) puts it, from a structure of existence to an optional game set, in which people increasingly choose their preferred attachments.

New thinking about relations of selves to place has come about in anthropology and other disciplines through “thinking outside the box of European intellectual history” (Pollock et al. 2000: 586). This involves being open to the likelihood that localness and movements beyond it will be configured in entirely different ways, and occasions thought about the extent to which intrinsic connections are imputed through category usage in the relations of certain kinds of people and geotopologies. A “cosmopolitan” disposition conventionally implies an inverse of a non-cosmopolitan positionedness. Classically, this referred to “tribals” and “peasants” harboring non-modern connections to land. When peasants move they are frequently considered as transgressive. Kearney (1996) deconstructs this image of the peasant, and from the hindsight of observing rural Mexicans now in multiple contexts of locatedness, he proposes that their “polybian” characteristics had been misrecognized in the developmentalist projections of peasant stereotypes as inflexibly rooted in land. However, Johnson and Clisby in this collection discuss how expatriate migrants seeking nonmodern connection to the environment view landless peasants in Costa Rica as anomalous, morally suspect squatters, having abandoned ethics of land stewardship, now valorized by outsiders.

Two contributions to recent cosmopolitan debates provide discrete alternatives for looking at “cultural cosmopolitanism” in terms of people-place relations. Sheldon Pollock (2000) considers historical perspectives on cosmopolitanism and asks, “what is its opposite?” The answer takes the form of a contrast between the Latin and Sanskritic worlds—in terms of not only the characteristics of their respective cosmopolitanisms but also the forms of vernacularization in subsequent periods. While the Latin-dominated world had a notion of *urbis in orbis*, the Sanskritic area had less of a sense of fixed dominion and took to the notion of *marg* or “way” as a more decentered, mobile model of civilization. There was no Rome for all roads to lead to. Pollock then looks at the invention of vernacular rhetorics of belonging by elites in the aftermath of cosmopolitan eras in European and South Asian history. He draws attention to the distinctive associations between a people and their language in medieval Europe, and he argues (against the

primordialist assumptions that are frequently attributed to vernacular rootedness within Western scholarship) that this has resulted in a nationalistic blindness to mixture and intersections. In South Asia no such umbilical connection with language and people is apparent, and regional affiliations are often expressed in terms of “ecology,” such as distinctive soils or water.²

Jonathan Friedman (forthcoming), on the other hand, presents a historically situated argument for the rise of “cultural cosmopolitanism” in modern Europe. He contrasts this to the realities of cultural complexity and the pluriverse worlds of people in Asia, whose capacities for self-positioning toward diverse linguistic, kinship, and political routes of contiguity defy scopes of serial culture-boundedness and make such people cosmopolitan without an explicit formulation of the sort. His analysis is directed rather to the explicit cultural tolerance that became an elite global practice from the late nineteenth century and can be accounted for through a class analysis, contrary to the arguments of scholars (e.g., Arjun Appadurai) extolling the trans- and post- characteristics of contemporary, territorially unhooked diasporas. Friedman outlines the features of late nineteenth-century cosmopolitanism, which include curiosity about “traditional” cultures, especially the Orient (transmitted through links with Freemasonry), relations to capital of a financial rather than industrial kind, and a disinclination to value the state as an appropriate context for realizing citizenship, tending toward a negation of social praxis in the self-identification of the cosmopolitan (Friedman forthcoming). The contemporary vogue for cultural cosmopolitanism was present within this European transnational elite network of families and bears a notable resemblance to the kinds of neoliberal, global practice that Friedman calls “New Age Managerialism” (much akin to aspects of deep ecology; see Guha 1989).

These two approaches demonstrate the fecundity of scope and analytical framing that the cosmopolitan problematic has generated, and the themes of both authors find resonance in this collection. Hegemonic class rhetorics of concern for the environment are central to Guneratne’s discussion of Sri Lanka’s history, in which environmentalism figured as an instance of general good expressed from a detached position, later challenged by others’ class interests toward the environment characterized more by necessity. Guneratne follows the subcultural channels through which transnational ideas came to be translated into Sri Lanka’s vernacular idioms and contexts of class relevance. In this volume Jalais and Strang, for their part, attend to distinct practices of dwelling that resist environmental agendas of national elites, which

treat the nonhuman as a separate domain and show in effect how in the Bengal Sundarbans and in North Queensland, respectively, “projects of the intimate sphere” call into question public ethics in ways that are “subversive of thin claims to universalism” (Pollock et al. 2000: 585). In these last two cases, the central problem is how to communicate to outsiders a social reality that includes people living alongside “wild” animals (Jalais), and in a landscape that is not just a material domain but also a cosmological mesh of ancestral personhood and secret knowledge (Strang).

Cosmopolitics

Having turned their gaze onto the culture that produced the idea of the environment, anthropologists have debated the specificity of this idea of a totalized entity of mute nonhumanity in which humans are seen uniquely to act with distinct forms of cultural consciousness. De-scola (1996, 2005), Viveiros de Castro (1998), and Ingold (2000) have rethought the modernist premise in which humans are seen as animated by culture (a structure of signifying representations) in order to apprehend and act in nature (an inanimate universe of biophysical materiality). For animists in Amazonia, jaguars and peccaries also have culture, and in both the Andes and Himalayas, mountains are the abodes of deities directly responsive to human welfare. In such contexts, social relations and culture communicate across the human/nonhuman divide.

In this new anthropological thinking about human-environmental relations, the phrasing “environmental cosmopolitan” confronts the epistemic gulf between knowledge practices that confer different ontological status to humans and nonhumans, and also questions the assumption that “cosmopolitan” in its “cultural” usage (of respect for others’ perspectives) only concerns different positions held by humans and not nonhumans. Latour has put this challenge most succinctly in his discussion of Beck’s new advocacy for a cosmopolitan sociology that seeks to move beyond the bias of methodological nationalism. Latour writes in turn of the ‘anthropological’ blindness of sociology:

For the sociologist, nature, the world, the cosmos, is simply there; and since humans share basic characteristics, our view of the world is, at baseline, the same everywhere. Perversity, acquisitiveness, undisciplined instincts account for the fact that we do not—we rarely have—peace. (2004: 453)

For Latour, the idea of cosmopolitanism has been historically characteristic of periods when confidence in reason and science has sustained a sense of a unitary cosmos, upon which attempts to build a world metropolis of willing citizens could be founded. Borrowing Viveiros de Castro's and Descola's comparative cultural critiques of this idea of a singular natural world, Latour goes on to declare that

the problem we face now is that it's precisely this "one cosmos," what I call mononaturalism, that has disappeared. It's impossible for us now to inherit the beautiful idea of cosmopolitanism since what we lack is just what our prestigious ancestors possessed: a cosmos. (2004: 453)

In order to present an alternative conception of relations between actors of all kinds, and not simply evoke the politics of mutual recognition in an exclusively human association, Latour takes up the term "cosmopolitics" from Stengers (1996, 2005). Stengers's cosmopolitical proposal is for a slowing down of those imperatives for urgency claiming to speak for the general good, which shut out consideration of who might legitimately have a relation to any issue. It casts doubt on the asymmetrical kinds of confrontation generated, for instance, by "naked citizens'" defense of principles of general common good against corporate interests (Stengers 2005).

In this collection the articles by Williams on French anti-GM protestors and by Raman on the anti-Coca-Cola movement in India explore the strands of creative alliance making and, as Graeber (2008) terms it, the "interstitial" associations made across a variety of interests and perspectives beyond the purview of the state. In these cases it is not the environment in the configuration of an entity in its own right that motivates those who oppose the global takeover of the world food system by biotechnology companies, or the spoliation of Indian villages' water sources and fields by Coca-Cola. In the French case it is the right of independent livelihoods and local cultures of food and landscape under threat that has drawn the coalition together, in India the principle of sustainable livelihoods and equitable treatment for the most marginalized of Indian society, the Dalits and Adivasis.

In these two cases, therefore, the environment is thoroughly socialized as concrete and actual parts of the array of life-sustaining practices, which come into public spheres of ethical deliberation through making explicit the unequal relationships of power in processes of resource control and consumption exercised in global strategies of corporate multinationals, which seek in their own cosmopolitan fashion to override culture and place.³ Martinez-Alier says of the "environmentalism of the poor" that

Quite often, conflicts over the access to environmental resources and services adopt languages which are not explicitly environmental. Much work remains to be done trying to identify the ecological content in social conflicts which have used non-environmental idioms. These are movements born from the resistance (expressed in many different languages) to the lopsided use of environmental resources and services by the rich and powerful. (2002: 264–265)

By contrast, the case discussed by Silvia Posocco (2008) shows how the global project of environmental protection propagated by UNESCO's Man and Biosphere program created zones of territory in Guatemala dedicated to biodiversity. She analyzes how this intervention generated a counterresponse from Guatemalan communities who reconfigured the emancipatory potential of zoning as a practice of territorializing claims against the state by displaced communities with insecure land rights. This case is an excellent example of how ethnographic perspectives can attend to the fact that though, as mentioned above, anthropologists have reflected on the cultural peculiarity of the Western concept of the natural environment, in so many parts of the world, societies with non-Western practices of relationship with the environment are being increasingly required to address the idea of the environment as a nonhuman domain (Campbell 2005). Posocco's study highlights the creative, "discrepant" cosmopolitanism of the Guatemalans in appropriating the concept of zoning and conjoining it with indigenous ecological rights discourses for drawing legitimacy, and idiomatic currency, to their own cause.

With cases such as this, it is ever harder to organize comparative modes of relating to the nonhuman along the neat structural lines suggested by Descola (2005). Concepts such as Raman's use of "subaltern cosmopolitanism" indicate possibilities for thinking about how power relations strategically enter representational schema and speak to the differential capacities to claim shares in environmental common property. Guneratne's historical overview permits questions to be asked about who deserves to be called truly cosmopolitan. Was it the Anglophone bourgeoisie who adopted concerns for wildlife protection in imitation of English colonial forms of symbolic capital, or the people who are now engaging with environmental issues for whom environmentalism offers the means to see traditional cultural practice outside habitual frames? Here the cosmopolitan problematic has worked to draw out shifting relationships between power, class, and culture in the time-space trajectories of environmentalism. In Johnson and Clisby's article the peasant way of life, its local foods, and practices of con-

nection to land and place are idealized and objectified by incomers. In doing so they produce a sort of demonization of those people that do not fit this moral universe. These include squatters who are seen to abuse the locality, as well as the developers of tourism resorts, where the environmentally and culturally destructive practices of the leisure industry continue apace. Although the eco-ex-pats position themselves on a moral high ground that contains some degree of cultural self-critique, Johnson and Clisby observe that such people's ability to aspire to green lifestyles abroad is predicated on a power dynamic of class privilege, which is only too apparent in the disparagement of the squatters as an illegitimate presence. This article presents a situation where an environmental ethic acts to make selective boundaries of wholesomeness and rather one-sidedly constructs particular kinds of others with whom respectful coexistence is anticipated. The aspiration toward a resolution between tradition and modernity by reaching out for participation in others' cultural practices of being in the world is not apparently reciprocated.

In her case, Jalais moves her analysis beyond the two-dimensional iconization of the cosmopolitan environmentalists' tiger to find the different guises in which the tiger emerges over history: as royal beast, as tyrant, as emblem of world heritage status, as participant in the state violence perpetrated on Bangla refugees. There is continuous power play in the trafficking of images about wildlife.

The study presented by Veronica Strang brings the environmental cosmopolitan enquiry into contact with the development of governance practice in search of stakeholder diversity in environmental management. Her analysis of processes of social and economic change in Northern Queensland neatly brings into view how different communities, whose habitual relationships with the landscape are becoming the object of collective reflection, are becoming articulated against each other. The interrelations of these communities (each with their distinct environmental practice) are followed in the public arenas of environmental management policy. In other words, at a moment in the area's history when room for livelihood activity with little reflexive concern for its consequences has come up against limits, Strang brings our attention to the fact that the wider environmental movement and international treaties enjoin the Australian state to plan for river and land use management by actively consulting with locally affected communities. Some remarkable convergences are therefore involved. Habitual practice is rendered explicit (environmentalized, as the risks and consequences of one set of practices on others' possibilities for pur-

suings their own), and the communities' differences are all coming into marked mutual visibility (culturalized, as rights-bearing communities with "identity"). Specifically, aspects of the Aboriginals' marking as a cultural group are being taken up by white cattle ranchers as a self-presentational tactic, in the context of their old economy having to adapt to new realities of tourism and urban development.

This is not, however, a pathway for communication of respective positions that carries the different environmental stakeholders along in a progressive and symmetrical manner. Strang points out how Aboriginals have attempted to convey their environmental relationships to government agencies and to other stakeholders by means of explaining their connections and knowledge of place through on-site communication and inviting others to visit their locales, actually going to places and talking about them (much in the same way that Jalais talks of how the Sundarban residents want to show outsiders their places and communicate about their tigers). Yet as the forums for decision making and consultation have increasingly moved away from local arenas to higher scales and more remote sites of administration, the Aboriginals' participation has diminished. Strang argues that the framing of cultural heritage is poorly integrated with that of resource management, when the latter is articulated through an objectified, biocentric, international naturalism. Attempting to find mutuality between enviro-speak and the local cosmological mesh of people and place therefore runs up against a discursive-epistemic power barrier. She consequently asks questions of "thin," normative versions of environmental cosmopolitanism:

Does cosmopolitanism itself, and the fluidity of connection to place that it implies, lead inevitably to a more alienated, objectifying, and commodifying vision of nature as "other"? And is it possible, employing this dualistic and reductive model, to integrate social and cultural issues into environmental management? (45)

Bureaucratization as Strang describes it is evident in many environmental projects that begin as grassroots ventures but become dominated by technomanagerial, abstract normative cosmopolitan regulatory models that have difficulty accommodating what people think to be important and look to science and policy for means to transcend cultural particularity.⁴ Herein lies the dilemma for solutions to environmental ills. For Martinez-Alier there are means to overcome discrepant valuations of the environment:

There is a clash in standards of valuation when the languages of environmental justice, indigenous territorial rights or environmental security are deployed against monetary valuation of environmental risks and burdens.

Non-compensatory multi-criteria decision aids, integrated assessment and participatory methods of conflict resolution are more appropriate for this ... very common type of situation, than the mere appeal to the disciplinary experts. Indeed, such methods may be understood as applied political ecology. (2002: 267)

Here there is a move away from "taking nature into account" in money terms and toward coping with value pluralism (Martinez-Alier 2002: 271). For Stengers, no such equivalence making can proceed without severe injustice being perpetrated in the aim of finding the general interest among people of good will. She argues, "political ecology affirms that there is no knowledge that is both relevant and detached," and in turning ecological phenomena into "causes for thinking," what is needed is for collective thinking "to proceed 'in the presence of' those who would otherwise be likely to be disqualified as having idiotically nothing to propose, hindering the emergent 'common account'" (2005: 1002).

Conclusion

Anthropological perspectives are necessary for considering cosmopolitan environmental dispositions, because they can view comparatively the relational pretensions of authority and generality tied up in speaking of and for the environment. They can do so in terms of intentional communicative networks, and their bearing on the affordances or propensity of environments, rather than as dissociated, abstract properties. The environment in this view is a peculiarly modern phenomenon, and rather than being a thing in itself, it reverberates with mixed inventive repertoires and historical echoes of relationship to presences of otherness (human and nonhuman) in the patchworked imagination of global society, looking out over new horizons.⁵ As anthropologists have shifted their attentions from remote corners, and from distinct and disappearing cultural practices, translocal social extensions have come increasingly into the frame. Gupta and Ferguson have argued that anthropology's greater contribution has not been to privilege the local but to bring "attentiveness to epistemological and political issues of location" (1997: 39). In presenting contemporary work of anthropologists on cosmopolitan environmental issues, there are new communities and relationships coming into view that fieldwork's holism once filtered out at the margins, in pursuit of immediate contexts of rele-

vance. Some of these new causes for relation are to face up to asymmetrically encountered giants of globalization with new market and regulatory freedoms to roam, alternately proposing to either use or protect the environment. Clearly, moving points rather than standpoints must now be prioritized, and in this methodological cosmopolitanism, anthropology brings movements of people in conjunction with changing social presences of places and their capacities for description by a pluriverse of actors with different languages of recognition and engagement.

The cosmopolitan is a figure coming from an optimistic era of European history who now is asked to inhabit a world troubled with its very possibility of continuity. This endangered planet asks, as a relatively new presence in public consciousness, for its recognition in turn by people articulating their situated commitments to human-environmental outcomes, through a variety of registers for environmental value. In this collection of articles, we see moves to bring attention to situated voices of presence and the audibility of responses to questions of environmental sensibility—how knowledge of the nonhuman, relationships to place, and the multiple webs of association with water, land, and species are often not merely perceived as enabling material factors for human existence but configured as participating agents of sociality. Rane Willerslev, panel discussant for the Environmental Cosmopolitans panel at the 2006 Association of Social Anthropologists conference, called up the figure of the shaman-hunter depicted as a composite of creaturely features on a cave wall. Sharing multiform embodied presences and keeping several perspectives at the same time, this figure strikes at anthropocentric conceits from twelve thousand years ago. Ethnographic curiosity for otherness is no monopoly of anthropology, and in the problematization of human relations with the nonhuman, an entrance to others' imaginary realms of extrahuman entanglement reflects back on our possibilities of seeing how we transform who we are through attention to others' modes of being in the world.

Acknowledgement

I thank Pnina Werbner for inviting me to convene the panel on Environmental Cosmopolitans for the Association of Social Anthropologists conference, Keele University, April 2006.

Ben Campbell is a lecturer at the Department of Anthropology, University of Durham. He obtained a Ph.D. at the School of Development Studies, University of East Anglia, for a study of exchange labor systems in a Himalayan agropastoral community in Nepal, later conducting research into the impact of a national park on Tamang indigenous environmental knowledge and livelihood practice. While a researcher at Manchester University, he organized a conference on comparative ethnographic experiences of environmental protection, which was published in *Conservation and Society* (2005). He participated in Manchester Anthropology's research on Public Understanding of Genetics, contributing work on GM crops and new configurations of ethnicity and nation in assisted reproduction. He is currently making a film of road building in Nepal and the re-territorialization of a "remote" Himalayan valley into a highway of globalization.

Notes

1. It is not simply academics who talk of cosmopolitan aspects of environmental matters: I found a gardening magazine with a feature on cosmopolitan composting, and I also noticed that several widely distributed bird species attract this label.

2. This is a point of difference made in Burghart's (1984) insightful analysis of the formation of nationhood in Nepal.

3. See Campbell (forthcoming) for an analysis of how the prospect of genetically modified crops in the UK in 2003 generated a public discussion that, because of the legal provision for a derogation of GM cultivation on the basis of demonstrable environmental risk, channeled public opposition into an explicit re-evaluation of the cultural relationship between citizens, the countryside, and its biodiversity.

4. Dave Carss and Mariella Marzano presented an excellent case study at the Environmental Cosmopolitans panel at the Association of Social Anthropologists conference (Keele University, 2006), describing European fishers and ornithologists contending the rights of cormorants to feed along the routes of their trans-European cosmopolitan movements.

5. The treatment of the environment as a thing is accompanied in many parts of the world by the understanding of social process as being thing-like, a phenomenon Eric Hirsch (2001) calls "entification."

References

- Burghart, Richard. 1984. "The Formation of the Concept of Nation-state in Nepal." *Journal of Asian Studies* 44 (1): 101–125.
- Campbell, Ben. 2005. "Introduction: Changing Protection Policies and Ethnographies of Environmental Engagement." *Conservation and Society* 3 (2): 280–322.
- . Forthcoming. "Fields of Posthuman Kinship." In *Kinship Matters*, eds. Carlos Salazar and Jeanette Edwards. Berghahn.

- Coetzee, J. M. 1999. *The Lives of Animals*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Descola, Philippe. 1996. "Constructing Natures: Symbolic Ecology and Social Practice." Pp. 82–102 in *Nature and Society: Anthropological Perspectives*, eds. Philippe Descola and Gísli Pálsson. London: Routledge.
- . 2005. *Par-delà nature et la culture*. Paris: Editions Gallimard.
- Friedman, Jonathan. 2006. "Globalization as Will and Idea: Cosmopolitanism, Globalizing Elites and Intellectual Discourses." Paper presented at the *Association of Social Anthropologists* (ASA) conference on Anthropology and Cosmopolitanism, April 2006, Keele University.
- Graeber, David. 2008. "On Cosmopolitan and (Vernacular) Democratic Creativity, or: There Never Was a West." In *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism: Rooted, Feminist and Vernacular Perspectives*, ed. Pnina Werbner. Berg.
- Grove, Richard H. 1995. *Green Imperialism: The Colonial Expansion, Tropical Island Edens and the Origins of Environmentalism, 1600–1860*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Guha, Ramachandra. 1989. "Radical American Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique." *Environmental Ethics* 11 (1): 71–83.
- Gupta, Akhil, and James Ferguson. 1997. *Anthropological Locations: Boundaries and Grounds of a Field Science*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hajer, Maarten. 1996. "Ecological Modernisation as Cultural Politics." Pp. 246–268 in *Risk, Environment and Modernity: Towards a New Ecology*, eds. Scott Lash, Bronislaw Szerszynski, and Brian Wynne. London: Sage.
- Hirsch, Eric. 2001. "Mining Boundaries and Local Land Narratives (*tidibe*) in the Udaabe Valley, Central Province." Pp. 19–38 in *Rationales of Ownership*, eds. Lawrence Kalinoe and James Leach. New Delhi: UBS Publishers.
- Ingold, Timothy. 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge.
- Kearney, Michael. 1996. *Reconceptualizing the Peasantry*. Boulder: Westview.
- Latour, Bruno. 2004a. *The Politics of Nature: How to Bring the Sciences into Democracy*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2004b. "Whose Cosmos, Whose Cosmopolitics?" *Common Knowledge* 10 (3): 450–462.
- Martinez-Alier, Joan. 2002. *The Environmentalism of the Poor*. London: Earthscan.
- O'Neill, John. 2005. "Environmental Values through Thick and Thin." *Conservation and Society* 3 (2): 479–500.
- Pollock, Sheldon I. 2000. "Cosmopolitan and Vernacular in History." *Public Culture* 12 (3): 591–625.
- Pollock, Sheldon I., Homi Bhabha, Carol A. Breckenridge, and Dipesh Chakravarty. 2000. "Cosmopolitanisms." *Public Culture* 12 (3): 577–589.
- Posocco, Silvia. 2008. "Zoning: Environmental Cosmopolitics in and Around the Maya Biosphere Reserve, Petén, Guatemala." *Nature and Culture* 3 (2), forthcoming.
- Robertson, Morgan. 2006. "The Nature That Capital Sees: Science, State, and Market in the Commodification of Ecosystem Services." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24: 367–387.
- Rutherford, Paul. 1999. "The Entry of Life into History." Pp. 37–62 in *Discourses of the Environment*, ed. Éric Darier. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Stengers, Isabelle. 1996. *Cosmopolitiques*. Paris: La Découverte.

- . 2005. "The Cosmopolitical Proposal." Pp. 994–1003 in *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, ed. Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 1998. "Cosmological Deixis and Amerindian Perspectivism." *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* (N.S.) 4: 469–488.
- Werbner, Pnina. 2008. 'Introduction: Towards a New Cosmopolitan Anthropology'. In *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism: Rooted, Feminist and Vernacular Perspectives*, ed. Pnina Werbner. Berg.