import, whether it be in South Bend, Indiana, or in Santiago, Chile. I have seen too many colleagues in my fifteen years at Notre Dame scorn our local community and refuse to live in town, read the local newspaper, or send their children to local public schools out of a snobbish sense of cultural superiority that ultimately robs our city of one of its primary lifelines: citizens who invest time, money, and ideas to the improvement of their environment.

Without pursuing the hostility this attitude imposes on our community, I propose we consider the spiritual desert that such a life suggests. Consider the following, adapted from Scott Russell Sanders's *Staying Put*:

> "The man who is often thinking that it is better to be somewhere else than where he is excommunicates himself," wrote Thoreau. The metaphor is religious: to withhold yourself from where you are is to be cut off from communion with the source. One cannot have a spiritual center without having a geographical one; one cannot live a grounded life without being grounded in a place.
>
> In belonging to a landscape, one feels a rightness, at-homeness, a knitting of self and world. This condition of clarity and focus, this being fully present is akin to what the Buddhists call mindfulness, what Christian contemplatives refer to as recollection, what Quakers call centering down. There is only one world, and we participate in it here and now, in our flesh and our place.

How does this mesh with cosmopolitanism? And how are our students already living the vision? Through study and service at sites abroad.

At Notre Dame, we place great emphasis on community service—in town and in every site where students go to study for a semester or year abroad. As assistant provost for international studies, I insist that students take an active role in local communities wherever they enroll: through service, theater, sports, internships, or spiritual activities. I have found it heartening in my site visits around the world to learn that many students are already taking time to serve their local communities by teaching English (in France, Japan, and Chile), by providing support to displaced peoples (in Uganda), or by volunteering in a variety of governmental offices (in Belgium, England, and Spain). Many return to these sites for more sustained research or service projects at a later date, as well, and they sustain friendships with host families, classmates, colleagues, and professors over a lifetime.

Through this engagement our students embody a kind of ongoing cosmopolitanism that we, as professors of language and literature, would do well to emulate. Our ongoing scholarship is crucial. But without making the human connections that feed our local communities—here and now, or there and then, wherever we happen to be—our scholarship will always be a hollow accomplishment.

Stanton is right: we must always be making connections, writing and reading communications with people from afar. But cosmopolitanism need not co-opt or abort efforts at grassroots citizenship. They can and must work hand in hand to make the professoriat a truly engaged segment of the population. Let it happen to us.

Julia Douthwaite
University of Notre Dame

Reply:

I am pleased that Julia Douthwaite casts her letter as a "supplement" to my address, "On Rooted Cosmopolitanism." However, I am puzzled by her criticisms since our texts share essentially the same views.

Her question "does cosmopolitanism have to connote a rootless and disembodied kind of political discourse?" is particularly perplexing as a response to a paper whose title and content explore the complexities of a "rooted cosmopolitanism." Douthwaite states that in contrast to my views, she believes "that we scholars must be fully rooted in our local polis." But I specifically refuse the opposition between cosmopolitanism and the nation and argue that "such binary thinking must be rejected in favor of a more capacious view that encompasses both the national and the transnational, the local and the global" and, again, that "cosmopolitanism must be a practice that is both local and global in context-specific doses"; put another way, I emphasize that we each have "multiple belongings," "a circle of enlarging allegiances," among which the local is prominent (636–37).

https://doi.org/10.1632/S0030812900166283 Published online by Cambridge University Press

While I did not specifically focus on students in an address to the members of the MLA, I applaud Douthwaite's efforts to engage students both in local community activities and in work abroad. My talk urges the members of the MLA to think of our work as a cosmopolitan practice: "I want to argue that what we, the teacher-scholars of the MLA, do in our many diverse ways is to exemplify and promote a cosmopolitan education and to engage in research and writing whose impulses and goals embody cosmopolitan thinking" (629). In particular, I cite Claire Kramsch's notion of learning a "foreign" language as a dialogic cultural practice, Anthony Appiah's model of conversation for both teaching and criticism, and Martha Nussbaum's ideal of a cosmopolitan education (629–32). I then try to refine David Damrosch's conception of world literature into a truly cosmopolitan practice based on knowledge of other languages.

I find one area of disagreement with Douthwaite, which involves what she believes are facts at the end of the eighteenth century and which I believe centers on the ways in which we read history. Douthwaite maintains that "the virile nationalism that developed in 1799 and on through the years of Napoleon's empire was for many people a travesty of the republican ideal" and insists that we should focus on the original intent of the revolution's "forebears." In my view, it is more important to gauge effects, what historians tell us happened in the 1790s, and not to invoke, in a way that would make Sartre cringe, what republican good intentions were. Indeed, what happened at the end of the eighteenth century bears great relevance for us today. That "a chauvinistic nationalism" (633) undermined cosmopolitanism and republicanism constitutes a crucial lesson for us in the republic of the United States, especially in the aftermath of 9/11 and amid the triumph of jingoistic discourses that pit "us" against "them" and menacingly proclaim, "You are either with us or against us."

Finally, Douthwaite invokes the idea of citizenship several times in her letter and claims that I oppose it to cosmopolitanism. I am surprised, since I do not discuss the connection between citizenship and cosmopolitanism, a complex issue that warrants a book in its own right. But since Douthwaite has raised the issue, I welcome the opportunity to underscore the critical importance of (re)defining citizenship today in a world where, as I wrote, there are dislocations of people (citizens) "in masses that the world has never seen" moving from south to north and east to west looking for work to survive and enduring hostile conditions of noncitizenship (637); where anti-immigrationism has reared its ugly head in a host of countries, including in western European nations historically known for their tolerance (e.g., the Netherlands); and where we have seen on our TV screens (and looked away from) the appalling conditions of refugees in Darfur and on the rooftops and in the Superdome of New Orleans. Who gets to be a citizen in our globalized world? What rights, what human rights do noncitizens have that fail to be upheld by nation-states, and how do we force nation-states to comply with international treaties they have signed? Ultimately, what cosmopolitan vision can encompass the plight of "enemy combatants" at Guantánamo Bay, who exist in the black hole of nonpersonhood with no citizen or human rights? These are indeed questions that we teacher-scholars of the MLA should confront as citizens of the world after 9/11. To be sure, some of us face similar problems in classrooms filled with the children of seasonal workers and immigrants who can't even be called second-class citizens. These defining issues for our time and place should be the subject of many more conversations and reflections and, undeniably, should be the cause for concerted action locally and globally.

Domna C. Stanton
Graduate Center, City University of New York

Eurasia and Imperialism

To the Editor:

Many thanks for publishing the conference debate "Are We Postcolonial? Post-Soviet Space" (121 [2006]: 828–36). It is most significant that in this discussion on postcolonialism the term *Eurasia* was used. To many thinkers and politicians in Russia today, *Eurasia* does not merely serve as a synonym for *post-Soviet*, it also represents dreams of a renewed empire. The designation of the post-Soviet non-Russian countries as Eurasian would represent a political neocontainment leading to neocolonialism.

https://doi.org/10.1632/S0030812900166283 Published online by Cambridge University Press