# The Cosmopolitan Amaranth: a Postcolonial Ecology

Christopher Lloyd De Shield
University of Malaya

> In Zaire women tear the leaves from red root (amaranth, what some people refer to as pig weed) stems and pound them in large wooden mortars and pestles before adding them to palm oil sauces.
> —*Extending the Table* (121)

> The Spanish conquerors were horrified to learn that the Aztecs mixed popped amaranth seed with human blood to form into a ceremonial cake as an offering to their gods. For this reason, it was illegal to cultivate amaranth in New Spain for many generations.
> —Rosita Arvigo and Michael Balick, *Rainforest Remedies* (37)

> The privatization and copyrighting of natural materials with commercial possibilities [...] has linked the colonization of territory and human beings with the colonization of all life.
> —Paul Gilroy, "A New Cosmopolitanism" (291)

The plurality of differentiated cosmopolitanisms that emerged after the critique of the idealistic project of the Enlightenment and the French *philosophes* is united at the root by a shared desire for grounding. The range of neologisms bears witness to this: collocations—lived, thick, discrepant, or, actually-existing cosmopolitanism—and portmanteaux, such as the influential "cosmopolitics," the more recent "eco-cosmopolitanism," or the comparatively unwieldy "macrocosm-opolitanism."[1] These qualifying terms all attempt to ground, in different ways, the universalist ideal inherent in historically sensitive meditations on the key term itself.

The diversity of practitioners from disparate fields who offer qualifications, groundings, and recuperations of cosmopolitanism as a term indicates that criticism of cosmopolitanism is itself cosmopolitan in character. Within postcolonial studies, the cosmopolitan ideal is routinely cited as inadequate or ambivalent for the field. Nevertheless, as in other disciplines, the term itself is not simply discarded. Theorists who yet criticize cosmopolitanism's Eurocentric, elite, "North," or "Western," neoliberal or global-hegemonic associations still routinely invoke it, despite the criticism —a signal that, for many, the term is yet recuperable. Attempts to salvage the term through theory testify to the continued belief in its necessity or potential. But for whom? The question is not only what is a better conception of cosmopolitanism, but also, who needs it? This is the question de Sousa Santos and Rodriguez-Garavito ask in their edited collection, *Law and Globalization from below: Towards a Cosmopolitan Legality* (2005). They answer straightforwardly that the person who needs it is "a victim of local intolerance and discrimination … [who] lives in misery

in a world of wealth [… who] is a non- or second-class citizen of a country or the world ... in short, the large majority of the world's populace" (14). Marshalling the term in service of the disadvantaged and marginalized is precisely the work of alternative postcolonial conceptions. Debate arises, not only as regards its provenance, however, but also on how best to wield it.

Postcolonial scholars routinely prescribe shifts in perspective as the necessary prerequisite to recuperative projects. One such perspectival shift is provided by Ursula Heise, who in *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet* argues for an *eco-cosmopolitanism*, an environmental world citizenship that acknowledges global impact and connectedness despite articulations of localism and place. Although Heise's critique is specifically directed at the North American environmental rhetoric of localism, her insistence on tempering the cultivation of a "sense of place" with a "sense of planet" provides a useful dynamic model of scalar simultaneity, a local-global interpenetration applicable to other contexts. The challenge, for Heise, is to demonstrate ecological and political awareness advocating on behalf of the more-than-human world from a connectedness rooted in larger, transnational, and global contexts, because the emphasis—at least in US environmentalist circles—has heretofore been on privileging cultivated attachment to local and immediate vicinities alone. "Rather than focusing on the recuperation of a sense of place," she argues, "environmentalism needs to foster an understanding of how a wide variety of both natural and cultural places and processes are connected and shape each other around the world, and how human impact affects and changes this connectedness" (21). Heise's shift toward a dynamic conception of space that acknowledges the manifest presence of the global in, and despite, articulations of the local clearly riffs on early understandings of cosmopolitanism as cultivated detachment from place, but it also draws on the ideals present in more contemporary articulations of actually existing cosmopolitanism, a version which posits ideals of "(re)attachment, multiple attachment, or attachment at a distance" (Robbins 3).

Another shift in perspective concerns the work of identifying candidate cosmopolitans. Describing cosmopolitanism as an idea ambivalent for the field of postcolonial studies, Sam Knowles observes that the term's "very generality has enabled numerous critics to expound at length on its features without realizing any particularly concrete definitions, and thus without reaching any kind of consensus on what the term means" (1). Knowles suggests there is a gap between "the idea of cosmopolitanism" and the "figure of the cosmopolitan" (2). He posits bridging this gap by studying actual cosmopolitans that would generate concrete definitions of the term.

Like Knowles—and others before him who look to "thick" descriptions and narratives of actually-existing cosmopolitans—I consider a particular cosmopolitan agent. But what previous literature and theory of cosmopolitanism routinely ignore, from anthropocentric bias, are examples from alternative, non-human categories. Thus, the rather more unique contribution I wish to make is to suggest looking

toward non-human nature as a source of actual cosmopolitans overlooked in most postcolonial conceptions, recuperations, and revisions of the term. What happens when we refuse to dismiss or ignore non-human nature as a rich source of potentially clarifying examples?

What follows then is an attempt to identify an actual cosmopolitan from non-human nature that bears association with members of the categories set out by Rodriguez-Garavito and de Sousa Santos (14) and that also demonstrates an ability to perform on different scales of theoretical abstraction. In so doing, I heed both Heise's and Knowles's calls by participating in the studied identification of actually-existing biotic cosmopolitans that inhabit local, and national environments at the subsistence level, but also register impact on the global or planetary scale.

## Cosmopolitanism and the Amaranth

A panoply of biotic cosmopolitans participate in subaltern economies—that is, economies of barter, neighbourly trade, and subsistence. These cosmopolitan agents are often complicit—along with small and urban farmers, migrant labourers, domestic servants—in sustaining extant alternatives to neoliberal conceptions of globalization that represent the Northern hegemony of transnational capital flows. Because they operate below the radar of global capital flows, they do not normally figure or register on charts or graphs of economic performance.

Considering these subaltern examples is to prescribe, just as other postcolonial scholarship does, a shift in perspective. But the nature of this shift is to consider the Global South from a biogeographical standpoint. Tropical regions of the Global South, for example, are hotbeds of cosmopolitanism: they exhibit a disproportionately rich biodiversity and multitudes of species trace their ancestry to these parts despite also being considered native, even indigenous, the world over. Countries of the Global South are home to innumerable floral and faunal species that are routinely ignored as viable exemplars of subaltern cosmopolitanism.

Tropical species, from weeds to fruit-trees, have crossed the world from the West Indies to the East Indies, and vice-versa, via natural dispersion, but also following colonial trajectories. Several tools exist to track and trace the paths of these biotic cosmopolitans through time and space. A recent study of the history of cultivated fruit in the Southeast Asian peninsula, for example, reveals how, "in the absence of other data, comparative linguistics is an important source for tracing the[ir] spread" (Blench 115). Indigenous Amazonians, the pineapple and the cashew became nativised in Southeast Asia after the Portuguese brought samples in diverse itineraries between Malacca and northeast Brazil. The Amerindian Tupi word for cashew is *caju* and for pineapple, *nana*; the Malay names for these fruits, *gajus* and *nanas*, are blatant derivatives of the Tupi via Portuguese (Blench 117).

The multiplicity of local varieties of pineapple celebrated among specific ethno-geographic regions of Borneo, or the Philippine archipelago, is testament to the fact that these fruits have found their way into native dishes and cultures.

This sort of situation, in which a fruit, plant, or animal has been present in an environment so long as to become native, is commonplace. For instance, R. Michael Bourke defines as indigenous in Papua New Guinea any fruit found there prior to 1870—the earliest date for which settlements by "foreigners" (Europeans, Asians, and other Pacific Islanders) can be traced, which caused major changes in agricultural production (Bourke and Harwood 22). In other, less "remote," regions, it is often impossible to precisely ascertain the origin of many fruits and plants because the processes would have occurred in ancient pre-history, perhaps before even the advent of humankind.[2] The origins of species such as the coconut, *Cocus nucifera*, predate the advent of humankind and are therefore somewhat mysterious; coconut enjoys a large dispersal range resulting from its dispersion via marine currents (though its present-day pantropical distribution was undoubtedly assisted by humans).[3] Animals and plants that display these characteristics are said, in the field of biogeography, to have "cosmopolitan distributions," that is, they are at home everywhere (Spellerberg and Sawyer, 110).

For this argument, however, I reflect on *Amaranthus* spp., a popular genus of edible weed; it goes by a hundred different names in innumerable local languages: in Bahasa Melayu, *bayam*; in Malayalam *cheera*; in Mandarin *yin choi*; in the Anglophone Caribbean, *callaloo*; in Brazilian Portuguese *cararu*. The purpose of examining a floral species in this way is to investigate a more theoretical question: what do strictly descriptive biogeographical versions of cosmopolitanism really have to offer theorists and critics of the cultivated ethical kind that appears in contested strife-riven debates within the humanities? Humanities-based conceptions routinely hail or critique Kantian formulations of cosmopolitanism as an originary model for contemporary articulations or prescriptions of its social and political potential. Biogeographical articulations of cosmopolitanism, by contrast, are completely disinterested in this intellectual genealogy and use the term straight-forwardly to describe "taxa that occur throughout the world" (Spellerberg and Sawyer 110). This reality then prompts the question: shared terminology notwithstanding, how might the biogeography of a genus of plant inform our approach to critiques of ethical formations *à la* Kant?

The Amaranth, I submit, is a model cosmopolitan that is, moreover, firmly centred on the Global South. As such, Amaranthus directly addresses the concerns of critics and theorists who seek concrete examples of recuperated cosmopolitanism, like Ursula Heise, Sam Knowles, or Paul Gilroy, whose articulations of an alternative cosmopolitanism I will interrogate shortly; and it might even provide a symbol of solidarity and resistance for postcolonial ecocriticism in general.

Having thus set out the premise for this argument, I will now consider the amaranth's significance in biogeographical and material cultural contexts more closely, before offering a postcolonial ecology that will foreground its relevance to the discourse and formulations of the ethical variety of cosmopolitanism.

## Introducing the Amaranth

A New World genus of species, in multi-ethnic Peninsular Malaysia amaranth goes by the names *bayam*, *yin choi*, or *cheera*. It is also sometimes called "spinach" in peninsular English, although it is not of the spinach family. Amaranth (in the peninsular Malaysian context henceforth called *bayam*) is often associated with peasant farming, as it is cultivated in diverse settings outside the conventional farm, in back lanes, pavement cracks, planter-boxes, and kitchen gardens. It is often cultivated by economic migrants, domestic servants or maids who grow vegetables and herbs to add to dishes they cook—that is, by the very subjects of much of postcolonial discourse in the Southeast Asian context. And while it is not known when the amaranth was introduced to Asia, its introduction certainly predates European colonialism (National Academy of Science, 1984).

It would be hard to find *bayam* at any of the Australian, European, US-American or other international franchises in the Peninsula. It is rather more popular in restaurants serving *kampung*-style food in any of the native cuisines. While amaranth, or *bayam*, grows on roadsides, beside houses and in empty lots, it is cultivated commercially in the peninsula as an indigenous green leafy vegetable.

Of about sixty species of amaranth, nearly all are useful. With sufficient sunlight and moisture amaranth grows rapidly, even in poor soils—an important reason for its popularity—and most species can be harvested within six weeks (Higman 355). Grown on small farms to provide nutrition for families above the level of subsistence, peninsular cultivation of *bayam* stands in solidarity with small farming among developing countries around the world (Altieri and Koohafkan, 2008), and small farming practices have been shown, in the view of ecological crisis, "to be one of the only viable options to meet present and future food needs" (Altieri 1).

This native citizen of the *semenanjung* (Malaysian peninsula) is also a native and naturalised citizen elsewhere, however. Amaranthus species were incredibly valuable among prehistoric subsistence cultures of the Americas. Today, Amaranth is one of the most popular food sources in tropical regions, including sub-Saharan Africa, India, Southeast Asia and the Caribbean (Nat. Sci. Acad., 1984). Within West African countries like The Gambia, plants of the amaranth genus are also recognized as a useful and popular nutritional resource (Prynne & Paul, 2011). In the Mandinka language it goes by the name "morongo," in Wolof it is known as "boroboro." In Botswana, amaranth is cooked with other vegetables in the dish called "morogo," or it is added to beef, boiled, and served as a popular soup (*Extending*

*the Table* 121). While examples of its popularity serve to showcase the cosmopolitan distribution among diverse national cultures the amaranth enjoys, more important for this essay is the recognition that amaranth, in its cosmopolitan distribution, acquires different names and becomes a constituent ingredient of otherwise discrete national cultures.

Peculiarly, although popular among such diverse societies, amaranth is still vastly underrated globally. According to the US National Science Academy's 1984 study on the amaranth, it is "only one of many underutilized food crops that are indigenous to third World Areas but neglected by researchers and policymakers" (1). Today, crop diversity is an issue of even greater concern especially considering the changes to the agricultural calendar brought on by climate change. Such concerns have prompted organizations like The Bolivian National Institute of Agricultural and Forestry Innovation (INIAF) to catalogue climate change-resistant seeds, such as the amaranth's.[4]

Amaranth grain has the nutritional value to be a major food crop on the world stage and yet is "virtually unlisted in agricultural statistics" of the world food economy which favours cereals, legumes and root crops, traditional cash-crops of the temperate climes (Nat. Sci. Acad. 8). While its potential is recognised by crop scientists, major "market barriers" persist (Myers "Amaranth: New Crop Opportunity"). Despite such studies, amaranth cultivation in the North faces intensified threats. Monocropping techniques, such as those promoted by large multinational agribusiness, inhibit attempts to diversify the world food economy with such alternative crops. Thus, the marginalization of a genus of edible plants from the world food economy parallels the economic marginalisation of the cultures which most value and utilize it.

## An Alternative Cosmopolitanism

Clearly, amaranth has an established association with those "non- or second-class citizen[s]" who nonetheless constitute "the large majority of the world's populace" (de Sousa Santos and Rodriguez-Garavito 14). In order to consider how the Amaranth might contribute to the recurrent postcolonial recuperations of cosmopolitanism, I turn to Paul Gilroy's attempts to theorize a *new cosmopolitanism*—one that would "generate an alternative sense of what our networked world might be and become" (Gilroy 289). Gilroy rescues the term cosmopolitanism not only from its Enlightenment usage where it was expressed as an exclusionary elite Eurocentric humanism, but also from its more recent use during the 2003 Iraq invasion by those neoliberal forces that justified political intervention "under the banner of cosmopolitanism and democratic humanitarianism" (289). For Gilroy, the supposedly benign interventions by Britain and the United States "should be easily recognizable as an update of older imperial themes" (289), and if the West were not so willfully ignorant of the postcolonial world in

general, they "would discover that previous phases of imperial and colonial rule were also regularly represented in civilizational and ethical terms" (289).

Gilroy takes issue with particular appropriations of the term that, he says, stubbornly centre the political topography of their humanitarian projects on the North Atlantic, where "Europe and the US are said to meet in order to quarrel over the relative merits of Kantian and Hobbesian rules" (289). What is fairly distinctive and laudable about Gilroy's conception here, and what distinguishes his from other attempts at articulating "vernacular cosmopolitanisms" is that he links ecological concerns, what he calls "planetary consciousness," to anti-colonial struggle. As he writes,

> The anti-colonial battles in Indo-China, South Asia, and Africa that ended the French and British Empire were world-historic, global events that specified a different global citizenship from the one that Kant had dreamed about … Since that point, environmental concerns have augmented the anticolonial solidarity. (289)

Such a move links Gilroy to other theorists of postcolonial ecology and ecocriticism, such as Graham Huggan and Helen Tiffin, who demonstrate postcolonial criticism's "long history of ecological concern" (3), or Elizabeth DeLoughrey and George Handley, who, in their recent edited collection, *Postcolonial Ecologies*, attempt to offer corrective supplements to "the recent scholarship theorizing the development of ecocriticism and environmentalism [that positions] Europe and the United States as the epistemological centers" (8).[5] Where Gilroy's project departs from these postcolonial ecocritics, though, is in his focus on a postcolonial *cosmopolitanism* which, for Gilroy, is galvanized by shared ecological threat.

Gilroy's *new cosmopolitanism* is *planetary consciousness*, not the "globalized mindset of privileged, unrestricted travellers, or some other unexpected fruit of heavily insulated overdevelopment," he writes, but a "critical orientation and oppositional mood, triggered by comprehension of the simple fact that environmental and medical crises do not stop at national boundaries, and by a feeling that the sustainability of our species is itself now in question" (290).

Gilroy's alternative appears to be a cosmopolitan solidarity for the socially, materially, and epistemologically downtrodden and, like other conceptions that derive from eco-apocalypse, it too is born of a justifiably shared fear of ecological collapse. But how does it work? In order to get to the level of planetary consciousness, Gilroy declares it imperative to cultivate "cosmopolitan disloyalty," and practice "systematic estrangement from the over-integrated culture of belligerent national states" (291). In other words, Gilroy is suspicious of the nation-state's role as a container for progressive politics.

Here Gilroy's prescription is nothing new. While postnationalism is not a necessary aspect or prerequisite of cosmopolitanism (the term itself predates the emergence of the modern nation-state (Cheah and Robbins 36)), scholarship on cosmopolitanism has often invoked a "planetary geographical imagination" against the parochialism of the

national category (Jazeel 78). Although frequently positioned as a counter-national term, cosmopolitanism—even in its central conception as an idea of Renaissance humanism—did not have to negate the nation as a category.

It is worth asking, then, if the cultivation of a cosmopolitan disloyalty is really sufficient, or at all necessary, in order to achieve Gilroy's desires (a truer understanding of human beings as a group together imperilled, inclusive of the already disenfranchised). Is a cosmopolitanism, predicated on the many looming shared ecological risks, really able to instil solidarity among inhabitants of the Global South?

Gilroy's critique highlights the massive inequality and institutional prejudice that undergirds neoliberal humanitarian discourse. Gilroy's argument parallels critiques of Kantian cosmopolitanism, such as David Harvey's, that contrast rather embarrassing "prejudicial remarks" (26) in Kant's *Geography* with his "much-vaunted universal ethics and cosmopolitanism" (29). While Kant considered geography to be an essential preliminary or a "propaedeutic" for his ethics, the actual content of his *Geography* seems politically and intellectually embarrassing (Harvey 26). Kant's personal prejudices and irrational beliefs belie the moral theory and ethics for which he is celebrated. Similarly, while neoliberal humanitarian discourse often promises to work for socio-economic upward mobility, improved access to valuable goods, and better quality of life, it is yet premised on sacrifices to national sovereignty, a hierarchical positioning at the lower rungs of industrial production, and a submission to the upward movement of global capital through mediated sites and means, all of which throw these initial claims in doubt.

But a dialectical underside is present in contemporary articulations of alternative cosmopolitanisms too. As I will show, Gilroy's *new cosmopolitanism* as a recuperative project is too easily inverted to work in service of exactly that which it opposes. Further, I will go on to claim that a postcolonial ecology of the amaranth is useful scholarship insofar as it reveals exactly this dialectic. It highlights trans-regional processes between areas as seemingly disparate as the Caribbean and Southeast Asia, and concrete solidarities that do not necessarily challenge ties to national cultures; it implicates the amaranth in cultural practices and products of multiple regions; and it reveals them to be both specific and particular as well as globally enmeshed. As such, a postcolonial ecology of the amaranth is instructive for those recuperative theorists of cosmopolitanism, like Paul Gilroy, who hope for "a new cosmopolitanism centred on the Global South" (289).

## Perverse Cosmopolitanisms

First, consider the dialectical underside to Gilroy's cultivated disloyalty and national estrangement. The history of neoliberalism has

provided numerous examples of global entities that waltz in perverse parody to the tune of solidarity with the global South. Multinational companies such as the Monsanto Corporation invest in strategies that undermine efforts at solidarity by infiltrating third-world markets under quasi-philanthropic guise.[6] Agribusiness giants say they are out to help farmers feed the world; they regularly cite as their *raison d'être* the need to feed an ever-growing population by "producing more,"[7] but Monsanto's agribusiness strategies include: monopolizing seed stocks, tying farm production to pesticide and herbicide use (especially its glyphosate-based herbicide Roundup) thereby preying on native cultural practices, and lobbying governments to conceal genetically modified produce by combating attempts at labelling (thereby denying consumer choice).[8]

Monsanto's attempt to control the world's commons and eliminate indigenous practices of cultivation under the rhetoric of feeding the world, exemplifies the processes by which a vision of the inter-related global system merely demands that the earth be *managed* on a global scale.[9] As such, the rhetoric of companies like Monsanto replicates what Arturo Escobar calls the "sustainable development discourse" in which "nature is reinvented ... so that *capital*, not nature and culture, may be sustained" (49).[10]

The cultivation of cosmopolitan disloyalty is moreover a common tactic used by multinational businesses and businessmen who relocate operations to Third World regions exploiting lax tax codes, cheap labour forces, and otherwise avoid closer scrutiny of their business practices.[11] Structural adjustments, like those advocated by the World Bank and the IMF that appear as favourable loans for impoverished countries, come with the condition of adopting neoliberal practices. They have been largely a failure for the poor, resulting in technological dependency and leaving peoples bereft of many social services. By opening up Third World countries to international extractive industries interested in short-term profits, they often facilitate the destruction of natural capital such as rainforests.[12]

As Pheng Cheah further points out, when one approaches parts of the Global South, one is likely to encounter the banal fact of illiteracy, and lack of basic amenities—adequate shelter, clean water—much less access to any enabling cosmopolitan discourse indicating conscious subscription to a planetary membership based on shared ecological concerns ("Cosmopolitanism" 493). Rather than address these serious inequalities, many transnational corporations perpetuate existing exploitation; and exploitation, even when the cosmopolitan agent is from the same country-of-origin as the exploited (Cheah 494). Indeed, Cheah observes how the "state-sponsored cosmopolitanism of developed countries in Asia" is used to "attract high-end expatriates" in finance service sectors especially, often exploiting their own "citizens and the lower-end migrant workers who bear the burden" resulting from this positioning (495). As Peter Hallward surmises in his book *Absolutely Postcolonial*, "post-national institutions on a global or continental scale are concerned with little more than the administration of the one thing that can be 'managed' at such a level of

generalisation—international finance" (132). To the extent that they disrupt "self-reproducing peasant economies" and erode national sovereignty whenever and wherever this challenges "free trade," global political institutions, such as the World Bank, or the WTO pose a threat to the solidarity of the Global South (Scruton 23).

Despite the laudable project of maintaining solidarity over planetary concerns, multinational companies with a record of atrocity in third-world regions too easily undermine and parody the type of post-national, postcolonial cosmopolitanism advocated by theorists like Gilroy. While the very scale of ecological threat persuades many theorists to formulate and align themselves with larger or transecting alternatives to the nation state, it is difficult to deny that the nation-state is currently best situated to protect the interests of populations in the Global South from predatory cosmopolitanisms pretending to operate in their favour.

Recuperative cosmopolitan scholarship then, before over-enthusiastically subscribing to post-national frameworks, ought to heed the many recent calls to reconsider the utility of the national category. Like cosmopolitanism itself, the nation-state needs recuperation. As John Barry and Robyn Eckersley write in *The State and the Global Ecological Crisis*, their project to "reinstate the state" as an entity that would facilitate positive environmental change, "it would be a great pity if environmental activists and NGOs were to turn their backs on what still remains the primary and most pervasive form of political governance in the world today" (x-xii). Or, as Peter Hallward writes in *Absolutely Postcolonial*, consider how the nation forms an "essential intermediary between local concerns and universal aspirations" (129). Indeed, even global organisations that have a stake in formulating international regulatory law are "dependent on nation-states for their legitimacy and motivating power" and, as Roger Scruton has argued, "it is a fantasy to think that any form of governance could be produced that would not overtly or covertly rely, in the end, on the territorial jurisdictions that those states have established" (308). Considering these realities, why flee from the national category in order to articulate strategic alliances among subjectivities from the margin? The nation-state, despite clearly possessing potential for abuse, would seem to be a more appropriate entity to protect local issues than the postnationalist alternatives.

Following these assertions, it may indeed be wise to consider forces inside and subject to the nation, at the particular local cultures and customs—rather than those beyond and outside it—to find grounds for solidarity between different regions that manifest themselves despite the particularity of their local expressions.[13] The apparently singular nature of local expression may yet bear resemblance to that of another. To reiterate with an appropriation from Foucault's *The Order of Things*, "[o]ne finds isomorphisms ... that ignore the extreme diversity of the objects under consideration" (xi).

This is why it is strange how very rarely non-human nature factors in debates over cosmopolitanism; such biota play remarkable roles in facilitating movement and engendering culture. And thus, the

Amaranth is revealed as an exemplary cosmopolitan whose significance to national cultures in the Global South runs concomitant with its cosmopolitan dispersion. Amaranthus species provide an interesting example with implications for cultivating solidarity in the face of predatory cosmopolitanisms such as that represented in agro-business multinationals like Monsanto.

## A Postcolonial Ecology of the Amaranth

From early colonialism, where it suffered Spanish attempts at eradication leading to its near-extinction some 500 years ago, to contemporary agrochemical companies developing high-tech poisons to "manage" it in fields of genetically modified monocrops—where it has developed resistance—amaranth's relationship with the North has been strained.

In North America, amaranth is known as "pig-weed" and gardeners battle it in their vegetable plots. The Spanish term for Amaranth translates into the same, *quelite de cochino*, pig's weed. According to the *Diccionario Real Academia*, *quelite* comes from the Nahautl word *quilitl* meaning "edible herb" and the Spanish word *cochino*, meaning "pig" —which is also a connotative adjective to describe someone or something filthy or nasty.

The amaranth was probably first domesticated by the Aztec and Maya civilizations of Central America and the Yucatán as a pseudograin. Bundles of it have been recovered from the Tehuacan caves in Mexico dated to over 5,500 years ago (Cheatham et al. 269). Among other names, the Aztec called it *quilitl*, the Maya, *xtesmukuy*. The mixed grain derived from *quilitl*, or amaranth, called *huauhtli*, was of central importance to their cultures at the time of the Spanish Conquest (Cheatham et al. 269). Moctezuma exacted yearly tributes from seventeen provinces of the Aztec Empire, amounting to 200,000 bushels of *huauhtli* making it a major commodity, ranking only slightly below maize and beans when measured by tribute.[14]

Amaranth features prominently in much of the Caribbean, where it is known as *callaloo*. In the Eastern Caribbean, callaloo leaves are mixed in a thick soup, which is called callaloo after this defining ingredient.[15] Callaloo is *the* most popular green leafy vegetable of Jamaica, despite ackee and okra taking the spotlight in terms of cultural significance (Higman 351). In Guyana, callaloo is often included in the national dish they call pepperpot. In Trinidad, callaloo is of particular national significance, serving as a model for the multicultural stew that is Trinidad and Caribbean creolization as a whole. A "callaloo nation" then is a mixed nation, one that is truly multi-ethnic and multi-cultural but which is experienced as a single dish.[16] Reflecting on the eponym in the journal *Callaloo*, Aisha Khan offers a culinary metaphor for cosmopolitanism:

> In Trinidad the politics of cultural struggle and the attendant politics of race and nation are an indelible part of Indo-Trinidadians' collective memory, and Afro-Trinidadians' collective memorialization of their respective diasporas. In both

> instances, certain key themes link the meaning of "diaspora" to the ideology of "nation." Arguably the preeminent theme is that of Trinidad callaloo. (53)

Khan goes on to declare that callaloo is, literally, "a national dish," a "metaphor for identity" and one that represents "a cosmopolitan world view" (53). However, Khan cautions that "'callaloo' is at best ambiguous and at worst a fraught template; from the perspective of most Afro-Trinidadians, it is still a measure of nation-state sovereignty" (62). Like cosmopolitanism then, callaloo, as metaphor, is a "floating signifier," or a stated ideal that is not immune to the agendas and vested interests that it informs (65).

In both Afro-Caribbean and Indo-Caribbean discourse, however, callaloo has historically been associated with the poor, colonised subjects, and slaves. In fact, it was probably also brought over to the Caribbean from West Africa (where it is also indigenous) through both active and incidental means. The US National Academy of Science's study of the amaranth introduces it thus: "few species of vegetables are so looked down upon" seen "worthy of picking only when one is driven by poverty" (8). This association was probably first cultivated during the colonial period when slavemasters and plantation owners documented slaves preparing amaranth leaves. In 1756, one colonial commentator in Jamaica noted how "calalou is frequently used for greens, by the negroes,"[17] and in 1794 another declared that, "because it grew wild and plentifully ... callaloo was of great service to poor slaves, who, if they can get salt to season it ... will live upon it weeks together."[18]

While these mid- and late eighteenth-century colonial accounts are revealing, the marginalisation of the amaranth in imperial global discourse can be traced more than two hundred years earlier. *The Useful Wild Plants of Texas* offers some fascinating socio-cultural history in its discussion of the amaranth genus. One criticism to register with the entry specific to the amaranth in this text concerns its description of New World amaranth decline. The text describes how the "ceremonial use of *huauhtli* flour may have been largely responsible for the decline in agricultural production following the Conquest" (269). However, this report of the decline seems to be a misrepresentation. The textbook places the blame on Aztec ceremony, strangely omitting mention of colonial forces that invented and enforced the prohibition of its cultivation.

According to Aztec custom, amaranth flour (*zoali*) was mixed with water or human blood and formed into religious and ceremonial objects. Spanish conquistadors quickly came to see grain amaranth as a symbol of heathen idolatry and a pagan parody of their own Eucharist (Cheatham *et. al.* 269). When the Aztecs were subjugated in 1519, it was the Spaniards who banned *both* the Aztec religion *and the cultivation of Amaranth* (Marx 40, my emphasis). Opposing the Aztec custom of offering cakes of popped amaranth seed and human blood to their gods, the Spanish conquerors made it "illegal to cultivate amaranth in New Spain for many generations" (Arvigo and Balick 37). Thus, already in the early colonial period, this "nutritious source of

greens and grain for millions of people approached extinction" (Cheatham *et. al.* 269).

Just as Paul Gilroy criticises cosmopolitanisms centred on the North Atlantic as constituting simple updates of older imperial themes, so does a postcolonial ecology of the amaranth reveal a similar phenomenon. Under Spanish colonialism in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries, amaranthus species were banned because their ritual use was perceived as a parody of Catholicism's Eucharistic rite and a threat to Spanish colonialist hegemony. In the Twenty-first Century, amaranth's adaptive potential has resulted in herbicide-resistant weeds that parody Monsanto's patented feats of genetic engineering (Culpepper, 2008; Waltz, 2010). Evidence of this type of resistance represents a threat to Monsanto's desired agricultural hegemony. Unsurprisingly, Monsanto's reaction has included attempts to deny the resistance of such weeds, prescribing greater levels of herbicide application, as well as increased litigation involving farmers who have their fields contaminated with Monsanto products.[19] In the US, resistance to Monsanto's "Roundup" brand of herbicides increasingly observed in the Palmer's Amaranth in particular has been taken up as heralding the doom of the company's current practices (Waltz, 2010). By now the isomorphism is obvious: with uncanny resemblance, the amaranth is vilified under a predatory cosmopolitanism despite its overarching significance to native cultures because it mimics, dangerously, the processes held sacred, and in this case, patented (intellectually sacrosanct) by the colonising power.

## Amaranth Cultivation as Eco-cosmopolitan Solidarity

A comparative postcolonial ecology of the amaranth, I argue, exemplifies solidarities on the "micro-level" of peasant cultures and home gardens. This type of cosmopolitanism—of the culinary, of the paddy, and of the kitchen—is actually articulated in the Global South. Just as amaranth cultivation then becomes a striking "subaltern" counterpoint to European *haute cuisine*, this type of cosmopolitanism, situated in the kitchen and the peasant farm, highlights a grounding of the term crucial for attempts at its recuperation.

Ursula Heise sees in such theoretical and conceptual recuperations of the term, with the concomitant debates over the national and global opposition, "a useful basis for thinking about environmental allegiances that reach beyond the local and the national" (21). Simultaneously operating at the micro-level but with global significance and in transnational solidarity in the Global South, amaranth cultivation might satisfy Heise's concept of an eco-cosmopolitanism and is, moreover, one that does not simply call for solidarity by virtue of the alarm of imminent global eco-catastrophe, but one which appeals to ordinary politics of shared responsibility.[20]

Sophisticated theorists of cosmopolitanism like Pheng Cheah are critical of attempts to figure post-nationalist cosmopolitanisms centred on the Global South. Gilroy's abstracting model, whereby a citizen

extracts herself from the particularities of her culture in order to gain the planetary consciousness necessary for cultivating solidarity across the Global South, thus must respond to suspicions and criticisms like Cheah's that note banal realities like illiteracy, lack of access to basic amenities, and the unlikely presence of any feeling of global belonging among the disparate peoples of the Global South ("Cosmopolitanism" 493). While such suspicions and criticisms seem justified, another look at sub-national cultures reveals shared processes, below the radar of postnationalist cosmopolitanisms, but which are nonetheless unearthed through comparativisms informed by postcolonial insights that "avoid excessive parochialism but also false universals" (Robinson 125).

Particular intra-national experiences, especially unique and diverse cultural practices, would seem to offer much to a world "seduced and tainted by the might of homogenizing forces" (Torres-Saillant 28). Foregrounding such diverse practices is especially crucial given perverse multinational entities' demonstrated ability to invoke and thereby co-opt—as a rationale to further their own ecologically dubious practices—the same global problematics and alarms eco-activists use for theirs. Such bizarre ironic phenomena indicate that ecological solidarity born solely from articulations of shared risk may be too easily perverted and co-opted by powerful interests that attempt to take advantage of state-level executive decisions and trump local manifestations of resistance to their global hegemony.

In contrast, many small communities of diverse members can understand simple actions such as amaranth cultivation or guerrilla gardening as a form of resistance to this type of global hegemony through an "eco-cosmopolitanism" that does not necessarily originate out of local culture, but does operate on a local arena. Transnational migrants maintain affiliation to their countries-of-origin yet participate in this type of action at the subaltern level. While their work cannot simply and easily be understood as being born from local national culture in the normative sense, it is nonetheless participant in it, however blindly or unconsciously. In this sense, the true indicator of amaranth's cosmopolitanism lies in its participation in, and unique transformations of, disparate cultures and its cultural impact at the locality itself.

What the cosmopolitan ecology of amaranth reveals is that it is possible to locate comparatively similar practices across disparate regions which, due to the fact of their similarity, *effect* a solidarity across the global South, without necessarily being cognisant of the fact. One might begin to address the banal realities Cheah points out by first identifying the sorts of blind cosmopolitan practices I am articulating here. While these may not at first be motivated by anything other than "long-distance, absentee national feeling" (Cheah 493), if cultivated, they could be "analytically distinguished" from such action following the direction of Patrick Murphy, who in *Ecocritical Explorations* argues for localism "in orientation" (1). That is, despite the motivations and regardless of their volition, such actions nevertheless manifest themselves at the level of the local and particular even when presenting ramifications potentially global in scale. As he

argues, "unique events ... do not occur in isolation from other unique events but in solidarity with them through mutual participation in human culture and in the material world" (34). Murphy highlights the example of intentional communities (for example, the Indigenous Environmental Network) whereby "fundamental commonalities and threats" link geographically and otherwise disparate groups because of the shared resemblance of their "inhabitory practices" (38).

As I have argued, everyday cosmopolitanisms are clearly revealed in the cultural, historical, and etymological routes and roots of some fauna and flora (such as the amaranth) of such comparatively disparate regions as Southeast Asia and the Caribbean. And, often, sub-national or other types of allonational groupings sustain these cultural formations with the legal protection of the state.

Thus, rather than prescribe more and more specific versions of ethical cosmopolitanism, or suggest, from above, what ought to be done below, for forging cosmopolitan solidarity across the Global South, it is helpful to learn from already existing, discrete performances that are nevertheless similar or analogous between nations and regions.[21] Such a shift in perspective, while useful, still needs concretization or interrogation by considering the trajectory of an actual cosmopolitan. This is where Heise's eco-cosmopolitanism, which conceives "imagined communities" of nonhuman and human alike on a planetary scale might usefully nudge Gilroy's offering toward the consideration of the more-than-human.

Considering the postcolonial ecologies like that of the amaranth forces one to take seriously the perspectival shifts suggested by theorists such as Heise and her concept of eco-cosmopolitanism, but also those who, like Gilroy, offer useful correctives to North Atlantic bias by extending geographical range. In so doing, the salutary recuperation of the cosmopolitan ideal may draw on the rich storehouse of actually existing examples present in the more-than-human world. As Heise argues, this realm includes nonhuman species but is also connected to "animate and inanimate networks of influence and exchange" (61). And it helps us to understand more fully how other cultures and other species are linked within the "imagined community" of the planet.

As such, autonomous nation-states of the Global South, like Malaysia, Botswana, and Belize—when alternatively hailed, courted, or bullied by predatory cosmopolitanisms centred on the North Atlantic—need to recall and revive their charge to respect, cultivate, and protect their biological diversity. If there is a way of realizing Gilroy's alternative vision of cosmopolitanism or a networked world centred on the concerns of the Global South, theorists of cosmopolitanism might continue working to identify remarkable cultural practices, such as amaranth cultivation among small farmers that, while seemingly isolable and specific, contribute to the ecological sustainability of the species as a whole.

## Notes

1. In her genealogy of the new cosmopolitanisms, Amanda Anderson notes the "prevalent prejudice in favour of neologisms" ("Cosmopolitanism, Universalism, and the Divided Legacies of Modernity" 266). "Discrepant cosmopolitanism" is mentioned in James Clifford's essay, "Traveling Cultures"; "actually-existing cosmopolitanism" comes from "the varieties of cosmopolitanism," Scott L. Malcolmson's contribution to Cheah and Robbins's book *Cosmopolitics*; Sam Knowles coins Macrocosm-opolitanism in "Macrocosm-opolitanism? Gilroy, Appiah, and Bhabha: The Unsettling Generality of Cosmopolitan Ideas," *Postcolonial Text* 3.4 (2007). "Cosmopolitics" is, of course, the title of Cheah and Robbins's edited collection *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation* (1998); Ursula Heise theorises "eco-cosmopolitanism" in *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet*: *Environmental Imagination of the Global* (2008).

2. The authors of *Tropical Rain Forests: An Ecological and Biogeographical Comparison* reveal, that in general, "the ancient land plants have the most cosmopolitan distributions" (Corlett and Primack 35). The factor of their having been around longer than other species certainly contributes to the degree of their dispersion but also the fact that the physical geography in the "Mesozoic and Early Tertiary" (radically different in the current age) enabled inter-regional dispersion within the tropical belt (35).

3. See the online handbook hosted by Purdue University's Center for New Crops and Plants Products. James A. Duke, *Handbook of Energy Crops* (unpublished, 1983).

4. See "El INIAF presento 21 variedades agrícolas para contribuir a la seguridad alimentaria," *Los Tiempos* [Cochabamba, Bolivia] 8 Feb. 2010. Web. 15 Apr 2015. <http://www.lostiempos.com/diario/actualidad/economia/20100208/el-iniaf-presento-21-variedades-agricolas-para-contribuir-a-la-seguridad_57021_102044.html >.

5. Ursula Heise's project may be implicated here. While Heise's eco-cosmopolitanism is usefully attuned to postcolonial concerns, her project still maintains as its ultimate object of inquiry and critique a US-based environmentalism.

6. As a dominant player in the market, Monsanto's company name is often used—as I use it here—as a term of convenience for representing large agri-business in general. This practice is especially common among anti-GM crops activists and critics. "Evil" is a popular epithet bestowed on the company by these activists. The descriptor is a probable result of the company's litigious nature and the putative zeal with which it persecutes perceived opponents no matter their size or

the extent of their resources. An internet search for the specific term "Evil Monsanto" yields thousands of results.

7. See Monsanto's web page "Monsanto at a Glance" where the company describes its focus on "empowering farmers—large and small—to produce more from their land while conserving more of our world's natural resources such as water and energy." Web. 15 Apr. 2015. <http://www.monsanto.com/whoweare/Pages/default.aspx>.

8. Monsanto's approach to insect and weed management depends upon an "agricultural simplification." Huge areas are devoted to one or two crops with little uncultivated area placing high selection pressure on pests that develop resistance (prompting companies like Monsanto to suggest ever-increasing application of their biocides).

See Andrew Kimbrell, "Genetically Engineered Foods will not Feed the World: The Center for Food Safety Pushes Back against Gates' Foundation 'Feed the World' Propaganda," Press Release, 25 Jan. 2012. < http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/press-releases/1147/genetically-engineered-crops-will-not-feed-the-world>.

See also Third World Network, "Malaysia's GMO Labelling Stance and US Pressure," 13 Jun. 2007. Web. 15 Apr. 2015. <http://www.twn.my/title2/FTAs/info.service/fta.info.service103.htm> Last accessed 15 Apr 2015>. The Third World Network, with headquarters in Penang, Malaysia, issued the following statement: "Malaysia's experience is shared by many others in the developing world which constantly come under pressure by the biotechnology industry and the USTR for them to have weak biosafety regulations and particularly to not require mandatory labelling of GMOs and GM products." <http://www.twnside.org.sg/title2/FTAs/info.service/fta.info.service103.htm>.

9. See Sachs (1988), whose phraseology I employ here. Sach's argument is reproduced in an influential essay by Arturo Escobar, "Constructing Nature: Elements for a Poststructural Political Ecology," *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements*, ed. Richard Peet and Michael Watts (London: Routledge, 1996) 46-68.

10. Vandana Shiva's critique of the privatisation of nature provides the exemplary oppositional position. She argues that "the transformation of commons into commodities ... implies the exclusion of the right to survival for large sections of society" (332). She further charges those "chasing the mirage of unending growth, by spreading resource destruction technologies," of supporting "a major source of genocide" (349).

11. Graham Huggan and Helen Tiffin critique this set of circumstances through Arundathi Roy's analysis of the "neocolonialist iron triangle—politicians, bureaucrats and corporations, often with international Aid backing—which has exploited the progressivist

ideologies of Third World economic development for its own immediate purposes...” (49).

12. Anthony Carrigan, “Out of this Great Tragedy Will Come a World Class Tourism Destination,” *Postcolonial Ecologies*, ed. Elizabeth DeLoughrey and George B. Handley (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2011) 275.

Deforestation can be viewed as a market inefficiency in that deforestation is incorrectly priced; what is viewed as short-term monetary gain is in fact a net loss in the long term. While in many countries GDP and carbon emission are looked upon as positive co-relatives—increase in activity (emitting more carbon) produces more income—in the case of Malaysia, deforestation has grossly distorted the picture—the carbon Malaysia emits is disproportionate to the GDP it produces.

13. Patrick Murphy points out a similar observation with regard to novelistic exemplifications of the “subsistence perspective” he highlights in his essay “The Ecofeminist Subsistence Perspective Revisited in an Age of Land Grabs and Its Representations in Contemporary Literature.” Murphy finds the “significant commonalities among them” remarkable given they “come from a variety of national literatures, with distinct styles and settings” (207).

14. See the image description of the *Codex Mendoza* pt. II fol. 035r. in the Bodleian Library’s digital manuscript collection “*Codex Mendoza.” Spanish Guide to Mexican Culture*. c.1540. MS. Arch. Mendoza A. 1. 113D. 038. (Accessed 26 April 2013).

15. The name *Callaloo* has also been taken as the title of a premier African diaspora literary journal, suggesting that it means to showcase various textures and flavours of Black literatures and other postcolonial literary materials to the world. <http://www.press.jhu.edu/journals/callaloo>.

16. Though Khan goes on to offer a nuanced critique of discourses of *mestizaje* and *creolisation* that reveal the politics of cultural struggle concealed by the terms’ use. See Aisha Khan, “Mixing Matters: *Callaloo Nation* Revisited,” *Callaloo* 30.1 (2007): 51-67.

17. Patrick Browne, *The Civil and Natural History of Jamaica*, 1756 (New York: Arno Press, 1972) 232, qtd in B. W. Higman, “Jamaican Versions of Callaloo,” *Callaloo* 30.1 (2007): 353.

18. Henry Barham, *Hortus Americanus: Containing an Account of the Trees, Shrubs, and Other Vegetable Productions of South America and the West-India Islands, and Particularly the Island of Jamaica* (Kingston: Alexander Aikman, 1794) 44, qtd. in B. W. Higman, “Jamaican Versions of Callaloo,” *Callaloo* 30.1 (2007): 356.

19. Indiana farmer Troy Roush's statement to the US Government Oversight committee is typical.

20. In *Green Philosophy* Roger Scruton criticizes alarms of this kind because they "turn problems into emergencies" that then tend to hijack compromise that ordinarily solves problems, by priming people for top-down political control by would-be leaders (39).

21. This sort of perspectival shift is also articulated by Mies and Bennholdt-Thomsen. In their book *The Subsistence Perspective: Beyond the Globalised Economy*, the authors turn to women's stories to point out that "the subsistence perspective *already exists* in diverse forms" and that it is "necessary, desireable, and possible" (7, my emphasis).

## Works Cited


Altieri, Miguel A. "Agroecologically Efficient Agricultural Systems for Smallholder Farmers: Contributions to Food Sovereignty." *Agronomy for Sustainable Development* 32 (2012): 1-13. Print.

Altieri, Miguel A. and Parviz Koohafkan. *Enduring Farms: Climate Change, Smallholders and Traditional Farming Communities.* Penang, Malaysia: Third World Network, 2008. Web. <www.twnside.org.sg>.

Anderson, Amanda. "Cosmopolitanism, Universalism, and the Divided Legacies of Modernity." *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Eds. Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998. 265-289. Print.

Arvigo, Rosita and Michael Balick. *Rainforest Remedies: One Hundred Healing Herbs of Belize*. 2nd ed. Twin Lakes: Lotus Press, 1998. Print.

Barham, Henry. *Hortus Americanus: Containing an Account of the Trees, Shrubs, and Other Vegetable Productions of South America and the West-India Islands, and Particularly the Island of Jamaica.* Kingston: Alexander Aikman, 1794. Internet Archive. Web. 7 Feb. 2014. <https://archive.org/details/hortusamericanu01barhgoog>.

Barry, John and Robyn Eckersley, eds. *The State and the Global Ecological Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press, 2005. Print.

Blench, Robert. "A History of Fruits on the Southeast Asian Mainland." *Occasional Paper 4 Linguistics, Archeaology and the Human Past.* Kyoto: Indus Project, 2008. Web.

Bourke, R. Michael, and Tracy Harwood, eds. *Food and Agriculture in Papua New Guinea*. Canberra: ANU Press, 2009. Print.

Browne, Patrick. *The Civil and Natural History of Jamaica*. London: Gray's Inn, 1756. Internet Archive. Web. 7 Feb 2014. <https://archive.org/details/mobot31753000808003>.

Carrigan, Anthony. "Out of this Great Tragedy Will Come a World Class Tourism Destination." *Postcolonial Ecologies*. Eds.

Elizabeth DeLoughrey and George B. Handley. Oxford UP, 2011. 273-290. Print.
Cheah, Pheng and Bruce Robbins, eds. *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998. Print.
Cheah, Pheng. "Cosmopolitanism." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23.2-3 (2006): 486-496.
Cheatham, Scooter, *et al*. *The Useful Wild Plants of Texas, the Southeastern and Southwestern United States, the Southern Plains, and Northern Mexico*. Vol. 1. Austin, Texas, 1995. Print.
Clifford, James. "Traveling Cultures" *Cultural Studies*. Eds. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013. 96-116. Print.
"*Codex Mendoza.*" *Spanish Guide to Mexican Culture*. c.1540. MS. Arch. Mendoza A. 1.. 113D. 038. Web. 7 Feb 2014. <http://bodley30.bodley.ox.ac.uk:8180/luna/servlet/s/wt9n09>.
Corlett, Richard T. and Richard B. Primack. *Tropical Rain Forests: An Ecological and Biogeographical Comparison*. 2nd Ed. Wiley-Blackwell, 2012. Print.
Culpepper, A.S., *et al*. "Distribution of Glyphosate-Resistant Palmer Amaranth (Amaranthus Palmeri) in Georgia and North Carolina during 2005 and 2006." *The Journal of Cotton Science* 12 (2008): 306-310.
DeLoughrey, Elizabeth and George B. Handley. *Postcolonial Ecologies*. Oxford UP, 2011. Print.
Dobson, Andrew. "Thick Cosmopolitanism." *Political Studies* 54 (2006): 165-184.
Duke, James A. *Handbook of Energy Crops*. Unpublished, 1983. Web. 26 Jan 2015. <https://www.hort.purdue.edu/newcrop/duke_energy/Cocos_nucifera.html >.
Escobar, Arturo. "Constructing Nature: Elements for a Poststructural Political Ecology." *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements*. Eds. Richard Peet and Michael J. Watts. London: Routledge, 1996. 46-68. Print.
"El INIAF presento 21 variedades agrícolas para contribuir a la seguridad alimentaria." *Los Tiempos* [Cochabamba, Bolivia]. 8 Feb, 2010. Web. 15 Apr. 2015. <http://www.lostiempos.com/diario/actualidad/economia/20100208/el-iniaf-presento-21-variedades-agricolas-para-contribuir-a-la-seguridad_57021_102044.html>.
Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things*. London: Tavistock, 1970. Print.
Gilroy, Paul. "A New Cosmopolitanism." *Interventions* 7.3 (2005): 287-292.
Hallward, Peter. *Absolutely Postcolonial: Writing Between the Singular and the Specific*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2001. Print.
Harvey, David. "Cosmopolitanism and the Banality of Geographical Evils." *Millennial Capitalism and the Culture of Neoliberalism*.

Eds. Jean Comaroff and John L. Comaroff. Durham: Duke UP, 2001: 271-309. Print.
—. *Cosmopolitanism and the Geographies of Freedom*. (Wellek Library Lectures in Critical Theory). New York: Columbia UP, 2009. Print.
Heise, Ursula. *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet*: *Environmental Imagination of the Global*. Oxford UP, 2008. Print.
Higman, B. W. "Jamaican Versions of Callaloo." *Callaloo* 30.1 (2007): 351-368.
Huggan, Graham and Helen Tiffin. *Postcolonial Ecocriticism: Literature, Animals, Environment*. London: Routledge, 2010. Print.
Jazeel, Tariq. "Spatializing Difference beyond Cosmopolitanism: Rethinking Planetary Futures." *Theory, Culture & Society* 28.5 (2011): 75-97.
Khan, Aisha. "Mixing Matters: *Callaloo Nation* Revisited." *Callaloo* 30.1 (2007): 51-67.
Kimbrell, Andrew. (25th Jan. 2012). "Genetically Engineered Foods Will Not Feed the World: The Center for Food Safety Pushes Back against Gates' Foundation 'Feed the World' Propaganda." Press Release. Web. 26 Jan 2015. <http://www.centerforfoodsafety.org/press-releases/1147/genetically-engineered-crops-will-not-feed-the-world>.
Knowles, Sam. "Macrocosm-opolitanism? Gilroy, Appiah, and Bhabha: The Unsettling Generality of Cosmopolitan Ideas." *Postcolonial Text* 3.4 (2007). Web.
Malcomson, Scott. "The Varieties of Cosmopolitan Experience." *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*. Eds. Pheng Cheah and Bruce Robbins. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1998. 233-245. Print.
Marx, Jean L. "Speaking of Science: Amaranth: A Comeback for the Food of the Aztecs?" *Science* 198 (1977): 40.
Mies, Maria and Veronika Bennholdt-Thomson. *The Subsistence Perspective: Beyond the Globalised Economy*. London: Zed Books, 2000. Print.
Mukherjee, Upamanyu Pablo. *Postcolonial Environments: Nature Culture and the Contemporary Indian Novel in English*. London: Palgrave, 2010. Print.
Murphy, Patrick D. "The Ecofeminist Subsistence Perspective Revisited in an Age of Land Grabs and its Representations in Contemporary Literature." *Ecofeminismo/s: mujeres y naturaleza* 22 (2013): 205-224.
Murphy, Patrick D. *Ecocritical Explorations in Literary and Cultural Studies: Fences, Boundaries, and Fields.* Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2009. Print.
Myers, Robert L. "Amaranth: New Crop Opportunity." *Progress in New Crops: New Opportunities, New Technologies.* Ed. Jules Janick. Alexandria, VA.: ASHS Press, 1996. 207-220. Web. 26 Jan 2015.

<https://www.hort.purdue.edu/newcrop/proceedings1996/V3-207.html>.
National Research Council [U.S.]. "Amaranth: Modern Prospects for an Ancient Crop." *Report of an Ad Hoc Panel of the Advisory Committee on Technology Innovation Board on Science and Technology for International Development.* Washington D.C.: National Academy Press, 1984. Print.
Peet, Richard and Michael J. Watts, eds. *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements*. London: Routledge, 1996. Print.
Prynne, C. J. and A. A. Paul. "Food Composition Table for use in The Gambia." Cambridge: MRC Human Nutrition Research, 2011. Web. 26 Jan 2015. <www.fao.org>.
Robinson, Jennifer. "Comparisons: Cosmopolitan or Colonial?" *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 32 (2011): 125-140.
Rodríguez Garavito, César A, and Boaventura de Sousa Santos. *Law and Globalization from Below: Towards a Cosmopolitan Legality*. Cambridge UP, 2005. Print.
Roush, Troy. "Are Superweeds an Outgrowth of USDA Biotechnology Policy? Statement of Troy Roush." House Committee on Oversight & Government Reform Subcommittee on Domestic Policy. 2010. Web. 26 Jan 2015. <http://oversight.house.gov/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/20100728Roush.pdf>.
Sachs, Wolfgang. "The Gospel of Global Efficiency." IFDA Dossier No. 68 (1988): 3-9.
Schlabach, Joetta Handrich, ed. *Extending the Table: Recipes and Stories from Argentina to Zambia in the Spirit of More-with-Less*. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1991. Print.
Scruton, Roger. *Green Philosophy: How to Think Seriously about the Planet*. London: Atlantic Books, 2013. Print.
Shiva, Vandana. *Ecology and the Politics of Survival: Conflicts over Natural Resources in India*. New Delhi: Sage, 1991. Print.
Simpson, David. "The Limits of Cosmopolitanism and the Case for Translation." *European Romantic Review* 16.2 (2005): 141-52.
Spellerberg, Ian F. and John W. D. Sawyer. *An Introduction to Applied Biogeography*. Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.
Third World Network. "Malaysia's GMO Labelling Stance and US Pressure." 13 Jun. 2007. Web. 15 Apr. 2015. <http://www.twnside.org.sg/title2/FTAs/info.service/fta.info.service103.htm>.
Torres-Saillant, Silvio. *An Intellectual History of the Caribbean*. New York, N.Y.: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. Print.
Waltz, Emily. "Glyphosate Resistance Threatens Roundup Hegemony." *Nature Biotechnology* 28 (2010): 537-538.
Werbner, Pnina. "Vernacular Cosmopolitanism." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23.2-3 (2006): 496-498.