

Brian Duffy

Cosmopolitanism and Patriotism in Richard Ford's 'Occidentals'

Martha C. Nussbaum's essay, 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism', is the opening contribution to the book, *For Love of Country?*, and is the essay to which the sixteen other contributors in the collection respond in the debate over what Nussbaum sees as being the essentially competing claims of patriotism and cosmopolitanism.¹ Nussbaum specifically wishes to make the case for young Americans to be exposed to cosmopolitan values during their formal education to counter what she considers to be an 'emphasis on patriotic pride [which] is both morally dangerous and, ultimately, subversive of some of the worthy goals patriotism sets out to serve' (4). Among these patriotic goals are the 'moral ideals of justice and equality' (4). It is Nussbaum's argument that a moral perspective demands that the effort to achieve these ideals not be restricted by national boundaries: as moral beings we must 'give our first allegiance to what is morally good—and that which, being good, I can commend as such to all human beings' (5). Nussbaum's essay, then, is a response to her own question as to whether patriotism or cosmopolitanism has the better moral credentials to achieve the ideals of justice and equality for all humanity. Her essay goes on to argue that these goals 'would be better served by [...] the very old ideal of the cosmopolitan, the person whose allegiance is to the worldwide community of human beings' (4).

Nussbaum is not the only contributor to the collection who identifies a new urgency in the debate about the role of cosmopolitanism in the Western world in the aftermath of the crumbling of the post-World War Two ideological world order and the attacks of September 11, 2001. In the book's introduction Nussbaum situates the debate within the context of the post-9/11 'national crisis' facing America (xiv), but goes on in her own contribution to emphasise the global context within which the challenges to and opportunities for cosmopolitanism must be considered, evoking explicitly the problems of the environment, the world food supply and population growth. Sissela Bok takes up this issue of the viability of a narrow national self-interested response when confronted with the global problems of AIDS and 'environmental, military, and humanitarian crises' (38). In his recent book, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, Kwame Anthony Appiah in his

turn emphasises the changing context for the debate on cosmopolitanism, and echoes Nussbaum's claim about the 'interconnectedness of all peoples' (xiii) when he observes that we have 'come to a point where each of us can realistically imagine contacting any other of our six billion conspecifics and sending that person something worth having' (or something they could well do without, as he hastens to add).² The challenge, for Appiah, is to find ways 'that will allow us to live together as the global tribe we have become'.³ Yet, for all that such reflections would counsel cosmopolitanism on pragmatic grounds in the face of the new globalised world order, it is with the force of the moral argument for cosmopolitanism that Nussbaum seeks to persuade the partisans of patriotic values.

In setting the terms of her discussion, Nussbaum draws upon a *New York Times* article by Richard Rorty in which he charges the 'academic departments' of some American colleges and universities, which he terms 'sanctuaries for left-wing political views', as being 'unpatriotic'. For Rorty, this academic left 'refuses to rejoice in the country it inhabits. It repudiates the idea of a national identity, and the emotion of national pride'.⁴ Nussbaum is suspect of this notion of patriotism, and, although acknowledging that 'Richard Rorty's patriotism may be a way of bringing all Americans together', she bluntly declares that 'patriotism is very close to jingoism' (14). In the national context in which she and Rorty are writing, the latter's appeal to patriotic values represents for Nussbaum an agenda which would seek to erect a strict hierarchy of value and attention, one in which national interests and affections take precedence over the moral imperative to seek to achieve justice and equality for all humanity. If, in Nussbaum's view, cosmopolitan ideals do not demand that we forego or neglect 'our special affections and identifications' (9) with regard to family, community, or country, she nonetheless considers Rorty's, and others', versions of patriotism as 'inward-looking' (4) in that it identifies Americans as morally worthy of special attention, an evaluation which will inevitably relegate the needs of others to a secondary moral status.

If Nussbaum considers the authority of the moral argument for cosmopolitanism to be indisputable, she recognises nonetheless that there are formidable obstacles to the realisation of her ideal of a 'moral community made up by the humanity of all human beings' (7). And the greatest impediment to the acceptance of a cosmopolitan perspective is posed by the ideology-conditioned limitations of the human imagination: for the cosmopolitan ethic to prevail, those who define and identify

themselves through local and national affiliations must be persuaded to overcome what Nussbaum terms “‘us-them’ thinking’ (x) and to extend their affections to human beings in distant regions of the world, to those whose lives may seem remote and whose cultures may seem foreign, even rebarbative. Time and again Nussbaum returns to both the dangers of and challenges to human imagination, for example when she warns of how readily ‘us-them’ thinking can lead to the ‘demonizing of an imagined “them”’ (x), or when she speaks of how, ‘[a]ll too often, [...] our imaginations remain oriented to the local’ (x).⁵ It is surely no coincidence, then, that Nussbaum begins her discussion by using the imaginative narrative of a literary text to illustrate the differences between cosmopolitan and patriotic values. She also signals her approval of another contributor, Elaine Scarry, because the latter points out, as Nussbaum puts it, that ‘works of imaginative literature play a pivotal role’ in the cultivation of ‘world citizenship’ (139). Scarry’s article, ‘The Difficulty of Imagining Other People’, begins with the proposition that ‘[t]he way we act toward “others” is shaped by the way we imagine them’ (98), recognising that the ‘problem’ attending such imaginings are all the more difficult to overcome when the other person ‘is a stranger or “foreigner”’ (98). Scarry’s contribution is an adaptation of a longer piece which dealt with the ‘foreignness’ of Turkish residents in Germany, but she also understands ‘foreigners’ and ‘foreignness’ in the wider sense of those configured as ‘others’ and in their ‘otherness’, whether within or without national borders. For Scarry, one of the strengths of ‘great literature’ is, indeed, its ‘ability to imagine others’ (103), a quality which surpasses the individual’s own imaginative resources. Literature confronts us with difference, and facilitates what Appiah calls an ‘imaginative engagement’ with the lives of others.⁶ Scarry cites Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* and E. M. Forster’s *Passage to India* as novels which occasioned radical re-imaginings by white readers of the ‘others’ of, respectively, black Americans and the population of India.

If, for Scarry, the positive and dramatic political consequences of the re-imagining of the ‘other’ facilitated by these two literary representations remain the exception, literature continues nonetheless to have recourse to the moral perplexities and dynamic narrative possibilities arising from the confrontation between self and other in the ideological and moral realms envisioned by both Nussbaum and Scarry. Richard Ford’s novella, ‘Occidentals’ (from his collection, *Women with Men*), is an exemplary imaginative literary text in this regard: ‘Occidentals’ deals with otherness

and cultural difference in terms consistent with Nussbaum's opposition between cosmopolitanism and patriotism, and the story also specifically thematises the problem of imagining the 'foreign' other, the central concern of Scarry's article. 'Occidentals' is further relevant to the debate carried out in *For Love of Country?* in that the story's protagonists are American: Nussbaum's lead article, and the responses to it, concentrate essentially on patriotism and cosmopolitanism in the American context. Overall, then, Ford's novella represents a remarkably relevant literary staging of Nussbaum's confrontation of values.

Ford's story takes place over the few days which his American protagonist, Charley Matthews, spends in Paris, where he has come, accompanied by his girlfriend Helen, to discuss the translation and publication in France of the one novel he has written. While there, they come across another American couple, friends of Helen who live in Paris. Much of the story is taken up with the attitudes and reactions of these four Americans to the encounter with France and French culture. The story's setting, of course, is not without symbolic significance: Paris is one of the great cosmopolitan cities of the world, and has long been a *terre d'asile* for the oppressed and persecuted from within Europe and beyond, a status which, in its own way, embodies Nussbaum's cosmopolitan ideal of treating others as 'moral equals' (133). There could hardly be a more appropriate setting, then, to enact the confrontation between the values of cosmopolitanism and patriotism.

The dominant cultural interaction in the text is between the Americans and the French, although there is also an important scene in which the four Americans come into contact with German and Japanese tourists. The expression of patriotism and allegiance to the local receives its sharpest, as well as most satirical, depiction in the story through the characters of Rex and Bea, the American friends of Helen whom Matthews and Helen come across while they are all doing the obligatory visit to the Eiffel Tower. These loud, boorish Americans, complacent and untouchable in their bubble of jingoistic cultural superiority, seem to be Ford's worst nightmare of his compatriots abroad. Faced with the multicultural reality and cosmopolitan possibilities of Paris, Rex and Bea distinguish themselves through their aggressive refusal to engage with Paris and their inability to countenance the moral or cultural equality of the other.

'We're American',⁷ announces Bea, as she introduces Rex and herself to Matthews. What seems at first a merely fatuous and unnecessary proclamation of

nationality turns out to be a symptom of an aggressive and cultivated sense of their American identity in the face of their unwanted but unavoidable presence in France. The motivations and incentives accorded to the character of Rex are crudely mercantile, the lucrative outcome of which is all that retains him in France. Rex attributes much of his business success to a deficiency he finds in the French, one hardened into the simplistic mantra of a stereotype: 'The French all hate to work. It's that simple' (199). The stereotype, of course, is the monoculturalist's weapon of choice, the reassuring blunt instrument through which negative cultural attributions are most readily and efficiently transmitted. Excessive attachment to one's native culture and the refusal to embrace a cosmopolitan perspective take the form here of a belligerent denigration of the other, foreign culture. But equally a target for Rex are international institutions which foster a cosmopolitan ethic of cooperation between nations and a notion of citizenship that extends beyond national boundaries. Rex has transposed his American faith in laissez-faire economics to France, and resents governmental or, even worse, pan-European intervention in the marketplace, just one instance of his inability to appreciate the notion of cultural difference. Both Bea and Rex warn Matthews not to get Rex 'started on the UN', '[o]r the EU' (202), institutions which either directly hinder Rex's zealous moneymaking, or which, in the case of the UN, promote notions of world citizenship which are anathema to Rex's chauvinistic politics: 'The UN's a loada crap', he proclaims in a response to a tentative cosmopolitan remark by Helen about 'different nationalities needing to get along better' (202).

The cosmopolitan possibilities of Paris — exposure to a different culture and to the multicultural experience of the city — are blocked from the outset by Rex and Bea's jingoistic patriotism. For them, living in France is the unfortunate price they have to pay for making money out of the French. In these unavoidable circumstances, everything they do is geared to ensuring that the France in which they are obliged to live is as little like the France of the French as possible. Rex and Bea, in fact, live in France as if they were still living in America. So it is that the principal scene involving Rex and Bea takes place in Clancy's, an American restaurant opened by Americans for 'people like themselves, who were stranded here with similar needs and tastes' (198). The antidote to this regrettable state of affairs is to create a space where American customers can feel they are still in America. Thus, the atmosphere in Clancy's is of an overwrought, whoop-it-up, good-ol'-boy celebration of all things

American. Clancy's, indeed, is less a restaurant than a stronghold, in both senses of the term: it is a bastion where the cause of certain American values are celebrated, 'a place where you could relax, be yourself and get shit-faced in peace, just like back home' (198), but is equally a fortified place of defence against the surrounding hordes, the enemy in this case being the French. Despite the attempt, however, to preserve a segregation policy, '[r]egrettably, it was beginning to get crowded, and even some French people were showing up, though they were always given the worst tables' (198). When the French do have the audacity to manifest their presence in Clancy's, Rex switches immediately into enemy-spotting mode: "'Yep, yep, there they are,'" he said. "I see 'em. Four of 'em with their fuckin' pooch'" (202). This satirical and comic edge in Ford's portrait is ever-present, as when, for example, he tinges Rex and Bea's Francophobia with a bovine awareness of the prestige of Gallic exotica: Rex gloats that Clancy's is located in the 'Frenchiest part of Paris' (197), and we learn that Rex and Bea visit the Eiffel Tower once a year, otherwise, Rex 'solemnly' records, 'you could forget you're in Paris' (184). The cosmopolitan experience for Rex and Bea, then, extends no further than postcard-cliché Paris, the only excursion they make out of the American cultural ghetto in which they have taken refuge.

Overall, Ford's portrayal of Rex and Bea depicts not merely a stubborn refusal to engage with the cultural and cosmopolitan possibilities of Paris, but also identifies how an excessive attachment to one's native culture and identity can easily slip into racism and xenophobia. The story, in fact, enacts Nussbaum's claim that 'patriotism is very close to jingoism'. The cosmopolitan education promoted by Nussbaum to counter excessive patriotism would aim to teach young Americans 'to recognize humanity wherever they encounter it, undeterred by traits that are strange to them, and be eager to understand humanity in all its strange guises' (9). In Ford's story, however, it is the very strangeness of French culture that triggers Rex's racism: unfamiliar French cuisine, dress habits, practices and demeanours represent an affront to his monocultural world view. These manifestations of cultural difference are so many deviations from the utterly natural, and therefore normative, condition of Rex's Americanness: isolated in his unexamined certainty that the American way is the only way, Rex views cultural diversity as an affront and a threat, the only response to which can be resistance and provocation.

Scarry's concern with how the 'foreigner' is imagined, and with the effect this

imagining has on the behaviour towards the foreign other, is the subject of image studies (also known as imagology). Image studies concerns itself with the images one culture holds of another, as well as those it holds of its own culture, and provides a useful context within which to consider the confrontation of values in Ford's story. Joep Leerssen, one of the leading theorists of image studies, defines the preoccupations of image studies as follows:

Image studies [...] is specifically designed to deal with the discursive manifestation of cultural difference and national identification patterns. Image studies analyses its source materials (encompassing literary artworks and other forms of discourse) for the formulation of notions of domestic and foreign, and of the character of national-cultural 'selves' and 'others'. Its central preoccupation is with the dichotomy between the images of the other and the self-image.⁸

Image studies, then, concerns itself with the expression of national attitudes to native and other cultures. The images referred to are characteristics or qualities attributed to a native or foreign culture; they are not the 'truth' about this or that nation or culture, but tell us, rather, how these cultures are represented or perceived through a given set of images held about them. The French theorist, Daniel-Henri Pageaux, distinguishes the three dominant modes of exchange that govern the representation of the other culture. First, there is what he calls the 'mania' mode, where the foreign culture is considered to be superior to one's own culture. Second, there is the 'phobia' mode, which is the opposite of the first: here, the foreign culture is considered to be inferior to one's own culture. Finally, there is the 'philia' mode, where both the foreign and native cultures are considered to be positive, and where the relationship between the two is characterised by mutual esteem.⁹ The 'philia' mode, for Pageaux, is the only case of real, bilateral exchange between cultures, where there is a genuine dialogue between equals; this is the mode which exemplifies, and guarantees, the exchange between moral equals demanded by Nussbaum's cosmopolitanism values. Rex, however, typifies the second level of intercultural exchange: he is Francophobic, and displays equally the traits that are a corollary of that attitude, among which is a vainglorious pride in his own culture, the patriotic reflex most feared by Nussbaum. Indeed, there is no possibility of exchange in the

phobic, even xenophobic, mode in which Rex functions. Rex and Bea's jingoism can only imagine non-American cultures as inferior, and, as Scarry predicts, they behave towards the 'foreigner' accordingly: Rex demands of the French a literal self-effacement in the restaurant and the metaphorical self-effacement of an inferior culture in the presence of a naturally superior one.

The characters of Matthews and Helen allow Ford to broaden his exploration of the confrontation between cosmopolitan and patriotic values. From the beginning of the story Ford takes care to establish the cultural sensibility and attitudes to Paris and France that Matthews and Helen bring with them, which range from Matthews's lazy unawareness and confused idealization of Paris to Helen's somewhat arcane historical knowledge and tourist-lore clichés. Matthews is highly educated (he is a former academic) and has written a novel, yet, despite having set part of the novel in Paris, he is surprisingly ignorant of the city and country where he hopes to have his novel published. His intellectually incurious attitude serve him badly upon his arrival, as he has the deflating and disorienting sense that Paris 'might as well have been East Berlin' (154). Matthews's perception of France, indeed, has its own tourist-cliché tinge to it: his idea of Parisian verisimilitude in his novel took the form of having 'important events take place near famous sites like the Eiffel Tower, the Bastille and the Luxembourg gardens' (154). Moreover, whatever Matthews has actually retained about Paris has fossilized into an idealistic and exotic image informed by the mythology of post-war Paris, and embellished with the clichés of these narratives to which he is susceptible: 'In the past, when he'd imagined Paris, he imagined jazz, Dom Pérignon corks flying into the bright, crisp night air, wide shining streets, laughter. Fun' (153). In all of this, Ford is subtle but unsparing in his delineation of the cultural unawareness and lack of curiosity of an educated American mind. It is surely no coincidence that Ford created characters which represent different strata of American society. One senses a clear desire not to restrict his indictment of American insularity to the easy target of lumpen, ill-informed Rex, but rather to broaden it to portray a wider American cultural tendency. Rex's racism, nasty and stupid as it is, could be put down to simple lack of exposure in insular America to the cosmopolitan notion of a world of cultural moral equals; Matthews's cultural ignorance and national complacency, however, are less easily explained away, and are more disturbing in so far as his education and professional life gave him every opportunity to extend his cultural awareness and appreciation beyond his country's borders.

If Matthews does not exhibit any of Rex's patriotic zealotry, his initial apathy to the possibilities offered by his presence in a foreign culture quickly slides into petulant animosity when confronted with unavoidable and bothersome quotidian contact with French life, particularly where the French language is concerned. He becomes irritated, for example, with French numbers, 'which the French purposefully complicated' (224), and is not averse to falling back on the stereotype of the difficult French, as when he decides against ordering a meal in French: 'His French wouldn't hold up, and lunch would degenerate into bad-willed bickering and misunderstanding—the horror stories people talked about' (242). And German tourists he comes across at the Eiffel Tower are equally reduced to an immutable stereotypical identity. On hearing them use the German noun *die Bedienung* as they survey the city beneath them, the imperialist fantasies of the Third Reich of fifty years previously are Matthews's only cultural reference point: 'He imagined it meant something admiring: the recognition of a paradise lost for the fatherland' (182).¹⁰

For the greater part of the story, the nearest Matthews gets to the cosmopolitan spirit is a self-serving performance of it, instigated by his fantasy of coming to live and work as a writer in Paris, and of assuming the identity of the mythical and exotic figure of the exiled American artist in Paris. His ostensible cosmopolitanism, in other words, is entirely utilitarian, and in no sense embraces Nussbaum's vision of a world citizenship based on 'diversity without hierarchy' (138). At one point, in a surge of the fantasizing to which he is prone, Matthews imagines the possibilities of a life in Paris:

[H]e could operate in [Paris] more or less on his own, just as he thought he'd be able to, even though it annoyed him not to know enough words to ask directions, or to understand if any were offered. He would need to stick to the simple, familiar touristic objectives (buying a newspaper, ordering coffee, reading a taxi meter), though this impasse would improve soon enough. But language or no language, he could go wherever he chose — even if he could only order coffee when he got there (226).

This is good illustration of the dandyism which Pageaux identifies as one of the defining features of the 'mania' mode of cultural exchange, namely a one-sided borrowing from another culture (of ideas, manners, attitudes, clothes, habits), which,

although at the opposite end of the spectrum to Rex's xenophobia, has ultimately the same consequence as the latter in so far as it does not initiate an equal exchange with the other culture. Matthews at this moment may genuinely believe that he is moving towards a more open, equal and, in due course, more cosmopolitan stance, but seems not to understand that the height of his ambition is to be able to adopt the external signs and imitate the gestures of participation in French life. Elsewhere, in similar vein, he imitates 'a little gasping sound' followed by a 'quick, shallow intake of breath' (150) that his French publisher makes, and that a former French colleague used to make. In so doing, Matthews is quick to make the leap — his ignorance of French culture notwithstanding — from the particular to the general, from the anecdotal to the stereotype: 'All French people must make this noise, Matthews believed. [...] He had no idea what it meant' (p. 151). Matthews's ostensible burgeoning cultural openness is nothing more than a performance of the cosmopolitan demeanour, devoid of any genuine allegiance to or acceptance of the other culture; it is prompted purely by self-interest, and is thus as 'inward-looking' as the narrow patriotism decried by Nussbaum. Ford returns elsewhere in the story to this notion of dandyish performance of cosmopolitan values. Matthews observes at one stage that 'there were a lot of Americans on the street, trying to act as if they spoke the language—his grad school French was too poor to even try' (179). The Americans who are trying to pretend they speak French are guilty of the mimicry of which Matthews himself is guilty. It is dandyism as appropriation, as facile impersonation, the goal of which is to create the impression of an easy, natural adaptation to the foreign culture, but which, in reality, has more to do with dissimulation than assimilation. If this is cosmopolitanism at all, it is simply the affectation of the aesthetic cosmopolitanism of style, amounting to little more than a fashionable, cafe-latte cosmopolitanism, the strain practised by the 'Comme des Garçons-clad sophisticate with a platinum frequent-flyer card' mocked by Appiah.¹¹

This notion of performance and self-projection at the point of intercultural contact is an implicit theme throughout the story. Matthews concludes that the French, too, in the above scene, are guilty of performing: 'They were like amateur actors playing French people but trying too hard' (179). Just as Rex and Bea seem to consider it insufficient simply to *be* American, and consider it necessary to play out their roles as Americans for the benefit of their French audience, Ford is suggesting here that the French are also self-consciously parading their idiosyncratic cultural

repertoire in front of the Americans, both examples of peacockish displays of, at once, cultural assertiveness and cultural defensiveness, and both drawing upon self-images and perceived national characteristics. Nor is Helen, the remaining American character, immune to acting out her Americanness: upon meeting Rex and Bea by chance at the Eiffel Tower, she becomes loud and ostentatious, lapsing, in an instance of cultural atavism, into a mode and performance she takes to be quintessentially American, but which is most notable for being an act of self-stereotyping. It is significant too that, at the moment Helen, Rex and Bea are over-performing the rituals of unexpected reunion, they are mingling with German and Japanese tourists. The performance of elemental Americanness seems directed at this precise audience: the Germans stare at them, and the text makes clear that neither Helen nor Rex appreciates the presence of the Japanese tourists. The latter's presence has Helen remark that '[y]ou might think you're in Tokyo up here' (184), and the language used to describe the Japanese tourists, seen from the perspective of Helen's character, has racist overtones: they are gathered in 'clusters', and are 'jabbering' (184). The German and Japanese tourists are both portrayed as invading armies of tourists pushing others aside: the Germans are 'shouldering in' (182) to have a better view of the city, while the Japanese are 'pressing toward' (184) the observation windows. And both are explicitly reduced to the stereotype of their Second World War identities: the text describes them, from Matthews's perspective, as 'Axis-power tourists' (184). In all of these chauvinistic expressions of national identity and allegiances at the meeting point of different cultures, Nussbaum's fear of the dangers of American patriotic pride is confirmed: faced with difference, with cultural otherness, the American characters take refuge, in their own ways, in what Nussbaum terms 'the comfort of local truths' and the 'warm, nestling feeling of patriotism' (15).

The failure of the cosmopolitan ethic in Ford's story, however, is not entirely the responsibility of the American characters. The two French characters who are given a voice to express their views of Americans are supercilious and insulting. Matthews's French translator explains to Matthews 'how [the French] see Americans', and, when he asks for clarification, she replies: 'As silly, [...] as not understanding very much. But, for that reason, interesting' (254). The attitude of Blumberg, Matthews's publisher, while also no doubt rooted in condescension, is more directly informed by history. Rudely cancelling his appointment with Matthews at the last minute to go on a Christmas holiday, he lays bare a long-nurtured wounded national pride: 'Now is, of

course, a perfect time to be in Paris. We all go away where it's warm. You have it all to yourselves, you and your friends the Germans. We'll take it back when you're finished' (152). A moment of mild personal friction is immediately recontextualised, situated now within the historical tensions of political and ideological conflicts and relationships. It is clear that Blumberg has German wartime and American post-war occupation on his mind, and his conflation of the two utterly different forms of historical military presence in Paris is impressive proof of the obstinate resistance of cultural prejudice to the passage of time and historical truth. Overall, the French do not emerge with greater credit than the Americans. Despite Helen speaking French to shop personnel, she is the victim of a snooty superiority, with 'small aproned Frenchmen' looking at her 'in annoyance, often before simply turning around and ignoring her' (179). It might be too generous to offer this background hum of disdainful anti-Americanism as a defence of Rex and Bea's Francophobia, and the text itself does not seek to do so. Yet it is nonetheless the case that anti-American sentiment is quite widespread in France, and the phenomenon has been much debated there in the aftermath of the disagreement between the French and US governments over the war in Iraq. Ford's story predates these events, but it nonetheless taps into a latent historical tension between the two countries, and which continues to the present day.

Towards the end of the story Matthews begins to display small signs of a new awareness and openness to French culture, and which produce instances of genuine self-reflection and a re-evaluation of his own cultural certainties, indications of a potential in him to embrace a more cosmopolitan demeanour. And there is great symbolic significance at the end of the story in his having lost the Fodor's tourist guidebook that Helen and he had relied upon to explain their Parisian experience to them, and in his beginning to find his way around from experience and local knowledge alone. Yet the overwhelming sense one takes from the story, when couched in the terms of the binary opposition between cosmopolitanism and patriotism proposed by Nussbaum, is that the moral exigencies of cosmopolitanism are much less alluring than the consolations and visceral attachments of patriotism. Nussbaum acknowledges that '[b]ecoming a citizen of the world is often a lonely business' (15), and that the sense of belonging offered by cosmopolitanism might seem insubstantial when set beside the strong identifications and allegiances of a national identity. Benjamin R. Barber's reply to Nussbaum's article, in its scepticism

about the appeal of cosmopolitanism, is representative of the most frequently articulated criticism of Nussbaum's stance in *For Love of Country?*: 'global citizenship', says Barber, 'demands of its patriots levels of abstraction and disembodiment most women and men will be unable or unwilling to muster, at least in the first instance' (34). Although Barber's contribution, on occasions, is itself a little strident in its defence of patriotism, one sees the point he wishes to make, as when, for example, Nussbaum declares that, faced with the easy comforts of patriotism, cosmopolitanism 'offers only reason and the love of humanity' (15). Willing as one may be here to refuse a world-weary cynicism, one cannot help but feel that this is an offer most could easily refuse. Yet one understands why Nussbaum, in her own national context, feels obliged to argue the case for looking beyond national boundaries: the American tradition of insularity and what Nussbaum refers to as the country's 'strong isolationist roots' (xii), along with a well-documented paranoia¹² and a gunslinger defence of the paramount national values of freedom and independence, can lead to frightening excursions from the American stockade, and can be all the more destructive for other countries and cultures because, as Nussbaum asserts, '[o]ur nation is appallingly ignorant of most of the rest of the world' (11).

In the binary opposition between cosmopolitanism and patriotism, the solution, surely, is to find a way for the two sets of values to coexist. One might begin, as do a number of Nussbaum's critics in *For Love of Country?*, by questioning the legitimacy of Nussbaum's binarism. Richard Falk is 'disturbed by its implicit encouragement of a polarized either/or view of the tension between national and cosmopolitan consciousness' (53), while Michael W. McConnell dislikes the 'presenting [of] cosmopolitanism in *opposition* to "patriotism" or "national pride"' (79). While one may concede Nussbaum her binarism as an efficient rhetorical stance, one must nonetheless insist that love of family, community and country does not preclude a love of humanity and a desire for a world of moral equals. Appiah insists that, '[f]ortunately, we need take sides neither with the nationalist who abandons all foreigners nor with the hard-core cosmopolitan who regards her friends and fellow citizens with icy impartiality'.¹³ From this refusal of the binarism of 'either/or' and 'us/them' emerges Appiah's notion of 'a rooted cosmopolitanism, or, if you like, a cosmopolitan patriotism' (22),¹⁴ a position inspired by his father's love of native region, country and mankind. Spurning the notions both of cultural purity and the 'spurious utopianism of "mixture"',¹⁵ Appiah articulates his entirely practicable vision

thus: ‘The cosmopolitan patriot can entertain the possibility of a world in which everyone is a rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of his or her own, with its own cultural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different, places that are home to other, different, people’ (22). Nussbaum, in arguing in so polemical a manner against patriotism, does herself, and her cause, something of a disservice: although accepting that ‘[c]ompassion begins with the local’ (xiii), her account does not make sufficient allowance for the deep and vital influence of, and sense of attachment to, family, local community, and, later, country in the formation of the self and personal identity: these are the contexts in which our affections are awakened and nurtured, our allegiances formed and strengthened, and, indeed, our moral identity constructed. As Charles Taylor puts it elsewhere (he is also a contributor to *For Love of Country?*): ‘We first learn our languages of moral and spiritual discernment by being brought into an ongoing conversation by those who bring us up.’¹⁶ This is the heritage with which we move out into wider communities, including that of ‘all human beings’. The moral identity of the cosmopolitan patriot will be born from the knowledge that cosmopolitanism demands only an extension, and not a renunciation, of these early identifications and first loves.

Notes

¹ Martha C. Nussbaum, *For Love of Country?*, ed. by Joshua Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002). The book consists of Nussbaum’s essay and the responses to it by sixteen critics, and concludes with Nussbaum’s reply to her critics. Further references to the book will be indicated parenthetically in the text.

² Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (Norton: New York, 2007), p. xii.

³ *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, p. xiii.

⁴ Richard Rorty, ‘The Unpatriotic Academy’, *New York Times*, 13 February 1994, Section 4, p. 15.

⁵ Nussbaum also speaks of ‘outsiders who are imagined as enemies’ (x), of ‘our ability to imagine the situation of others’ (xiii), of the need to ‘expand our imaginations’ (xiv), of educating children to cross national boundaries ‘in their minds and imaginations’ (15), and of cosmopolitanism’s difficulty in ‘gripping the imagination’ (15).

⁶ *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, p. 85.

⁷ Richard Ford, *Women with Men* (London: Harvill Press, 1997), p. 184. This collection consists of two novellas and one (long) short story. Further references to ‘Occidentals’ will be indicated parenthetically in the text.

⁸ Joep Leerssen, *Remembrance and Imagination: Patterns in the Historical and Literary Representation of Ireland in the Nineteenth Century* (Cork: Cork University Press in association with

Field Day, 1996), p. 6.

⁹ See Daniel-Henri Pageaux, 'De l'imagerie culturelle à l'imaginaire', in *Précis de littérature comparée*, ed. by Pierre Brunel and Yves Chevrel (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1989), pp. 133-161 (p. 151).

¹⁰ The German noun *Bedienung* means, in fact, 'service', and has no connotation that could be made fit in with Matthews's stereotyping of the German tourists. A possible explanation for his erroneous speculation may be that he picked up on the stressed 'dien' in *Bedienung*, and linked this to the noun *Dienst* or the verb *diener*, both of which apply to *military* service. The 'service' of *Bedienung*, however, has more to do with serving a customer, in, for instance, a restaurant.

¹¹ *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, p. xiii.

¹² The paranoia induced by the fear of the contaminating other had its most dramatic early manifestation in colonised America in the Salem Village witchcraft trials and hangings of 1692, when the Puritan colonists saw their Christian way of life threatened by the Devil's infiltration of their community. More recent examples in American history of such paranoia are the hostility directed at German Americans during World War One, the internment of over 100,000 Japanese Americans during World War Two, and the hysteria of the McCarty anti-communist witch-hunt from the late 1940s to the mid-1950s.

¹³ *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, pp. xvi-xvii.

¹⁴ Appiah also refers to this as a 'partial cosmopolitanism'. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, p. xvii.

¹⁵ *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, p. 113.

¹⁶ Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989), p. 35.

Works cited

Martha C. Nussbaum, *For Love of Country?*, ed. by Joshua Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press, 2002)

Richard Ford, *Women with Men* (London: Harvill Press, 1997).

Daniel-Henri Pageaux, 'De l'imagerie culturelle à l'imaginaire', in *Précis de littérature comparée*, ed. by Pierre Brunel and Yves Chevrel (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1989).

Kwame Anthony Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (Norton: New York, 2007).

Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1989).