



Translation Studies and Critical Global Citizenship Pedagogy in Contemporary Anglophone Caribbean Higher Education¹

Ian Craig

ian.craig@cavehill.uwi.edu

University of the West Indies, Cave Hill Campus

Abstract:

This paper explores ways in which frameworks of intercultural engagement used in Caribbean Literary Translation Studies and in Critical Global Citizenship Education contest those implied by the managerialist discourse of internationalization currently predominant in Anglophone Caribbean and other higher education systems. The work of Édouard Glissant, particularly, is used to exemplify the potential of Caribbean thought for supplying rich forms of inter-relation that acknowledge the inherently problematic character of intercultural interactions. Literary translation flows between the Anglophone Caribbean and Cuba are invoked as a possible site of pedagogical and research development around the ideas discussed.

Keywords: literary translation, critical global citizenship education, managerialism, Glissant, Anglophone Caribbean, Cuba.

Traductología y pedagogía crítica para la ciudadanía global en la educación superior del Caribe anglófono contemporáneo

Resumen:

En este artículo se explora cómo los conceptos de compromiso intercultural (*intercultural engagement*) empleados en los estudios de traducción literaria del Caribe y en la pedagogía crítica para la ciudadanía global, cuestionan los conceptos que subyacen en el discurso gerencialista de la internacionalización que hoy predomina en el Caribe anglófono y en otros sistemas de educación superior. Se recurre a la obra de Édouard Glissant, en particular, para ejemplificar el potencial del pensamiento caribeño para generar ricas formas de interrelación que asumen el carácter inherentemente problemático de las interacciones interculturales. Los flujos de traducción literaria entre el Caribe anglófono y Cuba se invocan como posibles focos de desarrollo pedagógico e investigativo en torno a las ideas discutidas.

Palabras clave: traducción literaria, pedagogía crítica para la ciudadanía global, gerencialismo, Glissant, Caribe anglófono, Cuba.

¹ This article belongs to the project “Caribbean Cosmopolitanisms: Mediations of the Local, Regional and Global in Caribbean Translation and Intercultural Studies”, supported by the University of the West Indies.

La traductologie et la pédagogie critique pour la citoyenneté mondiale dans l'enseignement supérieur des Caraïbes anglophones contemporains

Résumé :

Cet article a pour but d'explorer la façon dont les concepts de l'engagement interculturel, (intercultural engagement) utilisés dans la traductologie littéraire des Caraïbes et dans l'éducation critique pour la citoyenneté mondiale, mettent en question les concepts sous-jacents dans le discours managérialiste de l'internationalisation prédominant actuellement dans les Caraïbes anglophones et dans d'autres systèmes d'enseignement supérieur. En s'appuyant sur l'œuvre d'Édouard Glissant, en particulier, on illustre le potentiel de la pensée caribéenne pour créer de précieuses manières d'interrelation qui reconnaissent elles-mêmes la nature intrinsèquement problématique des interactions interculturelles. La circulation de traductions littéraires entre les Caraïbes anglophones et Cuba s'évoquent comme un possible centre d'intérêt du développement pédagogique et de recherche autour des idées abordées.

Mots clés : traduction littéraire, pédagogie critique à la citoyenneté mondiale, managérialisme, Glissant, Caraïbes anglophone, Cuba.

1. Introduction

This article seeks to assert the broader ideological and pedagogical value of the study of Caribbean literary translation in the contemporary Caribbean university, with particular reference to the Anglophone region. In doing so, it proposes an alliance between Translation Studies and Global Citizenship Education, and more specifically a 'critical' mode of this latter, mediated by debates around the problematic notions of 'internationalization', as posited ubiquitously in the discourse of contemporary universities, and of 'cosmopolitanism', a much contested term in discussions of how to enable young people to confront the political, ethical and social complexities of engaging meaningfully in a 'globalized' environment. Whilst Global Citizenship Education is most commonly a concept applied to civic education-oriented, often project-based pedagogies implemented mostly at pre-tertiary levels of education, it seems especially obvious in a postcolonial context that universities' drive to 'internationalize' should also incorporate debate and action around the concept of global citizenship, as I seek to exemplify below.

My premise here is that Caribbean Literary Translation Studies (CLTS), as a field of analysis and as a community of practice constituted by the researchers, teachers and students within it, offers conceptual frameworks and ways of thinking about intercultural dynamics and the mediation between the global and the local that are subversive of dominant discursive regimes that have colonized or threaten to colonize the Caribbean higher education space. Specifically, research in CLTS tends to counter the burgeoning obeisance to managerialist neo-liberal discourse that casts higher education as a set of commodifiable consumer goods, in which educational products, clients and providers circulate freely and unproblematically across international borders, apparently carrying minimal ideological freight. In particular, the instrumentalist notion of 'internationalization' generally wielded by this dominant

discourse frequently implies an understanding of cultural difference, otherness and intercultural engagement that is starkly at odds with the counter-hegemonic and non-hierarchical way these concepts tend to be framed in CLTS, which thus offers itself as a source of important counter-discursive contestation in this increasingly central area of higher educational endeavor.

My argument for this usefully subversive or resistant potential of CLTS is based on a number of axioms:

1. As a postcolonial locale centered around small states characterized by Creolization, the Caribbean is a particularly fecund terrain for the emergence of a literary translation practice and a mode of translation studies that probes the traditionally understood boundaries of these fields of activity.
2. In the literary field particularly, the Caribbean region has thus far fulfilled this heightened potential as an archetypal zone of translation only very partially, largely for the same reason that bestows its very potential in this sense in the first place: as a postcolonial locale made up of micro-states, it is especially prone to predatory exploitation for both economic gain and to reassert cultural dependency on metropolises.
3. For the same reasons as 1 and 2, above – small size and postcolonial status with attendant habits of epistemic dependency – the Caribbean education space is perpetually vulnerable to “uncritical tendencies of international educational policy and practice transfer” (Jules, 2012, p. 8), requiring it to be actively vigilant against and resistant to normative incursions and impositions, however benign or inevitable they may be presented as being.
4. The postcolonial framing of CLTS renders it inescapably ideological and political in orientation, often in a more self-evident and urgent way than literary translation studies in other locations (Tymoczko, 2006).
5. Accordingly, the practice of actual translation of Caribbean literary works and its results – the translations themselves – may be progressive in orientation or not, though in many cases it may be hard to determine whether a Caribbean translation process or text is entirely, partially or not at all progressive (the question of whether the foreignizing approach advocated by Venuti and others, for example, ultimately amounts to conspicuous respect for alterity or may conversely constitute a form of ethnocentric exoticism illustrates the difficulty of making such determinations categorically (Myskja, 2013)). It is precisely in elucidating these complexities that CLTS most compellingly addresses fraught issues of local-global mediation that tend to be elided or erased in neoliberal conceptions of internationalized higher education.
6. In this context, “progressive in orientation” may be taken to mean a translation practice or product that is undertaken or made outside the logic of globalized commercial exchange, in which the profit motive of the commissioning entity is paramount and typically determines the translation

strategy employed, or a practice or product that actively seeks to destabilize assumptions about how literary translation should be approached.

I begin my argument by applying to the Caribbean context some of the key insights of Suzy Harris's (2011) book *The University in Translation: Internationalising Higher Education*. Harris questions the all-pervasive hegemony of instrumentalist neoliberal, managerialist discourse in higher education in the United Kingdom and Europe by taking "translation as a metaphor for transformation; [...] transformation alludes to something that is difficult to measure and quantify, that resists the calculability that underpins current political thinking" (p. 96). She further relates translation to processes of internationalization in the contemporary university, arguing that "there is a clear undercurrent of thought to the effect that difference and incommensurability are neither good nor desirable", commonly resulting in "a false securing of identity through simplistic comparison and contrast with other cultures" (p. 111). For Harris, a meaningful contemporary definition of culture itself and of intercultural relationality, as projected by higher educational institutions, is at stake here:

What is absent from this way of thinking is any sense of seeing the strange in the familiar. [...] We need to move towards a position that starts from the recognition of the foreign or strange in the familiar and native, and in so doing begin to break down the hard boundaries between the native and the foreign to see that instability and tension exist within the native or home culture. Rather than seeing culture as stable and harmonious, we need to acknowledge the instability and the disorder that exist. Neither culture nor language is stable; there is no purity or foundation that one can hold on to. (Harris, 2011, pp. 111–112)

I then invoke the work of Édouard Glissant, particularly, to bring into full view the applicability to the Caribbean of Harris's critique, paying special attention to his vindication of *opacité*, which can be set directly against the drive towards 'transparency' across ever larger and more integrated—or 'managed'—cultural spaces that is characteristic of globalizing and regionalizing educational agendas. Both *opacité* and Glissant's vision of the *chaos-monde* are based on a radically egalitarian and anti-hierarchical understanding of cultural difference that resonates closely with Harris's critique, offering a distinctly Caribbean counterpoise to the homogenizing neoliberal vision underlying managerialist discourse. As we shall see, since Glissant's thought constitutes a theorization of cultural difference that originates in the Caribbean but, crucially, aspires to be *global* in application, it is profoundly incompatible with increasingly dominant notions of internationalization as framed in the instrumentalist neoliberal discourses of globalization that have tended to permeate Caribbean higher educational spaces, in common with those of many other locales.

Finally, I will examine a potentially important avenue of connection between CLTS and contemporary currents of Critical Global Citizenship Education (CGCE), since this latter would seem to be a crucial component of any internationalization strategy worth the name, given the normalization of student mobility and of international trajectories of professional and personal engagement that is implicit in the term

“internationalization” in its broader sense. Specifically, I will argue that the value negotiations and judgments implicit in analyses of Caribbean literary translation can cohere in useful ways with Michael Cronin’s (2006) concept of micro-cosmopolitanism and with the formulations of critical (as opposed to ‘soft’) global citizenship education advanced by Andreotti (2014) and others. The goal of identifying these mutual resonances goes beyond that of merely legitimizing CLTS as a significant field of inquiry, though this goal alone might be viewed as valid and sufficient in a generalized context of pressure on the Humanities and literary studies of all kinds to justify their relevance. Rather, these resonances might be used as the basis for crafting a Caribbean-specific pedagogy of CGCE, since the articulation of discipline-specific instantiations of such a pedagogy would currently seem to be urgently required, but largely lacking.

2. The managerial turn in Anglophone Caribbean higher education

The widespread adoption by higher educational institutions of practices and rhetoric derived from the corporate world has been amply documented (Deem, 2001; Deem & Brehony, 2005; Olssen & Peters, 2005; Rob Watts, 2016). In the Anglophone Caribbean context, I focus here on the University of the West Indies (The UWI) because as the region’s public university, it might be expected to be less aligned with the tendency of other more avowedly ‘entrepreneurial’ universities toward commodification, and thus perhaps relatively less ‘managerial’. We can therefore suppose that other universities in the region are at least as infused with the new managerial ethos as The UWI, which sets out its Vision in its current Strategic Plan 2012 to 2017 with these words: “By 2017, the University will be globally recognized as a regionally integrated, innovative, internationally competitive university, deeply rooted in all aspects of Caribbean development and committed to serving the diverse people of the region and beyond” (University Office of Planning and Development, 2012, p. 2). Firstly, the opening “the University will be globally recognized as...” bears closer examination. At our most charitable, we might invoke Stuart Hall (1991) in seeing the aspiration to be “*globally recognized* as regionally integrated” as a frank recognition of the intersubjectivity of cultural identity construction: we are only Caribbean to the extent that we and others are able to distinguish that which is Caribbean from that which is not, so the more this happens, through both shoring up our Caribbeanness and communicating it to the world, the more ourselves we will feel, and the more others will see us as ourselves. More realistically, we might also note that this opening chimes with the globalizing preoccupations of the dominant discourse of contemporary higher education, with the foregrounding of “will be globally recognized as”—rather than simply “will be” or “will seek to become”—signaling a neoliberal preoccupation with international rankings and visibility on ‘a world stage’ that is reiterated immediately and more explicitly in the property “internationally competitive” (Lynch, 2013).

The suspicion that the document has been hijacked, at least partially, by the new managerialism is amply confirmed by the Glossary of Selected Terms, which covers

seventeen items including: “Benchmarking”, “Business Process Reengineering”, “Competitive Advantage”, two types of “Capital”, “Globalisation”, “Key Performance Indicator”, and four nouns qualified by the adjective “Strategic” (pp. 44-45). Crucially, the term “Internationalization” is defined in the Strategic Plan as “an institution’s response to *globalization*. The process of increasing involvement of universities in international markets via students, faculty, programs, research, capacity building and partnering. Often used as a strategy to increase its visibility and hopefully its ranking” (p. 45). Whilst “capacity building” and “partnering” are doubtless unobjectionable activities for a higher education institution in a developing-world context, their subordination to an overarching goal of “increasing involvement [...] in international markets” inscribes the primacy of the neoliberal vision of higher education as just another form of global interchange, in which financial self-reliance is the ultimate measure of success. Since the lay understanding of the term ‘internationalization’ would seem to encompass all kinds of international relationships, this strongly instrumentalist definition is potentially problematic, implying a corporatist, purely ‘strategic’ vision of international engagement in which, as Rowe (2014, p. 56) observes, “alliances are grounded in nothing more than temporary alignments of interest, resulting in constant wariness and suspicion, even among those with whom one is allied for the moment.” Whilst this model of international engagement is by no means the only one present in the discourse of The UWI, its prominence as a definition in the institution’s most publicly available ontological declaration would seem to have important implications for the framing of a regionally located global citizenship pedagogy.

As has been remarked elsewhere, the rhetoric of The UWI is far from consistent in echoing solely neoliberal or managerial resonances and its actual activities are frequently aligned outside or even in direct contradiction to the instrumentalist and market-driven principles underlying such resonances (Craig, 2016). It would be surprising if such contradictions were not also observable in other Global South contexts, equally caught in the cleft stick of pressing developmental and social justice goals, on the one hand, and the interpellations of globalization in the form of ranking systems or regimes of international accreditation, on the other (Dzvimbo & Moloji, 2013; Mok, 2007; Ntshoe, Higgs, Higgs, & Wolhuter, 2008; Rhoads, Torres, & Brewster, 2005). Nonetheless, as the concept of internationalization moves to the center of higher educational endeavors in the Caribbean as elsewhere, there is surely an overwhelming need to interrogate the modes of international engagement being posited as desirable. In doing so, Harris’s (2011) book provides a useful precedent, as it examines a process of harmonization analogous to that now proposed for the Caribbean and Latin America (UNESCO, n.d.), but in a context that is further along that road, namely Europe and particularly the United Kingdom, often still an instinctive point of reference in the Anglophone Caribbean.

3. Translation as contestation

One evocative aspect of Harris's analysis is her discussion of the distinction between "space" and "place". Here, she invokes Brian Friel's play *Translations* (1981), in which the local inhabitants of a small Irish town in 1833 respond to the arrival of a group of British soldiers charged with carrying out an ordnance survey of the area, including "standardization" of the Gaelic place names into Anglicized forms (Harris, 2011, pp. 11–12). Harris reads this scenario through Heidegger, seeing in the English colonial project an echo of the empire-building of the Romans, whose imprint on Western thought Heidegger regarded as largely pernicious and a wrong turn away from the richer and more ontologically attuned tradition of the Greeks. Regarding the distinction between "space" and "place", Harris summarizes Heidegger as follows: "'Space' refers to a grid or something measurable as found on grid maps; whereas 'place' refers to a locale and suggests something that emerges through meaningful narrative connections" (p. 12). Harris implicitly links this to the Bologna Process by which European higher education has been harmonized, finding in the European Higher Education Area configured by that Process a drive towards an ideal of commensurability that tends to efface not only actual cultural differences but sometimes even any meaningful conceptual acknowledgement of difference itself and of the necessary discomforts it generates.

In analyzing the contemporary conception of European Higher Education as a space in this manipulable, neo-colonial sense, Harris also invokes Lyotard's notion of performativity, a prescient formulation from his work *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*, in which he signaled the following turn in the discourse of higher education:

The production of proof, which is in principle only part of an argumentation process designed to win agreement from the addressees of scientific messages, thus falls under the control of another language game, in which the goal is no longer truth, but performativity – that is, the best possible input/output equation. The State and/or company must abandon the idealist and humanist narratives of legitimation in order to justify the new goal: in the discourse of today's financial backers of research, the only credible goal is power. Scientists, technicians, and instruments are purchased not to find truth, but to augment power. (Lyotard, 1984, p. 46)

Echoing Lyotard, then, Harris views the new managerialism as a regime of conformity that seeks to coopt the academy through seemingly endless bureaucratic protocols in the name of 'transparency', thereby purporting to rescue all from subjective judgment at the hands of a reactionary priesthood, seen as jealously guarding the arcane secrets of disciplinary distinctiveness to perpetuate its own privilege. As Harris suggests by invoking Friel's *Translations*, whilst the emphasis on strategy, measurement, mapping, productivity and international expansion doubtless constitutes a ventriloquization of the language of private capitalist management to facilitate legitimation in a radically reconfigured financial scenario, these features also conspicuously resemble those of another expansive phenomenon of modernity, namely plain old-fashioned colonialism,

without the ‘neo-’, with its cartographic exactitudes and penchant for paperwork, the obeisance of periphery to center and a certain pious condescension masking its enforcements. Rowe (2014, p.56) recognizes the grim irony of acquiescence to this model in global North contexts:

It is truly stunning that, after a century of severe self-criticism and deconstruction of traditional and modern Western culture, we do not recognize this Cartesian process at work in our universities as the same colonization that was exported all over the globe with devastating consequences, now applied to our own best practices and cultural dignity. Perhaps managerial colonization of our universities today should be seen as some kind of perverse penance.

From the Caribbean perspective, we might observe that given the plainly disadvantageous predicament in which the new performative ethos places so-called developing-world higher education systems and institutions, it seems even more incredible that it has been adopted by many of these latter with quite such apparently uncritical alacrity and even missionary zeal. The most plausible explanation perhaps lies in its offer of structural certainty in the face of perpetual anxiety generated by unpredictable external forces, a phenomenon also observable within ‘developed world’ contexts:

[T]hese wider conditions of uncertainty and exposure to risk have in a sense left market processes and logics as the kind of lowest common denominator remaining for individuals relating across difference in pluralistic societies. In addition to the influences of top-down ideology, then, there are more existential kinds of attractions to buy into neoliberal educational reform with its offerings of standards, accountability and choice. And these ground-level attractions, I think, inform why groups who may well have the most to lose from neoliberal reform sometimes end up being neoliberalism’s strongest advocates. (Tarc, 2012, pp. 112–113)

The latter part of Harris’s book focuses on the link between translation and internationalization in the contemporary university, generating some monitory considerations on the way in which regional integration meshes with processes of managerial standardization, again a salutary precedent only months after the establishment of the “One-UWI Task Force” that seeks to “strengthen [the UWI’s] brand to make a greater global footprint” and at a moment when the integration of higher education in Latin America is being actively pursued, with the European process critiqued by Harris as an explicit model (Sharma, 2016). As noted, she argues that in the case of European higher education, the impulse towards harmonization across languages and cultures along performative lines tends to erode understandings of intercultural difference that include the necessary discomfort it generates through the often incommensurable character of cultural practices and understandings. Such differences are regarded as mere ripples in a smooth tapestry of continental mutual coherence, to be ironed out via translation, here superficially understood merely as a technical process of transfer between codes that are posited as structurally divergent, but always ultimately assimilable to the superordinate norm of European conceptual and cultural coherence. By way of counterpoint, she invokes Walter Benjamin, summarizing the thrust of his essay “The Task of the Translator” as follows:

There is always an element in the translation that refuses further translation, which is to acknowledge what is foreign, what is different, and to acknowledge that which is incommensurable. [...] It is not about communication: it is about a response provoked by what is beyond the self but that occasions the self's reaching out; it is an ethical responsibility first and foremost to which I am called. I am singularized; *I* have to respond, nobody else can make a response *for me*. For Benjamin the concept of translation is central to our existence as human beings - the relationship that exists between all objects and things: we are always in translation. (Harris, 2011, pp. 106–108)

As we shall see, this inter-relational ontology resonates strongly in the thought of Édouard Glissant, particularly in his “Poetics of Relation”, as glossed by Britton here:

We “know” that the Other is in us and has an impact not only on our development but also on most of our ideas and on the movement of our sensibility. Rimbaud’s “Je est un autre” [‘I is an other’] is historically quite literally true. A sort of “consciousness of consciousness” opens us up in spite of ourselves and makes each of us the bewildered actor of the poetics of Relation. (Britton, 1999, p. 17)

4. Glissant and the contestation of neoliberal internationalization

Caribbean postcolonial contestation might be seen in terms of the space vs. place distinction discussed by Harris. The neo-colonial designation of the Caribbean as an “American lake” or “basin” continues the colonial configuration of a largely empty but mapped territory to be arranged to suit outside interests, entailing an effacement of historical specificity, an enforced blankness which in turn finds an echo in tourist iconography, again offering up a space to be reordered at the whim of the visitor, often expunged of uncomfortable history or indeed of contemporary personal narratives (Kamugisha, 2007).

There are clearly important differences, however, between the Irish case of Friel’s *Translations* invoked by Harris and the Caribbean as conceptualized by both postcolonial theorists and by a “post-postcolonialist” thinker such as Glissant. Granted, on one level Caribbean creative writing can be seen as vindicatory of the region-as-place rather than merely as-space, as textual inscriptions of a self-asserted ontology to set against the self-serving myth of a paradisaical netherworld that somehow lies outside the realm of “real” places. In common with postcolonial theorists, however, Glissant tends to equate attachment to place with rootedness, the preeminence of which in turn belongs to the Old World order of identities based on notions of essence, filiation and transparency. Against this, he sets the Caribbean, in which: “the ‘space’ of Relation has supplanted the linear time-span of filiation. But, equally, the preeminence of Relation is now spreading to the rest of the world as the old violence of filiation is being swept aside by a new kind of ‘anarchical violence arising from the clash of cultures, in which ... legitimacy... disintegrates’” (Britton, 1999, p. 15). In this sense, importantly, Glissant’s *Poetics of Relation* amounts to a thoroughgoing ontology rather than merely a theory of Caribbean cultural identity:

Eric Prieto has recently noted that Glissant “has been able to use the specifically Caribbean, postcolonial dimension of his experience as the point of departure for a general theory that seeks to understand the underlying forces that drive the evolution of all cultures” (114). Creolization is a condition of the world at large today, one which can be analyzed by taking the Caribbean as its exemplary exposition, but does not pertain [sic] the “Creole” cultures alone. (Kaiser, 2012, p. 134)

For this reason, Glissant’s formulation of Relation and the *chaos-monde* is intended to fully supersede, rather than merely contest, totalizing Eurocentric concepts of global assimilability through administratively enforced ‘transparency’. Glissant’s concepts of “opacity” and the “right to opacity” are thus also crucial to the radical egalitarianism of his thought and hence to its significance in the context of a discussion of Caribbean resistance to discursive recolonization by neoliberally inspired higher educational agendas. Opacity can be seen as fundamental alterity, “the welcome opaqueness, through which the other escapes me” (Glissant, 1989, p. 162). This is “welcome”, because it is what prompts “the self’s reaching out”, in Benjaminian terms:

The poetics of relation presuppose that each of us encounters the density (the opacity) of the Other. The more the other resists in his thickness or his fluidity (without restricting himself to this), the more expressive his reality becomes, and the more fruitful the relation becomes (Glissant, 1969, p. 24). (Cited in Britton, 1999, p. 19)

As Britton goes on to attest, this constitutes a *cri de couer* against all totalizing agendas:

In this sense opacity becomes a *militant* position, so that Glissant can state unequivocally, “We must fight transparence everywhere” (1981, p. 356), and claim that opacity is a right: “We demand for all the right to opacity” (1990, p. 209). Finally, on the last page of *Le discours antillais*, he equates opacity simply with freedom: “their [opacity], which is nothing, after all, but their freedom” (1989, p. 256). (Britton, 1999, p. 19)

It is important to note that Glissant’s notion of Relation as constitutive of identity requires that “opacity” be not some kind of occluded *essence* of the Other to which access is denied, but rather a shifting *zone* of acknowledged difference, the boundaries of which are dependent on the interlocutor, the circumstances of the encounter and the moment at which it takes place, a configuration that will thus present itself uniquely in each encounter. Glissantian opacity therefore de-essentializes the Benjaminian notion of “the acknowledgment of an indissoluble core of strangeness that cannot be domesticated”, though the thrust of both conceptions –that fully assimilative claims to cultural equivalence are spurious– is comparable.

Glissant asserts the case for Caribbean relationality as a superior contemporary epistemology to that of European and other totalizing visions through his concept of “archipelagic thought”, identifying:

two current functions of thought: systemic thought, which is continental thought, heavy, dense, sure of itself, magnificent and sumptuous; and archipelagic thought, the thought of the archipelago, of the set of islands, which is a fragile, fragmentary, trembling thought, unsure of itself, but which is, perhaps, and in my opinion, the thought that is best suited for addressing today’s problems of the world totality. (Glissant, 2003, p. 108)

If the zeitgeist would seem to favor a philosophy of evanescence and the fluidly contingent, a jazz sensibility with a syncopated rhythm that leaves the stolid nations of empire shifting clumsily on their crumbling epistemological pedestals, the notion of center and periphery must inevitably and definitively be overthrown. It is worth quoting Glissant's words while holding in the mind the ubiquity of managerialist reconfigurations of 'globalized higher education' and the implicit hierarchies of value they inscribe:

There still exist centers of domination, but it is generally acknowledged that there are no exclusive, lofty realms of learning or metropolises of knowledge left standing. Henceforward, this knowledge, composed of abstract generality and linked to the spirit of conquest and discovery, has the presence of human cultures in their solid materiality superimposed upon it. And knowledge, or at least the epistemology we produce for ourselves from it, has been changed by this. Its transparency, in fact, its legitimacy is no longer based on a Right.

Transparency no longer seems like the bottom of the mirror in which Western humanity reflected the world in its own image. There is opacity now at the bottom of the mirror, a whole alluvium deposited by populations, silt that is fertile but, in actual fact, indistinct and unexplored even today, denied or insulted more often than not, and with an insistent presence that we are incapable of not experiencing. (1997, p. 111)

Glissant further advocates:

develop[ing] everywhere, in defiance of a universalising and reductive humanism, the theory of specifically opaque structures. In the world of cross-cultural relationship, which takes over from the homogeneity of the single culture, to accept this opaqueness - that is, the irreducible density of the other - is to truly accomplish, through diversity, a human objective. Humanity is perhaps not the 'image of man' but today the ever-growing network of recognized opaque structures" (1989, p. 133).

As Rachelle Okawa (2010, p. 14) notes, there are striking parallels between Glissant's formulation and the theoretical approach taken by proponents of a foreignizing mode of translation, such as Lawrence Venuti, who argues that a resistant translation strategy is one that should "acknowledge its 'own ethnocentric violence on the foreign text'" (Venuti, 1995, p. 24), precisely by refusing to sacrifice that which is opaque on the altar of a transparent readability that speciously implies an unproblematic mutual assimilability of linguistic and cultural practices. Notwithstanding critiques of the foreignizing approach as potentially elitist in its actual effects, the notion of a "resistant" mode of translation that refuses to efface its own tendency towards elisions and assimilations must be useful in the context of postcolonial translation, particularly in a literary and cultural landscape inevitably rendered fragile by small size.

Glissant's extraordinarily wide-ranging and fundamental explorations of intercultural relationality would seem to situate him as a pre-eminent theorizer of the human condition today, in a way that in turn places the Caribbean at the forefront of contemporary interrogations of identity construction and intercultural relationality. Further, given the

central role of translation in such interrogations, as asserted by Glissant and his exegetes, CLTS would naturally constitute a primary site of inquiry in the task of forging “new ways to think about literary transmission across the globe” and “new ways to map world literature” (Bermann, 2014, p. 7). However, whilst these “new ways” are doubtless lovingly traced in courses in Caribbean Thought or Francophone Caribbean literature, both in the region and beyond, there is no direct evidence that Glissant’s radically egalitarian vision of intercultural identity construction has had any effect on the dominant model of selfhood adopted by The UWI and other regional universities, which to some extent thus collude, it can be argued, in the implicit reinscription of the hierarchies he dismantles.

5. CLTS and Critical Global Citizenship Education

It is doubtless a truism to note that CLTS often takes up the concerns of postcolonial scholars and of Glissant in seeking to dismantle essentialist, hegemonic and ‘rooted’ conceptions of culture formation and cultural analysis. These goals are implicit throughout the special issue of *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction*, devoted to “The Caribbean in Translation”, for example. In reviewing “Translation to, from and in the Atlantic Creoles”, George Lang (2000) designates the second category of his analysis, translation into Creoles from “metropolitan” languages, as by default an “adversarial” mode of translation (he excepts Bible translation), in which the translator is writing “against the reigning system of norms in terms of which literary value is presumed to be the exclusive resort of the language of the hypotext” (p. 19). As Lang asserts, the very decision to translate into a Creole a text that is “pre-consecrated” as canonical in a dominant or metropolitan language is freighted with sociolinguistic and political assumptions, before so much as a line of actual translated text is analyzed: “Whenever a creole translator deliberately writes over a culturally consecrated hypotext the transmutation is inherently polemic. Targeting a text in the alien canon of the adjacent high culture is no neutral activity. The very choice of hypotext is telling” (p. 19).

In the same special issue, Richard Watts uses editions in Spanish and English of Césaire’s *Cahier d’un retour au pays natal* to show “the translation effected by the paratext, [which] can become a lens for viewing the complex ideological struggles within which the text is situated, as well as the ideological appropriations to which it was subject” (Richard Watts, 2000, p. 42). Watts’s analysis also offers two examples of translations with misleading cover images designed to locate the translated works in particular ‘niche’ publishing categories by triggering dubious genre associations. Watts later explored this tendency in a book-length study of Francophone paratexts, in an imaginative scholarly maneuver in which his centralizing of the ‘peripheral’ text as a focus of analysis can be seen to mirror the aims of postcolonial literary and theoretical projects.

More recently, Forsdick has integrated a range of recent contributions to postcolonial translation studies—with Glissant as a central point of reference—in his argument that

thinking about the Caribbean translationally casts new light on issues currently at the forefront of debates in translation studies, not least translation and creativity, and also transcends understandings of translation as a binary relation; at the same time, reflecting on the Caribbean in translation invites theoretical engagement around loss/creation, power/resistance, as well as around ongoing deferrals of meaning, but it also entails a clear privileging of the ethical and political dimensions of these practices and concepts. (Forsdick, 2015, p. 162)

If we take as read, then, that the Caribbean “[provides] a particularly illuminating and challenging frame” to examine such “ethical and political dimensions” of intercultural transmission, it should not be too great a leap to infer how CLTS would seem exceptionally well placed to make promising common cause with the emergent area of Critical Global Citizenship Education (CGCE). The notion of a *critical* global citizenship education has relatively recently been advanced, coinciding with the increasing centrality of ‘internationalization’ as a feature and function of higher education institutions. This critical approach seeks to redress “the lack of analyses of power relations and knowledge construction [that] often results in educational practices that unintentionally reproduce ethnocentric, ahistorical, depoliticized, paternalistic, salvationist and triumphalist approaches that tend to deficit theorize, pathologize or trivialize difference”, leading to “epistemic blindness to one’s own ontological choices and epistemic categories and thus to radical difference itself” (Andreotti & Souza, 2012, pp. 1–2). The ‘critical’ element in question thus seeks to problematize assumptions arising from the paradigms underlying Development Studies, which seeded emerging conceptions of global citizenship education and tended to imply the ascription of “differentiated value to cultures/countries perceived to be *behind* in history and time and cultures/countries perceived to be *ahead*” (Andreotti, 2015, p. 222).

Scholarship and pedagogical interventions around the concept of citizenship in the Caribbean have tended to focus on analyzing deficits in inclusivity in the notion of citizenship in Caribbean societies themselves (for example, Alexander, 1994; Kamugisha, 2007; Organization of American States, n.d.; Sheller, 2012; Smith, 2011), whilst “Global Citizenship Education” and allied concepts have tended to arise in the Anglophone global North, particularly. Whilst this emphasis reflects a necessary implicit acknowledgment that ‘postcolonial’ status does not equate to mature participatory democratic engagement, and an understanding that “rights of national political citizenship provide the conditions for acting as the ‘global citizen’” (Tarc, 2012, p. 113), it also perhaps derives from an assumption that students and young people in these latter regions of privilege are those most likely to live fully ‘global’—or ‘globalized’—lives. Even in the case of CGCE, which seeks explicitly to decouple the concept of global citizenship from hegemonic development narratives and the totalizing epistemological assumptions of Western humanism, it is often implied that this conceptual redress is most necessary to counter the unreflective condescension that

such narratives are likely to engender in the youth of the former colonial powers or 'First World', particularly.

Whilst these orientations are understandable, given the historical forces in play, there are at least four good reasons why the concept of a critical global citizenship is just as important for the education systems of postcolonial locales such as the Caribbean. Firstly, the internalization, reproduction and perpetuation of colonial modes of thought in postcolonial regions make it just as likely that the sense of a global hierarchy based on a hegemonic concept of progress and development is assumed and reinscribed in such locales as in former or neo-colonial powers; the only difference is that postcolonial subjects are likely to locate themselves in a different position in that hierarchy (Kamugisha, 2007). Secondly, the lives of postcolonial citizens are increasingly mobile and 'global' in ways that complicate traditional binaries such as expat vs. immigrant, or study abroad vs. international student (Craig, 2010, 2016). Thirdly, since postcolonial locales are most frequently the very recipients of the external interventions undertaken within the framework of a relatively uncritical development agenda, their citizens have a particular interest in acquiring a conceptual framework that critiques and contests such agendas. Fourthly, since Caribbean societies arose as a consequence of enforced conscription to the project of Western modernity and its scion, globalized capitalism, they offer themselves by default as sites of (potential) epistemological resistance to the hegemonic narratives underpinning that project. In turn, as Glissant's thought shows, this 'rootless' otherness configures an alternative identitarian paradigm that might enter into fruitful anti-hegemonic dialogue with decolonial thinkers elsewhere in the Americas and particularly with indigenous, non-Western interlocutors. For all these reasons, a Caribbean sense of global citizenship might be seen as 'naturally' oriented towards a critical approach.

In seeking to examine how CLTS might be both infused by and harnessed to promote such a Caribbean-specific pedagogy of critical global citizenship, Michael Cronin's concept of micro-cosmopolitanism is useful. Cronin first assesses the fraught concept of cosmopolitanism in general terms, summarizing Gregory Bateson (1973) by way of articulating the 'double bind' presented by unduly dichotomous approaches that assert mutually exclusive categories of nationalist vs. cosmopolitan orientations: "you abandon any form of national identification, seeing it as associated with the worst forms of irredentist prejudice, and you embrace the cosmopolitan credo or you persist with a claim of national specificity and you place yourself outside the cosmopolitan pale, being by definition incapable of openness to the other" (Cronin, 2006, p. 51). Cronin's micro-cosmopolitanism, on the other hand, seeks to be "a cosmopolitanism not from above but from below", by incorporating "the notion of a cultural complexity which remains constant from the micro to the macro scale. That is to say, the same degree of diversity is to be found at the level of entities judged to be small or insignificant as at the level of large entities". By focusing on "a local that is informed by diversity and difference", the macro-cosmopolitan can be engaged from the most local and micro-seeming starting point, with inquiries into apparently parochial locales radiating outwards to encompass surprising

routes of inward and outward movement. A published exploration of a small island off the coast of Ireland, for example, reveals “not only the remarkable richness of these reduced spaces but also the omnipresence of traces of foreignness, of other languages and cultures, in a place that through the work of John Millington Synge and others was closely identified with Irish language and culture and Irish cultural nationalism” (Cronin, 2006, pp. 68–72).

Cronin locates translation studies as a primary site of enactment of this kind of intercultural inquiry, which he sees as constituting a kind of ‘subversive nuancing’ or problematization-from-below of dominant understandings of the relationship between local and foreign, center and periphery, large and small, prominent and obscure. This mechanism is of particular utility for ‘peripheral’ countries, conventionally cast as “a kind of precosmopolitan nursery, a warehouse of the mind where cognitive raw materials await the necessary processing and polish of the present and former capitals of empires” (Cronin, 2006, p. 62):

In a sense, it is the fractal travelling of the intercultural researcher in translation studies that allows for the elaboration of a concept of the micro-cosmopolitan and the vital nuancing of cosmopolitan theory as it applies to very different social, cultural and political realities on the planet. The micro-cosmopolitan dimension helps thinkers from smaller or less powerful polities to circumvent the terminal paralysis of identity logic not through a programmatic condemnation of elites ruling from above but through a patient undermining of conventional thinking from below. (Cronin, 2006, p. 72)

For postcolonial contexts, Cronin’s conception of micro-cosmopolitanism thus offers modes of cultural analysis that seek to trouble a facile equation of the parochial with the ‘authentic’, or the cosmopolitan with either the ‘universal’ or the cynically commercial. These observations assert that a fully articulated “cosmopolitanism is by definition anti-essentialist, an important consideration for how we defend translation against its critics” (66). In this view, a ‘minority’ literature or linguistic vehicle such as a Creole altogether loses the stigma of that epithet because its particularity inevitably contains the cosmopolitan, to be discovered by the “fractal travelling” of intercultural researchers.

Since, as Cronin asserts, “commitment to appropriate, culturally sensitive models of translation would appear to be central to any concept of global citizenship in the twenty-first century”, Translation Studies and Global Citizenship Studies emerge as natural neighbors and interlocutors. Let us therefore examine some examples of how consideration of Caribbean translation phenomena might usher students beyond schematic understandings of cultural transfer. One example would be to take up Cronin’s suggestion, couched as a question, of remedying the absence of translated works in literature courses and programs built around national languages:

Rather than considering translation as an issue which only arises when one goes outside the national language or the national canon or when one is explicitly embarked on a course in literary translation, is it not time to actively consider translation as a phenomenon inside the language,

which should therefore properly appear on any undergraduate curriculum that would claim to be a comprehensive or at least a representative reflection of literary achievement in the language? (2006, pp. 124-128)

On one level, clearly, to the extent that transcription of Creole orality into a comprehensible written discourse necessarily implies the *a priori* translational status of many Caribbean literary works, translation and consideration of it are already inherent to the study of Caribbean literature. However, examination of ‘retranslations’ of such works into other contexts can itself be a highly productive way of interrogating what is at stake when the particularities of Caribbean experience and expression are presented to a cultural out-group (which is one way of describing the task of producing a translation of a Caribbean work of literature). This potential has been explored by Krista Slagle (2014) in her book chapter “Analyzing the Caribbean through the Vehicle of Translation Studies”, in which she uses Richard Philcox’s translation of Maryse Condé’s *Traversée de la Mangrove* to trace a path first from Condé’s ‘translation’ of orality to the written word, then onward to Philcox’s English rendering of the text, which the translator reveals is tonally influenced by Virginia Woolf’s *To the Lighthouse*. This effectively establishes a new intertextual correlation beyond the Caribbean for a work that already seems to draw on micro-cosmopolitan wellsprings through the key character of Francis Sancher, a gallicization of Francisco Álvarez Sánchez.

Slagle’s analysis appears in a collection, *Reimagining the Caribbean: Conversations among the Creole, English, French, and Spanish Caribbean*, that is explicitly underpinned by Glissant’s *Poétique de la Relation* and aims to offer a “de-Balkanized” vision of Caribbean cultural pedagogy that at the same time eschews a facile mapping of equivalences. In doing so, its frame of reference radiates beyond the region to multiple zones of origin and diaspora, as well as across borders of artistic genres and academic disciplines, a protean tendency evident also in the recent journal special issue on “Translating Creolization” edited by Bogle, Craig and Siegel (2016).

Cronin’s suggested move of including translated literature within the canon of a given linguistic space certainly represents a step towards incorporation of the rhizomatic conception of radically egalitarian connectedness asserted by Glissant (following Deleuze and Guattari), and thus assists in tracing the always politically inflected mutual interplay between particular and universal that undergirds a critical global citizenship sensibility. In this concluding section, however, I would like to propose that from the Anglophone Caribbean perspective, a focus on Cuban translators, particularly, and the political economy of Cuban literary translation, more generally, might be developed as an ideal entry-point for exploring a Caribbean understanding of critical global citizenship from the perspective of CLTS. This object of study generates a number of tensions, exploration of which brings into sharp focus the geopolitical context of Caribbean cultural production.

Cuba offers itself as fertile territory for interrogation of the grounds for our own suppositions because it is both a known and an unknown quantity from the

Anglophone Caribbean perspective: it generates a dense field of symbolic and affective resonance by dint of its status as the Caribbean nation most resistant to domination, but it nonetheless remains firmly on the other side of the 'Our/Other Caribbean' imaginary divide that continues to carve up the region into sub-areas according to language and respective colonial derivation. In the cultural sphere, on the one hand revolutionary Cuba has supported the continuation of the traditionally cosmopolitan cultural ethos the island had developed at an earlier stage. Whilst socialist internationalism has particularly favored official propagation of cultural sources deemed to be best aligned with the political status quo (meaning, in practice, a high volume of translations from Russian before the 1990s), a growing recognition of Cuba's Caribbean identity from the mid 1970s also resulted in the establishment of the Casa de las Américas prizes for Caribbean works in English or Creole (1975) and French or Creole (1979). Prize-winning works are translated into Spanish, generating a corpus of Caribbean works, translated on the basis of merit and cultural significance and thus distinct from the 'other' Caribbean canon in translation, produced within the capitalist logic of marketable potential and profit motive, with its well known tendency to pander to certain preconceived notions of the region (Richard Watts, 2005). It seems unlikely that a number of works by George Lamming or Kamau Brathwaite, for example, would be available in Spanish if it were not for the patronage of Casa de las Américas (though the work of artisan publishers in the region such as House of Nehesi in St. Martin or Éditions Desnel in Martinique should also be acknowledged) (Valdés León, 2014).

This project of Caribbean translingual cultural transmission instantly dignifies the prize-winning texts and authors by designating them as 'worthy of translation', defying the capitalist preoccupation with economies of scale that habitually leaves 'minority interest' regions, authors or works outside the flows of global literary translation production and distribution. As such, the commissioning of these translations can be seen as a decolonial move, establishing a regional ecosystem of translation that stands conspicuously apart from, rather than being a dependent sub-system of, the larger international publishing world, which tends to perpetuate dependency on metropolises. The anti-hegemonic character of the translations themselves is also evident in their unashamed use of Cuban Spanish, countering the tendency towards 'neutral' compromises or European variants evident in translation of other Caribbean works (Arencibia & Hernández Valdés, 2009).

However, on the other hand, whilst this can be justifiably celebrated as an enlightened commitment to cultural openness and regional solidarity, it is perhaps as well to remember that this laudable attention to intra-Caribbean literary cross-fertilization through translation began barely five years after Heberto Padilla's interrogation and public self-excoriation, and at the climax of a period known as the *quinquenio gris* (1971-1976), characterized by neo-Stalinist repression against authors and other dissenters in Cuba. The objects of this zealotry included one of the principal sites of intellectual inflow into a Cuban intellectual sphere sorely in need of external contact

points, given the stringency of limitations on international travel, namely *Crerios*, a journal of thought founded by the polyglot and self-taught translator Desiderio Navarro in 1972. *Crerios* also demonstrates that this contradictory profile of simultaneous facilitation and hindrance of translation flows was not limited to this especially turbulent period of Cuban intellectual life in the 1970s, as Navarro has denounced harassment and sabotage of *Crerios* as late as 2012, alleging that customs clearance procedures were being used to delay the arrival of the fortieth anniversary issue (the journal is printed outside Cuba), “por lo que puede haber en esta revista”, and that acts of “vandalismo furtivo” had been carried out in the journal’s offices. To complicate matters still further, Navarro himself stands accused of complicity with state security in excluding a number of ‘undesirable’ dissident figures from attending the fortieth anniversary event, at which a panel discussion on “El sentido de la esfera pública en Cuba” took place (Ponte, 2012).

The complexity of the Cuban translation universe can further be appreciated by considering the relative circumstances of literary translators inside and outside Cuba. Cuba has a long tradition of literary translation, in which a number of prestigious authors from the nineteenth century onwards, particularly, have also been prominent literary translators. The romantic poet José María Heredia, who spent much of his life in Mexico but was born in Santiago de Cuba, for example, was a prodigy who famously translated Horace before reaching the age of ten, and latterly produced translations of works by Walter Scott, Thomas Moore, and Voltaire, amongst others. José Martí himself produced a copious bibliography of translated work and near to his death wrote a detailed letter to his daughter María Mantilla containing advice on translation strategies (Arencibia, 2012). Translation continued to be a crucial component of Cuban cultural eclecticism throughout the twentieth century, through a series of influential cultural journals: the pre-Revolutionary *Orígenes*, in which José Rodríguez Feo’s translation work was particularly noteworthy; the controversial *Lunes de Revolución* under Cabrera Infante; and the successor of *Lunes*, *Unión*, which published Soviet-block authors for the first time in Spanish (Curbelo, 2012).

The relative high prestige enjoyed by translation, together with the socialist internationalism that infuses Cuban culture, alluded to above, helps to explain how issue 91 of the Casa de las Américas journal, dedicated to the Anglophone Caribbean, featured translations by figures such as Roberto Fernández Retamar, Eliseo Diego, Ambrosio Fornet, Samuel Feijóo, Antonio Benítez Rojo or Manuel Moreno Fraguas. Other specialist translators of Anglophone Caribbean literature, such as María Teresa “Tete” Ortega, Blanca Acosta, Ileana Sanz, Ester Muñiz and Ester Pérez emerged in later years (Arencibia & Hernández Valdés, 2009; Valdés León, 2014). Cuban literary translators enjoy a certain sense of professional camaraderie by belonging to the Unión Nacional de Escritores y Artistas de Cuba (UNEAC), which offers an annual literary translation prize named after José Rodríguez Feo, constituting an exceptional mark of recognition for literary translation in the context of a relatively small postcolonial nation. As cultural workers, some translators who undertake literary commissions

amongst other types of work receive a state salary—a virtually unheard of form of stability for literary translators in other contexts—and as a result of the state-promoted Cuban cultural eclecticism discussed above, there is a relative abundance of work (which may include audiovisual as well as strictly literary projects). This volume of activity and strength of tradition allowed Cuba to celebrate its thirteenth International Literary Translation Symposium in late 2015 (Asociación Cubana de Traductores e Intérpretes, 2015), at which President of the UNEAC Literary Translation Section (and International Federation of Translators prizewinner) Lourdes Arencibia reported that submissions for the Rodríguez Feo prize from the provinces outnumbered those from Havana and that provincial publishers were more prolific sources of translated literary work than those in the capital, since these latter were required to focus on promotion of Cuban literature (Pereda & Guerra, 2015).

It can thus be argued that Cuban literary translators enjoy a relatively high degree of institutional structuring and support of their vocation, when compared with aspiring literary translators in the ‘sink-or-swim’ capitalist ethos outside, which permits only a small elite within the world literature publishing system to live with any degree of stability as professional literary translators. It is thus very likely that Cuba is home to the largest cadre of professionals in the insular Caribbean region, certainly, whose job description includes ‘literary translator’ as a principal or officially recognized activity, and the largest proportion of citizens with an interest in literary translation, both as producers and consumers. However, the relative drawbacks of the Cuban literary translator’s position are also somewhat obvious. Freedom to choose source texts may be just as constrained or more so in a state-controlled cultural sphere as in the marketplace outside, particularly in moments of relative cultural intolerance such as the *quinquenio gris*, and as a result of Cuba’s difficulties in acquiring rights in the international publishing marketplace (Pereda & Guerra, 2015). The ability to travel in order to improve language skills and acquire crucial first-hand cultural knowledge has been severely limited for most Cubans for decades, initially by official controls and bureaucracy, latterly by sheer financial incapacity: the monthly state salary alluded to above would barely buy you a page or two of translation in most other contexts and precludes autonomous overseas travel for Cubans dependent on it, an isolation compounded by the well-known restrictions on use of the internet. Whilst for a small cadre of top translators their profession may have allowed them to travel widely (De La Vega, 2011), it seems unlikely that this has applied to the vast majority of literary translators in the provinces or those outside the upper echelons of the UNEAC, generating the paradox that the Caribbean’s most literary translation-oriented insular territory is the one that in recent history has been hardest to leave and enter freely.

From the vantage point of the Anglophone Caribbean and its small but ever resilient literary cultural sphere, how to evaluate, then, the gift of Cuban literary translation of Anglophone Caribbean works? On the one hand, the intra-regional but translingual intertraffic it has generated would seem to be a remarkably bold step towards fulfillment of the kind of pan-Caribbean cultural solidarity and autonomy of which

many Caribbeanists have long dreamed. On the other hand, it can be argued that this is the more or less direct result of a system that involves explicit constraints on personal freedom that many in the Anglophone Caribbean would not be prepared to accept. However, to engage this complexity fully, it would seem necessary to weigh these constraints against the more implicit ones generated by the postcolonial capitalist predicament of the Anglophone Caribbean, in which perpetual cultural and economic dependency are made to look like inevitable or ‘natural’ consequences of a supposedly ‘level playing-field’ of mercantile ‘equal opportunity’ that disadvantages small nations. Equally, careful consideration is required of the relative impact on culture of a centralized, avowedly internationalist socialist polity, in the Cuban case, versus the relative cultural *laissez-faire* in the range of broadly capitalist postcolonial systems in the Anglophone Caribbean: while the GDP per capita of Cuba may be barely a third of that of Trinidad and Tobago or Barbados and comparable to that of Jamaica, there is no evidence that cadres of literary translators are toiling for recognition in the provinces of any of these latter nations.

Most importantly, it would be necessary to listen to the testimony of a range of Cuban literary translators themselves, together with other cultural workers responsible for the production of such literary translations as those described above, in order to apprehend their own sense of the degree of relative satisfaction their work and professional trajectories have provided, as experienced from inside the “different logic” of the Cuban system and its modes of socialization. A project that included the gathering and contextualization of such testimony would not only repay some of the cultural debt accrued, but would also accord with the injunction in CGCE discourse that we must “Learn to Unlearn” (our assumptions about Cuba, mythologized and demonized in the Caribbean imagination as elsewhere), then “Learn to Listen to ‘different logics’” (here the testimony of Cuban literary translators of all persuasions), foregoing judgment on a given phenomenon initially apprehended solely from our outsiders’ perspective. Further, this project would broadly fit the description of “case studies examining ‘the complexity of issues related to colonise-colonised relationships’” through which “participants *Learn to Learn*” (Andreotti & Souza, 2008).

It will be obvious that these CGCE objectives derive from Gayatri Spivak’s (1988) reflections around the conundrum of reconciling privilege with a meaningful engagement of cultural otherness across often vast divides of class and relative opportunity, focused particularly on postcolonial theory and its exponents in academic and activist spheres. These reflections and objectives thus implicate those located ‘above’ their object of study in a received hierarchy, in a manner that may seem to have dubious application in the case of Anglophone Caribbean pedagogical engagements with Cuba, given the common postcolonial condition of both sides in the encounter. But this lack of clarity about who, if anyone, occupies the more ‘subaltern’ position in such a dialogue is perhaps precisely the point when seeking to forge a Caribbean pedagogy of critical global citizenship through the prism of literary translation: both interlocutors are free and unfree in ways that converge and diverge depending on how they are viewed and interpreted; the intercultural

dynamics that determine what is translated in and from each locale, and what is not, also sometimes overlap (in the subordination of outward flows to global capitalist imperatives) and at other times differ fundamentally (in the Cuban cultivation of a solidary intraregional inflow, as against the relatively minimal attention to translated literary work in the Anglophone region, in common with other Anglophone contexts).

Whilst the ‘merely’ regional character of this project may initially seem perverse in light of the goal of cultivating ‘global’ critical capacity, it should be obvious that it brings into bold relief the broader hemispheric and global debate between capitalist/individualist and socialist/collectivist orientations (the salience of which endures, however much proponents of the former may insist on its consignment to history). One might also argue – in accordance with Forsdick’s (2015) proposal to approach Caribbean translation chronotopically – that this moment, at the dawn of both the post-Fidel and the Trump eras, is particularly apposite for such an inquiry. And we should recall Cronin’s mode of analysis, in which the apparently ‘parochial’ is the ideal staging ground for global interrogations: “The micro-cosmopolitan movement, by situating diversity, difference, exchange at the micro-levels of society, challenges the monopoly (real or imaginary) of a deracinated elite on cosmopolitan ideals by attempting to show that elsewhere is next door, in one’s immediate environment, no matter how infinitely small or infinitely large the scale of investigation” (Cronin, 2006, p. 73).

In the context of Anglophone Caribbean higher education generally, this type of project has the obvious benefit of giving academic due deference to a rich vein of existing cultural interchange between the English-speaking region and its Spanish-speaking counterpart. Whether addressed through the disciplinary lens of Translation Studies, Literary Studies or Caribbean Studies—where the broader sociopolitical angles might be more prominent—it exemplifies the potential of a pan-regional inclusivity not in the service of greater competitive heft in the ‘globalized’ marketplace, but for its own sake as a celebration of commonality across difference, of a shared but differentiated particularity.

6. Conclusion

As postcolonial higher education institutions seek to integrate national, regional and global imperatives, the field of culture has a crucial role to play in offering frameworks for understanding local-global relationships that contest the neoliberal managerialist paradigm that currently dominates at least at the discursive level. In Glissant’s vision, the Caribbean region’s preeminent position as a zone of Relation, as opposed to filiation and rootedness, opens a space for a reconceptualization of human interaction around a mutual acknowledgment of fascinatingly problematic difference that precludes any attempt to dominate a cultural Other, “a world in which one is, quite simply, one agrees to be, with and among others” (Glissant, 1990, p. 128). I hope to have demonstrated that the convergence of CLTS and CGCE around decolonial modes of analysis offers a promising alliance for the assertion of such an egalitarian

vision of intercultural engagement in Caribbean higher education discourse and debate, with Cronin's micro-cosmopolitanism representing an example of how insularity, small size and even constraints on international movement and exposure need not constitute impediments to the acquisition of an informed and ethically responsible orientation toward the world at large, grounded in a mindful attention to the inevitable presence of elsewhere in the here and now. Intra-Caribbean pedagogies such as the suggested engagement with Cuban literary translators by Anglophone Caribbean researchers and students demonstrate again that the region, including its vast diaspora, contains and continually resignifies the global through its infinitely complex cultural practices.

References

- Alexander, M. J. (1994). Not just (any) body can be a citizen: The politics of law, sexuality and postcoloniality in Trinidad and Tobago and the Bahamas. *Feminist Review*, (48), 5–23. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1395166>
- Andreotti, V. (2014). 'Soft' versus critical global citizenship education. In S. McCloskey (Ed.), *Development Education in Policy and Practice* (pp. 21–31). London, England: Palgrave Macmillan UK. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9781137324665_2
- Andreotti, V. (2015). Global Citizenship Education Otherwise. In A. A. Abdi, L. Shultz, & T. Pillay (Eds.), *Decolonizing Global Citizenship Education* (pp. 221–228). Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense.
- Andreotti, V., & Souza, L. M. T. M. de. (2008). *Learning to read the world through other eyes*. Derby, England: Global Education. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/575387/Learning_to_Read_the_World_Through_Other_Eyes_2008_
- Andreotti, V., & Souza, L. M. T. M. de. (2012). Introduction: (Towards) global citizenship education otherwise. In *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education* (pp. 1–6). Abingdon, England; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Arencibia, L. (2012, March 24). Apuntes para una historia de la traducción en Cuba. *La Jiribilla - Revista de Cultura Cubana*, (568). Retrieved from http://epoca2.lajiribilla.cu/2012/n568_03/568_33.html
- Arencibia, L., & Hernández Valdés, E. (2009). Medio siglo de traducción y edición de las literaturas anglo y franco caribeñas en Cuba. *Cuba literaria*. Retrieved from <http://www.cubaliteraria.com/articulo.php?idarticulo=8095&idseccion=55>
- Asociación Cubana de Traductores e Intérpretes. (2015, October 11). XIII Simposio Internacional de Traducción Literaria. Retrieved from <http://www.acti.cu/index.php/2015/10/10/xiii-simposio-internacional-de-traduccion-literaria/>
- Bateson, G. (1973). *Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution and epistemology*. London, England: Paladin.
- Bermann, S. (2014). Translation as relation and Glissant's work. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, 16(3). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2516a>
- Bogle, D., Craig, I., & Siegel, J. F. (2016). Editorial. *Translation and Translanguaging in Multilingual Contexts*, 2(2), 171–180. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ttmc.2.2.001edi>

- Britton, C. (1999). *Édouard Glissant and postcolonial theory: Strategies of language and resistance*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&scope=site&db=nlebk&db=nlabk&AN=17069>
- Craig, I. (2010). Anonymous sojourners: Mapping the territory of Caribbean experiences of immersion for language learning. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal of Study Abroad*, 19, 125–149.
- Craig, I. (2016). Overseas sojourning as a socioeconomic and cultural development strategy. *Study Abroad Research in Second Language Acquisition and International Education*, 1(2), 277–304. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sar.1.2.06cra>
- Cronin, M. (2006). *Translation and identity*. Oxford; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Curbelo, J. D. (2012). La traducción en Cuba: Breve repaso de una tradición. *La Jiribilla - Revista de Cultura Cubana*, (568). Retrieved from http://epoca2.lajiribilla.cu/2012/n568_03/568_05.html
- Deem, R. (2001). Globalisation, new managerialism, academic capitalism and entrepreneurialism in universities: Is the local dimension still important? *Comparative Education*, 37(1), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050060020020408>
- Deem, R., & Brehony, K. J. (2005). Management as ideology: The case of “new managerialism” in higher education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 31(2), 217–235. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03054980500117827>
- De La Vega, M. C. (2011, September 14). Interview with prize-winning translator in Cuba [Web log post]. Retrieved from <https://mariacristinadelavegamusings.wordpress.com/2011/09/14/interview-with-prize-winning-translator-in-cuba/>
- Dzvimbo, K. P., & Moloji, K. C. (2013). Globalisation and the internationalisation of higher education in sub-Saharan Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 33(3), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.15700/201503070808>
- Forsdick, C. (2015). Translation in the Caribbean, the Caribbean in translation. *Small Axe: A Caribbean Journal of Criticism*, 19(3), 147–174. <https://doi.org/10.1215/07990537-3341741>
- Friel, B. (1981). *Translations* (1st edition). London, England; Boston, MA: Faber & Faber.
- Glissant, É. (1969). *L'intention poetique*. Paris, France: Editions du Seuil.
- Glissant, É. (1981). *Le discours antillais*. Paris, France: Éditions du Seuil.

- Glissant, É. (1989). *Caribbean discourse: Selected essays*. (J. M. Dash, Trans.). Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Glissant, É. (1990). *Poétique de la relation*. Paris, France: Gallimard.
- Glissant, É. (1997). *Poetics of relation*. (B. Wing, Trans.). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Glissant, É. (2003). The French language in the face of creolization. In T. Stovall & V. D. G. Abbeele (Eds.), *French civilization and Its discontents: Nationalism, colonialism, race* (pp. 105–113). Lanham, MD and Plymouth, England: Lexington Books.
- Hall, S. (1991). Old and new identities, old and new ethnicities. In A. D. King (Ed.), *Culture, Globalization and the World System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity* (pp. 41–68). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Harris, S. (2011). *The university in translation: Internationalizing higher education*. London, England: Continuum.
- Jules, T. D. (2012). Re-reading the anamorphosis of educational fragility, vulnerability, and strength in small states. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 15(1), 5–13.
- Kaiser, B. M. (2012). Poésie en étendue: Deleuze, Glissant and a post-postcolonial aesthetics of the Earth. In R. Braidotti & P. Pisters (Eds.), *Revisiting normativity with Deleuze* (pp. 133–144). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Kamugisha, A. (2007). The coloniality of citizenship in the contemporary Anglophone Caribbean. *Race & Class*, 49(2), 20–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396807082856>
- Lang, G. (2000). Translation from, to and within the Atlantic Creoles. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 13(2), 11–28. <https://doi.org/10.7202/037409ar>
- Lynch, K. (2013). New managerialism, neoliberalism and ranking. *Ethics in Science and Environmental Politics*, 13(2), 141–153. <https://doi.org/10.3354/esep00137>
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mok, K. H. (2007). Questing for internationalization of universities in Asia: Critical reflections. *Journal of Studies in International Education*, 11(3-4), 433–454. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315306291945>
- Myskja, K. (2013). Foreignisation and resistance: Lawrence Venuti and his critics. *Nordic Journal of English Studies*, 12(2), 1–23.

- Ntshoe, I., Higgs, P., Higgs, L. G., & Wolhuter, C. C. (2008). The changing academic profession in higher education and new managerialism and corporatism in South Africa. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 22(2), 391–403.
- Okawa, R. M. (2010). *Translation and resistance to transparent forms of knowledge: The case of Caribbean literatures* (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/814731256/abstract/CD739F5C9D0542B2PQ/1>
- Olssen, M., & Peters, M. A. (2005). Neoliberalism, higher education and the knowledge economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02680930500108718>
- Organization of American States. (n.d.). *Education for democratic citizenship in the Caribbean: A distance course for educators*. Retrieved December 23, 2016, from /educoas/education-democratic-citizenship-caribbean?lang=en
- Pereda, R., & Guerra, E. (2015, November 27). Encontrar lo invisible: traducción literaria en Cuba. *CMBF Radio musical nacional*. Retrieved January 5, 2017, from <http://www.cmbfradio.cu/articulo.php?art=2609>
- Ponte, A. J. (2012, June 3). A un quinquenio de la guerrita de los emails. *Diario de Cuba*. Retrieved January 12, 2017, from http://www.diariodecuba.com/cultura/1331024545_1202.html
- Rhoads, R. A., Torres, C. A., & Brewster, A. (2005). Neoliberalism, globalisation, and Latin American higher education: The challenge to national universities. In J. Zajda, K. Freeman, M. Geo-Jaja, S. Majhanovic, V. Rust, J. Zajda, & R. Zajda (Eds.), *International handbook on globalisation, education and policy research* (pp. 131–145). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer Netherlands. Retrieved from http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/1-4020-2960-8_9
- Rowe, S. (2014). Standing up to managerialism. *Liberal Education*, 100(3), 56.
- Sharma, Y. (2016, October 1). Towards an Ibero-American higher education space. *University World News*. Retrieved from <http://www.universityworldnews.com/article.php?story=20160930151128208>
- Sheller, M. (2012). *Citizenship from below: Erotic agency and Caribbean freedom*. Durham, NC and London, England: Duke University Press.
- Slagle, K. (2014). Analyzing the Caribbean through the vehicle of translation studies. In V. Orlando (Ed.), *Reimagining the Caribbean: Conversations among the Creole, English, French, and Spanish Caribbean*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books. Retrieved from

<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=810254&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

- Smith, F. (Ed.). (2011). *Sex and the citizen: Interrogating the Caribbean*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988). *Can the subaltern speak? In Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (pp. 271–313). Chicago: University of Illinois Press
- Tarc, P. (2012). How does “global citizenship education” construct its present? The crisis of international education. In V. Andreotti & L. M. T. M. de Souza (Eds.), *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education* (pp. 105–123). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Tymoczko, M. (2006). *Translation: Ethics, ideology, action*. *The Massachusetts Review*, 47(3), 442–461.
- UNESCO. (n.d.). *El espacio de la educación superior en América Latina y el Caribe (ENLACES/ELACES)*. Retrieved December 28, 2016, from http://www.iesalc.unesco.org.ve/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=3478:el-espacio-de-la-educacion-superior-en-america-latina-y-el-caribe-enlaces-elaces&catid=100&Itemid=449&lang=es
- University Office of Planning and Development. (2012). *The University of the West Indies strategic plan 2012-2017*. University of the West Indies. Retrieved from http://www.uwi.edu/Libraries/PlanningDocs/UWI_Strategic_Plan_2012-2017_Final.sflb.ashx
- Valdés León, C. (2014). Editar, traducir, divulgar el Caribe. *La Jiribilla - Revista de Cultura Cubana*, (664). Retrieved from <http://www.epoca2.lajiribilla.cu/articulo/6833/editar-traducir-divulgar-el-caribe>, <http://www.lajiribilla.cu/articulo/6833/editar-traducir-divulgar-el-caribe>
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London, England; New York, NY: Routledge.
- Watts, R. [Richard]. (2000). Translating culture: Reading the paratexts to Aimé Césaire's “Cahier d'un retour au pays natal”. *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 13(2), 29–46. <https://doi.org/10.7202/037410ar>
- Watts, R. [Richard]. (2005). *Packaging post/coloniality: The manufacture of literary identity in the francophone world*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Watts, R. [Rob]. (2016). *Public universities, managerialism and the value of higher education*. London, England: Palgrave Macmillan UK.