Author: Dr. Amber Engelson
Institution: Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts
Draft: 2021 International Research Workshop
Working Chapter Title: "Social Justice is Not About Language; It's About Humanity": Translanguaging to Cultivate One's Audiences"
Working Book Title: *Interanimating Audience*: *Translanguaging Towards Islamic Feminist Social Justice*

Institutional Description

Background Context: Indonesia

Understanding Indonesia and its sociopolitical history is central to understanding the institution where I researched, as well as the ethnographic case study chapter I include here. (Since this is a book project, I include this information in another chapter). Here is some vital information:

- Indonesia boasts the world's largest Muslim population, and since gaining independence from the Dutch in 1949, Indonesia has sought to remake itself into a pluralist, yet religious democracy. Despite the Muslim majority, the country's guiding document, Pancasila, avoids privileging Islam because of its majority status, though it does specify "belief in one God," which limits acceptable religious practice to monotheistic traditions. The other tenets of Pancasila include tolerance, unity, democracy, and social justice for all. Though the majority of Indonesian's Muslims are peaceful, there is still religious strife as seen in recent Christian church bombings and, as the following chapter will explore, the open conflict between dominant and non-dominant Muslim groups like the Ahmadiyya. The program where I conducted my research, the Indonesian Consortium for Religious Studies, was created to help foster the interreligious harmony promised by Pancasila.

- An archipelago comprised of an estimated 17,000 islands (6000 of which are inhabited), Indonesia is extremely polyglot, with an estimated 418 distinct language groups. In order to unite these disparate islands into the "Indonesia" we know today, the Dutch imposed Malay as the official language of commerce and education. Despite the fact that Malay was externally-imposed, upon independence from the Dutch, postcolonial leaders adopted it as the official language of Indonesia—renaming it Bahasa Indonesia—in an effort to avoid the interethnic conflict that might have ensued if a native tongue was chosen instead. Indonesia's post-colonial language policy has been lauded as one of the most successful language policies to date because of its peaceful results, with the majority of people speaking their mother tongue plus Bahasa Indonesia at the very least.

Approach and Methodologies: in Brief

The ethnographic case study chapter that follows is part of a larger book project where I explore ethnographic data collected over the course of 5 years (from 2009-2014) at the Indonesian Consortium for Religious Studies, a self-described English-medium "Indonesian, international,

inter-religious Ph.D. program" in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Given the program's complicated local-global identity, I crafted the following research questions to explore how language circulated in this particular context:

- How has the English language been positioned as both local and global in a specific Indonesian literacy context?

- How, in turn, do writers, as they use English, negotiate the point of contact between local and global?

Answering these questions involved putting research on Indonesia's geopolitics into conversation with semi-structured faculty interviews and program-related documents to better understand ICRS as a literacy site; conducting ethnographic teacher research; and, after the two-semester Academic Writing course I developed and taught was finished, conducting semi-structured interviews with students that I then put in conversation with text-based analyses of their final written portfolios. My 2014 follow-up study focused more specifically on the relationship between religion, civic engagement, and audience in students' rhetorical practices—themes that arose in my initial study which deserved more attention.

Glossary: General Theoretical Terms

The following theoretical terms and their attendant definitions shape the warp and weft of my book project.

- **Discourse:** Language (and other symbols) and the values, practices, and cultural ideologies it represents, and at times, transforms (See Gee and Bordieu).

- **Cosmopolitan language use:** Cosmopolitan language use is the way people activate shared (and continually shifting) language practices to create and recreate communities outside of the boundaries of the traditional nation-state, redefining existing power relationships and challenging the notion that languages are discrete, static entities linked to specific geographical locations and/or static identity groups (see Xiaoye You's *Cosmopolitan Language Use*). I get much more granular in the attached chapter.

- **Translingual Approach:** An understanding of linguistic diversity which assumes that languages naturally co-exist and overlap both internally, within a writer's repertoire, and externally, as languages and the discourses they represent co-mingle to transform existing communicative practices (see Canagarajah; Horner, Donahue, et al; Schreiber).

- **Translingual Ideal:** A yet-to-be-achieved global communicative revolution where both individual language users *and* linguistically dominant audiences begin to take equal responsibility for communicative action, sparked by the understanding that embracing linguistic diversity might be both enriching and mutually-transformative for rhetor and audience alike.

- **Dialogic Audience Negotiation:** An understanding that every communicative act is mediated by the language user's relationship to past voices and the often competing discourses they represent *and* by the way a writer perceives these discourses interacting with the often competing and diverse discourses of her intended audience, whose future response she anticipates. This dialogic interaction between past, present, and future discourses is mutually transformative in that a writer crafts her language use—and thus her textual identity—in relation to her future audience, while also shaping the identity of that audience in new ways through her forward-looking and imaginative language use. In this way, our identities—and the discourses that construct these identities—shift with every text we create or encounter, whether we're conscious of it or not, and in accordance to the degree with which we embrace discursive transformation (See Bakhtin; Halasek).

Understanding audience negotiation as dialogical is central to the way I define and locate translingual agency in my project—a process I describe at length below. These terms, which I draw from Bakhtin and Halasek, shaped the ways I located audience in my analysis:

  o **Backwards-looking audiences:** The heterogeneous voices that precede a writer's historical present and thus are audience to and shape a writer's work. A writer's translingual repertoire is comprised of the many voices that precede her in the Burkean parlor; which voice(s) a writer draws from to convey her message is in turn dependent upon situational power dynamics and the writer's relationship to forward-looking audiences. Locating the past voices that are audience to and thus interanimate writers' rhetorical negotiations—in other words, understanding *from whom* writers are basing their ideas— is central to understanding how they perform translingual agency in relation to *to whom* they choose to write and with *whom* they see their knowledge circulating, or their forward looking audiences.

  o **Forward-looking audiences:** The audiences a writer foresees her texts reaching in the future, which are comprised of "to whom" a writer addresses her text, and "with whom" a writer sees her texts actually circulating.
    o **"To Whom:"** Most text-based analyses of translingual agency use textual cues to explore "to whom" a writer appears to be writing, or what Ede and Lunsford term the "audience invoked." Asking "to whom" a writer seems to be addressing her texts helps us understand a writer's motivation for text-based translingual moves (like code-meshing or genre bending).

    o **"With Whom:"** My mixed method ethnographic approach also allows me to ask "with whom" writers see their texts circulating in the world, or what Ede and Lunsford term the "audience addressed." Merely asking *from whom* and *to whom* when considering how writers negotiate translingually between audiences past and present risks painting rhetorical situations as static and the relationship between writer and audience as unidirectional, with the responsibility for communication resting solely with the writer. As I argue below, translingual agency occurs both in-text and in process, as writers move their knowledge from one moment to the next. Asking "with whom" allows me to trace how writers engage in translingual agency, moving knowledge

from one rhetorical situation to the next, post-textual production. This question also places the onus for communication on both the writer *and* the audience who receives her text, a crucial step when it comes to achieving the translingual ideal outlined above.

Glossary: Disambiguating Agency

As my research questions indicate, exploring how agency manifests itself at ICRS was central to my project, and thus shaped the type of data I collected and the questions I asked of it. Not surprisingly, as I moved back and forth between my theoretical lenses and ethnographic data during the coding process, my understanding of "agency"— and thus the way I defined it— shifted and evolved. Here's a brief synopsis of how I came to understand and thus define agency at ICRS—a literacy context where translingualism is the norm rather than the exception.

First, it's important to acknowledge that *all* meaning-making endeavors could be considered acts of "translingual agency" given years of compelling research that shows how languages naturally co-exist and overlap both internally, within a writer's repertoire, and externally, as languages and the discourses they represent co-mingle to produce broader systemic language change (see Bakhtin, Gee, Canagarajah). However, there is also ample research indicating that we haven't yet achieved the **translingual ideal** outlined above because of existing power relationships. In order to highlight that there is still work to do, in my book I choose to define "translingual agency" in the following, more precise manner:

- **Translingual agency:** the process by which a writer assesses situational power dynamics in relation to audience, purpose, and the diverse voices at her disposal to make deliberate rhetorical choices.

As you can see, to avoid the pitfalls of power-flattening pluralism and to emphasize how situational power dynamics mediate all communicative practices, I limit my definition to moments where it's clear a writer makes *intentional* choices in relation to power—an understanding made possible through my ethnographic case study approach, which blended any text-based analysis with interviews, critical literacy narratives and reflective cover letters. In addition, my definition—with its focus on the *writer's choices* in relation to situational power dynamics— avoids the pitfall of associating translingual agency solely with *textual moves* that challenge dominant norms (see Bawarshi; Horner and Lu; Schreiber and Watson, Engelson). Though translingual agency *is* performed through textual moves like **code-meshing**, where a writer deliberately challenges dominant norms by meshing different codes within the same text (see Young), my definition goes beyond the text to reframe translingual agency as a writer-mediated, dialogical *process*. In keeping with the Bakhtinian theory I outline above, this process involves a writer assessing the relationship between the past voices, or backwards-looking audiences in her repertoire—and their attendant languages—and the apperceptive backgrounds of her forward looking audiences, which necessarily involves assessing situational power dynamics. Asking "from whom," "to whom," and "with whom," helped me locate this agency both in text and in process, from pre-textual production to post-text circulation.

Reframing translingual agency as writer-centered, dialogic and process-oriented offered both textual and extra-textual affordances when it came to analyzing my ethnographic data. Textually, my definition helped me acknowledge that when it comes to my research participants' writing, both deliberate genre-bending *and* intentional assimilation can be considered forms of translingual agency, provided that the writer was aware that she had multiple options at her disposal and that she made her choices in relation to existing power relationships (see Bawarshi's "Beyond the Genre Fixation"; Horner and Lu "Translingual Literacy"). Extra-textually, this definition allowed me to trace how the writers I worked with made different choices at different moments in time as power dynamics shifted, while also allowing me to trace how they chose to negotiate and circulate *knowledge* garnered from their engagement with texts from one context to the next to effect social change in their communities—a process that involved moving beyond the originating language/text to imagine what the knowledge itself might *do*. In the end, for the scholar-activists in my study, it was how the knowledge garnered through academic research could be activated—not necessarily what textual form it took at a particular moment in time— that seemed to matter most.

I also get a bit more granular when defining "agency" in my larger book project, as the following terms and definitions show. It's important to note that the following forms of agency can be translingual in orientation, depending on the situation and process involved when making decisions, but they might also stand on their own as separate forms of agency. For this reason, as I conducted my analysis and wrote up my data, I chose to disambiguate them from more obvious moments of "translingual agency" as I define it above.

- **Discursive agency/interventions:** Used to describe text-based interventions in situations where I wasn't able to study, using multiple methodologies, specifically how individuals negotiated situational power relations.

- **Material agency/interventions:** Used to describe situations where individuals moved beyond isolated text-based interventions to enact real-world change. These interventions involved embodied action or actions people took which moved past mere textual production in relation to an imagined or distant audience.

- **Feminist agency:** Used to describe discursive and material interventions intended to challenge the systemic oppression of women. To move past my undoubtedly West-centered feminist lens, in my book I deliberately center my participants' own definitions of feminist agency, which all differ slightly, to frame my analyses and craft their portraits.

****

Questions for Reviewers:
- **How can I make the parts more cohesive?** This is the final case study chapter of my book, and thus it is assimilating a lot of theory from previous chapters, while also introducing new data. I'm not sure if I "cohesed" very well given all the moving parts.

- **What can I cut?** This draft is currently almost 12,000 words, which is long for a book chapter, I think. I have a hard time deciding whether to cut the literature review or to cut

the data itself, and sometimes I fear that in my attempt to cohese, I am instead rather repetitive.

Thank you for reading such a lengthy text!

****

(Draft: 1/11/21)

"Social Justice is Not About Language; It's About Humanity": Translanguaging to Cultivate One's Audiences"

[Being] a politician is about the outside of me…Academic is already inside of me. This is like if you have bricks. I've already arranged the bricks, one by one, from the bottom, in academics. I don't want to start over. I have to make this a house. But for politics, it's like the outside. On the outside of the house, there's a garden. I don't want to throw out the garden, but I still want to keep establishing the house. It would be very nice if there was a house and a good garden.

This opening metaphor, in which Ninik, this chapter's case study, describes her literate identity, is central to understanding how she negotiates global literacy contexts as a devout Muslim, feminist activist, and politician. As Ninik's literacy portrait indicates, the academic house, or identity, that she has built is very much grounded in the material context of Indonesia, but, as this chapter will show, the bricks she has very carefully used to construct this "home" are decidedly cosmopolitan in orientation, a testament, one could argue, to her "home's" connection to the locally-grown yet globally-connected political garden surrounding it. To unpack the metaphor further, Ninik's political identity, or the surrounding "garden" she is currently cultivating, would not be considered a garden at all if it weren't associated with a home, or the cosmopolitan academic identity she has built. After all, from a definitional perspective, the difference between "garden" and "not garden" is the space's connection to human agency: plots of land are deemed "garden" because of their proximity to the home— provided, of course, that the human agent associated with the garden cultivates and tends to societally-recognized garden plants. Notably, both parts of her metaphor evoke a recursive and layered understanding of identity, and with that, a context-specific understanding of agency that involves the careful cultivation of the materials at hand.

When applied to Ninik's literacy practices, the materials she draws from to construct her home and garden over the course of five years spring from both local and global discourse communities, across the Indonesian, English, and Arabic languages and their attendant audiences. In this way, her literacy practices align with those of Faqih and Nina[1]. However, unlike Faqih, who relinquishes authorial agency to *serve* his local Indonesian audiences, and Nina, who works to *access* dominant Indonesian audiences from a non-dominant positionality, Ninik seeks to carefully *cultivate* audiences both local *and* global, and in so doing she crafts a distinctly cosmopolitan identity.

---

[1] See the case study portraits in Chapter 2 and 3.

How she takes agency to cultivate these resources to achieve her cosmopolitan ends is in turn very much mediated by the discursive and material "borders" she negotiates when navigating dialogically between and among these competing audiences. Discursively, Ninik must navigate the socially constructed borders traditionally drawn between languages that position languages as discrete entities solely capable of reaching discrete audiences, and on a more macro level, the socially-constructed borders that link one language to one nation-state in the broader cultural imagination. When it comes to material borders, because of global economic inequality, she must navigate unequal access to global literate resources and thus the border between the haves and the have nots, which involves moving herself and the literacy resources she accumulates across national borders. To complicate matters, as Ninik shifts between her academic and political identities over the course of time, so too do the power relationships she must navigate and leverage to achieve her social justice goals. Though her cosmopolitan ideals, inspired by her religious and feminist academic scholarship, remain the same, the translingual path she takes to reach them depends on the power relationships she sees in particular situations, which shows a writer-driven, emergent understanding of translingual agency, and with that, of cosmopolitan connection.

Theorizing Cosmopolitan Connection
As established in previous chapters, effective global rhetorical connection requires that the relationships between writer and audience be reimagined as dialogical, mutually-constitutive and constantly shifting. Given the cosmopolitan ethos Ninik constructs with her rhetorical acts and the complex, transnational rhetorical situations she navigates, Xioaye You's scholarship in *Cosmopolitan English* is particularly salient. For You, reimagining English through the lens of cosmopolitanism, with Standard English being one variety of cosmopolitan English (14) involves acknowledging the "historicity, artificiality, and rhetoricity of…cultural categories" (6) so "we can cease defining English along the lines of birthright, nation, ethnicity, or region, and we can instead understand it as a multiplicity of local practices constantly converging and intermingling with other linguistic and cultural forces" (19). Drawing from translingual theory, You argues against the theoretical notion that "languages are discrete systems that a speaker or writer can move between and draw elements from" (18), though he acknowledges that in practice it may sometimes *appear* that languages are discrete systems. He explains:

> While CE [cosmopolitan English] is full of instances of such language uses, it does not embrace the view of language as a discrete system typically defined by nation or ethnicity. Instead, based on their assessment of the rhetorical situation, CE users marshal the available resources from their repertoires to realize different designs in speech or writing, including potentially forming identifications with the Other" (17).

Here You highlights the cosmopolitan English user's rhetorical agency, emphasizing that different designs are possible in a translingual world. Echoing Horner, Lu, and Bawarshi that assimilation can evidence translingual agency, You implies that a writer may in fact choose to portray her languages as "discrete" in some "instances," reflecting and perhaps reinforcing the ideological link between language and nation-state/ethnicity that cosmopolitan theory seeks to challenge, whereas at other times she might seek to write across traditional discursive borders.

In a claim central to understanding Ninik's actual rhetorical choices, if not her ideals, You also points to the role that translation plays in cosmopolitan communication: he argues that a writer may at times "form ideas and feelings in other languages first and translate them into spoken or written English" (18). However, a writer might just as well code-switch or code-mesh,

"refus[ing] to translate in order to legitimize a certain type of text" or to achieve a certain rhetorical purpose (18). If we accept that writers should be able to and in fact *do* draw from the full range of languages in their literacy repertoire, we must also acknowledge that they might use different means to "[form] identifications with the Other" (You 17) depending on their intended audience, purpose, and rhetorical context.

Cosmopolitanism also challenges traditional assumptions regarding audience, which often rest on dated understandings of the relationship between language and a bounded nation-state or discrete identity grouping. You emphasizes that "when writing in English, a writer may need to communicate with an audience that cannot be easily pinned down to a single language or single culture. It might be a cosmopolitan audience, who like the writer, has crossed the arbitrary lines demarcating languages and cultures" (141). Or, as You suggests above, a writer might translate knowledge from one language to another, engaging in translingual agency to craft a cosmopolitan connection between backwards and forward-looking audiences that isn't yet there, but could be. Or, alternatively, given the cosmopolitan possibilities English opens up, a non-Western writer may choose to use English to communicate with local, non-Western audiences, temporarily rewriting traditional linkages between geopolitical borders and language by localizing English, as Canagarajah's research on the writing practices of Tamil academic Dr. Sivatamby shows ("Towards"), and as the portraits in this book emphasize. [2] Ninik, we will see, negotiates—and in so doing, redefines—cosmopolitan audience connection in all of these ways. Importantly, though, these choices are very much dependent upon the power dynamics she navigates in particular situations.

Indeed, though You frames linguistic choice as emerging from specific "contexts of interaction" (13), there are moments where his argument doesn't capture the lived experiences of my research participants, most likely because of the differing socioeconomic realities of our research contexts. As an example, though You acknowledges power repeatedly, and that cultural contact zones, and thus borders, do exist (11), he asserts that overall, rather than implying "rupture," the "conflicts, contradictions, and paradoxes generated as cultures initially collide and entangle will in general give rise to, if not be resolved" as language users "negotiate the tensions" to move "toward cultural synthesis" (34). Echoing You's research, at times Ninik does use her translingual practices to work towards synthesis between once-disparate audiences, re-drawing traditional borders between languages, religious beliefs, and the audiences long associated with them.

True cross-cultural synthesis, however, is not always possible, or desirable. In Ryoko Kubota's "The Multi/Plural Turn," she asserts that calls for linguistic borderlessness could reflect and promote neoliberal ideology if not framed in relation to existing power structures. Neoliberal ideology, which promotes notions of "individual agency, difference blindness, and elitist cosmopolitanism" (14), ignores existing class stratifications within nation-states, and with that issues of unequal access to literate resources—an argument reinforced by the research of Lillis and Curry; Trimbur; Ferguson, and my own research here and elsewhere (See "Resources are Power"). Ninik, we will see, is continually confronted by stratifications linked to the information divide discussed in Chapter 1, which render equitable synthesis impossible.

Just as celebrating borderlessness might make it easier to ignore unequal access, it might also obscure the desire by less-powerful linguistic groups to *maintain* linguistic borders. Cultural

---

[2] See also my article "To Whom Do We Have Students Write?" and Pennycook's *Transcultural Flows.*

synthesis is not always desired, Scott Lyons, Kubota, and others suggest. Though discourses coexist, are permeable, and thus cannot by nature be discrete, existing power relations *do* bleed into language mixes, often to the detriment of the least powerful language. Hybridity doesn't imply an egalitarian relationship between discourses, as indigenous peoples, who have a vested interest in asserting borders to maintain their languages, know. In Scott Lyon's words, sovereignty "is not something that is easily meshed. If anything, sovereignty requires the making of a fence, not to keep things out, but to keep important things in" (77). Maintaining linguistic borders, Ninik's portrait also shows, can be a way to unify against more powerful interests to achieve social justice for oppressed communities.

This tension between cultural synthesis and exclusion can be ameliorated, Ninik's portrait shows, by reframing cosmopolitan connection—and the linguistic negotiations linked to it—as inevitably provisional because of the temporal-spatial nature of discursive action (see Horner and Lu). As Paolo Freire argues, when an actor is confronted with a limit-situation, or a limitation linked to existing power relationships, [3] she has two options: submersion in the situation and thus tacit acceptance, or confrontation through critical reflection, which he refers to as praxis (5), or Conscientizagao. Freire argues that such reflection on existing discourses, no matter how provisional, is crucial to understanding that history, and thus humans themselves, craft "the very condition of existence" (109), which concomitantly implies they can also work to change that existence. In Freire's words:

> Only as this situation ceases to present itself as a dense, enveloping reality or a tormenting blind alley, and they can come to perceive it as an objective-problematic situation— only then can commitment exist. Humankind emerge from their submersion and acquire the ability to intervene in reality as it is unveiled. (109).

Once people discover themselves to be merely "in a situation," which involves pausing discourse for a moment and stepping outside of it to reflect on its human construction, Freire asserts they can imagine other, more ethical possibilities in the future.

Regardless of how a human chooses to define and then confront a particular limit situation, hearkening back to Horner and Lu's discussion of spatial-temporal agency, this human-agency-through-reflection is merely a temporary pause in the chain of signification that constitutes the ever-shifting power relationships people navigate. In Freire's words, "To exist, humanly, is to name the world, to change it. Once named, the world in its turn reappears to the namers as a problem and requires of them a new naming. Human beings are not built in silence, but in word, in work, in action-reflection" (88). This human-naming-of-the-world does not create a static, long-lasting truth, but rather requires a continual, processual movement between naming and reflection. To be fully "human," in Freire's eyes, involves continuous praxis: "reflection and action upon the world in order to transform it" (5).

By tracing how one writer, Ninik, momentarily defines and then transcends the diverse limit situations she encounters over the course of five years, this chapter emphasizes the ongoing work of cosmopolitan connection. Ninik, we will see, moves between synthesis and exclusion in the ways she carefully cultivates her backwards and forward-looking audiences from one moment to the next to work towards her cosmopolitan ideals. This process involves silencing some voices in her repertoire, while amplifying others, depending on the limit situation. To return to Bakhtin, *from whom* she draws her knowledge in any given moment and *to whom* she

---

[3] See also Jasper's *The Philosophy of Existence* and Petruzzi's "Between Conventions and Critical Thinking."

addresses her words is contingent upon *with whom* she seeks to make real world, cosmopolitan connections. These dialogic audience negotiations are in turn mediated by the limit situations she is confronted with and seeks to define amidst the competing discourses in her life. At times, she may work towards cross-cultural synthesis, while at others she might choose temporary exclusion. To return to Freire, Ninik is engaged in a continual process of working towards her ideals, "in word, in work, in action-reflection," (88), and underlying each intervention is her steadfast belief that cosmopolitan connection matters.

Cultivating a Cosmopolitan Identity, Brick by Brick
   Throughout her literacy portfolio and in her interviews, Ninik emphasizes a cosmopolitan orientation when it comes to working towards social justice. This belief in connecting across difference was undoubtedly fostered by her transnational lived experiences and the discourse communities that shaped her—from her Muslim faith to her advanced academic scholarship in English. However, she is careful to avoid mapping her own experiences and belief systems onto others who may approach social justice differently, a crucial means of establishing connection despite difference, as Ratcliffe argues, and a central means of transcending, or at least redefining for the time being, existing borders whether discursive or material, so that they bend towards justice.
   To Ninik, this desire for social justice should—and does—transcend linguistic and religious borders; rather, shared humanity should be the impetus for change. When I asked her in her 2014 interview whether she used the knowledge she garnered from English scholarship to effect social change, her answer was decidedly cosmopolitan in orientation. She replied,

> Social justice is not about language; it's about humanity. Probably different people define English differently, but you already know that English is something for me, like a tool. Right now we can see that it is imperialist and political in academic circles, but I think it's not English as itself. And right now many people use English. For me, it's like a tool. We can talk about social justice in any language.

Though Ninik admits here and elsewhere in her interviews that the preponderance of academic research in English and the requirement Indonesian scholars publish in English is symptomatic of linguistic imperialism, she also points to the fact that it's not the English language itself, but the humans using it that leads to such inequity. Given the right circumstances, English, like any language, can be used for social justice. We need to most past the text itself—or the language system being used—and focus on what we might *do*. It's not the language, but the action that matters.
   Ninik also points to two overlapping discourses in her repertoire—often situated at odds in dominant Western discourse— that she believes responsible for fostering this "human" desire for social justice. She continues:

> For me, my motivation [for social justice] is mostly about what I see and what I read. And mostly right now most of what I read is two types: firstly, religious, about Qu'ran, and second, academic books and articles in English. Everything like that is in English. But I think when thinking about social justice, you shouldn't think about religion, the country, the color of their skin, your language—you should think about what you see and talk about it with what's in your heart. As a human.

By naming these two backwards-looking audiences as her prime motivators, Ninik challenges existing (and problematic) borders in dominant Western academic thought: between religious and academic discourses and between Islam and progressive social justice (see Ringer and

Depalma; Stenberg). These discourses, and the languages and values linked to them, co-exist and interanimate each other in Ninik's discursive repertoire. Regardless of her own influences, though, she believes that global citizens need to move beyond the clear boundaries drawn around religion, country, race, or language to achieve social equity—a decidedly cosmopolitan belief.

This interest in cosmopolitan border crossing—whether discursive or material—likely springs from Ninik's literacy history. Islamic literacy, as she mentions, has played an important role in shaping her as a language user. Not only did she grow up in a Muslim-dominant society; her family also runs a powerful pesantran, or Islamic boarding school in her hometown of Banuwangi, and they serve approximately 5000 students. Ninik is a devout Muslim. That said, as we'll see, Ninik was quite clear in her interviews how important it was that she not be reduced to solely her religious identity—and rightfully so, given the ways Muslim women are often reduced to a single, essentialized identity in Western scholarship. Ninik's cosmopolitan, social justice-oriented identity exists at the intersection of multiple, sometimes competing discourses, two of which she experienced simultaneously, starting in junior high.

In her initial 2010 interview, Ninik described her experience moving from a secular junior high school, which spent more time on English, to an Islamic pesantran, where the balance shifted. She explained that "In junior high school I love English. My grades were the best. But after that I continue to high school, and I am not in secular school, but in the religious school, and the percentage is 70 percent religious courses and only 30 percent secular courses, like biology, geography, and English." Her "focus," she explained, shifted at that point and it wasn't until she "got a C" in an English Core course in college that she looked back and reflected on her lost passion for English. To return to the opening metaphor, some of the "bricks" Ninik used to arrange her academic identity were undoubtedly religious in nature, which influenced her initial relationship to English.

That said, the literate resources available for Ninik's academic house diversified when she was accepted to the Ford Foundation's International Fellowship Program, which eventually enabled her to earn her M.A. in Asian Studies in the United States at the English-medium University of Hawai'i at Manoa. Because her TOEFL scores were not adequate for immediate acceptance to the Master's program, the Fellowship funded a six-month English-intensive program in Jakarta, and another six-month training through the University of Hawaii's East-West Center. These opportunities necessitated sponsorship by the West-affiliated Ford Foundation because of the prohibitive cost of such prep courses. Access to academic English does not come cheap, and often, as Trimbur, Phillipson and others argue, only the privileged have access to such opportunities.

Ninik did choose to leverage her relative privilege for the social good, however. Because of her experiences border-hopping between Indonesia and Hawaii, when she returned to Indonesia, she knew she wanted to do an English-medium Ph.D. program in Indonesia, which led to her acceptance at the Indonesian Consortium for Religious Studies. When I asked her why she chose to apply to ICRS in particular, she explained that her primary motivation was to continue "my experience in international networking using English." ICRS, as an English-medium institution, allowed her to keep using English *within* Indonesia where she could be near her family, and, given that all ICRS students are required to study abroad, pretty much ensured that she would use her English in non-Indonesian contexts, too.

Not surprisingly, Ninik's cosmopolitan experiences—and desire for cross-cultural connection—affected the forward-looking audiences *to whom* she most often addressed her words. Unlike with Faqih and Nina, who most often imagined local Indonesian audiences, for

Ninik, it depended on the situation. When I asked in her 2010 post-course interview which audiences she most often imagined for her texts, she explained,

> Actually, I don't think about audience at first, particularly in class papers. I just follow the topic in class, what is interesting, but I always think about what topic in each class I can relate to women issues. Then, after I'm done, I revise for different audiences I think would like my writing.

The way Ninik describes her process when it comes to audience here likely hints at her cosmopolitan orientation; rather than choosing a discrete audience for her texts, she begins with the content, though feminist social justice is a prime motivator. Only after she writes her text does she revise for different audiences, which leaves space for her to move between inclusion and cross-cultural synthesis and at times, exclusion, while still working towards social justice. In keeping with her own transnational literacy history, these audiences are both local-to-Indonesia *and* Western. To whom she writes, as the next sections will show, is dependent upon what backwards-looking voices she wishes to share and what her forward-looking audiences need to know, choices that depend on situational power dynamics related to access and its corollary disconnect.

Indeed, as the next sections will emphasize, the limit situations Ninik encounters as an Indonesian PhD student and legislator do challenge her cosmopolitan ideals. Though she argues for a world that looks past arbitrary identity categories and the borders that construct them—to return to her words, "when thinking about social justice, you shouldn't think about religion, the country, the color of their skin, your language"— at times Ninik is forced to rely on the very same discursive boundaries she wants to deconstruct to negotiate competing discourses and achieve her social justice aims. By tracing her literacy practices through time, however, we can see how an exclusionary audience choice at one point does not preclude a move towards synthesis at another. Examining the various limit situations Ninik encounters and the way she moves between synthesis and exclusion as she negotiates audiences offers up new ways of understanding translingual agency, and with that cosmopolitan connection.

Cultivating a Cosmopolitan Indonesian Conversation, Brick by Brick

That achieving her ideal cosmopolitan connection was complicated by Ninik's lived experiences became quite clear in the way she engaged with the materials presented in the Ph.D-level academic writing course I developed and taught during the 2009-2010 academic year. Depending on the rhetorical situation she imagined for her texts, Ninik at times used English to deconstruct traditional cross-cultural borders for her projected audiences; at other times, however, she *relied upon* rhetorical borders to achieve her purposes. Just as importantly, through the content of her academic work, she continually highlighted material divides Indonesians must navigate in order to engage with global literacies. This discursive border work in her academic life foreshadows, in turn, the way she navigates across borders and between powerful literacy sponsors to achieve social justice as a citizen and politician.

In the first text Ninik constructed for my class, a critical literacy narrative,[4] she wrote her cosmopolitan ethos into the narrative *and* performed it by directly addressing an audience of Indonesian peers. *To whom* she addresses her text is localized to the peers *with whom* she learns. By sharing her experiences studying abroad with an audience she assumes will also study abroad— but hasn't yet— she works to alleviate cross-cultural friction they, as people who have

---

[4] See Chapter 1 for a detailed description of this assignment.

different experiences with global literacies, might feel. In this one text, she works towards helping others transcend borders more smoothly, while also pointing to the types of borders, material and discursive, she and her Indonesian peers must navigate as they engage in global academic literacy.

Ninik begins her literacy narrative by first establishing connection with her audience, and then constructing her cosmopolitan identity: "Although as other people, I have many discourse communities, for this paper, I would only like to address two discourse communities, which are my existence as a student in Hawaii and in Yogyakarta." She then makes both her purpose and her Indonesian peer audience quite clear:

> I know not only I have problems with cultural shock. Many students who just come back from abroad and continue their studies in Indonesia will face the same problems. Right now, I am still trying to solve my cultural shock even though I have been in ICRS for one month. For those of you who will have the same position as me, I have many suggestions.

She draws these suggestions for coping with "cultural shock" from her own experiences navigating the borders between her Hawaiian and Indonesian educational contexts.

To explore the friction, she moves on to interrogate differing cross-cultural audience expectations when it comes to her English ability:

> Although I am a pure Indonesian, I still got culture shock when I began studying in ICRS... When in Hawaii, I was considered as an international student, I could get excuses, if my English was not perfect. The program supported me to express myself freely. The main point when I talked in classes was my ideas. As long as my classmates and professor could catch my point, it was enough. Perfect English was not really important because it is only a tool to communicate my ideas.

Because she was considered an "international student" in Hawaii, people were more lenient of her non-standard language use, which forwarded to her the notion that communication, rather than correctness, was most important in communicative contexts. Communication across borders should emphasize content and connection over dominant English "standards."

That said, when she returned to Indonesia after two years in Hawaii, she felt her Indonesian cohorts had very different expectations of her English:

> Unlike in Hawaii, in ICRS my English should be perfect since I graduated from America. Actually, nobody speaks directly about that to me. However, I am able to feel it when I talk to some people. One of my friend said, "Your English must be advanced." It indicates they put my English skill higher than theirs. It really makes me uncomfortable. I am aware about my ability in English. Although I am a US alumna, it does not mean that my English skill is better than students who only study in country.

Because of these shifting expectations of her language abilities, Ninik feels friction as she works to construct an English-using identity at ICRS. She uses her literacy narrative to educate her peers, challenging assumptions they might have that English use in "native" speaker contexts is always standard, while also implicitly encouraging them as forward-looking audience members to be amenable to her non-Standard English. Through performance and content, Ninik points to English's cosmopolitan possibilities, suggesting the possibility that *all* English-using audiences learn to listen across borders and linguistic difference.

At times, however, as an academic Ninik relies on the fact that rhetorical borders *do* exist when it comes to knowledge traditions, despite English's increasingly cosmopolitan scope. She points out that exigent religious topics in the United States may be "old news" to Indonesian audiences:

>The topic of research [in the United States] is also, in my view, quite dissimilar. I remember one day my Indonesian friend asking me about my Hawaiian MA capstone's title. He gave me an unpleasant comment, "Why do you discuss about pesantren? Open your eyes, a thousand people already wrote about pesantren. You have to find another topic." It really made me disappointed. I realize that the topic of pesantren is a "common" topic in Indonesia. Pesantren from many different ways is already examined. However, for Hawaiian or Western scholars, in fact, this topic is still saleable. We can not take for granted that all people in West know about pesantren [. . . .] They really want to know what happens in Eastern countries, so pesantren, which is associated with Eastern countries, is still interesting for them.

Not only does Ninik highlight tensions having to do with differing perceptions of "common knowledge" across national borders, but she also points to the important role English plays in spreading non-Western religious knowledge to the West, a move that works towards cosmopolitan connection.

The fact that there *is* a border between Western and non-Western knowledge traditions is an affordance for Ninik; this border allows her to translate knowledge from her Indonesian backwards-looking audiences to educate Western forward-looking audiences who do not have access to Indonesian knowledge—a translingual maneuver that allows her to perform the cosmopolitan ethos she prefers. In turn, by writing about this friction in her literacy narrative, she uses English to encourage her Indonesian peer audience to do the same. English, Ninik both argues and shows, can educate Western *and* local audiences, though *how* particular content is received varies depending upon existing knowledge "borders."

In addition to discursive divides, Ninik also points to borders created by material inequality. She writes that despite having the same "standards" when it comes to academic performance, the material conditions under which she works in Indonesia are very different from those in Hawaii, making it "hard to adjust":

>Students in Hawaii are free to access library from anywhere as long as they have internet access [. . . .] Online journals can be downloaded freely by using students' ID [. . .] Internet is an essential tool that students are able to use anywhere in campus with high speed. The complete facility, for sure, will support students to focus more on study.

Ninik contrasts this experience with her Indonesian literacy context, where the library has "limited hours," the Internet connection is always "broken," and "recent academic articles are difficult to get." In this particular limit-situation, Ninik sees her ability to use English effectively for research circumscribed by economic inequality. Despite English's increasingly cosmopolitan role, the material context in which the language is used mediates any literate action, including actions that work towards cosmopolitan connection.

Ninik ends her literacy narrative with a section she titles "If You Are in My Position," where she uses direct address to give her Indonesian peer audience advice. She begins by encouraging her peers to make local connections when they return to Indonesia: "If you feel disappointed and angry about this condition, share with your friends who have the same experiences as you. It can help you to feel that you are not alone, and some time your friends will give you good advice to solve your problem…" Here, Ninik performs through her writing the very connection to her Indonesian peers she recommends, again signaling the performative nature of her literacy narrative. By conflating *to whom* and *with whom* and writing to an audience of peers, she opens up the possibility that they might respond with "good advice" in real time.

Ninik then moves from "local" to "global," pointing to how students' Western literacy

sponsors (see Brandt) can continue to help them transcend borders when it comes to accessing literate resources:

> Keep in touch with your colleagues from your previous university. It will help you to find sources that you need. In fact, Western universities usually have more open and complete sources. It is good ways not only to find sources but also to maintain networking. I believe networking always gain good things for us in the future.

This advice came from a place of experience. As will be discussed in more detail later, although there is a knowledge divide when it comes to academic sources, networking across languages and borders does help her "gain good things" for herself and others as a citizen and politician.

From a spatial-temporal perspective, this close-reading of Ninik's literacy narrative in relation to content and audience negotiation foreshadows her future literacy interventions. Over the course of five years, Ninik continually returned to the themes she concretizes in her literacy narrative, in word and action. She repeatedly returned to her argument that audiences should learn to listen across difference—linguistic, religious, or otherwise—and to the importance of networking across national borders to synthesize knowledge communities and work towards social justice. Though these themes reoccur, Ninik's rhetorical approach is mediated by situational power dynamics linked to existing societal borders, both discursive and material: as we trace her literacy practices we can see how she uses the various languages in her translingual repertoire to move back and forth between inclusion and exclusion. Regardless, however, she always cultivates some sort of cosmopolitan connection between the diverse audiences in her discursive toolkit.

Cultivating a Diverse Local Audience, Brick by Brick

How Ninik constructs her cosmopolitan ethos to reach forward-looking audiences within Indonesian borders differs depending on what she is writing about and how. The literacy narrative described above is meant for an Indonesian English-using peer audience, which points to the cosmopolitan nature of the English language itself, but without challenging the traditional assumption that her "local" audience is comprised solely of native Indonesians; however, in an editorial assignment sequence, Ninik shows another way cosmopolitan synthesis might be performed, this time by expanding the borders of what we might assume a "local" Indonesian audience looks like. In so doing, she also anticipates arguments by Mao, You, and Horner and Lu, that true cosmopolitan connection involves a willingness to listen across linguistic and rhetorical difference, with writer and audience equally ready to be transformed through the communication process.

As Chapter 1 discusses, at the mid-year point the Ph.D. students with whom I worked expressed a desire to learn genres that would help them mobilize their academic knowledge to reach local civic audiences. To help them do so, I asked them to translate an academic question they were working on into an editorial they might submit, if they chose, for wider circulation. So that they made conscious choices when moving between academic and civic audiences, I also asked them to submit a cover letter with their editorial, outlining their rhetorical choices in relation to the forward-looking audience they imagined.

For this assignment, Ninik chose to discuss a topic close to her heart: prenatal care in Indonesia. She begins her reflective cover letter by writing, "For my editorial, I think I hope some groups that can read it are Indonesian women, activists, doctors and the government. People who read the *Jakarta Post*." She signals here a local Indonesian English-using audience, which is not surprising given the *Jakarta Post's* readership.

However, her cover letter also signals that she does have another audience in mind: me, a white woman from the United States. Challenging the notion that local audiences are necessarily limited to citizens of the nation-state, Ninik uses her cover letter to make a direct request that I try to interpret from the perspective of her Indonesian audience:

> When you read my editorial, please put yourself as an Indonesian woman since if you just think from the side of an American woman you will find it difficult to feel what I want to deliver to my audiences.

Interestingly, Ninik emphasizes that it is only by grounding my own identity within her Indonesian context that her opinion piece will be effective for me as a "local"reader. In so doing, she encourages me to move past the notion that because I'm a native speaker of English, her linguistic choices must necessarily cater to me; rather, in order to be included, I, too, as audience member must work towards cultural synthesis in my interpretive practices. In so doing, she challenges the notion that English is necessarily linked to Western audiences, while also emphasizing that navigating across borders is a two-way street.

Indeed, throughout her editorial Ninik synthesizes Indonesian examples, and even Indonesian languages, with the Western rhetorical appeals I introduced in class to reach this hybrid "local" audience. A "typical" American audience, for instance, may "find it difficult to feel" the type of pathos Ninik wishes to engage in with her opening example because we are interpreting from vastly different social contexts. She begins her editorial as follows:

> The day was January 14, 2010. I sat on the bus with my sister, traveling from Jombang to Surabaya. As it was a full bus, there were some people who had to stand. The weather was hot, because the bus did not have AC. Suddenly a pregnant mother was standing next to me. I spontaneously stood up and gave my seat to her, but she who maybe was in her early 30s waved her hand as a sign of quiet refusal, and she said, "Matur nuwun ya, Saya mau ngamen (Thank you, I want to sing to beg)." I was surprised, then smiled to this beautiful woman and sat back. Not so long amid the smell of stinging sweat in a bus full of passengers, this mother was singing a song and using an instrument made of a series of bottle caps on a piece of wood.

Ninik paints a powerful image of a pregnant woman begging on a crowded, hot bus. That she is writing to an Indonesian audience is clear by her reference to Jombang and Surabaya— Javanese cities that most people reading from a non-Indonesian context would be unaware of—and by her use of code-meshing when relating the pregnant woman's words. Though Ninik translates the Bahasa Indonesia into English, the English, rather than the Bahasa Indonesia, is in parentheses, most likely indicating an audience that gravitates towards the Indonesian language first and English second. Furthermore, that Ninik merely "smiles" and "sits back," signaling her acceptance of the woman's begging, might give someone interpreting from an American context—where beggars are sometimes seen as "lazy" rather than "needy"—pause. Ninik, however, grew up in a culture where begging is, if not accepted entirely by governmental agencies, a fact of life for many Indonesians, many of whom feel it is their Muslim duty to donate small change to those less fortunate.

Indeed, Ninik, rather than condemning the mother for her decision to beg, continues:

> The burden of life has forced her to do this. Of course, she gathered the coins. Coins from passengers are to continue her life. They could be for childbirth preparation. Sacrifice makes truly a wonderful mother.

Ninik successfully portrays the discomfort the woman must feel on the crowded bus, and the poverty that forced her to such a situation. This allows her to interpret the mother's begging as

"sacrifice," rather than "endangerment" of an unborn child, as unsympathetic people interpreting from a different context might. Ninik was probably quite aware of this cross-cultural difference concerning begging because of her time in the U.S., which might have spurred her request that I read her text as she and her native-to-Indonesian audience would.

Ninik then steps back from pathos to acknowledge that the mother's actions were "risky," and to make her argument that reproductive health needs to be addressed in Indonesia:

> What this mother did is not without risk. Economic ability is the main reason that she is doing it. Besides that, there is also the possibility she did not have enough knowledge of the risks. Here in Indonesia, reproductive health does not include in the ranks of importance in household budgets, particularly for middle to lower class families. The need to eat, and school for our children is more important than the funds which are allocated to reproductive health. In addition, access to health services in Indonesia is very limited. In one village, there is usually only one health service, but not all villages have this service.

With her phrases "here in Indonesia" and "our children," Ninik emphasizes that English can be used to convey local issues, challenging the traditional linkage between English and Western interests; furthermore, since these facts are likely obvious to Indonesian audiences, one could argue that Ninik is invoking a mixed audience of Indonesians and people, like me, who might be reading from Indonesian soil but without context regarding Indonesian household budgets and where priorities rest when it comes to women's health.

Ninik then moves on to an example from her own life, where, because of faulty pre-natal care, her aunt died needlessly during childbirth. Her aunt had pre-eclampsia, or high blood pressure, she explains—drawing from research initially accessed through English. When her aunt went into labor, she was scheduled for a Cesarean section, but, because of a lack of doctors, her aunt was forced to wait for four hours for the doctor to come. Her aunt—with the nurses' permission, because they lacked knowledge concerning the condition—made the choice to have a natural birth despite the fact that, "Medically a person with high blood pressure is 'Forbidden' from giving childbirth naturally." Ninik's aunt eventually passed away. As Ninik explains in her editorial,

> Finally, God gave the best way for her. On Friday January 15, 2010 at 9:20, God called this mother to a peaceful end. Innalillahi wa Innalillahi rojiun.

Ninik draws upon God in ways audiences from the U.S., like myself, might consider strange in an opinion piece for a national newspaper—if, that is, that audience wasn't reading with a cosmopolitan, translingual orientation. Appeals to religion are only unconvincing to those used to interpreting from a non-religious context when reading national newspapers.

Ninik's choice to code-mesh Arabic into her English text without translation further indicates that her audience is (or should be) comfortable with and willing to understand Muslim religious references. She explained the phrase's meaning to me in her post-course interview:

> Usually if we have sad tragedies, we always say it. It means that everything is from God and everything goes back to God. This is very common in Indonesia, so even if I publish it in the *Jakarta Post*, it's OK.

Ninik implies that even though the *Jakarta Post* is an English-medium newspaper, it is still Indonesian, and thus accepting of common religious references. For this particular text, she assumes a mixed local audience that includes Muslim Indonesians, and those, like myself, who are willing to put in the work necessary to learn the Arabic phrase's meaning.

As further evidence of her translingual orientation, she signals that her rhetorical choices in this particular piece do not preclude her from making different choices when moving content across contexts and genres. In fact, in her post-course interview, she explained that she had already sent in her editorial in, but she wasn't worried about rejection because she had already circulated her knowledge elsewhere:

> I already sent it to the *Jakarta Post*. I can wait 3 weeks usually and then if it is not published, no problem. Because actually I have three stories in my editorial that I can share other places. I rewrote it in Indonesian on Facebook, but I didn't give any logos. Only pathos. Just giving the stories. I got many comments. But I hope through writing everybody here can accept this reality. They never realize this is important until they read it on Facebook.

Ninik highlights her belief that the feminist *action* her words catalyze, whether in English, or in Indonesian, is what matters most; whether on Facebook or in the *Jakarta Post*, she can spread social awareness through deliberate rhetorical choices, which might include using mostly English but localized content to reach a diverse "local" audience, with occasional code-meshing between English and Arabic; or in the case of her Facebook post, removing the logos and translating the information from English to Indonesian. This maneuver that might exclude some local English-users, like myself, who aren't fluent in Indonesian, but presumably she has already reached us via her opinion piece. By tracing how Ninik circulates the same knowledge in different limit situations, we can see how a writer might move between synthesis and exclusion, while still maintaining, overall, a cosmopolitan orientation when it comes to knowledge circulation.

Given linguistic divides, discursive borders *do* exist; however, in this particular assignment, Ninik successfully negotiates these divides to reach her local English-using audience, provided, of course, her English-using forward-looking audience members, regardless of their national origin, are receptive to her choices. In turn, by subsequently translating the knowledge from her English-medium opinion piece into Indonesian, she is able to bridge the linguistic divide for those without access to English. When viewed from a spatial-temporal perspective, her rhetorical choices indicate an awareness of situational power dynamics, and an ability to perform translingual agency accordingly.

Synthesizing Academic Borders

Unlike with the previous two texts, where Ninik rewrites boundaries when it comes to our perceptions of "local" audiences and which languages can serve what communities, in her advanced academic work Ninik chooses most often to write towards traditional Western academic audiences in an effort to expand our understandings of Indonesian women's agency. Even though she still maintains the traditional link between the English language and bounded Western identity group, her *process itself* is cosmopolitan because she seeks to create synthesis between the Indonesian backwards looking audiences that have shaped her and Western forward-looking audiences who have long been blind to Indonesian knowledge. Like with Faqih, her academic work is translingual in process, albeit seemingly "standardized" in form, so to locate her translingual agency, we must look to the *content* she translates from Arabic and Indonesian into English prior to textual production. In addition, when asked where she might move her knowledge post-textual production, Ninik rewrites traditional boundaries often placed between religious and feminist discourse as well as academic and activist discourses, suggesting new ways we in the West might locate *with whom* writers are sharing academic knowledge.

Ninik's dissertation project draws from ethnographic research in six different pesantran to challenge the Western notion that religious women are passive participants in arranged marriages. As her dissertation introduction states:

> In this research, I will explore how Indonesian women negotiate or resist the process of arranged marriages. This research will attempt to bring the marginalized voices of women into center stage by looking at how they perceive and value themselves within the practice of arranged marriage.

Ninik's own experiences with arranged marriage inspired her academic project. She explained in her 2014 interview that,

> I was married when I was 18, and at the time, I said "OK, I can accept this arranged marriage, but… BUT... I have to continue my study." So I give the requirement to my parents [that] my husband has to allow me to continue my study. I made the negotiation… So we are working from within system but still agency.

As with Nina, the personal *is* political and how she defines agency grounded in existing power relations. Furthermore, we can see how very important Ninik's scholarly identity—her academic house—is to her; her family, whom as educators themselves undoubtedly helped foster her desire to learn, supported her request. And her husband, Ninik emphasized repeatedly through our time together, values her scholarly work almost as much as she does.

Ninik continued in her interview to explain how her ability to negotiate her marriage was sanctioned by the Q'ran itself. In a translingual maneuver, she paraphrased the Q'ranic passage that encourages such negotiation from Arabic into English for me, once again working to educate a Western non-Muslim audience member:

> So I can accept arranged marriage, as long as there is negotiation. Because you know Prophet Mohammed, there is a friend of him, and she said that "my father married me off with the son of my father's friend without my permission."… And he said, "because your father married you off without your permission, your marriage is canceled." So actually, Prophet Mohammed already teaches us how to negotiate, how, even if we are women, we have the right to take agency. We have the right to speak. And to decide.

Here Ninik quotes the Prophet Mohammed himself as a backwards-looking audience who advocates for women's agency, reaffirming the importance of her religious identity in both her personal and academic life. She in turn performs cosmopolitan translingual agency in her interaction with me as an audience member by translating this particular Qur'anic passage.

Given the project's feminist focus and Ninik's interest in promoting public good, her project had the potential of benefitting multiple audiences. When I asked her what contribution she wanted her dissertation to make, either academically or publicly, she explained that she had just been discussing this with one of her dissertation advisors, an American academic:

> [My American advisor] asked me whether I was doing anthropology or activism. If you are doing activism, she said, from your dissertation you have to change something to contribute to change reality to be better, but if you want to be anthropologist, you have to explain this is the reality that is happening. Just tell the story. I choose the second one.

Ninik's advisor draws a clear border between the activist sphere and the academic sphere, in the process implying that anthropological writing for academic audiences need not "change reality to be better." Ninik chose the descriptive, as opposed to the activist, intervention.

However, when I asked her to elaborate, Ninik complicated the binary her dissertation advisor set up between activism and scholarly work by referencing an important backwards-looking voice from her dissertation:

> I just want to show Western academics, like Lila Abu-Lughod does, that actually we cannot say that Muslim women are always suffering. That women have agency and that they are actually doing something that people never think they are. We do agency and negotiation.

Ninik points to the work of Lila Abu-Lughod as central to her understanding of Muslim women's agency. According to Ninik's dissertation, Abu-Lughod critiques "how some Western feminists identify the term liberalism, secularism and human rights from their own stand. From their Western views, they judge the human rights, particularly women's rights, and religions… forget[ting] that the contexts of politics, economy, and history exert a great deal of influence in [women's] performance [of agency]" (36). By aligning her own research with Abu-Lughod's and pointing to the way Lughod's research challenges Western academic feminists, Ninik implies in her interview that her academic work can, in fact, "change reality," at least discursively. In so doing, she challenges the boundary often placed between academic scholarship and civic change.

Ninik views her English-medium dissertation project as a means to educate a Western academic audience, which in some ways re-affirms the traditional connection between English and the Western audiences associated with it. However, by focusing on her *process*, we can see how she works towards synthesis by seeking to overcome existing ideological borders between Islamic feminism and traditional Western feminism, as well as between academic research and social justice initiatives.

Cultivating an Activist Garden

Focusing on Ninik's processes, as opposed to just the texts she produces, is crucial when seeking to understand how she works towards her cosmopolitan ideals by transferring resources from her academic "house" to her political "garden." Ninik's cosmopolitan orientation is evidenced in the texts she creates, and thus her language choices, but it can also be found in the ways she seeks to transcend borders in her activist work.

As an example, in an effort to combat the global information divide that she describes in her literacy narrative, Ninik repeatedly leveraged her relative privilege to bring literate resources from the U.S. and other Western countries to Indonesia. While studying for her M.A. in the U.S., Ninik capitalized on the resources that came with US sponsorship so she could start a community library in her home town, Banuwangi. Ninik used her English networking ability to email various listservs at the University of Hawaii, explaining her initiative, and she left Hawaii with hundreds of books and multiple monetary donations. Currently, her multilingual library in Indonesia has over 900 books, journals, and DVDs, with 450 members. She continued bringing literate resources from the U.S. and other more resource-rich countries to Indonesia as a Ph.D. student. As a first-year graduate student, she played a central part, for example, in creating the Indonesian arm of the Swiss-based multilingual open access digital database, Globethics.net, which was discussed in Nina's chapter. Three years later, in 2013, she and Nina embarked on their "sandwich program" at Boston University[5], in part to gather literate resources not available in Indonesia. While they were there, I took the opportunity to visit them in the small, two-bedroom apartment they shared with another Indonesian family of three. I wasn't surprised to see that most of Ninik's and Nina's shared bedroom was overtaken with books. In her interview, Ninik explained why:

> You know that Nina and I are very poor, even we can't buy alarm clock, but [my

---

[5] See Chapter 1 for a detailed discussion of this study abroad program.

American advisor], during the weekend, if she has a new book and she thinks it's related to me and Nina and our research, she always scans the books for us even during the weekend, and she gives them to us. These are $126 dollar books; expensive! I also buy book from Amazon, it was about anthropology and women—it's a very old book—but I got it for only $1! And we get the B.U. ID so we can get access to the library, too.

She brought many of the books she was able to buy (or get scanned) back to ICRS and her community library, along with her B.U. library password. Issues of access create limit-situations anathema to cultural synthesis at times, but Ninik was able to transcend these borders through her strategic networking.

After she returned to Indonesia, this networking-towards-synthesis continued in her activist work with two NGOs, one transnational and one local, but both the beneficiaries of Ninik's aptitude for breaking down borders. In one transnational NGO, sponsored by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), Ninik was tasked with synthesizing teaching, academic scholarship and community outreach within Indonesia. Ninik explained that "in universities in Indonesia, there are three elements: research, community outreach, and teaching.And research and community outreach are not connected to each other. Actually, the important thing is how research can push community outreach. So I focused on community outreach." Though Ninik chooses a descriptive, anthropological approach to reach Western academic audiences in her own dissertation, through her work with this transnational English-medium NGO she helps other Indonesian scholars bridge the divide between research and real world activism on their own soil. In doing so, she re-writes traditional demarcations by engaging with an English-medium transnational organization within Indonesia to break down perceived borders in her own community.

This borderwork continued, albeit differently, with Ninik's work with a local Indonesian NGO meant to empower Indonesian female legislators. She explained that when working with this NGO, "I was so surprised because not one of the female legislators have email address…[I]t means that no one of them are literate in technology." She was also concerned that many of the women she interviewed were "lalu-lalu" (shy) when it came to voicing their opinions. As a feminist and someone who researches female agency, this demureness concerned Ninik: "How about if you are talking with other people and community? How will you advocate for women in your community in the legislature?" Ninik's work with this NGO helped her spread digital literacy and encourage women to more forcefully enter the political conversation—an intervention likely fueled in part by the cosmopolitan nature of Ninik's scholarly endeavors, which gave her ample opportunities to research and perform this type of agency herself.

As further evidence of her cosmopolitan orientation, Ninik chose to run for office because of a divide between activists and the political sphere that she experienced working with these NGOs. She explained:

I have to try to run because even if in NGO I try to talk with and empower the community. If the rules and decisions…if in the legislature, there is no one who is aware of this problem, nothing will be done. The legislators at top and NGOs at bottom have to work together, like a sandwich. If we have the top, we have to have the bottom, too. And inside, we can put good stuff, but if there is no bottom, there is no sandwich…

As an example, she pointed to the United Nations program, REDD, [Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation], explaining that they "empower community, but they only work with NGO, and don't have the networking with legislators. For example: illegal logging. The community is aware of it, but they still don't have the law. We have to put something

together, bottom up and top down." Ninik once again positions herself as a conduit, capable of disseminating information to unite discrete audiences, this time within Indonesia but between activists and the Indonesian governing body.

Ninik's activist experiences emphasize both that we should look past isolated texts when seeking to locate how actors craft cosmopolitan connections, and that these extra-textual engagements can be made across traditional geopolitical borders, as well as within a bounded nation-state. Not surprisingly, she brings this orientation to her work as a politician.

Cultivating a Political Garden

Ninik was uniquely positioned to intervene in the national civic sphere given her cosmopolitan identity, her connection to a powerful Islamic pesantran, and her fluency working across multiple languages and audiences. As Chapter 1 discusses at more length, Indonesia is a burgeoning democracy that strives for religious and ethnic pluralism, while also grappling with the need for global connection despite a history of exploitive relationships with Western imperialism (Li; Tsing). We can turn to the contact zone between Ninik's Muslim religion, her English-medium knowledge, and her political position to understand more fully how cosmopolitan action is mediated by existing power relationships. At times, Ninik's took translingual agency to work towards cultural synthesis, but at other times, it became clear that Ninik wanted to maintain existing boundaries to achieve her social justice aims, at least for the time being.

For some context, my final interview with Ninik occurred just after she was elected and just as the 2014 presidential election results were being counted. Ultimately, Joko Widodo, commonly referred to as Jokowi, was elected as Indonesia's seventh president post-independence. The first of Indonesia's presidents not to come from the political or military elite, Jokowi springs from working-class roots, an identity Ninik discusses later in relation to his English ability. He represents the Partai Kebangkitan Bangsa (PKB), or the National Awakening Party, whose platform focuses on increasing economic opportunity in rural areas and encouraging more involvement of women in strategic sectors across the archipelago. His election to office has been credited in part to the endorsement of Megawati Sukarnoputri, Indonesia's first woman president, daughter of former dictator Sukarno, and a central actor in the overthrow of Indonesia's second dictator, Suharto (see Coles). Given Ninik's feminist and activist ideals, it is not surprising that she ran under the same banner as Jokowi and was elected to Indonesia's Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat, or the People's Representative Council.

Ninik emphasized in her 2014 interview that the ability to network with the West represents a slippery signifier when it comes to Indonesian politics. For example, the ability to use English to network with the West—or the lack thereof—was used against Jokowi during his election campaign. She explained:

> Jokowi cannot speak English as well as Probowo [his opponent], so there's been a "black campaign" that says "Can you imagine if Jokowi wants to establish networking with Western countries. How could he do that? Because he can't speak English?" It's a tool that is a bridge, but also symbolizes power and wealth and maybe Jokowi didn't have as much growing up.

Here Ninik reflects on privilege and material access, implicitly acknowledging her own, while also pointing to the symbolic capital English holds and the still deep-seated link between English and the West in the global imagination.

Unlike Jokowi, whose ability to govern was questioned because of his inability to

network with the West, Ninik was subject to a "black campaign" during the election *because of* her ties to Western networking. Ninik explained that in one smear campaign, her opponent claimed she wasn't a member of Indonesia's largest Muslim organization—Nahdlatul Ulama (NU): "[My rival] made the black campaign… she said I am not truly Nahdlatul Ulama. This is very sensitive because in Banuwangi we are mostly NU followers…She said it is 'Because Ninik graduated from the United States.'…" Ninik's opponent was able to make such accusations because of the very boundaries cosmopolitanism tries to challenge—namely that religion and nation-state exist in a one-to-one relationship, with, for example the United States being entirely Christian and Indonesia ultimately Muslim, with little cross-pollination.

To help challenge these arbitrary borders in the minds of her Indonesian forward-looking audiences, Ninik used story-telling, a process that involved translating her English-medium experiences into Bahasa Indonesia. For example, she explained that she rewrote the narrative conflating religion and nation-state in her public appearances by pointing to how NU is a global organization: "[W]hen I give the public speech to public, they ask me, "Are you graduated from the U.S.?" and I say, "Yes. I graduated from the United States. And we had a NU group in Hawaii, not only from U.S. but around the world. We not only meet in person but also on Skype in English." Here Ninik works to break down the link between religion and nation-state in the Indonesian public's mind, while also challenging the link between language and nation-state by emphasizing that Muslims from "around the world" use English to communicate.

Ninik used a similar story to help her Indonesian audience imagine what inter-religious harmony might look like from *within* the same geopolitical space:

> I always told them how during the winter I am praying. How it is difficult to pray in a public space in U.S. And you know in Boston, in the Commons, there is a big church, St. Paul's church. In the vestment, every Friday, they let Muslims hold Friday prayer, and two times. Because there are many people who want to pray and there's no place.

Just as Ninik tries to erase false borders between nation-state, language, and religion when discussing N.U.'s global identity, in this story, she shows her Indonesian audience an example of inter-religious harmony and co-existence, while also establishing her ethos as a devout, albeit cosmopolitan, Muslim. Story-telling, and the translingual process of translating experience from one language to another, can be a means of rewriting cultural narratives towards synthesis.

How one tells stories, however, is dependent upon shifting power dynamics. In one situation, Ninik evidenced a clear desire to *construct* discursive borders to protect her feminist ideals from potentially hostile Indonesian audiences. In addition to her academic and civic writing, Ninik also writes fiction, generally in Indonesian, as a means of integrating Indonesian women's stories into public discourse. In her interview, she explained how she negotiated generic boundaries to further social justice:

> I am a feminist activist; sometimes people come to me to tell me their stories. And I try to combine with my imagination and the true story and I write the fiction. Because sometimes I have something to tell, but I cannot tell with true story or opinions. I have to tell another way, through poems, stories, fiction to help with privacy.

Here she explains that she draws on generic borders between fiction and non-fiction to protect the women who come to her, which allows her to still convey their stories to public Indonesian audiences while keeping their identities private. Discursive borders can work to promote intercultural understanding, at times.

As an academic and writer, Ninik explained that she initially didn't think twice about publishing stories like these in public Indonesian venues; after all, stories can promote social

change. However, once she was elected and became more of a public figure, things changed, particularly since her own religious identity was now under closer scrutiny. Synthesis across competing discourses is not always the best option when it comes to achieving one's cosmopolitan purposes. She explained:

> One of my fiction talks about a lesbian relationship. It will be very controversial in some religious people's minds because I am Muslim. But stories humanize. Because lesbians are my friends, and they say "I love this story!" But sometimes, it will be dangerous. Because I'm connected to well-known pesantran and a politician now… Because of this, I choose to translate my story from Indonesian into English.

Ninik is torn between wanting to humanize her Indonesian friends' relationships and the pressures put on her by her public identity. To navigate this tension, Ninik chooses to translate her work from Indonesian to English, erecting a rhetorical border. Essentially, Ninik translanguages to exclude certain audiences because power relationships have shifted from one moment to the next; confronted with a new limit-situation, she translates content from one language to another to protect her friends' identities, while also working to break the silence regarding the plight of Indonesian lesbians. In this case, though the message itself worked towards inclusion, the language used to convey that message worked to exclude some potential forward-looking audience members.

Despite this exclusion, Ninik is still able to perform her belief that "we can talk about social justice in any language," including English, despite its imperialist past, and perhaps, by using English, she also creates connections between English-using Indonesian feminists and the many English-using feminists conversing globally. Furthermore, given evidence from the rest of Ninik's portfolio of her ability to reach multiple forward-looking audiences with the same knowledge by moving between languages and genres, this exclusionary move could be read as provisional; in the future, she may choose to convey this feminist knowledge differently as the translingual river shifts around her and she is confronted with new limit situations.

Conclusion

From her portfolio we can see that Ninik's cosmopolitanism is an *orientation* towards knowledge that includes language itself, but that also exceeds it. Just as we must locate translingual agency both in text and in process, we must also trace how actors move knowledge and resources from one moment to the next to get a fuller picture of what cosmopolitan action might look like as power shifts around us.

In some contexts, especially in the moments when Ninik uses English to reach local Indonesian audiences, she does challenge dominant ideology that has long positioned English as a Western language. She shows how English can serve local Indonesian English-using audiences, and, in turn, how English-using forward-looking audiences can consist of folks from different nation-states even if they're reading from within a particular geopolitical space—a reality that requires careful maneuvering on the writer's part, and just as importantly, a willingness to listen on the audience's part. In this case, the English language itself *is* cosmopolitan.

In other contexts, however, Ninik doesn't necessarily redraw traditional borders when it comes to language itself: in her advanced academic literacy, she uses English to convey her feminist Islamic knowledge to Western forward-looking audiences, and likewise, in her political life she uses Bahasa Indonesia to convey her stories about the U.S. to Indonesian forward-looking audiences. These moves re-affirm, rather than challenge, traditional links between language and nation-state. In this context, it is the *content* she translates that matters when it

comes to cultivating cosmopolitan connection between disparate backwards and forwards-looking audiences, rather than the languages from which she draws this knowledge or in which she conveys the knowledge.

When looking at her activist work, it also becomes clear that her cosmopolitan orientation goes beyond moving knowledge across geopolitical borders and the language traditions linked to them; though Ninik does attribute her networking ability to cosmopolitan experiences made possible through English, we must look past a model that positions the English language itself as the sole locus of her cosmopolitanism. By tracing her rhetorical processes through time, we can see that Ninik transfers what she learned about cosmopolitan connection and "networking" to contexts where she uses Bahasa Indonesia to reach other Indonesians: for example, with the feminist NGO where she works to empower female legislators so they can insert themselves more fully into the Indonesian governmental conversation, and later, as a politician straddling both the activist and governmental realms within her home-country. Cosmopolitan engagement, Ninik's portfolio shows, can be found in overt textual moves that challenge traditional divides related to language and audience, or in process, as actors transfer knowledge across existing international and intranational borders. In the case of the latter, it's not the language itself but the overall orientation towards humanity that evidences cosmopolitanism.

Working towards shared humanity in this way necessarily involves navigating existing power relationships. As just established, in some contexts, Ninik was able to leverage her translingual resources to work towards *inclusion* and cultural synthesis, transcending existing borders, whether discursive or material. When Ninik's choices are traced over a period of time, however, we can also see how *exclusion* mediates her translingual rhetorical agency —both because of material inequality linked to unequal access and as a deliberate rhetorical choice on Ninik's part.

When it comes to exclusion related to material access, Ninik *was* able to leverage her cosmopolitan experiences to move literate resources from more affluent educational contexts to Indonesia, but issues of access still impede full and equal participation between global audiences, thus limiting true cosmopolitan synthesis. Borders both linguistic and economic do still exist and impede true cross-cultural understanding.

When it comes to understanding exclusion in relation to rhetorical choices, this chapter shows that as an academic, the information divide between Indonesia and Western audiences actually created an affordance for Ninik's own research interests—a divide she clearly valued and in fact used to construct her cosmopolitan academic identity. As a politician, in turn, Ninik found it necessary to use English—and the linguistic divide it affords—to exclude conservative religious audiences so that she might work to connect the stories of Indonesian lesbians to broader feminist conversations.

When understood in isolation from the rest of Ninik's portrait, these exclusionary moments might seem to challenge the central tenet of cosmopolitanism: working toward synthesis and mutual understanding. However, when viewed from a temporal-spatial perspective—and in relation to both the texts she creates *and* the processes she uses to transfer knowledge over the course of time—we can see that these moments of exclusion do not preclude her from making different, more inclusive choices in the future. As Freire suggests, full "humanity" is constantly in the making: "Once named, the world in its turn reappears to the namers as a problem and requires of them a new naming" (88). The way Ninik engages "in word, in work, in action-reflection" (Freire 88) is dependent upon what limit situations she encounters at any given moment, and the process is undoubtedly both continuous and translingual as this

chapter shows. Though each of these interventions may be provisional, "brick by brick" Ninik works to cultivate a more just and cosmopolitan house and garden.