

## **Chapter 1**

### **Introduction**

*Grant Jun Otsuki*

*Orcid.org/0000-0003-2359-6313*

*Shiho Satsuka*

*Orcid.org/*

*Keiichi Omura*

*Orcid.org/0000-0003-0715-1867*

*Atsuro Morita*

*Orcid.org/0000-0002-9040-6586*

### **Abstract**

The complexity of everyday life challenges the assumption of a single universal reality that everyone should share. This introductory essay introduces the notion of the “World Multiple,” which the chapters in this volume collectively explore in an attempt to understand the multiplicity of the worlds that people experience and generate in their everyday practices. The introduction traces the genealogies of “worlding” to mobilize it as an entangled, non-Newtonian, material-semiotic analytic for understanding how worlds are made through quotidian practices in multiple ways. It argues that this approach requires attention to various practices that generate space-time, and to the everyday politics enacted in those worlds. It then introduces chapters that examine how humans and non-humans caught among the social and material legacies of colonialism and capitalism and the hegemony of modernist technoscience strive to craft worlds worth living in diverse manifestations. This essay addresses the importance of paying close

ethnographic attention to people's worlding practices and to exploring the possibilities of life in a world respectful of multiplicity.

At 5:00 a.m. in Nunavut, in the Canadian North, an Inuit elder leaves his comfortably heated home to look out at the sea and check on weather and ice conditions. His extended family lies fast asleep. Satisfied with his grasp of the morning, he goes back inside and switches on his living room radio. As the aroma of his morning tea fills the room, he plays a hand of solitaire while listening to a weather report in the Inuktitut language and waits for his family to wake. Around 7:00 a.m., one of his sons enters the living room and asks the elder whether today will be for hunting. The elder gestures for his son to check the forecast on the computer. They then sit to discuss the weather on the basis of information from the radio and the internet, the elder's own early morning observations, and his *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit*—Inuit Knowledge, or IQ. As the elder's other sons join them from their own homes, the day's plan is fixed. Some prepare to hunt, donning thermal clothing, fueling snowmobiles or outboard motors, and bringing out rifles, harpoons, nets, and GPS receivers. Just before 8:00 a.m., a group leaves to hunt for *niqinmarik*—the *real* food of fish and meat. The *niqinmarik* will be shared among the hunters' families. This fulfills a moral responsibility: the animals will only offer their bodies to the hunters, if in return the hunters share the food with kin. Sharing the meat in this way makes it possible for the animals' spirits to be reincarnated. While some members of a family are hunting or fishing, others will go to work at the co-op or the hamlet office to earn the money needed for equipment and fuel. All of this needs to be done to generate their world, *nuna*.

Inuit hunters live complex realities where the world of technoscience and that of their indigenous knowledge, IQ, are entangled. *Nuna* is an intricately connected world of humans and

non-humans which the Inuit know, generate, and maintain through a long tradition of hunting activities. At the same time, nuna is a world filled with modern technologies, such as the internet and GPS, and market relationships and wage labor as people in the community work as government officials, co-op managers, and artists. When preparing their equipment for an expedition, they link labor at government offices with the moral obligation to participate in the reincarnation of wildlife. On the ice, they use snowmobiles and rifles to fulfill their responsibility to share niqinmarik among kin. Hunting is an important act of negotiating with animal worlds while connecting with spirits, ancestors, and people in the community. Their use of internet weather reports and GPS to hunt seal or polar bear maintains nuna, but also entangles their lives with a national weather monitoring network, the conservation policies of the Canadian nation-state, and a planetary satellite system. These practices create channels to worlds outside their immediate communities, making everyday Inuit life irreducibly multidimensional (see Omura, this volume). These practices sustain nuna, although they are never free from friction, tension, or transformation. Nuna is a world multiple, an assemblage of partially incommensurable knowledges, and partially connected practices.

Nuna is not another interpretation of a single material world. Such a conceptualization is a product of what John Law calls the “one-world world” doctrine (2015). This doctrine assumes the existence of only one natural world, and takes different cultures to be no more than interpretations of that world. This doctrine makes it possible to believe that the truth of these cultures can be measured by the standard of the natural world, privileging modern science as the authoritative means of knowing it.

The world multiple is an inspiration and a guide for thinking beyond the one-world world. The world multiple is both a world and worlds. It is fractal (cf. Law 2015); it may be

constituted by more worlds inside, and may be itself part of another world, none necessarily simpler or more complex than others. To paraphrase Donna Haraway, one world is too few, but two are too many (Haraway 1991, 177; cf. Strathern 2005, 36). In our use, the singular form will always imply the plural, and vice versa. But, the question of how many worlds there actually are is of little importance. What matters more is to make sense of the complex and multidimensional realities that people like the Inuit hunters are living. To do this, we need to consider the relationships between modern technoscience and other forms of knowledge and practices—often described as indigenous, traditional, folk or vernacular—in people’s engagements with the world. How should we attend to the simultaneous existence of the different material consequences generated by the entanglement of modern technoscience and other knowledges and practices? This book represents a collective experiment in exploring these questions with the figure of the world multiple.

### **From Body into World**

The idea of “the world multiple” emerged in initial conversations between Omura and Satsuka about the key theme for the workshop that led to this book, which was held in Osaka, Japan, in 2016. The workshop was a part of Omura’s collaborative research project, funded by the Japan Society for Promotion of Science. While the title of his funded project was “A Comparative Study of ‘Indigenous Knowledge’ and ‘Modern Science,’” Omura had been searching for an analytic framework that would avoid the binary opposition of “indigenous knowledge” and “modern science.”<sup>1</sup> From the nearly three decades that Omura has been working with the Inuit, he has become deeply committed to their IQ advocacy project. He feels uncomfortable with the framing of the Inuit and other indigenous peoples as passive recipients of global forces like

modern science, which makes the creative and multidimensional reality of their everyday practices invisible.

In Omura's observations of heterogeneous practices among the Inuit and in his attention to the material aspects of reality and ontological multiplicity, Satsuka detected resonances with Annemarie Mol's *The Body Multiple* (2002). In her ethnographic analysis of atherosclerosis treatments in a Dutch hospital, Mol illustrates the ontological multiplicity in a diseased body—a disease is not a single objective reality waiting to be discovered and diagnosed, but a phenomenon made real through the coordination of different medical practices. She demonstrates that these practices do not all fit together easily to generate a single reality; inasmuch as different specialists in various disciplines act on the body using different forms of practice, and as patients experience the disease, the body manifests materially in different ways. Yet these different practices are coordinated to make a diagnosis. The body with atherosclerosis is the ontological achievement of these coordinations. Mol's analytic approach seemed relevant to Omura's, but the conjuncture also brought Satsuka new realizations about the contradictory and complimentary practices of mushroom scientists and their material effects that she has been observing over the last ten years. She had been wondering how to make sense of the tension in her scientific interlocutors' project on artificially cultivating matsutake mushrooms, a project which can potentially belong both to the world of capitalist resource extraction and that of interspecies care and affection (see her chapter in this volume). Satsuka thus presented Omura with the challenge to extend Mol's insights from the body to the world multiple.

During the 2016 symposium that first brought the contributors to this book together in one place, the possibilities of the world multiple came alive as ethnographic insights drawn from around the world crossed with diverse conceptual tools. But moving away from a hospital in the

Netherlands to diverse settings in the world required us to deal with a broader array of unanticipated connections, unruly companions, and unfinished historical business. Mol's work provides us with a powerful provocation, but the "intricately coordinated crowd" (Mol 2002, 9) of the body multiple is a rather cordial one. In Mol's hospital, different bodies are enacted in the practices of experts in different departments, providing a map with which to trace the multiple embodiments of atherosclerosis. In the world beyond the hospital, crowds are rarely so easily managed. Everyday life is full of people engaging with practices from competing or incommensurable ontological genealogies. Our fields are often messy; practices do not neatly correspond to the social order that defines different communities of experts. Furthermore, in other worlds, it is impossible to turn a blind eye to the legacies and ongoing practices of colonialism, imperialism, militarism, and capitalist exploitation. These require us to consider how we encounter and think about multiplicity in the world, which we may find mangled by politics or disfigured by violence imposed on human and other-than-human beings. Attention to worlds brings into stark relief the political, historical, and social chains that encumber what kinds of worlds are possible.

### **Entangled Realities for Livable World**

At the symposium, our interest in challenging the one-world world took on a new sense of urgency. We were asking questions about how others strive to make worlds worth living in and for, and how anthropologists might best become part of these worlds. The past few decades have witnessed a heightened concern over environmental issues framed on a planetary scale: climate change, rises in sea levels, contamination of the biosphere, and species extinctions. The term "Anthropocene" (Crutzen and Stoermer 2000) was coined to signify the intensity of human

impact on the earth, indicating that human activities have become a major geological force working on a planetary scale. It has caught the popular imagination for how it epitomizes an awareness of the past centuries of industrialization and devastating resource extraction inscribed on the earth. It also captures anxieties about the livability of our planet in the future. The sciences and technologies of global environmental change—modeling, simulation, and remote sensing—have guided our optics toward a planetary view of the environment. This planetary consciousness has generated momentum among social scientists who have been critically reflecting on the centuries of colonialism, imperialism, and militarism that have caused the violent exploitation of humans, and enabled the destruction of many other-than-human beings on the earth. This moment requires both contending with the technoscientific consensus that human activity is impacting life at a planetary scale, while maintaining a suspicion of universals and the politics and interests they might obscure (Chakrabarty 2009, 221). How might we join critical reflections on the violence imposed upon human and non-humans on this planet? How can we do so while remaining critically wary of the holisms conjured forth by this new planetary consciousness?

Parallel with this development, indigenous and traditional environmental knowledge has drawn interest as a way of navigating the twilight of late modernity. Modern science is often critiqued as abstract, mechanistic, and reductionist, perceiving the natural world based on a dualistic ontology that separates nature from human society. In opposition, indigenous knowledges are characterized as embodied, organic, holistic, and composed from entangled relationships between humans and the other-than-human. This binary has long cast IQ explanations of hunting interactions as little more than irrational myths, because they “inappropriately” mix the human and the animal, with neither clearly belonging to the domain of

the “natural” nor the “social.”<sup>2</sup> But now, the very entanglement of “the natural” and “the social” in indigenous knowledges like IQ is being considered the key to overcoming the limitations of the abstract technoscientific approach. Since the 1980s, social scientists have advocated for the effectiveness of indigenous and other traditional knowledges in conserving biodiversity (e.g., Collings 1997; Freeman 1985, 1993). As a result, these knowledges have gradually been incorporated into decision-making processes, and consulting with their practitioners has become a policy requirement in some governments in North and South America (e.g., Blaser 2009; Nadasdy 2003; Omura 2005, 2013; Usher 2000; Wenzel 2004). Yet, as many critics have pointed out, indigenous and traditional knowledges have been assumed to be static cognitive frameworks; the holders of these knowledges are treated as though they are in the grip of epistemological paradigms that have remained unchanged from ancient times (Agrawal 1995; Krupnik and Vakhtin 1997; Omura 2007). While there is an inclusive drive to make up for past epistemic discrimination and violence, the “incorporation” (Nadasdy 1999) of indigenous and traditional knowledges into existing frameworks prolongs the hegemony of modern technoscientific expertise, and its basic assumption of a one-world world. How might we think beyond “incorporation,” and give heed to the interactions between modern, indigenous, and traditional forms of life?

The world multiple also reverberates with the fundamental rethinking of space and time that we have learned about from interlocutors in the sciences. Karen Barad’s writing on quantum physics (2007, 2017) shows how science itself is not all about a one-world world, but can offer up provocative ways to think about how worlds come into material being through entangled relationships. Using quantum physics pioneer Niels Bohr’s writings on the behavior of light, Barad (2007) explains that the way matter exists in the world cannot be determined prior to its

“intra-actions” with its surroundings. The quantum puzzle of whether light is *really* a wave or a particle misses the point that light *becomes* wave or particle depending on the constitution of the socio-material assemblages—that is, the experimental apparatuses—within which it is entangled. Moreover, this does not simply change how we think about “what” light is, but also “when” and “where.” Light is not a thing that flies freely against the background of a flat, Newtonian space-time. It demands different times and spaces depending on whether it becomes a point-like particle, or an arrow-like wave. Light exists as a heterotemporal, heterospatial matrix which shifts the nature of its being, time, and space contingent upon the specific relations in which it is placed. Anthropologists may usually have little to do with the ontological multiplicity of photons, but we have yet to fully come to terms with the fact that flat Newtonian space-time is no more than a partial way of imagining the world. As beneficiaries of modernity, we easily fall back into thinking about worlds as flat spaces and times occupied by our human interlocutors. But, we can take insights like Barad’s as warrant to explore the dynamics of multiple, entangled realities that people are already engaging with. How then, might we learn to sense and speak of these multiplicities?

### **Quotidian Politics of Worlding**

The chapters assembled here are diverse in their aims, interests, and styles of argumentation. Yet, they converge in how they explore the quotidian politics of worlds inspired by postcolonial perspectives. In doing so, these chapters show us that we need to focus on how worlds are socially and materially generated in practice within specific power relations. In other words, they show us that we need to attend to *worldings* and their politics (Zhan 2009, 2012; Tsing 2010, this vol.; Welland 2018). Worldings are “different stagings of the world” that engender a sense of

what is “natural” (Welland 2018, 29). They are situated “figurings of relevant worlds,” articulations of who and what matters in a particular form of life (cf. Tsing 2010, 48). These practices are not acts that can be performed by a lone individual, but material-semiotic “enactments” (Law 2015, Mol 2002) or “intra-actions” (Barad 2007) that always involve associating with human and non-human others (Latour 2005). Worldings may conjure an aura of totality, but they are practices that are always partial and incomplete on their own. Conversely, worldings may be polyvalent, generating the conditions of possibility for more than one world at the same time. They are unstable in their form and effects, and open to critique, resignification, and transformation (Welland 2018, 40).

Worlding has appeared in anthropology with multiple genealogies, primarily in literary studies and postcolonial studies (Tsing 2010; Welland 2018; Spivak 1985), but in the western canon, most trails pass through the work of Martin Heidegger (1993).<sup>3</sup> For Heidegger, a world is a space in which humans emerge as human beings through their relations with other things—human, animal, plant, and otherwise. It is the what and the where that make up the conditions of possibility of being human, encompassing both the actual realm of the humanly perceivable, and the virtual realm of the humanly possible (Heidegger 1993, 170). Conversely, the human being is a condition of possibility for a particular world. This feedback relation is what it means for a world (n.) to world (v.). For Heidegger, the world emerges out of what he calls “earth,” which is the stable, enduring, and nourishing ground which must constantly recede for worlds to come “into full radiance” (141–142) as figures. Heidegger’s first articulation of worlding appeared in thinking about art as a form of being, and since, it has been used by postcolonial theorists to think about art and literature as materially generative of worlds, not as mere representations of the world. But where Heidegger takes “world” and “being” (*Dasein*) as singular in relation to

each other (see Derrida 1982; Spivak in Derrida 1997, xvii), postcolonial scholars have emphasized the possible and actual other worlds that are generated at the margins of hegemonic ones—hence, Gayatri Spivak’s attention to “the Third World” (1985), Sasha Su-Ling Welland’s decolonizing “art worlds” in China (2018), or Mei Zhan’s *re-worlding* of Daoist oneness (2012). It is this postcolonial focus on worlding as a generative and critical practice that inspires this book.

The chapters in this volume take on the analytic challenge of considering the specificities of each ethnographic scene and how a multitude of practices among different actors generate the worlds in which they dwell. The attention to worlding changes where we must look for diversity. Anthropologists have classically used the concept of culture to explain why human ways of life can differ so much across space and time. Though culture has been defined in countless ways, it is usually opposed to the natural world, the material realm that exists independently of what humans might think of it. Anthropologists, like those in many other modern disciplines, have seen cultures as human interpretations of this naturalized “one-world world.” But if our practices *make* reality, then human diversity is not about differing cultures, but about differing worlds.

This also means that we do not take humans to be the only beings that act in the world. As the Inuit example implies, humans can play an important role in generating *nuna*, but their world cannot wholly encompass the worlds of animals. Moreover, the chapters show worlding as a multilayered practice, in which one actor can simultaneously participate in incommensurable worlds (see e.g., Omura, Langwick, and Satsuka), or one group of people can become a site of contestation among different worlding practices (see Iida). Multiple worlding practices come into contact and “fold” into tentative and tense stability (see e.g., Swanson or Bonelli), or, as de la Cadena’s chapter discusses, produce “not only” their intended effects, but also significant

“excesses.” Worldings are practices that involve heterogeneous actors and heterogeneity within actors. In this way, as Tsing’s chapter explicates, many of the chapters in this book are informed by and build on recent anthropological discussions of ontologies (e.g., Vivieros de Castro 2004; Gad, Jensen and Winthereik 2015; Henare et al. 2007; Holbraad and Pedersen 2017) and ethnographies that take non-human species seriously (e.g., Kirksey and Helmreich 2010; Kohn 2013; Ogden et al. 2013; Schrader 2010; van Dooren et al. 2016)

Our focus on practices of worlding points towards subtle forms of politics embodied by worlds multiple. Worlding always entails building some relationships and ignoring possibilities for others, or of being affected by some actors and indifferent to others. In this sense, there is a politics embodied in the socio-material constitution of worlds. This pushes us to rethink what counts as political. The political is often glossed in terms of questions of representation. As Gayatri Spivak points out, in this politics, it is assumed that an oppressed people “can [if given the chance,] speak and know their own conditions” (Spivak 1999, 269). The project of this politics is to create space for the self-representation and self-determination of the oppressed and provide that chance. This book indicates the limitations of this way of thinking. The subtle politics of multiplicity in practice are prior to representational politics in that they are enacted and can make their effects felt whether or not the actors involved are recognized by anyone as political subjects as such. Representational politics is a product of the Enlightenment and modern liberalism, which assumes humans are rational individuals with universal and intrinsic rights who possess the agency to resist external forces. But our everyday worlds are filled with politics that fit uneasily within this representational regime. They are populated by peoples whose subjectivities can only be represented if they are painfully and violently distorted. Our critique of

the “one-world world” questions the subjectivity assumed by this conventional politics, pushing us to focus on the *quotidian*.

The *quotidian* conventionally refers to the ordinary, the everyday, and the mundane.<sup>4</sup> In this sense, our exploration of *quotidian* politics is influenced by Michel Foucault, and his discussions of micropolitics in the basic conduct of life (Foucault 1988). Foucault forcefully illustrates the process in which modern liberal governmentality has been formed through the production of modern subjects who deeply internalize the norms of liberalism through their everyday conduct, disciplining themselves into productive workers and law-abiding and rational citizens (Foucault 1991). His work does not take the modern subject as a given, but as formed through *quotidian* practices. Thus, Foucault took an important step toward examining the foundational processes that made the one-world world. Beyond this, what many of the chapters in this book suggest is that in *quotidian* practices can be found possibilities for an “otherwise,” if we remain ambivalent about the notion of a single totalizing world that would enframe them. The *quotidian* is a notion capaciousness enough to hold other forms of worlding.

Ethnography provides a way of engaging with the world multiple. Indeed, ethnography may be thought of itself as a worlding practice entangled with concrete moments from the lives of our interlocutors (see Jensen and Walford in this volume). One may thus think of the *quotidian* as the experiential world that the anthropologist might come to share—or perhaps only glimpse—as she or he makes relations with his or her interlocutors using the practices of fieldwork. Accordingly, many of the chapters in this book work with an ethnographic “jeweler’s eye” (Fischer 2007) to bring the concrete and specific character of the relationships that generate specific worlds into relief. As postcolonial scholars have shown (e.g., Asad 1991), the ways that anthropologists represent other worlds can never be free of the modern, colonial world for which

our discipline was established. But we hope that insofar as it is a worlding, our writing can be multiple, polyvalent, and gesture to an otherwise.

The diversity of styles of argumentation, representation, and analysis embodied by this book's chapters show how anthropology itself is more than a singular mode of engagement with the world. Readers of this book will notice stark and even jarring shifts of tone between chapters. These are the traces of the authors' diverse backgrounds—their languages, the places where they grew up and developed their thoughts, their disciplinary training and the times and locations they received that training. They also reflect differences in the worlds that each author attempted to approach, which called for their own ways of being theorized and narrated. Anthropologists themselves enact worlds multiple, entangling them with our various disciplinary and political dispositions to generate different relationships, possibilities, and written representations. With their attention to quotidian politics, the chapters push our ability to see, listen to, and touch other worlds in subtle but profound ways, so that we might perhaps recognize new affinities, obligations, and responsibilities. And, like all good experiments, they provoke unexpected questions and reveal new directions to explore, even as they give us empirical confidence in the important lessons we have learned together.

**Chapter Organization: Entangled Worldings, Space-Time Multiplicities, Exploring Quotidian Politics**

Befitting the theme of this volume, readers will sense multiple ways of connecting its chapters. Some chapters share an emphasis on multiplicity in a particular region of the world, such as South America (de la Cadena, Bonelli, and Walford), Asia (Swanson, Nakazora, Zhan, and Satsuka), the Arctic and circumpolar regions of Canada (Blaser, Omura, and Honda), and Africa

(Iida, Langwick). Lateral linkages also exist in terms of our contributors' perspectives on plants or fungi (Nakazora, Langwick, Satsuka, and Tsing), science and technology (Swanson, Iida, and Satsuka), fraught conceptions of "indigeneity" (de la Cadena, Jensen, Nakazora, and Walford) or anthropological knowledge production (Jensen and Walford). While all of our contributors explore the potential of the world multiple, analytic and empirical trajectories differ. We have roughly grouped them according to how they navigate the contemporary problem space of the world multiple. These groupings are not mutually exclusive, but we offer them as three reference points for reading through this book.

The authors in the first section—*Entangled Worldings*—explore how forms of being enacted in worlding practices embody and enable forms of multiplicity both within and beyond the worlds of ongoing colonialist and imperialist projects. Marisol de la Cadena's chapter is exemplary here for her sensitive account of her own incapacity to fully occupy the worlds which her Andean interlocutors inhabit with ordinary ease. She describes how earth-beings or *tirakuna*, and Andean persons or *runakuna* exist with and beyond mountains and human beings, exposing in the process the violence in the translation and imposition of the notion of religion. Her refrain of "not only..."—"religious, but not only..." , "a mountain, but not only..."—marks the limits of translation, and gestures towards the simultaneous existence of other worlds.

Casper Bruun Jensen's chapter carries forth de la Cadena's argument to consider both classical debates in anthropology about emic versus etic standpoints, and contemporary debates stemming from the ontological turn. Jensen explores the consequences of de la Cadena's work in the Andes, as well as ethnographic reflections on infrastructures in the Thai Chao Phraya delta to argue for an emetic approach to anthropology, which faces the nausea induced by ontological instabilities to think about multiplicities of being.

In working through what Jensen calls an emetic approach, de la Cadena invokes Isabelle Stenger's notion of divergence to refer to "an ecology of practices [that are not] contradictory or incommensurable [but] heterogeneous" (2015, 112), producing multiple worlds and beings that "[continue] to be distinct." (de la Cadena, this volume.) Mario Blaser's chapter looks at such an ecology in Labrador, Canada, in which the biological species of "caribou" diverges from but also remains tied to the being known by Innu hunters as *atiku*. Blaser's ethnography follows this ontological divergence to highlight the political stakes it has for environmental conservation, resource-hungry states, and the continuation of Innu forms of life.

Keiichi Omura's chapter also focuses on divergence among indigenous hunters in Canada, but his concern is with understanding maps of the land as material-semiotic objects that translate between different worlds. Omura thinks of the topographical map as a "boundary translational matrix" and he explores the "strategic" and "tactical" practices (a distinction made by Michel de Certeau) that Inuit hunters use to mediate between their world and the world of the Canadian government.

Shunwa Honda's chapter is the third in the trilogy of chapters about the North. Like Omura, Honda is concerned with the lives of the Inuit, but his chapter examines multiplicities within the category of "Inuit" itself. Climate change has impacted and is received in radically different ways by Inuit in west Greenland versus north Greenland and Nunavut, Canada, which are structured by differing experiences of colonization, governance, economic development, and physical environment. Honda's chapter provides comprehensive empirical insights into Inuit life and in this sense, it complements Omura's chapter. But his main contribution is to present the diverse perceptions and responses that Inuit communities have had to climate change, demonstrating the multiplicity of ways to be Inuit.

The second section—*Space-Time Multiplicities*—is a cluster of essays concerned with how worlds multiple imply multiple, overlapping, and diverging spatialities and temporalities. The relationships among materiality, spatiality and temporality forms the center of Heather Swanson’s chapter dealing with the making of salmon bodies and landscapes in the most northern of Japan’s main islands, Hokkaido. The worldings wrought in the practice of comparison provide the path Swanson follows for examining how salmon and landscape have been entangled since the onset of Japan’s modernization and colonization endeavors in the nineteenth century. Comparisons between Hokkaido’s salmon and those of the Columbia River and between its landscapes and the frontiers of the American West transformed species and landscape, and also spurred the development of technologies, commodities, and a new place for Japan in the modernizing world. This assemblage of humans and non-humans is a materialized multiplicity of comparisons that have co-ordinated a way to “hang together” in time.

Cristóbal Bonelli’s chapter argues that the domination of the “one-world world” is also an imposition of a “one-time-temporality.” To draw out the divergent temporalities that dwell in the world, Bonelli offers an ethnographic and philosophical meditation on the “politics of when”—a form of politics in addition to the representational “politics of who” and the ontological “politics of what.” He draws together singular inscriptions of names—that of Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet on a sacred stone and of Miguel Cuevas Pincheira, one of his victims, on the bridge where he disappeared—with the Spinozan notions of *conatus* and “striving” to think about the entangled politics of duration, ontological persistence, and the material act of inscription.

If Swanson and Bonelli look at the multiple pasts that inhere in the present, then Moe Nakazora’s contribution examines worldings in which what counts as past, present, and future

are at stake. An outgrowth of her extensive work on Ayurvedic medicine in India, this chapter examines how Ayurvedic knowledge is translated with modern biomedical knowledge in the construction of biodiversity databases. Against the background of global and national agreements for protecting biodiversity, Nakazora shows how database projects for collecting Ayurvedic knowledge about plants in Uttarakhand become contentious “contact zones” (cf. Pratt 1992), where multiple knowledges and practices encounter each other to generate new temporalities in which plants and various practitioners live.

The second section concludes with Stacey Langwick’s ethnographic evocation of the lushness engendered by plants in Tanzania. “Lushness” is a particularly apt word with which to imagine the verdant and vibrant multispecies relations that *mlonge*—a tree used to produce herbal therapies—calls forth around it. Langwick shows us how Tanzania is a place where the often-overbroad notion of the “Anthropocene” (see Morita, this volume) is manifested in the quotidian as pervasive toxicity. *Mlonge* and the way it strives for life with others then become Langwick’s more-than-human guides for thinking about what worlds are possible in toxic times.

Anthropological analysis has always been in some way about finding ways to talk about worlds; analysis is a worlding practice, albeit one that necessarily leans heavily on translating the quotidian into text, usually in a Western, academic idiom. The chapters in *Exploring Quotidian Politics*—the book’s third section—acknowledge this ecology of practices. But, they refuse to sever abstractions from the quotidian worlds that they make available in text, so that they can offer analytics that stay entangled with worlds multiple. Such entanglements lie at the center of Mei Zhan’s chapter on entrepreneurial experiments with traditional Chinese medicine. These experiments are both classical and contemporary in orientation, but this is not a contradiction: Zhan argues that Daoism, Max Weber’s problematic studies of Chinese religion, and Maoist

materialism, among others, are not successive systems of thought, but tangles of worldly relations that Chinese medical entrepreneurs grasp at or sweep aside as they work to re-animate the “primal spirit” of traditional Chinese medicine. By doing so, her essay challenges our reverence for critical analysis as an epistemological act that is done to the world; instead, Zhan shows how critical analytics are *in* the quotidian doings of worlds.

A similar irreverence is evident among Vezo fishers in Taku Iida’s chapter, a careful study of the development, sharing, and transformation of various kinds of knowledge in southern Madagascar. Iida shows how relations among villagers and between fishers and foreign NGOs can help reveal how knowledges transform, multiply, and adapt over time. Iida distinguishes between knowledge and “information” in Gregory Bateson’s sense, to develop a model that sees knowledge as a practice and information as relations, and uses this to ponder, among other things, what this reveals about commonly held distinctions between “technoscientific” and “local” knowledges.

Antonia Walford’s essay takes us from analyses of knowledge to reflections on self-knowledge. São Gabriel de Cachoeira is a city located at the confluence of the Rio Negro and the Rio Uaupés in Brazil. Walford attends to how the people she encounters there, both “indigenous” and “outsider,” speak about the “world of the Indians” and the “world of the whites.” Comparison appears here as the practice of interest, but in contrast to Swanson’s approach, Walford is interested in how people iterate comparisons between “Indians” and “whites” in ways that both provide unexpected sources of stability for some Indigenous interlocutors and anxiety inducing, perhaps “emetic,” experiences for others. Walford uses these to think about the concept of “equivocation” (Viveiros de Castro 2004; see also the chapters in this volume by Blaser, de la

Cadena, Jensen, and Tsing), and how to more carefully theorize encounters between multiple worlds.

Shiho Satsuka's essay takes us into a forest of multispecies relations and introduces us to the work of matsutake mycologists and "meisters," scientists and farmers brought together by the charisma of the matsutake mushroom in Japan. Satsuka's questions concern the multiple, overlapping, and divergent worlds that mushrooms, scientists, and meisters enact through their relations with each other. Not unlike Langwick's interest in the lushness surrounding the mlonge tree, Satsuka attends to the multidimensional engagements that these actors have with each other, which both connect worlds and hold them apart, emphasizing the omnipresent but thoroughly situated potentials for the *otherwise* that inhabit worlds multiple, which epitomizes this volume's focus on subtle politics.

Anna Tsing concludes this section with a chapter that is wary of holism, but hungry for connection. Her essay stages an encounter between two ways of thinking about humans and non-humans in anthropology today—ontological anthropology and multispecies ethnography—to ponder their differences and feel out their resonances. Tsing traces a path from there through Annemarie Mol's work, Satsuka's analytic focus on "translation" (2015) and Morita's intervention in "infrastructure" (2016) to discuss the importance of "encounter" and "coordination" in thinking about the world multiple. She moves on to her own recent ethnographic experiments for evoking worlds multiple, such as the Matsutake Worlds Research (Matsutake Worlds Research Group 2009a, 2009b), and especially her collaboration with the visual artist/scholar Elaine Gan, and the "Golden Snail Opera" (Tsai et al. 2016), to suggest ways of intervening generatively in contemporary anthropological debates.

Atsuro Morita provides the afterword. Drawing out attention to the horizons of anthropology, Morita connects the experiments of this book's contributors back to Marilyn Strathern's 1995 reflections on the local and global. The "global" for Strathern was an imagined, encompassing scale or an "ever-expanding horizon" against which the "local" become meaningful relational object, though in shifting ways. Morita argues that, in contrast, the "world" of the world multiple is not a self-evident background for local relations, but is itself a relational object. This is due to, among others things, the realization that human life does more than imagine the globe, but constructs it in the age of the Anthropocene. Morita shows how this leads the contributors in this volume not simply to replace "globe" with "world," but to sound out the elusive depths of the worlds generated in complex, ceaseless, recursive movements between objects and their backgrounds.

The practices found and documented in these chapters point towards ways that the world multiple might help us cultivate "arts of living on a damaged planet" (Tsing et al. 2017). The world multiple is a modest experiment with "speculative fabulation" (Haraway 2015) to explore possibilities of life in a world respectful of multiplicity.

### **Acknowledgements**

Our thanks to the participants of the 2016 "World Multiple" symposium for inspiring this discussion. We are particularly grateful to Mei Zhan who offered close readings and helpful feedback that have improved the final text. Otsuki also thanks Jeff Sissons, Eli Elinoff, and Callan Sait for their feedback on earlier versions. Satsuka thanks the participants of her graduate seminars "Postcolonial Science Studies" and "Politics of Cohabitation" at the University of Toronto for discussing the issues addressed in this introduction and help her develop the ideas.

---

**NOTES**

<sup>1</sup> Omura was also not satisfied with the sensationalization of Inuit's "adoption" of modern technologies, such as the internet and GPS. The spirit of this book is also to explore analytic frameworks alternative to the conventional assimilation or acculturation model exemplified by the scandalization of indigenous creativity, which also reinforces the hegemony of modern "Western" technology.

<sup>2</sup> As Roy Wagner (1981) argues, in the modern Western ontology, social relations belong to the domain of culture as a product of creative human agency, while things must stay in the domain of nature as inert and given. From this perspective, applying social categories to the domain of nature inevitably looks like subjectivism, an unjustifiable extension of the logic of the cultural to the natural (cf. Ingold 1999). Whereas indigenous knowledges, as is typified by IQ, are characterized as not being constrained by modernist boundaries between animals and humans, see homologies between ecological interspecies relations and social interpersonal relations, and explicitly relate ecology and biology with religion, kinship, political organization, and myth.

<sup>3</sup> Zhan (2012) argues that Heidegger's "unworlded" Daoism by failing to acknowledge its influence on his thought, making Daoist ideas "invisible and unimaginable as analytical frameworks." (113) Heidegger was also influenced by Jakob von Uexküll's notion of "umwelt" ("around space") (Mazis 2008, 32–33).

<sup>4</sup> In this sense, the quotidian may resemble the traditional "local" field site of anthropology experienced in real-time. Our use of the quotidian is compatible with this meaning, but the contributors to this book show how worldings often do not respect the boundaries of things like the "local." Worlding practices bring many things that affect or are affected by us into range.

---

The quotidian is this space-time that is both made in practice, and where those practices take place.

## REFERENCES

- Agrawal, Arjun. 1995. "Dismantling the Divide Between Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge." *Development and Change* 26 (3): 413–39.
- Asad, Talal. 1991. "Afterword: From the History of Colonial Anthropology to the Anthropology of Western Hegemony." In *Colonial Situations: Essays on the Contextualization of Ethnographic Knowledge*, edited by George W. Stocking Jr. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Barad, Karen. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- . 2017. "No Small Matter: Mushroom Clouds, Ecologies of Nothingness, and Strange Topologies of Spacetime-mattering." In *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*, edited by Anna Tsing, Heather Swanson, Elaine Gan, and Nils Bubandt, 103–120. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Blaser, Mario. 2009. "The Threat of the Yrmo: The Political Ontology of a Sustainable Hunting Program." *American Anthropologist* 111 (1): 10–20.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2009. "The Climate of History: Four Theses." *Critical Inquiry* 35 (2): 197–222.
- Collings, Peter. 1997. Subsistence Hunting and Wildlife Management in the Central Canadian Arctic. *Arctic Anthropology* 34 (1): 41–56.

- Crutzen, P. J., and Stoermer, E. F. 2000. "The Anthropocene." *IGBO Global Change Newsletter*. 41:17–18.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1982. "The Ends of Man." In *Margins of Philosophy*, translated by Alan Bass. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- . 1997. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Fischer, Michael M. J. 2007. "Culture and Cultural Analysis as Experimental Systems." *Cultural Anthropology* 22 (1): 1–65.
- Foucault, Michel. 1988. "Technologies of the Self." In *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*, edited by Luther H. Martin, Hugh Gutman, and Patrick H. Hutton, 16–49. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- . 1991. "Governmentality." In *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, edited by Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Peter Miller. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Freeman, M. R. Milton. 1985. "Appeal to Tradition: Different Perspectives on Arctic Wildlife Management." In *Native Power: The Quest for Autonomy and Nationhood of Indigenous Peoples*, edited by Jens Brøsted, Jens Dahl, Andrew Gray, Hans Christian Gulløv, Georg Henriksen, Jørgen Brøchner, and Inge Kleivan, 265–81. Bergen, Oslo, Stavanger, Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget.
- . 1993. "Traditional Land Users as a Legitimate Source of Environmental Expertise." In *Traditional Ecological Knowledge: Wisdom for Sustainable Development*, edited by Nancy Williams and Graham Baines, 153–161. Canberra: Center for Resource and Environmental Studies, Australian National University.
- Gad, C., C. B. Jensen and B. R. Winthereik. 2015. "Practical Ontology: Worlds in STS and

Anthropology. *NatureCultures* 3: 67–86.

Haraway, Donna J. 1991. “A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century.” In *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*, 149–181. New York: Routledge.

———. 2015. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Heidegger, Martin. 1993. “The Origin of the Work of Art.” In *Basic Writings*, edited by David Farrell Krell, 139–212. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Henare, Amiria, Martin Holdbraad, and Sari Wastell, eds. 2007. *Thinking Through Things: Theorising Artefacts Ethnographically*. London and New York: Routledge.

Holbraad, Martin, and Morten Axel Pedersen. 2017. *The Ontological Turn: An Anthropological Exposition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirksey, S. Eben, and Stefan Helmreich. 2010. “The Emergence of Multispecies Ethnography.” *Cultural Anthropology* 25 (4): 545–76.

Kohn, Eduardo. 2013. *How Forests Think: Toward an Anthropology Beyond the Human*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Krupnik, Igor, and Vakhtin, Nikolay. 1997. “Indigenous Knowledge in Modern Culture: Siberian Yupik Ecological Legacy in Transition.” *Arctic Anthropology* 34 (1): 236–52.

Latour, Bruno. 1993. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 2005. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

- Law, John. 2015. "What's Wrong with a One-World World?" *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory* 16 (1): 126–139.
- Mazis, Glen A. 2008. *Humans, Animals, Machines: Blurring Boundaries*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Matsutake Worlds Research Group (Timothy K. Choy, Lieba Faier, Michael J. Hathaway, Miyako Inoue, Shiho Satsuka, Anna Tsing). 2009a. "A New Form of Collaboration in Cultural Anthropology: Matsutake Worlds." *American Ethnologist* 36(2): 380–403.
- . 2009b. "Strong Collaboration as a Method for Multi-sited Ethnography: on Mycorrhizal Relations," In *Multi-Sited Ethnography* edited by Mark-Anthony Falzon, 197–214. Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing.
- Mol, Annemarie. 2002. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Morita, Atsuro. 2016. "Infrastructuring Amphibious Space: The Interplay of Aquatic and Terrestrial Infrastructures in the Chao Phraya Delta in Thailand," *Science as Culture* 25(1): 117–140.
- Nadasdy, Paul. 1999. "The Politics of TEK: Power and the 'Integration' of Knowledge." *Arctic Anthropology* 36 (1/2): 1–18.
- . 2003. *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge, and Aboriginal-State Relations in the Southwest Yukon*. Vancouver and Toronto: UBC Press.
- Ogden, Laura A., Billy Hall, and Kimiko Tanita. 2013. "Animals, Plants, People, and Things: a Review of Multispecies Ethnography." *Environment and Society* 4 (1): 5–24.
- Omura, Keiichi. 2005. "Science against Modern Science: The Socio-political Construction of Otherness in Inuit TEK (Traditional Ecological Knowledge)." In *Indigenous Use and*

- Management of Marine Resources*, edited by N. Kishigami and J. Savelle, 323–44.  
Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology.
- . 2007 “From Knowledge to Poetics: The Sophia of Anti-essentialistic Essentialism in Inuit Traditional Environmental Knowledge.” *Japanese Review of Cultural Anthropology* 7: 27–50.
- . 2013. *Kanada inuito no minzokushi: Nichijōteki jissen no dainamikusu (Ethnography of Canadian Inuit: Dynamics of Everyday Practices)*. Osaka: Osaka University Press.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. 1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge.
- Satsuka, Shiho. 2015. *Nature in Translation: Japanese Tourism Encounters the Canadian Rockies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Schrader, Astrid. 2010. “Responding to *Pfiesteria piscicida* (the Fish Killer): Phantomatic Ontologies, Indeterminacy, and Responsibility in Toxic Microbiology.” *Social Studies of Science* 40 (2): 275–306.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1985. “Three Women’s Texts and a Critique of Imperialism.” *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1): 243–61.
- . 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stengers, Isabelle. 2015. *In Catastrophic Times: Resisting the Coming Barbarism*. Translated by Andrew Goffey. Luneberg: Open Humanities Press.
- Strathern, Marilyn. 2005. *Partial Connections*. Updated. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.

- Tsai, Yen-Ling, Isabelle Carbonell, Joelle Chevrier, and Anna Lowenhaupt Tsing. 2016. "Golden Snail Opera: The More-than-Human Performance of Friendly Farming on Taiwan's Lanyang Plain." *Cultural Anthropology* 31 (4): 520–44.
- Tsing, Anna. 2010. "Worlding the matsutake diaspora: Or, Can Actor-Network Theory Experiment with Holism?" In *Experiments in Holism: Theory and Practice in Contemporary Anthropology*, edited by Ton Otto and Nils Bubandt, 47–66. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Tsing, Anna, Heather Swanson, Elaine Gan, Nils Bubandt, eds. 2017. *Arts of Living on a Damaged Planet*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Usher, Peter J. 2000. "Traditional Ecological Knowledge in Environmental Assessment and Management." *Arctic* 53 (2): 183–93.
- van Dooren, Thom, Eben Kirksey, and Ursula Münster. 2016. "Multispecies Studies: Cultivating Arts of Attentiveness." *Environmental Humanities* 8 (1):1–23.
- Viveiros de Castro, Eduardo. 2004. "Perspectival Anthropology and the Method of Controlled Equivocation." *Tipiti* 2 (1): 3–22.
- Wagner, Roy. 1981. *The Invention of Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Welland, Sasha Su-Ling. 2018. *Experimental Beijing: Gender and Globalization in Chinese Art*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Wenzel, George. 2004. "From TEK to IQ: Inuit *Qaujimagatugangit* and Inuit Cultural Ecology." *Arctic Anthropology* 41 (2): 238–50.
- Zhan, Mei. 2009. *Other-Worldly: Making Chinese Medicine Through Transnational Frames*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

———. 2012. “Worlding Oneness: Daoism, Heidegger, and Possibilities for Treating the Human.” *Social Text* 29 (4 109): 107–28.