

A concrete, scientific, political, and or legal strategy to improve subaltern insurgent cosmopolitan:

Global injustices are inherently linked to cognitive injustices, we are actively looking for ways to improve the disparity between imported colonial ideals of western-centric knowledges and ways of seeing/ understanding the world. One possibility would be to organize a project of large-scale recording (whether in texts, video, or audio) of traditional knowledges of a culture to allow those knowledges to be preserved, studied, shared, and to legitimize knowledges held and created on the other side of the abyssal line. This project should be directed and managed by people within the culture whose traditional knowledges are being recorded so as not to influence what is or isn't recorded from an outside perspective projecting their values onto the group.

Try to indicate the political limits of Suosa Santos' linguistic approach to insurgent cosmopolitanism:

I think the most important issue in the intercultural approach of Suosa Santos is how to make sure that the intercultural translation itself will not become a new tool of domination. And that is from my point of view also some sort of political limit of Santos approach. Who and how can it be guaranteed that that the translation itself will not become dominated again?

Suosa Santos states that are two ways of learning through intercultural translation. From knowledges and practices across the global South and knowledges and practices in contact zones. He states that questioning this contact zone must be the first step of the work of translation and highlights that the participants of the translation process here must detach themselves from their respective cultural backgrounds. The question here was can the western participants really be able to defamiliarize with their cultural background and if they don't what will happen? Suosa Santos has a clear answer. You can not only rely on the contact zones between North and South because the defamiliarization may not happen thus domination will remain, and the conclusion is that intercultural translation can only take place in subaltern cosmopolitan contact zones.

But also, in the subaltern cosmopolitan contact zones some limits, or questions remain open for me. For example, in the issue who the translating person should be. Can there really be one person that is able to represents all knowledges and groups that are taking part in the translation process equally? And how can we make sure that there will not be a point where the translator will not focus more on its own group's knowledge than on other group's knowledge? And again, the most important question how can it be guaranteed that the translator itself is not and will not be dominated?

Try to indicate the political limits of Suosa Santos' linguistic approach to insurgent cosmopolitanism.

Insurgent cosmopolitanism means that we have to overcome the line of abyssal thinking. With the postabyssal thinking, not necessarily to eliminate Western scientific and legal framework, we must be able to see what the other knowledges are apart from already existing Western knowledge by gaining a cosmopolitan perspective. It is not only for subaltern. His linguistic approach focuses on ecologies of knowledges and intercultural translation. Ecologies of

knowledges have the idea of each theory is not complete, reciprocal incompleteness must be taken account. Intercultural translation aims to improve new hybrid forms of cultural understanding and intercommunication in order to create powerful alliances to fight with for social justice, human dignity and human decency. However, it is possible that different frameworks might be incompatible with each other. There is contradiction of modern political knowledge's being contradictory in the measure. It is based on the liberal way of representation where through which all people are able to participate political power but through tool presentation that in the moment realizes privatized everyone. This is problematic in a specific, not to all. If political representation is theorized as mandatory, mandates able to force the representatives continuously the return to confirm the reason why they are representatives. These two approaches are incompatible each other. Because the liberal democracy one is focused on individual and second one focused on different concrete groups that use representation in a mandatory way. This example shows how his idea of intercultural translation has limits.