Journal of Curriculum Studies
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713741620

Curriculum and the idea of a cosmopolitan inheritance

David T. Hansen

First Published:June2008

To cite this Article Hansen, David T.(2008)'Curriculum and the idea of a cosmopolitan inheritance',Journal of Curriculum Studies,40:3,289 — 312

To link to this Article: DOI: 10.1080/00220270802036643

URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00220270802036643

J. CURRICULUM STUDIES, 2008, VOL. 40, NO. 3, 289–312

Curriculum and the idea of a cosmopolitan inheritance

DAVID T. HANSEN

The ancient idea of cosmopolitanism is a topic of renewed interest today. Scholars and practitioners in many fields are examining what it means to conceive all human beings as linked by their membership in a shared cosmos. Some people focus on political cosmopolitanism, others on moral, cultural, or economic cosmopolitanism. This paper examines educational cosmopolitanism by elucidating the idea of curriculum as a cosmopolitan inheritance. It argues that curriculum can generate a cosmopolitan sensibility, by which one means an outlook that regards life experience as universally educational. It suggests that a cosmopolitan sensibility can assist people in working through some of the tensions that accompany global and local change in our time. It can position them to reconstruct creatively cultural and individual values rather than abandon them in the face of the ceaseless pressure of globalization. A cosmopolitan sensibility edifies human beings by helping them perceive why all persons, in principle, can be creative guardians and practitioners of creativity itself.

Keyword: cosmopolitanism; critical inheritance; meaning-making; curriculum; sensibility

In this essay I seek to provide an account of curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance. I will illustrate how such a curriculum can help generate a cosmopolitan sensibility, by which I mean a sustained readiness to learn from the new and different while being heedful of the known and familiar. It is a sensibility that esteems cultural creativity and conservation. I understand 'culture' to include its anthropological and artistic meanings as well as the process of a human being refashioning while preserving her or his individuality. As a creative as well as conservationist outlook, a cosmopolitan sensibility embodies more than mere openness to or tolerance of ideas and practices from elsewhere. Rather it is an educational orientation. It features not merely a willingness but a desire to learn from other traditions, a process that may mean lighting one's way in the world by their insights as well as by one's own.

My purpose in this inquiry is to reconstruct possibilities for teaching and educating within a rapidly changing world. It is a truism that the pace of change has accelerated in the wake of what is often summarized as globalization. Many commentators[1] trace that phenomenon to developments in the West, for example to forces triggered by the French and American Revolutions, by European imperialism, and by the Industrial Revolution.

David T. Hansen is Director of the Program in Philosophy and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 525 W. 120th Street, Box 204, New York, NY 10027, USA; e-mail: dth2006@columbia.edu. He is president-elect of the Philosophy of Education Society (North America) and a past president of the John Dewey Society; he has recently edited *Ethical Visions of Education: Philosophies in Practice* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2007).

Journal of Curriculum Studies ISSN 0022–0272 print/ISSN 1366–5839 online ©2008 Taylor & Francis
http://www.informaworld.com
DOI: 10.1080/00220270802036643

Others[2] contend that the roots of globalization reach back to the very beginnings of human history, and that at many decisive phases the process has moved from east to west rather than vice versa. However one interprets its origins, the contemporary speed and scope of globalization are staggering and show no signs of abating. Endless inventiveness in politics, business, technology, the arts, and more, runs side-by-side with the destruction of local traditions as well as of the natural environment. Curriculum workers today are rightly concerned with constructing educational approaches that can respond to these facts—that can, to deploy an existential motif, equip present and future generations to inhabit experience rather than merely suffer it.

In this project a cosmopolitan outlook can be of distinctive value. The idea has taken on renewed significance today in both scholarly and popular dialogue. This interest reflects a desire to respond in new ways to perceived strife, rupture, and fragmentation around the globe. For many observers, the end of the Cold War nearly two decades ago led not to renewed international harmonies but to an intensification of ethnic, religious, and other conflicts. The recent turn to the cosmopolitan also mirrors worries about the ascendancy worldwide of consumerist individualism, juxtaposed with the fear that the world's political resources are lagging behind economic forces unleashed by global capitalism (Habermas 1998, McCarthy 1999, Papastephanou 2005).

However, the cosmopolitan idea offers more than a critical asset with which to examine contemporary troubles. The idea is not merely parasitic upon crisis. It provides a fruitful, time-honoured standpoint for building upon human accomplishments in art, ethics, politics, education, and other fields of endeavour, and extending them both locally and globally. This perspective can be seen in the excitement and energy people everywhere are finding in new modes of co-operation thanks to expanded means of mobility, powerful communication technologies, proliferating non-governmental organizations, and the like. The idea of the cosmopolitan holds promise because it emerges at this nexus of possibility and challenge. It can help bridge appropriate regard for 'one's own'—one's family, cultures, communities—with a much needed regard the world over for people who are different as well as for the physical environment they inhabit.

In the first section that follows, I will provide a substantive conception of the cosmopolitan. I will indicate how the recent and rapidly growing literature on the topic helps us distinguish it from other 'isms', such as nationalism, humanism, pluralism, internationalism, liberalism, and multiculturalism, as well as from globalization. The literature undermines facile criticisms of the cosmopolitan such as its alleged uncritical universalism, ethnocentrism, unworldliness, moral rootlessness, and elite aestheticism.[3] At the same time, the literature undercuts hasty, romantic, and unguarded claims in favour of cosmopolitanism. In a sometimes convoluted, confusing manner, the term 'cosmopolitan' has been ascribed to singular notions of human nature or purpose ('ism') and to uncontainably plural outlooks ('isms'). I will indicate how recent research provides a framework for approaching this intellectual and practical diversity of outlook. In the second section, I will discuss why the cosmopolitan idea gives rise to the notion of

curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance. This idea, in turn, forms the basis for the subsequent section's analysis of a cosmopolitan sensibility. In concluding remarks, I underscore how this perspective on curriculum and its associated sensibility can help people broaden their creative and ethical horizons across space and time.

A perspective on the cosmopolitan

Historical background

The term 'cosmopolitan' derives from the Greek *kosmopolites*, or citizen of the world. The idea finds its first formal expression in the West in the voice of Diogenes, a so-called Cynic philosopher from the 4th century BCE, who famously declared that he came from the world rather than from a particular culture or polity. The Cynics construed what we call moral obligation as allegiance to humanity itself, a meaningful portion of which they knew given the polyglot cultural ethos of the Mediterranean world at the time (Schofield 1991: 141–145, Nussbaum 1997a: 56–58). Their influence percolated through subsequent renderings of the cosmopolitan. The idea reached an apogee in the ancient world among the Hellenistic and Roman Stoics, who suggested it was possible to devote oneself both to local and larger human community. They sought to frame ways of life in which one could be loyal to particularized obligations and to the needs and hopes of humanity writ large.[4] Their studies, reading, and conversation included an interest in what is today called cultural diversity, juxtaposed with a deep interest in the contours of individuality. As inquirers they practised philosophical anthropology: the elucidation of images of what it means to become and be a person, juxtaposed with systematic reflection on what is called the human condition.

In the wake of the Renaissance, with its 'rediscovery' of ancient sources, writers put forward portraits comparable to those of the Stoics about the importance of tolerance and mutual exchange. Their motive was both negative—they sought an ecumenical approach that could respond to seemingly intractable religious conflict, and positive—they celebrated human differences in culture, in customs, and more (Kraye 1996). During the 18th-century Enlightenment, writers, business people, jurists, artists, and others from across Europe sought to break out of narrow, royalty-centred absolutism. They rooted their cosmopolitan claims, in part, in the view that because people everywhere are capable of reason and moral agency, they merit being treated with respect. This outlook led cosmopolitan thinkers, in contrast with some of their contemporary savants, to condemn war, slavery, and imperialism (Schlereth 1977, Carter 2001, Muthu 2003). The political theorist and social commentator, Montesquieu (1689–1755) captures their outlook when he writes: (quoted in Kristeva 1993: 28)

> If I knew something useful to myself and detrimental to my family, I would reject it from my mind. If I knew something useful to my family but not to my homeland, I would try to forget it. If I knew something useful to my homeland and detrimental to Europe, or else useful to Europe and detrimental to Mankind, I would consider it a crime.

Kant (1963) gave this cosmopolitan idea a lasting boost in his well-known arguments for how to generate 'perpetual peace' among states. The legacy of these Enlightenment endeavours finds expression today in the renewed scholarly interest in the cosmopolitan mentioned previously, and in human rights and peace organizations, in various international agencies ranging from the United Nations to the International Criminal Court, and in an ever-expanding array of non-governmental organizations that work across political and geographic boundaries.

Cosmopolitanisms

Scholars participating in today's broad, spiralling research effort have identified several strands of cosmopolitanism, each with roots far back in time and space. They include the political, the moral, the cultural, and the economic (Kleingeld 1999, Kleingeld and Brown 2006). *Political cosmopolitanism* advances global arrangements to support political, social, economic, and (in today's world) environmental justice. While some writers have advocated a single world-government (Skolimowski 2003), most reject that option as a recipe for totalitarianism, and focus instead on transnational institution-building. Many argue for what Kristeva (1993) describes as a system of nations without nationalism: a reconstructed international ethos that incorporates formalized methods of hospitality, equitable economic practices, fair-minded responsiveness to political conflict, respectful agreements to reduce environmental degradation, and the like (Derrida 2001, Gregoriou 2004, Benhabib 2006).

Moral cosmopolitanism pivots around conceptions of the good, of justice, or of virtue that are said to cut across political, cultural, and religious boundaries. Where political cosmopolitanism highlights global citizenship and transnational institutions, moral cosmopolitanism points to dispositions such as open-mindedness and impartiality that all persons, or so advocates argue, can come to take on. Since ancient times this strand has featured debate about the limits of moral obligation. For example, Nussbaum (1997a, b) deploys ideas from across history, beginning with the Greeks, to argue that persons should conceive themselves as citizens of the world and should regard their moral obligations as applying to all persons equally with no automatic higher regard for compatriots. She does not mean persons must neglect their children, families, or neighbours to assist other people halfway around the world. However, she does claim that persons should attend to the local in the spirit that in so doing they are contributing to a more flourishing cosmos. In contrast, Appiah (2005, 2006) has criticized the view put forward by Nussbaum for implying that local affiliations are derivative or tributary, with regards to their moral legitimacy, to universal ones. Appiah argues for what he calls 'rooted cosmopolitanism' in which people should recognize the distinctive influence of local tradition and culture on their personhood and in which (contrary to Nussbaum's emphasis) a higher duty is owed in an array of circumstances to family or community. 'A cosmopolitanism with prospects', Appiah (2005: 223, 232) writes, 'must reconcile a kind of universalism with the legitimacy of at least some forms of [moral]

partiality. … [I]t is a composite project, a negotiation between disparate tasks'.

Cultural cosmopolitanism, as Kleingeld and Brown (2006), and others cast it, straddles allegiance to the values of local culture and to the values of intercultural borrowing and exchange. Cultural cosmopolitans reject attempts to homogenize communities, but they are equally suspicious of strong claims to cultural and national self-determination if they perceive in them the spectre of new barriers between groups. They criticize conceptions of identity that, in their view, wall-in human conduct and generate spiralling categories of the 'foreigner'. They endorse the possibility of cultural 'exit' or 'forgetting' on the part of individuals from local or larger configurations.[5] Cultural cosmopolitans are not necessarily anti-tradition, and they appreciate that people find boundless values, meanings, and uses in the local. However, cultural cosmopolitanism appears to take its identity, at least in part, through highlighting fluidity between local culture and hybrid culture-in-the-making.

Economic cosmopolitanism, according to Kleingeld and Brown (2006), pivots in one of its historic forms around claims for free trade. Advocates in this camp seek, on the one hand, to diminish political control over economic activity and, on the other hand, to release individuals and communities to cultivate their comparative economic advantage through trade rather than seek wasteful self-sufficiency. They believe that unfettered economic exchange is among the surest, most reliable ways to diminish national and communal animosities (Friedman and Friedman 2002). However, a broad array of theorists suggests this perspective frames not economic cosmopolitanism but rather what is today called neoliberalism, understood as an endorsement of free market principles conjoined with particular liberal values. Critics chastise this position for accepting what many people regard as the dark side of globalization, in which consolidated economic interests (e.g. multinational companies) often run roughshod over political, moral, environmental, and cultural concerns. These critics conceive forms of economic cosmopolitanism that are deeply shaped by concerns for social justice (Tan 2004, Barnett *et al.* 2005). For example, the 'capabilities approach' to social and economic development, as conceived by Sen (1999) and others (DeMartino 2000), can be understood as economic cosmopolitanism reconstructed through values derived from both moral and political cosmopolitanism.

Toward educational cosmopolitanism

I believe that what can be called *educational cosmopolitanism*, a concept I have not come upon in the literature, merits a central place in the dynamic mix of cosmopolitanisms conceptualized in recent research. The idea encompasses aspects of all the strands touched on above. However, it also draws upon distinctive traditions in such a way that it is not reducible to or merely parasitic upon a particular political, moral, cultural, or economic outlook.

A full-blown analysis of educational cosmopolitanism requires a larger canvas than a single essay can provide. My purpose here is to illustrate its trajectory, which I will do in the next section where I examine the idea of

curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance. In order to avoid confusion in that discussion let me first indicate how scholars have distinguished cosmopolitanism from other current 'isms'.

In brief, cosmopolitanism differs from both nationalism and internationalism because it does not treat either the nation or the state as the obligatory unit of analysis, nor as the necessary ground of action, in global politics. As touched on above, this posture does not imply a quixotic rejection of the idea of nations and states.[6] However, it does assert that a world basis for thought and action, one that is more than merely a sum of the (national) parts, merits at least equal billing. Some scholars have argued that part of the promise in cosmopolitanism is the moral and political check it could provide on nation- and state-based policy when the latter suppresses human beings in arbitrary ways.[7]

Cosmopolitanism differs from multiculturalism and pluralism because, unlike the latter, the cosmopolitan does not privilege already formed communities. It seeks to defend emerging spaces for new cultural and social configurations reflective of the intensifying intermingling of people, ideas, and activities the world over. However, cosmopolitanism does not automatically privilege the latter. As Hollinger (2002: 231–232)[8] puts it, 'Cosmopolitans are specialists in the creating of the new, while cautious about destroying the old; pluralists are specialists in the conservation of the old while cautious about creating the new'.

The cosmopolitan idea resembles humanism in presuming that the individual person, while understood as an intersubjective, social being, ought to be seen as something more than the product of social or psychological forces. (It differs from humanism when the latter projects a universal, *a priori* definition of human nature, a point to which I will return.) A person embodies more than a prefigured, preordained, or unchangeable identity. From a humanist outlook, every person merits respect as a being with dignity, with an expressivity and responsiveness to the world that should not be subdued or destroyed. This posture does not entail agreeing with or accepting everything that others do; moral and political cosmopolitanism have emerged, in part, as approaches to addressing differences in outlook and practice. The cosmopolitan idea also echoes liberal thought that, in accenting autonomy and agency, regards the individual as residing at the centre of moral thought and action at least as much as community. These fraternal relations with humanism and liberalism do not imply that either they or the cosmopolitan idea are hostile toward extant communities nor that they seek to elide the differential treatment some communities have historically suffered at the hands of others. As mentioned, political cosmopolitanism constitutes, in part, an effort to place social justice at the centre of inter-communal and international affairs.

Cosmopolitanism is not merely a reworked fusion of humanism and liberalism. While it foregrounds individual distinctiveness, agency, autonomy, and experience—a focus that I will explore in this essay—it also foregrounds the moral and cultural uniqueness as well as integrity of communities. The cosmopolitan idea presupposes individual and community diversity. It would vanish like a puff of smoke were homogeneity to triumph, an outcome some critics fear in unfettered globalization and to

which cosmopolitanism constitutes a rigorous response. At the same time, however, the cosmopolitan is not simply reconstructed moral, cultural, or political communitarianism. The cosmopolitan idea spotlights the more or less permanent exposure to difference on the part of cultures and individuals in the world today. Permeability and porosity seem everywhere the rule rather than the exception. Cosmopolitanism underscores the phenomenological impossibility of inhabiting a 'pure' identity untouched or unaffected by 'outside' contacts. From a cosmopolitan point of view, it is far better to come to grips with the influence of these contacts than to try to will them out of view.

For example, Lear (2006) shows movingly how the American Indian tribe, the Crow, successfully responded to the threat of cultural annihilation. They did so not by hardening their identity and defending it in a zero-sum manner, but rather by reconstructing certain core customs in conjunction with engaging new ideas and practices, and all of this in a creative fashion that helped them sustain cultural integrity, tradition, and distinctiveness. I would not claim that in so doing the Crow became cosmopolitan; as I will suggest later, the term does not operate like an identity card. Moreover, it is important to emphasize that the Crow had no choice but to act, having been assaulted and defeated in battle by a more powerful, relentless entity. However, from the point of view of the cosmopolitan the Crow offer humanity a dynamic lesson. Communities and individuals everywhere today are in varying degrees vulnerable to cultural dissolution (keeping in mind the multiple senses of 'culture' deployed here). In their generative response to this threat, the Crow illuminate why a cosmopolitan orientation weds a critical openness to the world with a critical loyalty toward the local.[9]

Finally, cosmopolitanism differs from universalism if the latter is understood as a unified, aprioristic, and unquestioning stance regarding such matters as human nature and reason. From a cosmopolitan point of view it goes without saying that all cultures engage in reasoning and that it is possible, albeit not always easy, for them to comprehend other cultures' turns of mind. Moreover, these reasoning processes embody distinctive traditions of thought, conduct, and response to the world, although they are not determined by them in a materialistic sense. 'Tradition without reason is blind', Putnam (2002: 94) observes, and 'reason without tradition is empty'. Thus, on the one hand, cosmopolitanism rejects strong versions of social constructivism which render ways of reasoning obscure and incomprehensible to others. On the other hand, while the cosmopolitan embraces the use of the concept universal as an accompaniment to the concept local (neither makes sense without the other), it has no truck with *universalistic* claims that there is one and only one substance and style to reasoning to which all must conform if they wish to be counted as rational. From a cosmopolitan point of view the very meaning of 'universal' is always already in reconstruction as people interact in new ways, however modest those ways may be in comparison with the totality of human experience (Anderson 1998, Butler 2002). I will return to this point in the section below on a cosmopolitan sensibility. I will suggest that this view of the universal is neither relativist nor absolutist in its premises but rather holds a deep, abiding respect for the reality of self, other, and world.

Curriculum, inheritance, and a cosmopolitan horizon

I turn now from this background sketch of the cosmopolitan to the work of education. My focus will be upon curriculum in the school setting, but it bears emphasizing that a cosmopolitan education emerges through countless social agencies, including the media and communication technology, which are themselves undergoing rapid change today. An important premise in what follows is that a cosmopolitan education does not necessitate a radical curricular overhaul of what is taught in elementary, secondary, or university settings. This modality of educating does not depend on or require a formal programme such as those featuring what is called civic education, global education, or moral education. A cosmopolitan orientation is not necessarily in conflict with either programming in general or with these specific programmes in particular. However, a cosmopolitan-minded education accentuates perspective understood as a method. It is a way of seeing that, for the teacher, illuminates how curriculum can constitute a potential and dynamic inheritance to all persons, while for the student it can issue in a deepening if also at times unsettling connection with the dynamic spaces between the local and the universal. In what follows I will try to give educational colour, texture, and tone to those spaces.

The world's address

The cosmopolitan idea invites the teacher to draw out from curriculum, whether in art or zoology, the ways in which subject matter expresses the human quest for meaning. This quest constitutes something other than the pursuit of knowledge in its instrumental and scientific senses, though it can be juxtaposed with them. The notion of a quest reflects the idea of curriculum as an existential response to experience: as an expression of attempts to make sense, to understand, to appreciate, to become at home. The quest for meaning is neither spectatorial in its posture nor acquisitive in its aim, although it can lead to wondrous new insights, tools, and methods for life. It is participatory in the sense of openness to being formed, not merely informed, by what one sees and learns. In figurative terms, the quest for meaning opens a growing person to the address of the world, as if the latter were asking her or him:

- What do you make of me?
- How is it for you being *in this place* rather than in some other kind of cosmos?
- How are you dwelling here?
- What relations do you have, and what relations are you creating, with the world around you?

Alongside the cosmopolitan outlook, the teacher would continue to conceive curriculum as providing students with knowledge about local and larger worlds, as spurring them to develop skills of reading, writing, numerating, conversing, and inquiring, and as developing the resources to pursue particular interests and needs. However, in the cosmopolitan,

curriculum serves more than the familiar functions of socialization, knowledge-acquisition, and preparation for productive life, as crucial as they remain. It also constitutes a world inheritance of meaning-making bequeathed to all human beings.

This world inheritance is something other than a sum of the parts. Unlike international, multicultural, or other enactments of pluralist curriculum, it is not concocted by incorporating prefigured inheritances from particular communities. A cosmopolitan outlook is not opposed to the latter approach, save when it (as with any other scheme of education) becomes dogmatic rather than deliberative about what students are allowed to encounter and learn. A pluralist approach can be taken as a necessary educational beginning although not as a final or self-sufficient ending. It is vital in today's world to inform students of cultural and community histories with their distinctive characteristics, purposes, and aspirations. It is equally important to educate students to seek mutual understanding, to esteem tolerance, and to learn how to criticize through both theory and action injustice whether at the local or global level. In fact some critics would argue that these aims add up to a cosmopolitan education.[10] However, in my view this conclusion obscures the issue by casting the cosmopolitan as a 'solution' to a predetermined problem. As I comprehend it, in the cosmopolitan the difference with pluralism is not one of content *per se*, but rather one of perspective or orientation as it influences people's reception and response to content. I will elucidate this idea by considering the term 'inheritance'.

Inheritances

A preliminary point is that education and socialization are not synonyms (Dearden *et al.* 1972, Oakeshott 1989). Socialization is the indispensable process of drawing the young into a way of life and equipping them to sustain it. Without socialization (other terms include acculturation and enculturation), human ways of life would perish. Socialization will remain a required activity of humans for as long as culture subsists. Through it, the young learn ways of understanding, communicating, and interacting, along with a body of cultural knowledge (which may always be evolving), that together are constitutive of their way of life. In the context of socialization, an inheritance means precisely this: an element in an established way of life. It is taken on 'uncritically', not in the sense of unreflectively or unimaginatively but rather in the sense that socialization makes it possible to be critical in the first place—i.e. to be in a position to stand back existentially from ideas, values, beliefs, and practices and to consider them rather than merely enact them. No such standing back, no such experience of being critical, is conceivable without having been socialized into a way of life. Without the latter there is nothing to stand back from, just as there would be nothing to stand upon. An unsocialized human being would find it as impossible to engage with people as they would with it (consider the story, *The Mind of Mr. Soames* (Maine 1961), rendered into a film in 1970 (Cooke 1970)).

The idea of a cosmopolitan education recognizes the necessity of socialization, which entails, in turn, recognizing the place of the local in human

life. *Education depends upon socialization*, on having entered a way of life and become a part of it. However, from a cosmopolitan perspective education has to do with new forms of understanding, undergoing, and moving in the world. These modes may be in accord with processes of socialization, but they do not simply replicate them. They typically accompany socialization and may be hard to distinguish from the latter. The differences between them can create tensions and difficulties when the requirements of socialization butt up against the impulses of education. At all times education is a standing back as well as standing in. In the experience of education the student maintains a degree of detachment or distance from the object of study even while being immersed in it. Put another way, the student is aware it is an object of study rather than 'just' an object; and it is an object of study because the student has rendered it so, often through the prompting of the teacher and the curriculum.

The student's awareness mirrors the fact that education is purposive rather than merely functional. Socialization is entirely functional: its aim is to sustain culture. Education is purposive as well as functional: its aim is to contribute to culture understood in its anthropological, artistic, and individual senses. In education a person responds to questions, pursues interests, and acts upon curiosity in ways that are always unscripted rather than predestined or preordained. Education constitutes an unsettling and unrehearsed adventure (Oakeshott 1989: 23) to places nobody has been before, in the sense that no two human beings understand the world and its elements in carbon-copy ways. In contrast, socialization is a marvellously well-rehearsed if evolving system of inhabiting the known and the familiar.

Thus, in an educational context an inheritance takes on a different character than in socialization, even if the vehicle may at first glance be the same. That is, the vehicle in both cases can take the shape of what we call books, methods, equipment, exercises, activities, and so forth. It can take the form of what is called history, arithmetic, science, physical education, etc. However, in education an inheritance is not like being bequeathed a piece of property or a cache of goods. It is not something a student can pull out of a pocket when asked for an accounting. It is not something a student can easily describe, even after a long immersion—or, perhaps, especially after a lengthy involvement. For example, the longer a person studies, say, art or philosophy, the deeper, richer, and more perplexing it may become. What are the boundaries of art? When does art 'begin'? Does it commence the moment a person takes brush in hand? Or does it only start when the painter turns a corner, figuratively speaking, and realizes (not necessarily in words) what is calling her or him to paint in the first place? What counts as philosophy as contrasted, say, with theory, ideology, or standpoint? How can we distinguish philosophy from rhetorical manipulation, or can we? When does philosophy 'happen'? Whenever we think? Whenever we question? Or does it highlight particular kinds of thinking and questioning?

In education an inheritance is a dynamic amalgam of convictions, values, ideas, practices, doubts, and even hopes and yearnings. To assimilate an inheritance educationally constitutes a process whose shape and substance are always in motion. That process encompasses thinking, imagining,

questioning, inquiring, contemplating, studying, and deciding. Students *participate* in an educational inheritance rather than merely ingest it or glance at it like a museum visitor idly strolling by one object after another. In this light, an inheritance is always something other than the visible or official curriculum (or 'vehicle' as touched on above). It is also something other than what have been dubbed, respectively, the 'enacted' and 'hidden' curriculum, though it could be understood as instantiated through them. Scholars have characterized the enacted curriculum as the work with subject matter that teachers and students in fact do rather than what they may have intended to do or had prescribed for them (Bussis *et al.* 1976, Snyder *et al.* 1992). The hidden curriculum denotes understandings, outlooks, habits, and the like that are, in turn, an unintended outcome of the enacted curriculum (Jackson 1968).

Curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance is an educational idea. It denotes a dynamic, purposive, if also unpredictable transaction between student and what has given life in the first place to the subject matter at hand. Consider a student in science class. Science metamorphoses from object to object of study when the student begins to ask about her or his experience of it rather than merely get through it. The object in question is, say, Copernicus's demonstration that the solar system is heliocentric. It becomes an object of study, and more, when the student feels and thinks questions such as 'How could Copernicus come up with this idea in the first place? What led him there? What education did he undergo? Why did he care about the solar system at all? How did he describe his discovery in his own terms? What were his emotions as well as his ideas, questions, conjectures at that time? With whom did he communicate about it? What was their critical response? Did he have any regrets about the approach he took? How has what he did influenced the way people look at the earth and its place in space and time? How has it influenced the way I look at such things? Shall I become an astronomer too?' Copernicus's effort half a millennium ago is on the road to becoming an inheritance for this student. Rather than merely acquiring information about him and the solar system, the student is taking on modes of questioning, wondering, being perplexed, and so forth, also illustrated above in the examples of art and philosophy. The student is responding to an address from the world embodied, in this case, in Copernicus and astronomy. The process has ongoing social and communicative elements.

The idea of curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance suggests that the questions the student enunciates here, or ones comparable to them, can be those of any student, any time, anywhere on the planet. Thus, while the study of Copernicus and astronomy is part of many national, regional, and local curricula the world over, as cosmopolitan inheritance it always reaches beyond such formal, institutionalized markers. It is always something other than what they can denote. Moreover, all the conceivable ways in which this subject is taught and undergone by students cannot capture the student's experience described above. In other words, no two students, however immersed in Copernicus and his achievement, will respond in an identical, point-by-point manner. No student's unrehearsed, unpredictable adventure in education will be duplicated by another.

Curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance is therefore not a traditionalistic or universalistic notion. It does not mean regarding accomplishments from the past uncritically and simply absorbing without remark their ideational content. Nor does the cosmopolitan prescribe which human achievements, from what eras, and from what parts of the globe, ought to be included in the curriculum. The idea highlights critical receptivity rather than a predetermined body of content *per se*. To recall an earlier metaphor, the cosmopolitan opens spaces between the local and universal and thus cannot be captured by or equated with either term. Put another way, in curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance the address from the world to every student is neither inherently local nor universal. Moreover, the fact that every student participates in a *particular* way also cannot be accounted for by deploying the local/universal distinction. I will provide another, more extended classroom example in the next section in order to illuminate further this perspective.

Educational cosmopolitanism aspires to provide all students with opportunities to experience local and broader traditions educationally rather than solely from the point of view of socialization. Students should be able to raise questions, to wonder about origins, and to compare critically their undertakings with other traditions, all in ways that derive as much from their reactions as from those of their elders. To return to how the cosmopolitan echoes humanist and liberal images of the human being, it would be a disservice to students to suppress and leave undeveloped, unarticulated, and unshared their fundamental responses to human experience as embodied in the curriculum.

At first glance this outlook may conjure an image of endless tension and strife with established belief and custom—in a word, with the trajectories of socialization. In my view it calls instead for insight, of a kind I do not purport to possess but toward which I can at least gesture. If a child asks why people believe in God, human equality, or science, there is no reason to reply 'Because the world is so and that's an end to it', or 'What a profound question, let us abandon our traditions and start over'. If heeded, the child's query could, however minutely in the scheme of things, lead to a richer conception of God, human equality, and science. Put another way that recalls how the Crow people responded to external pressure, the child's query could help her or his community reaffirm its integrity—its valuation of God, human equality, science—and yet in a way that positions it to subsist more efficaciously and indeed justly with the larger world, with its unfathomable diversity of values. Thus, to silence the child would be a disservice not only to her or his dignity, but to humanity itself because it would deprive it—whether at the local or global level—of always needed *new* and *reconstructed* cultural resources, with the latter understood from the perspectives of anthropology, art, and individual human flourishing.

Cosmopolitan inheritance and sensibility

The cosmopolitan idea as I understand it does not proffer a solution to the manifold predicaments and problems of our time. However, as an educational orientation it can give rise to a richer consciousness of the creative

legacy and capacity of people everywhere. Put another way, the practice of curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance can fuel the emergence of a cosmopolitan sensibility. This sensibility can dwell harmoniously, if not always easily, with what could be called local sensibilities regarding family, neighbourhood, community, or nation. It can educate and edify a person in her or his relations with the local.

Contours of a cosmopolitan sensibility

A cosmopolitan sensibility features something other than the stereotypical image of a contemporary urban dweller—say, in Bangkok, Buenos Aires, London, Mumbai, Nairobi, New York, St. Petersburg, Sydney, or Tokyo—enjoying cuisines from around the world, following international news, dressing cross-culturally, travelling near and far, and the like. There is nothing inherently wrong with any of these customs. They can trigger or even incarnate a cosmopolitan sensibility. However, they may not. They may lead persons, whether they like it or not, into the consumerist universe of globalization, a phenomenon quite different from the participatory ethos that I take cosmopolitanism to represent. Thus, travelling, revelling in art from the world over, and the like, are not in themselves markers of a cosmopolitan sensibility, and nor are they necessary for it. An immigrant baker, janitor, or cab driver, who as Malcomson (1998: 239) points out, is likely to have a greater command of multiple languages than many a university graduate, may have a livelier cosmopolitan sensibility than the most well-travelled, well-connected executive, who in any case is all too often camped out in airport lounges and chain hotels.

Let me put forward two realms of human conduct where one can witness the enactment of a cosmopolitan sensibility. One is the world stage occupied by renowned public figures. The other is the far less public setting of the classroom. I will begin by touching on the former.

When I picture such widely admired, well-known, global-sized figures as Mohandas Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, and Eleanor Roosevelt (there are many others), I witness in action a capacity to respect and to acknowledge publicly, in one and the same moment, one's own cultural traditions and the reality of other people's traditions. I observe in their doings a profound interest in people, not just in 'their own' but in people everywhere, an interest that expresses itself among other ways in a visible capacity for patience, reflection, articulate responsiveness, and self-criticism. I witness what it means to absorb and to make one's own ideas and values from other people's inheritances. These figures enact in an often bold fashion a living, dynamic conviction that as individuals they are not mere ciphers of internal or external material forces but rather are beings with a substantive degree of agency and autonomy, i.e. of freedom. At the same time, in their wondrously visible display of agency, they express a conviction that all of their listeners, all of their interlocutors, indeed all of their fellow humans are also agentive beings capable of influencing in better rather than worse ways the affairs of life.

So much for a brief look at extraordinary or unusual manifestations of a cosmopolitan sensibility. Its brush strokes include a visible interest in and

critical respect for the reality of other people and their traditions, inheritances, and concerns. They include a willingness to speak publicly about the things one cherishes even while listening, waiting, considering, pondering, and engaging those whose commitments may differ. And it incorporates a disposition to assimilate new ideas and values, albeit critically rather than thoughtlessly.

However, this summary of the cosmopolitan sensibility that I see Gandhi, Mandela, and Roosevelt expressing in their lives does not capture *in toto* either the persons they were, or are, or their actions. I make this obvious point in order to underscore the fact that an individual's sensibility is impossible to pin down or taxonomize in a final, complete way. As suggested, to me these figures illuminate in striking ways constituents of a cosmopolitan sensibility such as respect for the moral and ethical reality of other people, a respect that reaches beyond what can be contained by any national, regional, ethnic, racial, class, religious, or other boundary that comes to mind. However, we also know that these extraordinary persons have been or were at times harshly judgemental. They brought grief to various persons close to them; they were sometimes irresponsible and negligent in their policy-making; and they were at times confused or wracked by doubt about their direction.

The upshot of this observation is that it is important not to reify the idea of a cosmopolitan sensibility. Put in a more positive way, another constituent of a cosmopolitan sensibility is a recognition, however inchoate or inarticulate, that there would be something amiss, awkward, untrue to life experience for a person to (pro)claim, 'I am a cosmopolitan', or to say about his or her community, 'We are cosmopolitan'.[11] A cosmopolitan sensibility is not a possession, not a badge, not a settled accomplishment or achievement. It is an orientation that depends fundamentally upon the ongoing quality of one's interactions with others, with the world, and with one's own self. Like education itself it is ever incomplete, ever emergent.[12]

What does a cosmopolitan sensibility look like, or how does it appear, in ordinary, everyday life far removed from the public spotlight? Is it simply a more homely, down-to-earth (down-to-village, down-to-neighbourhood) version of what can be witnessed in the lives of famous cosmopolitan exemplars? The answer is yes and no. It does include in its everyday avatar respect for the moral, ethical, and cultural reality of other people, which encompasses in turn the willingness to engage that reality through speaking, listening, contemplating, being patient, and the like. However, a cosmopolitan sensibility in its everyday or 'rooted' manifestations[13] has its own qualities, among which are those, or so I would conjecture, that deeply influenced Gandhi, Mandela, and Roosevelt in their formative years (which is to say, for them, virtually all of their years).

The classroom example I will offer here respects the claim put forward by Murdoch (1970), Scarry (1998), and others that imagining or grasping the reality of other people is one of the hardest things for human beings to accomplish. For Murdoch, this outlook leads her to advance humility as a core virtue in the moral life.[14] For Scarry, it leads her to be highly sceptical of the sort of argument I am making on behalf of the cosmopolitan. She implies that education has a minimal as well as fragile capacity to form

moral imagination, a posture that leads her away from what I am calling educational cosmopolitanism and toward a strong version of political internationalism focused upon institution-building that can support justice worldwide.

In what follows, I will presume that humility constitutes a dynamic condition as well as outcome of authentic learning about world, other, and self.[15] However, I will part company with Scarry's presumption that successfully imagining the reality of other people and their concerns is a rare occurrence. This imaginative achievement is not the provenance solely of the moral heroes of the world. A close look at the everyday indicates it happens more often than meets the eye, perhaps especially an eye already primed to be sceptical by the all-too-comprehensible view that misunderstanding and violence dominate human affairs.

Educating sensibility

Consider a music teacher and music students in a local school (in this example, I will be offering a composite of what I have witnessed in a variety of classrooms). The students enjoy listening to music from all over the world. At one point several are so taken with the flamenco strains in a particular track that they want to incorporate its sound in their own budding compositions. If asked why, they might simply reply, 'Because we like it!' The teacher endorses their decision but at the same time poses a range of questions they must consider, some technical, some philosophical. What is the history of this form of music? What kind of instruments does it deploy and what are their histories? Of what materials are these instruments made? Who makes them? With respect to the origins of flamenco, to what in human life and/or in nature might it be a response? In what ways—call them ludic, if you will—do traditions of flamenco respond to particular human joys, sufferings, values, aspirations, and the like? How do those responses, in turn, help us think about how we express our own joys, sufferings, concerns, and hopes through music and perhaps art in general? Might the responses embedded in flamenco tradition suggest ways of reconceiving or even reconstituting our cares and desires?

In short, through questioning, coaching, suggesting resources, and the like, the teacher helps students move from what could become a consumerist, spectator-like, or acquisitive sampling to a participatory inquiry in which meanings and outlooks are explicitly at play. The teacher speaks, listens, waits, and acts as if the musical traditions of flamenco are not only emblematic of aspects of Spanish culture but are also a world inheritance bequeathed to persons everywhere—including in that teacher's local classroom far removed in space and time from flamenco's origins. Moreover, imagine for a moment a whole train of encounters like the one described here that this teacher helps make possible for students. This teacher's approach expresses in an everyday, ongoing manner a visible conviction that her or his students dwell someplace other than 'only' in the local—or 'only' in the universal—and that they are something more than 'only' the persons they appear to be at the moment. Rather, this teacher's actions imply that

the meaning of the local, of the universal, and of the very idea of individuality are always underway. In other words, from a pedagogical perspective the teacher's actions urge students to heed in one and the same moment the call of the local, of the universal, and of the unmappable, unfathomable spaces between those ever-moving end points—spaces that they are in a position to generate themselves as I will suggest below.

The students begin 'where they are': they have been intrigued by a piece of music. However, they end someplace else: they have incorporated into their sensibilities a response to a human inheritance that has percolated through the world. However modest this transformation may be in the totality of their evolving humanity, it is noteworthy not only in its technical and musical senses—the students and teacher now know more about flamenco than they did before—but in the accompanying philosophical, existential, indeed moral and ethical senses of their experience. The students still live *in* their local world, but they are no longer merely *of* it. They have the same names and are the same ages but their sensibilities are now different, however modest in comparison with the totality of the influences upon them. Their feeling and sense for the good, the true, and the beautiful are no longer the same. They have had an opportunity to cultivate a deeper intimation of what it means to take the world seriously (the good), to learn from the reality of its offerings (the true), and to appreciate it (the beautiful). To recur to the language I employed previously, they dwell someplace between the local—that which they were and are—and the universal—that which they can in principle take in and become. If they could speak like veteran artists or physicists, perhaps they would say they are no longer quite sure how to delimit the local and the universal.

Moreover, what these students have learned, and what they have become as persons with respect to their evolving sensibilities, will affect the local world in which they move because they will carry those sensibilities everywhere they go. This claim reflects the fact that in engaging the philosophy embedded in flamenco they did not abandon their own musical traditions and accompanying values even if these were subjected to influence. Their learning was not a matter of all or nothing, but was a 'transaction' between the new and the familiar such that both have been infused with new dynamism (Rosenblatt 1978, Dewey 1991). Thus their learning will also affect the ever-changing shape and substance of the universal, namely because these students' creativity and undergoing are unprecedented and irreproducible, and not just for them. They have expanded, deepened, and enriched the human tapestry in ways that matter, however infinitesimal all this may seem. As they consolidate their experience through subsequent encounters, their ever-evolving achievement can itself contribute, in microcosm, to a potential inheritance for others.

The cosmopolitan prism

These remarks constitute, from a critical perspective, a response to the question: What makes the example an instantiation of educational cosmopolitanism? To clarify the response let me briefly distinguish the cosmopolitan from

other educational approaches, with the proviso that there can be considerable overlap between them. As the literature on global, multicultural, and other pluralist curricula has documented, countless moments emerge in every subject that comes to mind—-from biology to physical education—for discussing the diverse roots of ideas, problems, methods, techniques, and the like, all of which point to comparable human curiosity and practical interest the world over. However, from a cosmopolitan perspective the fact that an inheritance such as poetry derives from communities everywhere is not the ultimate point of importance. Put another way, the teacher in the example here is interested in more than the aims of liberal and multicultural education, understood as including matters such as coverage and comprehensive scope, cultural recognition, and holistic self-development on the part of individual students. She or he is not opposed to those invaluable aims, but the latter do not capture a cosmopolitan outlook either singly or if fused into a unity.

Curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance reflects an orientation in its own right toward cultural creativity understood in its anthropological, artistic, and individual senses. The teacher does not regard flamenco as solely a local inheritance whose significance is *a priori* contained or exhausted within a particular frame of meaning. The teacher does not presume that to learn something authentic from flamenco traditions is reserved ipso facto only for those who inhabit its natal settings. However, the teacher does not pretend that students can experience the same meaning as its creators, much less reside in their outlook. There remains a sacred quality to their originary, artful creation. However, this sense of reverence, which mirrors cosmopolitan reverence for the sheer fact of the world, does not convert creations into possessions that cannot be genuinely shared with others. The idea of a cosmopolitan education encourages a sense of hospitality. People can participate in and welcome other traditions into their lives. They can come to understand aspects of how people far and wide have responded to the world's address. The teacher presumes that students will need time and space to engage new traditions, in part because of the scholastic challenge involved, and in part because the process will bring into the open their own sense of tradition and subject it to formative influence. In this regard a cosmopolitan education may seem synonymous with an aesthetic education. It is indeed aesthetic, but only if that concept is understood to embody critical appreciation, critical gratitude, and awareness that learning from the world is not merely a detour to self-discovery.

Appiah (2005: 252–272) is correct in stating that philosophical agreement regarding fundamental values is not required as a foundationalist ground for inter-communal or international political negotiation. It is enough, as he argues, if people comprehend particular concerns, circumstances, and options. However, in the project of cosmopolitan education it is vital to engage students with philosophical diversity such as that which may reside in different musical traditions. Figuratively speaking, the teacher here is helping students understand not only what it means to study flamenco but to imagine it as addressing them with questions about who they are and what they wish to become. The teacher is assisting students to come to grips with

what it means to be a human being as well as how they themselves can help constitute their humanity. The teacher is encouraging students to perceive why all curriculum represents, in principle, their inheritance, to which in due course they can contribute, even if it may be hard to isolate and assess their eventual imprint.

Moreover, they are all learning—teacher and students alike—more about what it means to be a critical rather than 'traditionalistic' custodian of inheritances of meaning, of purposiveness, and of responsiveness to the world (Hogan 1996, Hansen 2001: 114–15). Put another way, they are cultivating, at least in germ, a posture of what Arendt (1968) described as care for the world. They are experiencing the value, the meaning, and the wondrousness in acting as cosmopolitan creators. They are learning, constructing, and putting forward cultural resources for themselves and others. They see the value in recognizing flamenco tradition as more than 'just another nice sound' but as educational and as potentially edifying in its distinctive response to the very experience of being human. This emerging, always dynamic sensibility can help position them to participate that much more actively and constructively in the affairs of life into which they enter. As Dewey (1985: 370) memorably posed the matter, 'Interest in learning from all the contacts of life is the essential moral interest'. This interest is moral because it substantiates concern, responsibility, and creative guardianship of creativity itself.

Conclusion: the cosmopolitan invitation

Recent scholarship on the cosmopolitan has illuminated its political, moral, cultural, and economic strands of thought and practice. This research shows how the legacy of cosmopolitanism and its current impetus can assist a world struggling to find its way amidst a sea of rapid, often confusing, and sometimes violent changes. I have sought to elucidate aspects of educational cosmopolitanism as a distinctive outlook on curriculum and its realization through teaching and learning. Curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance highlights the quest for meaning that can be understood as informing, in a natal sense, what is called subject matter. Curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance is an educational idea that presupposes socialization but is not identical with it. This curriculum can generate a cosmopolitan sensibility that can accompany, in a critical spirit, students' growth in knowledge, information, and skills.

A cosmopolitan sensibility embodies respect for the reality of self, other, and world. It propels persons to communicate with others and with other traditions and inheritances. It disposes people not only to be open to new values and ideas but to consider them as addresses from the world, as potential candidates for guiding their own lives. Through an educational, reconstructive engagement between them and the familiar, they can become lights to illuminate the way.

Curriculum scholars have focused extensively upon international, global, and other extra-national questions and practices.[16] However, there remains an uncharted path ahead with regards to the cosmopolitan. In

undertaking this research programme and in trying out possibilities in the classroom, it will be important to be clear theoretically and philosophically about the meaning of the idea. Theoretically, as the growing and sophisticated current literature demonstrates, the cosmopolitan cannot be reduced to uncritical ethnocentrism, elite aestheticism, or any other dogmatic 'ism' that comes to mind. The idea illuminates why the moral partiality inevitable in any inhabitable way of life, including the cosmopolitan, is not a synonym with exclusion even though as with any human practice it could lead to such.[17] Correspondingly, curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance is not parasitic upon an *a priori* political, cultural, economic, or other blueprint, although it plainly has consequences for how people might come to arrange their lives. The fact that some claims about the cosmopolitan have been intemperate, over-reaching, and insufficiently self-critical illustrates the permanent difficulty in elucidating the idea. I call the task permanent, in part, because of the ceaselessly altering diversity characteristic of all persons and communities, however subtle these changes may be.

Philosophically, I believe it important to keep in view the long-standing aspect of the cosmopolitan idea as reflecting 'the love of wisdom'. As such it points toward a way of living, not in the sense of grasping final truths that one can trumpet to others, but rather in respecting truth so much—that is, respecting the reality of world, other, and self so much—that one appreciates what it means to live educationally. In this context, an intriguing next step in research would be to juxtapose curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance with recent curriculum inquiry on educating the human capacity for critical dialogue and deliberation.[18] Among the varied questions that come to mind are:

- Can the willingness and the skill to deliberate critically across difference be conceived as an ongoing world inheritance?
- Is it possible to balance the political value of learning to deliberate with the humanistic value of approaching curriculum as a cultural inheritance, without reducing one to the other?

In one of the few studies of which I am aware that deploys the idea of the cosmopolitan, Zembylas (2002) examines the interaction of the local and global in the evolution of science curriculum in Cyprus. He shows that what I would call curricular permeability is an inescapable feature of contemporary education, just as cultural porosity is an ubiquitous feature of contemporary life. In a manner that echoes Lear's (2006) study of the Crow response to pressure, Zembylas rightly argues that local curriculum traditions merit a critical defence.[19] However, the kind of analysis he undertakes—which I join him in encouraging other scholars to pursue—would be enhanced by engaging the resources the cosmopolitan idea provides. The cosmopolitan is not, as he suggests (Zembylas 2002, especially p. 508), a universalistic mode of curricular imperialism. The latter approach calls to mind, if anything, the homogenizing thrust of globalization to which cosmopolitanism is a distinct alternative. A cosmopolitan sensibility supports persons in being simultaneously creative and conservationist, with the latter mirroring not the political idea of conservatism but rather the ethos of today's environmentalism. People can learn to assimilate ideas and practices

from other traditions even as they reconstruct rather than abandon their own. Ultimately, a cosmopolitan sensibility may be a crucial outlook for persons everywhere who aspire, in a rapidly changing world, to realize the fullness of experience rather than merely suffer it.

Furthermore, as Burtonwood (1995) has argued in another curriculum study that foregrounds the cosmopolitan, in negotiating local and broader concerns it is important to keep in view the educational responses of the individual human being. Burtonwood recommends a critical outlook toward what I have portrayed as the creative, dynamic space between the individual, the local, and the universal. The idea of that space reveals why the cosmopolitan constitutes more than a reaction to parochially driven strife, rupture, and fragmentation. In one of its long-developing strands it has taken that form and has made an enduring contribution to conflict resolution and peace. At the same time, however, a cosmopolitan orientation constitutes a living reply to the ungraspable fact that we humans are *in the cosmos* in the first place, and have been bestowed with the creative resources to try to render an inhabitable, artful world within it.

Kant (1988: 28–29) pointed to this idea when he articulated what he called philosophy in its cosmopolitan sense. In that outlook, the outstanding questions are: What can I know?, What should I do?, For what may I hope?, and What is a human being? According to Kant, the questions concern, respectively, metaphysics, morality, religion, and anthropology. He conceived them as cosmopolitan because he regarded them as constitutive of the human condition. Human beings everywhere respond to them in their ways of life. As their answers evolve, so do their ways of life and vice versa. The questions could be taken, with some modification, as a springboard to curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance. What can students anywhere come to know? Much about themselves, others, and the world, and about the challenge and wondrousness in that very process. What should they do? Learn to learn from new traditions and forms of life even as they sustain in a dynamic fashion their own integrity. For what can they hope? That while their education will not equip them to create a heavenly abode, it can mark human affairs with more rather than less grace. What is a human being? A living, transforming being dwelling in response to, among so many other things, the inextinguishable quest for meaning.

Acknowledgements

My thanks to Stephanie Burdick-Shepherd for her artful and indispensable bibliographic assistance; to Jeff Frank and Avi Mintz for their close reading and criticism of the manuscript; to René V. Arcilla and Megan Laverty for many valuable conversations surrounding the cosmopolitan; to an anonymous reviewer for several important criticisms; and to audiences who raised useful questions in response to earlier versions of the essay I presented at the University of Humanistics in Utrecht (2004), the University of Manitoba (2004), the University of Kyoto (2005), Teachers College (2007), and the annual meeting of the Association for Moral Education, New York City (2007).

Notes

1. See e.g. Burbules and Torres (2000).
2. See e.g. Sen (2006).
3. See Carter (2001), Lu (2000), and Waldron (2000, 2003).
4. See Brennan (2005), Long (2006), Nussbaum (1994), and Reydams-Schils (2005).
5. See Gunesch (2004), Hill (2000), Hollinger (2002), Rizvi (2005), and Waldron (2000, 2003).
6. See also Calhoun (2007).
7. See e.g. Benhabib (2006) and Scheffler (2001: 111–130).
8. See also Earle and Cvetkovich (1995: 102, 158, 180–181).
9. Tully (1995) provides examples, from the point of view of constitution making, of what it can mean to learn authentically from minority communities under threat. The Crow experience also sheds light on why cosmopolitan practices can constitute something other than merely an effect, instrument, or expression of power. For a contrary perspective, see Popkewitz *et al.* (2006). In my view their Foucault-inspired analysis too hastily conflates the cosmopolitan with what has been called neoliberalism.
10. See Held (2002: 154–179) and Nussbaum (1997a).
11. See also Anderson (1998: 289).
12. As mentioned previously, in the Western tradition of cosmopolitanism the Cynic philosopher Diogenes (4th century BCE) is credited with rendering the idea public when he went around declaring he was a citizen of the world (*kosmopolites*). I think there was something obscure, misleading, and out of balance in that proclamation, though this criticism does not mean he should have publicly said he is only a citizen of a particular polity. The cosmopolitan points to existential spaces that are neither 'purely' universal nor 'purely' local but rather feature a dynamic fusion that is also always more than a mere sum of the parts.
13. See also Appiah (2006) and Cohen (1992).
14. For discussion, see Laverty (2007).
15. See also Hansen (2001: 167–191).
16. See e.g. Banks (2004), Gaudelli (2003), Noddings (2005), Parker *et al.* (1999), Pinar (2003), and Rohrs and Lenhart (1995).
17. See also Scheffler (2001: 122).
18. See e.g. Englund (2000, 2006) and Roth (2006).
19. See e.g. Smith and Williams (1999).

References

Anderson, A. (1998) Cosmopolitanism, universalism, and the divided legacies of modernity. In P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press), 265–289.

Appiah, K. A. (2005) *The Ethics of Identity* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Appiah, K. A. (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (New York: W. W. Norton).

Arendt, H. (1968) The crisis in education. In H. Arendt, *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought,* enlarged edn (New York: Penguin), 173–196.

Banks, J. A. (ed.) (2004) *Diversity and Citizenship Education: Global Perspectives* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass).

Barnett, A., Held, D. and Henderson, C. (eds) (2005) *Debating Globalization* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press).

Benhabib, S. (2006) *Another Cosmopolitanism,* ed. R. Post (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Brennan, T. (2005) *The Stoic Life: Emotions, Duties, and Fate* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Burbules, N. C. and Torres, C. A. (eds) (2000) *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives* (New York: Routledge).

Burtonwood, N. (1995) Beyond local cultures: towards a cosmopolitan art education. *International Journal of Art and Design Education,* 14(2), 205–212.

Bussis, A. M., Chittenden, E. A. and Amarel, M. (1976) *Beyond Surface Curriculum: An Interview Study of Teachers' Understandings* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press).
Butler, J. (2002) Universality in culture. In M. C. Nussbaum, *For Love of Country?,* ed. J. Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press), 45–52.
Calhoun, C. (2007) *Nations Matter: Culture, History, and the Cosmopolitan Dream* (New York: Routledge).
Carter, A. (2001) *The Political Theory of Global Citizenship* (London: Routledge).
Cohen, M. (1992) Rooted cosmopolitanism: thoughts on the Left, nationalism, and multiculturalism. *Dissent,* 39(4), 478–483.
Cooke, A. (dir.) (1970) *The Mind of Mr. Soames* [Film] (London: Amicus).
Dearden, R. F., Hirst, P. H. and Peters, R. S. (1972) *Education and the Development of Reason* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
DeMartino, G. F. (2000) *Global Economy, Global Justice: Theoretical Objections and Policy Alternatives to Neoliberalism* (London: Routledge).
Derrida, J. (2001) *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness,* trans. M. Dooley and M. Hughes (London: Routledge).
Dewey, J. (1985) Democracy and education. In J. A. Boydston (ed.), *The Middle Works of John Dewey 1899–1924: Vol. 9, 1916* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press).
Dewey, J. (1991) Knowing and the known. In J. A. Boydston (ed.), *John Dewey, the Later Works 1925–1953: Vol. 16, Essays, Typescripts, and 'Knowing and the Known'* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press), 1–279.
Earle, T. C. and Cvetkovich, G. T. (1995) *Social Trust: Toward a Cosmopolitan Society* (Westport, CT: Praeger).
Englund, T. (2000) Rethinking democracy and education: towards an education of deliberative citizens. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 32(2), 305–313.
Englund, T. (2006) Deliberative communication: a pragmatist proposal. *Journal of Curriculum Studies,* 38(5), 503–520.
Friedman, M. and Friedman, R. D. (2002) *Capitalism and Freedom,* 40th anniversary edn (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
Gaudelli, W. (2003) *World Class: Teaching and Learning in Global Times* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum).
Gregoriou, Z. (2004) Resisting the pedagogical domestication of cosmopolitanism: From Nussbaum's concentric circles of humanity to Derrida's *aporetic* ethics of hospitality. In K. Alston (ed.), *Yearbook of Philosophy of Education 2003* (Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society), 257–266. Available online at: http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-yearbook/2003/gregor.pdf, accessed 20 December 2007.
Gunesch, K. (2004) Education for cosmopolitanism? Cosmopolitanism as a personal cultural identity model for and within international education. *Journal of Research in International Education,* 3(3), 251–275.
Habermas, J. (1998) Learning by disaster? A diagnostic look back on the short 20th century. *Constellations,* 5(3), 307–320.
Hansen, D. T. (2001) *Exploring the Moral Heart of Teaching: Toward a Teacher's Creed* (New York: Teachers College Press).
Held, D. (2002) *World Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Thinking and its Opponents* (London: Continuum).
Hill, J. (2000) *Becoming a Cosmopolitan: What it Means to be a Human Being in the New Millennium* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield).
Hogan, P. (1996) *The Custody and Courtship of Experience: Western Education in Philosophical Perspective* (Blackrock, Ireland: Columba Press).
Hollinger, D. A. (2002) Not universalists, not pluralists: the new cosmopolitans find their own way. In S. Vertovec and R. Cohen (eds), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context, and Practice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 227–239.
Jackson, P. W. (1968) *Life in Classrooms* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston).
Kant, I. (1963) Perpetual peace. In I. Kant, *On History,* ed. L. W. Beck, trans L. W. Beck, R. E. Anchor and E. L. Fackenheim (Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merrill), 85–135.
Kant, I. (1988) *Logic,* trans. R. S. Hartman and W. Schwarz (New York: Dover).
Kleingeld, P. (1999) Six varieties of cosmopolitanism in late eighteenth-century Germany. *Journal of the History of Ideas,* 60(3), 505–524.

Kleingeld, P. and Brown, E. (2006) Cosmopolitanism. In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available online at: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/, accessed 20 December 2007.
Kraye, J. (ed.) (1996) *The Cambridge Companion to Renaissance Humanism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Kristeva, J. (1993) *Nations without Nationalism*, trans. L. S. Roudiez (New York: Columbia University Press).
Laverty, M. (2007) *Iris Murdoch's Ethics: A Consideration of her Romantic Vision* (London: Continuum).
Lear, J. (2006) *Radical Hope: Ethics in the Face of Cultural Devastation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
Long, A. A. (2006) *From Epicurus to Epictetus: Studies in Hellenistic and Roman Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
Lu, C. (2000) The one and many faces of cosmopolitanism. *The Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8(2), 244–267.
Maine, C. E. (1961) *The Mind of Mr Soames* (London: Hodder & Stoughton).
Malcomson, S. L. (1998) The varieties of cosmopolitan experience. In P. Cheah and B. Robbins (eds), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press), 233–245.
McCarthy, T. (1999) On reconciling cosmopolitan unity and national diversity. *Public Culture*, 11(1), 175–208.
Murdoch, I. (1970) *The Sovereignty of Good* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).
Muthu, S. (2003) *Enlightenment Against Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
Noddings, N. (ed.) (2005) *Educating Citizens for Global Awareness* (New York: Teachers College Press).
Nussbaum, M. C. (1994) *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
Nussbaum, M. C. (1997a) *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
Nussbaum, M. C. (1997b) Kant and cosmopolitanism. In J. Bohman and M. Lutz-Bachmann (eds), *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), 25–57.
Oakeshott, M. (1989) *The Voice of Liberal Learning: Michael Oakeshott on Education*, ed. T. Fuller (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
Papastephanou, M. (2005) Globalisation, globalism and cosmopolitanism as an educational ideal. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37(4), 533–551.
Parker, W. C., Ninomiya, A. and Cogan, J. (1999) Educating 'world citizens': toward multinational curriculum development. *American Educational Research Journal*, 36(2), 117–145.
Pinar, W. F. (ed.) (2003) *International Handbook of Curriculum Research* (Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum).
Popkewitz, T. S., Olsson, U. and Petersson, K. (2006) The learning society, the unfinished cosmopolitan, and governing education, public health and crime prevention at the beginning of the twenty-first century. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 38(4), 431–449.
Putnam, H. (2002) Must we choose between patriotism and universal reason? In M. C. Nussbaum, *For Love of Country?*, ed. J. Cohen (Boston: Beacon Press), 91–97.
Reydams-Schils, G. (2005) *The Roman Stoics: Self, Responsibility, and Affection* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
Rizvi, F. (2005) Identity, culture and cosmopolitan futures. *Higher Education Policy*, 18(4), 331–339.
Rohrs, H. and Lenhart, V. (eds) (1995) *Progressive Education Across the Continents* (New York: Peter Lang).
Rosenblatt, L. M. (1978) *The Reader, the Text, the Poem: The Transactional Theory of the Literary Work* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press).
Roth, K. (2006) Deliberation in national and post-national education. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38(5), 569–589.
Scarry, E. (1998) The difficulty of imagining other persons. In E. Weiner (ed.), *The Handbook of Interethnic Coexistence* (New York: Continuum), 40–62.

Scheffler, S. (2001) *Boundaries and Allegiances: Problems of Justice and Responsibility in Liberal Thought* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Schlereth, T. J. (1977) *The Cosmopolitan Ideal in Enlightenment Thought: Its Form and Function in the Ideas of Franklin, Hume, and Voltaire, 1694–1790* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press).
Schofield, M. (1991) *The Stoic Idea of the City* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Sen, A. (1999) *Development as Freedom* (New York: Knopf).
Sen, A. (2006) *Identity and Violence: The Illusion of Destiny* (New York: W. W. Norton).
Skolimowski, H. D. (2003) Cosmocracy: as the next stage in the development of democracy. *World Affairs: The Journal of International Issues,* 7(2), 142–160.
Smith, G. A. and Williams, D. R. (eds) (1999) *Ecological Education in Action: On Weaving Education, Culture, and the Environment* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press).
Snyder, J., Bolin, F. and Zumwalt, K. (1992) Curriculum implementation. In P. W. Jackson (ed.), *The Handbook of Research on Curriculum* (New York: Macmillan), 402–435.
Tan, K.-C. (2004) *Justice Without Borders: Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism and Patriotism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Tully, J. (1995) *Strange Multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an Age of Diversity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Waldron, J. (2000) What is cosmopolitan? *The Journal of Political Philosophy,* 8(2), 227–243.
Waldron, J. (2003) Teaching cosmopolitan right. In K. McDonough and W. Feinberg (eds), *Education and Citizenship in Liberal-Democratic Societies: Teaching for Cosmopolitan Values and Collective Identities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 23–55.
Zembylas, M. (2002) The global, the local, and the science curriculum: a struggle for balance in Cyprus. *International Journal of Science Education,* 24(5), 499–519.