

## Cosmopolitan education

Noah W. Sobe

---

Education provides one of the best arenas for examining the articulation of actually existing cosmopolitanisms with cosmopolitanism as a normative moral and/or political ideal. Schools are, after all, places where trained professionals struggle daily to impart, inscribe and actualize in their charges various visions of the proper individual and the good society. The distinction between cosmopolitanism as it is socially practiced and cosmopolitanism as a normative ideal has become increasingly commonplace in the emerging field of cosmopolitan studies. And, it is in educational institutions that we see one of the clearest relationships between the two. Through its curricula, physical spaces and operations, the modern school is one of the central (and consequential) sites for the enunciation of cosmopolitan ideals. It is also one of the key sites where cosmopolitan stances, dispositions and habits might be learned. And, if we look at cosmopolitanism learning from a different angle, it is also possible that the school is a site where individuals may experience the 'moments of openness' (Delanty 2006: 27) that can lead to profound cosmopolitan transformations.

The topic of cosmopolitan education has been a longstanding concern among philosophers of education. In recent years it has received increased attention, both in the wake of Martha Nussbaum's catalyzing work, and in connection with a widely felt need to better understand 'globalization' and determine how educators ought to respond to the realities, dangers, and promises of the brave new worlds we seem increasingly convinced that we inhabit. Over the past decade there has been an extensive conversation among philosophers of education and other education scholars on exactly how we should balance ethical and humanitarian universalisms with the demands of culture, identity, and group membership – not to mention the concerns of liberalism within pluralistic societies. This chapter does not exhaustively examine the contours of this ongoing philosophical discussion (for recent reviews of this literature, see Hansen 2009, Waks 2009); rather, I take more of a historical and sociological approach with the intent of grappling with the various ways that cosmopolitan education has manifested itself as a social project in different cultural settings at different historical moments. Though I will discuss several case studies, this chapter does not present a comprehensive overview of all the variants of cosmopolitan education. Rather, it aims to present an examination of the various issues, complexities, and controversies that emerge when cosmopolitanism and education intersect.

To understand the cosmopolitan intentions and outcomes of modern schooling it is necessary to understand the school as a site of cultural production as well as social reproduction. In the

social sciences, education systems are too often treated as an afterthought: what happens in schools is simplistically (and erroneously) seen as the derivative enactment of arrangements and processes that have already been ironed out in other domains. Instead, it is absolutely critical to examine the complex, unstable and emergent mechanisms of control and systems of coordination that are embedded in, propagated through, and contested across schools and other educational sites.

The first part of this chapter expands on the ways that the institution of modern schooling has historically been intertwined with cosmopolitan imperatives, particularly those relating to self-formation and the governance of individuals and populations. While the development of education systems around the globe is integrally connected with nation-building and the deliberate cultivation of national loyalties and identities, it is important not to lose sight of the ways that – similar to what Benedict Anderson (1991) has argued with regard to the seriality and ‘grammar’ of the nation form – state-organized compulsory formal schooling has become a strikingly standardized technique in the nation-state repertoire. Like other scholars (Pollock *et al.* 2000), I maintain that cosmopolitan worldliness can take vernacular form and have distinctive manifestations in different settings. The second part of the chapter expands on this and discusses cosmopolitanism as a form of governmentality, as one of the regulative strategies through which schools produce desirable subjectivities and proper forms of social organization. As I discuss, cosmopolitan stances and practices also produce their abject opposites, the individuals and groups whose competencies and commitments are suspect and who can become trapped in circuits of exclusion. In the third and final part of the chapter I explore in greater detail the global spread, in recent decades, of civic education curricula. Education researchers differ on the question of whether we see cosmopolitan ideals inspiring this curricular shift and on the question of whether actually-existing cosmopolitan practices and habituses actually do ensue. Nonetheless – or perhaps for this very reason – the ‘globalization’ of civic education curricula provide an excellent test case for analyzing claims that a ‘world polity’ has formed and for examining the possibility that schools around the globe are increasingly educating towards a universal cosmopolitan moral culture. Studies of schooling stand to play a vital role in the emerging field of cosmopolitan studies. As Delanty (2006: 41) notes, ‘without a learning process ... it makes little sense in calling something cosmopolitan’. Schools do not have exclusive purchase on learning, but they do – as this chapter discusses – contribute greatly to individuals learning to be at home in and make homes in the world.

### Schooling and worldliness

In liberal democratic theory, as espoused for example in Amy Gutmann’s (1999) work, the politics of education are conceptualized as unfolding in a public sphere where numerous interests and agendas compete. Notwithstanding the very real and consequential ways that a variety of political projects intersect and confront one another around issues related to educational policy and practice, it is important not to overlook the ways that modern schooling historically developed as a governmental project. Nor should we gloss over the ways that governmental concerns saturate the techniques and operations of educational institutions broadly conceived. National school systems in the West emerged in the wake of the European religious wars of the seventeenth century and the political reconfigurations that followed. As Koselleck (1985) argues, the idea of monarchical ‘rule by divine right’ as well as the practice of rulers being able to determine the authorized local religious denomination (under which Europe had seen such extraordinary carnage and civil disorder) were eclipsed as political thought began to center on the security and survival of the state itself. The state was the ‘leviathan’ that could end religious

slaughter and impose civil peace. Modern school systems emerged as a key means by which governments could administer and enhance that most precious state resource: the population (Hunter 1994). Education for state loyalty and social citizenship was intended to quash violent sectarian schisms. Similarly, the educational objectives of tolerance, self-responsibility, and self-control served the governmental interest in bolstering civic order and social stability. To the extent that schooling was harnessed to the cause of 'a universal peace', this was largely for intra-national as opposed to international peace.

Foucault usefully reminds us that it is not just 'the state' that assumes responsibility for the maintenance of social order: across the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries governmental reasoning became increasingly diffused, delegated to, and taken up by multiple actors and institutions. As this occurred, schools adopted the pastoral techniques elaborated by Christian religious orders. Yet, as Hunter (1994: 149) argues, education systems remained 'positively and irrevocably bureaucratic and disciplinary'. He goes on to say that,

This does not mean that the school system has been inimical to the goal of self-realization. On the contrary, one of the most distinctive characteristics of the modern 'popular' school – the one that makes it so difficult for critical theorists to understand – is that, in adapting the milieu of pastoral guidance to its own uses, State schooling made self-realization into a central disciplinary objective.

(Hunter 1994: 149)

One of the most iconic representations of Western education and the disciplinarization of self-realization can be found at the beginning of Jan Amos Comenius' 1658 *Orbis Pictus*. The book begins with an 'Invitation' (*Invitatio*) and a woodcut engraving of a boy and a teacher outdoors, engaged in conversation. A ray of sunlight crosses behind the teacher whose hand points both upward and outwards across the landscape. Comenius saw his textbook being used in the home and in classrooms, but he structured his 'World in Pictures' as a journey wherein an enlightened, trustworthy teacher guided the child across the world and its objects. Monitored/planned interactions between self and world are at the heart of the Western notion of curriculum. The metaphor of learning as travel has become deeply inscribed in the operations and self-descriptions of educational institutions (even if only as metaphor and not as actual practice). To see education as concerned with articulating relationships between self, other and world is to recognize that there is ripe cosmopolitan potential in the modern school. It is also to recognize that cosmopolitan potentialities are not necessarily a counter-current to the governmental, administrative and disciplinary logic of schooling. The two might run in opposition to one another, or they might flow together.

If, as I have argued, the interplay between self, other and world is deeply inscribed into modern education systems, we still have to attach a set of conditions or definitions in order to identify which of these transactions are *cosmopolitan* transactions. In my concluding section I take up the question of how schools (might) relate to an institutionalized system of cosmopolitan governance; here my focus is on 'cosmopolitanism as a way of being in the world' (Appiah 2006; Waldron 1995). To recognize these forms of cosmopolitanism in educational settings I have proposed in a previous publication (Sobe 2009) that when examining identity formation, researchers consider cosmopolitanism as self-definition in relation to and in relationship with the world beyond one's immediate local conditions. When considering this being-in-the-world as a form of political action, cosmopolitanism can be seen as a strategy for locating self and community betwixt and between local and global formations.

## Cosmopolitan governmentality, vernaculars and schooling

As noted above, Martha Nussbaum (1996) has perhaps made the most significant contributions to translating normative concepts of cosmopolitanism as 'allegiance to humanity' into concrete educational recommendations and visions. Nussbaum has proposed curricular projects based in the humanities that are designed to nurture ideal, cosmopolitan citizens who, as such, can rise above their national patriotisms. Her challenge has been taken up by a number of educational theorists (e.g. Donald 2007; Hansen 2008; Papastephanou 2002, 2005). It has also been subject to a strong debate and revision by educational theorists who find Appiah's notions of 'rooted cosmopolitanism' a more desirable, or more viable, alternative to Nussbaum's universalizing proposals. I will discuss the educational circulation of 'rooted cosmopolitanisms' later in this section. First, however, I want to home in on the ways that Nussbaum's cosmopolitan education follows in the Kantian tradition of articulating a 'regulative ideal' – a governing principle that sets forth an absolute ideal of the good (Stoddard and Cornwell 2003). Vitaly important in this are the exclusions and disqualifications that ensue for those who fail to properly embody or live up to this ideal.

Over the past several years, this 'regulative' dimension of cosmopolitanism has been seized upon by a group of educational researchers who work in a Foucault-infused post-structuralist tradition and analyze cosmopolitan educational imperatives as a form of 'governmentality' (e.g., Hultqvist and Dahlberg 2001; Popkewitz *et al.* 2006; Sobe 2008). At issue here are the ways that techniques of governing become enshrined in modes of thought. To examine cosmopolitanism as a form of governmentality is to examine a set of practices and rationalities that far exceeds the boundaries of institutions and political philosophies and extends well into the social administration of individuals, families and communities. Popkewitz *et al.* (2006) state that they

are interested in the rules and standards of conduct in producing the self-governing actors who are simultaneously responsible for the social progress and for ... personal fulfillment.

(433)

They then propose that

Cosmopolitanism ... provides a way to examine the system of reason that regulates, differentiates and divides the acts and participation of the child in the name of universal human principles such as the Learning Society.

(433)

For these scholars, then, cosmopolitanism goes beyond attachment to things non-local; it references the principles and norms that are bound up in how children are taught to think about humanness in local and global dimensions.

To illustrate cosmopolitan governmentalities, and also to enrich our understanding of the 'vernacular' quality that cosmopolitan projects have, I will briefly discuss two instances of the culturally and historically varying ways that schools seek to produce a cosmopolitan child-as-future-citizen. The first draws on my own historical scholarship on the particular notions of worldliness and extra-local forms of self-identification that Yugoslav schools sought to produce in the 1920s and 1930s. The second example is of the 'new cosmopolitanism' that is being expressed in contemporary American educational reform through the vision of – and the work done to create – 'lifelong learners'. Here I rely on scholarship by Popkewitz, who proposes that the 'universalization' of this new mode of cosmopolitanism creates a schema for exclusion and disablement even as it valorizes inclusiveness and participation.

Yugoslavia came into existence with the territorial reorganizations that accompanied the end of the First World War. With political sovereignty came the mandate to fabricate 'Yugoslavs' through a unified school system. The Yugoslav project was frequently attached to a larger project of Slavic integration and notions of Pan-Slavism circulated widely. In a recent book (Sobe 2008) I have argued that for Yugoslavs in the interwar era, the 'Slavic world' served as a space for cosmopolitan identity and political work to such an extent that it is appropriate to discuss 'Slavic cosmopolitanism' as one of the important regulative ideals circulating in and through the educational system.

In the 1920s and 1930s Czechoslovakia was the most important reference point for Yugoslavs actively seeking to modernize social institutions and cultural behaviors. Both Yugoslav teachers and students traveled to Czechoslovakia in significant numbers, 'importing' lessons and bringing examples back home that – on the basis of notions about Slavic kinship, coequality, and reciprocity – were seen as uniquely appropriate for the Yugoslav context/project (Sobe 2005a, 2005b, 2006). This practice of using Czechoslovakia to think about 'modern' modes of living and social organization extended into the Yugoslav school through curricular mandates that valorized Czechoslovak 'heroes' such as Jan Hus and Tomas Masaryk. Yugoslav children were also to take part in celebrating Czechoslovak national holidays and to participate in a form of Slavic gymnastics ('sokoling') that had been pioneered in Prague. Yugoslavia's attraction to Czechoslovakia was part of envisioning a Slavic world and forms of belonging that exceeded and surpassed local conditions and local constraints. In an uncanny presaging of the educational harmonization efforts underway in Europe at present, in 1927 a Yugoslav–Czechoslovak inter-parliamentary commission proposed that school laws and regulations in the two countries be coordinated, diplomas be recognized, and Czechoslovak and Yugoslav students be permitted to study freely in one another's countries at both the tertiary and secondary level (Sobe 2008). To be sure, this vision of Slavic integration and cooperation was never realized to anyway near the extent called for. Nonetheless, it helps to illustrate the 'cosmopolitical' significance of interwar Yugoslavia's 'Slavic' interests and activities.

The Slavic cosmopolitanism that can be seen in Yugoslavia in the 1920s and 1930s is very clearly a vernacular cosmopolitanism. It was, to use Arjun Appadurai's words, 'a world-generating optic' (2000: 8). While the world that was being envisioned did not encompass the terrestrial globe, it did propose its own form of universal reason and locate self and community betwixt and between local and global formations. And, it did specify a host of regulative behaviors, dispositions and modes of thought that were considered 'proper' for the ideal Yugoslav. At the same time, those who were unable to properly attach themselves to this social world in formation were disqualified, excluded and pathologized as outside the realm of the reasonable. In interwar Yugoslavia, the list of those who were deemed not 'worldly' enough could, for example, include strident ethnic nationalists, Roma, and the tradition-bounded peasantry.

Looking at a substantially different setting, Popkewitz (2008) discusses the 'new cosmopolitanism' that has begun to emerge in the United States at the beginning of the twenty-first century. This new cosmopolitan 'is spoken about in universal terms' and is manifested as 'the lifelong learner who acts as the global citizen' (112). In Popkewitz's account, this new cosmopolitan persona is saturated with myths of participation and inclusion that help to undergird its pretensions to universality. He points to the rhetoric of the 2002 'No Child Left Behind' (NCLB) legislation as creating 'a space of mystical participation in a common good that, in fact, differentiates and divides' (112). In Popkewitz's argument, the 'inclusionary project' that is carried out through NCLB and numerous other contemporary American educational initiatives postulates an 'all children' that is much more about sameness than diversity or difference. The contemporary American child-as-future-citizen is to live in the mode of the lifelong learner

who possesses 'self-responsibility in making choices, problem solves, works collaboratively, and continually innovates' (163). This mode of life is to be universalized and made open to 'all'. Yet, simultaneously, it becomes the standard against which 'all children' are measured, classified, and differentiated.

The normalization of the characteristics of the 'lifelong learner' leads Popkewitz (2008) to refer to the regulative cosmopolitanism that is presently entering the US educational arena as one calibrated on producing an 'unfinished cosmopolitan'. The new cosmopolitanism is 'unfinished' because 'the lifelong learner lives in a continuous course of personal responsibility', and inhabits a world where 'life is now thought of in segments of time where quick actions are required to meet the challenges of new conditions and where nothing seems solid or stable' (119). This contrasts with the cosmopolitan vernacular that Popkewitz describes as prevalent in US educational circles a century earlier. Early twentieth-century American cosmopolitanism engineered the child to fix problems and reduce uncertainty in the name of democratic ideals and within the social public sphere. In the early twenty-first century, the problem-solving individual has the capacity and responsibility to work across multiple domains and within multiple kinds of 'communities', none of which have clear boundaries.

Contemporary 'unfinished' American cosmopolitanism starkly contrasts with this earlier American cosmopolitanism in its dividing and differentiating mechanisms. At the turn of the twentieth century, individuals were organized in relation to a social whole that gained its definition because of a given 'national ethos' or on the basis of so-called 'civilizational' values. These formed the criteria that qualified and disqualified certain kinds of people. Increasingly, according to Popkewitz (2008), divisions occur at a different level. Comparisons are less and less made among people in terms of where they stand in relation to a quintessential 'American-ness' or in relation to 'American values'. Rather, Popkewitz argues that 'comparativeness operates at the micro level, related to the particular lifestyles, choices, and problem solving organized in collaborative communities' (113). Here it is evident that in Popkewitz's scholarship 'cosmopolitanism' captures a process of the globalization and universalization of categories and forms of reason, in addition to indexing particular ways of being in the world.

To conclude this section, it bears mention that in the post-9/11 environment of the US, cosmopolitan governmentalities have shifted in some intriguing ways. Katharyne Mitchell (2007) has pointed out that former US president George W. Bush embraced international education programs within a cosmopolitan idiom that emphasized enhancing the abilities of Americans to communicate with and understand others who are different from themselves. With programs such as the National Strategic Language Initiative, we are seeing the emergence of what Mitchell usefully terms 'strategic cosmopolitanism' – or 'cosmopolitan learning in service of the national interest' (2007: 709). Strategic cosmopolitanism extends beyond the kinds of 'global competencies' that the US Department of Defense prizes and is in desperate need of. It also intersects with a neoliberal vision where learning about others is less for purposes of multicultural tolerance and more motivated by ideas of 'global competitiveness' and the need to fashion individuals who can rapidly adapt to shifting national and international contexts (Mitchell 2003). Here, as in the previous examples of cosmopolitan governmentalities, we encounter regulative ideals that specify proper behaviors for individuals, though all in relation to social administration and normative visions of the good society.

### Global civic education and cosmopolitan governance

Formally organized schooling is today an omnipresent feature of human societies across the globe. To explain the global spread of schooling, a set of historians and sociologists of education have

drawn on the neoinstitutionalist 'world culture' theory work of John Meyer and others. Positing that it is possible to discuss culture in terms larger than states or nations, world polity analyses typically concentrate on the institutional features of transnational developments (Boli and Thomas 1997). The polity itself is conceptualized as a network of nation-states, international organizations and societies, all of which are in varying degrees informed by world cultural models. These models encompass notions such as the idea of agentic actorhood (Meyer and Jepperson 2000) as well as the hegemony of science as a master technique/principle (Drori *et al.* 2003). Arguments have been advanced that there is greater convergence in the ways that educational aims are specified by national governments around the globe (Fiala 2006) – even as these same societies diverge dramatically in terms of religious orientations or in terms of their political stability. As Rosenmund (2006: 188) puts it, education has uniformly become 'a means for human beings to cope with change and act as responsible citizens', and he adds that education is one of the arenas where societies increasingly articulate their commitments to developing wealth, democracy and equity. Even if there is, in practice, a 'decoupling' from or 'loose coupling' with world cultural models, *institutional isomorphism*, according to this line of scholarship, is an accelerating global educational trend.

This raises a set of intriguing questions concerning the global spread of civic education models. Across the nineteenth century and for much of the twentieth, one of the paradigmatic 'serialized' features of national education systems was a deep curricular immersion in specific national imaginaries (national histories, national literatures, etc.). Since World War II, as the bulk of the neoinstitutionalist scholarship would have it (Chabbot 2003; Meyer *et al.* 1997), winds have begun to blow in a different direction. Human rights and competencies-based (as opposed to patriotism-based) civic education curricula are increasingly becoming the global – or world-cultural – norm. Not to be overlooked in this, is the role played by international comparative assessments of civic education curricula (Torney-Purta *et al.* 2001) and the standardizing pressures that such assessments generate. Hunter and Meredyth note that the various international advocates of civic education tend to exhibit,

a telling mixture of statist concerns for security and moral-philosophical concerns about the prerequisites of a just society. Drawing on a Rawlsian philosophical-liberal vision of *modus vivendi*, global civic education is seen as a social means to build a universal cosmopolitan moral culture.

(2000: 1466)

If we accept the contention that there is isomorphic convergence in how schooling systems around the globe are tackling civic education, it is worthwhile to ask whether indeed schools are on track to produce globally an actual universal cosmopolitan moral culture.

Researchers trying to get a synoptic picture of how schools actually operate today have argued, for example, that human rights education is increasingly becoming a global norm (Ramirez *et al.* 2006; Suárez 2008). A similar trend has been documented in elementary and secondary history teaching (Schissler and Soysal 2005) where 'teaching beyond the national narrative' increasingly appears as a professional best-practice. In Europe, national histories are increasingly being recast within a 'European' framework; and in numerous sites around the globe, we increasingly see the incorporation of the national into a story (or multiple stories) of world developments. Based on a study of 465 history, civics and social studies textbooks, all published since 1970 and representing 69 countries in all, Bromley (2009) has identified the clear rise of an emphasis on universalism and diversity. One can ask where the nation appears in all of this, and in and of themselves these research findings do not mean that the agenda-setting

power of national governments has dimmed (in the slightest). More to the point is that in education – as Saskia Sassen (2001, 2008) has noted to be the case in other domains – national actors may well be increasingly gearing their actions to non-national considerations.

As Bromley (2009) discusses, some scholars (e.g. Papastephanou [2002] and Gunesh [2004]) maintain that normative cosmopolitan education *qua* normative cosmopolitan education logically needs to be based on the specification of cosmopolitan outcomes. Thus, regardless of the cosmopolitan ‘tendencies’ revealed by empirical investigations, to be accepted as such they would need to be backed by intentional cosmopolitan objectives. Nonetheless, seen from a different angle, the most important point (as I stated at the outset of this chapter) is simply that schools are sites par excellence where the expression of normative cosmopolitan ideals intersects with the production of actually-existing cosmopolitanisms. Both one and the other, however, can be productively viewed as instances of governance – where work is done to inscribe a specific *governmentality* in individuals and to configure societies according to a particular vision of the good. I take the position that this is neither good nor bad; it is simply inescapable. As the field of cosmopolitan studies continues to develop, cosmopolitan education should prove to be a vital research area. In addition to furnishing rich material for examining how individuals learn to be at home in and make homes in the world, schooling needs to be examined in relation to processes of abjection and the production of cosmopolitanism’s others. If cosmopolitan education continues to go global, we might expect circuits of inclusion and exclusion to also operate in an increasingly complex and transnational manner.

## References

- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Revised ed. London: Verso.
- Appadurai, A. (2000) ‘Grassroots Globalization’, *Public Culture* 12 (1): 1–19.
- Appiah, K. A. (2006) *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*, New York: W. W. Norton.
- Boli, J. and Thomas, G. M. (1997) ‘World Culture in the World Polity’, *American Sociological Review* 62 (2): 171–90.
- Bromley, P. (2009) ‘Cosmopolitanism in Civic Education: Exploring Cross-National Trends, 1970–2008’, *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 12 (1): 33–44.
- Chabbot, C. (2003) *Constructing Education for Development: International Organizations and Education for All*, New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Delanty, G. (2006) ‘The Cosmopolitan Imagination: Critical Cosmopolitanism and Social Theory’, *British Journal of Sociology* 57 (1): 25–47.
- Donald, J. (2007) ‘Internationalisation, Diversity and the Humanities Curriculum: Cosmopolitanism and Multiculturalism Revisited’, *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 41 (3): 289–308.
- Drori, G. S., Meyer, J. W., Ramirez, F. O. and Schofer, E. (eds) (2003) *Science in the World Polity: Institutionalization and Globalization*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fiala, R. (2006) ‘Educational Ideology and the School Curriculum’, in A. Benavot and C. Braslavsky (eds) *School Knowledge in Comparative and Historical Perspective: Changing Curricula in Primary and Secondary Education*, Hong Kong: CERC, 15–34.
- Gunesh, 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): 251–75.
- Gutmann, A. (1999) *Democratic education*, rev. ed., Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hansen, D. (2008) ‘Curriculum and the Idea of a Cosmopolitan Inheritance’, *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 40 (3): 289–312.
- (2009) ‘Chasing Butterflies Without a Net: Interpreting Cosmopolitanism’, *Studies in Philosophy and Education* 29 (2): 151–66.
- Hultqvist, K. and Dahlberg, G. (2001) *Governing the Child in the New Millennium*, New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Hunter, I. (1994) *Rethinking the School: Subjectivity, Bureaucracy, Criticism*, New York: St. Martin’s Press.



- Hunter, I. and Meredyth, D. (2000) 'Popular Sovereignty and Civic Education', *American Behavioral Scientist* 43 (9): 1462–85.
- Koselleck, R. (1985) *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Meyer, J. W., Boli, J., Thomas, G. M. and Ramirez, F. O. (1997) 'World Society and the Nation State', *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (1): 144–81.
- Meyer, J. W. and Jepperson, R. L. (2000) 'The 'Actors' of Modern Society: The Cultural Construction of Social Agency', *Sociological Theory* 18 (1): 100–120.
- Mitchell, K. (2003) 'Educating the National Citizen in Neoliberal Times: From the Multicultural Self to the Strategic Cosmopolitan', *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 28: 387–403.
- (2007) 'Geographies of Identity: The Intimate Cosmopolitan', *Progress in Human Geography* 31 (5): 706–20.
- Nussbaum, M. (1996) 'Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism', in J. Cohen (ed.) *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Papastephanou, M. (2002) 'Arrows Not Yet Fired: Cultivating Cosmopolitanism Through Education', *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 36 (1): 69–87.
- (2005) 'Globalisation, Globalism and Cosmopolitanism as an Educational Ideal', *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 37 (4): 533–51.
- Pollock, S., Bhabha, H. K., Breckenridge, C. A. and Chakrabarty, D. (2000) 'Cosmopolitanism', *Public Culture* 12 (3): 577–89.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (2008) *Cosmopolitanism and the Age of School Reform: Science, Education, and Making Society by Making the Child*, New York: Routledge.
- 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): 431–49.
- Ramirez, F. O., Suárez, D. and Meyer, J. W. (2006) 'The Worldwide Rise of Human Rights Education, 1950–2005', in A. Benavot and C. Braslavsky (eds) *School Knowledge in Comparative and Historical Perspective: Changing Curricula in Primary and Secondary Education*, Hong Kong: CERC, 25–52.
- Rosenmund, M. (2006) 'The Current Discourse on Curriculum Change: A Comprehensive Analysis of National Reports on Education', in A. Benavot and C. Braslavsky (eds) *School Knowledge in Comparative and Historical Perspective: Changing Curricula in Primary and Secondary Education*, Hong Kong: CERC, 173–94.
- Sassen, S. (2001) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (2008) 'Theoretical and Empirical Elements in the Study of Globalization', in I. Rossi (ed.) *Frontiers of Globalization Research: Theoretical and Methodological Approaches*, New York: Springer, 287–306.
- Schissler, H. and Soysal, Y. N. (2005) *The Nation, Europe, and the World: Textbooks and Curricula in Transition*, New York: Berghahn Books.
- Sober, N. W. (2005a) 'Cultivating a 'Slavic modern': Yugoslav Beekeeping, Schooling and Travel in the 1920s and 1930s', *Paedagogica Historica* 41 (1+2): 145–60.
- (2005b) 'Balkanizing John Dewey', in T. S. Popkewitz (ed.) *Modernities, Inventing the Modern Self and Education: The Traveling of Pragmatism and John Dewey*, New York: Palgrave, 135–52.
- (2006) 'Slavic Emotion and Vernacular Cosmopolitanism: Yugoslav Travels to Czechoslovakia in the 1920s and 1930s', in A. E. Gorsuch and D. P. Koenker (eds) *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 82–96.
- (2008) *Provincializing the Worldly Citizen: Yugoslav Student and Teacher Travel and Slavic Cosmopolitanism in the Interwar Era*, New York: Peter Lang.
- (2009) 'Rethinking "Cosmopolitanism" as an Analytic for the Comparative Study of Globalization and Education', *Current Issues in Comparative Education* 12 (1): 6–13.
- Stoddard, E. W. and Cornwell, G. H. (2003) 'Peripheral Visions: Towards a Geoethics of Citizenship', *Liberal Education* 89 (3): 44–51.
- Suárez, D. (2008) 'Rewriting Citizenship? Civic Education in Costa Rica and Argentina', *Comparative Education* 44 (4): 485–503.
- Torney-Purta, J., Schwillie, J. and Amadeo, J. (2001) *Citizenship and Education in Twenty-eight Countries*, Amsterdam: IEA.
- Waks, L. J. (2009) 'Reason and Culture in Cosmopolitan Education', *Educational Theory* 59 (5): 589–604.
- Waldron, J. (1995) 'Minority Cultures and the Cosmopolitan Alternative', in W. Kymlicka (ed.) *The Rights of Minority Cultures*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 93–122.