

Cosmopolitanism and Education: A View From the Ground

DAVID T. HANSEN

Teachers College, Columbia University

Background/ Context: *In recent years, scholars the world over in both the social sciences and humanities have reanimated the ancient idea of cosmopolitanism. They discern in the idea ways in which people today can respond creatively to rapid social, political, cultural, and economic transformations. Scholars in this burgeoning field have examined issues involving cultural hybridity, global citizenship, environmental justice, economic redistribution, and more. In the article, I examine from a philosophical perspective how a cosmopolitan-minded education can assist people in cultivating thoughtful receptivity to the new and reflective loyalty to the known.*

Purpose/ Objective/ Research Question/ Focus of Study: *Philosophical work has begun on possible relations between cosmopolitanism and education. However, there are virtually no published studies that deploy a systematic cosmopolitan frame of analysis in conjunction with qualitative or quantitative research. This article seeks to encourage such research by elucidating a distinctive conception of cosmopolitanism rooted in one of its long-standing strands. This strand is characterized as cosmopolitanism on the ground, and it features what has been called “philosophy as the art of living” and “actually existing cosmopolitanism.”*

Research Design: *The article is a philosophical investigation that builds an argument using the techniques of conceptual analysis, comparison, contrast, analogy, metaphor, illustration, and exegesis of texts.*

Conclusions/ Recommendations: *The long-standing strand of cosmopolitanism on the ground generates several key elements of a philosophy of cosmopolitan-minded education. These elements are (1) a recognition of the importance of local socialization as making possible education itself, (2) the recognition that a cosmopolitan outlook triggers a critical rather than idolatrous or negligent attitude toward tradition and custom, (3) the recognition that curriculum across all subjects can be understood as a cosmopolitan inheritance,*

and (4) the recognition that many teachers constitute an already existing cosmopolitan community and can build on their shared purposes to enhance educational practice the world over.

INTRODUCTION: THE VARIETIES OF COSMOPOLITANISM

In recent years, scholars the world over have reanimated the ancient idea of cosmopolitanism. They discern in the idea ways in which people can respond creatively to shifting patterns of human interaction generated by migration, rapid economic and political change, and new communication technologies. They perceive in cosmopolitanism a vibrant alternative to forces in globalization that uproot established ways of life, entrench consumerist individualism, undermine notions of collective responsibility, and degrade the physical environment. Their interest also reflects the fact that the celebrated end of the Cold War, which had utterly dominated international relations for 50 years, did not meliorate the human condition as so many had hoped and dreamed; rather, it unleashed new forms of intolerance and intercommunal violence. At the same time, the revived engagement with the cosmopolitan springs from excitement about new modes of human cooperation made possible by expanded means of mobility, the aforementioned communication technologies, proliferating nongovernmental organizations, alternative globalization movements, and the like.

The concept of cosmopolitanism has a lively, convoluted, sometimes contradictory history. In some versions, it foregrounds human similarities as a springboard to solidarity. In others, cosmopolitanism presumes that authentic solidarity depends on acknowledging the unfathomable variability in human beings and their communities. In some iterations, cosmopolitanism broadcasts universals and a priori images of human nature. In others, its universal gestures are provisional and emergent from human interaction and dialogue, rather than asserted as a metaphysical foundation. Some forms of cosmopolitanism articulate a universal morality. Others, including what some have called “rooted” cosmopolitanism, defend locally derived moral responsibilities and argue that their validity is not derivative from or tributary to universal claims.¹

Today’s wide-ranging literature on the topic mirrors these contrasting perspectives. Some scholars examine goals such as global citizenship and the establishment of a genuine worldwide political community. Others articulate moral ideals such as a global culture of open-mindedness and mutual regard. Still others focus on economic aims such as an equitable distribution of resources and a worldwide commitment to

environmental health. Many attend to cultural issues such as understanding and appreciating new, hybrid social configurations emblematic of the intensifying intermingling of people, ideas, and activities in many parts of the world. The philosophers Pauline Kleingeld and Eric Brown usefully review these strands under the headings of political, moral, cultural, and economic cosmopolitanism (Kleingeld & Brown, 2006).²

Educational scholars have begun to attend to cosmopolitan ideas, especially from a cultural and political perspective. They have shown how cosmopolitanism raises new questions about civic and citizenship education and, in general, about how education can equip people to negotiate justly and peacefully cultural, religious, ethnic, and other differences (Costa, 2005; Gregoriou, 2004; McDonough, 1997; McDonough & Feinberg, 2003; Papastephanou, 2002, 2005; Saito, 2008; Snauwaert, 2002; Todd, 2008). These contributions are noteworthy. Although research on cosmopolitanism in the humanities and social sciences has proliferated, with few exceptions scholars in these domains have not addressed its possible consequences for educational theory and practice.³ A helpful bibliography of recent research on cosmopolitanism by Ulrich Beck and Natan Sznaider (2006) contains not one entry devoted directly to education. Thus, as colleagues working on education and cosmopolitanism have begun to show, there exists here a dynamic and, in my view, fascinating and generative terrain for educational scholars to explore.⁴

Although the macro-political focus in much of the current work on cosmopolitanism is necessary and valuable, in this article I adopt a different point of departure. The route I will take has ramifications for democratic communication and organic, evolving solidarities, a thesis that I plan to take up elsewhere (cf. Kurasawa, 2004). However, I want to acknowledge an important side of the human context whose obviousness is matched by how taken for granted it is. Human life is not merely a sojourn of worry, trouble, and pain. It is not solely and at all moments a struggle. It is not essentially determined by fear and loss, greed and hate, violence and destruction. The story of humanity is not “a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.”⁵ Shakespeare’s forbidding and all-too-comprehensible words notwithstanding, his very creativity belies the claim. People the world over illuminate in their everyday lives qualities that constitute reasons for being and that even the worst of historical trials have never sundered: fellowship in family, community, and friendship; arts of song, sculpture, architecture, dance, and much more; fulfillment in work and social cooperation; and the very meanings conveyed by concepts such as love, appreciation, gratitude, joy, reverence, and play.

There is nothing sentimental or precious about these bodily, visceral,

and inextinguishable qualities. Their earthy origins open a window on a strand of cosmopolitanism that I hope to show has valuable consequences for education. This strand can be characterized as cosmopolitanism from the ground up. It is a cosmopolitanism rooted in everyday life. It spotlights the familiar fact that human beings can create not just ways to tolerate differences between them but also ways to learn from one another, however modest the resulting changes in their outlooks may be. It is a cosmopolitanism that does not take sides dogmatically and yet that does not stand apart from conflict, misunderstanding, and challenge. This cosmopolitanism does not involve joining a party, a movement, or a sect. It does not entail adopting an ideological posture that ipso facto excludes others. This cosmopolitanism fuses a way of moving in the world, or a way of being, with one's everyday commitments, activities, enjoyments, and concerns. It accompanies a person but need not dominate her or his outlook.

It is true and in many respects inspiring that various figures across historical time and space have proclaimed themselves as cosmopolitan. Consider Diogenes, a Greek thinker of the 4th century B.C.E., who, as far as scholars have been able to determine, was the first person to describe himself publicly as a *kosmopolites*: a citizen of the world. Poverty-stricken, iconoclastic, and deliberately provocative in his conduct, Diogenes urged his compatriots to question hitherto unexamined custom to liberate themselves from close-mindedness and dogmatism. His speech act in declaring himself cosmopolitan fueled subsequent lines of inquiry about how people can look beyond local commitments and embrace larger horizons of concern. Consider also the remarkable cosmopolitan gestures of Mohandas Ghandi, Eleanor Roosevelt, Martin Luther King, Nelson Mandela, and numerous other well-known figures. Their words and acts shed light on why the very notion of cosmopolitanism has been around for such a long time.

Exemplars are always helpful to contemplate. They generate hope in possibilities. However, their affecting examples distort the scene if they push everyday life into the shadows. Cosmopolitanism on the ground does not require heroism. Moreover, it does not depend on wealth, privilege, and power, even though increasing resources certainly position people to adopt new activities. In what follows, I will draw on recent field-based research to document the fact that working-class people, recent immigrants, youth, and others can express a more cosmopolitan orientation than the most well-heeled and advantaged.⁶ I will also attend to philosophical perspectives by figures such as Socrates, who, despite leading a materially modest existence, manifested a cosmopolitan interest in

the world. The idea of cosmopolitanism from the ground up challenges stereotypical views of the cosmopolitan as an elite and rootless standpoint in the world.

Put another way, cosmopolitanism on the ground does not contrast with the local but can only find expression there. Each of its enactments becomes instantaneously particularized and is informed by a sense of rootedness in the world. In this outlook, it is impossible to be cosmopolitan without a sense of the local. At the same time, it is impossible to be “local,” as contrasted with being parochial or close-minded, without a cosmopolitan orientation. What characterizes cosmopolitanism from the ground up is a fusion, sometimes tenuous and tension-laden, of receptivity to the new and loyalty to the known.

This outlook, it bears reemphasizing, is not all-encompassing. Diogenes may inspire, but his way of life is not a blueprint for others to follow. Cosmopolitanism is not an identity that elbows aside other dimensions of being a person. It is phasic. It comes and goes. It finds expression in particular moments, spaces, and interactions. An analogy with another intensely debated outlook—namely, what it means to be moral—can shed light here. John Dewey (1989) observed that a sign of maturity is knowing when to raise the question of the moral—that is, knowing when to ask whether an act or proposal is just, fair, good, or worthy. To ask this question about every act or notion would drive people mad and bring life to a halt; to never ask the question would render life a horror. In likeness, from a cosmopolitan perspective, it is out of the question to try to be open at all times to everything new, or loyal at all times to everything known. The former posture dissolves life, the latter petrifies it. Cosmopolitan artfulness involves discerning how and when to express openness and loyalty in the vicissitudes of everyday life. Such artfulness constitutes an educational stance toward the world. As such, it can help form an organic basis for democratic communication that radiates from the bottom outward rather than awaiting top-down initiatives, as vital as the latter often are.

In the initial sections that follow, I offer an account of the strand of cosmopolitanism to which I have referred here. This strand features what has been called “philosophy as the art of living” and what scholars have called “actually existing cosmopolitanism” (Malcolmson, 1998; Robbins, 1998), or what I have dubbed *cosmopolitanism on the ground*. In the remainder of the article, I build on this account to sketch some core elements of a philosophy of educational cosmopolitanism. This philosophy aspires to be universal without being universalistic, to be local without being parochial, to be culturally conservationist and tradition-respecting

without being traditionalistic, to be open to learning lessons for life from other traditions and inheritances, and to esteem the individual human being without becoming individualistic.

COSMOPOLITANISM ON THE GROUND (I):
ON "THE ART OF LIVING"

The tradition of philosophy known as the art of living includes persistent inquiry in the style of what is technically called philosophical anthropology: that is, the study of images, ideas, and ideals regarding what it means to be human, juxtaposed with reflection on what many have called "the human condition." As we will see, this line of philosophical anthropology complements recent field-based anthropology (or anthropologically informed work) on cosmopolitan practices on the ground. The linkage of these two anthropologies provides a frame for thinking through questions in curriculum and pedagogy from a cosmopolitan perspective.

Among other origins, philosophy as the art of living can be traced to Socrates and his strong interest in talking with people from near and far. Socrates time and again considers with others what it might mean to lead one's life according to other people's values. In so doing, he points to why cosmopolitanism implies more than tolerance of difference. Rather, it suggests a willingness to learn from or with other traditions and human inheritances. This orientation does not mean accepting or supporting other mores and customs, but it does mean regarding them as indices rather than as departures from the human. Socrates was often relentless in trying to come to grips with his own and other people's most underlying commitments. He never hesitated to take inquiry to the most universalizable plane. At the same time, he remained profoundly rooted in his local culture, so much so that even when threatened with execution, he refused to go into safe exile.

Although Socrates' moral and intellectual courage are exemplary, his reflective openness to the new, combined with reflective loyalty to the known, has been practiced (if in more modest form) by countless teachers and students who have taken discussion seriously. In the best of such discussions, it is never a question of abandoning wholesale one's prior views or self-conceptions, nor is it a question of defending a standpoint at all costs. Rather, the process is transactive: heeding others, participating, and keeping thought open to influence critically rather than blindly. The process can broaden and deepen understanding and outlook. From this perspective, discussion practices centered on interpretive inquiry—whether in art, history, literature, or science—mirror philosophy as the art of living. Discussion is not a mere means but an enactment of

significant values of listening, articulating, respecting others, and more.

On his part, Plato makes the intriguing move in *The Republic* of having Socrates and his interlocutors conceive the *kallipolis*, or just city, while meeting in the cosmopolitan port of Piraeus rather than in Athens (cf. Sallis, 2006). Moreover, Plato has Socrates complement, at the very start of the dialogue, the creativity of a community other than Athens. I take Plato to be suggesting that resources from any society are welcome if they fuel inquiry into the most just forms of association. I also hear him implying that people everywhere can deliberate about justice and the good, and that it is therefore important to keep the door, or port, open to their perspectives. This image of an open door or port, a quintessential cosmopolitan trope, would apply as much to the individual mind as to the mind of a given community. To be sure, humans have exhibited a formidable capacity to build walls around and between themselves. But Plato puts forward in dramatic fashion the image that humans can also be, to echo an aphorism from Ralph Waldo Emerson, both makers and openers of doors to one another.

This cosmopolitan dimension of thinking reached an apogee in the ancient world among the Hellenistic and Roman Stoics. They dwelled on how to lead a humane life in a world where individual and cultural differences abound and remain unfathomable in their range, diversity, and intensity. 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. Writers as varied as Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius ventured cosmopolitan ideas throughout their texts. Recent research on these and other figures undermines the stereotype of the Stoic as an aloof, isolated, long-suffering (“stoic”) individual. Scholars have demonstrated that the Stoics, through a diverse array of practices, were often public-minded and politically active, even as they focused on cultivating their moral, aesthetic, and intellectual ways of being.⁷

The tradition of philosophy as the art of living takes on further cosmopolitan expressions in Renaissance and early modern writers, among them Erasmus and Michel de Montaigne, who are deeply influenced by ancient commentators. They aspire to strike a note of critical tolerance and of enduring interest in all matters human (rather than in just their own concerns), and all of this in the midst of an era of unsettling social, economic, and cultural change. For example, Montaigne remains deeply rooted in his local French traditions and never breaks from them. In his pioneering essays, he makes plain time and again that he could not “speak” at all without them. At the same time, he submits his culture’s mores, habits, and ideals—and himself—to withering criticism, relying directly on perspectives from other cultures, societies, and historical eras.

In one and the same life, and often in one and the same moment, he learns from his neighbor and he learns from the stranger. He learns from what he calls “this great world of ours,” with its extraordinary diversity. He describes the world as a “looking-glass” into which, and through which, any person can gaze to render life more comprehensible and meaningful, although not necessarily more comfortable, as he also underscores (Montaigne, 1991, p. 177; for further analysis, see Hansen, 2002). What Montaigne learns, in short, is not merely new information but ways of being in which he simultaneously retains loyalty to the known and openness to the new.

These varied voices, with their wide-ranging and sometimes conflicting ideas, give rise in the modern and current era to a cosmopolitan-minded array of thinkers. As with the writers mentioned thus far, these figures remain fundamentally unclassifiable in part because they are so nontraditionalistic in their reception of the past and in their outlook toward the present and future. One might say these writers on the art of living (and on many other topics) take tradition with the utmost seriousness precisely through their conversational and critical rather than idolatrous approach to it. Thinkers as different as Emerson, Dewey, W. E. B. Du Bois, Virginia Woolf, Rabindranath Tagore, Maria Montessori, Hannah Arendt, Alain Locke, George Orwell, and Michel Foucault merge universal motifs with fine-grained concern for local human experiences, needs, and hopes.

From a cosmopolitan point of view, philosophy as the art of living can be understood first and last as an educational outlook. In between, so to speak, it is an often sharp critique of unexamined custom, albeit not through a unified lens but rather through an ever-changing *armoire* of perspectives. Its concern throughout has been on how a person can learn, through formal tuition and its fusion with experience, to draw as fully as possible on prior human achievements and one’s own life encounters to craft a humane, meaningful life, even, or especially, when extant conventions seem to reject, thwart, or cheapen this project. For many writers in the tradition, such a life would seek to be responsive to the demands of justice toward others and of the desire for self-improvement. The former refers to what today is called morality: whether and how people regard and treat others justly, fairly, and responsively. Self-improvement refers to what the tradition sometimes calls ethics: how persons might endeavor to cultivate as richly as possible their intellectual, moral, political, and aesthetic being. These writers illuminate how in actual life, morality and ethics are mutually implicated, such that the distinction is useful for purposes of inquiry and understanding rather than as marking out two separate spheres of experience. Epictetus (1st century

CE) urges, “Set up right now a certain character and pattern for yourself which you will preserve when you are by yourself and when you are with people” (1983, p. 22, ¶ 33). He articulates a fusion of ethics and the moral redolent of the classical ideal of fusing *logos* and *ergon*, or word and deed. He seeks to draw on notions of justice and his conviction in the vitality of personhood.

Put another way, Epictetus charts a path that heeds both local and universal values while recognizing the ever-challenging nature of the journey. In this outlook, persons put trust not solely in established custom and habit but also in their capacities to perceive, discern, criticize, and appreciate—capacities triggered in part by their encounters with differences from local norms. This always unfinished process draws on and cultivates what the tradition characterizes as exercises or practices of the self. Such practices include deliberative ways of speaking, listening, interacting, reading, writing, and more, which are at all times arts in development because their aim is not serving the self instrumentally but rather improving it. Thus, what Foucault and others dub “the care of the self” contrasts markedly with a narcissistic or self-absorbed posture (De Marzio, 2007; Foucault, 1994, 2005; Hadot, 1995; Nehamas, 1998). On the contrary, in this viewpoint, it is precisely by shifting attention from oneself to listening, to speaking thoughtfully, and to thinking as best as one can about the meanings of experience that the human being can most fully flourish. The focus on such practices constitutes another reason for perceiving philosophy as the art of living as an ongoing educational encounter in and with the world.

Foucault, Hadot, Reydamas-Schils, and other scholars cited previously have shown that these arts took on diverse forms across Stoic and other like-minded groupings that sprang up around the Mediterranean world in the Hellenistic and Roman eras. They helped people in the moral task of mutual recognition and support, and in the ethical task of self-transformation. To judge from remarks by Epictetus and others, their progress in both trajectories was typically modest and uneven. That fact does not reflect poorly on them but rather attests to the inevitable tensions and ambiguities that accompany engaging new ideas and norms. Their experience points to the symmetry between the diverse arts of listening, speaking, and interacting that they sought to cultivate and the image of cosmopolitanism on the ground. Such arts are deeply rooted in local interaction, exchange, and participation. At the same time, they can assist people in keeping one eye on the horizon: to remain attuned to how differently human beings approach questions of purpose, of value, and of meaning in their affairs. These practices can help persons in the task mentioned at the start of the discussion: discerning how and when

to be reflectively open to the new and reflectively loyal to the known. The next section focuses on contemporary encounters that further illuminate the contours of such learning.

COSMOPOLITANISM ON THE GROUND (II):
ON “ACTUALLY EXISTING COSMOPOLITANISM”

This section links the interest in philosophical anthropology characteristic of reflection on the art of living with what recent field-based, anthropologically minded research has been discovering about cosmopolitanism on the ground. This research documents why the art of living, with its associated, ever-dynamic practices, often emerges spontaneously and organically. It does not necessarily require a priori ideological commitments, such as a particular view of humanity’s place in the cosmos that was characteristic of some ancient Stoic thought. It is neither an elite nor aestheticized posture, although it can morph into such if people abandon its social, interactive basis.

The studies touched on below do not deploy the idiom of the art of living nor of philosophical anthropology. All the same, they illustrate a cosmopolitan orientation in ways that mirror these perspectives. The discussion here is intended to be suggestive rather than comprehensive. It would take a larger canvas to do justice to the range of current field-based research on the topic. Moreover, a central purpose here is to provide educational scholars a feeling for the kind of empirically based work that has been undertaken on cosmopolitanism. I am not aware of a single published study that has fused a systematic framing of the cosmopolitan with field-based inquiry on educational practice. I hope that the present article will encourage such research.

The studies commented on here could be productively viewed through broad political, sociological, juridical, and other theoretical and programmatic lenses. However, what can be learned from them cannot be accounted for solely through these familiar modes of classification and explanation. Put another way, it is certainly possible to treat cosmopolitanism as a proposed solution to contemporary problems generated by globalization and other macro forces. This defensible approach allows one to deploy cosmopolitanism as a tool or instrument for analysis and reform. But it is also possible to regard a cosmopolitan outlook not as a “solution” to anything—as if, to pose the matter polemically, life were solely an engineering problem—but rather as a way of living, or way of being, that answers to life’s unimagined possibilities and its all too determinant predicaments. Accordingly, my accent in the remarks that follow

will be on the artfulness of people as they respond to varying circumstances and conditions.

In a study of the meaning and possibility of “cosmopolitan citizenship,” Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey (2003) administered a questionnaire to 600 young people (10–18 years old) at four schools in Leicester, England. They followed up with a series of focused, discussion-based workshops with youth at each school. They sought to understand how young people interpret and respond to today’s often rapidly changing local and global circumstances. Their core finding jibes with what Szersznski and Urry (2002), in an interview study of a diverse sample of adults in Britain, dubbed “a culture of the cosmopolitan” that features not just awareness but critical appreciation for how differently people dwell in the world. “The young people in our research,” Osler and Starkey wrote, “demonstrated multiple and dynamic identities, embracing local, national and international perspectives” (p. 252). They showed that the youths’ self-reports and views cannot be straightforwardly ascribed to or captured by their class, ethnicity, race, religion, sense of nationality, or other familiar factors. The authors concluded, among other points, that “an education for national citizenship is unlikely to provide a sufficiently comprehensive context for [youth] to integrate their own experiences and identities” (p. 252). Osler and Starkey regard cosmopolitanism as pointing toward that more “comprehensive context.”

In a comparable study, Katharyne Mitchell and Walter Parker (2008) conducted focus group interviews with youth in a city in the western United States to plumb their responses to 9/11 and subsequent world developments. One of the authors’ aims was to examine the tenability of the view that people must choose between either a national or cosmopolitan outlook because the two cannot, or so some have argued, be reconciled or balanced. They drew especially on a significant debate between Martha Nussbaum (2002) and an array of noteworthy critics (among them Kwame Anthony Appiah, Judith Butler, and Hilary Putnam) regarding the very possibility of a cosmopolitan orientation in a world still defined by the nation-state and its claims to loyalty.⁸ In this article, I have remarked on the alleged gap or irreconcilability between the cosmopolitan and the local and have claimed that rather than opposites, the two are symbiotic. The relevant contrast is between cosmopolitanism *and* the local, on the one hand, and parochial outlooks on the other hand (the latter can be universalistic in tone and substance). I will have more to say on this point later.

Mitchell and Parker (2008) reported that some youth in their study

adopted—without any prior formal civic education on cosmopolitanism—what the authors characterized as “multiple, flexible, and relational” points of view toward the local and the global. The youths’ moral, political, and cultural allegiances cannot be contained within any preordained, particularized framework, whether it be called multicultural, pluralist, or national. The authors conceive cosmopolitanism as, among other things, a useful lens for understanding and appreciating the youths’ evolving perspectives. Their study supports the value of fine-grained attention to *how* people respond in a cosmopolitan mode to experience on the ground.

Michele Lamont and Sada Aksartova (2002) undertook focused interviews with working-class White and Black American men, in parallel with systematic interviews with a sample of working-class White and North African men in France. They examined how what they called “different ordinary cosmopolitanisms,” each informed by a particular language of moral universalism, “enable people to resist racism” in their everyday lives (p. 18). The ordinary cosmopolitanisms to which they referred found expression, in part, in the differing tropes that the men employed to describe their sense of self, other, and world. The Americans emphasized that hard work, demonstrating competence, and making a steady income lend one cross-cultural legitimacy, voice, and solidarity. The French shared these values about how to lead a life but also stressed socialist and republican ideals of fundamental human dignity as undermining racist presuppositions. All spoke unhesitantly in a universal register, in which they underscored their belief that all people seek a meaningful life and that there are good and bad persons in every community. They also strongly esteemed an attitude of moral seriousness toward life (cf. Duneier, 1992).

Lamont and Aksartova (2002) were struck by the contrast between the universalizing, cosmopolitan outlooks of the men and what they saw as the focus in the academy on cultural relativism, the celebration of difference, and multiculturalism, all of which they found notably absent in their sample’s voices. They recommended that researchers who study racism and responses to it shift their focus from identity to what they called “boundary work” (p. 18). They treated cosmopolitanism as a name for life in those ever-shifting boundaries in which persons artfully seek forms of solidarity that substantiate their sense of personhood and give them strength in living justly. Their project sheds light on what scholars have called rooted cosmopolitanism, which features moral allegiance not just to “one’s own” but to a broader horizon of people.

Pnina Werbner (1999) undertook systematic interviews with two groups of working-class Pakistani immigrants in Britain. One group,

whom she called “transnational,” more or less transplanted wholesale their ethnic culture from Pakistan, eliding significant interaction with the cultural environments they found on arrival. This self-cocooning, Werbner reported, was at times centered on religious foci and at others around marriage patterns. This approach contrasts with other working-class immigrants who partook, sometimes liberally, in new cultural forms of expression and identity. What Werbner characterized as their cosmopolitan patterns of life sometimes put them in tension with those who elected a more self-contained mode. The author described cases in which individuals found ways to lead a meaningful life (whether in self-enclosed or in experimental form) or in which they in effect emigrated from one group to the other. My focus here has been on people who “experiment,” but with that term understood in its Deweyan sense of human beings trying seriously to respond to life situations in which blueprints and prescriptions fall short or simply do not exist. Cosmopolitanism, as I approach it, refers not to the person who cuts the chord with the past and with all prior roots—the nomad “whose only real place of belonging is movement itself” (Skrbis, Kendall, & Woodward, 2004, p. 117). Rather, the concept characterizes the person who engages the larger world and finds *in* that engagement a renewed, revitalized, and creative mode of enhancing the integrity of the local, either directly through concerted action or indirectly by virtue of a way of being.

Werbner (1999) criticized the often unexamined assumption that cosmopolitanism constitutes merely an elite aesthete’s attitude toward the world.⁹ She argued that the cosmopolitanism of the working-class men and women in her study features both knowledge of, and openness to, other cultures and that it has a suppleness and range that is more dynamic than what can sometimes be seen among the privileged classes. Werbner also echoed what research has characterized as cultural cosmopolitanism when she concluded that cosmopolitanism “does not necessarily imply an absence of belonging but the possibility of belonging to more than one ethnic and cultural localism simultaneously” (p. 34).

Harri Englund (2004) undertook several years of field-based research among Pentecostal Christians in Malawi, almost all of them materially impoverished in comparison with the rest of the world. Englund’s framework derived in part from theoretical debates about the place of “home” in human sensibilities, particularly under conditions of globalization and considerable migration. This literature echoes the debate between Nussbaum and colleagues (touched on previously) regarding cosmopolitanism and nationalism. However, here the two camps are (1) those who consider the cosmopolitan homeless and rootless, and (2) those who regard home and roots as creative, dynamic outlooks of mind and place

rather than as denoting a natal fixture from which any movement ipso facto condemns one to an alienating exile.¹⁰ Englund found that the Pentecostal Christians with whom he lived retain a fluid sense of home. They have migrated to a city—they have *left* home in an authentic sense. They are at all times absorbed in what the author described as their cosmopolitan project of learning to dwell interactively where they now find themselves.

However, they do not reject their roots (usually in rural villages to which they periodically return). Englund (2004) reported that in general, they do not find useful in their self-understandings binaries such as village versus city, traditional versus modern, us versus them, or near versus far, even though they are keenly aware of value differences. The only binary that they embrace is that between heaven and what they see as a devil-saturated world in which humans are driven time and again to distraction and loss. They employ a universalized discourse of a suffering humanity, but not one of “believers” to be elevated and “nonbelievers” to be punished. They shared with the author their wish to send missionaries to Europe, if only they had the funds—not to convert people there into Pentecostals but to help them grasp what they regard as the source of conflict and unhappiness. According to Englund, compassion rather than ideology guides their lives and positions them to enact a rooted cosmopolitan morality toward others in the urban *mélange* in which they reside.

A final study that I will mention is Nikos Papastergiadis’s (2007) richly attuned examination of what he called “the cosmopolitan hospitality of art.” He described an internationally collaborative art exposition housed in an old building in Thessaloniki, Greece, that had, at various points in history, served as a mosque, a synagogue, a hostel for refugees, and a museum. He was interested, among other things, in understanding the reaction to the exhibit on the part of various visitors, whether fellow artists or local working-class, professional, and/or elderly people who came to look. He discerned in their responses what he called “glimpses” of the cosmopolitan. He quoted a local woman who came up to him to comment on the exhibit: “What all humans have in common is their mixture. It is this mixture that precedes and outlives any narrow national identity” (p. 140). Papastergiadis was struck by the modesty and “meekness” (a far from passive term he took from Norberto Bobbio) that he heard in the woman’s words. Their very ordinariness affected him more than strident calls for global political or economic concords undertaken in a cosmopolitan spirit, not because the latter are unimportant but because they lack the everyday spontaneity and organicity of the former

(cf. Waldron, 2006). Papastergiadis was moved by this and other down-to-earth glimpses of the cosmopolitan because they opened the door to a fundamental insight that he gained from the project:

What is it that art does that is so exquisite in its execution of the political that differentiates it from politics? I have been arguing that artists do not deliver documents which reveal the condition of cosmopolitanism, but rather that they take an active role in the mediation of its emergence. (p. 149)

And yet, in casting an eye back on these various studies, one could argue that working-class people, retired people, youth, highly prepared professionals, recent immigrants, deeply religious persons, and many others—including, as we will see, teachers and students—can all play mediating roles in bringing cosmopolitan sensibilities to life, which is to say in their own lives and in those of their neighbors. Put another way, we see in these studies indices of cosmopolitan artfulness, of on-the-ground practices of listening, speaking, and interacting, of being receptive toward the new and yet not in a way that abandons or negates the local. Indices are not airtight demonstrations. Scholars across the disciplines who are conducting fieldwork on cosmopolitanism typically underscore the provisionality of their findings, if only because this line of research remains fresh and open-ended. Nonetheless, their efforts are helping to clear a terrain for giving the cosmopolitan idea a thoughtful hearing.¹¹ I find the research fascinating in part because its outcomes articulate dynamically with long-standing traditions of philosophy as the art of living. This interlacing of philosophical and field-based inquiry generates a frame for thinking about education in cosmopolitan perspective, the subject of the next and final section.

TOWARD A PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATIONAL COSMOPOLITANISM

In what follows, I deploy interchangeably the terms *educational cosmopolitanism*, *a cosmopolitan education*, and *education viewed through a cosmopolitan lens*. The first accents educational work, the second a cosmopolitan outlook on it, and the third the fact that this orientation toward education is but one among many. In my view, it merits attention because of its rootedness in everyday life, especially at the ever-emerging crossroads of receptivity to the new and loyalty toward the known. That crossroads can be a scene of learning, and cosmopolitanism itself can be understood as an embodied, educational orientation in the world.

Two familiar utterances evoke this perspective. The Roman playwright and poet Terence gave voice to the first: "*Homo sum; humani nil a me alienum puto*"—"I am a man; I deem nothing that is human to be foreign to me."¹² The American philosopher John Dewey (1985) expressed the second in his closing line to *Democracy and Education*: "Interest in learning from all the contacts of life is the essential moral interest" (p. 370).

Terence's turn of phrase prompts the idea that in enunciating one's humanity—in whatever idiom deployed—a person enacts the idea that nothing about other humans, who are also enunciating their humanity in their words and works, is alien. In polemical terms: There are no foreigners. People may find other persons, and themselves, to be strange, off-putting, enigmatic, and opaque. But that response differs from regarding those features as beyond the pale of the human rather than as marks of its character. This posture does not necessitate endorsing, much less adopting, other customs and beliefs, whether those of individuals or communities. However, it does mean not recoiling from others' lives as if they were creatures from another cosmos.

Dewey emphasized learning from *all* the encounters in life, not just those that are familiar and confirming. This "interest" is moral, in his view, because it concretizes and thereby sustains the very possibility of meaningful contact across and within differences. The willingness to learn from every encounter does not mean that such learning will be easy or always possible. Understanding self and other is seldom guaranteed and is, in any case, always incomplete. But this interest does presume that there are no impermeable walls that permanently fracture human space and time.

Though penned over 2,000 years apart and in milieu strikingly different, the utterances from Terence and Dewey converge in educational cosmopolitanism. This term crystallizes modes of receptivity and communication that can be seen both in philosophizing on the art of living and in recent field-based research. Educational cosmopolitanism pivots around cultivating and strengthening these practices. At the same time, it constitutes an approach toward the cosmopolitan and the local in which the two become symbiotic rather than essentially antagonistic. I will consider several core presumptions in the outlook and then turn to questions of curriculum and teaching. This sketch of a philosophy of educational cosmopolitanism will necessarily be unfinished but, it is hoped, suggestive of what a fuller portrait would contain. As alluded to previously, I also hope that the overview will spark field-based research on the theme.

COSMOPOLITAN EDUCATION PRESUPPOSES LOCAL SOCIALIZATION

Pascal Bruckner (2000) argued that it may be impossible to appreciate cosmopolitan ideas, ideals, and ways of being without having undergone a sustained immersion in a local, particularized way of life with its own traditions and inheritances. Moreover, he averred, without such an experience it would be difficult to recognize, in a serious, thoughtful way, other people with their differing backgrounds, practices, values, customs, and hopes. As he put it, echoing the long-standing links between cosmopolitanism and notions of hospitality, “Je n’accorde l’hospitalité à l’étranger qu’à partir d’un sol où je peux l’accueillir” (p. 43; “I can only be hospitable if I have a place wherein I can welcome the newcomer” [my translation]). His trope can refer to both senses of place or home touched on previously: a physical locale like a town, village, nation, in which one has been reared, or a dynamic place of mind, attitude, and conduct with its own interlaced traditions and inheritances (e.g., a profession, a realm of art-making, and so on).

Cosmopolitan education presupposes local socialization into language, values, and ways of moving in the world. This fact means that it does not project a wholesale revision of curriculum and pedagogy. It would support multicultural educational projects to the extent that these engage the young with their community’s historic traditions and current trajectories. At the same time, it would endorse liberal educational projects to the extent that these provide the young critical detachment (not to be confused with “severance”) from those very same traditions and inheritances (cf. McDonough, 1997; Reich, 2002). However, educational cosmopolitanism would urge the teacher to perceive both sets of projects not as endings or termini but as beginnings: as points of departure toward an orientation of receptivity, of reflective openness to the new and reflective loyalty to the known. In such an outlook, preset and familiar frames of interpretation and understanding—whether cultural, religious, or political, and whether in art, science, history, or mathematics—would, at judicious moments, be juxtaposed with alternative frames that shed new light on the questions, problems, and issues at hand. The accent running through the process would be on the cosmopolitan expression of creativity the world over: at the level of community and culture, wherein people try to respond to change in ways that allow them to retain integrity; at the level of academic subjects, which are all marked historically by incessant transformation; at the level of arts, such as music and painting, which continually evolve; and at the level of individual human

beings seeking to make meaning in their lives and to make their way in the world.

COSMOPOLITAN EDUCATION SUPPORTS A CRITICAL
APPRECIATION RATHER THAN IDOLIZATION OF CULTURES,
ROOTS, AND TRADITIONS

Numerous commentators have suggested that one of the main values in cosmopolitanism is its seemingly paradoxical ability to bring people more fully home in reflective, aesthetic, and moral terms. This argument emerges, for example, in recent research on cosmopolitan traditions in Latin American arts and letters. Camilla Fojas (2005), Jacqueline Loss (2005), Noel Salomon (1979), and others refer to a variety of writers who found that immersion in European artistic traditions helped them recognize and articulate their own. Far from finding this immersion threatening, as if the only conceivable or inhabitable identity necessarily takes a fixed, airtight, and aprioristic form, they borrowed and fused into their thought a wide array of ideas, ideals, and techniques from elsewhere. They discovered that this educational process brought them more intimately into contact with their own distinctiveness—much as, to take a contrasting example, the careful study of African art by Picasso and his European contemporaries transformed the ethos of their work and helped them grasp what they were seeking to accomplish.

Working from the “margins” or “periphery,” as Fojas (2005, p. 54) put it, these writers reconstructed the “center” in ways that pruned off colonial and imperial legacies and provided dynamic cultural resources.¹³ Commenting on the spiraling, highly diverse artistic movements across Latin America in the 1920s, Jose Carlos Mariategui wrote that “beneath this precarious flux a new set of feelings, a new revelation is being prepared. These paths of universalism and cultural ecumenism, for which we are so often reproached, are bringing us gradually closer to ourselves” (Salomon, 1979, p. 103). Jose Maria Arguedas, a fellow Peruvian writer of a later generation, found that “by assimilating the arts created by other peoples who had much greater means at their disposal to express themselves,” he was able to come into a richer awareness of Peruvian traditions and to enhance and draw them out (Salomon, p. 108). For Salomon, these and related perspectives carry human sensibilities beyond “the division between supra-national cosmopolitans who invoke an abstract globalism to deny man’s need to be rooted in a homeland, and conservative, exclusivist nationalists who deny man’s need to open himself to the whole world and to maintain a dialogue with it” (p. 105).

These remarks flesh out why reflective openness to the new—or, as

Dewey put it, learning from “all the contacts of life”—does not imply dispersing self or community. Rather, it can mean revitalizing them in a reflexive spirit. Educational cosmopolitanism can substantiate an individual’s or community’s capacity to sustain its integrity (not to be confused with “fixity”). From a negative point of view, such an education can assist people in withstanding homogenizing pressures in globalization and other related forces. More positively, it can turn people’s imaginative gaze toward picturing their hard-won accomplishments as gifts to the cosmos: as cultural resources for themselves and for others. As Samuel Scheffler (2001) argued, people with a cosmopolitan orientation “demonstrate,” at whatever local or larger plane of life they occupy, “the very capacities that make it possible for human beings to create culture in the first place, and they enrich humanity as a whole by renewing the stock of cultural resources on which others may draw” (p. 113). As the field-based research touched on previously indicates, cultural creation appears to happen on the ground everywhere. Moreover, this creativity coheres with the art of living and its ever-dynamic practices of speaking, listening, doing, interacting, and the like. Such “ordinary,” open-handed, interpersonal, and trans-cultural creativity has marked human encounters for millennia. That fact perhaps accounts for it being ignored in much of the literature on cosmopolitanism, with its focus on a macro-level of analysis and recommendation. Yet the cost of relegating everyday life to the shadows is a one-sided view of cosmopolitanism as merely an instrument of global reform rather than as a way of being that might temper and guide the reformist impulse itself.

CURRICULUM AS COSMOPOLITAN INHERITANCE

Reflective openness to the new is a considered receptivity toward the unfathomable variability that flows incessantly into human lives: from other persons, from events, and from people’s own imaginations, thoughts, inquiries, undertakings, and experiences. Reflective loyalty toward the local reflects the fact that a cosmopolitan-minded person indeed does “leave home,” but not necessarily in a material or literal sense. Rather, the person leaves home behind in a parochial or walled-in sense of that term. A cosmopolitan orientation features an interest in learning from other traditions, a process that may mean illuminating one’s way in the world by their insights as well as by one’s own.

This perspective conjures the idea of curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance. In principle, all curriculum can be a public dispensation, and all curriculum can hold the promise of educating and edifying people anywhere. It can be seen as a shared human inheritance, a

cosmopolitan patrimony.

In concrete terms, students deserve the opportunity to study local traditions and inheritances, both for their own sake and as a platform to engage larger world horizons of experience, knowledge, and point of view. They also deserve like opportunities to study new traditions and inheritances, both for their own educational sake and as a platform to more fully grasp the beauties, the distinctiveness, and the limitations in local horizons. A common denominator in these efforts, at any age level and in any subject, would be work-in-depth so that teachers and students can move beyond a superficial or folkloric acquaintance.

Put a different way, from a cosmopolitan perspective it would be vital to engage students with philosophical diversity such as that which resides in different artistic, literary, scientific, vocational, and other traditions. Every new tradition in art, history, literature, language, and more that students encounter constitutes, in figurative terms, an address posing questions to them about who they are and what they wish to become. It is an address calling them to consider what it means, in the first place, to be a human being and what it would mean to help constitute their own humanity. It is an address drawing them into cultural creativity as they learn to do more than mimic the tried and the known, but rather to engage it dynamically with the unfamiliar. Curriculum as cosmopolitan inheritance highlights the quest for meaning that can be understood as informing, in a natal sense, what is called subject matter. In time, students can conceive why all curriculum represents, in principle, their inheritance, to which in due course they themselves can contribute even if it may be hard to pinpoint their eventual imprint.¹⁴

MANY TEACHERS ARE ALREADY COSMOPOLITAN-MINDED AND CAN DRAW THIS ASPECT OUT, CULTIVATE IT, AND RENDER IT EDUCATIVE FOR THEMSELVES AND OTHERS

Why are many teachers from quite different communities, cultures, nations, regions, and the like able to talk meaningfully with one another about educational matters? Why are they able to build common ground, sometimes swiftly and with fluency? This common ground does not spring from agreement per se on issues of curriculum, instruction, assessment, and the like. Rather, it derives from teachers' ability to generate language for expressing the importance of such issues in human lives, for articulating the significance of the very endeavor that goes by the name of education. To adapt a turn of phrase from Hans-Georg Gadamer (1984), one could describe this phenomenon as the natural propensity toward philosophy by many (obviously not all) who educate. Their efforts

sustain a continuous worldwide conversation undertaken in numerous registers about what it means to be a teacher, what makes teaching more than merely socializing others, and many related questions.

This conversation constitutes more than a mere sum of its national, cultural, and individual parts. It is not difficult to imagine instances in which, if a teacher did not explicitly identify herself or himself as, say, Chinese or Nigerian, or Catholic or Jew, or math or art teacher, an outsider to the dialogue might be hard-pressed to determine the person's "origins." This familiar occurrence does not reflect a universalized homogeneity. On the contrary, it signals the ability of many educators to bring to bear an intimate grasp, literally at their fingertips, of their local domains fused with an equally intimate, thoughtful receptivity to new outlooks and ideas. In their shared aspiration to get at the meaning of education and to perform the work well, these teachers stand in distinctive ways between the universal and the particular, between the global and the neighborhood. They stand between the naïve and the cynical, between the local and the parochial. They stand in a cosmopolitan space.

Educational work the world over has often been uncanny in its trajectories. Extensive testimony and research demonstrate that there are many teachers who resist being molded into functionaries or hired hands. They do not cast off the charge of socialization that is a critical aspect of their work. However, they also enact the longstanding fact that education means voyaging into the new, the unscripted, the unexpected, the unplanned, and the unpredictable—and not just for the individuals in question but for the world itself. That is, every person and every classroom or school community who undergoes this process—in which they express, in one way or another, their responses to being in the world—has added thereby to the human richness of the cosmos. Their contribution may be microscopic in comparison with the whole, and it may also have a family resemblance to others' additions. But every genuinely educational experience embodies dimensions that are unique and irreproducible.

Many teachers appreciate the ubiquitous fact that students do not learn in the same ways nor learn the same things, even if they sit side by side in the school for years. Moreover, these teachers enact, if not in so many words, the idea touched on previously that pedagogy and curriculum—whether they have to do with art or zoology—can be understood as embodying and expressing 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 universal quest for meaning is neither spectatorial in its posture nor acquisitive in its aim, although it can lead to invaluable 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?”

The images of inheritance, of cosmopolitan patrimony, and of the desire for meaning touched on here cohere with practices of the art of living highlighted earlier in the article. Those practices or arts include mindful ways of listening, speaking, interacting, reading, writing, reflecting, and more. They are bound up with the moral, cultivating humane relations with other people and supporting their right to dignity, and with the ethical, developing one’s intellectual, moral, and aesthetic being as richly as circumstances permit. These arts do not necessarily come easily or automatically for people, or so it seems, and thus can benefit from educational attention. Teachers in all subjects can help students, and themselves, develop them. Such arts can constitute an organic component of how a class handles questions and topics across the curriculum. Many teachers would be the first to say that they are already, in fact, teachers of communication in all its manifold forms. A cosmopolitan accent deepens the significance and range of their work. It does not replace a focus on skills, knowledge acquisition, and preparation for productive life. Rather, it opens a space for genuine education alongside the needs of socialization. This balancing act is intricate and necessitates pedagogical artfulness. In today’s climate of standardization and high-stakes testing, teachers merit all the support they can get from professional communities and the public in carrying out this task.

Meantime teachers can continue to learn from one another, as many do, about how to develop pedagogical artfulness—how to cultivate the art of teaching that for some seems to accompany the art of living. Teachers constitute an already existing cosmopolitan community. Many have an abiding disposition to share ideas, methods, and philosophies across any number of cultural or other markers of identity. The most serious-minded and playful of them seem to draw pleasure, insight, and edification from this transcommunal and transpersonal exchange. In so doing, they can trace their roots to pioneering educational influences such as Socrates. They can derive perspective from the fact that they are among those who play a dynamic role in cultivating the cosmopolitanism on the ground illuminated in the literatures featured here.

CONCLUSION: ON THE PROMISE IN EDUCATIONAL COSMOPOLITANISM

At the methodological center of this article has been the attempt to reside in the conjunction *and*, as in cosmopolitanism *and* education, cosmopolitanism *and* the local, receptivity to the new *and* loyalty to the known. It is not easy to characterize this conjunction philosophically, and it is not simple to occupy it in day-to-day life. Social, political, cultural, economic, and other pressures from without and psychological pressures from within constantly push people toward one end or another of the continua that mark human affairs. *Or* rather than *and* often seems the operative condition. Cosmopolitanism on the ground offers no surefire mechanism for resolving these apparently permanent aspects of being human. They accompany other ineliminable features of dwelling in an aleatory cosmos: the permanence of change, the impossibility of walling oneself off from the world's unceasing influence, the unfathomability in how humans respond to life's demands and opportunities, and more. In commenting on the inevitability of tensions between particular and universal concerns, Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006) remarked that cosmopolitanism "is the name not of the solution but of the challenge" (p. xv).

Part of the challenge is to accept yet another ongoing tension: that between regarding life as problem-solving and as encompassing ways of being whose value resides *in* those ways rather than solely in what they produce. The corollary here is the persistent tension between education as a functionalist instrument and as an end or way of being in its own right. Cosmopolitanism on the ground points to a dynamic orientation toward these and other tensions felt everywhere today. It constitutes an approach toward life that does not supplant local commitments but rather can accompany and indeed strengthen their integrity. Its varied, if not always consistent, expressions can be seen, on the one hand, in thinkers and practitioners of the art of living ranging from Socrates to Tagore, and on the other hand, in immigrants, youth, working-class people, religious persons, artists, teachers, and many others. Their lives demonstrate why cosmopolitanism constitutes something other than the stereotypical image of the well-off urban dweller enjoying cuisines, music, and fashion from around the world while also following international news and traveling far and wide. There is nothing inherently objectionable about any of these customs, which can trigger or even incarnate a cosmopolitan orientation. But they may not. They may propel persons into the consumerist, spectatorial orbit of some forms of globalization, a phenomenon quite different from the ethos that cosmopolitanism represents.

Put another way, cosmopolitanism comprises something other than utilizing an environment strategically, and something other than adapting to change (as important as that capability will always be). Cosmopolitanism means *participating* in pluralist change as an agent, as an actor, rather than remaining passive or reactive to events. As Bob White (2002) wrote, “unlike ‘globalization’ or ‘modernity,’ cosmopolitanism is not something that happens to people, it is something that people do” (p. 681). Among the voices that can be heard in the literatures cited here are those of people, young and old alike, putting their foot forward, both figuratively and literally speaking. They engage the world at whatever level their resources and strength permit. They think about their settings and the world writ large. And their porosity to influence from the world differs from that of some rocks in which water merely passes through.

Educational cosmopolitanism constitutes an approach toward deepening people’s creative ability to balance openness and loyalty. It points to a way of being expressed at the crossroads of Terence’s and Dewey’s remarks cited previously: to learn to see the human in its uncontainable diversity as human and to aspire to dwell educationally in the world. Cosmopolitanism on the ground does not solve the predicaments of the human condition, but nor does it have to await top-down initiatives to spring to life. The cosmopolitan resources of “ordinary” people constitute soil in which local, practical enactments of democratic life can be rooted. As seen in the diverse literatures that have emerged over time and that have brought this orientation to the fore, cosmopolitanism can be endlessly generative with regard to how people actually live and might continue to live.

Acknowledgments

My thanks to Stephanie Burdick-Shepherd and Terri Wilson for their essential bibliographic assistance; to several anonymous reviewers and to Lyn Corno for excellent criticism; to Deborah Kerdeman for a fine-grained critical reading of an earlier version; and to audiences who raised helpful questions in response to earlier versions of this article that I presented to La Société Francophone de Philosophie de l’Éducation (Paris), the Institute of Education (University of London), the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain (Edinburgh), the University of Stirling, the Sibelius Academy (Helsinki), the University of Oslo, Leuven University, the Philosophical Studies in Education Special Interest Group at AERA (New York), and the Philosophy of Education Society (Boston).

Notes

1. For helpful overviews, see Cheah & Robbins (1998), Earle & Cvetkovich (1995), Hannerz (1990), Lu (2000), McCarthy (1999), Mehta (2000), and Scheffler (2001). On rooted cosmopolitanism (especially as a moral concept), see Appiah (2005, 2006), Cohen (1992), and Hollinger (1995).

2. On the political dimension, see Benhabib (2006), Brock & Brighouse (2005), Carter (2001), Heater (1996), and Toulmin (1990). On the moral, see Appiah (2005), Nussbaum (1997a, 1997b), and Scarry (1998). On the cultural, see Hill (2000), Hollinger (2002), Rizvi (2005), and Waldron (2000, 2003). And on the economic, see Barnett, Held, & Henderson (2005), DeMartino (2000), Sen (1999), and Tan (2004).

3. Gunesch (2004), Heater (2002), Knippenberg (1989), and Nussbaum (1997a, 2002) are among those who have discussed educational implications. Nussbaum's ideas have been productively criticized by philosophers of education; see, for example, Burbules (1999) and Papastephanou (2002).

4. It seems all the more timely to undertake this task in light of the emergence of educational research associations the world over and recent discussions about the possible formation of a world educational research association (American Educational Research Association, 2007).

5. From William Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, Act 5, Scene 5, lines 29–31.

6. Malcolmson (1998) noted that an immigrant cab driver or street cleaner is as likely (if not more so) to know more languages and to have more intercultural transactions than many an Ivy League graduate. A small-town schoolteacher, fisherman, or market seller may have a livelier cosmopolitan sensibility than the most globe-trotting, well-connected business executive who, in any case, is all too often camped out in airport lounges and chain hotels. In short, the most widely travelled person can be the most parochial of all in outlook and sense of judgment. As I will suggest, a cosmopolitan-minded education does entail "travel," but with an accent not on physical movement per se but on intellectual, ethical, and aesthetic journeying.

7. See, for example, Brown (2006), Foucault (2005), Hadot (1995), Nussbaum (1994), Reydam-Schils (2005), and Sellars (2003).

8. For useful commentary on this debate, see Bader (1999) and Waldron (2000, 2003). Hiro Saito (2008) has argued for what he called a "cosmopolitan-national" orientation in which the two parts, in a sense, discipline one another but are also mutually dependent.

9. For related critiques see, for example, Beck (2004), Cheah & Robbins (1998), and Waldron (2000, 2003).

10. See Yi-Fu Tuan's (1996) provocative account of "cosmopolitan hearth," a turn of phrase that at first glance may sound oxymoronic.

11. Additional field-based studies include Edmunds & Turner (2001), Hiebert (2002), Mitchell (2001), Park & Abelman (2004), and White (2002). Historical studies of cosmopolitanism on the ground include Jacobs (2006), Jasanoff (2005), and Rosenfeld (2002). Also see Kurasawa (2004) for an account of cosmopolitanism "from below" centered in various anti-neoliberal global movements that the author identifies. Let me add a related note here. In the previous section of the article, I traced aspects of cosmopolitanism largely through traditions in Western thought, in part because this is where one finds its most extensively rendered forms. However, cosmopolitan motifs appear in numerous other philosophical traditions—for example, in the Hindu *Upanishads* (11th century B.C.E.) and in Confucius's *Analects* (6th century B.C.E.). Contemporary scholars are articulating cosmopolitan themes in these and other traditions while also showing that the movement in cosmopolitan ideas has often been east to west (Bhattacharya, 1997; Levenson, 1971; Sen,

2006; Shayegan, 1992; Tuan, 1996; Weiming, 1998) and south to north (Fojas, 2005; Loss, 2005; Salomon, 1979).

12. The quote comes from his play *The Self-Tormentor* (*Heauton timorumenos*), line 77, written circa 166–160 B.C.E. The translation is by Norton (1904, p. 175).

13. Fojas offers a particularly lucid distinction between Latin American movements directed against neoimperial forces, emanating especially from North America, and movements directed toward cultural creativity. The idea that cosmopolitan impulses often derive more from the margins than the center is documented throughout the burgeoning literature on the topic. This fact mirrors the emphasis that I believe should be accorded cosmopolitanism from the ground up. This perspective also echoes the historic fact that authoritarian regimes the world over have repeatedly persecuted cosmopolitan-minded people in their midst. See, for example, Elon (2002).

14. For a fuller treatment of the ideas in this and the next subsection, see Hansen (2008).

References

- American Educational Research Association. (2007). Education research representatives resolve in principle to establish a world education research association. *Educational Researcher*, 36(7), 411–413.
- 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.
- Bader, V. (1999). For love of country. *Political Theory*, 27, 379–397.
- Barnett, A., Held, D., & Henderson, C. (Eds.). (2005). *Debating globalization*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2004). The truth of others: A cosmopolitan approach. *Common Knowledge*, 10, 430–449.
- Beck, U., & Sznaider, N. (2006). A literature on cosmopolitanism: An overview. *British Journal of Sociology*, 57, 153–164.
- Benhabib, S. (2006). *Another cosmopolitanism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Bhattacharya, S. (1997). *The Mahatma and the Poet: Letters and debates between Gandhi and Tagore, 1915–1941*. New Delhi, India: National Book Trust.
- Brock, G., & Brighouse, H. (Eds.). (2005). *The political philosophy of cosmopolitanism*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, E. (2006). Hellenistic cosmopolitanism. In M. L. Gill & P. Pellegrin (Eds.), *A companion to ancient philosophy* (pp. 549–558). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Bruckner, P. (2000). *Le Vertige de Babel: Cosmopolitisme ou Mondialisme*. Paris: Arlea.
- Burbules, N. C. (1999). Book Review—*Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* by Martha C. Nussbaum. *Harvard Educational Review*, 69, 456–466.
- Carter, A. (2001). *The political theory of global citizenship*. London: Routledge.
- Cheah, P., & Robbins, B. (Eds.). (1998). *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cohen, M. (1992, Fall). Rooted cosmopolitanism: Thoughts on the Left, nationalism, and multiculturalism. *Dissent*, 478–483.
- Costa, M. V. (2005). Cultural cosmopolitanism and civic education. In K. Howe (Ed.), *Philosophy of education 2005* (pp. 250–258). Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society.
- DeMartino, G. F. (2000). *Global economy, global justice: Theoretical objections and policy alternatives to neoliberalism*. London: Routledge.

- De Marzio, D. M. (2007). The care of the self: *Alcibiades I*, Socratic teaching and ethics education. *Journal of Education*, 187(3), 103–127.
- Dewey, J. (1985). *John Dewey. The Middle Works 1899–1924: Vol. 9, Democracy and Education 1916* (J. A. Boydston, Ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1989). *John Dewey. The Later Works 1925–1953: Vol. 7, Ethics* (J. A. Boydston, Ed.). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Duneier, M. (1992). *Slim's table: Race, respectability, and masculinity in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Earle, T. C., & Cvetkovich, G. T. (1995). *Social trust: Toward a cosmopolitan society*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Edmunds, J., & Turner, B. S. (2001). The re-invention of a national identity? Women and “cosmopolitan” Englishness. *Ethnicities*, 1(1), 83–108.
- Elon, A. (2002). *The pity of it all: A portrait of the German-Jewish epoch, 1743–1933*. New York: Picador.
- Englund, H. (2004). Cosmopolitanism and the devil in Malawi. *Ethnos*, 69, 293–316.
- Epictetus. (1983). *Handbook of Epictetus* (N. White, Trans.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Fojas, C. (2005). *Cosmopolitanism in the Americas*. W. Lafayette, IN: Purdue University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1994). The ethic of care for the self as a practice of freedom. In J. Bernauer & D. Rasmussen (Eds.), *The final Foucault* (pp.1–20). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Foucault, M. (2005). *The hermeneutics of the subject* (F. Gros, Ed., G. Burchell, Trans.). New York: Picador.
- Gadamer, H.-G. (1984). On the natural inclination of human beings toward philosophy. In *Reason in the age of science* (F. G. Lawrence, Trans., pp. 139–150). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 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.), *Philosophy of education 2003* (pp. 257–266). Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society.
- 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, 251–275.
- Hadot, P. (1995). *Philosophy as a way of life* (A. I. Davidson, Ed., M. Chase, Trans.). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7, 237–251.
- Hansen, D. T. (2002). Well-formed, not well-filled: Montaigne and the paths of personhood. *Educational Theory*, 52, 127–154.
- Hansen, D. T. (2008). Curriculum and the idea of a cosmopolitan inheritance. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 40, 289–312.
- Heater, D. (1996). *World citizenship and government: Cosmopolitan ideas in the history of Western political thought*. New York: St. Martin’s Press.
- Heater, D. (2002). *World citizenship: Cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents*. London: Continuum.
- Hiebert, D. (2002). Cosmopolitanism at the local level: The development of transnational neighborhoods. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context, and practice* (pp. 209–223). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, J. (2000). *Becoming a cosmopolitan: What it means to be a human being in the new millennium*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Hollinger, D. A. (1995). *Postethnic America: Beyond multiculturalism*. New York: Basic Books.

- Hollinger, D. A. (2002). Not universalists, not pluralists: The new cosmopolitans find their own way. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context, and practice* (pp. 227–239). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jacobs, M. (2006). *Strangers nowhere in the world: The rise of cosmopolitanism in Early Modern Europe*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Jasanoff, M. (2005). Cosmopolitan: A tale of identity from Ottoman Alexandria. *Common Knowledge*, 11, 393–409.
- Kleingeld, P., & Brown, E. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism*. Retrieved December 8, 2006, from <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/>
- Knippenberg, J. M. (1989). Moving beyond fear: Rousseau and Kant on cosmopolitan education. *Journal of Politics*, 51, 809–827.
- Kurasawa, F. (2004). A cosmopolitanism from below: Alternative globalization and the creation of a solidarity without bounds. *European Journal of Sociology*, 45, 233–255.
- Lamont, M., & Aksartova, S. (2002). Ordinary cosmopolitanism: Strategies for bridging racial boundaries among working-class men. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19(4), 1–25.
- Levenson, J. R. (1971). *Revolution and cosmopolitanism: The Western stage and the Chinese stages*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Loss, J. (2005). *Cosmopolitanisms and Latin America: Against the destiny of place*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lu, C. (2000). The one and many faces of cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8, 244–253.
- Malcolmson, S. L. (1998). The varieties of cosmopolitan experience. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation* (pp. 233–245). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- McCarthy, T. (1999). On reconciling cosmopolitan unity and national diversity. *Public Culture*, 11, 175–208.
- McDonough, K. (1997). Cultural recognition, cosmopolitanism and multicultural education. In S. Laird (Ed.), *Philosophy of education 1997* (pp. 127–135). Urbana, IL: Philosophy of Education Society.
- McDonough, K., & Feinberg, W. (Eds.). (2003). *Citizenship and education in liberal-democratic societies: Teaching for cosmopolitan values and collective identities*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Mehta, P. B. (2000). Cosmopolitanism and the circle of reason. *Political Theory*, 28, 619–639.
- Mitchell, K. (2001). Education for democratic citizenship: Transnationalism, multiculturalism, and the limits of liberalism. *Harvard Educational Review*, 71, 51–78.
- Mitchell, K., & Parker, W. C. (2008). I pledge allegiance to . . . Flexible citizenship and shifting scales of belonging. *Teachers College Press*, 110, 775–804.
- Montaigne, M. (1991). *The essays of Michel de Montaigne* (M. A. Screech, Trans.). London, Penguin.
- Nehamas, A. (1998). *The art of living: Socratic reflections from Plato to Foucault*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Norton, G. (1904). *Studies in Montaigne*. New York: Macmillan.
- 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 & M. Lutz-Bachman (Eds.), *Perpetual peace: Essays on Kant's cosmopolitan ideal* (pp. 25–57). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2002). *For love of country?* (J. Cohen, Ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.

- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review*, 55, 243–254.
- Papastephanou, M. (2002). Arrows not yet fired: Cultivating cosmopolitanism through education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 36, 69–86.
- Papastephanou, M. (2005). Globalisation, globalism and cosmopolitanism as an educational ideal. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37, 533–551.
- Papastergiadis, N. (2007). Glimpses of cosmopolitanism in the hospitality of art. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 10, 139–152.
- Park, S. J., & Abelmann, N. (2004). Class and cosmopolitan striving: Mothers' management of English education in South Korea. *Anthropological Quarterly*, 77, 645–672.
- Plato. (1992). *Republic* (G. M. A. Grube & C. D. C. Reeve, Trans.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Reich, R. (2002). *Bridging liberalism and multiculturalism in American education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 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, 331–339.
- Robbins, B. (1998). Introduction Part I: Actually existing cosmopolitanism. In P. Cheah & B. Robbins (Eds.), *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation* (pp. 1–19). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rosenfeld, S. (2002). Citizens of nowhere in particular: Cosmopolitanism, writing, and political engagement in eighteenth-century Europe. *National Identities*, 4(1), 25–43.
- Saito, H. (2008, March). *Envisioning cosmopolitan-national education: Ethics of dialogical affiliation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY.
- Sallis, J. (2006). *Topographies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Salomon, N. (1979). Cosmopolitanism and internationalism in the history of ideas in Latin America. *Cultures*, 6, 83–108.
- Scarry, E. (1998). The difficulty of imagining other persons. In E. Weiner (Ed.), *The handbook of interethnic coexistence* (pp. 40–62). New York: Continuum.
- Scheffler, S. (2001). Conceptions of cosmopolitanism. In *Boundaries and allegiances: Problems of justice and responsibility in liberal thought* (pp. 111–130). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Sellars, J. (2003). *The art of living: The Stoics on the nature and function of philosophy*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. New York: Knopf.
- Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and violence: The illusion of destiny*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Shayegan, D. (1992). *Sous les Cieux du Monde*. Paris: Editions du Felin.
- Skrbis, Z., Kendall, G., & Woodward, I. (2004). Locating cosmopolitanism: Between humanist ideal and grounded social category. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 21(6), 115–136.
- Snaauwaert, D. T. (2002). Cosmopolitan democracy and democratic education. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 4(2), 5–15.
- Szerszynski, B., & Urry, J. (2002). Cultures of cosmopolitanism. *Sociological Review*, 40, 461–481.
- Tan, K.-C. (2004). *Justice without borders: Cosmopolitanism, nationalism, patriotism*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Todd, S. (2008). Ambiguities of cosmopolitanism: Difference, gender and the right to education. In K.
- Roth & I. Gur-Zev (Eds.), *Education in the era of globalization* (pp. 67–84). Amsterdam: Springer.

- Toulmin, S. (1990). *Cosmopolis: The hidden agenda of modernity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tuan, Y.-F. (1996). *Cosmos and hearth: A cosmopolite's viewpoint*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Waldron, J. (2000). What is cosmopolitan? *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8, 227–243.
- Waldron, J. (2003). Teaching cosmopolitan right. In K. McDonough & W. Feinberg (Eds.), *Education and citizenship in liberal-democratic societies: Teaching for cosmopolitan values and collective identities* (pp. 23–55). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Waldron, J. (2006). Cosmopolitan norms. In S. Benhabib, *Another cosmopolitanism* (pp. 83–101). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Weiming, T. (1998). Epilogue: Human rights as a Confucian moral discourse. In De Bary, W. T. & Weiming, T. (Eds.), *Confucianism and human rights* (pp. 297–307). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Werbner, P. (1999). Global pathways: Working class cosmopolitans and the creation of transnational ethnic worlds. *Social Anthropology*, 7, 17–35.
- White, B. W. (2002). Congolese rumba and other cosmopolitanisms. *Cahiers d'Etudes Africaines*, 168, 663–686.

DAVID T. HANSEN is professor and director of the Program in Philosophy and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. He is past-president 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* (Teachers College Press, 2007).