Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education

Cosmopolitanism and Education

Amy Stornaiuolo and T. Phillip Nichols

Subject: Educational Purposes and Ideals, Educational Theories and Philosophies, Education and Society
Online Publication Date: Mar 2019 DOI: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.252

Summary and Keywords

In the opening decades of the 21st century, educators have turned toward cosmopolitanism to theorize teaching and learning in light of increasingly globalized relationships and responsibilities. While subject to extensive debates in disciplines like political science, philosophy, anthropology, and sociology, cosmopolitanism in education has primarily been explored as a moral framework resonant with educators' efforts to cultivate people's openness to new ideas, mutual understanding through respectful dialogue, and awareness of relationships to distant and unknown others. Scholars have recently called for more critical cosmopolitan approaches to education, in which the framing of cosmopolitanism as a neutral, essentializing form of global togetherness is subject to critique and includes analysis of systems of power, privilege, and oppression. However, while scholarly efforts to articulate critical cosmopolitanisms (in the plural) are still in nascent form in terms of educational practice, recent work in other disciplines offer promise for forwarding such a critical agenda. In sociology, for example, a focus on cosmopolitics foregrounds the labor of creating a shared world through ongoing, often conflictual negotiations that take into account the historical and contemporary political exigencies that shape that process. A framework of cosmopolitics for educators, particularly as a counterpoint to liberal understandings of cosmopolitanism as a form of ethical universalism, will be explored. Such a critical approach to educational cosmopolitanism not only foregrounds the local, everyday actions needed to build connections with others and create common worlds—but also acknowledges the historical and sociomaterial conditions under which such actions take place. A cosmopolitical approach to educational practice thus recognizes multiplicity and contingency—the mobility that locates people and ideas in new relations can just as easily lead to prejudice and bias as tolerance and solidarity—but does so in an effort to understand how social, political, and economic structures produce inequality, both in the present moment and as legacies from the past.

Keywords: global citizenship, cosmopolitics, postcolonialism, critical cosmopolitanism, world-building, mobility

Introduction

In light of growing economic globalization, new forms of transnational mobility, and an increasingly fractious international landscape, scholars across multiple disciplines have become continuously more concerned with theorizing how people learn to live with one another across significant differences, understandably turning toward cosmopolitanism in their efforts (e.g., Beck, 2012; Chouliaraki, 2016; Hansen, 2011; Harvey, 2009). With a long and complex history, the study of cosmopolitanism has often traced the origin of the term to ancient Stoic philosophies about developing world citizenship through allegiance to a shared human community (Kleingeld & Brown, 2013). Since Kant's (1991[1795]) articulation of cosmopolitanism, scholars have found the ethical universalism of cosmopolitanism compelling as a liberal project, a recognition of people's human rights and concern with humanity as a whole.

Educational scholars have found cosmopolitanism to offer a generative approach given that educators are tasked with fostering dialogue and understanding across a range of cultural and ideological differences (Hansen, 2010, 2011, 2014). American philosopher Martha Nussbaum's 1994 essay about "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism" renewed academic interest in cosmopolitan approaches to education. She argued that liberal education could cultivate cosmopolitan capacities by highlighting collective similarities and positioning people to work together to bridge cultural differences. Debate ensued in the decades after Nussbaum proposed her vision of cosmopolitan education, leading a number of scholars to both expand and challenge her arguments in order to develop a robust ethical framework for educators in a globalized world (see Naseem, & Hyslop-Margison, 2006; Papastephanou, 2013).

These various histories and critiques of cosmopolitanism have been debated in light of new forms of mobility and globalization. Indeed, scholars now talk of the "new cosmopolitanisms," a descriptive pluralism that recognizes the ways people in contemporary times negotiate multiple and overlapping commitments, loyalties, and identities (Robbins & Horta, 2017). Critical and postcolonial scholars have proposed studying "cosmopolitanism from below" and "rooted cosmopolitanism" to address persistent critiques about cosmopolitanism as a normative ideal, suggesting these locally rooted forms of cosmopolitanism take into descriptive account people's lived histories and everyday realities of negotiating multiple commitments, particularly in circumstances of forced migration, state-sponsored violence, and diaspora (e.g., Appiah, 2006; Bhabha, 2017; Kurasawa, 2004; Mignolo, 2000). Though critical approaches to cosmopolitanism have been recognized as important directions in educational research (e.g., Hawkins, 2018; Luke, 2004; Stornaiuolo, 2016), the majority of educational scholarship to date has explored cosmopolitanism as a process of recognizing or cultivating cosmopolitan dispositions and attitudes in individuals (e.g., Choo, 2016; DeCosta, 2014; Hull, Stornaiuolo, & Sahni, 2010; Juzwik & McKenzie, 2015; O'Connor, 2018). This essay suggests that emerging sociological efforts to theorize cosmopolitanism as cosmopolitics offer a potentially generative direction for educators, emphasizing the active political labor required to construct common worlds across differences (Cheah & Robbins, 1998;

Saito, 2015; Watson, 2014). We argue that an explicitly political grounding for cosmopolitanism can reorient educators both to interrogating the systems and histories that work against a vision of a diverse shared humanity and to creating contexts in which the labor of negotiating cosmopolitan world-building activity can thrive.

Historical Foundations of Cosmopolitanism

Most characterizations of cosmopolitanism, from the Stoics to Enlightenment thinkers to contemporary scholars, revolve around the central belief that people belong to a single, shared human community, regardless of their other multiple affiliations and commitments (Kleingeld & Brown, 2013). From such a standpoint, cosmopolitanism involves the development of mutual understanding and cooperation between peoples from different cultures and geographies, suggesting a model of governance beyond the nation-state in which multiple global and local allegiances and identities are taken into account. While there exists a wide and varied literature examining cosmopolitanism as a moral and socio-political philosophy, Vertovec and Cohen (2002) offer a helpful synthesis of these diverse strands. Proposing six perspectives that predominate across the extensive literature, they suggest that cosmopolitanism has been seen as (1) a sociocultural condition; (2) a philosophy or worldview; (3) a political project to develop transnational institutions; (4) a political project to recognize multiple identities; (5) a dispositional orientation or attitude; and (6) a mode of practice. In creating this heuristic for understanding the complexity of approaches to cosmopolitan philosophies, Vertovec and Cohen (2002) illustrate where some of the most persistent tensions have emerged, calling for a more explicit political program of research that can address the resulting challenges—and necessity—of cosmopolitanism in this global era.

Contemporary scholars often frame cosmopolitanism as a response to increasing globalization and as an important means of recognizing mobility and multiplicity (e.g., Beck, 2012; Delanty, 2012; Rajan & Sharma, 2006; Robbins & Horta, 2017). Indeed, cosmopolitanism has been described as a “new humanism” that imagines the world as it might be, not just in forwarding the universal idea that we are connected in our shared humanity but in recognizing how that vision of shared humanity in practice has more often been denied or destroyed than respected and celebrated (Fine & Boon, 2007, p. 6). Recognition of these fraught histories of colonialism, racism, and patriarchy has been at the center of more critical approaches to cosmopolitanism. Critical scholars have suggested that such an analysis not just of what society or the world *might be* but also how the world *has been* and *currently is* represents an important dimension of cosmopolitanism for contemporary times (e.g., Gandhi 2017; Lamont & Aksartova, 2002; Mignolo, 2000; Quayson, 2017). For example, postcolonial scholar Go (2013) examines the role colonialism has played in the production of cosmopolitan thought, arguing that analysis of the complex and contradictory legacies of colonialism require scholars to account for people’s interconnected realities and histories—and to resist any romanticizing of “others” as existing outside systems and institutions. Such clear-eyed analysis of these histories of oppression and inequity open those historically rooted

practices to critical interrogation, in turn recognizing multiple ways of living in the world that do not derive from any one culture or set of universals. While critical scholars have raised extensive critiques of cosmopolitanism, we focus here on three widely discussed in educational circles: the term's Western orientations, its presumptions of a shared universalism, and its tendency toward detached dilettantism. Below, we draw attention to how scholars have worked to refashion the concept in light of these critical perspectives before turning, in the subsequent section, to consider how these debates have animated contemporary educational scholarship concerned with cosmopolitanism.

One of the most pervasive critiques of contemporary cosmopolitanism is its Western orientation and Eurocentric, Enlightenment foundations. While the genealogies of cosmopolitan thought extend through multiple cultures and Indian, Persian, Muslim, and Chinese philosophies (e.g., Delanty & He, 2008; Haiping, 2017; Harris, 2017; Kwok-Bun, 2002; Zubaida, 2002), the macro-narratives about cosmopolitanism often trace its histories from ancient Greece through the Enlightenment (see Calhoun, 2017). These accounts frequently center Kant's (1991[1795]) conception of a cosmopolitan order derived from rationality and legal and civic mandates to develop a peaceful federation based on the principle of hospitality and joint membership in a universal community. Numerous scholars since Kant have expanded, critiqued, and reformulated his ideas; notably, Derrida (2001) recasts cosmopolitan hospitality as a moral project centrally concerned with the dispossessed and persecuted. Critical scholars have questioned the foundational nature of these macro-narratives and located alternative conceptions in other cultural frameworks (e.g., Haiping, 2017; Harris, 2017; Munro & Shilliam, 2010). Murphy (2015), for example, describes how Japanese Buddhist intellectual Watsuji Tetsurō's philosophy offers an important grounding for a critical cosmopolitanism that rejects Western foundations of space and time, instead framing existence as a state of betweenness, or aidagara, that is dynamic and constantly negotiated through our bodies as they are grounded in particular epistemic locations. This form of relational ontology offers possibilities for transformation through reflexivity across multiple relationships and over time, a framing explored by contemporary cosmopolitan scholars seeking to disrupt the status quo and rearticulate new cosmopolitanisms for the contemporary era (e.g., Delanty, 2012; Gandhi, 2017; Calhoun, 2017).

Some scholars take an explicitly postcolonial approach to Western foundations of cosmopolitanism, arguing that we can only transcend its Eurocentric tendencies by understanding the last centuries as a history of empire (e.g., Alavi, 2015; Go, 2013; Lavan, Payne, & Weisweiler, 2016; Mignolo, 2000). From such a stance, Go (2013) argues that European and Western imperialism involved relations of power centered around logics of race and ethnicity that continue to shape current geopolitical realities. Argentinian semiotician Walter Mignolo (2000) locates the cosmopolitan project in relation to colonialism, whereby we cannot instantiate critical forms of cosmopolitanism unless we root those understandings in histories of colonial violence. In contrast with the abstract universals favored in Western notions of cosmopolitanism, Mignolo's concept of "border thinking" emphasizes both the heterogeneity of perspectives that converge as individuals and collectives negotiate across difference, and the necessity for everyone to

have opportunity to participate in such deliberations. In this way, diversity itself becomes the universal project, as new forms of ethical and political imagining become rooted in subaltern perspectives.

A second critique of traditional forms of cosmopolitanism involves precisely these questions about what constitutes universal principles around which everyone can agree. In addition to questioning whether there exists a single community to which everyone belongs or a single tradition from which cosmopolitan principles can emerge (e.g., Gutmann, 2002), a number of scholars have rejected "universalizing" models rooted in Western, elitist, and colonial moral imaginaries (e.g., Appiah, 2006; Bhabha, 1994; Delanty, 2012; Hollinger, 2017; Mignolo, 2000; Pin-Fat, 2013; Werbner, 2008). In focusing on grassroots, grounded, everyday forms of negotiating difference and diversity, these scholars frame cosmopolitanism "from below" as a response to such universalizing principles. While Appiah (2006) acknowledges that this kind of "rooted cosmopolitanism" may seem like an oxymoron, with rootedness suggesting one is firmly located in place and history and cosmopolitanism suggesting that one is a citizen of the world, he insists that both are fundamentally intertwined. Living in a globally connected world, in which our allegiances are criss-crossed and our cultural and communal practices are located in histories of globalization and colonization, people can hold these inward-and-outward facing perspectives and commitments in generative relation to one another. Gandhi (2017) pushes this idea of "on-the-ground" cosmopolitan activity further in arguing that a focus on these "minor" practices can disrupt macro-narratives of mobility tied to economic imperatives, offering an ethics of connection that is explicitly anti-imperial. Chouliaraki (2013, 2016), who writes about the power asymmetries inherent in cosmopolitan practice, argues that for these tensions to be generative, we must pair critical reflection about social inequality with a commitment to understanding across difference, in order to avoid uncritical celebrations of global togetherness that reproduce and exacerbate global inequities.

A final critique of cosmopolitanism stems from the popular connotation of cosmopolitan individuals as wealthy, rootless dilettantes with the means to travel and consume different cultures (for discussion of such historical characterizations, see Hansen, 2014 and Hollinger, 2017). Rarely are migrants or refugees called cosmopolitans, however, and those seen as rootless, such as people from Jewish or Roma cultures, have historically been subject to persecution and social stigma (see Campano & Ghiso, 2011). Santiago (2017) recognizes that many people on the move in contemporary society do so by necessity or force, calling such a formulation "cosmopolitanism of the poor." Postcolonial scholars warn that an uncritical cosmopolitanism can essentialize peoples and edge toward color-blind ideologies that obscure and negate people's lived experiences (e.g., Canagarajah, 2012; Kubota, 2014). Such scholars call for a more rigorous analysis of power and inequalities, particularly as we all operate within neoliberal institutions that shape our beliefs, actions, and policies.

Contemporary Conceptions of Cosmopolitanism in Education

Cosmopolitanism has found particular resonance in educational scholarship, beginning with the work of Nussbaum (1994, 1997), flowering in the scholarship of American educational philosopher David Hansen (2008, 2010, 2011), and extending empirically and conceptually in the work of other educational scholars (e.g., Campano & Ghiso, 2011; Canagarajah, 2012; Choo, 2016; De Costa, 2014; Hull, Stornaiuolo, & Sahni, 2010; Juzwik & McKenzie, 2015; Papastephanou, 2002; Rizvi, 2009; Stornaiuolo, 2016). In arguing that education should play a central role in preparing young people for their moral responsibilities to a shared human community, Nussbaum (1997) suggested that a liberal education could foster three cosmopolitan capacities: critical self-examination and reflection, identification with a global human community, and narrative imagination—or, the ability to imagine across cultural differences.

A number of educational scholars have since taken up Nussbaum's concept of the narrative imagination by examining how arts and literature can help people experience other realities through multiple perspectives, cultivating empathy and greater awareness of one's own position and relationality toward others in the world (e.g., Campano & Ghiso, 2011; Choo, 2016). This view of the arts and literature as a key world-building activity (see Beck, 2012; Stornaiuolo, 2015) is characterized by Cheah (2008, p. 26) as an important means of developing a stance of openness through narrative imagination:

> Cosmopolitanism is primarily about viewing oneself as part of a world, a circle of belonging that transcends the limited ties of kinship and country to embrace the whole of humanity. However, since one cannot see the universe, the world, or humanity, the cosmopolitan optic is not one of perceptual experience but of the imagination. World literature is an important aspect of cosmopolitanism because it is a type of world-making activity that enables us to imagine a world.

Art and literature, in this view, helps us imagine ourselves in relation to others with whom we are not immediately or visibly connected, as we navigate the moral, ideological, and physical distances between us and conceive of the world more broadly (Hull & Stornaiuolo, 2014).

Hansen (2008) has explored how these forms of art and literature at the heart of the narrative imagination are intertwined with cosmopolitanism by way of the "art of living," a process of cultural creativity that allows individuals to craft a meaningful life by being responsive to the needs of others as well as the needs of the self. Hansen introduced the term "educational cosmopolitanism" to theorize how educators in particular can foster this art of living, which combines "a critical openness to the world with a critical loyalty toward the local" (p. 208). At its foundation, Hansen recognizes educational cosmopolitanism to be a moral endeavor, one consistent with Chouliaraki's (2016, p. 3)

definition of cosmopolitan's moral project as the act of "recognizing the humanity of others and acting upon them without demanding reciprocation".

In his introduction to a cosmopolitan-themed issue of *Curriculum Inquiry*, Hansen (2014) suggested that educational scholarship might explore the art of living through field-based research into the human particulars of cultural creativity. The articles in the special issue take up that call, extending earlier conceptual and empirical work into how teaching and learning could be informed by cosmopolitan ideals (Campano & Ghiso, 2011; Canagarajah, 2012; Hull, Stornaiuolo, & Sahni, 2010; Stornaiuolo, Hull, & Sahni, 2011) by studying people's practices "on the ground" in schools, online, and in alternative spaces. In that special issue, all five empirical articles examined the cosmopolitan capacities and dispositions of educators and students in particular lived contexts. Hawkins (2014, p. 5), for example, found that "cosmopolitan artfulness" offered one way for transnational students learning English and communicating with other youth to grapple with global concerns while remaining responsive to their local histories and contexts. Vasudevan (2014) also studied young people's everyday practices, examining their multimodal expressions of belonging even as they negotiated systems of law that constrained those expressions. Hull and Stornaiuolo (2014) studied how young people negotiated their obligations and responsibilities toward one another in an international online community, suggesting that youth's participatory online practices call into question who is in a position to offer hospitality, to speak, to listen, and to represent themselves and others. Choo (2014) engaged in cross-cultural research with world literature teachers in her efforts to understand how curriculum and pedagogy can cultivate imagination hospitable to the other. Finally, Wahlström (2014), in her examination of classroom conversations, proposed four cosmopolitan capacities (self-reflexivity, hospitality, intercultural dialogue, and transactions of perspectives) that offer a continuum for researchers to understand how people occupy various positions of resistance and receptivity at different times and places. All five of these articles contribute to empirical understandings about how individuals might develop cosmopolitan capacities and dispositions through everyday teaching and learning opportunities.

Much of the recent work in education embraces the liberal ideal of cosmopolitanism while pushing back on neoliberal framings that seek to commodify people's practices or offer instrumental explanations for human behavior. Choo (2016), for example, distinguishes between strategic cosmopolitanism in education, which presents as an economic argument to support neoliberal practices like school and global competitiveness, and ethical cosmopolitanism, which involves a humanistic impulse to treat others hospitably and to reflectively consider one's responsibilities toward others. De Costa (2014) similarly examines these tensions in his study of young people in Singapore negotiating between state-sanctioned educational and linguistic practices and their everyday, local discursive practices. These efforts by scholars to articulate educational cosmopolitanism on-the-ground have focused primarily on how individuals develop cosmopolitan capacities and dispositions through interaction (e.g., DeJaynes, 2015; Dunkerly-Bean, Bean, & Alnajjar, 2014; Juzwik & McKenzie, 2015; O'Connor, 2018; Vinokur, 2018).

In positing cosmopolitanism as a potentially generative ethical educational framework, scholars have routinely called for more critical approaches to cosmopolitan education. However, it remains unclear what such a critical orientation entails in educational practice. For example, Dunkerly-Bean, Bean, and Alnajjar (2014) propose a cosmopolitan critical literacy rooted in Freirean notions of praxis as they examine how urban middle school students engaged with a global human rights curriculum. They suggest that a critical orientation to cosmopolitanism in their study involved the opportunity for students to draw on their own histories, engaging self-reflexively about their position in the world. Hawkins (2018) also proposes a critical cosmopolitan framing for her work, calling for an analysis of power in understanding how people negotiate across differences. While it is not always clear that scholars share a definition of criticality, most agree that a critical orientation may emerge in dialogue as a key component of cosmopolitan practice (see Appiah, 2006). Juzwik and McKenzie (2015), for example, examined an evangelical student's experiences in a classroom, suggesting that the routine, everyday opportunities to engage in ethical discourse represents important pedagogical work, even though such work is challenging and raises significant questions about the normative nature of schooling. To emphasize the importance of dialogue in examining existing power structures, Canagarajah (2012, p. 196) proposes a dialogic cosmopolitanism that treats "power as open to negotiation and realignment" through dynamic conversation. Like Canagarajah, and Juzwik and McKenzie, Stornaiuolo (2016) does not frame these negotiations as inherently just or easily accomplished; she suggests that conflict is an important and perhaps even necessary component of having challenging conversations that can lead to cosmopolitan practices in educational spaces.

Despite these scholars' efforts to theorize critical and postcolonial approaches to cosmopolitanism through studying people's practices, however, there remains much that we do not know about how to implement such a framework in the educational sphere. In fact, Robbins and Horta (2017) argue that to move past liberal conceptualizations of cosmopolitanism, we must both recognize the present salience of past injustices and take into account the ways economic structures produce inequalities. A key part of such an effort to historicize, Horta (2017) suggests, is to accept the contradictions inherent in any attempt to work toward openness and receptivity, as these can lead just as easily to prejudice as to tolerance. We turn now to recent work on more political dimensions of cosmopolitanism to offer possibilities for educators to develop critical orientations to cosmopolitanism.

Cosmopolitics

Building on postcolonial critiques of cosmopolitanism, scholars across a range of disciplines have now begun to imagine how the philosophy might be reconfigured so as not to reproduce its historically ethnocentric or colonizing impulses. The philosopher of science Isabelle Stengers (2010, pp. 79–80), for example, suggests that if there is some underlying virtue to be retained from earlier articulations of cosmopolitanism, the point of access to these ideals will not be through Kant or the Stoics or "the promises the West

might flatter itself for propagating," but rather, "from the price others have paid for this self-definition." Like other critics, Stengers invokes the longer legacies of Western exceptionalism as a counterpoint to those who might position cosmopolitanism as an uncomplicated antidote to state and colonial violence—instead, suggesting that the term itself is an outgrowth of such legacies. However, Stengers goes a step further, arguing that it is not only non-dominant human perspectives that have been excluded from traditional cosmopolitan projects, but also the perspectives of non-humans—plants, animals, bacteria, minerals—who share citizenship of the world with us, and whose flourishing and survival is increasingly bound up with our own. In an age when empire and industry have wrought intractable changes to the geosphere and atmosphere and produced climatic catastrophes that disproportionately impact the most world's most vulnerable populations (e.g., Chakrabarty, 2009; Taylor, 2014; Mitchell, 2013; Nixon, 2013), a notion of "cosmopolitanism" that promotes harmony across human difference yet elides the linkages between social and environmental justice is too narrowly conceived. For Stengers (2010), there is need to theorize a true politics of the whole *cosmos*—or, a "cosmopolitics."

Both dimensions of this term—"cosmos" and "politics"—hold important challenges for discussions of cosmopolitanism. Sociologist of science Bruno Latour (2004) suggests that a principal flaw of traditional cosmopolitanism is that its conclusions are rooted in the assumption of a singular, shared cosmos. From such a perspective, the boundaries of nations and people groups may be recognized as malleable constructs, but the drama that plays out between these communities is presumed to unfold against the backdrop of an unchanging, unified "world." It is to this notion of a fixed cosmos that traditional cosmopolitanism appeals when putting forward an ideal of universal, global citizenship. However, for Latour, like the postcolonial critics before him (e.g., Bhabha, 1994; Mignolo, 2000), this fixed world is a fiction—one that obscures the contingent histories of scientific, geopolitical, and philosophical labor that have made possible the image of a unified "world" community. In fields like science studies (Hess, 1997; Biagioli, 1999), where there is a long tradition of interrogating how "worlds" come to be built, shared, and undermined (e.g., Koyre, 1957; Kuhn, 1962), a rich literature has emerged that illuminates how the cosmos, as we know it, is not easily separated from the mechanisms *by which* we know it—namely, the practices that make it legible to us and allow us to ratify our observations as "facts" (Shapin & Schaffer, 1985; Haraway, 1987; Mol, 2002). And because these systems of ratification are not neutral or universal, there is an important sense in which we inhabit a plurality of "worlds"—even as we share a real, singular planet. A central concern for cosmopolitics, then, is not to invoke the existence of an already-existing global identity, but rather, to negotiate the contours of what kind of common world we might build and inhabit together. This means attending to the breadth of available, extant worlds that have been excluded from traditional framings of the "cosmos"—including those of non-dominant people groups, as well as those of non-humans and natural resources upon which human life depends (Saito, 2015; Watson, 2014; see Harding, 2008; Bennett, 2010).

If the “cosmos” in cosmopolitics signals a more inclusive framework for imagining the possible worlds we might inhabit and who we might inhabit them with, the “politics” reflects the means by which we negotiate the common world to be built together. In Benhabib’s (2008) call for an explicitly political vision for cosmopolitanism, these common worlds are constituted by the political reality that peoples, values, and norms are more entangled across national borders than ever before. Such a recognition, however, must be coupled with an analysis of historically conditioned power asymmetries, as legacies of racism, colonialism, religion, and free market capitalism continue to influence how politics play out in lived experience (Chouliaraki, 2016). Drawing on the work of Derrida (2001), Latour (2004), and Stengers (2010), Watson (2014) suggests that imagining, producing, and governing more livable worlds not only requires openness to what may arise (e.g., strangers) but also involves attending to the violence intrinsic to the process.

Unlike traditional cosmopolitanism, which can appear to present global citizenship as a universal, a priori condition, cosmopolitics foregrounds the tremendous amount of labor necessary for producing the values and conditions that support justice, equity, and mutual flourishing. As Latour (2004, p. 455) argues:

> A common world is not something we come to recognize, as though it had always been here (and we had not until now noticed it). A common world, if there is going to be one, is something we will have to build, tooth and nail, together.

The use of “tooth and nail” here suggests a central challenge to this work: we will not always be in agreement about the common world we desire. Cosmopolitics, then, serves as both a process for deliberating and building consensus, as well as a reminder that inhabiting a shared world is never something we can take for granted—it is always a precarious, collective achievement.

Implications for Educators

One of the central implications of a cosmopolitical focus for educators is the recognition that the work of connecting people across differences, in various relational configurations, is effortful. If we need to fight “tooth and nail” to build common worlds, a significant question for educators is how to create spaces where people can engage seriously in that work, speaking across and about differences in perspective, geography, lived histories, oppressions, and power asymmetries. A cosmopolitical stance suggests that one way forward is for educators to create opportunities for world-building through the creative and literate arts, through dialogue, and through personal and collective narrative practices—while recognizing that there is no one, fixed, utopic world to which we all aspire to belong. Such a recognition is a powerful insight, and while consensus may be negotiated, moments of connection may occur when the activity has created opportunities for building diverse worlds and working to communicate across and between them. Figuring out what worlds we are building, and our positions in those worlds in relation to others, is *the very work of education*—fundamentally, political work.

Rather than papering over the effort of such world-making, educators should make its effortful nature part of the very discourse and framing of activity. As so many critical cosmopolitan scholars have noted, the process of negotiation opens possibilities—shared worlds are never found but always built.

One way educators can create expanded opportunities for cosmopolitical engagement is by opening pathways for different forms of dialogue, while simultaneously acknowledging that dialogue, by itself, has limitations. In a cosmopolitan sense, dialogue does not seek agreement or consensus *per se* but offers means to engage, deliberate, and co-construct meaning across difference. A cosmopolitan dialogue will be conflictual and challenging, to be sure, but that is part of the work that world-building demands, especially if we endeavor to engage our co-constructors—human and non-human—on their own terms and not solely in our own image. But there are also moments when it is necessary to recognize the limits of dialogue as a standalone solution. While discussion can sometimes lead to consensus across differences, it can also position competing ideas as viable alternatives to one another, even if one is blatantly racist, classist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, or ableist. Cultivating conversations between oppressors and the oppressed does little to ameliorate the latter's suffering—and more often exacerbates it by requiring them, in the name of "dialogue," to justify their existence, dignity, and rights to those who would withhold or obstruct their liberation. In other words, dialogue that unfolds in an uneven matrix of power may be insufficient to undo the legacies that produced such inequities. In the context of education, this means a cosmopolitical approach may, at times, demand strategic withdrawal from forms of dialogue that reproduce histories of marginalization among students or that compromise broader projects of social, economic, and racial justice. At the same time, such a cosmopolitical approach can also encourage explicit engagement with those histories of injustice—and the contributions and perspectives omitted from whiggish histories of Western humanism—in the work of teaching and learning. Acknowledging the political nature of education, then, opens spaces for new relations, new forms of discourse, and a more honest accounting of historically rooted practices of oppression that are instantiated in everyday life and the practice of educational institutions.

Finally, a cosmopolitical stance must involve a focus not just on the individual, but also on broader network structures and the ways humans and non-humans are positioned therein. When we frame some students or teachers as "more cosmopolitan" than others, or theorize cosmopolitanism as a trait that inheres in people instead of a negotiation that emerges from practice, we risk reproducing a neoliberal ideology that reifies abstract ideals and leverages them to rank and sort people in ways that deny their humanity, their experiences, and their agency. If cosmopolitanism is a relational practice, any configuration of self, other, and world will be continually negotiated across contexts and the life course. One implication for educators, then, is to open spaces for critical reflexivity and analysis of power relations, with the goal of fostering inquiry into the ways power emerges in particular contexts and from particular histories. Such a framing will require careful analysis not only of colonial and racist legacies, but also of other categories of difference (ability, sexuality, gender, and so on) that have been used to

marginalize or oppress individuals and groups. Such analysis also demands that individuals critically examine their own privilege and complicity in systems that deny people their humanity, particularly economic systems that produce or maintain historic inequities. These are essentially humanizing practices that educators can cultivate by creating opportunities for critical self-reflection, reflexivity, and narrative imagination—but always within broader political analyses of how these local histories and practices are situated in networks and systems that benefit some and disenfranchise, oppress, and commit violence against others.

Conclusion

It is clear to see why scholars have renewed interest in cosmopolitanism in light of the significant global challenges we face—poverty and expanding economic disparities, xenophobia, terrorism, new forms of war and international conflict, modern slavery, climate change, refugee crises, and the list goes on. For educators, such global challenges are exacerbated by neoliberal reform efforts, funding disparities, policy overreach, and unequal access to schooling and digital technologies for many children. With its focus on how people might cooperate, collaborate, and communicate across our shared humanity, cosmopolitanism offers hope and possibility that we might yet build a shared world. Yet any framework that offers an imagined world order connecting people to one another across differences must also take into clear account the political realities—and histories—that have divided us.

Rather than seeking a normative, universalized vision for a human rights agenda in one common world we share, critical, cosmopolitical approaches to education foreground the practice of building the worlds we want to live in and recognizing that we not only live in networks of people and things, with histories that condition those worlds, but that we ourselves are networked in relation to everything around us. The universal principle from this perspective is not only diversity, as Mignolo (2000) might suggest, but a commitment to the labor involved in building and negotiating the worlds we want to live in.

This essay proposed a framework of cosmopolitics for educators to not only foreground the local, everyday actions needed to build connections with others and create common worlds—but also acknowledge the historical and sociomaterial conditions under which such actions take place. A cosmopolitical approach to educational practice thus recognizes multiplicity and contingency—the mobility that locates people and ideas in new relations can just as easily lead to prejudice and bias as tolerance and solidarity—but does so in an effort to understand how social, political, and economic structures produce inequality, both in the present moment and as legacies from the past. For educators, such a cosmopolitical stance means recognizing the histories and current realities of colonialism, racism, and white supremacy while opening space for alternative ways to imagine oneself, things, other people, and the world more broadly in relation.

Further Reading

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Cheah, P. (2006). *Inhuman conditions: On cosmopolitanism and human rights*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Delanty, G. (2012). *Routledge handbook of cosmopolitanism studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Igarashi, H., & Saito, H. (2014). **Cosmopolitanism as cultural capital: Exploring the intersection of globalization, education and stratification**. *Cultural Sociology*, *8*(3), 222–239.

Oikonomidoy, E. (2016). **Critical cosmopolitan educational research: Grounded and potentially transformational**. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, *14*(4), 466–476.

Ong, J. C. (2009). The cosmopolitan continuum: Locating cosmopolitanism in cultural and media studies. *Media, Culture & Society*, *31*(3), 449–466.

Popkewitz, T. S., & Rizvi, F. (2009). **Globalization and the study of education: An introduction**. *Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, *108*(2), 7–28.

Robbins, B., & Horta, P. L. (Eds.). (2017). *Cosmopolitanisms*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Rizvi, F. (2009). Toward cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *30*(3), 253–268.

Todd, S. (2010). Living in a dissonant world: Toward an agonistic cosmopolitics for education. *Studies in the Philosophy of Education*, *29*(2), 213–228.

References

Alavi, S. (2015). Muslim cosmopolitanism in the age of empire. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.

Beck, U. (2012). Redefining the sociological project: the cosmopolitan challenge. *Sociology 46*(1), 7–12.

Benhabib, S. (2008). *Another cosmopolitanism*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Bennett, J. (2010). *Vibrant matter: A political ecology of things*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Bhabha, H. (1994). *The location of culture*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

Bhabha, H. (2017). Spectral sovereignty, vernacular cosmopolitanisms, and cosmopolitan memories. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 141–152). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Biagioli, M. (Ed.) (1999). *The science studies reader*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Calhoun, C. (2017). A cosmopolitanism of connections. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 189–200). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Campano, G., & Ghiso, M. P. (2011). Immigrant students as cosmopolitan intellectuals. In S. A. Wolf, K. Coats, P. Enciso, & C. A. Jenkins (Eds.), *Handbook of research on children's and young adult literature* (pp. 164–176). New York, NY: Routledge.

Canagarajah, S. (2012). *Translingual practice: Global Englishes and cosmopolitan relations*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

Cheah, P. (2008). What is a world? On world literature as world-making activity. *Daedalus*, *137*(3), 26–38.

Cheah, P., & Robbins, B. (1998). *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Choo, S. S. (2014). **Cultivating a hospitable imagination: Re-Envisioning the world literature curriculum through a cosmopolitan lens**. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 68–89.

Choo, S. S. (2016). Fostering the hospitable imagination through cosmopolitan pedagogies: Reenvisioning literature education in Singapore. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *50*(4), 400–422.

De Costa, P. (2014). Reconceptualizing cosmopolitanism in language and literacy education: Insights from a Singapore school. *Research in the Teaching of English*, *49*(1), 9–30.

DeJaynes, T. (2015). **"Where I'm From" and belonging: A multimodal, cosmopolitan perspective on arts and inquiry**. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, *12*(2), 183–198.

Derrida, J. (2001). *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness*, trans. M. Dooley & M. Hughes (Ed.), S. Critchley & R. Kearney. London, U.K.: Routledge.

Dunkerly-Bean, J., Bean, T., & Alnajjar, K. (2014). **Seeking asylum: Adolescents explore the crossroads of human rights education and cosmopolitan critical literacy**. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, *58*(3), 230–241.

Chakrabarty, D. (2009). The climate of history: Four theses. *Critical Inquiry*, *35*(2), 197–222.

Chouliaraki, L. (2013). **Re-mediation, inter-mediation, trans-mediation**. *Journalism Studies*, *14*(2), 267–283.

Chouliaraki, L. (2016). Cosmopolitanism. In J. Gray & L. Ouelette (Eds.), *Media Studies*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Delanty, G., & He, B. (2008). Cosmopolitan perspectives on European and Asian transnationalism. *International Sociology*, *23*(3), 323–344.

Delanty, G. (2012). The idea of critical cosmopolitanism. In G. Delanty (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of cosmopolitanism studies* (pp. 38–46). London, U.K.: Routledge.

Fine, R., & Boon, V. (2007). **Cosmopolitanism: Between past and future**. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *10*(1), 5–16.

Gandhi, L. (2017). Utonal life: A genealogy for global ethics. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 65–90). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Go, J. (2013). **Fanon's postcolonial cosmopolitanism**. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *16*(2), 208–225.

Gutmann, A. (1996). Democratic citizenship. In M. C. Nussbaum & J. Cohen (Eds.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 66–71). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Gutmann, A. (2002). Civic minimalism, cosmopolitanism, and patriotism: Where does democratic education stand in relation to each? *Nomos*, *43*, 23–57.

Haiping, Y. (2017). Other cosmopolitans. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 254–270). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Hansen, D. T. (2008). Education viewed through a cosmopolitan prism. *Philosophy of Education Yearbook*, 206–214

Hansen, D. T. (2010). Cosmopolitanism and education: A view from the ground. *Teachers College Record*, *112*(1), 1–30.

Hansen, D. T. (2011). *The teacher and the world: A study of cosmopolitanism as education*. London, U.K.: Routledge.

Hansen, D. T. (2014). **Cosmopolitanism as cultural creativity: New modes of educational practice in globalizing times**. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 1–14.

Haraway, D. (1987). *Primate visions: Gender, race, and nature in the world of modern science*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Harding, S. (2008). *Sciences from below: Feminisms, postcolonialisms, modernities*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Harper, H., Bean, T. W., & Dunkerly, J. (2010). Cosmopolitanism, globalization and the field of adolescent literacy. *Canadian and International Education*, *39*(3).

Harris, A. (2017). Afropolitan style and unusable global spaces. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 240–253). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Harvey, D. (2009). *Cosmopolitanism and the geographies of freedom*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Hawkins, M. R. (2014). **Ontologies of place, creative meaning making and critical cosmopolitan education**. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 90–112.

Hawkins, M. R. (2018). **Transmodalities and transnational encounters: Fostering critical cosmopolitan relations**. *Applied Linguistics*, *39*(1), 55–77.

Hess, D. (1997). *Science studies: An advanced introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Hollinger, D. A. (2017). Cosmopolitanism and the problem of solidarity. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 91–101). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Horta, P. L. (2017). Cosmopolitanism prejudice. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 153–170). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Hull, G., & Stornaiuolo, A. (2014). Cosmopolitan literacies, social networks, and “proper distance”: Striving to understand in a global world. *Curriculum Inquiry 44*(1), 15–44.

Hull, G. A., Stornaiuolo, A., & Sahni, U. (2010). Cultural citizenship and cosmopolitan practice: Global youth communicate online. *English Education*, *42*(4), 331–367.

Juzwik, M. M., & McKenzie, C. (2015). Writing, religious faith, and rooted cosmopolitan dialogue: Portraits of two American evangelical men in a public school English classroom. *Written Communication*, *32*(2), 1–29.

Kant, I. (1991 [1795]). Perpetual peace: A philosophical sketch. In Reiss (2nd Ed.), *Kant: Political Writing* (pp. 93–130). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

Kleingeld, P., & Brown, E. (2013). **Cosmopolitanism**. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2014).

Koyre, A. (1957). *The closed world and the infinite universe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kubota, R. (2014). **The multi/plural turn, postcolonial theory, and neoliberal multiculturalism: Complicities and implications for implied linguistics**. *Applied Linguistics*, *37*(4), 474–494.

Kuhn, T. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Kurasawa, F. (2004). **A cosmopolitanism from below: Alternative globalization and the creation of a solidarity without bounds**. *European Journal of Sociology*, *45*, 233–255.

Kwok-Bun, C. (2002). Both sides, now: Culture contact, hybridization, and cosmopolitanism. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context, and practice* (pp. 191–208). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Lamont, M., & Aksartova, S. (2002). **Ordinary cosmopolitanisms: Strategies for bridging racial boundaries among working-class men**. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *19*(4), 1–25.

Latour, B. (2004). Whose cosmos, which cosmopolitics? Comments on the peace terms of Ulrich Beck. *Common Knowledge*, *10*(3), 450–462.

Lavan, M., Payne, R. E., & Weisweiler, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Cosmopolitanism and empire*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Luke, A. (2004). **Teaching after the market: From commodity to cosmopolitan**. *Teachers College Record*, *106*(7), 1422–1443.

Luke, A., Sefton-Green, J., Graham, P., Kellner, D., & Ladwig, J. (2018). Digital ethics, political economy, and the curriculum: This changes everything. In K. Mills, A. Stornaiuolo, A. Smith, & J. Zacher Pandya (Eds.), *Handbook of Digital Writing and Literacies Research* (pp. 251–262). New York, NY: Routledge.

Mignolo, W. D. (2000). The many faces of the cosmo-polis: Border thinking and critical cosmopolitanism. *Public Culture*, *12*(3), 721–748.

Mitchell, T. (2013). *Carbon democracy: Political power in the age of oil*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso.

Mol, A. (2002). *The body multiple: Ontology in medical practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Munro, M., & Shilliam, R. (2010). Alternative sources of cosmopolitanism: Nationalism, universalism and Créolité in Francophone Caribbean thought. In R. Shilliam (Ed.), *International Relations and Non-Western Thought* (pp. 159–177). London, U.K.: Routledge.

Murphy, M. (2015). **The critical cosmopolitanism of Watsuji Tetsuro**. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *18*(4), 507–522.

Naseem, M. A., & Hyslop-Margison, E. J. (2006). Nussbaum's concept of cosmopolitanism: Practical possibility or academic delusion? *Paideusis*, *15*(2), 51–60.

Nixon, R. (2013). *Slow violence and the environmentalism of the poor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1994). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. *Boston Review*, *XIX*(5), 3–16.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: A classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

O'Connor, B. H. (2018). Cross-border mobility and critical cosmopolitanism among South Texas University students, *Teachers College Record*, *120*(5), 1–54.

Papastephanou, M. (2002). Arrows not yet fired: Cultivating cosmopolitanism through education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *36*(1), 69–86.

Papastephanou, M. (2013). **Cosmopolitanism discarded: Martha Nussbaum's patriotic education and the inward–outward distinction**. *Ethics and Education*, *8*(2), 166–178.

Pin-Fat, V. (2013). **Cosmopolitanism and the end of humanity: A grammatical reading of posthumanism**. *International Political Sociology*, *7*(3), 241–257.

Quayson, A. (2017). City of youth and mellow elusiveness: Accra's cosmopolitan constellations. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 215–229). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Rajan, G. & Sharma, S. (2006). *New cosmopolitanisms: South Asians in the US*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Robbins, B., & Horta, P. L. (2017). Cosmopolitanisms. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 1–20). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Rizvi, F. (2009). Toward cosmopolitan learning. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *30*(3), 253–268.

Saito, H. (2015). **Cosmopolitics: towards a new articulation of politics, science and critique**. *The British Journal of Sociology*, *66*(3), 441–459.

Santiago, S. (2017). The cosmopolitanism of the poor. In B. Robbins & P. L. Horta (Eds.), *Cosmopolitanisms* (pp. 21–39). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Shapin, S., & Schaffer, S. (1985). *The leviathan and the airpump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the experimental life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Silverstone, R. (2007). *Media and morality: On the rise of the mediapolis*. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity.

Stengers, I. (2010). *Cosmopolitics I*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Stornaiuolo, A. (2015). Literacy as worldmaking: Cosmopolitanism, creativity, and multimodality. In K. Pahl & J. Rowsell (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Literacy Studies* (pp. 561–572). New York, NY: Routledge.

Stornaiuolo, A. (2016). Teaching in global collaborations: Navigating challenging conversations through cosmopolitan activity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *59*, 503–513.

Stornaiuolo, A., Hull, G. A., & Sahni, U. (2011). Cosmopolitan imaginings of self and other: Youth and social networking in a global world. In J. Fisherkeller (Ed.), *International perspectives on youth media: Cultures of production and education* (pp. 263–280). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Taylor, D. (2014). *Toxic communities: Environmental racism, industrial pollution, and residential mobility*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Vasudevan, L. (2014). Multimodal cosmopolitanism: Cultivating belonging in everyday moments with youth. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 45–67.

Vertovec, S., & Cohen, R. (2002). Introduction: Conceiving cosmopolitanism. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen, *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context, and practice* (pp. 1–24). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Vinokur, E. (2018). **Cosmopolitan education in local settings: Toward a new civics education for the 21st century**. *Policy Futures in Education*, *16*(8), 964–984.

Watson, M. C. (2014). **Derrida, Stengers, Latour, and subalternist cosmopolitics**. *Theory, Culture & Society*, *31*(1), 75–98

Werbner, P. (2008). Towards a new cosmopolitan anthropology. In P. Werbner (Ed.), *Anthropology and the New Cosmopolitanism* (pp. 1–29). Oxford, U.K.: Berg.

Wahlström, N. (2014). **Toward a conceptual framework for understanding cosmopolitanism on the ground**. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *44*(1), 113–132.

Zubaida, S. (2002). Middle Eastern experiences of cosmopolitanism. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context, and practice* (pp. 32–41). Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press.

Amy Stornaiuolo

University of Pennsylvania

T. Phillip Nichols

Baylor University