London Review of Education
Vol. 8, No. 2, July 2010, 93–104

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Curriculum reform in a globalised world: the discourses of cosmopolitanism and community

Steven P. Camicia* and Barry M. Franklin

School of Teacher Education and Leadership, Utah State University, Logan, UT, USA

Under conditions of globalisation, the discourse of cosmopolitanism adds a new dimension to analysis of curriculum reform. We examine the meanings and contentions of curriculum as a regulatory function in rapidly changing, global communities. We examine cosmopolitanism and curriculum through the lenses of two cosmopolitan discourses, neoliberal and democratic. This provides a theoretically complex snapshot of how the discourse of cosmopolitanism reflects different ideologies concerning community and curriculum reform. We support and conclude with a curriculum proposal promoting a democratic cosmopolitan discourse that is culturally responsive, democratic, and socially just in the face of neoliberal globalisation.

Keywords: globalisation; cosmopolitanism; community; curriculum reform; democratic education

There are, it seems, critical connections between the array of discourses – the textual ideas that provide meaning and constitute systems of power – that we employ to talk about the interplay between broad cultural practices and the narrower policies and programs of specific institutions such as the schools. Such discourses serve an important role as the lenses that enable us to explain and understand for example, what schools teach, how teachers and student behave and interact with each other, how they relate to the larger society, and how over time they maintain themselves as well as change.

In this essay we will explore two such discourses that have been particularly popular in recent years in explaining, symbolically, how schools act to establish a sense of collective belonging that connects individuals to each other and joins individuals to groups of various sorts (Cohen 1985; Popkewitz 2008). One is community, which according to Alan Ehrenhalt is used variously to refer on one side of the political spectrum to 'a more egalitarian society' and on the other to a society committed to 'self-discipline and personal responsibility' (1998, 93). The other is cosmopolitanism that Martha Nussbaum defines as offering our principal loyalty 'to the moral community made up by the humanity of all human beings' (1996, 7). Although these notions can and have been used separately to describe a sense of collective belonging, they have increasingly been used together in framing an understanding of that sense. In this essay, we address these two forms of collective belonging.

The essay examines the meanings, conflicts, agreements, and new directions that inscribing discourses of community, cosmopolitanism, or a combination of the two poses for the curriculum in its regulatory role in rapidly changing global settings. Our inquiry illustrates the blurred boundaries of geopolitical belonging, and more specifically, the relationships between individuals, governmental, and nongovernmental organisations. We provide a theoretically complex

*Corresponding author. Email: steven.camicia@usu.edu

ISSN 1474-8460 print/ISSN 1474-8479 online
© 2010 Institute of Education, University of London
DOI: 10.1080/14748460.2010.487327
http://www.informaworld.com

snapshot of how discourses of community and cosmopolitanism can be used to identify the intents and affinities of curriculum reform (Parker and Camicia 2009; Franklin 2010). We offer examples from the US and Great Britain. The essay concludes with a proposal that brings together discourses of community and cosmopolitanism to shape a curriculum that is culturally responsive, democratic, and socially just.

We will first examine the ways in which scholars have used the notion of community to inscribe individuals and groups with a sense of collective belonging. Second, we ill look at how other scholars have used the notion of cosmopolitanism for the same purpose. Third, we will examine the efforts of still others to bring the two concepts together in framing a notion of collective belonging within the curriculum. We will then provide examples of how such an orientation to the curriculum has played itself out in practice. Finally, we will draw some conclusions concerning how using these two discourses move us along further in our understanding of the present day school curriculum, in the US and in other national settings.

Those who use these discourses either separately or in combination with each other typically assign them multiple and often conflicting meaning. These discourses are in effect what we call sliding or empty signifiers (Burgos 2003; Lecan 1977; LaClau 1994). The multiple worldviews and conflicting social visions embedded in these discourses are often at the heart of much of the conflict that surrounds curriculum reform and education. Language, then, is a struggle over the dominance between one meaning over other meanings (Bakhtin 1981). Such disputes are clearly ideological but the outcomes have profound impacts upon a host of educational practices, particularly curriculum reform (Camicia 2007, 2008).

The current matrix created by efforts to align schooling with larger social and economic transformations that are making our world increasingly global and multicultural provide us with a fertile terrain to explore this conflict. Of particular interest to us in this regard are the far-reaching effects of globalisation and its effects on the organisation and meaning of social life, a process which Held and McGrew define as 'the expanding scale, growing magnitude, speeding up and deepening impact of transcontinental flows and patterns of social interaction' (2002). The result has been to intensify our awareness of global issues by expanding and accelerating human interactions and flows of capital between nation states (Held et al. 1999).

We are particularly interested in exploring how a discourse of community that once offered us an interpretive lens for understanding the regulative role of schooling, particularly curriculum, has been assigned new meanings under conditions of globalisation and the discourse of cosmopolitanism. We find it productive to view the discourse of cosmopolitanism as having two strands communicating two unique visions for community. First, neoliberal cosmopolitanism defines global citizens as a community of self-starting entrepreneurs who function best when government regulations support market rationality. Second, democratic cosmopolitanism defines global citizens as a community of diverse individuals who behave optimally when government regulations support cultural representation, human rights, and social justice. These two strands of the cosmopolitan discourse support unique rationales for community, and, by extension, curriculum.

Community and schooling

We noted at the beginning of this essay that the concept of community refers to a sense of collective belonging that binds groups and individuals together around common goals and a sense of the common good. Educational scholars, policy makers, and politicians have used the discourse of community throughout the twentieth century as a conceptual lens for interpreting the role of the curriculum as a unifying element in national settings (Fendler 2006; Franklin 1986, 2010; Popkewitz 2008).

At the root of this contestation has been the imprecise meanings given to the term. The political scientist Robert Booth Fowler (1991) has identified five such viewpoints. There is the participatory community that is built on face-to-face relationships, self-governance, and equality. There is also the republican community in which the ethos of the civic virtue and personal responsibility prevail. A respect for traditional values and a commitment to family, neighbourhood, church, and nation also describe a form of community, which Fowler refers to as a community of roots. He goes on to locate a sense of community in the human desire for the survival of the planet that is built on environmentalism, sustainability, and peace. Finally, he points to the role that varieties of religious experience play in forming a sense of community. The sociologist Suzanne Keller notes similarly that the term has been used to describe a physical or geographical place, a set of shared values, and the bonds and networks that join people and groups together (2003). In a 1955 essay, George Hillery identified 94 different and often conflicting definitions of the term in the sociological literature of his day (1955). As a result, there is something nebulous in the discourse of community that leads those who employ it to talk about the concept in vague and often times contradictory ways (Fendler 2006; Phillips 1993).

One of the sites where the interplay between community and curriculum has been and remains particularly visible in the US and in England involves the shaping of public and educational policy surrounding ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged populations. Accompanying America's transformation from a largely rural and agrarian society to an urban, industrial one at the end of the nineteenth century and into the first two decades of the twentieth was the influx into the population of large numbers of eastern and southern European immigrants. For the native born population of northern and western European origin who dominated the nation's business and professional classes, this population shift was seen as undesirable as it brought into the country large numbers of individuals who they believed lacked the experience, sentiments, and even intellectual capacity to live and function in a democratic society. They were seen as a source of social instability and disruption.

The first line of defense that they proposed was immigration restriction, which led to an array of federal legislation that reduced the number of immigrants from this eastern and southern Europe as well as Asia who were admitted into the country. Beyond immigration restriction, they turned to the public schools to instil immigrants who successfully entered the country with the dispositions, knowledge, and skills that would smooth their transition to citizenship. In effect, the schools would become instruments of social control for containing the threats that the native born population saw as stemming from this pattern of immigration.

Early twentieth century intellectuals, particularly those identified with the emerging social sciences, were as it turns out divided as to how the American state should deal with this supposed population change. They framed their response using the discourse of community. There were those like the psychologist Edward L. Thorndike, and the sociologists David Snedden, Ross L. Finney, and Edward A. Ross who saw these immigrants as representing a threat to social order and stability and ultimately to American democracy itself. For them, the idea of community became something of a defensive notion designed to curb what they saw as the disruptions and dislocations that they identified with a growing diverse and heterogeneous population. The schools were to their way of thinking an agency for constructing a homogenous and likeminded community.

There were others, most notably the philosopher John Dewey and the sociologists Charles Horton Cooley and George Herbert Mead who took a far less defensive position. They did not fear immigrants but welcomed them as a source of fresh ideas and innovative practices that would enrich American society. They too framed their response to immigration using the discourse of community albeit a different one. Their understanding of community was one that was built on the mutual adjustment of all segments of society to a commonly agreed set of

values, attitudes, and standards of behaviour reflecting the diverse cultural practices of the population. Securing this mutual and reciprocal adjustment was the task of a democratic brand of social control that they entrusted to the schools (Franklin 1986).

Later in the century, the Scottish philosopher John Macmurray developed a notion of community that served a similar discursive function. Although his concept was rooted in a different intellectual tradition, it did like Dewey's posit mutuality and reciprocity as the guiding principles of human interaction (Fielding 2000, 2007). When, however, this idea of community was adopted by Tony Blair as part of his 'third way' rationale for the reforms of his New Labour government, it became something very different. Rather than the voluntary, non-coercive moral principle that for Macmurray had no purpose beyond itself, community for Blair was to be a contractual notion to describe the pattern of rights and obligations that should exist between the individual and the state. It was this form, as we shall see later in this essay, that became the vehicle for correcting the family, community, and individual deficits that New Labour saw as characteristic of immigrant and working class communities that stood in the way of Britain's economic productivity in a globalised world (Hale 2006).

Curriculum and community

One of the most important sites for debate surrounding the discourse of community in twentieth century America has been the school curriculum. In his history of this conflict Zimmerman (2002) found that although numerous ethnic and racial groups have been successful in adding their viewpoint to the national meta-narrative of the American experience, few of them have been successful in changing the underlying theme of nationalism. The challenges that ethnic minorities have made over the years to the Eurocentric orientation of the social studies curriculum did result in the inclusion of more accounts of heroes from this or that national group. They did not, however, succeed in deconstructing the metanarratives that seemed to justify their exclusion and marginal status from the story of the nation in the first place.

It is the social studies curriculum in the US and in other nations that has been the contemporary venue for the struggle over the discourse of community that was not dissimilar to what we saw in the debates between early twentieth century intellectuals over eastern and southern European immigration. In their examination of the conflict surrounding the national history standards in US schools – one phase of the effort of American educational reformers at the end of the twentieth century to upgrade curriculum content and enhance academic achievement – Nash, Crabtree, and Dunn have noted a division between those promoting critiques of the nation and those holding to a metanarrative of national exceptionality. They claimed that those who attacked the historians who wrote these standards 'as cultural elitists who are actually frightened by the shattering of elite control over history writing, by the subsequent widening of historians' lenses, by the "opening of the American mind" rather than its closing' (1997, 24). In their conclusion, they argued that the challengers of the new standards (see Cheney 1995) echoed a familiar ring in curriculum controversies throughout the century – the standards drifted too far from a metanarrative of US exceptionality.

The curriculum in other nations has mirrored these findings from the US For example, national metanarratives of exceptionality at the expensive of critical reflection are common in many countries. The reluctance to look inward and consider multiple perspectives in the social studies curriculum is a common refrain in many countries, including Brazil (Silva 2004), China (Crawford and Foster 2008), Soviet and post-Soviet Russia (Wertsch 2002), and Bosnia and Herzegovina (Torsti 2007).

The discourse of community as it has developed in the school curriculum encourages speech that lauds a national family through metanarratives of national exceptionality and topics such as

heroism, progress, loyalty, national security, and theistic privilege. Wertsch describes the construction of these metanarratives as a process of 'collective remembering'. Contention arises as groups 'renegotiate collective memory' (2002, 149). Displays of historical narratives in public places such as museums (Trofanenko 2006) or the historical narratives in school curriculum (Segall 2006) position individuals and groups within identities of dominance and subjugation. The curriculum in many countries becomes a vehicle for reifying identities related to 'us' and 'the others' (Torsti 2007). One of the effects of the discourse of nationalism in social studies curriculum is to inscribe nationality on subjects or to define the nation as the scope of community belonging.

A question that we need to consider at this point is the continuing value of the notion of community for conceptualising the regulative role of schooling and the curriculum in particular. The issue is whether or not our existing notions of collective belonging make sense for a world that is experiencing the accelerating pace of globalisation. Whether it is through increased flows of human migration or the ever growing danger of contagion or epidemic devaluing of capital across global markets, the communities that we live, work, and learn in are changing in dramatic ways. These effects have spawned rich debates in many of the social sciences about traditional notions of identity and belonging (Castles and Davidson 2000; Ritzer 2007). Under these conditions, a single nation can no longer be the sole player in promoting social and educational services. Such provisions have multiple sponsors, sometimes across nations, sometimes within nations.

In recent years, the discourse of community within the curriculum has been challenged by this increasing globalisation and the growing awareness that using the national community as the point of departure and return is becoming less tenable. It is this awareness that encourages us to examine new visions for the scope and character of community and curriculum reform. One such vision is tied to the discourse of cosmopolitanism in its various forms, which we examine next.

Cosmopolitanism, neoliberalism, and curriculum

In US and British schools, the curriculum has traditionally served nationalistic intents by promoting worldviews of national exceptionality (Foster and Crawford 2006) and a nationalistic understanding of community. Although international education has been around in one form or another since the nineteenth century (Sylvester 2002), globalisation is intensifying challenges to nationalistic worldviews of community, as well as related issues such as local autonomy (Caldwell and Lozada Jr. 2007), citizenship (Ong 2006), human migration (Castles and Davidson 2000), economics (Friedman 2005), social sciences (Beck 2007), education in general (Suárez-Orozco and Qin-Hilliard 2004) and curriculum in particular (Nicholls 2006). Some propose revising curriculum toward a cosmopolitan worldview to prepare students for the challenges of globalisation (see Noddings 2005). In the remainder of this essay, we explore the range of intents for a cosmopolitan curriculum and what vision of community do these intents suggest? The questions that this paper addresses are these: What is the range of intents for cosmopolitan curriculum? What visions of community do these intents suggest?

Globalisation has intensified demands on the curriculum due to the rapidly increasing awareness and material connections within and across geopolitical boundaries. One of the responses to these changes is to reform curriculum in a way that is more responsive to a global community. Because of the often contradictory purposes toward which schooling is directed, its transformative impact more often than not has been partial rather than total. Under the discourse of neoliberal cosmopolitanism, students are future citizen/consumers/workers/entrepreneurs in a global marketplace. As a product of market rationality, curriculum

reflects goals for efficiency, standardisation, and individual responsibility, three key elements of neoliberal cosmopolitanism.

There is, under conditions of globalisation, a shift in the role of the state itself from that of directing to one of enabling. While the state ceases to govern directly, it does not retreat from its role in regulation. Rather, that role occurs indirectly and is mediated by civil society operating through such non-government organizations as public private partnerships. At the same time, the mechanism for regulating individual conduct shifts from external social control to self-governance. According to Rose:

> The state is no longer to be required to answer all society's needs for order, security, health and productivity. Individuals, firms, organizations, localities, schools, parents, hospitals, housing estates must take on themselves – as 'partners' – a portion of the responsibility for resolving these issues – whether this be by permanent retraining for the work, or neighbourhood watch for the community. This involves a double movement of autonomization and responsibilization. Organizations and other actors that were once enmeshed in the complex and bureaucratic lines of force of the social state are to be set free to find their own destiny. Yet, at the same time, they are to be made responsible for that destiny, and for the destiny of society as a whole in new ways. Politics is to be returned to society itself, but no longer in a social form: in the form of individual morality, organizational responsibility and ethical community. (Rose 1999, 174–5)

Taken together, these two changes undercut the ability of a notion of community as it is traditionally defined to interpret and understand curriculum reform. We see this when we look at those initiatives that rely on the mechanism that characterises much of curriculum change under conditions of globalisation, the educational partnership. This arrangement is a product of so-called 'third way' thinking and reflects the commitments of that movement to among other things the reconstruction of the state through processes of devolution and decentralisation, an increased reliance on civil society and the development of social capital for governing, and the promotion of a collaborative relationship between individuals and the state (Franklin, Bloch, and Popkewitz 2003; Giddens 1998, 2000).

One of the best examples of this approach in the US was the early to mid 1990s Annenberg Foundation funded New York Networks for School Renewal. A partnership of three intermediary groups and a community organisation, the initiative used Annenberg grant money, public funding, and private sector, cash and in-kind support to redesign New York City's schools into a number of smaller, theme-based schools of choice as a means of raising standards, enhancing academic achievement, and increasing social mobility among the city's largely minority and economically distressed student population. At the heart of this project was the partnership that established the New York Networks themselves as well as numerous partnerships between individual schools and profit and non-profit civic, business, and philanthropic organisations to fund added personnel, resources, and services.

Two of the Networks' smaller high schools reflect this neoliberal orientation. The International Arts Business School, for example, offers a focus on the fine and visual arts but sees its curriculum being 'infused with the themes of arts and business' and seeks to help its students 'to develop knowledge and experience in the business aspects of the arts'. The East–West School of International Studies sees its mission as preparing students for 'an international world'. Yet, its focus is on providing those enrolled with preparation for a 'professional career' and the skills that will prepare them for 'success' (New York City Department of Education 2009).

For a program that more clearly highlights this brand of neoliberal cosmopolitan educational reform, we need to turn to England and look at the Education Action Zone initiative that Britain's Labour government introduced in its early days in power under Prime Minister Tony Blair. This program brought together clusters of usually 15 to 25 schools located in areas of social and economic distress with the intent of improving the academic performance for youth

within these schools. Such increases in academic standards, it was hoped, would over time enhance the employment opportunities for zone students and help to rejuvenate local economies battered by the impact of globalisation. The zones were administered by partnerships involving the schools, local education agencies, parents, community groups, and private sector organisations and were funded by a combination of direct government support and private sector, particularly business, contributions.

The neoliberal orientation of this reform comes through most clearly in the changes that Blair made to the concept of community that he claimed to have adopted from Macmurray. As he expressed it, community was a notion to describe the pattern of obligations and rights that should exist between individuals in their relationship with the state. It was an idea that posited the duty of individuals to participate in those activities that would aid the state to address the problems of a globalised world, particularly those related to economic productivity, employment, and social cohesion. The idea of community that Blair wanted to promote through EAZs reflected the belief that those economically disadvantaged individuals and groups that receive the social supports that the British state has provided in welfare benefits, health service, and education bring with them an obligation for those individuals to work hard, attend school, seek employment, and upgrade their skills through a commitment to lifelong learning.

For New Labour, the economic and social problems that Britain faces under conditions of globalisation are not the result of structural difficulties but rather of individual and group failure. As a consequence, New Labour policy-makers have been willing to support a range of coercive strategies to enforce parental responsibility, school attendance, and academic achievement in their belief that such policies will produce a more skilled, efficient, and committed workforce and ultimately a more prosperous state. It is the penchant of New Labour to promote the idea of community to fix failed individuals rather than a failed state that inscribes a neoliberal orientation to their views (Franklin 2005).

Elements of this orientation can be seen in the academies program that the New Labour government began introducing in 2000. An adaptation of the Conservative Party's City Technology Colleges, these are schools that are established, funded, and managed by partnerships between of public and private agencies and that operate independently of local authorities. These schools are given significant autonomy including the ability to depart from the national curriculum and to establish their own distinct working conditions and pay standards. Some are newly organised while others are the result of reconstituting existing schools that have been judged to be failing (Ball 2007; Chitty 2009). Titcombe (2008) describes a number of academies that have introduced curriculum programs with a decidedly neoliberal bent. One such school, he points out, has installed a facility to train students for employment as customer service representatives. He also notes that the Manchester, England Airport is considering sponsoring an academy to train future airport employees. The role of this brand of curriculum reform, then, is to address the needs of a global market by educating and training citizen entrepreneurs who can navigate this new form of community. Under neoliberal cosmopolitanism discourse, citizens who do not perform are judged almost solely responsible for poor living and working conditions because the state has provided them the tools to be self-starting entrepreneurs.

The discourse of democratic cosmopolitanism: curriculum reform and resistance in a global age

In a recent study, Parker and Camicia (2009) found contradictory themes in current attempts to internationalise the curriculum. Their findings are illustrated in our following examples. The New York Networks that we described earlier included established schools similar to the ones we already identified that inscribed their curriculum with a neoliberal orientation. There were,

however, Network schools whose course of study includes ideals of democratic cosmopolitanism. The Peace and Diversity Academy, for example, sees its principal goal as seeking 'to create leaders who have the requisite skills and attitudes to build an increasingly just and democratic global society'. It is a school that claims to be 'committed to fostering anti-bias attitudes, inspiring social justice and peace activism, building student and teacher skills in active communication, conflict resolution, mediation, diplomacy and human rights leadership'. Similarly, the High School for Global Citizenship encourages its potential students to help 'change the world' by 'slowing global warming, ending poverty, achieving peace over war and choosing diversity over intolerance' (New York City Department of Education 2009).

Another example in the US of the framing of curriculum using the discourse of democratic cosmopolitanism is the International High School Smaller Learning Community at Berkeley High School in Berkeley, California. One of the six academic programs that comprise Berkeley High School, the international community was designed to establish an international studies program within the school. An interdisciplinary program that comprises three hours of the student's day, it focuses its attention on 'the study of nations'. The program seeks to impart to its students the 'cultural awareness necessary for constructive relations and understanding with people of all nationalities'. In addition to the courses that comprise a traditional high school course of study, the program includes courses in global studies, global history, global literature, economic systems, and comparative values. Beyond coursework, this initiative includes an array of international study options that enable students to travel, study, and engage in community service activities in Latin America, Europe, Africa, and other locations throughout the world. For the staff of this program, its key purpose is to 'further students' recognition and development of universal human values' (Berkeley International High School 2009).

Across the Atlantic, George Green's School has also has also used the International Baccalaureate (IB) as its vehicle for inscribing democratic cosmopolitanism into its curriculum. A comprehensive secondary school located in the multiethnic and economically distressed London Borough of Tower Hamlets, the school frames its identity in a decidedly cosmopolitan discourse. This is a school, according to its website, with a motto of 'all different/all equal/learn today/succeed tomorrow'. With a specialism in the humanities, the George Green's School is committed to an ethos of 'sharing our humanity' with one of its principal goals being to encourage its students 'to create a better and more peaceful world through intercultural understanding and respect', The website goes on to note that the IB program 'encourages students across the world to become active, compassionate and life long learners who understand that other people, with their differences, can also be right'. It is the intent of the school to adhere to the commitment of all IB program 'to develop internationally minded people who recognising their common humanity and shared guardianship of the planet help to create a better and more peaceful world' (George Green's School 2010a).

The school's website uses a similar discourse to define its curricular offerings. The history course offerings note a commitment to 'international understanding'. Courses in environmental systems are directed to providing students with an understanding of the 'values of internationalism'. And the goals of the geography courses include among others 'recognizing the need for social justice, equality, and respect for others'. In addition to its clearly academic curriculum, the school offers a number of programs in business generally and in the hospitality industry specifically that are often seen as indictors of a neoliberal orientation. The description of these courses on the website, however, deemphasise immediate employment and stress instead how their completion serve as prerequisites for entry to a college preparatory curriculum and ultimately to the university. While these descriptions do not explicitly use democratic discourse, they neither use neoliberal discourse (George Green's School 2010b).

It is our contention that in order for curriculum to be culturally responsive, emancipatory, and democratic, it must resist the discourse of neoliberal cosmopolitanism. Such a resistance would redefine the raison d'être of curriculum reform from the needs of the global marketplace to the struggle for global social justice. As a result, curriculum reform would redefine the scope and intent of community. Stated simply, *the discourse of democratic cosmopolitanism* is a privileging of the human family over chauvinistic orientations toward memberships in other political bodies such as a state or nation. Such a discourse, for example, would recognise the importance of human rights over national security. As described earlier in this essay, the discourse of cosmopolitanism is often overpowered by that of neoliberal cosmopolitanism in the US and the UK.

Conclusion

We have thus far argued that the discourse of cosmopolitanism, both neoliberal and democratic, has been closely aligned to the discourse of community and conveys a sense of belonging that binds groups and individuals together around common goals and a sense of the common good. The shift to a globalised world does not negate traditional parochial discourses related to community, but the diversity of such an increasingly globalised world and the myriad of complex problems that it poses for those of us who inhabit it heighten the need for deconstructing and reconstructing traditional lenses used for examining community and curriculum reform. The scale of the traditional lenses must be different, and bringing in the discourse of cosmopolitanism provides for that difference in scale. The scale must move from local and national communities to a global community. In addition to a change in scale, the discourse of cosmopolitanism also provides a powerful lens for understanding the qualities, affinities and intents for community.

Like the notion of community, cosmopolitanism can be seen as a floating signifier with a diversity of competing meanings. Undergirding these multitude meanings and constituting the great virtue of the idea of cosmopolitanism is that it points to a unified and collective sense of belonging that binds people together and cuts across the local settings in which they live and work. Joining the idea of cosmopolitanism to that of community challenges such particularities as race, gender, and nationhood. It goes against the conventional wisdom that supreme power lies in the hands of the state and entrusts it instead to a notion of 'world citizenship' (Fine 2007, 2). It is a concept, according to the philosopher Martha Nussbaum, that calls on us to offer our principal loyalty 'to the moral community made up by the humanity of all human beings' (Nussbaum 1996, 7).

Yet, under conditions of globalisation, states have hardly disappeared. Despite the shift from their role of directing to that of enabling, their place vis a vis transnational and international institutions ebbs and flows with differing circumstances. What is called for, then, is a versatile discourse through which we can accommodate different demands for solidarity and commonality, some that are particular and operate at the level of the state and others that are universalistic and encompass all of human kind. With its roots in ancient Greek and eighteenth century Enlightenment thought, the idea of cosmopolitanism provides us with the language that we need to shape our notion of community in those twin directions.

A notion of cosmopolitanism can provide a more effective understanding of community as an interpretive lens for understanding curriculum reform (Fine 2007). Interpreting the signifier of 'community' in this way enables us to revise a valuable curriculum concept, community, to meet the demands of educational change in an increasingly globalised world. A cosmopolitan curriculum is emerging in the in the US and other countries, but the intents and understandings of cosmopolitanism and community vary (Parker and Camicia 2009). Themes of neoliberalism and democracy are central to the discourse of cosmopolitanism, each communicating a different

vision of a global community, and as a result, different intents for a cosmopolitan curriculum. Neoliberalism is the most powerful of these cosmopolitan discourses. Our examination of these two different intents for cosmopolitan curriculum provides a point of departure for new studies of the interrelationships between globalisation, curriculum, cosmopolitanism, community, and social justice that offers democracy as a site of resistance to neoliberalism.

Notes on contributors

Steven P. Camicia is an assistant professor of social studies education in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership at Utah State University. His research focuses on curriculum and instruction in the areas of perspective consciousness, social justice, global education, and democratic decision-making processes.

Barry M. Franklin is Professor of Education in the School of Teacher Education and Leadership and Adjunct Professor in the Department of History at Utah State University. His research and writing focus on issues of curriculum reform policy and history of education.

References

Bakhtin, M.M. 1981. *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin.* Trans. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Ed. M. Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
Ball, S.J. 2007. *Education plc: Understanding private sector participation in public sector education.* London: Routledge.
Beck, U. 2007. Cosmopolitanism: A critical theory for the twenty-first century. In *The Blackwell companion to globalization,* ed. G. Ritzer, 162–76. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
Burgos, R. 2003. Partnership as a floating and empty signifier within educational policies: The Mexican case. In *Educational partnerships and the state: The paradoxes of governing schools, children, and families,* ed. B. Franklin, M. Bloch, and T. Popkewitz, 55–79. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Caldwell, M.L., and E.P. Lozada Jr. 2007. The fate of the local. In *The Blackwell companion to globalization,* ed. G. Ritzer, 498–515. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
Camicia, S.P. 2007. Deliberating immigration policy: Locating instructional materials within global and multicultural perspectives. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 35, no. 1: 96–111.
Camicia, S.P. 2008. Deciding what is a controversial issue: A case study of social studies curriculum controversy. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 36, no. 4: 290–307.
Castles, S., and A. Davidson. 2000. *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging.* New York: Routledge.
Cheney, L.V. 1995. Nothing's sacred: Kill my old agency, please. *Wall Street Journal,* January 24: A22.
Chitty, C. 2009. *Education policy in Britain.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.
Cohen, A.P. 1985. *The symbolic construction of community.* London: Tavistock.
Crawford, K.A., and S. Foster. 2008. The Sino-Japanese War and the politics of official remembrance in the People's Republic of China. In *War, nation, memory: International perspectives on World War II in school history textbooks,* ed. K.A. Crawford and S.J. Foster, 89–109. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
Dewey, J. 1966. *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education.* New York: The Free Press.
Ehrenhalt, A. 1998. Where have all the followers gone? In *Community works: The revival of civil society in America,* ed. E.J. Dionne Jr, 93–8. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
Fendler, L. 2006. Others and the problem of community. *Curriculum Inquiry* 36: 303–26.
Fielding, M. 2000. Community, philosophy and education policy: Against effectiveness ideology and the immiseration of contemporary schooling. *Journal of Education Policy* 12, no. 4: 397–415.
Fielding, M. 2007. The human cost and intellectual poverty of high performance schooling: Radical philosophy, John Macmurray and the remaking of person-centered education. *Journal of Education Policy* 22, no. 4: 383–409.
Fine, R. 2007. *Cosmopolitanism.* New York: Routledge.
Fowler, R. 1991. *The dance with community: The contemporary debate in American thought.* Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
Foster, S.J., and K.A. Crawford. 2006. *What shall we tell the children? International perspectives on school history textbooks.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Franklin, B.M. 1986. *Building the American community: The school curriculum and the search for social control.* London: Falmer Press.
Franklin, B.M. 2005. Gone before you know it: Urban school reform and the short life of the Education Action Zone initiative. *London Review of Education* 3: 3–27.
Franklin, B.M. 2010. *Curriculum, community, and urban school reform.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Franklin, B.M., M.N. Bloch, and T.S. Popkewitz, 2003. *Educational partnerships and the state: The paradoxes of governing schools, children, and families.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Friedman, T.L. 2005. *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
George Green's School. 2010a. *George Green's sixth form prospectus.*
George Green's School. 2010b. *All different/all equal/learn today/succeed tomorrow.*
Giddens, A. 1998. *The third way: The renewal of social democracy.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Giddens, A. 2000. *The third way and its critics.* Cambridge: Polity Press.
Hale, S. 2006. *Blair's community: Communitarian thought and New Labour.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Held, D., and A. McGrew. 2002. *Globalization/anti-globalization.* Malden, MA: Polity Press.
Held, D., A. McGrew, D. Goldblatt, and J. Perraton. 1999. *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Hillery, G.A., Jr. 1955. Definitions of community: Areas of agreement. *Rural Sociology* 20: 111–23.
Keller, S. 2003. *Community: Pursuing the dream, living the reality.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Lacan, J. 1977. The agency of the letter in the unconscious, or reason since Freud (A. Sheridan, Trans.) *Écritis: A selection.* New York: W.W. Norton and Co.
Laclau, E. 1994. Why do empty signifiers matter to politics? In *The lesser evil and the greater good: The theory and politics of social diversity,* ed. J. Weeks, 167–78. London: Oram Press.
Nash, G.B., C. Crabtree, and R.E. Dunn. 1997. *History on trial: Culture wars and the teaching of the past.* New York: A.A. Knopf.
New York City Department of Education. 2009. *Online high school directory.* http://print,nycenet.edu/ChoicesEnrollment/High/Directory/boroughlist/default.htm.
Nicholls, J. 2006. Beyond the national and the transnational: Perspectives of WWII in USA, Italian, Swedish, Japanese, and English school history textbooks. In *What shall we tell the children? International perspectives on school history textbooks,* ed. S.J. Foster, and K.A. Crawford, 89–112. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
Noddings, N. 2005. *Educating citizens for global awareness.* New York: Teachers College Press.
Nussbaum, M. 1996. Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism,* ed. J. Cohen, 2–17. Boston: Beacon Press.
Ong, A. 2006. *Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
Parker, W.C., and S.P. Camicia. 2009. Cognitive praxis in today's 'international education' movement: Intents and affinities. *Theory and Research in Social Education* 37, no. 1: 42–74.
Phillips, D.L. 1993. *Looking backward: A critical appraisal of communitarian thought.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Popkewitz, T. 2008. *Cosmopolitanism and the age of school reform: Science, Education, and making society by making the child.* New York: Routledge.
Ritzer, G., ed. 2007. *The Blackwell companion to globalization.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
Rose, N. 1999. *Power of freedom: Reframing political thought.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Segall, A. 2006. What's the purpose of teaching a discipline, anyway? The case of history. In *Social studies: The next generation,* ed. A. Segall, E.E. Heilman, and C.H. Cherryholmes, 125–39. New York: Peter Lang.
Silva, P.B.G. 2004. Citizenship and education in Brazil: The contribution of Indian peoples and Blacks in the struggle for citizenship and recognition. In *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives,* ed. J.A. Banks, 185–214. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
Suárez-Orozco, M.M., and D.B. Qin-Hilliard. 2004. *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
Sylvester, R. 2002. Mapping international education: A historical survey 1893–1944. *Journal of Research in International Education* 1, no. 1: 91–125.
Titcombe, R. 2008. How academies threaten the comprehensive curriculum. *Forum* 50, no. 1: 49–59.
Torsti, P. 2007. How to deal with a difficult past? History textbooks supporting enemy images in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 39, no. 1: 77–96.

Trofanenko, B. 2006. The public museum and identity: Or, the question of belonging. In *Social studies: The next generation,* ed. A. Segall, E.E. Heilman, & C.H. Cherryholmes, 95–109. New York: Peter Lang.
Wertsch, J.V. 2002. *Voices of collective remembering*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Zimmerman, J. 2002. *Whose America?: Culture wars in the public schools.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.