CHAPTER 3

Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship

Hugh Starkey

The conferences organized by the Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Washington in Bellagio, Italy in 2002 (Banks, 2004) and in Seattle, Washington in 2015 (Banks, 2015) are part of a strategy by the Center's leadership to bring scholars of citizenship education into dialogue with multicultural education. It aims to challenge researchers to mediate the views of marginalized students, teachers, and parents and to develop frameworks of theory that can enable schools and education systems to offer access to an inclusive sense of citizenship (Banks, 1997, 1998, 2004). This is a major task since citizenship education and multicultural education have developed as independent strands within the field of education. In the USA the National Association for Multicultural Education (NAME) and the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) have different origins and memberships. Although individual members have overlapping interests and concerns, at a formal level there is scope for greater dialogue. For example, a major NCSS initiative to provide detailed guidance for social studies standards involving collaboration between 15 organizations and consultation with a further 24 stakeholders did not include NAME in the writing or reviewing process (NCSS, 2013).

Implicit in the framing of the two conferences is the concern that democracy is being undermined in many national contexts, including the USA. Whilst global migration has increased diversity in nations across the world, the school curriculum has often ignored or marginalized the perceptions and experiences of minoritized groups who have to struggle for recognition as equal citizens.

This chapter reviews a number of theories or lenses that can help to inform the complex challenge of providing education in contexts of diversity in a way that recognizes the citizenship of minoritized groups and promotes rather than threatens democracy. Concepts such as citizenship, human rights, utopia, cosmopolitanism, and democracy provide different but complementary perspectives that interact, often in perhaps distracting creative tension. All these concepts are continuously debated, defined, re-defined, challenged, appropriated, and misappropriated. Nevertheless, I attempt to focus all these perspectives on a single challenge, namely that of learning to live together in societies characterized by superdiversity (Vertovec, 2007; Castles, 2016). By so doing I suggest that there is a powerful underlying logic that can bolster discourses of equalities, freedoms, and capabilities that are required in struggles for social justice.

The concept of "education for cosmopolitan citizenship" draws on this range of perspectives and enables educators to embrace both unity and diversity in national contexts (Osler & Vincent, 2002; Osler & Starkey, 2003, 2005). It is based on a definition of citizenship as feeling, status, and practice and explicit commitments to human rights. Cosmopolitan citizenship recognizes diversity at all levels from the local to the global. However, this requires scholars and educators to lead and promote a wide-ranging dialogue. If the nation-state is an imagined community (Anderson, 1991), then this dialogue constitutes a process of re-imagining the nation-state as cosmopolitan (Osler, 2008). Such a debate involves contributions from, amongst other disciplines, political science, law, international relations, philosophy, sociology, social policy, social psychology, theology, geography, and education.

In a context of globalization, citizenship education inevitably engages with the realities of multicultural schools and communities. Theoretical perspectives and practical

insights from multicultural education can facilitate the adaptation of citizenship education to these new contexts of diversity. This requires citizenship educators, whose role is often framed in narrowly nationalistic terms, to recognize and embrace multicultural diversity. A dialogue with citizenship educators may encourage multicultural specialists to re-emphasize the political dimension of struggles for rights that are so enriching for democracy.

Multicultural education is defined by the NAME as a philosophical concept that provides the basis for preparing students for living together in an interdependent world. It has its roots in "ideals of freedom, justice, equality, equity, and human dignity" (NAME, 2003). As the NAME definitional statement notes, these ideals are clearly articulated in constitutions such as those of the USA and South Africa and by the United Nations [UN], particularly the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [UDHR] (United Nations General Assembly, 1948). There is recognition both of the importance of a national and constitutional dimension and of the transnational dimension of human rights. The foundational ideals of multicultural education, that are valued both nationally and transnationally, provide a vision that guides the project to reform citizenship education.

Cosmopolitanism

The *Democracy and Diversity* international consensus panel (Banks et al., 2005) introduced the concept of cosmopolitanism to the Center for Multicultural Education's project of uniting multicultural education and citizenship education following Osler (2000a). These published guidelines suggest, but do not explicitly reference, cosmopolitan citizenship as a concept able to reconcile the goals of advancing both unity and diversity in a globalizing age. My contribution to this book is to attempt to define and illustrate both cosmopolitan citizenship and education for cosmopolitan citizenship.

Cosmopolitanism derives from a perspective already present in ancient Greek philosophy and many religious traditions. It was developed in the European Enlightenment, notably by Immanuel Kant (Heater, 2002; Nussbaum & Cohen, 1996; Nussbaum, 2002; Osler & Starkey, 2005). It is based on a liberal conception of human beings as a single community in which all have equal entitlement to dignity and to fundamental freedoms. The cosmopolitan perspective has much to offer educators in multicultural societies in a globalized age, since it is an ideal that "combines a commitment to humanist principles and norms, an assumption of human equality, with a recognition of difference, and indeed a celebration of diversity" (Kaldor, 2003, p. 19).

Cosmopolitanism is a philosophy that has profound legal and moral implications. Since the end of World War II (1945) it has found concrete expression in human rights which are based on the concept that all human beings are equal in dignity and that they belong together as members of the "human family", an expression used in the UDHR proclaimed in 1948. The moral force of this international declaration that all human beings have equal entitlement to human rights and fundamental freedoms leads to a political obligation on states to ensure equal treatment and access to services and democratic structures for all irrespective of consideration of origins or background including ethnicity, religion, and nationality (Held, 2010).

The UDHR enunciates standards and principles that underpin international law which is a system based on treaties between sovereign nation-states. Contemporary nation-states operate in a cosmopolitan world (Held, 1995; Beck, 2002). They voluntarily cede some sovereignty through their commitments to a range of human rights treaties and instruments that are effectively requirements of membership of the UN. These treaties provide a normative and international legal framework that member states of the UN are expected to

observe. Whatever the actual extent of compliance with human rights norms, the legitimacy of states is no longer solely defined by reference to the nation but also by reference to the international human rights regime (Levy, 2010). Within and between states cultures of human rights develop where there is a respectful approach to all individuals and recognition of the importance of self-defined as well as ascribed identities (Gutmann, 2003).

Citizenship

"Cosmopolitan citizenship" brings together two ideas, cosmopolitanism and citizenship, each indicative of a worldview. This evolution of the nation-state from self-contained entity to international actor has influenced concepts of citizenship. A restrictive but common definition of citizenship refers to people in relationship to the nation-state as a sovereign polity (Stoker, 2011). This derives from the fact that the development of nationalism was premised on the concept of nationality as a "founding principle" (Isin & Wood, 1999, p. 93).

However, defining citizenship exclusively in terms of nationality fails to include understandings of the complex relationships in multicultural societies (Banks, 2009b; Osler 2011).

Nationalised citizenship is used to supress an earlier tradition of citizenship as forged in struggle and representing the aspirations of people to exercise agency in the face of despotism and autocratic structures (see, for example: Schama, 1989; Knight, 2005). This tradition challenges any claim by the governments of nation states that they alone have the moral and legal power to determine claims of citizenship. It informed struggles for racial justice and civil rights as I will illustrate in a later section.

Global migratory movements have brought about a situation where national citizenship is often exclusionary. Although citizenship as nationality was at one point usually accorded by right to those born within the jurisdiction of the nation state, the political salience of global migration has led governments to make the acquisition of nationality more difficult. It may be conditional on lengthy periods of residence, good conduct and passing a citizenship test.

However, as Dewey noted, the identification of citizenship with the powerful discourse of nationality, occurred at a specific point in history, the late 19th century, when imperialism flourished and democracy was reserved for a minority. He observed that newly established national education systems aimed to eliminate cosmopolitan perspectives and transnational identities. At this particular time:

> education became a civic function and the civic function was identified with the realization of the ideal of the national state. The "state" was substituted for humanity; cosmopolitanism gave way to nationalism. To form the citizen, not the "man," became the aim of education (Dewey [1916] 2002, p. XX).

Dewey recognised that cosmopolitanism is a learnt perspective. Education can develop the capacity of people to identify with fellow human beings irrespective of national boundaries and develop what Appiah calls "concern for strangers" (2006, p.82). However, the promotion of cosmopolitan perspectives ceased to be a function of education when formal national education systems instead focused on promoting a concept of citizenship restricted to an unthinking and patriotic adherence to the nation state. It may not be surprising that governments wish to define citizenship in their own terms as nationality, but the nationalisation of citizenship is a political act that excludes many residents of nation-states who do not meet legal requirements for this status. Education of the national citizen relies on

promoting 'national boundaries as morally salient'. It constrains learners' perspectives by irrationally glorifying and naturalising nationhood defined by borders that are essentially 'an accident of history' (Nussbaum & Cohen, 1996, p. 11).

While Dewey (1916/2002) informs our current understanding of education as a cosmopolitan project, he also powerfully influences our understandings of the meaning of democracy and particularly what democracy means in an educational context. Dewey's vision is of a cosmopolitan democracy in which the horizons of all members are constantly extended by opportunities to learn from those from other backgrounds. He concludes that:

> A democracy is more than a form of government; it is primarily a mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience…each has to refer his own action to that of others, and to consider the action of others to give point and direction to his own [This] is equivalent to the breaking down of those barriers of class, race, and national territory which kept men from perceiving the full import of their activity. (p.101)

In other words, in a democracy, the principle of reciprocity is fundamental. A citizen is required both to "refer his own action to that of others" and also "to consider the action of others". Citizens are aware both of the impact of their own actions and of ways in which the behaviour and lifestyle of others may enrich their own. Democracy requires "the breaking down of [] barriers of class, race, and national territory". The idea of cosmopolitan democracy needs to be nurtured in school. Dewey recognises that this will require teachers to engage with controversial issues but he stresses that "the emphasis must be on whatever binds people together in cooperative human pursuits" (Dewey, 1916/2002, p. 114).

In the current century, migrants may live in a particular nation-state for years without access to nationality. Consequently, urban schools in very many countries include children who may not have attained or acquired the nationality shared by the politically dominant

population but who will nonetheless have aspirations to be able to participate fully in political, social and economic life (Pace & Bixby, 2008). The education and rights of these children are compromised if what is offered is a limited and limiting nationalistic perspective.

Educational movements promoting 'global citizenship' have gained considerable traction in the 21st century. This recognises the cosmopolitan perspective of citizenship in a globalised multicultural world of migratory flows. However global citizens are perhaps framed in an international or diplomatic perspective in which a national identity continues to be salient. Cosmopolitan citizens have a commitment to people rather than governments. They are likely to challenge any actions or discourses of governments that fail to respect, protect and fulfil human rights.

The realities of global migration and the demographic diversity of cities provide the opportunity to redefine citizenship in order to de-couple it from a narrow focus on nationality. In so doing we can follow Dewey in attempting to reclaim the aims of education from the powerful grasp of the nationalists.

One rearticulation of citizenship conceptualises it as a feeling of belonging and a practice as much as a status (Osler & Starkey, 2005). Education for cosmopolitan citizenship encourages feelings of solidarity and collective impulses to freedom that are not necessarily grounded in or dependent on a commitment to the nation (Osler & Starkey, 2003). Instead, education for cosmopolitan citizenship provides a way of looking at the world and making judgements on the basis of the universal standards of human rights. Cosmopolitan citizens, aware of their human rights and the entitlement of all human beings to these rights, look both backwards and forwards. The backward gaze brings into view abuses of human rights including racial discrimination as well as political and social struggles for justice and

equality. The forward gaze is to a utopian vision of justice and peace in the world (Osler & Starkey, 2010).

Nation states depend on bureaucracies that derive from an Enlightenment tradition of modernity based on rationality and imposing structure and order on society. Diversity challenges the preference for uniformity and the imposition of neat categories defined by boundaries and borders (Bauman, 1989). Cosmopolitan citizenship involves re-imagining the nation as cosmopolitan (Osler, 2008). This is theorised by Beck (2012) as cosmopolitization, that is " 'encounter' or 'enmeshment' with the excluded Other" (p. 8). One of Beck's examples of cosmopolitization is the political invisibility of migrant domestic workers, who are forced to give up their own family life and travel to distant countries to provide caring, cooking and cleaning in institutions and private homes, sometimes living virtually as members of the employer's family. They are recruited on the basis of being exploitable for low wages, replacing local workers and creating new inequalities of nationality, colour and ethnicity (Beck, 2012).

Cosmopolitanism is also a trope featuring a wealthy elite with homes in tax havens and no sense of solidarity or moral obligation. This elite cosmopolitanism contrasts with the reality of an everyday and mundane cosmopolitanism epitomised by the experience of migrants and their families who retain links across the world while contributing to local communities. While globalization is often experienced as pressure on the nation state from without, nations increasingly develop "*internal* globalization, globalization *from within* the national societies" in a process of cosmopolitization (Beck, 2002, p. 17). This social theory underpins the task of reimagining the nation as cosmopolitan.

Conceptually, cosmopolitan citizenship recognizes that local struggles for justice have national and international dimensions and ramifications to the extent that distinctions between national and international or local and global cease to be meaningful (Beck, 2012). Physically crossing borders may still require passports and permissions, but ideas, information and culture, like cash, can be transmitted across borders instantaneously through the internet and solidarities are developed and sustained through social media. The cosmopolitan nation is a microcosm of global society and living together requires bridge figures, individuals who straddle cultures and help to mediate when there are tensions as well as helping to expand the horizons of those who are culturally more limited (Zuckerman, 2013).

Human Rights as Utopia

A precursor to the conceptualisation of education for cosmopolitan citizenship is found in a widely cited report from a UNESCO Commission that identified four pillars of education in the twenty-first century (Delors, 1996). The report emphasizes that 'learning to live together' in a multicultural and multifaith globalised world is one of the key challenges for education. Education based on 'recognition of our growing interdependence' may help 'to manage the inevitable conflicts in an intelligent and peaceful way'. Learning to live together in multicultural societies requires a vision based on the acceptance of the legitimacy of multiple points of view. Delors (1996) calls this vision a "necessary Utopia" (p. 11)

Human rights are those common standards that provide a basis for governments and people to negotiate political and cultural differences. The common ground is that the same standards apply to all and this principle underpins both multicultural and citizenship education. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms that all the carefully defined rights and freedoms set out in its articles are the entitlement of all human beings "without

distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status" (article 2). It asserts the moral and political proposition that education "shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups" (article 26).

The vision of peace and equality expressed in the UDHR may be characterised as a utopian vision. Human rights are concerned with the world as it should be rather than the world as it is. One important role of citizenship education is to highlight gaps between is and ought and suggest strategies and actions for promoting social and economic justice. In principle, the inhabitants and citizens of any nation can demand of their government that their rights be upheld. The rights are the same across all nations, irrespective of local and regional political, social and economic conditions and traditions. This international and transnational rights regime provides a philosophical, moral and legal superstructure that interacts with the other political and economic superstructural elements of globalisation (Spring, 2015).

Human rights provide a way of looking at the world. They are set out formally and definitively in various human rights instruments. The modern conception of human rights dates from the 1940s. At the end of the Second World War the Allied Powers created a new organization, the UN, with a commitment to justice and peace in the world. The Charter of the UN was signed in 1945 and it proclaims respect for human rights as the means for achieving world peace. An international Human Rights Commission was established to draft the UDHR, which was proclaimed by the General Assembly of the UN on 10 December 1948.

The preamble to the UDHR first sets out the principles of human rights:

> Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world … (1948, p.1)

The main innovation of the UDHR is that it recognizes, for the first time, a *universal* entitlement to rights applying to all "members of the human family". Previously, because of a concern for national sovereignty, states were immune from external control or moral pressure when they enacted discriminatory legislation or allowed their agents freedom to undertake extra-judicial killings or torture.

The preamble to the UDHR also sets out a vision of a possible future that can be seen as a utopia.

> … and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people (1948, p.1)**.**

This section incorporates ideas set out in a speech by US President Franklin J Roosevelt in 1941. His four freedoms come as two pairs. Freedom of speech and belief are sometimes defined as negative freedoms since it is argued that they simply require inaction by government. The freedoms are asserted in opposition to interference from authority. They are among the civil and political rights essential for any form of democracy and political activity. Although freedom of belief is frequently associated with religious persecution, it applies just as much to political beliefs.

The two other freedoms are freedoms "from". The first is the psychological freedom from fear. This is the right of citizens and others living in the state to security, guaranteed through a system of policing and laws. Freedom from want is the right of access to basic

standards of nutrition, health care, income, and shelter. Without these, human beings are deprived of their capacity to develop their capabilities and thus effectively robbed of their dignity and personal liberty (Sen, 2009).

Following the preamble, human rights are then precisely defined in 30 articles. René Cassin, one of the drafting committee of the UDHR summarized the content as:

- personal rights (life, freedom, security, justice) in articles 2–11;

- rights regulating relationship between people (freedom of movement, rights to found a family, asylum, nationality, property) in articles 12–17;

- public freedoms and political rights (thought, religion, conscience, opinion, assembly, participation, democracy) in articles 18–21;

- economic, social and cultural rights (social security, work, equal wages, trade unions, rest and leisure, adequate standard of living, education, cultural life) in articles 22–7 (cited in Osler & Starkey, 1996, p. 4).

Freedoms are not absolute. Where there are no constraints but an imbalance of power, the advantage is always with the powerful. The power relation is of the essence. A human rights perspective balances freedoms with a concern for equality of access to rights. Freedoms are exercised *in society* and claiming them is constrained by the acceptance of the principle that all other human beings can claim the same right.

The vision in the UDHR of freedom, justice, and peace in the world is utopian. Utopia can be an inspiration and a driving force motivating humans to exercise agency and shape history (Mannheim, [1929, 1936] 1991). Utopia as possibility has been theorised by Giddens as "utopian realism" (1990, p.156) and by Rawls as "realistic utopia" (1999, p. 128). Looking

at ideal solutions but relating them to actual social trends and developments may help address specific social and political problems.

That said, utopian visions characterized some of the most appalling political regimes of the twentieth century (Moyn, 2010). Hitler, Stalin, Mao, and Pol Pot all governed on the basis that they had a vision of a better world. The UDHR is proposed on an entirely different basis from these "failed utopias" (Klug, 2000, p.189) that are based on superiority of race, class, or nationality. The failed utopias respond to the issue of living together by eliminating from the discourse of 'us' those individuals and groups that challenge the authority or the authenticity of the single story vision (Bauman, 1989; Adichie, 2009). Contemporary authoritarian regimes continue to depict dissidents as enemies of the regime who can be outlawed that is to say denied the protection of the law. Opponents were and are vulnerable to arbitrary arrest, detention, exile, and genocide. A human rights perspective on cosmopolitan citizenship emphasizes that all must be included in the 'us' and it is this vision that drives political action.

Utopia requires and encourages imagination; it is this process of imagining utopia that has the capacity to challenge dominant discourses and taken for granted assumptions. Imagining that we can live differently from the way we presently do encourages us to question the premises on which our societies are organised. The utopia serves to introduce "a sense of doubt that shatters the obvious" (Ricoeur, 1978, p. 21). In other words, by providing a positive vision of ideals for living together, we can encourage young people to be skeptical of curriculum content and school routines where these may serve to perpetuate injustices and discrimination.

In approaching the challenge of living together in increasingly diverse societies, a number of scholars and educators have drawn inspiration from the UN Convention on the

Rights of the Child [CRC] (United Nations, 1989). The internationally recognised legitimacy of claims of equality and justice inspired by the UNCRC provides a powerful tool for children and young people. It can encourage them as they explore and develop their political identities and understandings of rights-based citizenship. The Convention also provides a set of guidelines and an agenda for action for educators. It defines for children and young people the claims that they can make to ensure that their human rights are respected (Covell, Howe & Polegato, 2011; Jerome, 2012; Osler & Starkey, 1998, 2005; Verhellen, 2000).

Human Rights as Struggle

In reality, there is always a struggle to achieve the ideals of freedom and justice that motivate education for cosmopolitan citizenship (Bowring, 2008; Osler, 2015, 2016). In every society oppression and discrimination are likely to be experienced by young people even when they also have scope for freedom and access to justice. Although all young people are likely to experience discrimination because they are considered less capable than adults, young people from minority groups and those with disabilities as well as young women may suffer a double or treble disadvantage. They are at an intersection of several discriminatory structures and practices. Among the most common manifestations of discrimination is the practice of ascribing identities to young people on the basis of their appearance or accent. Banks (2004) notes that a "citizen's racial, cultural, language, and religious characteristics often significantly influence whether she is viewed as a citizen within her society" (p. 5). In other words, teachers or adults may make assumptions about young people or indeed their parents that can lead to discrimination.

A commitment by teachers and other adults to promoting, protecting and defending internationally defined children's rights is a commitment to foreground the intrinsic universal qualities of individuals such as dignity and subjectivity. Such a perspective challenges

ascriptive identities such as nationality, race, ethnicity, age, and gender (Soysal, 2012). On a practical level, citizenship education potentially supports struggles by citizen students to overcome prejudice and challenge ascribed and limiting identities such as 'child', 'immigrant' or 'less able'. Such struggles contribute to an empowering education and may help to close what Levinson (2012) calls the civic empowerment gap, namely the difference between the facility that members of the majority community may have in achieving their demands and the struggles that minorities have to even make their demands heard.

School curricula for history and social studies in many countries include major struggles for racial and social justice, such as the American civil rights movement and the ending of Apartheid in South Africa. I will draw lessons from the following narratives, parts of which are likely to be familiar to teachers and young people across the world and which illustrate the essence of cosmopolitan citizenship. In this case the leaders of momentous campaigns call both for equal citizenship at home and for international solidarity in their pursuit of justice.

Struggle against Apartheid. Nelson Mandela's speech when standing trial in South Africa resonates as articulating ideals that are those that also inspire educators today. His vision of the goal of his political struggle is a utopia that drives his actions.

> I have cherished the ideal of a democratic and free society in which all persons live together in harmony and with equal opportunities. It is an ideal which I hope to live for and to achieve (Mandela, 1964)

Mandela was studying for a law degree and was committed to the rule of law, but his commitment to justice caused him to challenge Apartheid laws. The principles of human rights inspired his struggle for the repeal of the Apartheid system that denied any form of meaningful citizenship to the majority Black population in South Africa.

In his autobiography, Mandela recalls the sense of global solidarity with the African National Congress [ANC] struggle at the time of his trial: "[N]ight-long vigils were held for us at St Paul's Cathedral in London. The students of the University of London elected me president of their students' union in absentia … (Mandela, 1994, p. 443). The trial was followed by 27 years in prison after which Mandela led the transition of his country to a multicultural democracy based on a new constitution. This case illustrates several key points. First there is the distinction between the law and justice. Secondly, struggles are led by dreams or visions of a better future. Finally, international solidarity, in this case by students and young people, provides much needed support and encouragement for those struggling.

Civil rights, human rights and citizenship. On his way to Oslo to receive the Nobel Peace Prize Martin Luther King, Jr. made a brief speech in London where he linked the struggles for freedom and racial justice in the USA with those of Mandela and the ANC: "In our struggle for freedom and justice in the United States, which has also been so long and arduous, we feel a powerful sense of identification with those in the far more deadly struggle for freedom in South Africa (King, 1964, para 1)." King (1964) explicitly refers to "the great mass of South Africans denied their humanity, their dignity, denied opportunity, denied all human rights" (para. 5). And in the name of the struggle for human rights, he argued passionately for citizens in the UK and USA to campaign and pressure their governments to implement economic sanctions against the apartheid regime, since it is "the one form of non-violent action that could bring freedom and justice to South Africa" (King, 1964, para. 6).

This is an example of a transnational action linking the USA, UK, and South Africa in a common concern and struggle. The struggle is described as against the denial of human rights. It identifies a particular set of actions that citizens can promote from a sense of citizenship and solidarity, namely individual and collective sanctions.

Another example from this period involves teachers making a stand on the issue of voter registration. In January 1965, teachers' leader Frederick Reese persuaded virtually every Black teacher in Selma to march to the courthouse to demand to be registered to vote. Reese had forewarned the chair of the board of registrars in a polite letter requesting that the board be open on the Friday of the march. He pointed out that the courthouse was open for citizens to pay taxes any day of the week, but voter registration was restricted to the first and third Monday of the month. As the teachers arrived, Reese recalls that Sheriff Jim Clark and deputies formed a line across the door:

> I reminded him that the courthouse did not belong to him, it belonged to us also, and we were there as citizens … we had a right to go in the courthouse and I would not back down from that right (Hampton & Fayer, 1990, p. 218).

In spite of their polite and measured request, as citizens, the response came in the form of billy clubs as the Sheriff and his men knocked the teachers down the steps.

The teachers had shown moral and political leadership in the cause of racial justice that stirred up the community. On 1 February Martin Luther King, Jr. arrived and led 250 marchers to the courthouse, where they were all arrested and put in jail. Two days later 800 schoolchildren marched and they too were taken into custody. Citizenship, in this tradition, requires moral courage and a clear sense of the distinction between the law and justice. The standard by which the law and its enforcers should be judged is fair treatment, due process, and respect for human dignity. These principles are enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, articles 1–11.

Bringing together local and global dimensions. Malcolm X travelled extensively in Africa in 1964. He became very much aware of the parallels between the anti-colonial and

post-colonial struggles and domestic struggles including the voter registration campaign in the South of the USA. In his final speeches he stressed the importance of human rights and the role of the United Nations. In a speech in Selma he accused the US government under President Lyndon Johnson of dereliction of its duty to protect the 22 million Black citizens of the USA.

> In their failure to protect our human rights, they are violating the United Nations Charter and they are not qualified to continue to sit in that international body and talk about what human rights should be done in other countries of this earth (Clark, 1992, p. 27).

Whereas accusations of hypocrisy in not respecting human rights are usually made against other countries, Malcolm X here uses knowledge of international law to frame a domestic struggle. By bringing together the local and the global dimensions, he puts pressure on the government of his own country.

In a key speech to students in London, Malcolm X argued that the civil rights movement needed to rethink and focus instead on human rights. Civil rights imply a merely domestic struggle, whereas naming a struggle for human rights raises it to the level of 'a problem of humanity, a problem of the world'. He evokes the possibilities of solidarities from Africa, Asia, Latin America, and Europe. Individuals and groups can "step into the picture and do whatever is necessary to help us see that our rights are guaranteed us – not sometime in the long future but almost immediately" (Clark, 1992, p. 63). This line of argument is an example of what Levy (2010) calls "recursive cosmopolitization", namely that "local problems are resolved with recourse to global prescriptions while local solutions are inscribed in international institutions" (p. 579). The resolution of the racial discrimination in the state of Alabama required the problem to be viewed from a wider perspective. First there was

recourse to the Federal Government with a demand to uphold the US Constitution and then, when this proved slow, an appeal for global solidarity in the name of the moral authority of human rights. The success of the campaign then reinforces the status of the international human rights regime.

Citizenship education in multicultural societies

The above examples of approaches to struggle for citizenship and human rights can inform classroom discussions of current issues. Teachers may be wary of initiating such discussions since they can sometimes lead to clashes with school authorities or parents that schools find difficult to handle. However, it is precisely these controversial discussions that provide real learning opportunities (Hess, 2009, Hess & McAvoy, 2015). Rizvi (2009), taking a cosmopolitan perspective argues that:

> Our approach to teaching about global connectivity should begin with the local, but must move quickly to address issues of how our local communities are becoming socially transformed through their links with communities around the world and with what consequences (p. 263).

To transpose Simone de Beauvoir's (1949/1972) famous assertion that one is not born a woman but becomes one I would assert that, unless we confine the definition of citizen to nationality, citizens are not born, they are made. People learn to be citizens. This process starts with a realisation that there is such a thing as a citizen and that citizens have choices and agency (Hudson, 2005). They have to acquire an identity as citizens, alongside many other identities. The construction of identities is a life-long process, but it is often most dramatically enacted at the time of adolescence. Wearing clothes and hairstyles designed to attract attention and subverting expectations in school uniform or conventional dress may provoke daily conflicts with parents and school authorities. In this way young people develop

their identities through an essentially political process of struggle for emancipation in the development of a personal lifestyle.

For some young people, participating in or organising anti-war protests is a symbolic and accessible political activity. Local protests express global connectivity. Participation is a manifestation of cosmopolitan citizenship. A classic case made legal history in the United States as *Tinker v. Des Moines School District* (1969). In 1965, Mary Beth Tinker, her brother and a friend were excluded from school for wearing black armbands as a protest against the Vietnam War. Although the school allowed students to wear certain political symbols, this freedom of expression did not extend to the wearing of anti-war armbands. The parents took the case through the courts ending with vindication in the Supreme Court. The judgement by Justice Abe Fortas is famous for the assertion that: "It can hardly be argued that either students or teachers shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the schoolhouse gate" (O'Brien, 2006, p. 8). While accepting that schools have the right to regulate dress and appearance and ban aggressive and disruptive actions, the judge argued that the armbands did not interfere in any way with the work of the school and the rights of other students.

A more recent example of students struggling to find adequate expression for their views was reported in an ethnically diverse school in northern California. Senior students of a Government class that encouraged discussion of current issues decided to start a Social Justice and Peace club, with the support of their teacher. The name of the club (Social Justice and Peace club) is itself interesting, carrying echoes of the preamble to the UDHR. The students planned a lunchtime rally in school to mark the second anniversary of the invasion of Iraq. They submitted advance copies of their speeches and even toned these down after reaction from the principal. Following discussion with the school authorities, they were given

permission to stage the event, but not to use any form of amplified sound. Just before the event the two student organisers were told that they would be excluded from school for two days on the grounds, which they strongly denied, that they had harassed a visiting military recruiter. If they entered school premises they would be barred from graduating. The students organised a protest outside the school and subsequently found support from a civil liberties group as well as their parents. After some months of negotiations, the students were finally allowed to hold a rally on school premises and with amplification (Pace, 2008).

Another example of students using resistance and persuasion comes from a case study of a demographically mixed high school in London, England. In line with many instances of changes in schools inspired by neoliberal economic theories, the school leadership provided a new computer-based individualised virtual science class for students preparing for important exams. The students found it hard to concentrate without the support of a teacher and felt they were learning nothing. Their resistance, informed by what they had learnt about their rights in citizenship education classes, initially took the form of a letter to the head teacher. It attempted persuasion rather than threats, but expressed profound discontent. It legitimised the claim on the basis of the responsibility of the school to provide adequate preparation for the exam. Getting no response, the students organised a petition, involving a wider group of students. This led to a meeting with the head, who insisted that the experiment of learning with computers was a success. The students would not accept this and argued that the real reason for the virtual class was to save money. In this case there was no resolution of the issue, but the refusal of the head to compromise eventually led to a full-scale strike of students and the departure of the head (Mejias, 2012).

In these cases, students in demographically mixed schools learned to struggle for their rights and freedoms, using knowledge acquired in citizenship classes. Such practical learning

may be of greater benefit to the students than classes based on reified notions of culture or situations where racism is denied or minimised. Multicultural education that starts from explorations of identities, rights and struggles for justice looks very different from the approach implicit in the International Food Fair example below. The very real struggles for recognition and appropriate educational provision may involve parents, civil rights groups, the media and in some cases the law.

In France, where the State is committed through its constitution and legislation to a radical separation of public and private spheres in the name of secular neutrality, struggles over school dress codes have been a live issue since 1989 when a school principal, associated with a far right party, excluded three girls for wearing headscarves (Lorcerie, 2005). A total ban on headscarves and other outward and visible signs of religious affiliation in schools was implemented in 2004 but the climate of intolerance to religious symbols, created by the legislation led in 2015 to two cases of young women being asked not to wear long black skirts in school. This is a clear case of the school authorities ascribing a particular meaning to a dress code that is not exclusively identifiable with any single religious tradition (Languille, 2015).

When the hijab was banned from French schools, Muslim families were forced to accept that if they were to access French state schools they had no choice but to conform to the national legislation. In a further development the French government in October 2010 banned the concealing of the face in public spaces. The intention was clearly to outlaw the wearing of the *burqa* or the *niqab* in public, but since such a ban would be discriminatory on grounds of gender and religion, the more general interdiction of face covering was preferred. On human rights grounds, the ban restricts freedom of expression in the sense of choosing what to wear in public and also freedom of religion. It is also discriminatory because there

are many exemptions to the ban. It does not apply to sport, drama and medicine, for example. In fact the only face covering likely to be systematically targeted is the *niqab* (Nussbaum, 2012). However, the European Court of Human Rights in 2014 upheld the ban on the grounds that the national government had the right to determine, on the basis of its own interpretation of national culture, the best way of preserving public order in order to promote peaceful living together (Languille, 2015).

The case of the French ban on concealing the face shows how cosmopolitan and national perspectives interact when it comes to interpreting the law. This case illustrates the uneasy interaction between politics, human rights law, and cosmopolitan human rights principles. Struggles for freedom of expression are essentially political. Young people are inevitably aware of power dimensions in their interactions with adults and with structures such as those imposed by school dress codes, timetables, examinations, and routines. Attempts by students to exercise agency in the context of these structures quickly reveal where power lies. Students have options such as resistance, which may be confrontational. However, where schools create real opportunities for participation, students may be persuaded of the rationale for the constraints or even be persuasive in making a case for change (Pérez-Expósito, 2012; 2015).

Struggles for self-expression and resistance to structures in place sometimes result in conflicts and confrontations with authority that may lead to punishments, including exclusion from school. Citizenship education can help young people to recognise the language and culture of the powerful and further help them to learn to communicate using appropriate linguistic and cultural registers such as Standard English in the USA or the UK, for example. The intention of such support is not, as perhaps in previous generations, to attempt to replace or cover up the language of the home or the street, because the young people need to be able

to interact in those contexts as well. Rather it is to facilitate dialogue with a range of interlocutors including administrators, employers, and elected representatives. The aim is therefore to help young people become adept at what linguists call "code switching" (Levinson ,2012). The ability to code switch is the capacity to change rapidly between language and cultural registers according to context. In linguistic terms it may require shifting between the language used between friends to a form of address more readily acceptable to a teacher or other authority figure. In cultural terms, it may require awareness, for example, that it is usual to wear formal clothes to attend or visit a place of worship. Tourists may be expected to cover their heads or remove their shoes. Understanding these codes is a useful skill that facilitates identity management (Adachi, 2014).

In multicultural contexts, given that people do not occupy single, static identity positions but have multiple identifications, all of which are undergoing constant change, what social psychologists refer to as identity management may be important (Ellemers & Van Rijswijk, 1997). This means developing self-awareness when representing oneself to others in terms of gender, sexuality, class, culture, and ethnicity all of which complicate unilinear readings of race (Raby, 2004).

Evidence from empirical studies of schools practising multicultural education suggests that, at a classroom level, the focus is not necessarily on the civic empowerment of students. For example Chan (2007) conducted fieldwork in a school in Canada, located in a multicultural inner city area where students are said to speak 31 languages and have family links to 38 countries. The school attempts to provide a culturally sensitive curriculum. Chan focused on students' identities and ways in which the students' own narratives and cultural practices are challenged as they interact with school activities, including but not exclusively, the curriculum. Her underlying question is the extent to which these young people feel

included (identify with the activity and with the school) or excluded (may potentially feel rejected and therefore not identify with it).

Chan (2007) presents vignettes or stories. In each case, although the intentions of the teachers are to be inclusive, the outcomes are somewhat ambiguous. One example shows how a teacher prepared for and delivered a learning sequence that culminated in the school's International Food Fair. The starting point is a request from the teacher to name foods that the students eat at home and identify different ways these foods are cooked. Students suggest pizza (baked), spaghetti (boiled) and fries. The teacher appears to be frustrated by the responses of the students and is the only one to name 'ethnic foods'. Although the teacher was intending to be inclusive and valuing the cultural backgrounds of the students he was misguided since he was not prepared to accept the genuine answers the students gave. The students resisted this approach and declined what was effectively an invitation to assert their cultural difference, preferring to assert their common culture. Projects of nation building encourage people to "see likeness where, before, they might have seen difference" (Nussbaum, 2012, p. 14). The emphasis on difference in multicultural education provides ammunition for conservative political leaders in Europe who claim that multiculturalism has failed (Group of Eminent Persons, 2011).

The International Food Fair example above is an example of the contributions approach to multicultural education (Banks, 2006). This celebrates diversity and either ignores racism or treats it as individual prejudice. However the title 'International' invites a diplomatic framing where teachers start to ascribe identities to the students and see them as representatives of a nation or culture. In a separate study Levinson noted teachers turning to: "the Filipino students for the 'Filipino perspective' on a topic, or to the African-American child for the 'black perspective'" (2007, p. 632).

An identification of children in school with their country of origin or parental origin can lead to children and teachers ascribing unwanted identities. In a study of a primary school in Cyprus where attempts had been made to introduce intercultural education, Papamichael (2011) observed the teasing of Paula, a high achieving girl of Romanian origin. Following media reports about a supermarket burglary by a Romanian man, one teacher described how some children in her class addressed Paula by making funny sounds with the word Romania and her name the next day. Although the incident was clearly upsetting to Paula, the teacher declined to react or respond, wishing to minimise the effects of the name calling. The teacher missed an opportunity to engage in dialogue with all the students and explore issues of exclusionary teasing.

Multicultural Education and Citizenship Education

The implementation of multicultural education in public schools may involve teachers of all disciplines and it requires a climate, ethos and organizational structure that reinforces rather than contradicts the key messages. It involves content integration, knowledge construction, prejudice reduction, an empowering organizational culture and equity pedagogy (Banks, 1997) and is "a process that permeates all aspects of school practices, policies and organization" (NAME, 2003). In this permeation model, all teachers have a role in promoting the cosmopolitan ideals of human rights and understandings of national constitutional guarantees of equality. The whole school community should ensure that minority perspectives are not ignored when decisions on curriculum content, allocation of resources, and staffing are made (NAME, 2003). However, without a dedicated timetabled time for helping students explore these key concepts and ideas, a school's commitment to standards and to measurable indicators such as examination success rates may overwhelm good intentions (Mejias & Starkey, 2012). Hence the close alliance of multicultural education with

citizenship education was endorsed by the distinguished international consensus panel (Banks et al., 2005).

Since the beginning of the 21st century, governments and NGOs across the world have shown an interest in and commitment to citizenship education. Such interest stems from concerns about the effects of globalisation and migration; an awareness of global inequalities; concerns about young people's lack of engagement with formal democratic processes and their perceived tendency to antisocial behaviour; and the rise of racist, ultranationalist, and sectarian political groups, prepared to use violence to drive out or eliminate those defined by them as unworthy of protection (Osler & Starkey, 2006).

Citizenship education, which can also be known as social studies or civic education, has achieved a status in many parts of the world as a curriculum subject with timetabled time and specialised teachers. Even in its most anodyne form of civic education, where the focus is on national institutions of government, citizenship education has a political dimension. At least implicitly it considers issues of power. It also, in principle, addresses the ideals of freedom, justice, equality, equity, and human dignity that underpin multicultural education.

That said, the political dimension of multicultural education remains somewhat undeveloped. The index of the *Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education* (Banks, 2009a) directs those seeking information on "political literacy" or to "racism and citizenship education" to a single chapter of the 40 entries (Starkey & Osler, 2009). Even in the context of antiracist education, which may highlight the privileges of dominant groups, political literacy and sociological understandings of racism are 'frequently neglected' (Moodley, 2012, p. 1671). A volume intended to contribute to multicultural education by providing case

studies of good practice, omits key political concepts such as citizenship, democracy, human rights and struggle from its index (Au, 2009).

In Canada, which has had a policy of multiculturalism since 1971 that has been widely taken up by schools, the emphasis may still be on celebrations of difference, tolerance, understanding, an acceptance of diversity and empathy for minorities rather than on economic and political realities (Joshee & Sinfield, 2010). Teachers may feel they have little opportunity to engage with sociological and political readings of school and society, including consideration of the role of the schools in the perpetuation of inequalities. Consequently, they "tend to de-politicize questions of race and racism"' (Raby, 2004, p. 379).

In parallel, when the context is citizenship education, racial diversity is frequently an 'invisible issue' (Pace, 2008, p. 32). The conceptualisation of citizenship education as political education overlooked diversity as an issue (Crick, 1998; Osler, 2000b, 2008). Empirical studies of political discussions in schools reveal that they rarely focus on issues of diversity and racial justice (Hess & McAvoy, 2015). In this case citizenship education avoids one of the major political realities that is salient in virtually any national context across the world.

Multicultural education and citizenship education can be brought together as education for cosmopolitan citizenship (Osler & Vincent, 2002; Osler & Starkey, 2003). Citizenship education as mandated and conceptualised by national education authorities is likely to have a limited and limiting "nation-bound perspective" (Sleeter, 2010, p. 1). A perspective on citizenship education informed by multicultural education challenges that assumption or at least challenges reductionist conceptions of the nation as representing and being represented as the reified culture of a dominant group (Osler, 2008).

Conclusion

Cosmopolitanism is a perspective that conceptually unites multicultural education and citizenship education. This is implicitly recognised by Kymlicka (2004) in his contribution to the edited collection published following the previous international conference hosted by the Center for Multicultural Education. Drawing on the contributions of Castles and Ong he noted that "the logic of multiculturalism can be seen as pushing the boundaries of the nation state" (2004, p. xv). This was also picked up by Parker (2004) in the concluding chapter as he argues for cosmopolitan values to underpin his multinational curriculum for diversity and democracy.

One further development of the work of the Bellagio conference was the international consensus panel (Banks et al., 2005) that explicitly advocated knowledge of human rights and a tension between patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In the decade since the consensus panel, its framework and programme of action have been widely used across the world. Globalization and social media have brought the awareness of the world as an interdependent system more fully into the consciousness of citizens, including young people.

Nussbaum, in a classic dialogue with leading scholars of cosmopolitanism, asserted that "through cosmopolitan education we learn more about ourselves" (Nussbaum & Cohen, 1996, p. 11). In other words, by learning about and with other people from a diversity of traditions and cultures we are able to relativize our own practises and beliefs. This provides an argument based on self-interest since individuals benefit from the capacity to be self-reflective. The approach is also likely to strengthen democracy as it recognises diversity as a democratic asset. In practical terms education for cosmopolitan citizenship combines multicultural education with traditions of citizenship based on rights and struggle. In

Hugh Starkey *Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship* in: James A. Banks (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

implementing this agenda, multicultural education might need to become more political and

citizenship education more multicultural.

Hugh Starkey *Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship* in: James A. Banks (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

References

Adachi, S. (2014). *Faith and social integration of young British Muslims in changing society: Identity management and knowledge of resources*. Paper presented at the British Sociological Association Conference University of Leeds 23-25 April

Adichie, C.N. (2009) The danger of a single story. Retrieved from www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story/transcript?language=en

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, UK: Verso.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. London, UK: Allen Lane (Penguin).

Au, W. (Ed.). (2009). *Rethinking multicultural education: Teaching for racial and cultural justice*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.

Banks, J. A. (1997). *Educating citizens in a multicultural society*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Banks, J. A. (1998). The lives and values of researchers: Implications for educating citizens in a multicultural society *Educational Researcher, 27*(7), 4-17.

Banks, J. A. (2004). Preface. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. xix-xxv). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2004). *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. A. (2006). *Race, culture and education: The selected works of James A. Banks*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hugh Starkey *Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship* in: James A. Banks (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Banks, J. A. (Ed.). (2009a) *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education*. London, UK: Routledge.

Banks, J. A. (2009b). Diversity and citizenship education in multicultural nations. *Multicultural Education Review*, 1(1), 1-28.

Banks, J. A. (2015). *Global migration, structural inclusion, and citizenship education across nations: A conference sponsored by the Center for Multicultural Education* [conference program]. Seattle, WA: University of Washington, Center for Multicultural Education.

Banks, J. A., McGee Banks, C. A., Cortes, C. E., Hahn, C., Merryfield, M., Moodley, K. A., et al. (2005). *Democracy and diversity: Principles and concepts for educating citizens in a global age*. Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, University of Washington.

Bauman, Z. (1989). *Modernity and the Holocaust*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Beck, U. (2002). The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society, 19*(1-2), 17-44.

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

Bowring, B. (2008). Misunderstanding MacIntyre on human rights. In K. Knight & P. Blackledge (Eds.), *Revolutionary Aristotelianism* (pp. 205-214). Stuttgart, DE: Lucius & Lucius.

Castles, S. (2016). The challenges of international migration in the twenty-first century. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Global migration, structural inclusion, and citizenship education across nations*. Washington, D.C.: American Educational Research Association (in progress).

Hugh Starkey *Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship* in: James A. Banks (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Chan, E. (2007). Student experiences of a culturally-sensitive curriculum: Ethnic identity development amid conflicting stories to live by. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 39*(2), 177-194.

Clark, S. (Ed.) (1991) *Malcolm X talks to young people*. New York, NY: Pathfinder.

Clark, S. (Ed.) (1992) *Malcolm X February 1965: The final speeches*. New York, NY: Pathfinder.

Covell, K., Howe, R. B., & Polegato, J. L. (2011). Children's human rights education as a counter to social disadvantage: A case study from England. *Educational Research, 53*(2), 193 - 206.

Crick, B. (1998). *Education for citizenship and the teaching of democracy in schools*. London, UK: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

de Beauvoir, S. ([1949] 1972). *The second sex*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Delors, J. (1996). *Learning: The treasure within*. Paris, FR: UNESCO.

Dewey, J. ([1916] 2002). Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education. In S. J. Maxcy (Ed.), *John Dewey and American Education Vol. 3*. Bristol, UK: Thoemmes.

Ellemers, N., & Van Rijswijk, W. (1997). Identity needs versus social opportunities: The use of group-level and individual-level identity management strategies. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 60*(1), 52-65.

Giddens, A. (1990). The consequences of modernity. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Group of Eminent Persons. (2011). *Living together: Combining diversity and freedom in 21st-century Europe*. Strasbourg, FR: Council of Europe

Hugh Starkey *Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship* in: James A. Banks (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Gutmann, A. (2003). *Identity in democracy*. Woodstock, UK: Princeton University Press.

Hampton, H., & Fayer, S. (1990) *Voices of freedom: An oral history of the civil rights movement from the 1950s through the 1980s*. New York, NY: Bantam.

Heater, D. (2002). *World citizenship: Cosmopolitan thinking and its opponents*. London, UK: Continuum.

Held, D. (1995). Democracy and the new international order. In D. Archibugi & D. Held (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan democracy* (pp. 96-120). London, UK: Polity.

Held, D. (2010). Cosmopolitanism after 9/11. *International Politics 47*, 52-61.

Hess, D. (2009). *Controversy in the classroom: The democratic power of discussion*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hess, D., & McAvoy, P. (2015). *The political classroom: Evidence and ethics in democratic education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Hudson, A. (2005). Citizenship education and students' identities: A school-based action research project. In A. Osler (Ed.), *Teachers, human rights and diversity: Educating citizens in multicultural societies* (pp. 115-132). Stoke on Trent, UK: Trentham.

Isin, E., & Wood, P. (1999). *Citizenship & Identity*. London: Sage.

Jerome, L. (2012). Children's rights and teachers' responsibilities. In R. Mitchell & S. Moore (Eds.), *Politics, participation & power relations: Transdisciplinary approaches to critical citizenship in the classroom and community* (pp. 101-117). Rotterdam, NL: Sense.

Joshee, R., & Sinfield, I. (2010). The Canadian multicultural education policy web: Lessons to learn, pitfalls to avoid. *Multicultural Education Review 2*(1), 55-75.

Kaldor, M. (2003). American power: From 'compellance' to cosmopolitanism? *International Affairs, 79*(1), 1-22.

Hugh Starkey *Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship* in: James A. Banks (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

King, M. L. (1964) Speech on South Africa at City Temple, London, December 1964.

Retrieved from www.rfksafilm.org/html/speeches/africaking.php

Klug, F. (2000). Values for a godless age: The story of the UK's new Bill of Rights.

Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.

Knight, L. W. (2005). *Citizen: Jane Addams and the struggle for democracy* Chicago, IL:

University of Chicago Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2004). Foreword. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education:*

Global perspectives. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Languille, C. (2015). *La possibilité du cosmopolitisme: Burqa, droits de l'homme et vivre-*

ensemble[The possibility of cosmopolitanism: Burqa, human rights and living

together]. Paris, FR: Gallimard.

Levinson, M. (2007). Common schools and multicultural education. *Journal of Philosophy of*

Education 41(4), 625-642.

Levinson, M. (2012). *No citizen left behind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Levy, D. (2010). Recursive cosmopolitization: Argentina and the global human rights regime.

British Journal of Sociology, 61(3), 579-596.

Lorcerie, F. (Ed.). (2005). *La politisation du voile en France, en Europe et dans le monde*

arabe [The politicisation of the headscarf in France, in Europe and in the Arab world].

Paris, FR: L' Harmattan.

Mandela, N. (1964) Nelson Mandela's statement from the dock at the opening of the

defence case in the Rivonia Trial. Retrieved from www.anc.org.za/show.php?id=3430

Mandela, N. (1994) *Long walk to freedom* London, UK: Abacus.

Mannheim, K. ([1929, 1936] 1991). *Ideology and Utopia: An introduction to the sociology of knowledge*. London, UK: Routledge.

Mejias, S. (2012). *NGOs and human rights education in the neoliberal age: A case study of an NGO-secondary school partnership in London.* PhD thesis, Institute of Education University of London, London.

Mejias, S., & Starkey, H. (2012). Critical citizens or neoliberal consumers? Utopian visions and pragmatic uses of human rights education in a secondary school in England. In R. C. Mitchell & S. A. Moore (Eds.), *Politics, participation & power relations: Transdisciplinary approaches to critical citizenship in the classroom and community.* (pp. 119-136). Rotterdam, NL: Sense.

Moodley, K. (2012) Political literacy and education. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Encyclopaedia of diversity in education* (pp. 1670-1673), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moyn, S. (2010). *The last Utopia: Human rights in history*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.

National Association for Multicultural Education. (2003). *Definition of multicultural education.* Retrieved from http://nameorg.org/position-statements/.

National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS). (2013). *The college, career, and civic life (C3) framework for social studies state standards: Guidance for enhancing the rigor of K-12 civics, economics, geography, and history.* Silver Spring, MD: NCSS.

Nussbaum, M. (2012). *The new religious intolerance: Overcoming the politics of fear in an anxious age*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Nussbaum, M. C., & Cohen, J. (1996). *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hugh Starkey *Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship* in: James A. Banks (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

O'Brien, E. (2006). *The many ways of student voice. An examination of student participation in decision-making in United States schools.* Unpublished Master's Thesis. Faculty of Law University of Fribourg, Fribourg, CH.

Osler, A. (2000a). The Crick report: Difference, equality and racial justice. *Curriculum Journal, 11*(1), 25-37.

Osler, A. (Ed.). (2000b). *Citizenship and democracy in schools: Diversity, identity, equality.* Stoke on Trent, UK: Trentham Books.

Osler, A. (2008). Citizenship education and the Ajegbo report: Re-imagining a cosmopolitan nation. *London Review of Education, 6*(1), 9 - 23.

Osler, A. (2011). Teacher interpretations of citizenship education: national identity, cosmopolitan ideals, and political realities. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 43*(1), 1-24.

Osler, A. (2015). Human rights education, postcolonial scholarship and action for social justice. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 43*(2), 244-274.

Osler, A. (2016). *Human rights and schooling: An ethical framework for teaching social justice.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (1996). *Teacher education and human rights.* London, UK: Fulton.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (1998). Children's rights and citizenship: Some implications for the management of schools. *The International Journal of Children's Rights, 6* (3), 313-333.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review, 55*(3), 243-254.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education.* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Hugh Starkey *Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship* in: James A. Banks (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2006). Education for Democratic Citizenship: a review of research, policy and practice 1995-2005. Research Papers in Education, 24(4), 433-466.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2010). *Teachers and human rights education*. Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham.

Osler, A., & Vincent, K. (2002). *Citizenship and the challenge of global education*. Stoke on Trent, UK: Trentham.

Pace, J. (2008). Teaching for citizenship in 12th Grade Government classes. In J. Bixby & J. Pace (Eds.), *Educating democratic citizens in troubled times: Qualitative studies of current efforts* (pp. 25-57). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Pace, J., & Bixby, J. (2008). Introduction: Studying citizenship education in troubled times. In J. Bixby & J. Pace (Eds.), *Educating democratic citizens in troubled times: Qualitative studies of current efforts* (pp. 3-24). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Papamichael, E. (2011). *Exploring intercultural education discourses and everyday practices in a Greek-Cypriot primary school.* Unpublished PhD thesis, Institute of Education University of London, London, UK.

Parker, W. C. (2004). Diversity, globalization, and democratic education: Curriculum possibilities. In J. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pérez-Expósito, L. (2012). *Students' representations of political participation: Implications for citizenship education in Mexico City's secondary schools*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Institute of Education University of London, London, UK.

Hugh Starkey *Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship* in: James A. Banks (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Pérez-Expósito, L. (2015). Scope and quality of student participation in school: Towards an analytical framework for adolescents. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth 20* (3), 1-29.

Raby, R. (2004). 'There's no racism at my school, it's just joking around': Ramifications for anti-racist education. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 7*(4), 367-383.

Rawls, J. (1999). *The law of peoples*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (1978). Imagination in discourse and action. In A.-T. Tymieniecka (Ed.), *The human being in action: The irreducible element in man. Part II. Investigations at the intersection of philosophy and psychiatry* (pp. 3–22). Dordrecht, NL: Reidel.

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

Schama, S. (1989). *Citizens: A chronicle of the French Revolution.* London, UK: Penguin.

Sen, A. (2009). *The idea of justice*. London, UK: Allen Lane.

Sleeter, C. (2010). Probing Beneath Meanings of Multicultural Education. *Multicultural Education Review, 2*(1), 1-24.

Soysal, Y. (2012). Citizenship, immigration, and the European social project: Rights and obligations of individuality. *British Journal of Sociology, 63* (1), 1-21.

Spring, J. (2015). *Globalization of education: An introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Starkey, H., & Osler, A. (2009). Antiracism, Citizenship, and Education: European ideals and political complacency. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*. New York: Routledge.

Stoker, G. (2011). *Prospects for citizenship*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Academic.

United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child.* New York, NY: UNICEF.

Hugh Starkey *Globalization and Education for Cosmopolitan Citizenship* in: James A. Banks (Ed.) (2017). *Citizenship Education and Global Migration: Implications for Theory, Research, and Teaching*. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

United Nations General Assembly. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York, NY: United Nations.

Verhellen, E. (2000). Children's rights and education. In A. Osler (Ed.), *Citizenship and democracy in schools: Diversity, identity, equality* (pp. 33-43). Stoke-on-Trent, UK: Trentham.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30*(6), 1024-1054.

Zuckerman, E. (2013). *Digital cosmopolitans: Why we think the internet connects us, why it doesn't and how to rewire it*. New York, NY: Norton.