

Undoing Double Binds in Curriculum: On Cosmopolitan Sensibilities in US Curriculum Studies

James C. Jupp
Georgia Southern University

Double-Binds.ⁱ In the historical present, the United States curriculum field exists between double binds. Articulating one of the binds, the world of positivist common-sense curriculum management, a-historically enmeshed in standards, psychometric assessment, international “achievement,” and globalization, impatiently strums its fingers and asks *what works* in schools? Articulating the other bind, reconceptualist curriculum studies, a-historically enmeshed in 1960s’ oppositional intellectual style, “resists” curriculum management and ask *what’s next* on the new left? The first bind, encapsulated in *what works*, grasps at post-World War II triumphalism, ever-alluring in the North American psyche. The second bind, encapsulated in an oppositional *what’s next*, has worked through consumption-production of cultural studies new wave strategies as a means of a-critically institutionalizing 1960s opposition. These double binds, in their static opposition, conserve an a-historical present in which curriculum management prevails. Creative *undoing* of double binds, a theme that runs through this essay, requires not an oppositional *what’s next* strategy borrowed from the new left, but rather the careful study of one’s own and others’ traditions I call cosmopolitan sensibilities. By way of definition, cosmopolitan

Books Discussed

- Ibargüengoitia, A. (2000). *Suma filosófica mexicana*. México, DF: Editorial Porrúa.
- Malewski, E. (ed). (2010). *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* New York, Routledge.

sensibilities refers to *the careful, creative, and reflective study of one's own and others' traditions as a means of leveraging subjectivity and creating progressive, open-ended, non-determinist dispositions*. Specifically understood as *sensibilities* (not a “framework,” “approach,” or “perspective”), cosmopolitan sensibilities suggest the quality of being able to endure, appreciate, and respond to complexity. As reconceptualist curriculum scholar, teacher educator, and ex-teacher, I define, explain, and provide examples of cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies as strategy and tactic that amplify reconceptualist curriculum work in the historical present.

Discursive contours. In describing cosmopolitan sensibilities as creative undoing of double binds, this historical essay develops the following contours.

1. The emergence of reconceptualist curriculum represented a process of “*transplantamiento*” (Ibargüengoitia, 1980/2000, p. 53) or international transplantation of established European critical and postcolonial traditions interpreted and re-deployed through US and Anglophone concerns.
2. Reconceptualist curriculum’s *transplantamiento* reflected and simultaneously co-created *cultural studies new wave strategies* as elephant-in-the-room that significantly advanced curriculum studies along several lines, providing ever-newer conceptual “product” through the 80s and 90s, yet in the historical present, this *transplantamiento* takes on a repetitive character as recent new waves reconfigure ideational content of previous waves.
3. Reconceptualist curriculum studies’ *next moment* and “post-reconceptualization” (Malewski, 2010, p. 5) modestly seek to advance the continuation of cultural studies new wave strategies yet paradoxically demonstrate *new waves’ exhaustion* in the present under descriptors of proliferation and refinement.
4. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, well underway both in recent new waves and inside reconceptualist curriculum’s next moment, serve to deepen rather than to reject cultural and curriculum studies’ international *transplantamiento*, and in doing so, cosmopolitan sensibilities carefully and critically *re-engage* emergent traditions for the progressive undoing of oppositional double binds.

Cosmopolitan sensibilities, as critique of cultural studies new wave strategies, represent a critique forged-in-love as my degree is in both curriculum and cultural studies. As forged-in-love critique, cosmopolitan sensibilities do *not* seek an oppositional dismissal of cultural studies influences in curriculum studies. Rather, cosmopolitan sensibilities seek to better understand reconceptualist curriculum scholars’ international *transplantamiento* through historical through-lines or “verticality” (Pinar, in press, p. 4) that “documents the ideas that constitute the complicated conversation” (ibid). The purpose of focusing on historical verticality, as this essay will demonstrate, is to extend, deepen, and enrich curriculum studies through a recursive move that recovers past intellectual traditions inside and outside curriculum studies as a way forward.

Transplantamiento

First internationalization? There is no *first* internationalization of curriculum studies, but US reconceptualist curriculum provided one *prior* to the internationalization of the present. Reconceptualist curriculum scholars provided a rupture with positivist traditions in educational research in the US, reconstructed Deweyan progressive lines, and *most importantly re-initiated a transplantamiento of long-standing European critical and postcolonial traditions*. Understood through Antonio Ibargüengoitia’s (1980/2000) notion of “*transplantamiento*” (p. 53), such international transplantations refer to the im-

portation and development of traditions “in order to obtain different ends” (p. 53).ⁱⁱ As demonstrated in the exchange between Philip Jackson and Maxine Greene below, the reconceptualization of curriculum studies represented a reckoning with reconceptualist curriculum scholars’ transplantamiento that, in the historical present, requires sustained intellectual effort to extend, deepen, and enrich.

Jackson and Greene’s exchange. Reviewing an exchange between Philip Jackson (1980) and Maxine Greene (1980) provides insight into curriculum studies’ transplantamiento and subsequent need for cosmopolitan sensibilities. Begrudgingly recognizing reconceptualist curriculum scholars’ influences, Jackson (1980), in “Curriculum and its Discontents,” narrated the arrival of reconceptualist curriculum scholars after a decade-long argument about the field and the status of reconceptualist scholars in it. After at least a decade of announcements that the academic study of curriculum was variously “moribund,” (Schwab, 1969, p. 493), “dead” (Huebner, 1976/1999, p. 253), and “fragmented and arrested” (Pinar, 1978, p. 207), Jackson (1980) characterized reconceptualist curriculum as “decidedly left of center” (p. 166):

The key [reconceptualist] ideas being drawn upon are distinctly European in flavor, with French and German influences predominating. Besides Marx and Freud, others frequently cited in this literature include Heidegger, Husserl, Merleau-Ponty; Sartre, Schutz, Gramsci, Polanyi, and Habermas. The major argument in support of drawing upon these new sources of ideas (new for educators, that is) is, as I understand it, they are more helpful in thinking about and understanding the richness and complexity of educational phenomena than are the intellectual frameworks that have till now dominated educational thought. (p. 166)

Missing the centrality of Freire’s (1968/1998a, 1970/1998b) influence among other critical and post-colonial traditions along with the reconstruction of US pragmatism, Jackson (1980) nonetheless correctly characterized reconceptualist curriculum as drawing on new sources of ideas, “new for educators, that is” (p. 166). What Jackson understood as new ideas represented the transplantamiento of new traditions in curriculum studies referred to above. Overall, Jackson (1980, 1992) registered his skepticism and ambivalence toward reconceptualist curriculum scholars’ transplantamiento, yet some of his writings recognized (rather than ignored) a rupture in what he understood as “intellectual frameworks” (1980, p. 166). Cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies seek to understand reconceptualist curriculum *not* as a simple swapping of *a priori* beliefs in fundamentalist “frameworks” *but rather* as deliberate and purposeful transplantamiento of traditions for pursuing different ends, purposes, and outcomes in understanding curriculum. From the purview of cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum, this transplantamiento along with its subsequent challenges is still taking place and, again, needs to be extended, deepened, and enriched.

Maxine Greene (1980), in her response to Jackson (1980), recognized the significant challenges inherent in reconceptualist curriculum scholars’ transplantamiento. Advancing directions taken up in reconceptualist curriculum, Greene’s response provided generous space for reconceptualist curriculum in her affirmation of its radical critique and democratic purposes. Nonetheless, Greene provided a criticism of reconceptualist curriculum of her own, and it is precisely Greene’s criticism—*yet to be fully reckoned with* by reconceptualist scholars—that cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum recover and reconstruct for advancing reconceptualist curriculum. Greene affirmed reconceptualist curriculum scholars’ “radical distrust of institutions that have not lived up to their ‘promise’ of democracy” (1980, p. 172); nonetheless, Greene leveled a strong critique of reconceptualist curriculum scholars’ a-historicism and failure to grasp the intellectual traditions embedded in reconceptualist curriculum’s

audacious transplantamiento:

But I believe this [new sources of ideas] represents an effort (not always well-informed) to seek out social theories that more properly account for the contradictions of democratic society than those being considered doctrine in the field of education. One difficulty stems from the tendency to skim from the surface of very complex, deeply rooted philosophic positions—to quote Habermas, for instance, without familiarity with nineteenth century German philosophy; to attack Dewey on revisionist grounds without having read more than *The Child and the Curriculum*.... (p. 172)

Greene's critique, a generous reading of reconceptualist curriculum, is forged-in-love (as I hope my critique will be read). Greene recognized the potential for reconceptualist curriculum scholars' transplantamiento, yet she also understood the challenges taken up by reconceptualist curriculum scholars as a struggle to provide an historicized understanding of curriculum that is even more urgent in the present. As it turns out in retrospect, the elephant-in-the-room, left unmentioned by both Greene and Jackson, was the rise of cultural and other "area" studies and their influence on reconceptualist curriculum scholars' work.

Cultural Studies "New Wave" Strategies

Elephant-in-the-room. Though impossible to sort out in this essay, suffice it to modestly assert that " 'cultural studies' "—along with several other "area" studies purposefully elided hereⁱⁱⁱ—corresponded with co-constructed reconceptualist curriculum scholars' rupture. Cultural studies, understood through this purposeful elision, provided a corresponding and co-created rupture with received frameworks and international transplantamiento of traditions that Jackson (1980, 1992) complained about and Greene (1980, 1988) created and practiced. Regarding the trajectory of cultural studies, Stuart Hall (1990) explained that 1956 *not* 1968 represented the start of institutionalized cultural studies project that "was then, and has been ever since, an adaptation to its terrain; it has been a conjunctural practice. It has always developed from a different matrix of interdisciplinary studies and disciplines" (p. 11). Hall's comments regarding "adaptation to terrain" and "conjunctural practice" (p. 11) articulate the multiplication of "area" studies that include reconceptualist curriculum scholars' transplantamiento and subsequent ascendance. As I do not want to strain the obvious correspondence and influence of cultural studies on reconceptualist curriculum scholars' consumption-production, the Reader may simply survey state-of-the-field compendiums in both in cultural and curriculum studies: Note, as examples, the parallel epistemological and political concerns in Grossberg, Nelson, & Treichler (1992) and Pinar, Reynolds, Slattery, & Taubman (1995), or subsequently, During (1999) and Malewski (2010). Two questions that this essay raises yet does not answer for reconceptualist scholars in the historical present are: *To what extent does "making it," in the vulgar careerist sense, require importing new product from cultural studies into US curriculum studies?*^{iv} And, on the heels of that question: *To what extent is the a-critical consumption-production of cultural studies in reconceptualist curriculum still an insurgent, transformative, or radical practice almost fifty years after 1968?*

Related to these questions is the ubiquitous presence of cultural studies new wave strategies in curriculum studies. These strategies have provided *what's next* on the new left for reconceptualist scholars over the last four—going on five—decades. As Kashope Wright (2000) articulated, reconceptualist curriculum passed through numerous new waves dominated, for the most part, by cultural studies concerns:

Curriculum theorizing has been overtly politicized: It has been variously institutionalized, freed of institutional constraints, restricted to K-12 schooling, opened up to other pedagogical spaces, queered, raced, gendered, aestheticized, psychoanalyzed, moralized, modernized, and postmodernized. (p. 4)

Interestingly, Kashope Wright (2000) developed a passive-voice construction in characterizing the field that might be paraphrased: Curriculum theorizing has been institutionalized, freed, opened, queered, raced, gendered, aestheticized, psychoanalyzed, modernized, and postmodernized. Though Kashope Wright (2000) implied *by curriculum scholars*, the phrase *by cultural studies'* concerns could be slotted-in to this sentence, and it would read coherently as well. Paradoxically, reconceptualist curriculum scholars, in their focus on cultural studies waves accelerating in the 1980s and 1990s, ever-hastened in developing politicized discourse at a time when "radical" politics in higher education represented an increasingly compromised strategy and began to appear *rather* as component of the status quo (West, 1993), especially when understood in relation to double-binds as the 1960s disappeared in the rear-view mirror. Even more troublingly within the double-binds of the historical present, reconceptualist curriculum scholars' focus on *what's next* in cultural studies new wave strategies no longer represented a rupture but instead began to reproduce the privileged center of the field (Appelbaum, 2002). Peter Appelbaum (2002), retrospectively in the twilight of what's next, characterized the field as conceptually-and-paradigmatically over-crowded for meaningful work and instead theorized de-territorializing curriculum studies through a deconstructive "*dis*"-*conceptualization* as transgressive move to free up space in reconceptualist curriculum. It is important to note that in the historical present cultural studies new wave strategies, bringing ever-newer waves into reconceptualist curriculum scholars' *what's next*, currently serve to reproduce a received field rather than to counter the Tyler Rationale. Nonetheless, cosmopolitan sensibilities, rather than dismissing cultural studies' influences in curriculum studies, begin to answer the question of how to extend, deepen, enrich, and *continue transgressive work in a received field imbricated with cultural studies new waves* yet do so in ways that are historically informed by traditions inside and outside curriculum studies.

Several other cultural studies new waves, including browning curriculum (Gatzambide-Fernandez & Murad, 2011), m/othering curriculum (Springgay & Freedman, 2009), and public pedagogy (2011), could possibly be added to Kashope Wright's (ibid) list of new waves in reconceptualist curriculum since the article's publication. Nonetheless, these new waves in reconceptualist curriculum appear to newly reconfigure previous critical race (e.g., Anderson, 1988; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1998; McCarthy & Crichlow, 1993), feminist relationality (e.g., Grumet, 1988; Noddings, 1984; Goldstein, 1997, 2002), and critical pedagogy (e.g., Freire, 1968/1998a, 1970/1998b; Giroux, 1988), respectively. Collectively, recent new waves begin to suggest an exhaustion with new wave strategies in reconceptualist curriculum while simultaneously performing the strategy, sometimes with little sense of historical accumulation of ideational content. Promisingly, from the purview of cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies, *cultural studies new waves no longer seem to provide "new" conceptual product and instead further suggest the need for reworking reconceptualist curriculum's historical verticality*. This historical verticality could lead to increased understanding of curriculum traditions as resources for curriculum design, teacher education, and teachers' careful professional study.

Nonetheless, in recent new wave strategies, historical verticality *though thin* is nonetheless emergent in m/othering curriculum (Springgay & Freedman, 2009) through working historically with Grumet and Merleau-Ponty, and it *is* also emergent in browning curriculum through working historically with

William Watkins and Annie Winfield along with other critical race scholars. Perhaps public pedagogy (Sandlin, O'Malley, Burdick, 2011) best articulates the potential for an historicized verticality inherent in cosmopolitan sensibilities. In reviewing historical and contemporary literatures, Sandlin, O'Malley, and Burdick (2011) carefully signal resources for researchers interested in the discourse providing a thematic analysis that provides historical verticality through William Schubert to John Dewey, through Henry Giroux to Stuart Hall and Antonio Gramsci besides surveying feminist and other cultural studies scholarship organized around the topic. Public pedagogy further develops an international transplantamiento and begins to display what I call cosmopolitan sensibilities in reconfiguring historical Marxian and critical theory for work in the historical present.

It is important to note, in finishing this section on cultural studies new wave strategies, that cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies do not pit historical verticality *against* cultural studies waves in curriculum studies. Rather cosmopolitan sensibilities, in emphasizing historical verticality, embrace *both* cultural studies *and* intellectual history, *both* curriculum studies *and* curriculum history—to bring forth the best of what both have to offer educational work: transgressive-provocative scholarship coupled with careful, historicized understanding. Understood through reconceptualist curriculum scholars' international transplantamiento, cosmopolitan sensibilities seek an advancement of curriculum studies through deepening historical verticality that moves our understanding *from contemporary curriculum discourses to historicized curriculum traditions as mean of conceptualizing collective intellectual labor*. Rather than opposing cultural studies influences, cosmopolitan sensibilities' move from discourses to traditions signals *not* a negation *but rather* a return to the Birmingham School Center for Cultural Studies' intellectual production that—in fighting for its existence—demonstrated historicity in carefully situating itself in both post-World War II Britain *and* Marxian and other intellectual history (As exemplar, see Clark, Hall, Jefferson, & Roberts, 1975/2000). As cosmopolitan sensibilities suggests, *the next moment*, though only partially recognized by Malewski (2010), advances curriculum studies through an increased attention to historical verticality of the field.

The Next Moment

A *post*-? Erik Malewski's (2010) edited volume *The Next Moment* further articulates the need for increased historical verticality in the field. Malewski carefully negotiates the difficulties of cultural studies new wave strategies or "shifts" yet paradoxically adds a *post*- in advancing curriculum studies' "post-reconceptualization" (p. 5). Malewski (2010) modestly negotiates between reconceptualist curriculum scholars' and what he terms post-reconceptualist curriculum scholars' work yet avoids directly conjuring up notions of new waves, shifts, ruptures, or revolutions. Malewski's (2010) edited volume documents and expands upon presentations and interactions at the 2006 Purdue Conference, not least of which represented a "breakdown" (p. 3) between up-and-coming activist scholars of color and established senior scholars. While recognizing and providing space for the breakdown, Malewski nonetheless forgoes cultural studies' new wave strategies in characterizing curriculum's post-reconceptualization. Instead of emphasizing cultural studies new wave strategies, Malewski describes the post-reconceptualization as further proliferation and refinement of reconceptualist curriculum discourses that represent processes of collective inquiry over the last forty years, if not more. On describing the relationship between reconceptualist and post-reconceptualist curriculum, Malewski (2010) writes:

For those who think of post-reconceptualization as a break from reconceptualization—a paradigm shift—this [argument] might sound like a rehearsal of existing terminology, a return to a prior

period or an extension of an existing one. These conceptions of curriculum as object and change through paradigm shifts date back between three to four decades. Yet it seems that the stakes are high, particularly when the paradigmatic language is inadequate to describe the changes that have taken place... (p. 7)

Lacking the “paradigmatic language,” Malewski uses *post-* in *post-reconceptualist* curriculum to describe the proliferation, reconfiguration, and refinement of reconceptualist curriculum he calls *post-reconceptualization*. Read through understandings in cultural studies “new waves,” the *post-* in the term *post-reconceptualization* suggests a residual requirement of new wave strategies by asserting a wave, shift, or revolution *even in the self-acknowledged absence of such phenomena*.

Cosmopolitan sensibilities, rather than following a paradoxical *post-reconceptualization*, follow Madeleine Grumet’s thinking published in Malewski’s volume. Rather than suggesting another wave, shift, rupture or revolution through the *post-* in *post-reconceptualization*, Grumet (2010) acknowledges how subsequent reconceptualist curriculum scholars’ critiques now inform her understandings of *currere* and advocates continued extension, deepening, and critique to describe what is needed in the next moment:

Nevertheless, affixing the adjective *post-* [Grumet’s emphasis] to structuralism, modernism, colonialism, reconceptualization infers an abrupt conclusion to thought, and a repudiation of the lived world that spawns these theories. Let us just say, “to be continued.” (p. 408)

Cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies, eschewing the *post-* in *post-reconceptualization*, recommends Malewski’s proliferation, reconfiguration, and refinement yet recurs to an understanding of international *transplantamiento* and historical verticality as best means for informing the *next moment*. Cosmopolitan sensibilities echo Grumet’s (2010) generosity: “Let us just say, ‘to be continued’” (p. 408) through engagement in historical traditions inside and outside curriculum studies.

From the purview of cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum, Malewski’s 2010 edited volume suggests potential historical verticality in a similar way to that suggested by recent cultural studies new wave strategies. Malewski (2010), skillfully reading the field and juxtaposing up-and-coming scholars’ with senior scholars’ work, begins to articulate *not* another wave, shift, movement, or revolution *but rather* a reconfiguration of the discursive formation that extends, deepens, and enriches historical verticality in provoking “existing terminology into doing new work” (Rolleston in Malewski, 2010, p. 5). Never before in reconceptualist curriculum scholarship has one generation of scholars drawn on, directly critiqued, or reconfigured previous reconceptualist scholars’ work in the rhetorical development of the their own. As Malewski correctly demonstrates, understanding reconceptualist curriculum in the historical present requires not new wave, shift, movement, or revolution assuming linear time but rather suggests, as cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum do, a reconfiguration and refinement of emerging through lines read as emerging traditions. Understanding reconceptualist curriculum in the historical present assumes the abandonment of linear “advancement” and instead non-linear recursivity (Paz, 1948/1987, 1978) that resides *not* in a tranquil “traditionalism” *but rather* in progressive, critical, provocative, transgressive, and intransigent strategies to condition and convincingly respond to neo liberal globalization’s a-historical *what works*.

In the sections above on *transplantamiento*, *cultural studies new wave strategies*, and *next moments*, this essay historically read reconceptualist curriculum studies and revealed a trajectory already well underway. This trajectory in curriculum studies emphasizes cosmopolitan sensibilities as a means to

advance curriculum studies beyond its present a-historical condition of oppositional double-binds. Cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies, as a possible means for advancing curriculum studies, seeks *not* the faddish *what's next* in the new left strategy that presently conserves double binds in curriculum. *Rather* cosmopolitan sensibilities seek to extend, deepen, and enrich reconceptualist curriculum's transplantamiento with historical verticality for double bind's creative *undoing*. The creative *undoing* of double binds, through cosmopolitan sensibilities, provides a means of advancing the field with a renewed historical voice toward reengaging teacher education, teachers, and researchers with increased credibility and relevance. In the section that follows, I will clearly layout what I mean by cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies: *what they are, what they aren't, ethics, and examples*.

Cosmopolitan sensibilities: Definition, ethics, examples

What they are. Writ large, cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum represent nothing new (Appiah, 2005, 2006; Hansen, 2008, 2009, 2011; Todd, 2008, 2009; Pinar, 2009, 2012; Sen, 2006). As Ghanaian-British-American scholar Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006) notes, cosmopolitanism dates back "at least to the Cynics of the fourth century BC" (p. xiv). Rejecting Appiah's top-down and dispassionate legalisms and (at times) pessimisms, cosmopolitanism sensibilities in curriculum studies nonetheless further develop his emphasis on intercultural and intersubjective understanding through knowledge of our own and others' traditions. Appiah explains:

We should learn about people in other places, take an interest in their histories, their civilizations, their arguments, their errors, their achievements, not because that will bring us into agreement, but because it will help us get used to one another. If that is the aim, then the fact that we have all these opportunities for disagreement about values need not put us off. Understanding one another may be hard; it can certainly be interesting. (2006, p. 78)

Rather than re-performing cultural studies new wave strategies, cosmopolitan sensibilities instead seek to understand curriculum through careful study in multiple traditions inside and outside curriculum studies. Cosmopolitan sensibilities' careful study in multiple traditions seeks to develop historical verticality's connections between past and present along with engagement in provocative, transgressive, critical, and progressive conversations of the present that can advance our fuller understanding of ourselves and others' traditions. Cosmopolitan sensibilities' careful study purposefully problematize a-historical, neo conservative notions of *what works* in schools yet simultaneously extend and deepen what has become static, ailing, and conservative in *what's new* on the new left strategies. Cosmopolitan sensibilities' careful study suspends facile reductions to "first beliefs," "value statements," or "ideological commitments" that dominate discussions that conserve and strengthen fundamentalist double binds of the historical present. Seeking to extend, deepen, and enrich reconceptualist curriculum's transplantamiento, cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies refer *to careful, creative, and reflective study of one's own and others' traditions as a means of leveraging subjectivity and creating progressive, open-ended, non-determinist dispositions*. In taking up the careful, creative, and reflective study of multiple traditions, cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum recognize that study within traditions participates in, produces, generates, and constitutes these same traditions along with the quality of ideational content within those traditions (West, 2004; Elliot, 1919/1975).

What they are not. Cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies refer *not* to another wave, *but rather* the word "cosmopolitan" conditions *sensibilities*. *Sensibilities*, as defined in the Oxford English

Dictionary (2012), refer to *the quality of being able to appreciate and respond to complex emotional or aesthetic influences*. Rather than supplanting previous new waves with another new “framework,” cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies provide patient, internal-external, attitudinal, dispositional practices that allow for emergent, complex, and dialogic understandings in historical and contemporary issues. In working through the notion of sensibilities, cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum distrust yet simultaneously historicize and contextualize facile, reductive, and a-historical paradigm statements or “frameworks” inherent in previous new wave strategies. From the purview of cosmopolitan sensibilities, paradigm statements and “frameworks” in previous new waves become reduced to fundamentalisms in variously stated “values,” “first beliefs,” or “ideological commitments,” and in these fundamentalist reductions, paradigm statements and “frameworks” create and accompany ongoing *identity violence* inside (Appelbaum, 2002) and outside (Sen, 2006) curriculum studies. Seeking the creative *undoing* of double-binds, cosmopolitan sensibilities instead recall Rousseau’s (1762/1992) anti-universalist exhortations that the only thing we *all* have to agree on is the social contract itself thereby providing for open-ended discussion of all other ideas without fear of fundamentalist “framework” reprisals. In consciously seeking to infuse historical verticality into cultural studies scholarship in curriculum, cosmopolitan sensibilities emphasize Sharon Todd’s (2008) historicized engagement in cosmopolitan education as imperfect, incomplete, not-finished, yet embroiled in not-easy-to-be-resolved differences. Extending Todd’s (2008) notion of imperfect education, cosmopolitan sensibilities invokes historical verticality as a way of making for malleable discussions rather than fundamentalism’s identity violence.

As a sensibility distrustful of “first beliefs,” “value statements,” “ideological commitments,” and their fundamentalist “frameworks,” the notion of cosmopolitan sensibilities developed in this essay differs significantly from that of David Hansen (2008, 2011) and Hansen and his colleagues (2009). Although the cosmopolitan sensibilities discussed here align with Hansen and his colleagues’ focus on recapturing and engaging history and traditions of study, cosmopolitan sensibilities as developed here do not align with Hansen and his colleagues’ understanding of “tradition” and “teaching orientation.” Despite notable disclaimers, Hansen and his colleagues’ engagement with traditions too often reify stodgy tête à tête with the ancients rather than cosmopolitan sensibilities described here that seeks to extend, deepen, and enrich traditions of cultural and curriculum studies *through co-creating and generating traditions*. Moreover, Hansen (2011), unlike Todd (2008, 2009), tends to describe cosmopolitan education as new paradigm statement or “framework” for teachers to “internalize” seemingly replacing multicultural “frameworks.” To substantiate these critiques of stodgy traditionalism and “another framework” for teacher education, Hansen’s (2011) final chapter evinces both reductionist tendencies that cosmopolitan sensibilities emphatically disagree with:

In the chapters of this book I have been contributing to an ever-evolving and yet substantive cosmopolitan canon for research, teaching, and teacher education. It includes writings by Plato and Marcus, Montaigne and Gournay, Tagore and Dewey. (p. 96)

And, in discussing his “approach” to education, Hansen continues:

Thus the approach here aspires to provide all students with opportunities to experience local and broader traditions educationally rather than solely from the point of view of socialization. (p. 98)

Cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies, differing from Hansen yet agreeing with Todd’s

(2008) imperfect education, enable teaching with historical and dispositional complexity, discussing relevant historical reading (*not* a fixed “canon”), and in research, engaging generous reviewers’ comments to be more *historically thorough* than previous curriculum scholars have been. Having discussed a definition along with counter-definitions of cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies, this essay moves on to a discussion of cosmopolitan sensibilities’ ethics.

Ethics. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, in its definition, includes the word *study*. By definition, cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum suggest an ethics of careful, creative, and reflective study (Block, 2001, 2009; Pinar, in press) that might be fostered in institutional settings but certainly extend beyond them. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, in emphasizing an ethics of study, support authentic learning and study as identity creative self-formation called identifications (e.g., Block, 2001, 2009; Ikeda, 2010; Kung, 2012; Slattery, 2006; West, 2004). *Beginning with learning as self-formation, an ethics of study conceives of careful, creative, and reflective study as an on-going process of identification of self within social and historical boundedness.* Conceiving of study as process of identification within boundedness, an ethics of study understands subjectivities as biologically, historically, and socially bounded yet open-ended and non-determined. Understanding identification as bounded yet open-ended, an ethics of study assumes study within traditions as *deadly-serious* and *always-already-in-process* work for making, reconfiguring, and reworking what is understood in common sense ways as our “selves.” When attended to fully, study provides processes of identification with personal and social growth along with material and spiritual freedoms. An ethics of study, recognizing study as site of material and spiritual freedoms, understands study as having a sacred character similar to prayer or meditation in that it provides for an encounter between material subjectivity and spiritual transcendence (Block, 2001, 2009; Ikeda, 2010; Kung, 2012). Articulating an ethics of study, Alan Block (2001) elaborates on study as taken up here:

And what do we do when we engage in curriculum? What do we do when we engage in acts of learning? I am going to suggest that engagement in study is a prayerful act. Study is a stance we assume in the world. Study is a way of being—it is an ethics. ... We stand in awe at the complexities of our lives which we only realize in part. A blessing, as study is, is a moment of insight, a chance for direction. (p. 1)

An ethics of study, providing the ethical center for cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum, values authentic learning as autobiography, identifications as on-going personal and social growth, and—as Block (2001) emphasizes—an open-ended relationality with selves, others, and the world ready for “insight, a chance for direction.” (p. 1)

Examples. After having defined cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum and emphasized its ethics, discussing examples of work with cosmopolitan sensibilities further develops this notion for curriculum studies. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, reaching back genealogically yet driving forward in progressive directions, abound: Rubén Dario’s (1888/1992) literary creativity, engaging Greek Idealism, Shakespeare’s muses, and Latin American indigenous history along with Marxian class critique, provides a trajectory for Latin American aesthetic modernist traditions (e.g., Neruda, 1950/1997; Mistral, 1924/1971; Paz, 1948/1987; Garcia Marquez, 1967/1992) that dialectically engage aesthetic ideals for specific historical, social, and political interventions. Mahatma Gandhi’s (1927/1987) intellectual production, taking up Hindu religious resources and practices alongside Christian and English common law traditions, provides a trajectory for traditions of ecumenical and political solidarity (e.g.,

Hahn, 1995 King, 1958/2010; Malewski, 2011). DT Suzuki's (1958/1998) cross-cultural writings, generating texts in which Buddhism, Christianity, and European phenomenological traditions communicate, provide for a tradition of dialogue between East and West (e.g., Ikeda, 2010; Kung, 2012; Watts, 1966/1989; Jardine, Friesen, Clifford, 2006). W.E.B. Du Bois (1903/1995), drawing on African-American spirituals, European phenomenology, and US pragmatism (which he helped articulate) provides a trajectory for a tradition of activists, authors, and writers forming the Harlem Renaissance and beyond (e.g., DiAquoi, 2012; Hughes, 1959/1990, Neale Hurston, 1937/2006; West, 1989; Wright, 1937/2008). An important loosening of multicultural education's reductive "framework" and unsubtle group "identities," cosmopolitan sensibilities articulated above focus on flexible-yet-careful intercultural study, intersubjective communication, critical readings of multiple traditions, and the development of resources for creative and self-narrativized identifications. Cosmopolitan sensibilities, as exemplified in traditions identified above, emphasize *not* who can authentically speak for whom *but rather* sincere, profound, and egalitarian intercultural and intersubjective engagement over a lifetime. From the examples above, an outline of not-necessarily-"Western"-yet-humanistic cultural resources begins to emerge that proposes prolonged study along with intercultural and intersubjective engagement in multiple historical traditions as cosmopolitan sensibilities.

Curriculum studies examples. Curriculum scholars whose work develops cosmopolitan sensibilities demonstrate increasing understanding that curriculum studies carefully advances multiple intellectual traditions. Recently, David Smith (2006), Chet Bowers (2003, 2012), Hongyu Wang (2004), and William Pinar (2009, 2012)—all engaged in curriculum's internationalization—have moved toward cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum. What these reconceptualist scholars share, as exemplars of cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies, is an understanding that their work emerges in the context of long-standing, multiple, and complex traditions.

David Smith's (2006) *Trying to Teach in a Season of Great Untruth* provides a series of essay-length reflections on globalization processes as they relate to curriculum. Globalization, writes Smith, represents a dangerous resurgence of global capitalization under the banner of neoliberalism that damages lived experience and ecology alike. Smith particularly emphasizes the need to reconsider essentialized understandings of subjectivity identified with Immanuel Kant, arguing that Kant's autonomous rational subject now provides the common sense ideology advancing neo-liberal globalization along with resistant essentialized identities. Smith, recognizing that historical trajectories of globalization that make rejections, reversals, or simply flip-the-script on "modernity" are counterproductive, instead argues for working within "*transmodernity*" (ibid, p. 10). Transmodernity articulates a dialectical relation between past, present, and future in which past traditions provide cultural resources for recognizing global interdependence between those disenfranchised and those living in first world conditions while requiring the latter to live in creative tension with their privileges as a means of living ethically with others. For Smith, the Zen Buddhist tradition provides important conditions for Kantian individualism and allows for a way to "live well, to be free of delusion, and to be attuned to the deepest rhythms of Life so that one is living Life according to its fundamental nature" (ibid, p. 40). Smith, exemplifying cosmopolitan sensibilities, invites curriculum scholars to carefully study their own intellectual traditions and engage other intellectual traditions "not as *exotica*, but as part of a new serious interlocutionary partnership over matters of human survival" (ibid, p. 38).

Chet Bowers (2003, 2012), recognizing similar right-left double binds to those framing this essay, works through European intellectual history and Taoist spiritual traditions in conceptualizing *mindful conservatism*. Opposing modernization in neoconservative globalization *and* in "transformative" leftist politics, Bowers seeks to wrest away notions of conservatism from shallow left-right political spectrums

reflecting double binds in the historical present. Instead, Bowers proposes mindful conservatism based on Confucian and Burkean understandings in arguing for preservation of cultural and environmental commons. Bowers (2012), in developing mindful conservatism, focuses on *cultural commons* that conserve spiritual, literary, democratic, and other cultural resources along with *environmental commons* that recognize and understand regional biomes' significance for a sustainable future. Bowers, dismissing modernist educational "reformers", goes on to emphasize the centrality of cultural and environmental commons:

First, future educational reformers will need to recognize that there are as many cultural ways of knowing as there are languages. ...Second, future educational reformers must take into account the vast number of bioregions that make up the world's interacting ecosystems. (2012, pp. 1-2)

Flipping conservatism on its head in his *mindful conservatism*, Bowers creatively recovers careful engagement of traditions, called cosmopolitan sensibilities here, for the advancement of ecologically-sustainable and democratic communities in the future.

Hongyu Wang's (2004) *The Call of a Stranger on a Journey Home* also develops cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum. Wang, performing an intersubjective dialogue through intercultural essay, gender analysis, and autobiography, develops the notion of a creative, loving, and ethical third space between self and others for understanding subjectivity as on-going process. Providing careful readings of Greco-Roman traditions in Foucault, psychoanalytic traditions in Kristeva, and Taoist traditions in the Confucian scholarship, Wang performs her careful study as possible transcendence in which subjectivity is interactive, relational, and in-process. Wang's (2006) third space, working carefully in multiple traditions, refuses essentializing syntheses, representations, or "answers" that reduce one tradition to another or self to other, but instead Wang's third space draws on Bakhtin's polyphonic unity so as to "bring...Foucauldian transgression, Kristevian maternal love, and Confucian rationality together" (p. 139). Like Smith (2006), Wang (2004) engages in careful study of multiple traditions not for learning about exotic cultures but rather as personal, social, and spiritual engagement in creating her moral self as a means of possibly, with others, living in more just ways and thereby creating a more just world.

William Pinar's (2009) *The Worldliness of a Cosmopolitan Education* further articulates cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum. Pinar, after a series of philosophical inquiries related through cosmopolitan themes, provides biographical sketches narrating the life, education, and passionate public service of Jane Addams, Laura Bragg, and Pier Paolo Pasolini. Emblematic of what Pinar means by "cosmopolitan education," Pasolini furiously studies and lives an anti-fascist expression emboldened by millennial Christian spirituality and contrarian decadentism. As activist, teacher, film-maker, and public intellectual, Pasolini draws on seemingly contradictory millennial Christian and Marxian traditions along with a vast understanding and mastery of European visual arts, especially in relation to his work as film maker. Pasolini, perhaps Pinar's alter ego, takes up the problem of his life relentlessly transgressing social norms and his previous work through deepening engagement in humanistic traditions. For example, Pasolini represents working poor youth in *Accatone* only to recast such representation as integral to the culture industry in his next film *La ricotta*, suggesting "the only way an artist can contest capitalistic society and create 'non-bourgeoisie' films or novels is to take the subject of the work as the creation of the work itself" (Pinar, 2009, p.120). Pasolini, as Pinar narrates, creates a body of work transgressing social and personal norms that, ultimately, create a stylistics of "free indirect discourse" (p. 124). Pasolini's free indirect discourse, contrasting with left "ready-made" critical identities, loosens identities and opens space for creative subjectivity of others through a lived stylistics of existence.

Back to verticality. Cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum, representing a conscious historicizing of reconceptualist curriculum's transplantamiento, require increased attention to the field's verticality for complex conversation and aesthetic understanding. What draws together work reviewed as examples of cosmopolitan sensibilities is *not* the suggestion of cultural studies new wave strategies that "add a concept" to the literature *but rather* the emerging collective sense that reconceptualist curriculum scholars participate in, produce, generate, and constitute traditions that are connected with older ones in the wake of curriculum's transplantamiento. Increased attention to verticality in multiple traditions, central to cosmopolitan sensibilities defined and exemplified above, requires curriculum scholars: 1) engaged study in *and* 2) production of intellectual and intercultural history for the advancement of curriculum studies. Though these activities complement one another, engaged study in intellectual history refers to curriculum scholars' reading and working with intellectual history inside and outside of curriculum studies and the conscious development of verticality in reconceptualist curriculum studies.

Conclusion

Both...and... In closing this essay, I return to the example of Maxine Greene. Cosmopolitan sensibilities recover and reconstruct a trajectory underdeveloped in curriculum studies' conversation since Greene's (1988) *Dialectic of Freedom*. This work was articulated through left-right double binds of 1980s' "culture wars" that on the conservative right (e.g., A. Bloom, 1987; H. Bloom, 1994; Hirsh, 1988) reconstituted Western "canon" and on the left pursued a variety of US-and-Anglophone conceived multiculturalisms (e.g., Simonson & Walker 1988; Minnesota Humanities Commission, 1991; Gollnick & Chinn, 1986). The "culture wars," pursued simultaneously with the grand emergence of state standards and standardized assessments, presented itself as double bind very much representing "the paranoid style in American politics" (Hofstadter, 1964, p. 77). In the culture wars, both sides' claims escalated in millennial fervor in which conservative standards and No Child Left Behind won the day by integrating multicultural concerns and "identities" into the standards "program."^{vi}

Greene's road less-traveled sought the creative *undoing* of static double binds and recurred to intellectual history inside and outside the United States in developing and explicating *both...and...* humanistic curriculum. Having lived the curriculum in her own study, Greene revealed the "framing error" of the culture wars as shallow tropes in her writing. In her performance, Greene drew on careful study in multiple historical traditions in theorizing curriculum. Greene's dialectic of freedom embraced *not* narrow disciplines nor a monolithic canon *but rather* a rare, subtle, and revelatory demonstration that curriculum emerged from long-standing traditions that required continual remaking, historical and contemporary study, careful political tactics and strategies, and intellectual effort if progress were to be realized.

Cosmopolitan sensibilities, by historicizing facile "new waves" and loosening a priori frameworks' "first beliefs," "value statements," and "ideological commitments," challenges curriculum studies by returning to Greene's critical engagement, progressive complexity, and aesthetic understanding of traditions-in-the-making and traditions-for-curriculum-performance that are recovered in teaching and learning when authentic. Creatively *undoing* the culture wars' double binds through the embrace of multiple traditions, Greene writes:

There should be nonetheless a continuing initiation into the great traditions in which we are all, whether we are aware of it or not, embedded. ...But none of them [traditions] must ever be thought of as complete or all-encompassing. Turned on the shared world of actualities, they cannot but con

tinue resonating and reforming in the light of new undercurrents, new questions, new uncertainties. (1988, pp. 126-127)

Performing dialectical work in multiple traditions, Greene prophetically argued that curriculum take on a pedagogical function extended here in cosmopolitan sensibilities. Greene argued that lived curriculum through study of multiple traditions provided for emergent, complex, and dialogic understandings in historical and contemporary issues. Though Greene's work addressed the 1980s' cultural wars, her understanding refused narrow double binds that then (and now) attempt to colonize and limit *not only* our work *but also* meaningful, democratic deliberation. In *Dialect of Freedom*, Greene refused double binds, and through careful study in multiple traditions, transcended double binds in a way that instructs curriculum scholars in the present. The question for us now is: *In curriculum studies, how do we continue Greene's progressive work under historical conditions of globalization?*

Returning to an historical understanding of one's own and others' traditions, cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum suggest a triangulation of the past, present, and future that provides verticality for the advancement of curriculum in the next moment. But even more importantly, cosmopolitan sensibilities provide for understanding the unfinished and non-determinist historical horizons for an amnesiac field of curriculum writ large. Focusing on intellectual history inside and outside curriculum in approaching contemporary curricular and educational questions, cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum recuperate a broader historical and humanistic cosmopolitanism that seeks international understanding, dialogue, and deliberation through careful, creative, and reflective study of multiple traditions and, in doing so, works against the grain of an a-historical, quick-fix interest in *what works* in dominant educational discourse matched, mimicked almost, by *what's new* in cultural studies new wave strategies.

The task, as understood through cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies, is not developing cultural studies new wave strategies. Rather, the task represents a creative *undoing* of a-historical double binds "in an age that has forgotten how to think historically in the first place" (Jameson, 1991/2001, p. ix). So the task that cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum undertakes—definitely a progressive-critical historical task—is doubly hard, *first* because understanding multiple historical traditions represents difficult and time-consuming study not currently existing in curriculum studies programs' "perspective fetish," and *second* because the reconceptualized field frequently has dismissed and continues to dismiss historical work, unreflectively, as "conservative." Nonetheless, facing these difficulties, cosmopolitan sensibilities resist hegemonic accountability discourses, critique but extend cultural studies' influences in curriculum studies, emphasize an ethics of careful study in multiple traditions, and reassert historical verticality in the face of "naturalized" neoliberal globalization and "naturalized" 1960s oppositional style.

Cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum, re-deploying Maxine Greene's intransigence before double binds and engagement in multiple traditions, selectively take up one key understanding from the younger Marx's (1844/1982) thinking. The younger Marx illuminated international historical conditions, and thereby de-stabilized received understandings of "nature" inherent in Enlightenment philosophers' political economy:

The distinction between capital and land, between profit and ground rent, and between both and wages, and industry, and agriculture, and immovable and movable private property—this distinction is not rooted in the 'nature' of things, but is an *historical distinction*, a fixed moment in the formation and development of the contradiction between capital and labor. (p. 123)

Cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum, valuing an historicized critical intelligence that understands the historical present as but “fixed moment...not rooted in the ‘nature’ of things” (Marx, 1844/1982, p. 123) seeks to destabilize a *naturalized* common sense neoconservative globalization with its *what works* strategy while simultaneously challenging *what’s new* on the new left to do more rigorous and credible work. It is through these progressive historical trajectories—which cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum sustains—that curriculum studies might triangulate curriculum studies beyond its present condition of containment.

Endnotes

ⁱ I borrow this gestalt from Gayatri Spivak (2012) who reports on borrowing it from Bateson.

ⁱⁱ All quotes taken from books with Spanish language titles in the reference page were translated by the author.

ⁱⁱⁱ I understand the relationships between cultural studies, women’s studies, gender studies, media studies, and other “studies” areas are complex and require, really, a separate essay to flesh out. For the purposes of this essay, I knowingly elide the “studies” areas influences, to a degree, under “‘cultural studies’”. Nonetheless, the elision, I think provides a useful working gestalt for provoking curriculum studies scholars because of the obvious trafficking between cultural studies and curriculum studies.

^{iv} On the topic of transplantamiento of reconceptualist scholars, US Marxians’ revision of this international transplantamiento that “grafts” their work to George S. Counts deserves a note (Apple, 2000). This grafting of US Marxian work to Counts stretches credibility, recasting Counts as sole “revolutionary Marxist” among Chicago School intellectuals. This “grafting” is also a sub-argument of Paraskeva’s (2011) emergent work in *Conflicts in Curriculum Theory*. Though parting ways with Paraskeva on this sub-argument, cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies developed here supports Paraskeva’s critical engagement in multiple traditions as fluid itinerancy. A full assessment of Paraskeva’s recent work requires a separate essay not easily addressed in the structure of this essay. Back to Counts (1932a, 1932b): A student of Albion Small (Cremin, 1964; Kliebard, 1995), Counts had more to do with a left-leaning liberal welfare state and Frank Lester Ward’s US intellectual trajectory than Marx and Engels’ scientific socialism.

^v In this short list of works, I develop not an exhaustive review but rather a short emergent list of reflections on the internationalization of curriculum studies that provide examples of cosmopolitan sensibilities.

^{vi} It is instructive to recall that within double binds, the ambitious agenda of US-Anglophone multiculturalisms eventually, inside the program of state standards, received a few “bullets” in all state standards, or, if you will, by extension, that cultural studies wave strategies concerned with power and identity were “implemented” in No Child Left Behind’s monitoring of “all students” by respective groups. Cosmopolitan sensibilities in curriculum studies seek to re-invigorate cultural studies influences by infusing it with greater depth and a convincing historical verticality. It is precisely the a-historicity that permeates and provides space for the double binds of the present, and this is an a-historicity of what works and what’s next on neoconservative right and new left.

References

- Appelbaum, P. (2002). *Disconceptualizing curriculum: Is there a next in the generational text?* *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 18(1), 7-19.
- Anderson, J. (1988). *The education of Blacks in the South: 1860-1935*. Chappell Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Appiah, K.A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Appiah, K.A. (2005). *The ethics of identity*. Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press.
- Apple, M.W. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Apple, M.W. (1979). On analyzing hegemony. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 1(1), pp. 10-27.
- Block, A. (2001). Ethics and curriculum. Personal communication.
- Block, A. (2009). *Ethics and teaching: A religious perspective on revitalizing education*: New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Bloom, A. (1986). Introduction: Our virtue. *The closing of the American mind* (pp. 25-43). New York, NY: Touchstone.
- Bloom, H. (1994). *The Western canon: The books and school of the Ages*. New York, NY: Harcourt & Brace.
- Bowers, C.A. (2012). *Educating for a sustainable future: Mediating between the commons and economic globalization*. Retrieved from <http://www.cabowers.net/pdf/Educatingforasustainablefuture.pdf>
- Bowers, C.A. (2003). *Mindful conservatism: Rethinking the ideological and educational basis of an ecologically sustainable future*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Clark, J.; Hall, S.; Jefferson, T & Roberts, B (1975/2000). Subcultures, cultures, and class. In S. Hall and T. Jefferson (Eds.) *Resistance through rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britain* (pp. 9-79). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Counts, G. S. (1932). Dare progressive education be progressive? *Progressive Education* 4(9), 257-63.
- Counts, G. S. (1932). *Dare the school build a new social order?* New York: John Day.
- Cremin, L. (1964). *The transformation of the American school*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Darío, R. (1996). *Azul*. Mexico, DF: Editores Mexicanos. (Originally published 1888.)
- DiAquoi, R. (2012). Hopefully they will see you in a different light: A critical race analysis of double-consciousness. In B. Sams, J. Job, and J.C. Jupp's *Excursions and recursions through power, privilege and praxis* (pp. 83-98). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Press.
- Du Bois, W.E.B. (1995). *Souls of black folks*. New York, NY: Signet Classics. (Originally published 1903)
- During, S. (Ed.) (1999). *The cultural studies reader* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Elliot, T.S. (1975). Tradition and the individual talent. In F. Kermode *Selected prose of T.S. Elliot* (pp. 37-44). New York, NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux. (Originally published 1919.)
- Freire, P. (1998a). *La educación como práctica de la libertad*. México, D.F.: Siglo Veintiuno Editores. (Originally published 1968.)
- Freire, P. (1998b). *Pedagogía del oprimido*. México, D.F.: Siglo Veintiuno Editores. (Original work published in 1970)
- Gandhi, M. (1987). *Lo que yo creo*. Mérida, Yucatán: Editorial Dante.
- García Márquez, G. (1992). *Cien años de soledad*. México, DF: Editorial Diana.
- Gaztambide-Fernández, R. & Murad, Z. (2011). Out of line: Perspectives on the "Browning" of Curriculum and Pedagogy. *Journal of Curriculum and Pedagogy* 8(1), 14-16

- Giroux, H.A. (1988). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gollnick, D.M. & Chinn, P.C. (1986). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society*. Columbus, OH: Prentice Hall.
- Goldstein, L. (2002). *Reclaiming caring in teaching and teacher education*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Goldstein, L. (1997). *Teaching with love*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Greene, M. (1980). *Response to Philip Jackson*. *Curriculum Inquiry* 10(2), 172-175.
- Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Grossberg, L.; Nelson, C. & Treichler, P. (Eds.) (1992). *Cultural studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Grumet, M. (1988). *Bitter milk: Women and teaching*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Grumet, M. (2010). Response to Nina Asher: Subject position and subjectivity in curriculum theory. In E. Malewski's *Next moment* (pp. 403-409). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hahn, N.T. (1995). *Living Buddha, living Christ*. New York, NY: Riverhead Books.
- Hall, S. (1990). The emergence of cultural studies and the crisis of the humanities. *The Humanities as Social Technology* 53, 11-23.
- Hansen, D. (2008). Curriculum and the idea of cosmopolitan inheritance. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 40(3), 298-312.
- Hansen, D. (2011). *The teacher and the world: A study of cosmopolitanism as education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hansen, D.; Burdick-Shepherd, S.; Cammarano, C. & Obelleiro, G. (2009). Education, values, and valuing in a cosmopolitan perspective. *Curriculum Inquiry* 39(5), 587-612.
- Hirsch, E.D. (1988). *Cultural literacy*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Huebner, D. (1976). The curriculum field: Its wake our work. In V. Hillis & W.F. Pinar (Editors) *The lure of the transcendent: Collected Essays*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hughes, L. (1959/1990). *Selected poems Langston Hughes*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Ibargüengoitia, A. (2000). *Suma filosófica mexicana*. México, DF: Editorial Porrúa.
- Ikeda, D. (2006). *A new era of the people: Forging global networks of robust individuals*. Tokyo, Japan: The Soka Gakkai.
- Ikeda, D. (2010). *A new humanism: The university addresses of Daisaku Ikeda*. New York, NY: I.B. Tauris.
- Jackson, P. (1992). Conceptions of curriculum and curriculum specialists. In P. Jackson (Ed.) *Handbook of research on curriculum*. New York, NY: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Jackson, P. (1980). Curriculum and its discontents. *Curriculum Inquiry* 10(2), 159-172.
- Jardine, D.; Friesen, S. & Clifford, P. (2006). *Curriculum in abundance*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.
- Kashope Wright, H. (2000). Nailing jello to the Wall: Pinpointing aspects of state-of-the-art curriculum theorizing. *Educational Researcher* 29(5), 4-13.
- Kincheloe, J.L. & Steinberg, S.R. (1998). Addressing the crisis of whiteness: Reconfiguring white identity in a pedagogy of whiteness. In J.L. Kincheloe, S.R. Steinberg, N.M. Rodriguez, & R.E. Chennault (Eds.) *White reign: Deploying whiteness in America* (pp. 3-30). New York, NY: St Martin's Press.
- King, M.L. (2010). *Stride towards freedom: The Montgomery story*. Boston, MA: Beacon. (Originally published in 1958.)
- Kliebard, H.M. (1995). *The struggle for the American curriculum* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

- Kung, C. (2012). Buddhism as an education. Retrieved from http://www.buddhanet.net/pdf_file/buddeduc.pdf
- Marx, K. (1982). *The economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844* (Ed. D. J. Struik). New York, NY: International Publishers. (Originally written in 1844.)
- Malewski, E. (2010). Introduction: Proliferating curriculum. In E. Malewski *Curriculum studies handbook: The next moment* (pp. 1-40). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Malewski, E. (2011). Part I The making of Mahatma Gandhi: Turning the searchlight inward. Presentation given at the annual meeting of the Curriculum & Pedagogy Group: Akron, OH.
- McCarthy, C. & Crichlow, W. (1993). Introduction: Theories of identity, theories of representation, theories of race. In C. McCarthy & W. Crichlow (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (xiii-xxix). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Minnesota Humanities Commission. (1991). *Braided lives: An Anthology of multicultural American writing*. St Paul, MN: Minnesota Council of Teachers of English
- Mistral, G. (1971). *Lecturas para mujeres*. México, DF: Porrúa. (Originally published in 1924.)
- Neale Hurston, Z. (2006). *Their eyes were watching God*. New York, NY: Harper Collins. (Originally published in 1937.)
- Neruda, P. (1997). Canto general. In R. Alberti (Ed.) *Antología poética*. México, DF: Planeta Mexicana. (Originally published 1950)
- Noddings, N. (1984). *A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Oxford English Dictionary (O.E.D.) (2012). Entry for “sensibility.” Retrieved from http://oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/sensibility?q=sensibilities#sensibility__2
- Paraskeva, J. (2011). *Conflicts in curriculum theory: Challenging hegemonic epistemologies*. Palgrave MacMillan: New York, NY.
- Paz, O. (1948/1987). *El laberinto de la soledad*. México, DF: El Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Paz, O. (1978). Invención, subdesarrollo, modernidad. In *Corriente alterna* 10, 19-24
- Pinar, W.F. (In Press). Curriculum studies in the United States: Present circumstances, intellectual histories. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pinar, W.F. (1978). The reconceptualization of curriculum studies. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 10(3), 205-217.
- Pinar, W. F. (2009). *The worldliness of a cosmopolitan education*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pinar, W.F.; Reynolds, W.; Slattery, P. & Taubman, P. (1995). *Understanding curriculum*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Pinar, W.F. (2012). *What is curriculum theory?* (2nd ed.) New York, NY: Routledge.
- Rousseau, J. (1992). *El contrato social*. México, D.F. Editores Mexicanos.
- Sandlin, J.; O'Malley, M. & Burdick, J. (2011). Mapping the complexity of public pedagogy scholarship: 1894-2010. *Review of Educational Research* 81(3), 338-375.
- Sen, A. (2006). *Identity and violence*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Simonson, R. & Walker, S. (Eds.) (1988). *Multicultural literacy: Opening the American mind*. St. Paul, MN: Graywolf Press.
- Slattery, P. (2006). *Curriculum development in the postmodern era*. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Smith, D. (2006). Trying to teach in a season of great untruth: Globalization, empire, and the crises of pedagogy. Sense publishers: Rotterdam, Netherlands.
- Spivak, G. (2012). Introduction. In G. Spivak's *An aesthetic education in the era of globalization*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA.

- Springgay, S. & Freedman, D. (2009). M/othering a bodied curriculum: Sleeping with cake and other touchable encounters. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* 25(2), 25-37
- Suzuki, D.T. (1958/1998). *Buddha of infinite light*. Boston, MA: The American Buddhist Academy.
- Todd, S. (2008). Facing humanity: The difficult task of cosmopolitan education. Retrieved from http://www.philosophy-of-education.org/conferences/pdfs/Sharon_Todd.pdf.
- Todd, S. (2009). *Toward an imperfect education: Facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Wang, H. (2004). *The call from a stranger on a journey home: Curriculum in a third space*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Wang, H. (2006). Globalization and Curriculum Studies: Tensions, Challenges, and Possibilities. *Journal of the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies* 2(1), <http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/jaaacs/vol2/index.htm>
- Watts, A. (1989). *The book: On the taboo against knowing who you are*. Vintage Books: New York, NY. (Work originally published in 1966.)
- West, C. (2004). *Democracy matters: Winning the fight against imperialism*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- West, C. (1993). *Keeping the faith: Philosophy and race in America*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- West, C. (1989). *The American evasion of philosophy: A genealogy of pragmatism*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Wright, R. (1937/2008). *Black boy*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.