

‘Ex and the city’: On cosmopolitanism, community and the ‘Curriculum of Refuge’

Molly Quinn

Teachers College, Columbia University

Broadway-Lafayette

On a Saturday night –

The warm breeze of trains bounding in,

Snapshots right before eyes’ mind

Arranged as if by artistic design.

Bound by moment of connection,

Trains running like wine flows.

A small girl in braids

Sits upon her mother’s lap complaining,

Sweetly says ‘Good bye’ to me

With full-on eyes in departing.

Through subway glass now

This woman’s baby bouncing,

Full black head of hair bobbing, on

Bench leaning over from behind

‘bum’ with cheap tees for sale.

The palette of humanity passing before me

Prenatal in pregnant moments

Of waiting, seemingly without sense,

Yet telling all, oh so much –

We, none of us are strangers;

Strangers, all are we...

The inarticulate, unspeakable fullness

enveloping me....

(Quinn, 2006, June, excerpts from *On City Waiting*)



TO CITE THIS ARTICLE PLEASE INCLUDE ALL OF THE FOLLOWING DETAILS:

Quinn, Molly (2010). ‘Ex and the city’: On cosmopolitanism, community and the ‘Curriculum of Refuge’. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry* 7 (1) <http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci> <access date>

I had forgotten how rich in sights
and delights of stories this city is.

Uncannily warm for February's way,
I've walked the streets *sans* gloves
in open coat, leisurely making my unmarked way
to Kelly Ann's art opening.

And later with Cam to a Chelsea haunt of hers,
Sueños, 'Dreams' in homemade fresh
guacamole, key lime pie with caramel,
erroneously rendered multiple rounds
of almond rounds frosted with powdered sugar,
'til we can eat no more –

much more mouth-watering memories
of flavors to savor but I wander
from these streets... night lights
there as ever they were, not just for me,
but then and there, Yes!... to see
a sea of souls in Harold Square.

Hooves clapping the pavement,
heels tapping, hearkening former times....

Happening upon has-been haunts
in that there had been better times there,
times that have passed,
friends I know now not where,
cares come somehow to take their places.

Crowding out, too, the wandering,
city jaunts and haunts and stories of the streets.

Cam still wanders.
 of late, she says,
Sapon bestowed citrus almond hand cream divine,

Quotidien, the perfect peaceful café moment
 with the perfect egg salad and baguette.

Cam still wanders,
 Cam still dreams –
 Sueños! Sueños!
 Come again to me,
 or me to thee.

This night, despite
 late-night, slow, subway-fatigue
 journey home,
 thy dreamy visitation upon me
 has indeed been
 Sweet.

(Quinn, 2008, February 10, excerpts from *On City Wandering*)

Cosmopolitanism, curriculum and the city: A prelude of the particular and personal

In approaching the subject of my address, I find myself compelled to begin with this medley of ‘Subway Soliloquies’ selections to foreground the living textures of city life, as well as the context for my own engagement with cosmopolitanism, and as in relation to community and curriculum as and of refuge. This engagement is also neither as a ‘cosmopolitan’ woman in the familiar sense – although I live and have lived in New York City for some time, I am essentially and quintessentially a Southern ‘hick from the sticks’ – nor as a scholar of cosmopolitanism per se. Rather, this work represents a recent interest and relatively new inquiry of mine, the arrival to which – counter to those who have critiqued cosmopolitanism for its epistemic *everywhereness, no-whereness* (Gaudelli, 2007, February) – has not been rationalistic or universalistic or abstract in any real or primary sense, but instead has issued from my own lived experiences.

More particularly, I have come to cosmopolitanism through my experience of the *inhospit-abilities*, inhospitableness, inhospitality, of academia, my own attempts to reckon with the testimonies of the even greater experience of such for teachers in schools with whom I have worked: the inhospitable dwellings – if they are and can be that, *dwellings*, that is – we have made of education, curriculum, schools, for children. The theologian Arthur Sutherland (2006) documents our moment of want, our times as particularly inhospitable, and that with myriad statistics, as have many educational thinkers with respect to the ways in which

education fails to include much less welcome many (i.e., Delpit, 1995; Kozol, 1991, 2007; and Polakow, 1993).

Seeking to understand, and respond to, this scene has taken me first to Jacques Derrida's work (1997/2000, 2002) on hospitality – and the question of ethics constituting it: hospitality as radical openness to the other, 'to the other than oneself, the other than "its other," to an other beyond any "its other"' (2002, p. 364). In well-known curriculum thought, these explorations have met up with Dwayne Huebner's (1999) notion of curriculum itself as otherness, and teaching as the art of lending out our minds each to the other – involving care for ideas, in Nel Noddings' formulations (1992), openness to imagining things 'other-wise', encountering other voices and views, as in city waiting and wandering. As such, Derrida (2002) suggests that hospitality raises questions for us, then, about the very concept of 'concept' itself, sheltering and letting itself be haunted, visited by, another concept. *How open are we, in education, to encountering new and 'other' understandings? How present are we to differences, to stories of the streets?* So we might ask ourselves, would that we were truly cosmopolitan perhaps, in this way. Maxine Greene's work (1973) on the teacher as stranger has beckoned here, as well – bringing the otherness of herself as well as curriculum into contact with that of her students; as well as on the educational potential of a pedagogical aesthetics of 'making strange the familiar'. This inquiry and interest have also strongly resonated, then, with Hongyu Wang's (2004) sense that at the heart of education is this relationship of self to other, and as stranger, and also to the stranger within. Awad Ibrahim (2005) and Barbara Kameniar (2007) each, albeit from different self and social locations, explore this kind of relationship, explicitly taking up the question of hospitality in the work of teaching, and its complications – teacher as host, or agent of another cultural 'Host', pedagogically acting, too, to make familiar the strange, and perhaps centrally via the curriculum.

I have noticed that while education is full of welcoming discourses and convocations, and entertaining such relations, questions remain with respect to welcoming courses of curriculum for scholars, teachers, students, and beyond, particularly in a cosmopolitan age and context of globalization. My sense has been that inquiring into hospitality might open me to hospitable possibilities in my – and our – work and world: in thinking and dwelling in curriculum in the now, in ways that might truly support the aspiration to 'cultivate our humanity' (Nussbaum, 1997) via education, as classically conceived, to attend to the 'vocation of humanization' to which Paulo Freire (1970/1995) calls us. For me, this intention means learning to become present to our selves, each other, our manner of dwelling together, in wide-awakeness (Greene, 1978) and respect. This ideal embraces Dale Snauwaert's emphasis (2002) on what he calls 'the principle of humanity', moral equality, authentic self-awareness, and ethical agency, in his articulation of a cosmopolitan education. It also takes up David Hansen's affirmation (2007, February) of 'open-hearted and open-minded exchanges', those that welcome encounters with the foreign – stories of the streets, by which we might give and grow and find mutual delight. Thus, my hope here includes a concern also for learning to be present to and in joy and love together educationally, as well.

Via what Simon Critchley and Richard Kearney (1997/2006) call Derrida's form of 'conceptual genealogy', historical analysis of concepts, I have undertaken such in order to understand and also hopefully respond in some affirmative, ethically-sensitive manner to my situation in the world, which clearly has also finally taken me into the study of cosmopolitanism, to which hospitality is a central concept. I have wandered into this 'citizenship of the world' particularly via the work of Derrida (1997/2000, 2002, 1997/2006) then as well, among others, and also as inspired by lectures at Teachers College made by Hansen (2007, February) and Snauwaert (2006, October) I was fortunate to be able to attend.

From my own situatedness, thus, I have felt compelled first to reckon with the painfulness of situations (local, national, global) of profound inhospitableness (many such examples here of which we all could give)¹, which is also a coming face-to-face (Levinas, 1961/1994) with human vulnerability, frailty, unanswerability, unfathomability, in which we must respond beyond the limits of the politics of identity, even the ethics of identity, attending to human ‘subjectivity that saturates’ in social-‘situatednesses’ that can be neither foretold nor foreclosed in their futurity (Pinar, 2008, March).

Reckoning with this experience and context of inhospitality means responding in view, too, of the ‘bloody traumas of history’ (Critchley and Kearney, 2006) that live on into the present, which Marianna Papastephanou (2002) on cosmopolitanism, with Paul Ricoeur, highlights – that we are constituted by histories we can’t reach, of inherited cultural debts or injuries we are often neither conscious of nor can truly repay or fully heal when recognized, and that ever only as in a glass darkly. Given such, via Derrida’s cosmopolitan address and call for the city of refuge (1997/2006), I have been taken with this sense of an ontical if not ontological need for refuge; inciting also Emmanuel Levinas’ insights into cities of refuge – which perhaps multicultural curriculum efforts fail to fully consider – that we are, each and all, ever in relation, and as both victims and victimizers, guilty and innocent, hospitable and inhospitable, etc. (Eisenstadt, 2003, Winter): both of which require asylum and amnesty – sanctuary, haven for hiding, healing, forgiveness...and unendingly, before the unforgivable, seeking ever to make possible the impossible. Moreover, this brokenness is also part and parcel of our ‘exquisite humanness’ (Forsthoefel, 2006) – hearth of humanity’s *hearth* too together, a brokenness all too-often denied in educational thought, curriculum inquiry and pedagogical practice, and to much suffering as well. In this way, I am affirming William Pinar’s (2008, March) emphasis on the ‘worldliness’ of curriculum (via Janet Miller, and Edward Said) in his turn to cosmopolitanism², that the ‘perpetual peace’ for which the cosmopolitan philosopher Kant hopes is ‘predicated upon passion’ – the heart of reason perhaps, or *the heart whose reasons reason knows not of*.

I have begun, thus, from the place of my own passions, the heart of my own reasons, my own way of waiting and wandering in the world – and herein, perhaps, in some lightness, and admittedly much privileged peace, albeit not without relation to the brokenness, darkness and violence to which I have hearkened. In preview of our ‘city tour’ together, then, I offer a glimpse here into some of my own genealogies of, and journeys into, cosmopolitanism as a curriculum theorist, and into where it is taking me – embryonic and tentative to be sure as yet as such is – in terms of conceptualizing via cosmopolitanism this idea of the curriculum of refuge. In a sense, I have presented, in advance of the paper, something of my own ‘curriculum of refuge’, and thus also transgressed the borders and boundaries of the academic address – which is, of course, also an intentional experiment, an attempt here to an act of hospitality as host(ess) of difference, toast to alterity. Such, in affirmation of the face-to-face, constitutes an invitation to conversation³ between/among the ‘us’ brought together via

¹ Derrida (1997/2006), in a context ripe with state and non-state sponsored violence and the legacies thereof (whether via terrorism, enslavement, persecution, censorship or other) in which the victims are innumerable, hesitates here to set forth a particular example as to “risk sending the anonymous others back into the darkness... , a darkness which is truly the worst and the condition of all others” (p. 6).

² For a more thorough and most excellent address, see Pinar (2009), *The Worldliness of a Cosmopolitan Education: Passionate Lives in Public Service*.

³ While my choice of the word ‘conversation’ here is deliberate, a rich word with a rich history, and favored here over ‘deliberation’ or ‘dialogue’, albeit not excluding such, I cannot explicate such richness at present or its relation to a cosmopolitan ethics. Its use does reflect a direction in which I expect I am moving, to consider the possibilities of pedagogies of nonviolence, a direction strongly influenced by certain world visionaries

this address by which we may entertain some of the questions such an inquiry raises, as well as the possibilities for curriculum it might open us up to, open up to us, visit upon us: with thanks to those who choose to take to the streets, as it were, with me in this way, and entreaties to those whom such transgression offends to – Yes! Please forgive – and persevere with me still.

Introduction

In a 1996 Strasbourg address to the International Parliament of Writers on the call of cosmopolitanism in contemporary times – the way of asylum and work of amnesty less and less respected amid ‘the violence which rages on a worldwide scale’ (Derrida, 1997/2006, p. 5), Derrida comes to the question in this wise:

...As for this citizen of the world, we do not know what the future holds.... we look to the city, rather than to the state...because we have given up hope that the state might create a new image...; our plea is for what we...call the ‘city of refuge’. (pp. 3, 6, 7, 8)

It might be said that similar questions might be posed and pleas made concerning the curriculum in contemporary times; it might be posited that the call of cosmopolitanism be heard – the way of asylum and work of amnesty attended – as well, with respect to our educational listening and labor, if even only as brought into conversation with central multicultural courses and discourses of the day. In a time when the ‘state’ – particularly perhaps in the US – has created a problematic image for the curriculum and crafted mechanisms of control for the school (i.e., via *No Child Left Behind* & *NCATE* regulation, see Pinar, 2004; Kozol, 2007; Leonardo, 2007), my plea is for what I call the ‘curriculum of refuge’, and I draw upon cosmopolitanism in my address, re-searching its promising vision of community, responsibility, and its potential relation to the public space of what we call ‘education’.

In response to current intellectual inquiries in the field oriented ‘toward civic responsibility’ (i.e., See Tate & Anderson, 2008), as well as my lived context in New York – city of the world, and cosmopolitan experiment in democratic asylum, I have entitled this work, *‘Ex and the city’: On cosmopolitanism, community and the ‘Curriculum of Refuge’*. I play, too, on the former HBO series (and subsequent films) *Sex and the City* not only as a popular cultural icon for New York and life in the city; but more specifically in reference to its exploration of the search for community and connection amid a world of strangers, and attention to the politics of identity in the making, breaking, and re-imagining of relationships – and thus also the perpetual need for personal asylum and amnesty – in pursuit of the good life (i.e., the American Dream).

Moreover, in striving toward civic responsibility and citizenship, and seeking to re-search and cultivate such educationally, we must remind ourselves that implicitly here we are acknowledging a faith or hope for the ‘city’, the very meanings of these ideas/ideals etymologically rooted therein (i.e., see the *Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, 2006; the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989). The interests in and efforts toward the internationalization of curriculum studies in recent years perhaps reflects as well this faith in the city, and hope for world citizenship via education beyond ‘state’ borders (i.e., See <http://www.iaacs.org>; Pinar, 2003, 2006, May; Gough, 2002, 2004). In highlighting ‘Ex’ (rather than ‘Sex’), I aim

(archetypal teachers of peace and justice like Gandhi, King, Jr., Mother Teresa and the Dalai Lama) whose refuge-curricula – certainly constituted by resistance, deliberation, sacrifice and suffering – have achieved much in transformatively bringing people together, and together in envisioning the possibilities and praxes of justice and peace anew, in cultures of violence and those which teach violence.



also to allude, for my thesis, to its important myriad significations, i.e., ‘ex’-without, not including, or without the right, to deprive of; to bring to a certain state; free from; free of charges; exodus; to delete or cross out; outmoded, of antique appearance (i.e., see the *Random House Unabridged Dictionary*, 2006; the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 1989). In stirring up these many meanings, and these many relations to and for the city, I mean to affirm the call of cosmopolitanism – an ethics of universal hospitality rooted in antiquity (and, alas perhaps, out of fashion⁴, or a new ‘*gen EX*’ ethics); as well as inclusion of, even sanctuary for, the exiled (ex-iled), whether rooted in nationality, language, race, religion, class, gender, sexuality, ability, or other – in the curriculum.

The ‘gateway of opportunity’ which while New York City has symbolized to many in the US – particularly for the foreigner given its history of immigration – education represents to even more across the world is perhaps closed altogether for subsequent generations, the future of humanity, without such affirmation. For, indeed, ‘the geography of opportunity has become a local, state and global challenge’ where ‘cities and metropolitan regions are experiencing intensified... disparities’ and this ‘trend toward increased class- and race-based geospatial polarization has implications for schools, neighborhoods...’ and beyond (Tate & Anderson, 2008). I feel that cosmopolitan criticism – with a heart for the ‘open’ and ‘free’ city, brought to bear upon multicultural debates in education, and undertaken toward the call for and conceptualization of the ‘curriculum of refuge’ can assist us in opening up new geospatial possibilities for social justice in and through education, and can speak in powerful ways to the cultivation of ‘civic capacity’ that recognizes our global interdependence and embraces a responsibility of world citizenship, even as locally lived and rooted.

Thus, we set out for the city, as it were – wandering, welcoming city jaunts and haunts and stories of the streets. In section one, *City sidewalks*, we seek first to get our ‘lay of the land’, as it were, attending to the ground upon which we walk in our explorations of cosmopolitanism, articulating something of the historical context for its introduction into, and the path leading to, our thinking of curriculum anew in this way. To do so, while we take our way largely through the poststructuralist readings of Jacques Derrida (1997/2006), we also welcome Kwame Anthony Appiah (2006), among others, as he is a particularly well-known contemporary advocate of cosmopolitanism, in and out of academic circles, whose view and vista can assist us in our walk. Then, in *City of lights*, section two, we seek guidance in our journey and jaunt together via illuminating thought in ‘cosmopolitan’ education – i.e., Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey (2003), Nick Stevenson (2003), Dale Snauwaert (2002), David Hansen (2007, February; 2008), and Marianna Papastephanou (2002) – highlighting through this work that which in our view we deem to be important to considering this notion of a curriculum of refuge built upon cosmopolitan insights. Finally, borrowing from Derrida’s plea (1997/2006) for the ‘city of refuge’, a plea which also incites a rich history of hospitable practice and thought, in section three, *Hot child in the city?*, we consider a frame, or structure for dwelling of some kind, for entertaining the possibilities visited upon us in conceptualizing the ‘curriculum of refuge’ for our children via education in a cosmopolitan way.

City sidewalks: Walking into a cosmopolitan way in the world

‘Where have we received the image of cosmopolitanism from? *And what is happening to it?*’ Derrida (1997/2006, p. 3) first asks us concerning this tradition we have summoned to our

⁴ As formerly noted, this ethics of hospitality, it has been evidenced, has been weakened, undermined, in present times (Sutherland, 2006). We might add here, as well, that our times are particularly inhospitable for children – in and out of school settings – too (i.e., Kozol, 1991, 2007; Polakow, 1993; Delpit, 1995; Steinberg & Kincheloe, 1997; Kliewer, 1998; Lareau, 2003; Quinn, 2003; Leonardo, 2007).

curriculum ‘conversations’ (Pinar et al, 1995). Seeking inspiration in it anew, he calls it ‘more than twenty centuries’ old, situating it in the Abrahamic laws of hospitality, tracing the cosmopolitan ‘tradition’ particularly through Greek stoicism, Pauline Christianity, and Enlightenment thought – of which Kant’s formulation of the ‘law of universal hospitality’⁵ in his ‘Definitive Article in View of Perpetual Peace’ is most famous (See Kant, 1795/1972). Others, such as the political philosopher Appiah (2006), ground cosmopolitanism more definitively in the expression coined by the Cynics of the 4th century B.C. (i.e., the story of Diogenes) – one subsequently, however, taken up in the third century B.C. by the Stoics (i.e. Cicero, Seneca, and Roman emperor Marcus Aurelius), and also through them later influencing Christian thought. From *cosmos*, meaning ‘world’, and *politēs*, referring to a ‘citizen’ of a particular city or *polis*, these critics paradoxically called themselves ‘citizens of the world’, calling into question the customary idea that every civilized person solely belonged to a particular community among communities, and affirming a shared universal humanity to which we are also all bound.

From such, Appiah highlights twin threads woven together in the notion of cosmopolitanism: 1) ‘that we have obligations to others... beyond...ties of kith and kind, or even the more formal ties of shared citizenship’; 2) ‘that we take seriously the value not just of human life but of particular human lives, which means [also] ...the practices and beliefs that lend them significance’ (p. xv). Particularly in the global age of worldwide communications, through which we can learn about and affect lives anywhere and everywhere, we have responsibilities as such to all persons. Thus, Appiah also places at the heart of the cosmopolitan concern an affirmation of ‘the very idea of morality’ (xiii), ‘the idea that in the human community, as in national communities, we need to develop habits of coexistence: conversation in its older meaning, of living together, association. And conversation in its modern sense, too’ (p. xix). It is, here, as well, that Appiah and Derrida, perhaps, agree – returning to cosmopolitanism as a conversation of and on ethics – the ethics of identity and citizenship – in the face of particular and universal human suffering, and over issues of human difference and solidarity.

Thus also, Derrida (1997/2006), in embracing cosmopolitanism in his address, as that which historically commands respect – affirming its present promise, despite its tensions and possible as well as historical perversions, does so particularly in the way of respecting an ethics of hospitality. He explains:

Hospitality is culture itself and not simply one ethics amongst others. Insofar as it has to do with the *ethos*, that is,...the familiar place of dwelling,...the manner in which we relate to ourselves and to others, to others as our own or as foreigners, *ethics is hospitality*. (pp. 16-17)

This respect lies for such figures, too, not in an unproblematic or uncritical image or history of cosmopolitanism, and as such, the symbols and moments taken up as central to its endorsement are distinguished from others, within and from a context that begs the question Derrida raises around what is, in fact, happening to cosmopolitanism. We have walked our way, we might submit, if only sideways, into it. This question is inclusive, then, of a larger

⁵ Within this law is the conceptualization of the individual in the context of world citizenship, a condition Kant postulates that peace requires. The stranger, also a fellow-citizen in one sense, has the right in traveling beyond the borders of home not to be treated as an enemy, but rather to associate, to sojourn, if only temporarily. As inhabitants all of the earth’s surface, of which once none had more claim to than any other, we are responsible for engaging the presence of each other. In recent times, there has been a renewed interest in Kant’s work on peace, particularly in a context of increased world migrations as well as issues around immigrant rights and rights to asylum.

one concerning what is happening in the present historical moment, a moment that particularly calls for something of the restoration of this tradition's dignity, revival of its heritage of meaning. Derrida insists that it at once constitutes a new cosmopolitanism, ethics, 'cosmopolitics' – a true transformation in the history of the right to asylum, a bold innovation in the duty of hospitality – to which we have yet to arrive.

Indeed, political philosopher Seyla Benhabib (2006) identifies 'cosmopolitanism' as a keyword of our times – highlighting that certain cosmopolitan norms of human right and international law are now well at work as life has moved to a global scale, yet also reminds of cosmopolitanism's many and conflicted significations. Succinctly summarizing some of these differences, scholar of law Jeremy Waldron (2006) speaks of interests in world order and polity – norms of justice, celebrations of the fluidity of culture and dissolution of cultural boundaries – conceptions of identity as hybrid and fragmented, and concerns regarding the universal love of humankind and a shared humanity – responsibilities all persons owe to one another. Despite his express ambivalence in 'settling' on cosmopolitanism, especially in any affiliation with that 'unpleasant posture of superiority' over the provincial, Appiah (2006) embraces it from a place of critique: 1) in repudiation of 'globalization', signifying nothing and everything under macroeconomic terms; and 2) in dismissal of 'multiculturalism', which he describes as a 'shape shifter ... so often designat[ing] the disease it purports to cure' (p. xiii). In this, he feels scholars have magnified the 'strangeness of strangers' out of all proportion, and aspires through a return to cosmopolitanism to make it a little more difficult for us to see the world so easily divided, particularly between an 'us' and a 'them'.

Derrida's inspiration to this call emerges from the highly contested and politically charged enforcement of the Debret Laws in France, inhospitable to immigrants and those without rights of residence. He also references a world context pregnant with violence, soaked in 'the bloody traumas of history' (Critchley & Kearney, 2006, p. vii), where, too, the inviolable rule of state sovereignty has become increasingly precarious. He will, of course, interrogate the secularization of what Hannah Arendt (1967) calls a 'sacred history' – i.e., the language of forgiveness is incited even by countries in the East (of non-Abrahamic religious origins) with respect to human rights in international relations – as well as the 'conditions' Kant sets upon the claims of 'unconditional' hospitality, subjecting it to the state ultimately as defined by the law, in cosmopolitanism. Yet, this philosopher so known for his post-structural, deconstructive 'rage against reason' (Bernstein, 1991), turns nonetheless to a new idea of cosmopolitanism, historically founded upon a faith in human reason, within reason, or perhaps within a reason reconceived, as well.⁶

My inspiration to cosmopolitanism issues similarly from a national context here in the US – and some might argue, an international and global context as well – wherein immigrant rights are seriously at issue, and questions of hospitality loom large with respect to our openness to the 'other' – and to who is the 'other' – in an ethos affected by contested responses to terrorism and war, natural disasters and declining economies, and the possibilities of global warming and universal healthcare, among others. Of course, particularly perhaps in New York City as a historical and contemporary site of immigration, our schools (and universities) also reflect these issues and uncertainties, and sadly – as some would argue, via the dominant influences of NCLB legislation and high-stakes standardized testing, among others – an inhospitable educational scene as well, especially for *other people's children*, to borrow from the language of Lisa Delpit (1995; See also Footnote 1.). Unsurprisingly, then, we are also responding to a renewed interest in cosmopolitanism in

⁶ For more on this notion of the faith of reason, and reason reconceived, in concert with Adorno and Horkheimer's affirmation of certain Enlightenment tenets despite persisting issues with reason and other central foundational ideas therein, see Quinn, 2001.

education, particularly in the realm of ethics and around the question of citizenship, that has arisen in recent years (i.e., Papastephanou, 2002; Snauwaert, 2002, 2006, October; Osler & Starkey, 2003; Stevenson, 2003, 2007, February, 2008). Admittedly, too – in concert with the etymology of ‘curriculum’ as a course for running, then of study – not only has the world scene brought us to this path, but also my present educational journey has given me reason to engage this course to and discourse of cosmopolitanism in confronting questions within my own work I could not side-step, specifically with respect to multiculturalism and teaching for ‘social justice’.⁷ In this way, taking a cosmopolitan way, in walking beside such questions, has also cast them in a new light, opening up new possibilities for response and responsiveness in conceptualizing education and curriculum in present times.

City of lights: Illuminating the call of cosmopolitanism in education

By cosmopolitanism I mean a way of viewing the world that among other things dispenses with national exclusivity, dichotomous forms of gendered and racial thinking, and rigid separations between culture and nature, and popular and high culture. (Stevenson, 2003, p. 332)

Cosmopolitan citizenship does not mean asking individuals to reject their national citizenship.... Education for cosmopolitan citizenship is about enabling learners to make connections between their immediate contexts and the national and global contexts.... It implies a broader understanding of national identity....that...may be experienced differently by different people. (Osler and Starkey, 2003, p. 252)

Perhaps because of the history of cosmopolitanism in its claims of and to world citizenship, much of the literature in education that seeks to take up this philosophical tradition does so through the aim of teaching or learning for citizenship. From Osler and Starkey, whose work involves research undertaken in the UK with some 600 students on their views of community and civic engagement, we find first an important point of illumination via their attention to the sense of belonging that is required for any understanding or experience of citizenship – a sense constituted through many personal and cultural aspects of identity that are not always primarily or essentially or solely ‘national’ in construction. While endorsing citizenship as a contested concept and education as a site for such conceptual debate, they are critical of the ‘national’ limitations set upon the term as educationally-engaged, not only because legally these limits have already been called into question, but also because such conceptions reflect deficit-oriented views of youth that largely ignore their lived experiences and complex identities as well as ‘participatory’ views of citizenship. Children are not, in fact, ‘citizens-in-waiting’, but performing citizenship in manifold ways in the various communities in which they daily live and move. This criticism calls to mind the contention of Dewey – whom Hansen (2007, February), incidentally, identifies with a cosmopolitan legacy in education – that education be not only a preparation for life, but an engagement in and with life itself, and hope for the school community as ‘an embryonic democracy’ in which students participate, as well.

⁷ In The ‘Mystical Foundation’ of Multiculturalism? Cultivating Cosmopolitan Consciousness & Democratic Dialogue in Curriculum and Pedagogy (Quinn & Shah, 2008), we articulate in some detail the professional context that led us to take up cosmopolitanism in our work, particularly as counter-narrative and counter-praxis to multicultural conceptions in education, which we also herein critique.

Recognizing the fragility of democracy and import of the sustainability and solidarity of communities – an understanding evidenced both in their review of research on education for democratic citizenship (2006) as well as their own inquiries with students (2003), Osler and Starkey posit that we must re-imagine the nation – the state – as a truly diverse and inclusive community, as a necessary precondition for democracy’s renewal, which also involves education for what they term ‘cosmopolitan citizenship.’ Citizenship, and citizenship education, is ever, in fact, referential of an imagined community that is all too often envisioned homogeneously with the expectation that minorities, immigrants, those constituting ‘difference’, assimilate; and that also fails to acknowledge the many communities of which students are simultaneously members.

We foreground, via this wandering and wondering, the import of attending to imagining and re-imagining⁸. Stevenson (2003) grounds much of his work here, as well: his focus, a cultural model of citizenship for a cosmopolitan age, critiquing present conceptions of culture and related forms of education for modern citizenship, he posits, present conditions exceed. The cultivation of a ‘cosmopolitan imagination’ is called for, amid the rise of what has been called the ‘cultural’ society wherein citizenship is oriented more around norms, meanings, identities and practices than legal rules, procedures and sanctions. Here, much as Herbert Kliebard (2004) claims in exploring the ‘struggle for the American curriculum’, the sites of power are to be found in the minds of people, in the symbolic forms ever in societal creation, embodied as such also in codes, discourses, and narratives that are in circulation. The struggle over the ground of this imagined community also, in this way, returns us to the want of belonging, and for inclusion. Thus, Stevenson (2003) asserts: ‘Definitions of citizenship need to link the struggle for rights and social justice with the quest for recognition and cultural respect’ (p. 331).

Such definitions must attend to the inherent complexities of citizenship and cultural identity, as well. From their studies of student conceptions of citizenship, Osler and Starkey (2003) conclude that, perceiving themselves as active participants of ‘overlapping communities of fate’ – a term borrowed from political theorist David Held (1995, 1996) – that are at once local, virtual, regional, national, and global, students are not likely to find education that is oriented around strictly national – or for that matter, narrow and insular cultural – conceptions of citizenship able to embrace their own experiences and identities or contribute to their meaningful integration. Nor does such a view, I would suggest, critically challenge postures of hostility toward those deemed ‘other’, much less cultivate those of genuine recognition and respect. Thus, Stevenson (2003), quite importantly, emphasizes the quest for a communicative society, labor that attends to the sustained import and influence of the media, globalization, identity politics, democratic ideology and the struggle for cultural inclusion. This reckoning with the import of belonging and identity as concerning community, culture and the imagination, within global as well as local contexts, appears to be essential to any cosmopolitan conception of curriculum. The citizen of the world does not relinquish the home of – that is – the citizen her- or himself, and in context.

The context of globalization – not only economic, but also ethical in development – reflected in the international human rights movement, Snauwaert (2002) claims, ‘expands the scope of the egalitarian logic of democracy transnationally,’ necessitating the articulation of ‘a cosmopolitan theory of democratic education’ (p. 5).⁹ In a sensitive philosophical

⁸ Such is foundational to conceptualizing the curriculum of refuge, as well, in order to resist our propensity for essentializing or exoticizing otherness and/or our relational aspirations to peace and justice.

⁹ Political theorist David Held (1995, 1996), in outlining a model of cosmopolitan democracy, also asserts that the locus of democracy is not only to be found within the nation-state. Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey (2003) draw upon his work, as well, in their argument for a cosmopolitan conception of citizenship in education.

exploration of the shared principles of democracy and cosmopolitanism – documenting historically, via such ‘events’ as the Nuremberg Tribunal and U.N. Declaration of Human Rights, what he suggests constitutes moral progress and a positive development in human history – he works to establish a shared humanity that ‘carries with it a moral imperative to respect the dignity of every human life’ (p. 8). Snauwaert goes on to assert that such an imperative is not merely an ideal, but one grounded in the customs of democratic societies and principles of the international community, and also ties it to the Kantian possibility for peace in the world.

In sketching out the contours of a cosmopolitan democratic education, he foregrounds the cultivation of citizens who can respond in ways consistent with this ethical imperative – the principle of moral equality, or what he calls ‘the principle of humanity.’ Here, he highlights the positive value of sympathy, which actively engages a response of care toward the other, and what he identifies as a negative value – respect, constituted in its requirement that one refrain from violating the rights of the other. Such dispositions additionally cohere in ‘a moral identity and sensibility that is grounded in an authentic sense of self... the basis of self-determination and thus moral agency’ (p. 11). Addressing, as well, central dispositions – principally rooted in fear of a loss of self constituted by external possessions (including beliefs and ideologies) and socially-constructed identifications – that inhibit such authenticity, Snauwaert advocates what he calls ‘a more authentic’ mode of living and being than one based on ‘having’: authentic self-awareness. Here, he affirms Maxine Greene’s work (1978) on the import of ‘wide-awakeness’ as at the heart of moral agency.

From our perspective, Snauwaert’s work points to an important problem, one as yet perhaps remains to be more fully and formally theorized in education and curriculum, or thought in pedagogical practice: the problem of fear and desire. Joseph Knippenberg (1989, November) actually critiques the work of contemporary peace educators in this regard in their chief reliance on what he calls ‘enlightened fear’ for the cause of peace. In a comparative analysis of Rousseau and Kant on cosmopolitan education, he also sides with Kant in his focus on the moral love of honor, the attachment to human dignity, as the better path to peace – perhaps not willing to entertain as does Snauwaert (2002) possibilities beyond the possessive mode of being. In addition, while Snauwaert does not speak of hospitality, per se, his affirmation of an authentic self-awareness resonates strongly with Derrida’s notion of ethics as hospitality with respect to ‘a manner of being there’ in the ways we relate to ourselves as well as to others as ‘other’ or not. It remains, of course, as well, to conceptualize the meaning of hospitality and means of its cultivation in educational and/or curricular terms.¹⁰ While to take up this course directly here might take us too far a wandering, considering and articulating the ‘curriculum of refuge’ seems to call for an ethics of hospitality. Hansen (2007, February; 2008) – who also grounds his interest in cosmopolitanism in re-imagining education in terms of an ethical vision for, and in response to, present times – seeks as well to move us toward such curricular terms.

These are times, he says, characterized by ‘accelerating acceleration’ in which the intensified experience of the unfathomability and impermanence of human life flies in the face of our deep need and desire for stability; in which new forms of indifference and violence are generated – and thus also fear, along with enhanced communications and modes of connectivity. He looks forward to curriculum anew through this view, not only in terms of

¹⁰ For an initial attempt here, regarding the theorizing of hospitality in relation to curriculum, in an educational context, see Quinn (in press), “‘No Room in the Inn’? The Question of Hospitality in the Post-(Partum) Labors of Curriculum Studies”, in E. Malewski (Ed.), *Articulating the Present (Next) Moment in Curriculum Studies: The Post-Reconceptualization Generation(s)*. New York: Routledge. Concerning the pedagogical address of hospitality, see also Ibrahim (2005) and Kameniar (2007).

content conceived as cosmopolitan inheritance through which we can better understand our time and this, our truly multi- and inter-cultural legacy, albeit particularly others in an appreciative light, but also cosmopolitanism itself as ‘an engine of ideas’ for curriculum, teaching and learning. Issuing from Dewey’s claim that we can learn from all the contexts of life, he emphasizes a quest for meaning, the perennial human project, that does not deny this unfathomability and impermanence, or need for stability, but rather reckons with such as a question of ethics concerning what it means to be human, and how we are to live – and that, together within a world compass, via the cosmopolitan call to engage with and learn from innumerable contexts and encounters with others. Thus, no blueprint as such is embraced in education nor can it ever be, but rather care is taken concerning how we: ‘hold our educational values, cultivate open-hearted and open-minded exchanges, and welcome such encounters with the foreign’ in order to learn and grow. I submit that this conception of the ‘curriculum of refuge’ I am hoping to develop, and to which we shortly turn, takes up such care and cultivation, implicitly reflecting an ethics of hospitality – an exhortation of radical openness to the other (Derrida, 1997/2000, 2002).

The sense of risk and necessity for refuge¹¹, as it were, that perhaps attends this call entails, however, also addressing what Critchley & Kearney (2006) have called ‘the traumas of history’ – the historical-relational context of cross-cultural encounter that Papastephanou (2002) emphasizes in her illumination of ‘arrows not yet fired’ in articulating education in a cosmopolitan way. ‘Cosmopolitanism envisions peace and reconciliation...’ (p. 69), she says and continues: ‘It paves paths for encounters. Encounters undo identities, reshuffle their interpretative material and their self-understanding, and unleash new creative energies’ (p. 69). Such exchanges are bound to be discomfiting, particularly in the presence of unresolved conflicts that thwart the call of openness to genuine encounter. Because such is the case, Papastephanou undertakes a critical reading of cosmopolitanism through Ricoeur’s attention to historical memory and human temporality, which she suggests is not yet adequately taken into account. While cosmopolitanism is future-oriented – engaging the imagination with respect to yet-to-come possibilities that might encourage the advent of society in a new image grounded in equality, compassion and care – it must embrace this futurity in the now, in which the past is also present, and reverberates. In our midst, then, are also others who are ghosts of a vampire past, which requires of us not only a sensitivity to our future co-dwellings but also a reckoning with disputes and differences that are rooted in history, unequal power relations, in which we presently live nonetheless.

‘It is history that nourishes many of our misconceptions, expectations, feelings and opinions about others.... [We cannot] overlook the fact that I and the Other have never really been disengaged’ (p. 78). Thus, Papastephanou emphasizes a conception of cosmopolitan education that acknowledges the demands the cultural dimensions of teachers’ and students’ identities make upon them, in terms of the historical – in its ‘diachronic aspect’: an understanding of the other as other is presupposed, including the recognition of each community’s own past relations and its interactions with many others, those that live out contemporarily in complex ways. Ibrahim (2005) – via his experience of being both teacher and ‘foreigner’ – and Kameniar (2007) – in her study of a convert to and teacher of a ‘foreign’ religion – actually explore these complex cultural demands and dimensions, and the pedagogical difficulties and possibilities they present, as they are played out in the work of

¹¹ These two necessities relate to Hansen’s (2008) educational call for the cultivation of a cosmopolitan sensibility in a dynamic space of interaction that honors local, global, universal and individual simultaneously. This curricular permeability mirrors the cultural porosity of contemporary times – open to deepened, expanded, transformed understanding and experience through encounters with others – as it acknowledges and supports efforts to recognize and reaffirm the integrity of persons and cultures as they are, have been and are becoming.

teaching. Both also engage the notion of hospitality, by which we might understand classroom and curricular contexts as places of cultural encounter, characterized too by hybridity, plurality and ‘multi-chronicity.’

Another point of elucidation here, then, is the importance of attention to intercultural study, the relations between and among difference, of which Cameron McCarthy’s discussion of ‘nonsynchrony’ (1990) is particularly also generative – i.e., our own cultural identities are intercultural, as it were, themselves plural, paradoxical, complex, conflicted and shifting, ‘in relation’. Bringing the light of history to this ideal is not meant to continue into the present the pain and suffering of the past, but rather to acknowledge that which does live into the present, and to do justice to the ‘entanglement of cultures’: the reality of cross-cultural contacts and conflicts – conflicts that have created cultural debts, and that call us to responsibility, beyond simply understanding (Papastephanou, 2002).

Herein is not only a recourse to an other-oriented curriculum that explores past and present relations with such otherness, but also to a course of actual engagement that reckons with this indebtedness – a model of forgiveness, in turning to Ricoeur (1996), ‘teaching of the kind of forgiveness and the *request* for forgiveness that emerge only out of a genuine engagement with the other’ (Papastephanou, 2002, p. 81).¹² As Papastephanou takes up his work thus, she embraces the work of forgiveness as central to the aspirations of cosmopolitanism, and to education in its service, ‘a specific form of that mutual revision, the most precious result of which is the liberation of promises of the past which have not been kept’ (citing Ricoeur, p. 83). As I see it, by attending to the dangers of memory – the aftermath of which often includes repression, guilt, shame, condemnation, internalized oppression or self-deception, she posits that forgiveness opens up possibilities for encounters that are truly synchronistic, such that genuine repentance and meaningful and dignified expiation, in the language of religion – healing, reconciliation, and peace – also become genuine possibilities, new and more humane ways of dwelling together. Moreover, it is this reading of cosmopolitanism by the light of forgiveness, this illumination of the work of forgiveness as essential to its educational address, that most profoundly brings us to Derrida’s recovery of the idea of the ‘city of refuge’ – questions of amnesty and asylum at the heart of it, and to this formulation/transformation of curriculum via the notion of the ‘curriculum of refuge.’ Let us, perhaps in pause on our walk through this city, come together finally now to – and to explore – the potential sanctuary of such a vision.

Hot child in the city? Imploring the ‘Curriculum of Refuge’

Each human being suffers in a way no other human being suffers.

Henry Nouwen

Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied in a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly.

Martin Luther King, Jr.

¹² Ricoeur does acknowledge the virtues of other models that seek to integrate identity and alterity, or at least authentically engage difference in the way of shared understanding: in efforts of translation, though symbolically important as ‘linguistic hospitality’, as a passage to cultural hospitality and acknowledgment of the spiritual relationships among languages and cultures, certain meanings can be lost or altered, or alterity subsumed. While an exchange of memories is vital too, in listening to and really hearing another, he maintains that exaggerated memory or the loss thereof has contributed much to the tragedy of human oppression and violence (Papastephanou, 2002).

All of us suffer. Suffering is tragically universal and profoundly particular. We are all, too, subjects both of justice and injustice. There is no escaping – via our past and present and even future actions and encounters – the unrelenting need to forgive, and for forgiveness, personally, and collectively, as a result of the communities in which we dwell and participate, and collective histories into which we have been born, as well. As the characters in *Sex & the City*, already in community and ever-seeking the experience of community, we are ever in relationship – making, breaking or re-thinking/recreating it, yet also existentially every alone, ex-iled in the city too, condemned to face or perhaps flee from our impact on and how we are impacted by the other – our radical responsibility and radical inter-course and inter-constitution. In this way, the need for asylum and amnesty is a need we all share too – the acknowledgment of which is, we must add, by no means an abnegation that this suffering is particular, and particularly and profoundly plays out via unequal power relations, not just interpersonally but also between and among cultures of difference. The need for asylum and amnesty may be indeed more urgent for, even more acknowledged by, some more than others, and for diverse reasons requiring different responses, yet not wholly foreign or unrelated each to the others’, in the need itself.

Still, whether we conceptualize our manner of ‘being [here-] there’ with Heidegger (1927/1962) as our ontological condition of ‘being-guilty’ in the forgetfulness of being, or with Derrida (1985/1988) via ‘*oto-* or *autre*-biography,’¹³ in recognition that it is ‘the ear of the other who signs’ our name, or through some less philosophical formulation, we find that we are all, each, implicated in the ‘bloody traumas of history’, the present world scene and curriculum situation, the suffering of others, the pain of the world, and many would argue, even our own plight (i.e., Serres, 1986/1989; Asher, 2006, September), and plight of our own. Every decision we make, action we take, even if in the pursuit of justice, ever cuts, and divides, undertaken – Derrida (1990) continues through Kierkegaard – in ‘the night of non-knowledge’ in which the impact can never be certain or ever fully known. If we introduce Levinas on ‘Cities of Refuge’ (i.e., as discussed in Eisenstadt, 2003, Winter) into our conversation, he puts it in this wise: we attend through them, and this human history, so consciously to the manslaughterer because we are all manslaughterers¹⁴ – perhaps ‘killing’ without intention, participating unwittingly in oppression, but guilty, as such, nonetheless, even in our innocence; and, perhaps, suffering from such as well.

If democracy is fragile, it is because we are. The idea of the city of refuge, and thus the curriculum of refuge, while issuing from historical circumstances defined by a heightened experience of exile and exchange in a cosmopolitan age, is built then first upon an acceptance of human vulnerability – fallibility, imperfection, incompleteness, and collective unprecedented constitution – and thus also does not deny these fears, desires, and needs for belonging and restitution (even revenge?) that making our way through the wisdom of those advocating a cosmopolitan education have already highlighted for us; and from which emerges our capacities for imagining community anew. This is, of course, in itself no easy task – and radically understated as well. For, not only does it require of each of us a reckoning with our own mysterious, terrifying, ambiguous and exposed unanswerability even to ourselves (Butler 2005; Greene, 2008a, March, 2008b, March) as well as before the other – and as educators, shepherding others in addressing the same; but also, as Stevenson (2003) points out: ‘The subject is now constituted as an active, choice-driven, and risk-reducing individual’ (p. 337),

¹³ Here, Derrida (1985/1988) highlights the voice – and word, and sound – of the other in the construction of one’s subjectivity, referencing in French the ear with *oto*, and the other with *autre* in discussing autobiography (*oto-* and *autre*-biography).

¹⁴ For those interested in exploring further this aspect of our being, and its impact – educationally and beyond, see Quinn (2001), especially Chapter 2.

competitive, entrepreneurial, infinitely flexible in movement. 'Its [sic] is these virtues that are 'threatened' or at least partially disrupted by the presence of the urban poor, refugees, immigrants and beggars' (p. 338), who are not only seen as social failures and excluded but also deemed needing 'discipline', especially in our cultural institutions, like schools.¹⁵

We might consider, though, that it is not just or even principally the difference the presence of these others in our midst introduce to us that we fear so much, but rather their reflection of our own vulnerability (i.e., in Heidegger's formulation, our being-guilty, *thrownness*, being-toward-death, etc.) with which we have not reckoned – and the shame, blame or other associated with it. Most of our wisdom traditions go so far as to suggest that at and by the very site and 'stench', if you will, of our brokenness is brought forth the fragrant offerings that heal and bless and bring us together. In this respect, perhaps in concert with William Pinar and Madeline Grumet's 'poor curriculum' (1976), we might recommend a 'broken curriculum'¹⁶ as foundational to any conception of the curriculum of refuge.

We have worked overly much to establish here the place for curriculum from this fractured scene of human existence, what the Dalai Lama (2007, October) in a recent New York City public lecture on 'Peace and Prosperity' called the 'fundamental human condition' we share, or what Thich Nhat Hanh (1999) refers to as 'inter-being', our ontological interconnectedness. The Other is always and irreducibly wholly Other, but also I and the Other are indeed – paradoxically, aporetically perhaps – one, as well. We are one, for one, in the need for asylum, no matter where we choose to take refuge – if even as our '*Sex & the City* girls' in their signature cocktail of choice, ironically perhaps, named 'the cosmopolitan', though its harmonious sweetness is found 'in the mix.' But part of the plea here is exactly not to lose ourselves in or to the, or any, 'drug of representation,' as Michel Serres (1986/1989) calls it. The 'cosmopolitan' of our imbibing via the curriculum of refuge rather calls us to the 'toast of relation' – *Sueños! Sueños!* to realize the sweet dream: more aptly, to break bread together – challah, pita, wheat-free or *Wonder* – in an ethics of hospitality, and all the delights such an ethics entails, as well as demands of us.

Derrida (1997/2006), of course, turns to this historical provision of the city of refuge also in response to particular, present historical conditions, as do we here concerning curriculum. We do live in a heightened sense of the need for sanctuary, in the acceleration of and unavoidability of encounters with otherness, as well as of, alas, the experience of inhospitableness. And this intensified experience is evident, as well, in our schools. The rise, in the US, of campus and school shootings by and of students across the country in recent years quickly at first comes to mind. In New York City, as in other locales, the state also threatens the city schools with takeover if their students are not performing and conforming to prescribed standards and purposes as determined via pre-scripted assessments. Five year-olds fill classrooms where play is diminished, barely permissible, because

¹⁵ For powerfully illustrative examples here, see Arendt's analysis (1967) of 'border police' as related to immigrant history, as well as Derrida's discussion (1997/2006) of her work in relation to cosmopolitanism; and in an educational context, David Nasaw's social history of American public education (1979) as a response to growing immigrant populations. Our posture, via the curriculum of refuge, we suggest, flies in the face of an educational and curriculum history and legacy grounded in human perfect-ability, the denial of human vulnerability and efforts at its eradication.

¹⁶ I borrow this term from William Doll (2008, January), coined in a graduate seminar entitled *Bending Time*, in which he was entertaining where the new might come from, particularly, in time, how the new might emerge in curriculum. Undoubtedly influenced by chaos, complexity and systems theories, in affirming a 'broken curriculum', he highlights the value of 'symmetry-breaking', the breaking down of systems, disequilibrium – the nonlinear, unpredictable, unaccountable, unforeseen. There can be no transformation without perturbation, some degree of instability. Herein, the vulnerable, questionable, even inequitable, might also be seen in a new and potentially uplifting light.

kindergarteners must become, as expeditiously as possible, competent for an adult culture that seems to lend more importance to ‘concept mapping’ than ‘sharing’ and ‘napping.’

If one takes seriously ‘post’-critiques of knowledge (i.e., Serres, 1986/1989, 1991/1997; Lather 1996, 2007), at least as conceived and advanced in the West, this ‘small thing’ with our ‘little ones’ in itself is not unrelated to the ‘the violence which rages on a worldwide scale’ (Derrida, 1997/2006, p. 5); rather, we must consider that we are, in fact, educating our young in artless inhospitality, into a culture of violence. Jonathan Kozol (1991), for example, further documents in great detail the ‘savage inequalities’ particularly evident in American schools serving poor children and children of color. The term R.D. Laing (1967) picks up from Jules Henry’s critique of the work of schooling, from the 60s, is fitting here: ‘the pathetic surrender of babies’ (p. 72).¹⁷ In the name of citizenship defined by our highest ideals, the political-powers-that-be, generally via the state, initiate these dogged pursuits of academics and educators, creating conditions of duress for many, and especially for many children (i.e., See Pinar’s, 2004, analysis with respect to governmental regulation of education in the US). We are all, and our children, in manifold ways, each the ‘hot child in the city’, as it were, in search of a place of refuge, for difference, for the face-to-face, for forgiving and forgiveness. Stevenson (2003), taking up Foucault, pushes us further through cosmopolitanism to a ‘queer’ ethics that affirms not only the right to be different, but also the freedom to invent difference, to create a space for the possibilities of experimentation, for the creation of new identities. These are problems and potentialities that conjure up visions of the city of refuge – the call for free and open cities, of the curriculum of refuge that might support such views and ‘vagrancies’ of thought and practice.

What the city of refuge, for Derrida (1997/2006), means is that we must ‘make an audacious call for a genuine innovation in the history of the right to asylum or the duty to hospitality’ (p. 4) – for difference, our share in it, and for its living, inventive, collective embrace. What such suggests is an innovation along the order in education echoed by the inclusion movement, perhaps, the curriculum of refuge that is multicultural in terms of inclusive curriculum – anti-racist, anti-oppressive, et al – a sanctuary for the unsanctioned: different epistemologies, subaltern discourses, other courses; initiated in audacity for interrogating the apparatuses of welcoming (2002), practices of legitimation, in academia and education themselves, including the rights and responsibilities curriculum takes up (or doesn’t), and has (or hasn’t) historically, too. So conceived, this call may also involve offering protection, as well, to children, from a culture of consumerism, for instance, what has been called our ‘audit society’, and the machinations of adulthood; and even hiding from curriculum inquiry itself as well – in calling for a protective haven from the grasp of research – observations and experiences of the most compelling encounters and beautiful engagements happening among teachers, students, and others in classrooms and schools (Tocci et al, 2008); i.e., resisting the scholastic urge to turn all of life experience into ‘data’.

This certainly must entail addressing what Noel Gough (2002) terms ‘the long arm of globalization’, in its metaphorical meanings and multiple manifestations, here referential of the omnipresent educational embrace via the state, and the totalizing scripted and tested

¹⁷ Laing’s (1967) *Politics of Experience* engages a psychological analysis of the age of alienation. To sustain our own image of ourselves in conditions marked by oppression and colonization, and to rationalize the industrial-military complex in which we participate, we must interiorize our own violence upon ourselves and our children, and hinder our capacity to see clearly. This work begins in the home, and via schooling, with children – where we teach them to hate one another without appearing to do so, where violence is disguised as love. Jules Henry’s work (1963) is central to Laing’s analysis of “The Mystification of Experience” as related to educating the young, this work of schooling.

curriculum it authorizes – as well as the omniscient grasp of ‘mono-cultural’ accountability¹⁸ through assessment of student, teacher, school, school of education – from which we must flee and find refuge. This curriculum of the city, as it were, counters that of the state, coming against the propensity to absorb every person and experience and effect in education as data, against the reification of human understanding and ‘rubrication’ of human life, and co-opting of culture. In this way, perhaps, curriculum may be conceived as a refuge *for* culture itself – including a commitment to preserving the culture of childhood, which is also a haven for childhood, and – in accord with Derrida’s (2002) conception of culture – a haven for hospitality itself, an affirmation of humanity¹⁹ itself, as well.

By such rights and duties, this educational course so re-visioned is not only multicultural, but also intercultural, and perhaps *trans-cultural* or *post-cultural* too: it seeks to invent, re-invent, community and culture, making room for their imaginative transformation and experimentation by and with and among the new life that is in our midst, for the not-yet and yet-to-come [i.e., the child/children as curriculum, all that we hope for and cultivate with(in) the child/children via education; See Jardine, 1992; Huebner, 1999]. Acknowledging and addressing the histories and hybridities, complexities and contradictions, of such, this curriculum of refuge is, too, a curriculum of ‘interculturality’ (Eg ea-Kuehne, 2008, March) – engaging encounters with and across difference, and exploring their effects, entertaining the ethics of our dwellings together. Herein, reckoning with the past that is present now and in the future, this curriculum meets with contexts of desire, othering, guilt, shame, blame, loss and fear, too, in the way of world citizenship – the critical and creative call of hospitality: opening to otherness, conversing with difference; and engaging the possibilities of difference beyond difference, of engaging difference differently, other-wise.

This work means, also, undertaking experiments in forgiveness, and healing, in inventing differences in our relations to each other, in relating differently. As such, the curriculum of refuge, inciting a ‘sacred’ history via the city of refuge, is perhaps also a kind of attempt at a redemption of or reconciliation with, and transformation of, history.²⁰ It may be, for example, that Israeli and Palestinian children educationally working through their own wounds, the traumas of their histories, together, might invent a different history, possibilities for peace, that the negotiations of international governments and ‘peace’ talks of states cannot.²¹ The curriculum of refuge means imagining and creating spaces where forgiveness, healing, communion, and fellowship might actually be made possible.

¹⁸ For a convincing and compelling critical analysis of the discourse of ‘accountability’ in American education, see Pinar (2004). Relatedly, Leonardo’s (2007) analysis of NCLB discourse and documentation, which lucidly unveils a constitutive albeit concealed Whiteness throughout, is also of interest with respect to my argument here.

¹⁹ Derrida (2002) claims that there is no culture that is not one of hospitality, and continues to posit culture as hospitality itself, as well as linking such to that which confirms the essentially human. The womanist, theological scholar, N. Lynne Westfield (2001) concurs, saying: “...to describe hospitality is to describe the delightfulness of being human...” (p. 46).

²⁰ Derrida (1997/2006) picks up from Arendt (1967) this identification of the right to asylum with a sacred history – grounded in an enduring medieval tenet that he who is in a territory is of the territory, albeit a right which, in her analysis, has been increasingly eradicated, and this in the face of great numbers of refugees and situations of great need. Historically, as identified with a divine command to Moses for the affordance of cities of refuge, principally for those guilty of manslaughter, these sites made possible human acts of atonement as well as protection. A response to the problem of vengeance, too, the right to sanctuary denied or violated was deemed of great criminal offense. By the Judaic codes, clean roads of double-width were to be constructed to such cities, and signposts created, to support fugitives in flight to them. Those in charge of these towns were also charged with finding accommodations for those who arrived in such conditions, as well (i.e., *The Holy Bible*, 1985; Douglas, 1962).

²¹ Derrida (1997/2006) also affirms Arendt’s recognition (1967) that the relations between states, treaties between governments, limit international law, also in ways a world government would be hard-pressed to

The theoretical or critical reflection involved here, is also then, as Derrida (1997/2006) claims, ‘indissociable from ... practical initiatives’ (p. 4). For instance, Derrida’s insistence that these open cities of refuge so conceived across the world be autonomous – each as independent from the other as from the state as is possible, though allied to each other according to ‘forms of solidarity yet to be invented’ (p. 4) – incites ideas of initiatives making for free sites for curriculum experimentation, with global (and cross-, inter-, multi-cultural) affiliations, collaborations, communications, exchanges – akin to the freedom schools, perhaps, into which Pinar (2004) inquires anew from the scene of the present historical moment – and governance by the state, as such, suspended, re-constituted. Hiro Saito (2008, March), in ‘Re-Envisioning Cosmopolitan Education,’ seeks to explore the possibilities to be found in some of our already existing non-governmental, transnational resources: for example, problem-solving programs that get students cross-culturally involved in tackling local and global world issues together.

With him, we might also highlight the necessary educational tasks of cultivating emotional affiliations with concrete foreign others among ourselves as well as our students via shared interests and exchanges of stories, photographs, and even important statistics; and of cultivating transnational understanding, elucidating the global connections that are already present inside our own environments, how the local materials we use, even to which we are attached, are made available to us through the labor of others in other parts of the world. Such considerations may involve such simple curriculum – even classroom-specific – initiatives as pedagogical investigations into the production and distribution of familiar items of treasured use (i.e., like my daily cup of dark-roast coffee; See also Asher, 2005, for additional examples critically engaged in a college course in a teacher education program) or communications cross-culturally via e-pal exchanges, or larger curricular experimentations – ‘curriculum of refuge summits’, as it were, organized around particular inquiries or addresses, like the problem-solving programs Saito finds potentially supportive in cultivating a cosmopolitan consciousness and ethics of world citizenship.

‘How can the hosts...and guests of cities of refuge [– teachers and students, ‘ex’s and texts, of the curriculum of refuge –] be helped to recreate, through work and creative activity, a living and durable network in new places and occasionally in a new language?’ Derrida (1997/2006, p. 12) might have us ask. Here, in doing justice to the ‘entanglement of cultures’ (Papastephanou, 2002), the marginalization of ‘others’, the ‘othering’ is acknowledged and challenged; educators are called to create ‘free’ spaces that allow for the unheard stories to be heard (Boler, 2004), for conversations to thrive in a context of shared and mutual responsibility to and for each and every ‘other’; schools – as places of asylum and amnesty – are charged to welcome all in as citizens (Kliwer, 1998); and in, albeit beyond, the progressive tradition, education might also be reconstituted – and perhaps that principally through the curriculum, to bring forth what Derrida (1997/2006) imagines: ‘the experience of cities [curricula] of refuge’, and also as that which gives ‘rise to a place...for reflection – for reflection on the questions of asylum and hospitality – and for a new order...and a democracy to come to be put to the test’(p. 23).

Akin to the school as ‘an embryonic democracy’ in Dewey’s conceptualization, herein the curriculum of refuge – site for subjective and social reconstruction (Pinar, 2004) – may, in fact, contribute to that for which Derrida hopes in reconstituting the cities of refuge, that they re-orient the politics of the state as well. Moreover, we must concur with him that such work demands a prudent distinction between categories (i.e. immigrant, foreigner, exiled, displaced, etc.), highlighting the import of difference and vigilance against its exclusion, as

resolve, and as such, looks to the legacy of cities of refuge, offering a kind of sovereignty to and of the city, as a site of possibility for addressing the concerns of amnesty and asylum, international human rights.

well as a re-formation, trans-formation, of our very modalities of membership, constructions of citizenship, engagements with difference. Addressing this call for the curriculum of refuge, in reconceptualizing and recontextualizing the landscape of contemporary curriculum studies through the understandings of cosmopolitanism, is, to me, a first step toward realizing such possibilities, toward taking hospitality to the streets, so to speak – wherein, too, school smarts and street smarts may freely also meet.

Cosmopolitanism, curriculum and refuge from conclusion: A post-script to the scripted

There's a sense in which cosmopolitanism is the name not of the solution but of the challenge.... Cosmopolitanism is an adventure and an ideal. (Appiah, 2006, p. xv, xx)

...the voyage of children, that is the naked meaning of the Greek word *pedagogy*. Learning launches wandering. (Serres, 1991/1997, p. 8)

My 'Subway Soliloquies' selections with which I began this address – initiated as they were by walking city sidewalks into a new way, wondering anew before illuminations of bright city lights, wandering into unexpected moments of refuge as well as memories of refuge's want – are, in truth, no soliloquies at all, as such, albeit underground, indeed, perhaps. Their records and recollections come only by encounters with others, brought into being by my relationship to strangers, the call of others and otherness, in my midst. Relationships are present; encounters are shared, even as constituted by alterity or experienced as solitary. I have given them visual form in my imagination as subterranean trains of thought, moving trains for thought, upon refuge, the experience of refuge – that are at once also places for reflection, sanctuaries for difference, haven-dwellings for openness to otherness; all of which are ever also inconclusive, incomplete, their 'not yet', more than they already are, moving – and moving, changing, me too, and this as challenge, and adventure, and ideal.

Yet, really, I make the poetic, as much as the politic, by walking it;²² take up the cosmo-poetic, as well as the cosmo-politic/-politan, by wondering and wandering into it too – and perhaps welcoming, at least entertaining, its call to me, that which it illuminates for me. And this, from the textures of living, contexts of life. Thus, though this personal track, tracking the trail of humanity's footprints from cosmopolitan terrain, is laid down here in advance, meaning to foreshadow, mirror, abstract, prefigure, the trains of thought I go on to present in the more professional address that follows, temporally, I brought such personal poetic musings to this work after the re-search story was writ and recorded – although they were penned actually in an earlier chronological time.²³ And, as embracing adventure, ideal, the challenge of responsive encounter with another, curriculum in a cosmopolitan way, with community and culture, is indeed, and especially with respect to the experience of refuge, all and much a matter of time.

²² With this turn of phrase, I am alluding to the published conversation between two champions for human and civil rights, Miles Horton and Paulo Freire (1990), on education and social change, which they frame through a line translated from the poetry of Antonio Machado (1982), affirming that: "we make the road by walking."

²³ Though to engage the central and constitutive concept and experience of time – not only with respect to a cosmopolitan ethics but also to curriculum studies – here is to take us too far a field from our present inquiry, I foreground temporality here intentionally (i.e., the past and future as ever in the present), particularly playing on Papestphanou's (2002) consideration of forgiveness as related to cosmopolitanism, via Ricoeur, as the possibility of synchronistic, in addition to diachronic, encounters with each other.

Here, for instance, in response to a lecture of Maxine Greene (2008b, March), 'The Poet, the City and Curriculum', of which I was also in attendance, Wendy Kohli (March, 2008) borrows from other poets to claim that the only reason to read a poem – to which I might also add, and/or write a poem – is to open to another life, to see the world as it could be otherwise, other-wise. She goes on to suggest that herein one does not really merely read the poetic, but actually participates in it, lends one's life to it, by which the new opens up: via the metaphorical constitution of the poetic, new things are brought together, opening out and expanding horizons, enabling us to move back and forth between actual and possible. I hope a sense of this movement has been made possible for the reader here in my initiation via, experiment with, the poetic, perhaps expanding notions of cosmopolitanism, postulating new openings for curriculum by it as well, inviting new encounters with otherness – for encountering difference, the world, the world of curriculum, citizenship, otherwise; for reflections on the experience of refuge in education that embrace both actual and possible, asylum and amnesty.

For, this event, with another lecture by Greene (2008a, March) delivered on the occasion of her 90th birthday, in which she emphasized the dire need in education to cultivate a 'passion for the possible' (in the words of Ricoeur), distinguishing such from the predictable – which now dominates in schools, moved me, and opened up new and expanded ways for me of seeing in and being with my work on cosmopolitanism – encouraging me to lend my life to it, as it were, which is also to embrace a posture of hospitality. Greene (2008b, March) introduces her thoughts here through the poet of and on the city, too, elucidating from such this essential work of education in 'opening doors' 'with no keys'. She critiques teacher education, and curriculum development, for its locked rooms and closed doors, for, in a hunger for final solutions, failing to truly attend not only to the stories of teachers and students and their existential engagements in and with the world and each other, but also in ignoring the temporality by which all narratives are marked, that these stories are ever unfolding and in their very telling also give to life its meanings (citing Sartre). She affirms, too, drawing upon Merleau-Ponty, that the self appears, then, not as or by interiority, but rather via dialogic meanings, discovered and recovered in the midst of others. These encounters, with and in the midst of others and otherness, have thus compelled me to bring myself, my own stories, and something of the temporality of their unfolding, to this inquiry into cosmopolitanism: the setting and scene of its address, its sights and insights, and sources of possibility for conceiving curriculum anew via its vision in the 'city of refuge'. Such in and of itself has also experientially been something, for me, of a curriculum of refuge.

It has reminded me that the beauty of the world may be embraced, without denying or abnegating its brokenness too – and that part of the beauty is indeed found in our human response to both, but perhaps most profoundly, to and in its and our brokenness. As Greene interrogates the educational discourse of the day, asking 'Accountable for what? To whom?' – foregrounding too the question of responsibility, and ethics, she also acknowledges the inhospitable conditions that have brought me, through and with Derrida as well as via the work of others, to the study of cosmopolitanism: that the world into which educators initiate children is, in fact, one subjected to far too much indifference and violence. She envisions teachers, then, in their strangeness in classrooms amid strangers and reckoning with such, at work as healers of this 'plague of indifference.' Awake to the ambiguities and unanswerabilities of their life and practice, they challenge in the national context the 'American Idols' that via celebrity and materialism capture the imagination of youth in a prescribed vision within a questionable moral fabric, and work to create a space in this world for children wherein trust is possible, and help them not only to trust, but also to be capable of outrage. For if even a labor of loss, our humanity requires both empathy and the impetus

to fight the cruelty of our forgetfulness and disinterest, as well as the violence issued by manifold modes of inhospitality. And such, too, ever extends beyond the national context.

In this, conceiving a curriculum of refuge, in concert with Derrida's call for the revival of cities of refuge, is the work of hospitality, of care, even love – to take up this 'passion for the possible' in education and curriculum studies via the *heart* of cosmopolitanism, as much as its *mind*. For every, each, moment, 'love calls us to the things of the world' (Wilbur, 1988), and simultaneously to, in fact, in the words of Ghandi, *be the change we wish to see in the world* – i.e., world citi-zenship, and particular responsiveness concerning the ex-iled. Let us, here too, never conclude, but rather commence, ever again and again, in invitation, bringing our stories, taking ourselves, to the streets, to the places where there are no streets, praying, playing and laboring to come together in, across, through, by our shared otherness, brokenness, vulnerability, as refuge to and for one an-other.

References

- Appiah, K. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Arendt, H. (1967). *The origins of totalitarianism*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.
- Asher, N. (2005). Engaging postcolonial and feminist perspectives for a multicultural education pedagogy, *Teachers College Record*, 107(5), 1079-1106.
- Asher, N. (2006, September). Writing Home/De-Colonizing Text(s). Special lecture, sponsored by the Departments of Arts & Humanities Programs in English and Social Studies and of Curriculum & Teaching, at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Benhabib, S. (2006). The philosophical foundations of cosmopolitan norms. In R. Post (Ed.), *Another cosmopolitanism* (pp. 13-44). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Bernstein, R. (1991). *The new constellation: The ethical-political horizons of modernity/post-modernity*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Boler, M. (2004). *Democratic dialogue in education: Troubling speech, disturbing silence*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Butler, J. (2005). *Giving an account of oneself*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Critchley, S., & Kearney, R. (2006). Preface. In J. Derrida, *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness* (p. vii-xii). (M. Dooley and M. Hughes, Trans.) NY: Routledge. (Original work published 1997)
- Dalai Lama. (2007, October). Peace and Prosperity. Public lecture, presented at Radio City Music Hall, New York City, New York.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other People's Children*. New York: The New Press.
- Derrida, J. (1988). *The ear of the other: Otobiography, transference, translation: Texts and discussions*. (P. Kamuf, Trans.). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press. (Original work published 1985)
- Derrida, J. (1990). Force of law: "The mystical foundation of authority." *Cardozo Law Review*, 11(5-6), 919-1044.
- Derrida, J. (2000). Step of hospitality/No hospitality. In A. Dufourmantelle & J. Derrida (Eds.), *Of hospitality* (pp. 75-160). (R. Bowlby, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1997)
- Derrida, J. (2002). Hostipitality. In G. Anidjar (Ed.), *Acts of religion* (pp. 356-420). New York: Routledge.
- Derrida, J. (2006). *On cosmopolitanism and forgiveness*. (M. Dooley and M. Hughes, Trans.) NY: Routledge. (Original work published 1997)

- Doll, W. E., Jr. (2008, January). Graduate Seminar Class Lecture, Bending Time, held at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
- Douglas, J.D. (Ed.). (1962). *New bible dictionary*. (2nd Ed.). Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Eg ea-Kuehne, D. (2008, March). Interculturality as an Emerging Theme in International Education: EU's "2008: The Year of Intercultural Dialogue." Chair, Symposium and paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference, New York City, New York.
- Eisenstadt, O. (2003, Winter). The problem of the promise: Derrida on Levinas on cities of refuge. *Cross Currents*, 52(4), 474-482.
- Freire, P. (1995). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. (M. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Continuum. (Original work published 1970)
- Forsthoefel, T. (2006). *Soulsong: Seeking holiness, coming home*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Gaudelli, W. (2007, February). Discussant Response, on D. Hansen's, The Idea of a Cosmopolitan Education as a Response to a Changing World. Special lecture, sponsored by the Boston Research Center for the 21st Century and the Philosophy and Education Program at Teachers College, presented at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Gough, N. (2002). The long arm(s) of globalization: Transnational imaginaries in curriculum work. In W. E. Doll, Jr., and N. Gough (Eds.), *Curriculum visions* (pp. 167-178). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Gough, N. (2004). A vision for transnational curriculum inquiry. *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 1(1) <http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci>.
- Greene, M. (1973). *Teacher as stranger: Educational philosophy for the modern age*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Greene, M. (1978). *Landscapes of learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, M. (2008a, March). Pedagogies of Thought. Paper presented on the occasion of her 90th birthday at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Greene, M. (2008b, March). The Poet, the City and Curriculum. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (AAACS) Conference, New York.
- Hanh, Thich Nhat. (1999). *Going home: Jesus and Buddha as brothers*. NY: The Berkley Publishing Group.
- Hansen, D. (2007, February). The Idea of a Cosmopolitan Education as a Response to a Changing World. Special lecture, sponsored by the Boston Research Center for the 21st Century and the Philosophy and Education Program at Teachers College, presented at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Hansen, D. (2008). Curriculum and the idea of a cosmopolitan inheritance, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 40(3), 289-312.
- Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and time*. (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). San Francisco: Harper & Row. (Original work published 1927)
- Held, D. (1995). Democracy and the new international order. In D. Archibugi and D. Held (Eds.), *Cosmopolitan democracy*. Cambridge, ENGLAND: Polity Press.
- Held, D. (1996). *Models of democracy* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge, ENGLAND: Polity Press.
- Henry, J. (1963). *Culture against man*. New York: Random House.
- The Holy Bible. (expanded ed.). (1985). New York: Thomas Nelson.
- Horton, M., & Freire, P. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Huebner, D. (1999). *The lure of the transcendent*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ibrahim, A. (2005). The question of the question is the foreigner: Towards an economy of hospitality, *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing*, 4(21), 149-162.
- Jardine, D. (1992). Reflections on education, hermeneutics, and ambiguity: Hermeneutics as a restoring of life to its original difficulty. In Pinar, W. & Reynolds, W. (Eds.), *Understanding curriculum as phenomenological and deconstructed text* (pp. 116-127). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Kameniar, B. (2007). Dilemmas in providing hospitality to others in the classroom: Stories about one Christian religious education teacher, *Transnational Curriculum Inquiry*, 4(3), <http://nitinat.library.ubc.ca/ojs/index.php/tci>.
- Kant, I. (1972). *Perpetual peace; A philosophical essay*. (M. C. Smith, Trans.). New York: Garland. (Original work published 1795)
- King, Jr., M.L. (http://www.wisdomquotes.com/cat_justice.html)
- Kliebard, H. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958, third edition*. New York: Routledge.
- Kliewer, C. (1998). *Schooling children with down syndrome: Toward an understanding of possibility*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Knippenberg, J. (1989, November). Moving beyond fear: Rousseau and Kant on cosmopolitan education. *Journal of Politics*, 51(4), 809-827.
- Kohli, W. (2008, March). Discussant Response, on M. Greene's The Poet, the City and Curriculum. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (AAACS) Conference, New York.
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Kozol, J. (2007). *Letters to a young teacher*. New York: Crown Publishers.
- Laing, R. (1967). *The politics of experience*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Lareau, A. (2003). *Unequal childhoods: Class, race, and family life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lather, P. (1996). *Troubling clarity: The politics of accessible language*. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66(3), 525-545.
- Lather, P. (2007) *Getting lost: Feminist efforts toward a double(d) science*. Albany NY: SUNY Press.
- Leonardo, Z. (2007). The war on schools: NCLB, nation creation and the educational construction of whiteness. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 10, 261-278.
- Levinas, E. (1994). *Totality and infinity*. (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press. (Original work published 1961)
- Machado, A. (1982). *Selected poems*. (A. Trueblood, Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- McCarthy, C. (1990). *Race and curriculum: Social inequality and the theories and politics of difference in contemporary research on schooling*. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.
- Nasaw, D. (1979). *Schooled to order: A social history of schooling in the United States*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. NY: Teachers College Press.
- Nouwen, H. (2002). *Life of the beloved: Spiritual living in a secular world* (p. 88). New York: Crossroad Publishing. (Original work published 1992)
- Nussbaum, M. (1997). *Cultivating humanity: a classical defense of reform in liberal education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- 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. (2006). Education for democratic citizenship: A review of research, policy and practice. *Research Papers in Education*, 21(4), 433-466.
- Oxford English dictionary (2nd. ed.). (1989). (J. Simpson & E. Weiner, Eds.). Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Papastephanou, M. (2002). Arrows not yet fired: Cultivating cosmopolitanism through education. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 36(1), 69-86.
- Pinar, W. (Ed.). (2003). *International handbook of curriculum research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Pinar, W. (2006, May). 'Bildung' and the Internationalization of Curriculum Studies. Paper presented at the International Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (IAACS) Third World Conference, Tampere, Finland.
- Pinar, W. (2008, March). On the Worldliness of Curriculum Studies: Identity Politics, Autobiography, Cosmopolitanism. Paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Curriculum Studies (AAACS) Conference, New York City, New York.
- Pinar, W. (2009). *The worldliness of a cosmopolitan education: Passionate lives in public service*. NY: Routledge.
- Pinar, W., & Grunet, M. (1976). *Toward a poor curriculum*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co.
- Pinar, W., Reynolds, W., Slattery, P., & Taubman, P. (1995). *Understanding curriculum: An introduction to the study of historical and contemporary curriculum discourses*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Polakow, V. (1993). *Lives on the edge: Single mothers and their children in the other America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Quinn, M. (2001). *Going out, not knowing whither: Education, the upward journey and the faith of reason*. NY: Peter Lang.
- Quinn, M. (2003). Getting Thrown Around: Little Girls and Cheerleading. Taboo: *The Journal of Culture and Education*. 7(2), 7-24.
- Quinn, M. (in press), 'No room in the inn'? The question of hospitality in the post-(partum) labors of curriculum studies. In E. Malewski (Ed.), *Articulating the present (next) moment in curriculum studies: The post-reconceptualization generation(s)*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishing.
- Quinn, M. (2006, June). On city waiting. Unpublished manuscript.
- Quinn, M. (2008, February 10). On city wandering. Unpublished manuscript.
- Quinn, M., & Shah, A. (2008). The 'mystical foundation' of multiculturalism? Cultivating cosmopolitan consciousness & democratic dialogue in curriculum and pedagogy. Unpublished manuscript.
- Random House unabridged dictionary. (2006). New York: Random House.
- Ricoeur, P. (1996). Reflections on a new ethos for Europe. In, R. Kearney (Ed.), *The hermeneutics of action*. London: Sage.
- Saito, H. (2008, March). Re-Envisioning Cosmopolitan Education. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference (AERA), New York City, New York.
- Serres, M. (1989). *Detachment*. (G. James & R. Federman, Trans.). Athens, OH: Ohio University Press. (Original work published 1986)

- Serres, M. (1997). *The troubadour of knowledge*. (S. F. Glaser & W. Paulson, Trans.). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. (Original work published 1991)
- Snauwaert, D. (2002). Cosmopolitan democracy and democratic education, *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 4(2), 5-15.
- Snauwaert, D. (2006, October). *Cosmopolitan Ethics and Being Peace: The Relationship between Spirituality, Justice and Peace*. Special lecture in the Educating for Global Peace: Spiritual & Ethical Perspectives on Peace and Justice Lecture series, sponsored by the Peace Education Center at Teachers College and the Biospherical Institute, presented at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.
- Steinberg, S., & Kincheloe, J. (1997). *Kinderculture: The corporate construction of childhood*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Stevenson, N. (2003). Cultural citizenship in the 'cultural' society: A cosmopolitan approach, *Citizenship Studies*, 7(3), 331-348.
- Sutherland, A. (2006). *I was a stranger: A Christian theology of hospitality*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Tate, W., & Anderson, J. (2008). 2008 AERA Program Theme: Research on Schools, Neighborhoods, and Communities: Toward Civic Responsibility, (http://www.aera.net/meetings/Default.aspx?menu_id=342&id=2898). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Tocci, C., Johnson, E., Kontovourki, S., Oppenheim, R., and Quinn, M. (2008). How Does This Impact Students and Teachers? Exploring the 'Significance' of Educational Research in Relation to Curriculum. Unpublished manuscript.
- Waldron, J. (2006). Cosmopolitan norms. In R. Post (Ed.), *Another cosmopolitanism* (pp. 83-101). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Wang, H. (2004). *The call from the stranger on a journey home: Curriculum in a third space*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Westfield, N.L. (2001). *Dear sisters: A womanist practice of hospitality*. Cleveland, OH: The Pilgrim Press.
- Wilbur, R. (1988). "Love Calls Us to the Things of This World," in *New and collected poems* (p. 233-234). New York: Harcourt.

Author

Molly Quinn is associate professor of education in the Department of Curriculum & Teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University, Box 31, 525 West 120th Street, New York, NY 10027, USA; e-mail: quinn@tc.columbia.edu. The author of *Going Out, Not Knowing Whither: Education, the Upward Journey and the Faith of Reason* (NY: Lang, 2001), much of her work as a curriculum theorist engages 'spiritual' and philosophical criticism toward embracing a vision of education that cultivates wholeness, beauty, compassion and social action.