Cosmopolitanism, Citizenship, and Education Through the Lens of John Dewey

9

Jason Beech

Contents

Abstract

This chapter analyses the challenge of educating students in and for a cosmopolitan world. I argue that since students live in a cosmopolitan reality, educational institutions could address productively this challenge by using the everyday experiences of students as a starting point and an input for pedagogic action. I explore Dewey's notions of democracy and experience and reflect upon their implications for the development of pedagogies aimed at the education of young people for living together in a hyperconnected world.

Keywords

Cosmopolitanism – Global citizenship · Dewey · Experience · Democracy and education

J. Beech (✉)
Escuela de Educación, Universidad de San Andrés – CONICET, Victoria, Argentina
e-mail: jbeech@udesa.edu.ar

A. Peterson et al. (eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Citizenship and Education*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67828-3_33

Introduction

This chapter uses some concepts developed by John Dewey to reflect upon the challenge of educating in and for a cosmopolitan world. Specifically, I explore the concepts of experience and democracy, which are central to Dewey's philosophy. I contend that Dewey's ideas could be used to expand pedagogic imaginations in addressing one of the most pressing issues in education today: the need to prepare young people for living together in a hyperconnected world.

The chapter is divided into three sections. In the first section, I analyze the challenges of citizenship education in a cosmopolitan reality, and I sketch the idea that these challenges could be addressed productively by using everyday experiences of students as a starting point for pedagogic action. In the second section, I examine the concepts of democracy and experience in Dewey's writings. In the third section, I revisit some of my initial ideas based on Dewey's work and its implications for the development of pedagogies aimed at education in and for a cosmopolitan reality.

The Challenges of Education in and for a Cosmopolitan World

Citizenship education has always been among the key objectives of educational systems, promoting the kind of knowledge, abilities, and sensibilities that people need to live together with others that are different. However, citizenship education is dynamic. Its aims, and the methodologies that are used to pursue those aims, are transformed as empirical conditions and social values change. Thus, one of the key issues in thinking about citizenship education in the current times is to understand the world in which our students live.

If education is defined as the process through which young people develop the means of orientation (Elías 1994) that will help them interpret and act upon the world, then these means of orientation should be defined in context. In the case of education for living together with others that are different, a key element is to think about who are the others with whom our students interact and those with whom they will interact in the future. This empirical question is followed by an ethical one: How do we want them to connect with these others? What kind of attitudes do we want to promote in those encounters? The last issue is practical and refers to the kind of pedagogic strategies that can be used to promote those dispositions.

In their origins, most educational systems were based on the logic of educating citizens to develop a national identity and loyalty to the homeland. The spatial reference was the nation-state. To know whether the others deserved our respect, compassion, and loyalty, the question was simple and binary, are they our compatriots? This way of approaching citizenship education was rooted in the projects aimed at constructing nation-states and at legitimizing the power of new modes of social organization that included many groups that previously did not have much in common. Rousseau (1966), one of the founders of political nationalism, argued that patriotism was the most heroic of passions and the best way of educating good people. He also asserted that the "feeling of humanity" evaporated and became

feeble when trying to include all humans. He deduced from this reasoning that it was recommendable to limit our "humanity" to our fellow citizens.

Notwithstanding the opinion that one might have of Rousseau's statement and the educational priorities that were deduced from it, what is clear is that the empirical conditions of connectivity have changed profoundly since the times of the French intellectual. If the idea of including all humanity sounded implausible at those times, the current global flows of images, ideas, people, and capital generate a situation in which connectivity among all humans seems to be much more feasible (Appadurai 1996, 2013; Urry 2007; Vertovec 2009), while the notion of having geopolitical territorial boarders that coincide with symbolic identity borders is much more difficult to sustain (Rizvi and Beech 2017).

Nation-states with uniform languages, identities, and cultural experiences, if they ever existed, have become a fiction. The coexistence of different identities, life styles, and cultural preferences within the territories of nation-states and the recognition of these diversities have become a global norm (Rizvi and Beech 2017). Thus, even when senses of belonging to local and national spheres are still important, these are dynamic phenomena that are articulated in new ways in changing empirical conditions of extended connectivity and flows across national borders.

Citizenship education is aimed at promoting the type of knowledge, abilities, and sensibilities that students need to live together with others. Consequently, shifts in conditions of connectivity, mobility, and the growing presence of diversity imply a challenge for the ways in which citizenship education is conceptualized and enacted. How then can we think of citizenship education in a hyperconnected world? To address this issue, I suggest, the first step is to question the idea that globalization is a kind of abstract entity that is "out there," dislocated from everyday social interactions. On the contrary, the phenomena we tend to associate with globalization are part of our everyday lives.

Beck (2006), for example, argues that we live in a "cosmopolitan reality," since we are in continual contact with what we construe as "other cultures." This cosmopolitan reality is not only a reality of the elites or middle classes that have access to leisure travel. Migrations have grown significantly at a global level, and most of those who migrate are escaping conflicts of adverse living conditions, searching for a better life. For many, mobility is not a choice, but it is rather a strategy of survival. Furthermore, cosmopolitan realities influence even those that are immobile and meet "the other" in their own local territories.

In order to conceptualize these realities, Skrbis and Woodward (2013) use the concept of "everyday cosmopolitanism," arguing that most people participate in cosmopolitan encounters in their daily lives. In addition, the increasing global dimension of issues such as equity, justice, security, and sustainability, and the realization of the global scope and origin of the challenges of current times create "a global horizon of experience and expectation" (Beck 2006, p. 73).

People's reactions to everyday cosmopolitanism are varied (Beck 2006; Rizvi and Beech 2017; Skrbis and Woodward 2013). On the one hand, there are positive reactions to the global mobility of people. Many people decide to travel abroad to work, study, or simply to discover new experiences, if they can afford it. Others, that

might not be able to travel, celebrate meeting with different others in their own locales. There are countries that promote global economic exchange, immigration, and some have programs to host refugees that flee from unfavorable conditions at home. However, on the other hand, the growing mobility of people images and objects has created fears and anxieties resulting in xenophobic political views (Appadurai 2006). Opposition to immigration has become widespread in some parts of Europe, the USA, and other places, in some cases related to projects that seek to reaffirm closed and reactionary national, cultural, and/or religious identities (Wodak 2015). The politics of fear towards the other is growing in many parts of the world, aiming at establishing barriers that define who is allowed to move and who is not. Thus, we live in a world with contradictory views on mobilities and its desirability (Rizvi and Beech 2017).

The challenge is even more complex when faced with a context of fragmentation of the public sphere. Borja and Castells (1997) argue that processes of urbanization have augmented ethnic pluralities in big cities through intranational and international migration. Contemporary migration processes have certain characteristics that pose huge challenges to social cohesion. The combination of migrations with digital media result in what Appadurai (1996) calls diasporic public spheres, since migrant groups can stay in permanent contact with their "culture" of origin, reducing the need to "adapt" to the locale in which they now live. This creates a new order of instabilities in the constitution of subjectivities and collective identities. In addition, ethnic minorities tend to concentrate in specific areas of global cities, where they sometime become the majority of the population. As noted by Borja and Castells (1997): "spatial segregation based on cultural and ethnic characteristics of the population is not the inheritance of a discriminatory past, but rather a fundamental trait of cities in contemporary societies: the global information age is also the age of local segregation" (p. 4 – my own translation).

Urban segregation and the dynamics of digital communications that tend to the fragmentation and isolation of ethnic and political identities contribute to the development of extreme and closed political positions. This creates a challenge for the construction of communities that are open to dialogue in difference, and for democratic coexistence. As Arendt (1958, p. 57) noted, many years ago "The end of the common world has come when it is seen only under one aspect and is permitted to present itself in only one perspective."

Global mobilities, everyday cosmopolitanism, and the political debates that these realities trigger have a significant impact on education. Educators have the challenge of helping students understand and interpret a complex world in which mobility of people, images, imaginaries, ideas, and capital are happening at a scale never before experimented and are considered to be desirable by some but are feared by others. How can schools help young people to develop a moral sensibility towards the type of cultural exchanges that have become a constitutive part of their daily lives? How to promote democratic living together in a world in which the encounter with the other is frequent and inevitable, but the public sphere has weakened and conversation with those that different perspectives and positions is the exception?

Although there is no univocal or definitive answer to these questions, Rizvi and Beech (2017) have suggested that a possible approach is to consider the daily experiences of students as a starting point for pedagogic practices that promote citizenship education in and for a cosmopolitan world. To explore this approach, in the next section I discuss some concepts in the work of John Dewey.

Experience and Democracy in the Philosophy of John Dewey

In the preface to his book *Democracy and Education*, Dewey (1916, p. 4) suggested that "the philosophy stated in this book connects the growth of democracy with the development of the experimental method in the sciences, evolutionary ideas in the biological sciences, and the industrial reorganization." According to Dewey, these developments were key in promoting the transformations that were taking place in the US society at the beginning of the twentieth century. Thus, when relating education with democracy, Dewey was not developing a theory of democratic education or a version of citizenship education but rather a much broader philosophy for education in general (Quay 2016). The subtitle of the book – *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* – is quite eloquent in this sense. As Quay (2016) argues, Dewey's project aimed at a philosophical reflection on the kind of reforms that should be made in education to go along with the significant social changes of the time.

Thus, when thinking about the relation between education and democracy in Dewey's work, it is important to understand that his writings encompassed much more than citizenship education, addressing the role of education in the development of individuals and society. As Biesta and Lawy (2006, p. 65) notes "democracy is not confined to the sphere of political decision-making but extends to participation in the 'construction, maintenance and transformation' of all forms of social and political life."

One of the key issues in Dewey's analysis of the relation between education and democracy is the dynamism of societies and its implications for education. He criticized what he called traditional education for being anchored in the past and being unable to apprehend the waves of social change that were taking place in his times. He had a very critical view of the contents of traditional education:

> that which is taught is thought of as essentially static. It is taught as a finished product, with little regard either to the ways in which it was originally built up or to changes that will surely occur in the future. It is to a large extent the cultural product of societies that assumed the future would be much like the past, and yet it is used as educational food in a society where change is the rule, not the exception. (Dewey 1938/1997, p. 19)

Dewey's focus on the relation between education and social change in moments of significant transformations makes his work very relevant to analyze the type of challenges that education is facing today in terms of educating young people in and for a cosmopolitan world.

Dewey noted how the technological changes of his times, such as access to automobiles, cinema, and radio, broadened the horizons of experience and aspirations of children and people in general. In this way, he noted that there was a direct relation between technological changes and transformations in the ways in which people related to their environment and other people, creating new challenges for social cohesion (Quay 2016). It was in this spirit that Dewey construed the challenges that democracy posed to education. In order to survive, democracy had to be dynamic, and education is a fundamental strategy to foster the kind of change that sustains democracy. Dewey (1937/1985) noted that "the greatest mistake that we can make about democracy is to conceive of it as something fixed, fixed in idea and fixed in its outward manifestation" (p. 138).

The fundamental unity of Dewey's philosophy was found in understanding the relation between experience and education (Dewey 1938/1997). Experience is what permits a close connection between theory (reasoning) and practice (Quay 2016). Thus, the development of a theory of experience was central in his philosophical and pedagogical writings. Dewey promoted a progressive education that should be based on the daily experiences of students. Consequently, he argued that any "practical attempts to develop schools based upon the idea that education is found in life-experience are bound to exhibit inconsistencies and confusions unless they are guided by some conception of what experience is" (Dewey 1938/1997, p. 51). The solution to this problem resided in the development of a profound philosophy of the social factors that operate in the construction of individual experiences (Dewey 1938/1997). He identified two key factors that influence experiences.

The first of these factors is, according to Dewey, the principle of continuity. The continuity of experience implies that each experience that an individual has is built upon experiences that the person had in the past, and at the same time modifies in some way future experiences. This implies that the central aim of an education based on experience is to intervene on the effects that a given experience of the student will have on his or her future experiences. Dewey stressed that a fundamental role of educators is to define which kind of experiences contribute to the positive development of the student and which do not.

> Growth, or growing as developing, not only physically but intellectually and morally, is one exemplification of the principle of continuity. The objection made is that growth might take many different directions: a man, for example, who starts out on a career of burglary may grow in that direction, and by practice may grow into a highly expert burglar. Hence it is argued that "growth" is not enough; we must also specify the direction in which growth takes place, the end towards which it tends. (Dewey 1938/1997, p. 36)

In that sense, for Dewey, the intervention of the educator is the key in influencing the direction that growth will take, since each experience is a "moving force," and its value can only be judged in terms of the direction that that movement takes. Thus, it is "the business of the educator to see in what direction an experience is heading" (Dewey 1938/1997, p. 38).

The second factor that operates in the construction of experience according to Dewey's theory is the principle of interaction. This principle is based on the notion that experiences take place in a given context. Experiences imply an interaction between an individual and its environment. There is a subjective or individual aspect and another contextual or external one that interact to constitute an experience.

> The word "interaction," which has just been used, expresses the second chief principle for interpreting an experience in its educational function and force. It assigns equal rights to both factors in experience—objective and internal conditions. Any normal experience is an interplay of these two sets of conditions. (Dewey 1938/1997, p. 42)

Thus, experiences are not constituted solely in the body and the mind of a person. They do not happen in a vacuum. They are partly constructed by the elements that are outside the individual. The environment of experience can manifest in diverse ways, and it is comprised of elements such as the people with whom the individual interacts, the themes in the conversations they have, materials such as books or toys, the location, etc. (Dewey 1938/1997).

The transactional characteristic of experience creates a challenge for teachers that must generate a "connection between the child and his [sic] environment as complete and intelligent as possible" (Dewey and Dewey 1915/1972, p. 390). Teachers must learn how to use the material and social context that is available to extract from it everything that could constitute a virtuous experience for students. Dewey stresses that given this challenge, what he calls progressive education is much more difficult to accomplish than traditional education (Dewey 1938/1997).

In this way, Dewey suggests that the principle of continuity and the principle of interaction are closely related and should not be seen as different aspects. They are the "longitudinal and lateral aspects" of experience. Given the principle of continuity, when a person passes from one experience to the next one, what (s)he has lived and learned in the first situation becomes an instrument to understand and act upon the following situation. Thus, there is not only change in the individual but also in the ways in which (s)he interprets the environment. In this way, continuity and interaction taken as a unified process define the relevance and educational value of an experience.

At the same time, Dewey's notion of progressive education implies a particular relation with temporality. One of his most well-known statements is the one that suggests that education is not preparation for life, that education is life itself.

> The ideal of using the present simply to get ready for the future contradicts itself. It omits, and even shuts out, the very conditions by which a person can be prepared for his future. We always live at the time we live and not at some other time, and only by extracting at each present time the full meaning of each present experience are we prepared for doing the same thing in the future. (Dewey 1938/1997, p. 49)

Dewey argues that education must be centered on current experiences of students as fundamental material for its intellectual, physical, and moral growth. Teachers

must help students develop the ability to make sense of their experiences at a moral and cognitive level, so that they can also use it independently in future experiences.

Dewey did not elaborate in his work a detailed pedagogic method to obtain the kind of educational effects he expected from experiences (Quay 2016). However, he did provide some ideas linked with the relevance of reflexivity and with the role of teachers that are worth exploring in more detail since they can provide a source of inspiration for the development of pedagogies aimed at education in and for a cosmopolitan reality.

Dewey highlighted the importance of promoting reflection on experiences so that these could be educationally relevant. For an experience to have an educational value, it should tend towards a more profound knowledge of facts and to the development of new ideas (Dewey 1938/1997).

> To reflect is to look back over what has been done so as to extract the net meanings which are the capital stock for intelligent dealing with further experiences. It is the heart of intellectual organization and of the disciplined mind. (Dewey 1938/1997, p. 86)

The relevance of promoting a reflexive attitude towards experiences stresses the importance of the role of teachers. For Dewey progressive education based on experience should not be seen as foreign to organization and planning. It does not imply that the teacher leaves its students to develop knowledge and abilities in an unstructured mode. On the contrary, the role of teachers is fundamental, even if the style of their work is different from what they do in traditional education. The teacher is no longer in the position of "external boss or dictator but takes on that of leader of group activities" (Dewey 1938/1997, p. 59).

Freedom should not be understood as an end in itself. The lack of all kinds of restrictions could be negative and destructive for cooperative activities and could result in a negative kind of freedom. He gave the example of a game or a sport in which children need certain rules that define restrictions to behavior to be able to play. Without those restrictions, a state of absolute freedom becomes detrimental for social relations and for cooperative activities. The freedom that matters is "a freedom which is power: power to frame purposes, to judge wisely, to evaluate desires by the consequences which will result from acting upon them; power to select and order means to carry chosen ends into operation" (Dewey 1938/1997, p. 63). The ideal of education is to develop the power for self-control, but if we simply remove all type of external control there is no guarantee that self-control will be developed.

Thus, Dewey reminds us that the guide of the teacher contributes to the development of the kind of freedom that matters. Sometimes, based on simplistic readings of progressive education, teachers might think that intervention and restricting the conduct of their students might be negative, risky, or even authoritarian. Dewey mentions cases in which, in the name of promoting freedom, teachers leave their students on their own surrounded by objects and materials without providing them with guidelines regarding how they can make good use of those materials or the kind of activities that they should perform. Reflecting on this kind of situations he sustains that it "is impossible to understand why a suggestion from one who has a larger

experience and a wider horizon should not be at least as valid as a suggestion arising from some more or less accidental source" (Dewey 1938/1997, p. 71). Of course those teachers can also abuse of their positions and force students towards channels that pursue their own objectives, rather than the well-being and the moral, physical, and cognitive development of students. But the way to avoid this kind of negative situation is not to renounce to the power and obligation that the adult has to plan educational activities and guide students. "The plan, in other words, is a co-operative enterprise, not a dictation. The teacher's suggestion is not a mold for a cast-iron result but is a starting point to be developed into a plan through contributions from the experience of all engaged in the learning process." (p. 72).

Therefore, from this brief review of some of the central concepts in Dewey's pedagogical theories, we can extract some principles to think more profoundly about the challenge of educating in and for a cosmopolitan world. These are: a broad conception of the relation between education and democracy, the dynamism of democracy, the significance of using present experiences of students as an input for their education, the principles of continuity and interaction as factors that define experience, and the importance of promoting reflexivity and rethinking the role of teachers.

Revisiting the Challenges of Educating in and for a Cosmopolitan World Through the Lens of Dewey's Philosophy

In this final part, I will reflect upon the relevance of Dewey's philosophical concepts for the challenge of educating young people in and for a cosmopolitan reality. It might be worth clarifying that I will not present a series of detailed recipes for pedagogic action, since that would be in contradiction with the main principle that I want to put forward: that it is the actual everyday cosmopolitan experiences of students that should be the starting point for democratic education. Experiences are constructed through interaction between individuals and their environments, consequently pedagogic strategies aimed at using experiences as a fundamental element should be adapted to the specific experiences available to students (and teachers) in their context.

The first aspect I want to emphasize is the focus in education for democracy. As I mentioned when analyzing the link between education and democracy in Dewey, it is important to have a broad conception of education for democracy, to avoid what could be called a narrow perspective of its relevance. In other words, we should not think that education for democracy is the task of a few school subjects or curricular compartments that formally are in charge of the issue. Education for democracy is what makes the school meaningful; it is related to the ontological aims of education (Dewey 1916; Quay 2015), or what Jackson (2012) calls transformative educational traditions. Education for democracy is the most profound aim of education: the transformation of the self. The project of converting the other into something different. I suggest that an education for democracy is a way of conceptualizing this project, and consequently it cannot be reduced to a few school spaces and times.

In terms of the curriculum, it is also necessary to open the "curricular cage" of citizenship education, understanding that all school subjects contribute to this central role of schools. I am not only referring to the principle that all teachers should be aware of their role as educators that exceeds teaching history or physics but rather to the notion that the categories and concepts that students learn through the school disciplines to understand, interpret, and act upon the world are a fundamental input when people define their ethical positions. The disciplines are not exempt from values, and school contents are not neutral. Consequently, the development of an education for democracy in a cosmopolitan world requires a revision of disciplinary contents to assess the kind of political and ethical values that they promote.

In his great book, *Learning to divide the world,* Willinsky (1998) argues that attitudes of negative discrimination towards others are not the result of ignorance but rather of the education that we receive. He shows how many of the categories we use to classify the world and populations that are still taught in schools were created during the times of the great European empires and their colonial projects. In this way, he argues, educational systems keep reproducing ethnocentric views of the world and stereotypes that are the breeding ground for negative discrimination towards certain groups.

Thus, the concepts and ways of representing the world that are learned in the different school subjects have a great impact on the ways in which we conceptualize the world, construct our collective identities, and develop our views on others that are different. For example, school textbooks for primary schools in Argentina offer definitions of the notion of globalization such as this:

> It can be said that globalization consists of a set of strategies that tend to consolidate the hegemony of the big industrial, financial, and media corporations, whose aim is to appropriate the natural and cultural resources of poor countries. . . (Kapelusz 2001, p. 293)

It is clear that the process of globalization can be associated with modes of economic, political, and cultural domination, and it is important that students learn about global inequalities and how they are based on historical configurations of international relations at a global level. Yet, this kind of ultra-simplified and biased definition not only omits a significant and valuable part of global exchanges but also seems to be quite negative in terms of promoting a morally productive attitude towards cosmopolitan encounters and global processes.

In any case, global inequalities rather than being presented exclusively from a defensive perspective that promotes closure should be the object of reflexive practices, promoting the analysis of international power relations, inequalities and injustices, and the evaluation of the political position of students, their representations, imaginaries, and desires related to these issues. Dewey's notion of the importance of experience as a fundamental pedagogic input can be a valuable resource to contribute to the reflexivity of students and to the analysis of how global flows and their consequences impact on their own life and their communities. Global processes should be studied in their complexity, understanding their historical construction with the aim of generating the conditions for students to imagine a more just global order.

Another relevant aspect that Dewey contributes to this discussion is the dynamism of democracy as a concept, both as an ideal and in terms of its empirical manifestations. This is linked to what Beck (2006) identifies as the emergence of a cosmopolitan reality in current times. We live in an interconnected world in which the definition of collective identities, symbolic borders, and the idea of a common ground for living together are being questioned and are unstable and dynamic. It is a world of permanent change, complex, and chaotic. This is the reality in which students live. It is the world that they must understand to be able to act upon it. Thus, our pedagogic strategies should have the capacity to bring those complex and dynamic realities into the processes of teaching and learning.

In this sense, Dewey's perspectives imply a significant change in the traditional way in which schools have addressed issues related with the moral development of student. Pedagogic strategies often take abstract normative declarations as a starting point: the Constitution, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, or others (Rizvi and Beech 2017; Todd 2009, 2013; Wahlstrom 2014). Of course that it is important that students learn about these regulations. The challenge is how to introduce them into the content of these norms in ways in which they can develop an interpretation of how the normative and ethical principles that are included in regulations relate to their everyday experiences and ethical decisions, so that they can use them productively in their future experiences.

However, when these declarations are presented to students in an abstract form, it is difficult for students to link them to their actual everyday experiences. We can easily fall into a style of teaching that promotes decontextualized learning of these norms if we simply present to students a list of principles that define the behavior of a good citizen. In this way, we generate idealized moral constructions that do not exist and cannot exist in reality, since no person can always abide by every rule that (s)he would agree with in an abstract form.

Moral conflicts and contradictions are inherent to human behavior. It is not so difficult to agree on a set of common ethical principles in abstract. The everyday practical challenge is that the borders between those principles are not always clear and the problem is not only to abide by an abstract moral order or not. We are many times faced with the dilemma of making decisions in which we must choose between violating one ethical norm or another, both of which we would agree with in abstract. For example, most people would agree that lying is wrong, and that hurting someone else's feelings is also bad. The practical problem is that many times we are faced with a situation in which one of these rules will be broken, and we need to decide in a second which one to break.

Our students are already citizens that participate in interactions with others and in cosmopolitan encounters, and consequently they are permanently faced with moral dilemmas and ethical decisions. Based on Dewey's notion of the educational potential of experience, the question then is how we can have pedagogic strategies that link the conversations on normative declarations with everyday moral experiences of students, opening the possibility for reflection and moral evaluation of their actions and decisions, and having an impact on future experiences and ethical behavior. In other words, what I am suggesting is that pedagogic strategies for

citizenship education take as a starting point the experiences of students, of teachers, or even other experiences that could be similar to those lived by students and are documented in cultural productions, such as movies or books (Rizvi and Beech 2017).

As argued by Rizvi and Beech (2017), once experiences of encounters with others are made visible, the next step is to promote reflexive and critical evaluation of these experiences. The ethical evaluation of our own conduct and decisions should avoid falling into a simplistic binary good-bad analysis (although of course in some cases, it might be quite clear that certain attitudes or behaviors can be classified as being good or bad). On the contrary, everyday experiences should be debated in their complexity, making students aware of how moral everyday decisions can bring certain values of rights of different groups into conflict.

I suggest that by identifying everyday experiences, and promoting a critical and complex reflexive attitude and moral evaluation of these experiences, it is possible for students to develop the capacities to relate to normative and ethical principles in a more productive and contextualized from. Instead of students learning about important normative declarations in an abstract form, they would be able to link these norms with their everyday life and decisions and, in this way, their interpretations of previous experiences could become a guide for action, generating the reflexive capacity to relate their daily actions with the construction of a more just global order.

As Dewey notes, enacting these types of pedagogic strategies is complex and more difficult than simply teaching students to memorize the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (to caricaturize what Dewey called traditional education). The role of teachers change but in no way are they less involved with the learning process. On the contrary, it is fundamental that teachers construct a scenario to make the experiences of students visible and to promote a profound and significant reflection so that the process can have an impact on future daily experiences of students. Teachers are challenged with the need to find a fine balance between being the guide that the learning process requires and allowing at the same time for students to contribute to the proposed activity. This implies revising the ways in which we relate with knowledge, certainty, authority, and agreement. It is not an easy challenge.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I have defined citizenship education as the part of education aimed at developing the kind of knowledge, abilities, and sensibilities that students need to live with others. I also suggested that citizenship education is dynamic and should be adjusted as empirical conditions and social values change. Consequently, in order to define the kind of citizenship education that should be promoted, it is key to understand the world in which students live.

Recent changes in connectivity, mobility, and the ways in which diversity is valued imply significant shifts in terms of the kind of encounters with others that people have and will have in the future. Thus, citizenship education needs to be

rethought. The first step I proposed in that direction is the awareness that students are already living in a cosmopolitan reality in which encounters with different others are part of their daily life. Thus, rather than presenting students with abstract normative principles about global citizenship, I suggested that their everyday cosmopolitan experiences could be used as a starting point for the development of pedagogies aimed at education in and for a cosmopolitan reality.

To further explore this pedagogic principle, I argued that Dewey's notions of experience and democracy as potentially potent inputs to design pedagogies aimed at a type of citizenship education that can dynamically adapt to different empirical realities, using the experiences of students as a source for reflexive learning. In this way, students could develop the ability to relate to ethical principles in more productive and contextualized ways.

I have only reached the stage of proposing a series of pedagogical principles (set at a quit high level of abstraction) for the design of a kind of citizenship education that can address the challenge of preparing young people to live together with others in a cosmopolitan reality. Partly because it would be contradictory with this approach to give a detailed recipe for pedagogic action, when my main argument is that ethical learning should be contextualized. But also because educating for democracy in and for a cosmopolitan world is one of those challenges that some authors call "wicked problems" (Rittel and Webber 1973). It is one of those problems that, given its nature, it can never be fully solved. The challenge of educating good citizens does not have an end. We will never reach a moment in which we will be satisfied. Because it is a contested issue and we will not all agree exactly on what being a good citizen entails, and even if we agreed, there will always be room for improvement. Thus, education in and for a cosmopolitan world is a never-ending project that requires permanent attention and effort both at an individual and at a collective level.

References

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

Appadurai, A. (2006). *Fear of small numbers*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Appadurai, A. (2013). *Future as Cultural Fact: Essays on the Global Condition*. New York: Routledge.

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

Beck, U. (2006). *Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Biesta, G., & Lawy, R. (2006). From teaching citizenship to learning democracy: Overcoming individualism in research, policy and practice. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 36*(1), 63–79.

Borja, J., & Castells, M. (1997). *La ciudad multicultural*. La Factoría. No 2, Availabe from www.lafactoriaweb.com/articulos/borjacas2.htm

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1937/1985). *The challenge of democracy to education*. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), The Later Works of John Dewey, 1925–1953 (Vol. 11). Carbondale.

Dewey, J. (1938/1997). *Experience and education*. New York: Touchstone.

Dewey, J., & Dewey, E. (1915/1972). Schools of tomorrow. In J. A. Boydston (Ed.), *The middle works of John Dewey, 1899–1924* (Vol. 8, pp. 206–405). New York: E. P: Dutton & Company.

Elías, N. (1994). *Conocimiento y poder*. Madrid: La Piqueta.
Jackson, P. W. (2012). *What is education?* Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
Kapelusz. (2001). *Ciencias Sociales 9*. Buenos Aires: Kapelusz.
Quay, J. (2015). *Understanding Life in School: From Academic Classroom to Outdoor Education*. London: Palgrave MacMillian.
Quay, J. (2016). Not 'democratic education' but 'democracy and education': Reconsidering Dewey's oft misunderstood introduction to the philosophy of education. *Educational Philosphy and Theory, 48*(10), 1013–1028. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131857.2016.1174098.
Rittel, H. W. J., & Webber, M. M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences, 4*, 155–169.
Rizvi, F., & Beech, J. (2017). Global mobilities and the possibilities of a cosmopolitan curriculum. *Curriculum Inquiry, 47*(1), 125–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.2016.1254500.
Rousseau, J. (1966). A discourse on political economy. In J. Rousseau (Ed.), *The social contract and discourses*. London: J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd.
Skrbis, Z., & Woodward, I. (2013). *Cosmopolitanism: Uses of the idea*. London: Sage.
Todd, S. (2009). *Toward an imperfect education: Facing humanity, rethinking cosmopolitanism*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
Todd, S. (2013). *Difficult conversations, or the difficult task of facing humanity*. Paper presented at the presentation as part of the impossible conversations series, National College of Art and Design, Dublin. http://www.hughlane.ie/phocadownload/exhibitions/cummins_conversation3fin-26.pdf
Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism*. London: Routledge.
Wahlstrom, N. (2014). Toward a conceptual framework for understanding cosmopolitanism on the ground. *Curriculum Inquiry, 44*(1), 113–132.
Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Wodak, R. (2015). *The politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. London: Sage.