

Steven P. CAMICIA, Juanjuan ZHU

Citizenship Education under Discourses of Nationalism, Globalization, and Cosmopolitanism: Illustrations from China and the United States

© Higher Education Press and Springer-Verlag 2011

Abstract The authors, one from China and one from the United States, present a theoretical framework for understanding the discursive fields of citizenship education as composed, in large part, of the discourses of nationalism, globalization, and cosmopolitanism. The framework is illustrated by examples from citizenship education in China and the United States. Citizenship education in these examples is largely influenced by the discourse of nationalism. The discursive fields are fractured, context-specific, and dynamic. In conclusion, the authors call for awareness of how these discourses operate, and propose that the discourses of globalization and cosmopolitanism merge and strengthen within citizenship education. The effect could be a new citizenship education that is responsive to the current needs of local and global democratic communities.

Keywords citizenship education, nationalism, globalization, cosmopolitanism

Introduction

Citizenship education, in one form or another, is embedded in the curriculum of most countries. Our discussion here conceives of citizenship education in a broad sense, incorporating areas such as languages, political science, history, and moral

Received June 2, 2011

Steven P. CAMICIA (✉)

Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services, School of Teacher Education and Leadership, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-2805, USA
E-mail: steven.camicia@usu.edu

Juanjuan ZHU

Emma Eccles Jones College of Education and Human Services, School of Teacher Education and Leadership, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322-2805, USA
E-mail: juanjuan.zhu@aggiemail.usu.edu

education. These parts of the curriculum contain claims about the types, sizes, and qualities of the communities that we live in. The purpose of citizenship education is to teach citizens to make informed decisions that will enable different types of communities to make effective shared solutions to social problems. This paper adds to discussions about the purpose of citizenship education by conceptualizing the ways in which citizenship education is influenced by discourses of nationalism, globalization, and cosmopolitanism. Brief examples are provided from China and the United States in an effort to illustrate our theoretical framework. This is not intended as a comparison between the two countries but rather as a snapshot of the ways such discourses influence different disciplines of citizenship education in different locations. In this paper, the authors ask, “How do the discourses of nationalism, globalization, and cosmopolitanism function on the discursive fields of citizenship education?” This investigation of the evidence helps to expand conversations about the influences of global discourses on citizenship education in different countries.

Discourses in Citizenship Education

Two perspectives guided our investigation. The first involves critical and postmodern understandings of discourse. In China and the United States, discourses surrounding citizenship education have been influential in shaping conversations and understandings of the quality and scope of local and global communities. This paper paid particular attention to discourses of nationalism, globalization, and cosmopolitanism.

The second perspective involves new understandings of how these discourses interact on a global discursive field (Camicia & Franklin, 2010, in press). Power relations between discourses are asymmetrical, or put another way, some discourses are more influential in changing policy and curriculum than others. The degree to which a discourse such as nationalism has the power to shape policy will depend on the context in which the discourse operates. In order to understand how they operate, it is important to show how they morph in different locations and communities. For example, Law (2007) has illustrated how the discourse of cosmopolitanism in citizenship education is unique to Shanghai. Each location and context in the world influences and is influenced by discourses differently, resulting in not one, but a dynamic mix of discourses that shapes citizenship education.

Discourse

As a conceptual lens, discourse helps in understanding citizenship education and

reforms because it focuses on the rules of what and how speech is interwoven with social relations and ideologies. Because social relations are central to topics of citizenship education, how ideology and language influence these relations is of central importance. Citizenship education is governed by discourses that influence the way local and global communities are conceptualized, and as a result, the way that citizenship is conceptualized. Mills (1997) provides an operational definition of discourse:

A discourse is not a disembodied collection of statements, but groupings of utterances or sentences, statements which are enacted within a social context, which are determined by that social context and which contribute to the way that social context continues its existence. Institutions and social context therefore play an important determining role in the development, maintenance and circulation of discourses. (p. 11)

Wodak (2001a) echoes this definition by describing discourse as a thematically bundled group of statements. These themes are reflective of ideological stances. In her description of critical linguists, Wodak (2001b) writes that they take “into account the insights that discourse is structured by dominance; that every discourse is historically produced and interpreted, that is, it is situated in time and space; and that dominance structures are legitimated by ideologies of powerful groups” (p. 3). In our theoretical framework, we are particularly interested in the ways that discourses of nationalism, globalization, and cosmopolitanism influence citizenship education in different contexts and locations.

Discourses of Nationalism, Globalization, and Cosmopolitanism

The discourse of nationalism is ubiquitous in citizenship education. Citizenship education has been traditionally influenced by the intent to bolster national identity. With the inception of modern nation-states, citizenship education has been the primary tool for creating “imagined communities” (Anderson, 1991, 2005). Anderson’s studies have illustrated how education and mass media have created powerful discourses that define nation-states as unique and different from “other” nation-states. Citizenship education often articulates visions of the nation, visions that emphasize exceptionality, pride, and national unity. This is most evident in history curricula which construct a national identity through narrative, something Wertsch (2002) calls “collective remembering.” A prominent part of these narratives is the construction of clear divisions between those identified as belonging to the national community and those who do not (Torsti, 2007). The discourse of nationalism places the nation state as the lens through which the world is viewed, in which all actions, both local and global, are there to

strengthen the nation state.

However, the discourse of nationalism does not function in isolation. It is influenced by increased flows of capital, ideas, and people across geopolitical boundaries. Rather than having complete power over citizenship education, discourses such as those of globalization and cosmopolitanism have created new conceptions of citizenship (Castles & Davidson, 2000; Ong, 1999, 2006). Held, McGrew, Goldblatt and Perraton (1999) define globalization as:

a process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions—assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact—generating transcontinental or interregional flows and networks of activity, interaction, and the exercise of power. (p. 16)

The discourse of globalization can be found in attempts to call attention to this process and focus upon concepts of global standardization and efficiency (Apple, 2000; Camicia and Franklin, 2010). The discourse of globalization also complicates or challenges traditional assumptions embedded in social theories that privilege a national lens, such as those found under the discourse of nationalism. The implication of globalization is a matter of great debate within social science research communities because it results in the traditional notions of social relations across the globe being challenged (Ritzer, 2007). Educational researchers also question traditional nationalistic lenses within citizenship education (Burbules & Torres, 2000; Capella, 2000; Law, 2004; Myers, 2006; Parker, 2004; Smith, 2003). One of the responses in citizenship education to the discourse of globalization is a shifting focus upon a global rather than a national community. Whether the intents of the curriculum are economic or cultural, calls toward a global understanding of human relations has been on the rise in citizenship education (Bromley, 2009).

The concept of cosmopolitanism has many aspects or, as Vertovec and Cohen (2002) describe, “windows.” These relate to focuses upon different aspects of global relations and various epistemologies concerning the connections between human beings (Benhabib, 2006; Fine, 2007). This is complicated by the fact that, as illustrated by theorists such as Law (2007) and Camicia and Franklin (in press), the discourse of cosmopolitan has different qualities depending upon context and location. For example, the discourse of cosmopolitanism can function differently in citizenship education in urban and rural settings.

For the purposes of this article, a working definition is used that describes the discourse of cosmopolitanism as privileging a global human family or what Nussbaum (1996) refers to as citizens of a global community of human beings. The discourse of cosmopolitanism is often found in the texts of organizations that focus on a global community. As a global community, global issues such as

climate change, resource depletion, pollution, and human rights are central. One of the main goals of global, cosmopolitan education is to help educate citizens of the world to solve problems that humanity shares (Osler & Starkey, 2003). The discourse of cosmopolitanism influences nationalistic discourses because it challenges the parochial, self-centered qualities of the discourse of nationalism.

Finally, the relative power of the discourses to one another is contingent upon what, when, and where people are speaking. Discourses are not equally powerful but embedded in a dynamic network of power relations (Foucault, 1990). Discourses are also fractured and even seemingly coherent bundles of statements can be complicated by different contexts and power relations. For example, as has already been mentioned, the discourse of cosmopolitanism has multiple windows of meaning depending upon the stakeholder, theorist, and contexts (Vertovec & Cohen, 2002). Conceptually, Appiah (1996, 2006) blends the discourses of nationalism and cosmopolitanism into what he terms “rooted cosmopolitanism.” He emphasizes the importance of having a home country and customs while recognizing that humans are part of a larger, global community. His example shows how the power relation between different discourses is rarely a zero sum game. The discourses of nationalism, globalization, and cosmopolitanism blend and morph in citizenship education, creating a postmodern condition of hybridity, fluidity, and multiplicity. Bromley (2009) has reported that textbooks around the globe have increasingly engaged with cosmopolitan concepts and understandings. This illustrates the shifting terrains that the globe is now experiencing in the way that these discourses function in citizenship education.

Steinberg (1999) calls the terrain in which discourses struggle for influence a “discursive field.” The competition between dominant and marginal discourses on a discursive field is governed by power relations or “orders of discourse” (Foucault, 1981). In citizenship education, the discourse of cosmopolitanism can be weakened by an increased sense of national security and unity that some find in the discourse of nationalism. This was illustrated in instructional materials that surfaced after the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States (Hess & Stoddard, 2007).

Finally, discourses operate on a discursive field to privilege some speech while silencing other speech. We conceptualize the absence of discourses as important as the presence of other discourses. What schools do not teach is what Eisner (2002) refers to as the “null curriculum.” He writes:

What schools do not teach may be as important as what they do teach. I argue this position because ignorance is not simply a neutral void; it has important effects on the kinds of options one is able to consider, the alternatives that one can examine, and the perspectives from which one can view a situation or problems. (p. 97)

In what follows, brief examples concerning citizenship education, one from China and one from the United States, are presented. With these examples, we hope to show how educational researchers and educators might be able to identify the discursive fields of citizenship education within various contexts as they are or are not influenced by the discourses of nationalism, globalization, and cosmopolitanism.

China: Citizenship Education for the Construction of a Socialist Harmonious Society

On October 11, 2006, the last day of the sixth closed-door plenum, the 16th Central Committee of the Communist Party of China (CPC) adopted a resolution that specifically addressed “major issues concerning the building of a socialist harmonious society” (Communist Party of China, 2006, October 11). Chinese people from all walks of life were called upon by the Communist Party to align themselves with the newly identified central theme of China’s economic, political, social, and cultural activities (Han, 2008), namely the construction of a socialist harmonious society. One year later, the doctrine of a harmonious socialist society appeared in the amended Constitution of the CPC with its significance reaffirmed at the Party’s 17th National Congress on October 21, 2007 (Communist Party of China, 2007, October 25). As noted by President Hu Jintao during a speech delivered to key leaders at the provincial level at the Central Party School of the CPC, a socialist harmonious society can be characterized by the following six features: democracy and the rule of law, justice and fairness, sincerity and amity, vitality, stability and order, and harmonious co-existence between man and nature (People’s Daily, 2005, February 20).

Within the framework of the socialist harmonious society concept, the government has developed a set of moral values called “Socialist Concepts on Honors and Disgraces,” or “Eight Honors and Eight Shames” in March, 2006, just before the resolution on the overall concept was passed. As components of “the socialist core value system,” which is “essential to cultural harmony in the country” (Xinhua, 2006, October 18), the eight pairs of opposing moral codes in rhyming Chinese constitute the new socialist ethical standards set down by the government. The following is one version of the English translations of the Eight Honors and Eight Shames (Xinhua, 2006, October 18):

Love the country; do it no harm.
Serve the people; never betray them.
Follow science; discard superstition.

Be diligent; not indolent.

Be united, help each other; make no gains at other's expense.

Be honest and trustworthy; do not sacrifice ethics for profit.

Be disciplined and law-abiding; not chaotic and lawless.

Live plainly, work hard; do not wallow in luxuries and pleasures.

Serving as a foundation for socialist citizenship ethics (Boswell, 2007), the list of eight honors and shames was soon promulgated in a large-scaled morality drive to all Chinese. Intensified moral education among citizens, especially among the young generation, ensued.

Both the advancement of the harmonious society concept in general and the promotion of the Socialist Concepts on Honors and Disgraces in particular, seem conducive to the development of citizenship education in China. As President Hu reiterated in his report to the 17th National Congress of CPC, "education about citizenship should be enhanced and socialist concepts of democracy, the rule of law, freedom, equality, equity and justice should be established" (Xinhua, 2007, October 24; Geis & Holt, 2009) in the building of a socialist harmonious society. This remark conveys the important and heartening message that the CPC is about to pay due attention to citizenship education embodying democratic values to meet the needs of a market economy (Liu, 1998) under conditions of globalization. Thus, the discourse of globalization was an underlying rationale for the new citizenship education policy.

Schools and their curricula are particularly important vehicles for the promotion of citizenship education. In terms of explicit curriculum (Eisner, 2002), study materials in various forms such as songs and ballads were developed, for students at all grade levels to learn at school assemblies, class meetings, Chinese lessons and citizenship-education-related courses such as ideo-ethical or ideo-political classes. In terms of the hidden curriculum (Longstreet & Shane, 1993), posters, bulletin boards, blackboard newspapers, and school radios have all functioned as facilitators to assist the dissemination of the harmonious society concept and the Eight Honors and Eight Shames. Undoubtedly, China's citizenship education promoting the Socialist Concepts on Honors and Disgraces in building a socialist harmonious society has the potential to cultivate responsible and morally upright citizens while addressing issues that would threaten the country's unity and development in an era of rapid domestic GDP growth and globalization (Boswell, 2007; Communist Party of China, 2006, October 11; Han, 2008).

However, China's citizenship education effort is not without problems. A closer look at the socialist harmonious society concept and the list of the Eight Honors and Eight Shames reveals that a nationalistic, collectivist discourse of citizenship is extolled instead of a cosmopolitan one. Unfortunately, this

discourse of nationalism runs the risk of negating individual rights and values, homogenizing diverse voices and interests (Feng, 2006; He, 2001; Xinhua, 2007, October 24), as well as limiting Chinese citizens' abilities to navigate the shifting and increasingly interconnected terrains of cultural, political, ecological and economic formations at different levels of the global community.

The discourse of nationalism is clearly articulated in the Eight Honors and Eight Shames. A request for uncritical patriotism and doing the nation no harm is listed as the very first couplet in the set of socialist moral values. This makes a strong statement as to how much the discourse of nationalism is valued by the Chinese government. A narrow focus on national loyalty and a parochial pursuit for national interest conveyed in the slogans, however, seems incompatible with the new demands and situations Chinese citizens face in the context of an increasingly globalized world, given that globalization has rendered national borders porous, blurred, and shifting (Osler & Starkey, 2005) and that citizens currently find themselves operating daily in "overlapping communities of fate" (Held, 2001, as cited in Osler & Starkey, 2003, p. 246): local, regional, national, and international, instead of just within their national borders. The discourses of cosmopolitanism and globalization are weakened by the discourse of nationalism influencing citizenship education.

In terms of collectivism, the sentiment can be discerned from the second couplet of the socialist concepts on honors and shames. The slogan of "serving the people" can always strike a chord with Chinese people and remind them to put collective and people's interests first before personal rights can be fulfilled. In a policy document entitled "Gongmin Daode Jianshe Gangyao" (Implementation Guidelines to Establish Civic Virtues in Citizens) issued in 2001 by the Central Committee of the CPC, it was clearly stipulated that "[a citizen's] personal legal rights must be aligned with his/her obligations and commitment to society (...) He/She must always put the national and people's interests first while enjoying personal legal rights" (Implementation Guidelines to Establish Civic Virtues in Citizens, 2001, as cited in Feng, 2006, pp. 91–92). Stated differently, collectivism carries the connotation that citizens' rights and interests are permitted "only when citizens fulfill their obligations and perform their social duties and only when there is no conflict between the nation's and the collective interests and their own" (Feng, 2006, p. 92).

This collectivist citizenship model illustrates the discourse of nationalism. Bhabha (1994) and Huddart (2006) argue that the narration or imagination of nationalism negates the fluidity, plurality, heterogeneity and hybridity of every identity. Within a collectivist paradigm, individual rights such as the right to voice personal perspectives, which in a globalized and diversified world are bound to be plural and heterogeneous, are considered secondary to homogenous political will and the general public interest. Too often, such a nationalistic,

collectivist citizenship discourse jeopardizes the vitality of a multicultural nation because a dynamic source for growth, i.e., individual difference and cultural diversity have been suppressed (Kymlicka, 2003; Osler & Starkey, 2010).

In contrast, a cosmopolitan discourse of citizenship that is epitomized by a global outlook and enables citizens to exercise their citizenship effectively at all levels, local, national, regional, and global (Osler & Starkey, 2003, 2005), seems missing in the socialist concepts of shame and disgrace. Even though terms influenced by the discourse of cosmopolitanism such as democracy, justice, and fairness, present themselves in the harmonious society concept proposed by the government, it would be too early to conclude that the discourse of cosmopolitanism has gained power in relation to the discourse of nationalism in the discursive field of China's citizenship education.

As their terms and content suggest, both the socialist harmonious society concept and the Socialist Concepts on Honors and Disgraces were proposed with specific intentions that were nation-state bound. It has been stated unambiguously in the resolution of the CPC's Central Committee that the construction of a harmonious society is of strategic importance in addressing the acute domestic issues which China is facing while experiencing rapid GDP growth and globalization. These include uneven urban, rural, and regional economic development, increasing human resource pressures, serious problems with employment, social security, wealth distribution, education, health care, housing, industrial safety and environment, an incomplete infrastructure and judicial system, government corruption and the loss of virtue and morality (Communist Party of China, 2006, October 11). Clearly, national referents, such as national unity, political legitimacy and the allocation of resources within national borders (Law, 2007) are still points of departure and return for China's citizenship education. The discourse of cosmopolitanism is eclipsed by that of the discourse of nationalism, which magnifies its power from the discourse of globalization.

However, the discourse of cosmopolitanism has gained room in China's overall citizenship education curricula (Lee & Ho, 2008). Echoing this general trend, Bromley (2009) has identified an increased cosmopolitan emphasis in citizenship education textbooks in much of the world, but Bromley also found that Asia was the only region that failed to demonstrate significant increase on any of the four measures of cosmopolitanism. In a more focused case study on Shanghai, one of China's most metropolitan cities, Law (2007) found that both students and teachers from three public junior high schools there considered the global dimension of citizenship education under-valued compared with the other three dimensions, i.e., personal and social, local, and national, in the implemented curriculum. This result confirmed Lee and Gu's (2004) conclusion after a questionnaire survey in Shanghai about the perceptions of secondary

teachers and principals of the provision of global education, that global education was insufficient, especially in terms of teaching materials. Cosmopolitanism construed as “allegiance to the worldwide community of human beings” (Nussbaum, 1996, p. 4) is still more of a rhetoric than a reality in China’s citizenship education enterprise.

To conclude, the critical examination of China’s socialist harmonious society concept and the list of Eight Honors and Eight Shames conducted above have illustrated that the discourse of nationalism still predominates in the complex discursive field of citizenship education in China. Globalization and growing transnational flows of people, capital, and information may have helped to increase the power of the discourse of cosmopolitanism, but the discourse of nationalism expressed as national stability and safety remains the most powerful force in citizenship education in China.

United States: Dominance of Nationalistic Discourse

While on the surface, citizenship education in the United States extols democracy and choice, the curriculum is nevertheless constrained by discourses of nationalism, which limit the policy choices that students have available while discussing issues such as human migration (Camicia, 2007). The discursive field is complex. The dominance of the discourse of nationalism over the discourses of globalization and cosmopolitanism is evident in the way that the discourses of globalization and cosmopolitanism are used in the service of nationalistic goals. For example, students are taught to see the world through multiple perspectives in order to navigate a global marketplace or better understand national security risks. In what follows, historical and contemporary illustrations of the ways that the discursive field of citizenship education in the United States has been dominated by the discourse of nationalism are provided. We are particularly interested in curriculum areas where the discourses of globalization and cosmopolitanism could be incorporated further but are not, and where the discourses of globalization and cosmopolitanism are thus part of the null curriculum, that is, what schools do not teach.

The discourse of cosmopolitanism in the United States is illustrated by citizenship education theorists and reformers (Becker, 2002; Bigelow & Peterson, 2002; Crocco & Cramer, 2005; Merryfield & Wilson, 2005) who focus upon global perspectives, issues, and communities. Although on the rise (Bromley, 2009), the discourse of cosmopolitanism is still part of the null curriculum in the United States (Gaudelli, 2003; Myers, 2006). Citizenship education in the United States follows a long history of a discourse of nationalism, with the discourse of cosmopolitanism receiving multiple waves of resistance (Sylvester, 2002, 2005).

Zimmerman (2002) detailed the history of challenges to citizenship education in the United States during the twentieth century. The discourse of nationalism was a common refrain as exceptionalism and a metanarrative of progress limited dissonant refrains from historically marginalized social groups. Although the voices of marginalized groups within the United States have been included in the curriculum, these inclusions are brief and tangential to an unaltered discourse of nationalism that holds the United States up as an example of democracy, progress, and justice. Although the United States has itself experienced considerable immigration, the history curriculum is not influenced by a cosmopolitan discourse that seeks to focus upon the factors that cause humans to migrate. Rather, students learn about the exceptionalism of the United States as the most desirable nation to live in. This ignores such realities as the need for cheap labor in the United States, the exploitation of immigrants, and the United States policies that have created global push and pull effects on human migration.

Zimmerman (2002) compares the process of citizenship education reform in the United States to a conference room table where chairs are added, but the furniture is never changed. In other words, marginalized voices are only included in the social studies curriculum in the United States when they do not challenge dominant notions of unity and exceptionalism. For example, heroes representing marginalized groups are added to an already abundant list of national heroes. This focus on heroes discourages critical engagement with narratives that question American exceptionalism and progress.

Nash, Crabtree, and Dunn (1997) also examined the social studies curriculum throughout the twentieth century in the United States. Their findings mirror those of Zimmerman (2002). Nash, Crabtree and Dunn found that the curriculum uncritically held onto narratives of national exceptionalism, and that this is an illustration of the discourse of nationalism exerting influence over the discourse of cosmopolitanism in citizenship education. They write that “those who attack historians as cultural elitists are actually frightened by the shattering of elite control over history writing, by the subsequent widening of historians’ lenses, by the ‘opening of the American mind’ rather than its closing” (2002, p. 24). Nash, Crabtree and Dunn’s familiarity with national standards came from their experience as leaders in the development of National History Standards in the 1990’s. The standards were challenged by many (e.g., Cheney, 1995, January 24) as too critical of the United States and not laudatory enough about the exceptionalism of the United States, its progress, and its heroes. This orientation to citizenship education is becoming increasingly untenable as the discourse of globalization questions the parochial lens of the discourse of nationalism.

Currently, there is a movement in the United States toward a more “global” or “international” perspectives in citizenship education. However, in their analysis of the international education movement, Parker and Camicia (2009) found that

the movement had multiple affinities and intents, but most affinities were oriented toward the nation. Global citizenship education is often framed as a way to protect the United States against threats, both economic and military. Globalization is often framed as causing an urgent need for global citizenship education. It is a citizenship education that is oriented toward national defense. This illustrates the power of the discourse of nationalism in the citizenship education in the United States and its magnification of power when combined with discourse of globalization. While on the surface the intent seems cosmopolitan, the actual affinity is still toward the nation.

The dominance of the discourse of nationalism over the discourse of cosmopolitanism is also illustrated by state standards, programs funded by governmental and nongovernmental agencies, and written instructional materials. The following excerpt from the introduction of the National Security Language Act to the House of Representatives of the United States illustrates the way that a discourse of cosmopolitanism can be overpowered by a discourse of nationalism:

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, we can no longer keep our nation safe if we do not commit ourselves to learning the languages and cultures of critical areas around the world. The security of our troops overseas and the American people here at home demand that we act quickly to eliminate the severe shortage of critical need language professionals in this country. Inaction on this issue is not only irresponsible; it's dangerous. That's why I rise today to introduce legislation, the National Security Language Act, which would significantly expand our investment in foreign language education on the primary, secondary, and post-secondary level. Al Qaeda operates in over 75 countries, where hundreds of languages and dialects are spoken. However, 99 percent of American high school, college and university programs concentrate on a dozen (mostly European) languages. In fact, more college students currently study Ancient Greek (20 858) than Arabic (10 596), Korean (5 211), Persian (1 117), and Pashto (14) put together. We need to do more to make sure that America has the language professionals necessary to defend our national security. (Holt, 2003, December 9)

When seen through this lens, it is hard not to see the discourse of nationalism influence programs such as dual language immersion programs in public schools and the National Security Language Initiative for Youth (NSLI-Y). Governmental and non-governmental organizations fund these programs, in large part, for national security. In their study on stakeholders surrounding such programs, Parker and Camicia (2009) found that shifts toward the discourse of cosmopolitanism were present but that discourses of nationalism and globalization were found in statements about military and economic national security.

The discourse of nationalism can also be found in studies of citizenship education as it relates to specific international issues such as terrorism and

human migration. Hess and Soddard (2007) found that curriculum developed in the wake of the attacks of September 11, 2001 on the United States put forward an uncritical account of the attacks. The curriculum presented the topic of terrorism uncritically by not examining the nature of the United States relations within global politics that might help spawn such attacks. This illustrates the influence of the discourse of nationalism on citizenship education.

Camicia (2007) found that two of the most well-known citizenship education instructional material programs teaching about deliberation and immigration policy were heavily influenced by the discourse of nationalism. Although students are presented with “multiple” perspectives regarding the issue of immigration to the United States, it is clear that these materials exhibit a narrow range of choices and perspectives that fall within a nationalistic lens. This leads Camicia (2009) to label such phenomenon in citizenship education in the United States as soft forms of democracy because on the surface the curriculum seems to contain choice; however, a closer examination reveals a narrow range of nationalistic choices. This serves to bolster national affinities at the expense of a cosmopolitan global perspective.

In sum, these brief historical and contemporary examples from citizenship education in the United States illustrate how in tandem with talk about global citizenship and democracy, citizenship education illustrates weak forms of both. In the next section, we discuss the implications of citizenship education that exhibits the force of the discourse of nationalism at the expense of the discourses of globalization and cosmopolitanism.

Conclusion

The examples presented from China and the United States illustrate the complex discursive fields in which citizenship education operates. Although the discourse of nationalism is most powerful, these snapshots of citizenship education indicate that the discursive field is fractured, dynamic, and context-specific. The various programs and policies surrounding citizenship education indicate the strong influence of the discourse of nationalism over the discourse of cosmopolitanism and globalization. In China, the nationalistic perspective is most evident in the calls for harmony with a limited and exclusive focus on issues of domestic concern at the expense of examining multiple perspectives that might challenge notions of a cohesive community. In the United States, the discourse of globalization intensified an examination of global issues such as terrorism and immigration through a national rather than global perspective.

The lack of influence of the discourses of cosmopolitanism and globalization in the examples presented are strong indications that although there has been an

increase in rhetoric around democracy and global communities, the discourses of globalization and cosmopolitanism are most often found in the null curriculum. When these discourses are apparent, they are often operating in the service of the discourse of nationalism. The null curriculum is a powerful statement to students about the scale and qualities of local, national, and global communities. When the discourse of nationalism exerts the strongest force, students are left viewing the world with limited options and perspectives.

The need to solve global problems intensifies every day as the process of globalization increases the need and opportunities to solve shared problems (Held et al., 1999). Students must be taught to solve global problems (e.g. climate change, resource depletion, social injustice, and poverty) within citizenship education and understand cosmopolitan rather than nationalistic perspectives on citizenship (Case, 1993; Diaz, Massialas, & Xanthopoulos, 1999; Gaudelli, 2006; Kniep, 1986; Merryfield, 1998). An international panel of experts (Banks et al., 2005) concluded that citizenship education should contain multiple cultural and global discourses in order to better prepare students to contribute to local and global communities. Traditional notions of citizenship and citizenship education must keep pace with the demands of globalization (Castles & Davidson, 2000; Ong, 1999; Suárez-Orozco, 2004).

The discourse of globalization can be used to intensify those of nationalism and cosmopolitanism. When in the service of the discourse of nationalism, the discourse of globalization serves to focus on global markets, national security, parochialism, and competition. When in the service of the discourse of cosmopolitanism, the discourse of globalization serves to focus upon global democracy, multiple perspectives, and international cooperation. The authors propose that curriculum developers and educators make explicit attempts to strengthen the discourses of cosmopolitanism and globalization in citizenship education. Currently, when the discourse of cosmopolitanism influences the curriculum, it is a weak influence that usually gives way to the discourse of nationalism. Along with the theorists that we have cited throughout this article, we envision a new citizenship education that is responsive to the needs of a global human family that is facing increasing globalization. The starting point of this responsiveness is an awareness of the multiple contexts and discursive fields in which citizenship education functions.

References

- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London, England: Verso.
- Anderson, B. (2005). *Under three flags: Anarchism and the anti-colonial imagination*. New York, NY: Verso.

- Appiah, K. A. (1996). Cosmpolitan patriots. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 21–29). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a world of strangers*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Apple, M. W. (2000). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 57–77). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Banks, J. A., Banks, C. A. M., Cortés, C. E., Hahn, C. L., Merryfield, M. M., et al. (2005). *Democracy and diversity: Principles and concepts for educating citizens in a global age*. Seattle, WA: Center for Multicultural Education, University of Washington.
- Becker, J. M. (2002). Globalization and global education: Ever the twain shall meet? *International Social Studies Forum*, 2(1), 51–57.
- Benhabib, S. (2006). *Another cosmopolitanism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The location of culture*. London, England: Routledge.
- Bigelow, B., & Peterson, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Rethinking globalization: Teaching for justice in an unjust world*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools Press.
- Boswell, M. (2007, July 23). *Harmonious society*. Retrieved August 12, 2011, from <http://chinaelectionsblog.net/?p=13726>
- Bromley, P. (2009). Cosmopolitanism in civic education: Exploring cross-national trends, 1970–2008. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 12(1), 33–44. Retrieved August 14, 2011, from http://www.tc.columbia.edu/cice/Issues/12.01/12_01_Bromley.html
- Burbules, N. C., & Torres, C. A. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Camicia, S. P. (2007). Deliberating immigration policy: Locating instructional materials within global and multicultural perspectives. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 35(1), 96–111.
- Camicia, S. P. (2009). Identifying soft democratic education: Uncovering the range of civic and cultural choices in instructional materials. *The Social Studies*, 100(3), 136–142. doi:10.3200/TSSS.100.3.136-142
- Camicia, S. P., & Franklin, B. (2010). Curriculum reform in a globalised world: The discourses of cosmopolitanism and community. *London Review of Education*, 8(2), 93–104. doi:10.1080/14748460.2010.487327
- Camicia, S. P., & Franklin, B. (in press). What type of global community and citizenship? Tangled discourses of neoliberalism and critical democracy in curriculum and its reform. *Globalisation, Societies, and Education*.
- Capella, J. R. (2000). Globalization, a fading citizenship. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 227–251). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Case, R. (1993). Key elements of a global perspective. *Social Education*, 57(6), 318–325.
- Castles, S., & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship and migration: Globalization and the politics of belonging*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Cheney, L. V. (1995, January 24). Nothing's sacred: Kill my old agency, please. *Wall Street Journal*, p. A22.
- Communist Party of China. (2006, October 11). *Communiqué of the sixth plenum of the 16th CPC Central Committee*. Retrieved August 12, 2011, from http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-10/11/content_5191071.htm
- Communist Party of China. (2007, October 25). *Full text of constitution of Communist Party of China*. Retrieved August 12, 2011, from <http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2007-10/25/>

- content_6944738.htm
- Crococo, M., & Cramer, J. (2005). Technology use, women, and global studies in social studies teacher education. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education*, 5(1), 38–49. Retrieved August 30, 2011, from <http://www.citejournal.org/articles/v5i1socialstudies1.pdf>
- Diaz, C. F., Massialas, B. G., & Xanthopoulos, J. A. (1999). *Global perspectives for educators*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Eisner, E. W. (2002). *The educational imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Feng, A. (2006). Contested notions of citizenship and citizenship education: The Chinese case. In G. Alred, M. Byram, & M. Fleming (Eds.), *Education for intercultural citizenship: Concepts and comparisons* (pp. 86–105). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Fine, R. (2007). *Cosmopolitanism*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader* (pp. 48–79). Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality. Volume I: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Gaudelli, W. (2003). World class: Teaching and learning in global times. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Elbaum Associates.
- Gaudelli, W. (2006). *Visions and structures of global citizenship: Building dialogic space in curriculum*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Geis, J. P., II, & Holt, B. (2009). “Harmonious society”: Rise of the new China. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, 3(4), 75–94.
- Han, A. G. (2008). Building a harmonious society and achieving individual harmony. *Journal of Chinese Political Science*, 13(2), 143–164. doi:10.1007/s11366-008-9021-y
- He, R. F. (2001). 当代中国公民价值观教育的核心: 培育个体观念 [The core of contemporary citizenship education in China: Developing individual consciousness]. 长白学刊 [*Changbai Journal*], (4), 59–61.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). *Global transformations: Politics, economics and culture*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hess, D. E., & Stoddard, J. (2007). 9/11 and terrorism: “The ultimate teachable moment”, in textbooks and supplemental curricula. *Social Education*, 71(5), 231–236.
- Holt, R. (2003, December 9). *Introduction of the National Security Language Act*. Retrieved August 14, 2011, from http://www.fas.org/irp/congress/2003_cr/hr3676.html
- Huddart, D. (2006). *Homi K. Bhabha*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Kniep, W. M. (1986). Defining a global education by its content. *Social Education*, 50(6), 437–446.
- Kymlicka, W. (2003). Multicultural states and intercultural citizens. *Theory and Research in Education*, 1(2), 147–169. doi:10.1177/1477878503001002001
- Law, W. W. (2004). Globalization and citizenship education in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *Comparative Education Review*, 48(3), 253–273.
- Law, W. W. (2007). Globalisation, city development and citizenship education in China’s Shanghai. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 27(1), 18–38. doi:10.1016/j.ijedudev.2006.04.017
- Lee, W. O., & Gu, R. F. (Eds.). (2004). 国际视野与公民教育: 香港及上海中学状况调查研究 [Global Citizenship Education: A Survey on Secondary Schools in Hong Kong and Shanghai]. 上海, 中国: 上海社会科学院出版社 [Shanghai, China: Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences Press].

- Lee, W. O., & Ho, C. H. (2008). Citizenship education in China: Changing concepts, approaches and policies in the changing political, economic and social context. In J. Arthur, I. Davis, & C. Hahn (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of education for citizenship and democracy* (pp. 139–157). Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.
- Liu, G. H. (1998). *Civic education in China: Past, present, and future challenges*. Retrieved January 14, 2010, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED428990.pdf>
- Longstreet, W. S., & Shane, H. G. (1993). *Curriculum for a new millennium*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Merryfield, M. M. (1998). Pedagogy for global perspectives in education: studies of teachers' thinking and practice. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 26(3), 342–379.
- Merryfield, M. M., & Wilson, A. H. (2005). *Social studies and the world: Teaching global perspectives*. Silver Spring, MD: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. London, England: Routledge.
- Myers, J. P. (2006). Rethinking the social studies curriculum in the context of globalization: Education for global citizenship in the U.S. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 34(3), 370–394.
- Nash, G. B., Crabtree, C., & Dunn, R. E. (1997). *History on trial: Culture wars and the teaching of the past*. New York, NY: A. A. Knopf.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (1996). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 2–17). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Ong, A. (1999). *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ong, A. (2006). *Neoliberalism as exception: Mutations in citizenship and sovereignty*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2003). Learning for cosmopolitan citizenship: Theoretical debates and young people's experiences. *Educational Review*, 55(3), 243–254. doi:10.1080/0013191032000118901
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.
- Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2010). *Teachers and human rights education*. Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham.
- Parker, W. C. (2004). Diversity, globalization, and democratic education: Curriculum possibilities. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 433–458). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Parker, W. C., & Camicia, S. P. (2009). Cognitive praxis in today's "international education" movement: A case study of intents and affinities. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 1(37), 42–74.
- People's Daily. (2005, February 20). 胡锦涛强调：深刻认识构建和谐社会的重大意义 [Hu Jintao: Having a profound understanding of the significance of constructing a harmonious society]. Retrieved August 13, 2011, from <http://politics.people.com.cn/GB/1024/3187879.html>
- Ritzer, G. (Ed.). (2007). *The Blackwell companion to globalization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Smith, D. G. (2003). Curriculum and teaching face globalization. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *International handbook of curriculum research* (pp. 35–51). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Steinberg, M. W. (1999). The talk and back talk of collective action: A dialogic analysis of repertoires of discourse among nineteenth-century English cotton spinners. *American*

- Journal of Sociology*, 105(3), 736–780.
- Suárez-Orozco, C. (2004). Formulating identity in a globalized world. In M. M. Suárez-Orozco & D. B. Qin-Hilliard (Eds.), *Globalization: Culture and education in the new millennium* (pp. 173–202). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Sylvester, R. (2002). Mapping international education: A historical survey 1893–1944. *Journal of Research in International Education*, 1(1), 91–125. doi:10.1177/147524090211005
- Sylvester, R. (2005). Framing the map of International Education (1969–1998). *Journal of Research in International Education*, 4(2), 123–151. doi:10.1177/1475240905054386
- Torsti, P. (2007). How to deal with a difficult past? History textbooks supporting enemy images in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 39(1), 77–96.
- Vertovec, S., & Cohen, R. (2002). Introduction: Conceiving cosmopolitanism. In S. Vertovec & R. Cohen (Eds.), *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: Theory, context and practice* (pp. 1–22). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (2002). *Voices of collective remembering*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Wodak, R. (2001a). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63–94). London, England: SAGE Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2001b). What CDA is about: A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1–13). London, England: SAGE Publications.
- Xinhua. (2006, October 18). CPC promotes “core value system” to lay moral foundations for social harmony. Retrieved August 12, 2011, from http://news3.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-10/18/content_5220576.htm
- Xinhua. (2007, October 24). 胡锦涛在党的十七大上的报告 [Hu’s report to the 17th National Congress of CPC]. Retrieved August 12, 2011, from http://news.xinhuanet.com/newscenter/2007-10/24/content_6938568.htm
- Zimmerman, J. (2002). *Whose America? Culture wars in the public schools*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.