On Literature's Use(ful/less)ness: Reconceptualising the Literature Curriculum in the Age of Globalisation

Suzanne S. Choo

National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

[Note: This paper underwent peer review and was accepted by the journal. This is a draft copy of the paper before it was submitted to the journal for copyediting. To read the final published article and to cite, please refer to: Choo, S. S. (2011). On Literature's use(ful/less)ness: Reconceptualizing literature education in the age of globalisation. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 43*(1), 46-67.]

In an article entitled 'Will the Humanities save us?' published in The New York Times, Stanley Fish (2008: para. 13) makes this provocative statement, 'To the question "of what use are the humanities?", the only honest answer is none whatsoever'. The keyword in the question is 'use' and here, Fish seems to be attacking not the study of the Humanities itself but the question of its instrumental value in a utilitarian hyper-capitalist age of globalisation. One decade before this, Robert Scholes, in 'The Rise and Fall of English', echoes a similar concern. He (1998: 20) asks how literary studies can help students become fit for life in the present world and proceeds to show that the accelerated decline in interest and enrolment in Literature may primarily be attributed to the 'serious gap between literary and artistic values, on the one hand, and the commercial and competitive and active values in our society, on the other'. Once again, almost a decade before Scholes' influential book, Alvin Kernan displays a similar apprehension. At the end of his book entitled, 'The Death of Literature', Kernan (1990: 213) concludes by speculating that a new literature curriculum would appear, if at all, 'when some new way, plausible and positive, is voiced to claim for the traditional literary works a place of some importance and usefulness in individual life and society as whole'.

While three American scholars across two decades have voiced the same concern regarding the instrumental value of Literature, their approach to this question is starkly different. Fish adopts an anti-utilitarian position arguing that criticism, the key work of English departments, is a parasitic enterprise concerned with reproducing itself in the form of an academic industry comprising of journals, conferences, seminars, and dissertations all of which justify their own ends. At the other extreme is Scholes who argues that the curriculum needs to be redesigned to provide more useful skills to students. His strategy is to focus not on the subject matter of literature but a particular set of skills he terms, textuality, which students may apply in the real world. Somewhere in between Fish and Scholes is Kernan who does not make a

conclusive point about what he envisions the future of literature education to be. His tone, however, seems fatalistic in his implication that literary studies has been attacked on all sides by various political groups (feminists, postcolonialists and deconstructionists) so that it is now an empty signifier devoid of all meaning. Kernan particularly accuses deconstructionist and post-structuralist critics of undermining the credibility of literary studies by valorising the hegemonic ideological intentions of the curriculum. At the same time, what Kernan, Fish and Scholes fail to observe is the ideological frame structuring their arguments. More specifically, this ideological frame may be characterised in terms of particular binaries between utilitarianism and pragmatism on the one hand, and humanism and idealism on the other. Instead of conceiving the literature curriculum in terms of a position one privileges in the binary structure, the question is whether the literature curriculum may be conceptualised as a hybrid space incorporating both values of utilitarianism and humanism, pragmatism and idealism. In the first part of the paper, I explore the hybrid nature of the literature curriculum which combines the ideological perspectives of globalisation with cosmopolitanism or, more simply stated, a curriculum that is framed by the paradox of its usefulness and uselessness. In the second part of the paper, I show how this hybridity is at present compromised by World and Global Literature curricula models and argue for a reconceptualisation of the curriculum through the model of a Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum.

The Hybrid Nature of the Literature Curriculum

In her recent book, ‘Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities’, Martha Nussbaum articulates a disturbing trend that nations, thirsty for profit, are investing their systems of education in applied skills particularly in science and technology so as to stay competitive in the global market. The result is that the humanities and arts, perceived by policy-makers as useless frills, are being cut away. ‘If this trend continues,’ Nussbaum (2010: 2) observes, ‘nations all over the world will soon be producing generations of useful machines, rather than complete citizens who can think for themselves, criticise tradition, and understand the significance of another person’s sufferings and achievements’. Implicitly, Nussbaum sees an education in Literature and the humanities as antithetical to education centred on scientific and technical training for national economic growth. At the same time, what she proposes is not for policymakers to choose between these two apparently dichotomous models of education but to see how both can coexist and contribute to a richer model of education that even includes the goal of strengthening a nation’s economic growth and global competitiveness. For example, such a model would involve education for global citizenship as well as responsible citizenship where the acquisition of scientific and technical proficiencies is balanced with the cultivation of core critical thinking skills and ethical dispositions.

What the above example provides is a case of a positive rather than negative difference based on Jacques Derrida’s (1968: 279) logic of ‘différance’[1] involving an inter-play between time (to defer) and space (to distinguish within a system of shared relations). In other words, the logic of differing is historically situated with the entry of new elements that modifies pre-existing

elements. Thus, a negative difference would imply that the coming together of opposing elements results in tension with one element becoming privileged over the other in the end while a positive difference would mean that the tension resulting from opposing elements results in a shared space where these elements may co-exist. Another way of conceiving this positive difference is through the notion of hybridity which implies the paradoxical co-existence of one or more dualisms. In fact, a historical survey of the literature curriculum demonstrates how its hybrid nature has been framed by three significant dualisms from the time of its conceptualisation in the nineteenth century to the present. The first two dualisms – concerning nationalism and colonialism as well as concerning its transcendental and use value – were essential to the formation of literature education as a significant subject in the core national curriculum in both the UK and the USA in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. From the mid-twentieth century to the present, it is the third dualism oriented towards the development of global and responsible citizenship that determines discourses related to the objectives of the literature curriculum.

Dualism 1: nationalism and colonialism

The first dualism concerns the establishment of the canon as a core part of the curriculum. Two seemingly contradictory examples related to the rise of English Literature as a national subject in the late nineteenth century may be observed. In the first example, the failure of religion led to the rise of literary studies in the UK and the USA. Before English Literature was ever taught as a subject in schools, Religious Studies dominated the curriculum. By the late nineteenth century however, various political and social forces served to challenge its core position in the curriculum. In the UK, various factors such as the expansion of the empire, new discoveries in science, profits from the slave trade and colonialism resulted in greater secularism and materialism. The rise of an influential middle class coupled with an increasingly discontented working class suffering the dehumanising effects of industrialism led to a general cynicism towards the dominance of the church in matters of the state (Richardson 1994). In education, Religious Studies was rapidly declining in popularity and science rather than religion seemed to provide the answers people were looking for. Within such a context, the ground was fertile for the replacement of Religious Studies with a quasi-religious secular form of liberal education. Thus, Terry Eagleton (1996: 20) states that '[i]f one were asked to provide a single explanation for the growth of English in the later nineteenth century, one could do no worse than reply, "the failure of religion"'. A similar phenomenon may be observed in the USA during this time as well. Arthur Applebee (1974) describes how English had emerged as a major subject in schools by the 1890s. The elementary reading instruction emphasised religious teachings and moral lessons and a typical reading book ('The New England Primer') included the Lord's Prayer, at least one catechism and other religious pieces. While such a curriculum may have addressed particular needs of the early colonists, by the early twentieth century, it had become redundant in addressing the chief problem of providing the disparate colonial states with a common tradition of culture and government as well as a common spirit of citizenship (Applebee 1974).

Clearly, various political and social forces resulted in a displacement of Religious Studies through the introduction of English Literature in the national curriculum. It was at this point that literature education adopted a new position-taking in the curriculum primarily through its oppositional relationship with Religious Studies (Bourdieu 1983). Primarily, this relation was established because literature education, unlike Religious Studies, provided the state an ideological tool to forge a greater sense of nationhood. Thus, although the concept of literature was originally conceived as information printed in a book, it later became redefined as fictive or imaginative writing, specifically, those texts which seemed to speak, through 'affectations of pleasure and sympathy to the general and common interest of man' (Richardson 1994: 260). Inherent in the term 'imagination' is the connotation of projection or vision (Eagleton 1996). The implication is that literary studies became associated with a form of 'fiction making' designed to develop a sense of nationhood through a recreation and retelling of its mythological histories in story form. For example, the common curriculum in the early 1900s in Oxford emphasised old and Middle English texts such as 'Beowulf' and 'Sir Gawain' in order to inspire the national spirit and foster greater social cohesion (Palmer 1965). These texts were specifically chosen for their capacity to dramatise the glories of English history and thus, were valued for defining the Englishman's sense of identity. The possibilities of a new literary canon therefore resulted in the scriptural canon becoming marginalised in the national curriculum and later relegated to the confines of subjects taught in religious schools.

Paradoxically, while literature education evolved as a subject in the national curriculum as a result of political opposition to Religious Studies during the late nineteenth century, the reverse was occurring in the colonies of the British Empire. Gauri Viswanathan's (1989) study of literature education in India during the colonial period provides an insightful account of how the subject evolved through attempts by the state to forge an alliance between religious and secular forms of education. One of the key challenges the colonial government faced was how to manage Indian subjects and imbue within them a sense of civic duty and responsibility. The natural recourse was to turn to education as a hegemonic tool that would reinforce bourgeois western values. The problem was that transference of the curriculum from England, with its strong emphasis on Religious Studies, to a colonised nation such as India would prove to be disastrous and almost surely result in violent reactions from locals already suspicious of their colonial ruler's involvement in education reform in their country. Furthermore, Hindu beliefs were strongly embedded in Indian culture and identity which, in the eyes of British colonial rulers, obstructed the introduction of modern sciences and the more empirical subjects into the curriculum (Viswanathan 1989). During this period, Viswanathan (1989) describes how governor-general William Bentinck, acting on the advice of Thomas Macaulay, made English the medium of instruction in the local schools in India and more importantly, endorsed a new function for English instruction in the dissemination of moral and religious values. Literature education grew as a result of this alliance with Religious Studies. Just as the reading of scripture was aimed at conveying moral values by evoking the imagination through graphic imagery (e.g. of heaven and hell), the reading of selected secular texts could also promote these values through

portraits of courage, civility, and chivalry as depicted in English stories and legends. Here, the intent was not to use literary studies to develop a sense of nationalism. Rather, the intent was to keep the colonised native in a position of awe and admiration of British culture and in so doing, ensure his or her continued subjugation while preserving colonial rule. Texts were therefore selected specifically for their alignment with Christian values. Aside from ‘Paradise Lost’, other texts such as the poetry of the Romantics were used to convey the deeper connection between nature and the human soul. Highly imagistic poems by Wordsworth were also selected as these provided a bridge to understanding the imagery in religious texts. The plays of Shakespeare were chosen not only for aesthetic reasons but for their capacity to promote moral values (such as the consequences of vanity in ‘King Lear’ or insubordination to the universal order in ‘Macbeth’).

What must now be quite clear in the seemingly contradictory accounts in the development of literature education in the UK and the USA on one hand and colonised nations such as India on the other is that literature education finds itself constantly fashioning and re-fashioning its position in relation to social and political contexts as well as pre-existing subject domains. Its ideological purposes are therefore fluid and negotiated within the tensions of its situated space. At the same time, the hybridity of such a space may be observed in these accounts which describe the co-existence of both an internal aim (the development of nationalism) and an external aim (the consolidation of power through dominating other nations or communities). The reconciliation of tensions inherent in these two aims are dependent on the discourse of another dualism – an appeal to a transcendental value of literature education (in the case of the former aim) and an appeal to a use value (in the case of the latter).

Dualism 2: transcendental value and use value

The transcendental value of literature education may be inferred in the writings of Matthew Arnold who regarded Literature as serving a significant social mission in cultivating the moral and intellectual culture of a working class who were increasingly drawn into a mass education system. In Arnold’s (1960) essay on ‘Common Schools Abroad’ first written in 1886, he makes a comparison between the system of education in the UK and that in Europe. What causes schools in the UK to fall short of European schools, he says, is the over-emphasis on ‘useful knowledge’ at the expense of knowledge that ‘reaches the soul and feelings, and trains its pupils to that which is really human’ (Arnold 1960: 292). For Arnold, Literature especially plays an important role in humanistic training. By studying great works of literature and the background of their authors, he argues, one is able to draw out their transcendental qualities. One such transcendental quality is more clearly mentioned in an earlier essay, ‘The study of poetry’, where Arnold (1880: 12) argues that the best poetry possesses ‘high poetic truth and seriousness’. Arnold’s thesis concerning the power of literary studies in conveying universal truths inherent in great works of literature ironically ignores the material value attached to such a study. In the seventeenth century, knowledge of basic reading and writing distinguished the educated from the uneducated. To be literate in this context afforded one a particular social and economic position in society. By the mid-eighteenth century, pragmatic knowledge evolved to

cultural knowledge and entry into bourgeoisie elite circles required not just a demonstration of an ability to read texts (i.e. to be literate) but an ability to read particular texts in the realm of high culture (i.e. Literature) (Williams 1977).

Here again, we observe the co-existence of two paradoxical discourses at the same time. On one hand, literary studies contained the potential to humanise through the transmission of its transcendental moral values; on the other hand, it also afforded a particular use value which was to legitimise one's educated and cultured sensibilities. The co-existence of such a paradoxical dualism was also observed in two key movements – New Criticism and Reader-Response. Gerald Graff (1987) notes that the New Critics' insistence on the disinterested nature of the poetic experience as well as their ahistorical emphasis on the intrinsic and transcendental value of the text are implicit rejections of utilitarianism that ironically mask an 'interested' agenda. This agenda was primarily aimed at countering the technocratic impulses of modernisation by establishing greater methodological rigor and professional respectability in the field. For example, I.A. Richards' (1929) method of Practical Criticism was directed towards providing a more efficient and structured approach to developing greater powers of discrimination in students. The ahistorical thrust of New Criticism was later attacked by Reader Response theorists who argued that meaning occurs through the reader's transaction with the text (Rosenblatt 1995), through the reader's act of filling in 'gaps' in the text based on his or her disposition and prior experiences (Iser 1972), and through the reader's interpretation of the text as coloured by his or her interpretive community (Fish 1980).

The co-existence of the ahisotrical hermeneutics of New Criticism and the situated hermeneutics of Reader-Response may be observed in the contemporary literature curriculum. Mediating between a disinterested technical method of criticism and a subjective personal response to the text is the notion of informed response; that is, a personal response grounded on a close analysis of the formal structures of the text. The notion of informed response is a key criterion in the assessment of literature essays in many high-stakes standardised examinations[2]. At the same time, the practice of training students to provide informed responses to texts not only fuses the tradition of New Criticism and Reader Response, it fulfils both transcendental and utilitarian functions. This is similar to Louise Rosenblatt's (1995: 75) distinction between efferent reading and aesthetic reading: 'All reading is carried on in a matrix of experienced reading: efferent reading gives attention primarily to the referent alone; aesthetic reading places the experienced meaning in the full light of awareness and involves the selective process of creating a work of art'. Thus, efferent reading fulfils the utilitarian function of comprehending the text while aesthetic reading fulfils the transcendental function of experiencing the text and an ideal pedagogical approach would be inclusive of both.

As the previous examples have shown, the dualism between transcendental value and use value is paradoxical but need not be necessarily antagonistic. In reality, these dualisms have co-existed in the aims of literary studies, its key movements, and its pedagogical approaches. The question is, how may the hybrid nature of the literature curriculum be characterised in the

present, taking into account the impact of globalisation? In the next section, I argue that the hybrid nature of the contemporary curriculum is impoverished by a curriculum centred on instrumental aims. In particular, I examine two models of the literature curriculum – World Literature and Global Literature – and argue for a reconceptualising of the curriculum that necessarily accounts for the inclusion of a third dualism: the development of global and responsible citizens.

Dualism 3: the development of global and responsible citizens

Although globalisation is a term that resists any straightforward definition, most would agree that it is characterised by three main features. The first feature is economic globalisation which emerged in the late seventies with the implementation of neoliberal policies in many countries[3]. The result was the increasing internationalisation of trade among nations and the rise of transnational corporations that eroded the authority of the nation-state. By the late 1990s, terms such as the ‘knowledge economy’ and ‘knowledge capitalism’ became commonplace. These originate from policy documents by the OECD and World Bank reporting on the strong dependence on production, distribution and use of knowledge in industrialised nations with knowledge now becoming the most important form of global capital[4]. Related to this is the second feature, technological globalisation, which describes the role of technology as the primary driver of knowledge and innovation in post-industrial societies. This phenomenon has been accorded various names such as the ‘digital economy’, ‘networked society’, ‘technocapitalism’ depending on which particular role of technology is given emphasis[5]. In recent years, several scholars have cautioned against the extremes of economic and technological determinism in theorising globalisation particularly since economic and technological activities are embedded in culturally constructed contexts[6]. Here, cultural globalisation, the third feature of globalisation, describes the creation of a transnational or global imagination as a result of exchanges of knowledge, capital and technology from people and groups around the world.

One avenue through which cultural globalisation may be examined is through the ways in which a curriculum is articulated and established since the curriculum represents a corpus of cultural knowledge as well as attempts by the state to enact social control and respond to demands for international competitiveness (Astiz, Wiseman and Baker 2002, Tyack and Cuban 1995). A good example is the phenomenon of global education, which emerged in the United States in the 1970s and 1980s and which became increasingly incorporated in school curricula towards the end of the decade (Frey and Whitehead 2009). Although, the goals of global education have been articulated in different ways, they have typically been oriented towards the development of global and responsible citizens. On one hand, arguments related to the development of global citizens have been framed according to the need to develop ‘transnational imaginaries’ in which local knowledge traditions can be performed together with global or universal discourses (Gough 2000), the need to equip students to critically evaluate political and economic systems impacting the world (Davis 2006), the need to prepare students to be globally competitive by equipping them with the kinds of skills and knowledge, such as flexible thinking

and tolerance for ambiguity, required in an inter-connected world as well as the ways in which national standards may be internationally benchmarked through comparative tests such as PISA (Keating, Ortloff and Philippou 2009). On the other hand, arguments related to the development of responsible citizens have been framed according to the need to build a global community by becoming aware of common human problems that transcend national boundaries (Frey and Whitehead 2009), and more importantly, by exploring the significance of world, as opposed to national, citizenship involving ethical obligations to humanity (Marshall 2009).

Essentially, the aims of global citizenship centre on the development of tangible, instrumental skills geared towards preparing students to compete in a global world while the aims of responsible citizenship emphasise non-measurable values that promote a climate of critical and reflective stewardship of resources and more importantly, extend the space of accountability beyond one's community and nation.

The Limitations of World Literature and Global Literature Curricula Models

Despite the varied manifestations of global education, what is clear is that a holistic account of global education must necessarily include the aims of cultivating both global and responsible citizens. Set within this context of global education, the contemporary literature curriculum must similarly attend to such a hybrid space. However, it is obvious that recent arguments by various scholars regarding the future of the literature curriculum is coached in globalist-oriented[7] terms emphasising Literature's capital power since this most directly addresses questions of 'use' in abstract economic terms. I will highlight these arguments paying particular attention to three forms of capital that have become integrally tied to the usefulness of literary studies – institutional capital, cultural capital, and linguistic capital.

The roots of literary institutional capital as a response to the effects globalisation may be traced to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe who first pronounced the need to introduce *Weltliteratur* (or World Literature) in schools in the 1820s[8]. At the Congress of Natural Scientists in Berlin in 1828, Goethe remarked that the aim of conceiving a universal, world literature is not simply for different nations to become more familiar or appreciative of another culture and history through reading foreign works of literature. Rather, the aim is 'that the living, striving men of letters should learn to know each other, and through their own inclination and similarity of tastes, find the motive for corporate action' (quoted in Strich 1949: 350). Goethe's utopian vision for global unity through shared cultural exchanges must be interpreted in the light of its historical context especially since he wrote during the period of accelerated geopolitical homogenisation beginning with the Congress of Vienna, the beginnings of an international mass market system, an increasing rate of literary translation activities and cross-national media coverage (Pizer 2000). For Goethe, World Literature would play an important role in capitalising on the growing interconnectedness of the world as observed when he calls on scholars and teachers in German universities to look beyond the narrow circle of national literature. Ironically, it is clear that Goethe's vision of World Literature encompasses a utilitarian aim of strengthening Germany's own literature. For example, he later explains that World Literature does not simply mean

studying the literature of every nation or community but only those which warrant the attention of literary scholars (quoted in Eckermann 1964: 175):

> [W]hile we thus value what is foreign, we must not bind ourselves to some particular thing and regard it as a model. We must not give this value to the Chinese or the Serbian, or the Nibelungen; but if we really want a pattern, we must return to the Ancient Greeks, in whose works the beauty of mankind is constantly represented.

The last phrase in the above quote exemplifies Goethe's idea of world literary study. Here, he is concerned with the aesthetic representation of mankind. In other words, to Goethe, the study of world literature should revolve around the notion of 'universal aesthetics' as represented by classical Greek and Latin literary works. When Goethe later says (quoted in Geary 1986: 255), 'I am convinced a universal world literature is in the process of being constituted, in which an honorable role is reserved for us Germans', this 'honorable role' is a result of situating German literature within the larger context of western literature thus creating stronger connections with a much revered classical literary heritage. In this context, the inclusion of World Literature would provide institutional capital to the universities by elevating the status of national literature.

Eventually, the formation of a canon based on classical Greek and Latin literary texts paved the way for the establishment of the western canon[9]. As the classics lost its pragmatic value in an increasingly secular and material Industrial age, new forms of institutional capital needed to be found. As highlighted previously, the western canon was both an effective tool to promote nationalism at home and colonialism abroad. There was also the added factor of its cultural capital. John Guillory (1993) adopts Bourdieu's sociological method in examining the strange relationship between canonical literary works as cultural capital and market capital. The logic of the market suggests that high literary art ought to be expensive but advances in technology and printing reverse this logic. To offer a present-day example, consider how literary paperback classics can be purchased for less than five dollars or how Shakespeare's plays may be downloaded for free off the internet. Although access to literary high art is publicly accessible, there is a way to restrict its access – through education. The possession of cultural capital therefore occurs through a 'particular' kind of education (Guillory 1993). By elevating works into 'classics' or the 'canon' in the curriculum, the education system ensures the continued production of cultural consumers. The result is a distinction between culture produced by the field of production and scholastic culture (Bourdieu 1983). In other words, unlike the general masses, these are individuals who have the ability, skills, and prior knowledge to access, engage with, and discern great works of literature; these are individuals who have been skilled in the various schools of literary criticism and who have been validated as possessing these skills through the education system with its benchmarks of achievement such as standardised assessments. The question of literature education's use in the age of globalisation then is really the question of the use of criticism in the age of globalisation. Herein lies a fundamental contradiction – criticism becomes politicised when it functions to provide cultural capital to literature education. To demonstrate criticism essentially means to demonstrate it in a particular

way, such as adopting the method of New Criticism or interpreting a text from a particular ideological lens. At the same time, the politicised nature of criticism results in the entry of new voices advocating counter-political perspectives such as marxist criticism, postcolonial criticism, feminism criticism, and post-structuralist criticism.

One effect of the democratisation of the practice of criticism is that the notion of cultural capital has shifted since the notion of criticism itself now includes different and divergent schools of thought. In other words, a World Literature curriculum centred on the classics or the western canon has less value than a World Literature curriculum centred on the goals of multiculturalism. Hence, it is no longer possible to associate literature education's cultural capital to the idea of training in particular schools of criticism. Furthermore, the signifying term 'culture' has now extended beyond 'high' cultural works of the western canon to a broader meaning of cultures of the world. Thus, in the 1960s, courses and programmes began to appear that consolidated a sense of the importance of representing the literatures of minority populations. In response to the huge wave of immigrants entering the UK and USA, the category of Commonwealth Literature appeared in UK universities and the category of Third World Literature emerged in North American universities during the late 1960s[10]. In contrast to Comparative Literature, established in the universities to focus on western European nations, another field known as Area Studies was established to focus on foreign nations. In the USA, Area Studies was founded at the beginning of the Cold War particularly by grant corporations such as the Ford Foundation. To meet the demands of the war, scholars were needed who had diverse knowledge of foreign languages and culture (Spivak 2003). Again, such associations are closely related to the effects of globalisation. Regarding the establishment of the fields of Comparative Literature and Area Studies, Gayatri Spivak (2003: 3) adds, 'Whatever our view of what we do, we are made by the forces of people moving about the world'. Literature education's cultural capital now involved 'providing an entry into the performativity of cultures as instantiated in narrative' (Spivak 2003: 13). In other words, given the recognition of the inter-connectedness of the world, this newer version of cultural capital encompassed possessing the ability to access, interpret and critique another culture through acquiring that culture's language as well as knowledge of its cultural texts.

While this appeal to Literature's new cultural capital was useful in introducing the study of minority literature to an eurocentric literary tradition, a key limitation was its counter-canonical emphasis. In the 1960s, when Third World Literature was introduced as a course in English departments, its primary aim was to construct a counter-canon that displayed civilisational differences. For example, documents of an African past were used as testimonies of African-American heritage as opposed to Dante, Chaucer and Milton, hallmarks of western civilisation. According to Aijaz Ahmad (1992: 90), this counter-canonical strategy involved the study of 'documents which referred to that which had been left behind, which had been there before the journey, and which was now to be recouped – by the descendant of the slave, the immigrant, the incoming student – as a resource of both memory and hope'. In short, such an

approach reinforces the west versus the rest binary that ironically strengthens colonialism as a disciplinary frame.

The alternative response to the problem of the binary related to literature education's cultural capital is then to consider its linguistic capital. By this, I do not refer to the acquisition of diverse languages but rather the ability to acquire a language of interpretation that transcends culture. This is what Scholes (1985) refers to as textual power. According to him, such an approach perceives reading not as consumption but as the productive activity of meaning making. Scholes further argues that the literature curriculum should be designed to teach three core skills – reading, interpretation and criticism. While the teaching of reading would involve teaching students knowledge about generic and cultural codes needed to comprehend the text, the teaching of interpretation would involve teaching students to discuss how the text is structured, what kind of oppositions sustain its meaning and how these oppositions link to the larger system of societal values. Finally, the teaching of criticism would involve teaching students to question the intentions of the 'author', particularly the ideological positions he or she adopts in the text. In a later book, Scholes (1998) again argues for the need to restore the centrality of studying literariness or textuality in literature education. Here, it is not the type of cultural text that matters i.e. whether it is high or low, major or minor, but the literary skills acquired. Not only does such an approach move beyond questions of culture and thereby evade issues regarding the politics of culture and criticism, it more importantly offers greater pragmatic value for students. Through this approach, literature education would equip students to read, interpret and criticise all types of texts in a variety of modes, genres and media. Such an approach that stresses knowledge in varied semiotic systems have become increasingly crucial given the effects of technological globalisation and given the highly media-saturated world that students today are growing up in.

One way to differentiate this curriculum from a World Literature curriculum centred on the goals of multiculturalism is to term it a Global Literature curriculum. Such a curriculum is inclusive of a range of texts from around the world but more than that, it is designed to meet the instrumental demands of globalisation. Hence, it is skills rather than content that is foregrounded. In fact, Scholes' emphasis on textuality parallels the contemporary New Literacies movement. This describes the predominance of scholarly research in the late twentieth century related to various forms of literacies such as critical literacy, visual literacy, digital literacy, media literacy and multimodal literacy. These are often termed 'new' literacies in order to make a distinction from an older form of literacy centred on the printed text. What is common among all these new forms of literacies is the emphasis on the acquisition and learning of particular skills associated with communication in a social and cultural context (Nixon 2003, Unsworth 2004). In a key position paper on a pedagogy of multiliteracies, the New London Group (1996) outlines six design elements – linguistic design, visual design, audio design, gestural design, spatial design and multimodal design – which comprise the metalanguage of multiliteracies to be incorporated into the school curriculum. Part of multi-literacy education involves learning how these various modes of communication contribute to the overall message (Kress and Jewitt 2003)[11]. Broadly speaking, the focus of these various studies is on the materiality of the text. Thus, instead of

studying the meaning behind an image, sound or word and how it works individually, the study is extended to an examination of what these particular modes are and how one mode works in combination with others. Theoretically, this involves a change from linguistics, which accounts for language alone to semiotics, a theory which accounts for all sign systems (Kress 2003). Within such a semiotic framework, form is inherently bound with the meaning of the text and a multimodal analysis thus necessitates familiarisation with all other modalities of communication rather than the printed word alone.

A Global Literature curriculum grounded on semiotics implies that popular culture texts, multicultural texts from other countries can co-exist and find a shared space with literary classics in the classroom. However, the problem with such a curriculum is that the emphasis on literacies and literary skills neglects the importance of 'soft skills'. By this, I refer to the moral and ethical components of literature education, components which cannot be easily assessed or measured and yet are a vital part of the humanistic tradition of literary studies. Indeed, in current research related to new literacies, there is little discussion about issues of social justice, human rights, empathy and compassion, as well as the possibility of universal values. To put this another way, new literacies and semiotic emphases may be seen as a reaction to the effects of cultural globalisation and this reaction has largely been articulated according to a utilitarian argument in which Literature's usefulness is proven by adopting the scientific and objective language of globalist discourse. This imbalance then requires the intervention of another discourse, one that also accounts for Literature's apparent 'uselessness' by highlighting its transcendental, non-measurable humanistic values rather than tangible skills alone. As I will argue in the following section, such an imbalance may be countered by re-imagining the literature curriculum as a hybrid space comprising the third dualism – the development of global and responsible citizens. I term such a hybrid model a Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum in order to distinguish this from World and Global Literature curricula models.

The Case for a Cosmopolitan Literature Curriculum

Cosmopolitanism is a complex term with many varied definitions but two main distinctions call for a deeper examination. The first distinction is that between old and new cosmopolitanism (Williams 2007). While old cosmopolitanism proposes that national differences be minimised in favour of a uniform enlightened culture, new cosmopolitanism adheres to a more realistic and hybrid perspective that respects tradition and loyalty to nation while also subscribing to a belief in universal values so that one then becomes open to cultural diversity and becomes committed to conversations with other cultures (Williams 2007). However, it is also important to note a similarity in both old and new cosmopolitanism. Just as old cosmopolitanism emerged in Europe in the eighteenth century as a result of the increasing internationalisation of trade and commerce, new cosmopolitanism emerged in the late twentieth century as a result of the acceleration of globalisation. This therefore points to the fact that cosmopolitanism is not antithetical to globalisation; rather, in attempts to regulate the excesses of capitalism, globalisation has provided the necessary conditions for the materialisation of cosmopolitanism

which is regarded as the 'normative' or 'human' face of globalisation (Cheah 2009). In relation to literature education, what this implies is that in arguments concerning the curriculum's relevance, one cannot regard the potential uses of literature's capital power as separate from its humanising influence.

The second distinction is that between shallow and deep cosmopolitanism. Typically, most people would associate cosmopolitanism with the idea of worldly sophistication, of having knowledge of other cultures or material expertise in other cultures as opposed to a parochial or provincial outlook (Scheffler 1999). In relation to the curriculum, Saranindranath Tagore (2003) links this kind of shallow cosmopolitanism to multiculturalism which centres on a broad yet superficial reading of other cultures. A multicultural perspective celebrates the multiplicity and diversity of cultures so that one may speak of African Literature, Japanese Literature or Caribbean Literature etc. However, because such a strategy involves attempting to define boundaries around cultures, it relapses into narrow parochialism. Hence, 'a deep cosmopolitan syllabus must pay special heed to mapping and exploring plotting of intersection across elements of the syllabus, where the algebra of intersection profiles conceptual similarities without glossing over textures of difference' (S. Tagore 2003: 87). In other words, deep cosmopolitanism is characterised by its hybrid nature. Here, the paradoxical tensions may be rephrased as such: respecting tradition while being open to the new, recognising boundaries or differences but finding commonalities or intertextual features across cultures, and being ethically committed to one's own family or community as well as to the human race. The question is, how would one concretise a cosmopolitanism of hybridity as described above in designing the literature curriculum or to put it another way, what would a hybrid Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum look like? I posit five essential aims of such a curriculum which are linked to the need to facilitate deparochialising education, global interconnectivity, narrative imagination, commitment to world ethics, and hermeneutic interventions.

In terms of design, a Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum would promote a 'deparochialising education' (Lingard, Nixon and Ranson 2008) that begins with familiarising students with the literary traditions of their own culture. This would then lead to problematising notions of 'nation' and 'culture' as bounded and homogenous concepts. For example, in a study of Harper Lee's 'To Kill a Mockingbird', a popular text used in many Language Arts high school classrooms, instead of focusing solely on issues of racial discrimination, the teacher could encourage students to probe the structures of race established in the text and how the author herself problematises these structures through minor characters such as Calpurnia who is both servant and authority figure to the children as well as Mr. Raymond, a white man who marries a black woman. A useful entry point would be to view nations as 'imagined communities'[12] where the idea of a nation or culture may be viewed as a politicised constructs established by particular ideological apparatuses.

In terms of its goals, a Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum would promote the aim of global inter-connectivity. The point is for students to conceive of themselves as inter-related beings who are affiliated with their community as well as with the world at large. To facilitate this, such a

curriculum would seek to extend the local to the global. For example, instead of exploring issues of anti-Semitism in Shakespeare's 'The Merchant of Venice', such investigations should be correlated with the treatment of anti-Semitism in the Elizabethan world and the contemporary world. The text then becomes a platform for educating students about the political affairs of the world (O'Connell 2007) and of everyday life (Choo 2010). It therefore involves a pedagogy that facilitates interdisciplinary learning where students develop an 'integrated code' so that they recognise connections among varied fields of learning such as History, Politics, Geography, Music, Science etc. (Lingard, Nixon and Ranson 2008: 15).

The deconstruction of binaries can be facilitated by developing imagination and sensibilities that demonstrate reflective openness to other cultures. This is what Martha Nussbaum (1997b: 10) describes as a 'narrative imagination' referring to the 'ability to think what it might be like to be in the shoes of a person different from oneself, to be an intelligent reader of that person's story and to understand the emotions, wishes, desires that someone so placed might have'. This necessitates intertextual prior knowledge in that students should already be well-acquainted with the significant histories of different communities in order to see from the perspective of others. It is here that Literature offers a powerful tool since, more than any art form, it provides access to the consciousness of another person or community (Donald 2007; Jollimore and Barrios 2006). Ultimately, a Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum would direct students to see themselves as citizens of the cosmos in which they are connected as well as ethically bound to other human beings, even strangers and foreigners they do not know.

In relation to the above point, an even more radical approach is to consider that it is not enough to know in an abstract way that one is a citizen of the world. What is more important is to demonstrate this through a proactive ethical commitment. Here, the curriculum plays a vital role since it is the space where the world is explained to the young and where the impetus for change is elaborated (Pinar 2009). For example, educators can be very intentional about the texts studied in the classroom by being sensitive to contemporary prejudices and stereotypes. Thus, when they sense a prevailing suspicion or hatred towards a particular group or community, this could be followed by a deliberate attempt to create space in the classroom for a closer examination of these latent emotions. Nussbaum (1997a) suggests that schools and universities can teach young people to regard the alien as one whom they might actually learn something from and one whom, given a change of situation, they might themselves be. An even more provocative strategy would be to deliberately read about one's community from the point of view of other communities. For example, the film 'Flags of our fathers' directed by Clint Eastwood in 2006, describes the capture of the Japanese island of Iwo Jima during World War II from the perspective of the American military. Its companion film, 'Letters from Iwo Jima', also directed by Eastwood, portrays the war from the perspective of the Japanese army that defended the island. To push this idea a little further, imagine a classroom scene in which students, while studying World War II literature, also read how foreign nations, even enemy nations, thought about the war and how these nations viewed their own imagined community. As Nussbaum (1997a: 11) nicely puts it, such a curriculum promotes 'a kind of exile – from the comfort of

local truths, from the warm nestling feeling of loyalties, from the absorbing drama of pride in oneself and one's own'. The idea of an ethical commitment is closely connected to the idea of world citizenship in which one is deeply inter-connected with other worlds and therefore partakes in the suffering of others. This involves an awareness of universal ethical values or basic human rights that one should adhere to irrespective of communal affiliations. Developing an ethical commitment also implies developing students' capacities to be proactive moral agents. In other words, aside from exposure to the injustices committed to others, schools should empower students to be not just passive readers but active agents who can contribute to the alleviation of suffering and the promotion of universal harmony. This is all the more important given how easy it is to be indifferent to the daily bombardment by the media about news of war, natural disasters, terrorist attacks etc.

Finally, an important aspect of a Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum entails 'an attitude that seeks to destabilise alterity through continuous hermeneutic interventions' (S. Tagore 2008: 1081). Hermeneutics is a theory of interpretation involving the way 'gaps' between a text and its recipient, the past and the present are negotiated. In filling in the 'gaps', one way a hermeneutic intervention operates is by deconstructing binaries. Rabindranath Tagore, who won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1913, provides an excellent example of someone who applied such an approach through the establishment of the Visva-Bharat University. The cosmopolitan orientation of the university is encapsulated in its slogan, 'The world in one nest'. In setting up the university, Tagore encouraged the study of foreign cultures and emphasised the development of a cosmopolitan curiosity about the world. More importantly, Tagore attempted to deconstruct particular conceptual binaries and envisioned a hybrid culture incorporating many opposites such as east and west, modern and traditional, elite and mass (Williams 1999). This is achievable through Tagore's emphasis on two essential human attributes – humility and compassion. Humility involves recognising that one knows very little amidst the vastness and richness of the world. At the same time, compassion is also necessary for one to move outside the lens of one's worldview. Thus, through the university, Tagore aimed to inculcate what he terms, 'a sympathy with all humanity, free from all racial and national prejudices' (R. Tagore 1961). Another appropriate pedagogical approach is to apply the ancient Greek notion of the suspension of judgement inspired by philosophers such as Sextus Empiricus. This refers to the belief that all learning should lead to tranquillity which occurs when one is able to suspend judgement and live with differing and contradictory perspectives. While this practice of suspending judgement coupled with an attitude of humility and compassion seems at odds in the context of a rational modernist system of education in which the language of science has been translated into rigid disciplinary boundaries, standardised assessment and syllabi, it is a necessary aspect of a cosmopolitan disposition that would prepare students to live in tranquillity in a complex, diverse and interconnected world.

Conclusion

Returning to the question posed at the beginning of this paper, how does a Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum address the problem of Literature's usefulness or more specifically, it's apparent uselessness in the age of globalisation? I have argued that instead of addressing the question by appealing to one side of a binary, for example, by privileging Literature's use value over its transcendental value, an alternative is to conceive the literature curriculum as a hybrid space. Through various accounts of the history of literary studies, hybridity is evidenced in various paradoxical dualisms such as the co-existence of projects of nationalism with projects of colonialism as well as the co-existence of literature education's utilitarian function of equipping students with particular literacies with a transcendental purpose of aesthetic appreciation. It seems then that in re-conceiving a literature curriculum that meets the demands of the twenty-first century, we must take into account the old dualisms (nationalism and colonialism as well as the transcendental and use values of literature education) while redefining them in the contemporary context.

In this light, I have argued why both a World Literature and a Global Literature curriculum cannot adequately address the hybrid nature of the curriculum. On one hand, a World Literature curriculum with its counter-canonical, resistant angle reinforces nationalistic loyalties and does not take into account what I term the positive spirit of colonialism. We often associate the term colonialism with the domination and oppression of other communities when, in the original spirit of its Latin meaning, 'colere', colonialism refers to the manner in which new settlers, in search of new ideas and new experiences, looked to foreign cultures for inspiration. In this light, a World Literature curriculum remains narrowly parochial rather than open to influences, cross-currents and resonances with other communities. On the other hand, a Global Literature curriculum is essentially a reactionary model that proposes to restore Literature's use value by emphasising its institutional, cultural, and linguistic capital. By couching the goals of literature education in the language of economics so that the teaching of measurable and transferable skills become a key focus of the curriculum, it neglects the moral and transcendental dimension. It is therefore like a curriculum without a soul.

We are therefore compelled to look for the alternative in a Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum. Such a curriculum is aimed at cultivating a 'critical openness to the world with a critical loyalty toward the local' through the encouragement of dialogue and respect for other people and their traditions (Hansen 2008: 8). In other words, although one begins with one's own tradition and perceives the new through the lens of one's culture, such a tradition and culture is not static but becomes gradually transformed through openness to the influence of others. Eventually, students are pushed to see themselves as part of the wider community, known as the world. A Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum also contains both utilitarian and transcendental values. In terms of its use value, it prepares students for global labour markets where they are expected to be mobile, to be able to shift among different communities, to relate and communicate with diverse groups by having dispositions related to cosmopolitan curiosity, openness and empathy towards others. In a book entitled 'Literature and International Relations', Sheeran (2007: xxiii) discusses how Literature can provide insights into international relations

and the art of diplomacy, a skill which will becoming increasingly important in the future: 'The insight gleaned from literature: the stories, characters and plots, set in various locations, provide reference points that transgress borders and uncover cultures in a manner that compliments the "making sense" of a social and political world operating in constant flux'. More importantly, a Cosmopolitan Literature curriculum balances an instrumental value with an ethical, moral dimension. That is, it provides a clear vision and goal for the acquisition of literacies, literary, communicative and other skills associated with literature education. Such a goal transcends race, class, nation, and other imagined boundaries. Simply put, it provides a compelling reason why literature teachers should teach particular literacies and literary skills – not because they wish their students to conquer, colonise or oppress another but because they hope that through language, their students would continue the work of advancing the human race by promoting basic human freedoms, by speaking for the voiceless and the oppressed, and by ensuring the endurance of essential humanistic values.

Notes

1. In Différance, Derrida (1968: 279) distinguishes two aspects of 'to differ': 'In the one case, "to differ" signifies nonidentity; in the other case it signifies the order of the same. Yet there must be a common, although entirely different [différante], root within the sphere that relates the two movements of differing to one another. We provisionally give the name difference to this sameness which is not identical: by the silent writing of it's "a", it has the desired advantage of referring to differing, both as spacing/temporalising and as the movement that structures ever dissociation'.

2. The notion of informed response has been articulated in different ways in high-stakes standardised assessment. For example, the International General Certificate Examination administered by the University of Cambridge requires students to 'communicate a considered and reflective personal response to the text' (UCIE 2010: 8); the International Baccalaureate English marking notes states that 'Relevant discussion of literary features must appear in every response' (IBO 2007: 5); in the New York State Regents High School Examination, students must 'develop ideas clearly and fully, making effective use of a wide range of relevant and specific evidence and appropriate literary elements' (TSED 2010: 53).

3. See Burbules and Torres (2000).

4. See OECD (1996, 2001) and the World Bank (2003).

5. See Kellner (2002).

6. See Luke and Luke (2000).

7. Marianna Papastephanou (2005) distinguishes globalisation from globalism. While globalisation refers to the intensification of global interconnectedness, globalism refers to discourses about globalisation, the manner in which it is thematised and theorised.

8. John Pizer (2006) notes that the first author to have used the expression Weltliteratur or ‘World Literature’ is Christopher Martin Wieland, a German scholar who articulated his thoughts on the subject in a series of handwritten notes in 1813. Wieland’s idea of World Literature, centred on the reading of classic Greek and Latin writers such as Horace, implicitly points to a disdain for contemporary literary works of his time and instead suggests a nostalgia for ancient European ‘high’ culture. Goethe later extended Wieland’s ideas and is considered by scholars to have first fully articulated the broad parameters for Weltliteratur. See also Auerbach (1969), Damrosch (2003), Lawall (1994) and Moretti (2000).

9. Georg Brandes (1899) later extended Goethe’s criteria of aesthetic worth by proclaiming that in actuality, only a handful of writers such as Shakespeare belong to World Literature. His arguments echo other scholars of the time who paved the way for the establishment of the western canon.

10. See Ahmad (1992) and Spivak (2003).

11. In a more recent paper on media education in the twenty-first century, Henry Jenkins (2006) argues for the need to develop new competencies and social skills such as play (the capacity to experiment with one’s surroundings), distributed cognition (the ability to interact meaningfully with tools that expand mental capacities) and transmedia navigation (the ability to follow the flow of stories and information across multiple modalities). In another study, Renee Hobbs (2003, 2007) links media literacy instruction to the development of critical reading and evaluative skills.

12. The term ‘imagined communities’ was coined by Benedict Anderson (1991) denoting the constructed nature of nations and communities.

References

Ahmad, A. (1992). Languages of Class, Ideologies of Immigration. In A. Ahmad (ed), *In Theory: Class, Nations, Literatures* (New York: Verso), 73--94.

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso).

Applebee, A. (1974). *Tradition and Reform in the Teaching of English: A History* (Urbana, Illinois: NCTE).

Arnold, M. (1880). *The Study of Poetry.* Available online at: http://arnold.classicauthors.net/StudyOfPoetry/StudyOfPoetry2.html, accessed October 6, 2009.

Arnold, M. (1960). Common Schools Abroad. In F. Neiman (ed), *Essays, Letters, and Reviews by Matthew Arnold* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 291--305.

Astiz, M. F., Wiseman, A. W., and Baker, D. P. (2002). Slouching towards decentralization: consequences of globalization for curricular control in national education systems. *Comparative Education Review*, 46 (1), 66--88.

Auerbach, E. (1969). Philology and Weltliteratur. *The Centernnial Review,* 3 (1), 1--17.

Bourdieu, P. (1983). The field of cultural production, or: the economic world reversed. In R. Johnson (ed), *Pierre Bourdieu: The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press), 29--73.

Brandes, G. (1899). On World Literature. Available online at: http://global.wisc.edu/worldlit/readings/brandes-world-literature.pdf, accessed October 6, 2009.

.

Burbules, N. C. and Torres, C. A. (2000). Globalization and education: an introduction. In N.C. Burbules and C.A. Torres (eds), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives* (New York: Routledge), 1--26.

Cheah, P. (2006). *Inhuman Conditions: On Cosmopolitanism and Human Rights* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Choo S. S. (2010). Cultivating moral sensibilities through aesthetic education: the power of everyday cosmopolitanism. *The International Journal of the Humanities*. Available online at: http://www.Humanities-Journal.com, accessed July 5, 2010.

Damrosch, D. (2003). *What is World Literature?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

Davies, P. (2006). Educating citizens for changing economies. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 38 (1), 15--30.

Derrida, J. (1968). Différance. In J. Rivkin and M. Ryan (eds), *Literary Theory: An Anthology,* 2nd ed. (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing), 278--299.

Donald, J. (2007). Internationalisation, diversity and the humanities curriculum: Cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism revisited. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 41 (3), 289--308.

Eagleton, T. (1996). *Literary Theory: An Introduction*, 2nd Ed. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers).

Eckerman, J.P. (1964). *Conversations with Goethe* (New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing).

Fish, S. (1980). *Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Fish, S. (2008, January 6). Will the humanities save us? *The New York Times.* Available online at http://fish.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/01/06/will-the-humanities-save-us/, accessed on October 6, 2009.

Frey, C. J. and Whitehead, D. M. (2009). International education policies and the boundaries of global citizenship in the US. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41 (2), 269--290.

Geary, J. (1986). *Goethe's Collected Works, Vol. 3* (New York: Suhrkamp).

Gough, N. (2000). Locating curriculum studies in the global village. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 32 (2), 239--342.

Guillory, J. (1993). *Cultural Capital: The Problem of Literary Canon Formation* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).

Graff, G. (1987). *Professing Literature: An Institutional History* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).

Hansen, D.T. (2008). Curriculum and the Idea of a Cosmopolitan Inheritance. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 40 (3), 289--312.

Hobbs, R. (2007). *Reading the Media: Media Literacy in High School English* (New York: Teachers College Press).

Hobbs, R. and Frost, R. (2003). Measuring the acquisition of media-literacy skills. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38 (3), 330--355.

International Baccalaureate Organization (2007). *Marking Notes – English Standard Level Paper 2 (*Geneva, Switzerland: IBO).

Iser, W. (1972). The reading process: A phenomenological approach. In D. Lodge (ed), *Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader* (Essex, UK: Longman), 211--228.

Jenkins, H. (2006). *Confronting the Challenges of Participatory Culture: Media Education for the 21st Century* (Chicago: The MacArthur Foundation).

Jollimore, T. and Barrios, S. (2006). Creating Cosmopolitans: the case for literature. *Studies in the Philosophy of Education*, 25 (5), 363--383.

Keating, A., Ortloff, D. H. and Philippou, S. (2009). Citizenship education curricula: the changes and challenges presented by global and European integration. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41 (2), 145--158.

Kellner, D. (2002). Theorizing Globalization. *Sociological Theory,* 20 (3), 285--305.

Kernan, A. (1990). *The Death of Literature* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the New Media Age* (London: Routledge).

Kress, G. and Jewitt, C. (2003). Introduction. In C. Jewitt and G. Kress (eds). *Multimodal Literacy* (New York: Peter Lang), 1--18.

Lawall, S. (1994). Introduction. In S. Lawall (ed), *Reading World Literature: Theory, History, Practice* (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press), 1--64.

Lingard, B., Nixon, J., and Ranson, S. (2008). Remaking education for a globalized world: policy and pedagogic possibilities. In B. Lingard, J. Nixon, and S. Ranson (eds), *Transforming Learning in Schools and Communities: The Remaking of Education for a Cosmopolitan Society* (New York: Continuum Books), 3--36.

Luke, A. and Luke, C. (2000). A situated perspective on cultural globalization. In N.C. Burbules and C.A. Torres (eds), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives* (New York: Routledge), 275--298.

Marshall, H. (2009). Educating the European Citizen in the global age: engaging with the postnational and identifying a research agenda. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 41(2), 247--267.

Moretti, F. (2000). Conjectures on World Literature. *New Left Review*, 1 (Jan/Feb), 54--68.

Nixon, H. (2003). New research literacies for contemporary research into literacy and new media? *Reading Research Quarterly*, 38 (3), 407--413.

New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66 (1), 60--92.

Nussbaum. M. C. (1997a). Kant and stoic cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 5 (1), 1--25.

Nussbaum. M. C. (1997b). *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defence of Reform in Liberal Education (*Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Nussbaum, Martha, C. (2010). *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).

O'Connell, K. M. (2007). Art, nature and education: Rabindranath Tagore's holistic approach to learning. In D.T. Hansen (ed), *Ethical Visions of Education: Philosophies in Practice* (Danvers, MA: Boston Research Association for the 21st Century), 126--140.

OECD. (1996). *The Knowledge-based Economy* (Paris: OECD).

OECD. (2001). *Schooling for Tomorrow: What Schools for the Future?* (Paris: OECD).

Palmer, D.J. (1965). *The Rise of English Studies* (London: Oxford University Press).

Papastephanou, M. (2005). Globalization, globalism, and cosmopolitanism as an educational ideal. *Educational Philosophy and Theory,* 37 (4), 533--551.

Pinar, W. F. (2009). *The Worldliness of a Cosmopolitan Education* (New York: Routledge).

Pizer, J. (2000). Goethe's "World Literature" paradigm and contemporary cultural globalization. *Comparative Literature*, 52 (3), 213--227.

Pizer, J. (2006). *The Idea of World Literature: History & Pedagogical Practice* (Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press).

Richards, I. A. (1929). *Practical Criticism* (New York: Harvest Book).

Richardson, A. (1994). *Literature, Education and Romanticism: Reading as Social Practice 1780-1832* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press).

Rosenblatt, L. (1995). *Literature as Exploration* (New York: MLA).

Scheffler, S. (1999). Conceptions of cosmopolitanism. *Utilitas,* 11 (3), 256--276.

Scholes, R. (1985). *Textual Power: Literary Theory and the Teaching of English* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Scholes, R. (1998). *The Rise and Fall of English: Reconstructing English as a Discipline* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Sheeran, P. (2007). *Literature and International Relations: Stories in the Art of Diplomacy* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing).

Spivak, G.C. (2003). *Death of a Discipline* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Strich, F. (1949) *Goethe and World Literature*. (London: Routledge).

Tagore, R. (1961). "To teachers". In A. Chakravarty (ed), *A Tagore Reader* (New York: Macmillan Company), 213--223.

Tagore, S. (2003). Tagore, education and cosmopolitanism. In S.F. Atatas, T.G. Lim, and K. Kuroda (eds), *Asian Interfaith Dialogue* (Washington, DC: World Bank), 78--92.

Tagore, S. (2008). Tagore's conception of cosmopolitanism: a reconstruction. *University of Toronto Quarterly,* 77 (4), 1070--1084.

The State Education Department (2010). *Regents High School Examination: English – Scoring Key and Rating Guide* (Albany, NY: State University of the State of New York).

The World Bank. (2003). *Lifelong Learning in the Global Knowledge Economy: Challenges for Developing Countries* (Washington D.C.: World Bank).

Tyack, D. and Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

University of Cambridge International Examinations (2010). *International General Certificate of Secondary Education: Literature - English Syllabus (For Examination in June and November 2010).* Available online at: http://www.cie.org.uk/, accessed July 5, 2010.

Unsworth, L. (2004). *Teaching Multiliteracies Across the Curriculum: Changing Contexts of Text and Image in Classroom Practice. (*Berkshire, UK: Open University Press).

Viswanathan, G. (1989). *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Williams, L.B. (2007). Overcoming the ‘contagion of mimicry’: The cosmopolitan nationalism and modernist history of Rabindranath Tagore and W.B. Yeats. *American History Review*, February, 69--100.

Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).