Nation state, popul(ar)ism, and discourses of global citizenship: 
examples from Scotland’s Curriculum for Excellence

Mostafa Gamal & Dalene M Swanson

University of Stirling

Abstract

Through a critical examination of Scottish curricular policies and practices, this chapter addresses the ways in which nationalist popul(ar)ism assembles a range of identities, discourses and representations of the Scottish nation. It argues that the appropriation of global citizenship as articulated in such national policy frameworks as the Scottish national curriculum, Curriculum for Excellence (CfE), acts to hide its agency as producing ‘global citizenship’ as a complex site of discursive power that seeks to serve the hubris and intentions of nationalist discourses. By way of exemplification, a first section critically speaks to the ways in which these sentiments can be found within the Scottish Higher English curriculum, and the power of effect this holds symbolically in the discursive construction of the Scottish citizen. Working heuristically from Arnott and Ozga’s (2016) view that in its attempt to mobilise some of the resources of nationalist sentiment, the Scottish Government deploys two interrelated discourses: The first one is an economy-driven, outward referencing discourse that aims to position Scotland as a key player in the global economy; the second master discourse, is inwardly referencing and promotes the nation to itself. An examination of this inwardly referencing discourse reveals the cultural postering, narratives and tropes that undergird the political project of Scottish nationhood. The second section supports the first by providing a critical discursive analysis of global citizenship policy and curricular intentions. It articulates how these are taken up in ways that centralise Scottish nationhood and the framing of youth identities within these nationalist global citizenship discourses, also alluding to the effects of power in such discursive manoeuvrings. In articulating the above concerns, this chapter seeks to reveal concomitant relationships between the reactions to expanding neoliberal institutional governance borne out by the rise of Alt-right fascism and Trumpianism, and nationalist popul(ar)isms, elements of which can be found embedded within educational institutions and mandates, such as those of global citizenship education and curricula.


***************
“…culture is a sort of theatre where various political and ideological causes engage one another. Far from being a placid realm of Apollonian gentility, culture can even be a battleground on which causes expose themselves to the light of day and contend with one another, making it apparent, for instance, American, French, or Indian students who are taught to read their national classics before they read others are expected to appreciate and belong loyally, often uncritically, to their nations and traditions while denigrating or fighting against others” (Said, 1994, p. xiv)

**Introduction**

The advent and advancement of globalisation has brought with it new and reinvented ideas about the world and the interconnectedness of humanity and ecological life within it. While globalisation has, for many of the (hyper)globalists at least, promised an overwriting of the limits of national entities and bordered conceptions of citizenship and its relationalities (Held and McGrew, 1999; Ohmae, 1990), many skeptics argue that it has become an unwanted extension of the interests of the nation state and the national identities it inscribes (Hirst and Thompson, 1999). Global citizenship discourses have arisen from discourses of globalisation and the realist call to accept globalisation as ‘here to stay’. While ‘global citizenship’, juridically paradoxical and even oxymoronic in its conception, is a contested term within the politics of knowledge production (Swanson, 2011, 2012; Andreotti, 2006; Jefferess, 2008), it has also become a site of struggle for competing ideological meanings, and has been appropriated by policy actors, networks of governance sectors, and powerful international entities to serve particular political interests. In this sense, there has been a call to ‘indigenise’ and decolonise the term, its implied practices, and the ways it gives credence to a particular global imaginary invested in geo-political inequality
and the existing hegemonic politico-economic relations (Swanson, 2015; Abdi, Shultz & Pillay, 2015).

One of the ways in which global citizenship has been appropriated is to serve the hubris and intentions of nationalist discourses within particular state-informed policies, especially educational and curricular ones. These bear traces of popul(ar)ist rhetoric; embracing the neologism - popul(ar)ist, as a double entendre. It is populist in the sense of appealing to the ‘ordinary citizen’, appearing to understand their ‘needs’ and desires, and to be sympathetic to their daily trials and tribulations. It is also exclusionary as it is culturally or nationally deterministic. It is at the same time popularist, in the sense of embracing a political doctrine designed to appeal to the majority of the electorate. Nationalist popul(ar)ism could be understood as the common sense appeal to the majority’s desires through the state’s nationalist rhetoric. Here, it offers the ‘ordinary citizen’ the promise of the benefits of progress, security, the suggestion of certainty, and the hope of mostly-economic ascendancy of the nation state and its people. These rhetorical devices often have the psychoanalytic function of calling on nationalist pride and collective nostalgia of a glorious often-colonial past and the status it secured in global relations, even if not advertently, and thus are often framed implicitly through the perpetuated myths of empire and its presuppositions and presumptions. They are also discourses that provide the legitimacy by which ‘the other’ of a nation as constructed by a shared nationalistic imaginary is excluded.

While the dominant discourses on global citizenship testify to nationalist economic functionalism, and more critical discourses appeal to its social justice aims, there is
increasing focus on the ways in which global citizenship as appropriated in political public relations discourses and governmental and institutional policy documents elides justice-oriented intentions with the ambitions of the state, interpellating (Althusser, 1971) individuals and groups into citizens of the state and subjects of capital, while at the same time genuflecting to global social justice. It is a dangerous manoeuvring that presents global citizenship as a justice-oriented discourse, while it simultaneously enables and justifies global inequality by advancing neoliberalism and neo-conservativism and the idea of a benign state. It is particularly problematic in that it takes the place of social justice while arguably advancing an agenda that works against it (Swanson and Pashby, 2016; Swanson, 2016).

By way of exemplification, it can be argued that there are traces of nationalist popul(ar)ism in Scotland’s Curriculum for Excellence (CfE), which provides a reading of the ways in which these sentiments insert themselves within educational policy and curricula. Since Education is perceived as providing a powerful forum for socialising the next generation citizen, it becomes self-evident as to why it may manifest in these particular documents.

The rest of this chapter is given over to providing a critical analysis and discussion of the ways in which nationalism and popul(ar)ist discourses are construed within Education Scotland’s CfE, Scotland’s national curriculum. The following sections exemplify the discourses at play in the following order:

1) The first section, ‘Scottishness’ and the Scottish Higher English Curriculum, critically speaks to the ways in which these sentiments can be
found within the Scottish Higher English curriculum, and the power of effect this holds symbolically in the discursive construction of the Scottish citizen;

2) The second section, **The Popularisation of a Nationalistic Global Citizenship**, provides a critical discursive analysis of global citizenship policy and curricular intentions, and articulates how these are taken up in ways that centralise Scottish nationhood and the framing of youth identities within these nationalist global citizenship discourses, also alluding to the effects of power in such discursive manoeuvrings.

3) The short concluding paragraphs restate the key thematics that draws together discussions on nationalist popul(ar)ism, discourses on global citizenship, and the ways in which they find political effect in policy and curricula such as that of Scotland’s CfE. As neoliberal institutional governance expands despite the confused common sense (Swanson, 2015) borne out by the rise of Alt-right fascism and Trumpianism, so nationalist popul(ar)ism further embeds itself within educational institutions and mandates, such as those of global citizenship education and curricula. A number of red flags are therefore raised. These point to the inadequacy of such global citizenship discourses in the way in which they fall short of critical political engagement, an engagement that is necessary in its process of holding the state to account. But, more importantly, the inadequacy of a critically robust global citizenship agenda also fosters a problematic conservative agenda that holds the existing unequal geo-politic structures and relations in place under the prevarication of ‘neutrality’, or worse, of claiming to serve the interests of global social justice.
‘SCOTTISHNESS’ AND THE SCOTTISH HIGHER ENGLISH CURRICULUM

There is probably few better examples of the effects and symbolic power of nostalgic and popul(ar)ist nationalism than that evoked within the Scottish Higher English curriculum. Nationalism in this context is not a bounded and coherent ideology but rather a heterogenous assemblage of discursive strategies and practices that are often competing and contradictory. Nevertheless, it can be asserted that nationalism is mobilised as a discursive resource for educational policy by the Scottish government in order to consolidate the idea of it as the central entity around which Scottishness coheres, and the paternal representation of Scotland’s survival as an imagined sovereign country. It can be argued that Scottish nationalist discourse (re)creates the “nation” by foregrounding certain tropes, motifs, sentiments and a particular historiography that conceives of the “national” in terms of linguistic purity as well as cultural and social homogeneity. In this sense, nationalism entails an exclusionary imaginary and, as is the case with nationalist discourses and ideologies, there remains elision, distortions and collective acts of forgetting, as well as denial of relationalities in acts of narrating or constructing the nation. At the same time, the curriculum and policy in question articulates a vision for developing children and young people as active global citizens. As Shultz (nd, p. 3) notes: “any understanding of citizenship should bring with it a concern with entitlements, exclusion, access, and equity. Therefore, educating for global citizenship has its roots in justice”. In committing to ethical action in global citizenship’s name, it can be argued that “one needs to be reminded of the paradox of its imperative” (Swanson, 2011, p. 123), that it should not merely be celebrated uncritically, and that “it needs to address political oppression and injustice alongside the complicities within its own discourses and performances in
the social domain”. Yet, Swanson and Pashby (2016, p. 184) also assert that often: “Global Citizenship Education (GCE) tends to ignore critical engagement with ethics and complexity that inform global inequities worldwide, and often fails to achieve the self-reflective political consciousness called forth by a critical GCE”. One way in which this critical failure occurs is through the prevalence of nationalist discourse within the rhetoric of global citizenship education, for which Scottish Education policy is an example. It can be argued that dominant nationalist discourse, as so mobilised, is at odds with the avowed aim of developing global citizens.

The following is divided into two parts. The first part, Sentiments, tropes and historiography, deals with the ways in which the Scottish Higher English curriculum constructs and narrates the Scottish nation by evoking a range of devices, through particular historical narratives and imaginaries. The second section, Exclusionary imaginary, silences and elision, deals with particular myth-making, erasures, absences, emphases and conflations that characterise the discourse of nationalism. In 2011, the Scottish government established the Scottish Studies working group for the purpose of providing strategic advice and direction to support the implementation of its 2011 election manifesto commitment to develop the concept of ‘Scottish Studies’. The group recommended a mandatory requirement for Scottish pupils studying Higher English to answer at least one question of a Scottish novel, play or poem. Following this, Mike Russell, Education Minister at the time, announced a prescribed list of Scottish texts from which teachers and pupils were expected to choose.

Sentiments, tropes and historiography.
The decision to prescribe set texts has been decried as an example of direct political interference that likely narrows the range of texts and literary traditions to which pupils are exposed. The larger argument being pursued here, however, is that the prescribed list serves as an attempt to delimit a literary cannon or national heritage whose coherence “is defined by a political concept of Scottishness” (Connell, 2004, p. 41). This select canon privileges “nationality over aesthetic character as the primary organisational concept for tradition” (Connell, 2004, p.49). Accordingly, Scottish literature, as defined in the prescribed list lends credence to ‘Scottishness’ as a set of distinct traits, values and cultural morays that embody an understanding of Scotland as specific organisation of place. In this sense, Scottish identity is formulated within what Said (1994, p.3) refers to as, “a system of representation framed by a whole set of forces”, and in the Scottish context, the striving for distinctiveness has been enabled by a history of conflict with and domination by England within a United Kingdom, and the resentments this has wrought. It is in the context of this historical backdrop that the question can be raised as to how curricular discursive practices construe, evoke and propagate national sentiments. To exemplify how nationalism is operationalised in the Scottish prescribed literature, a few texts are critically engaged with here.

Following Arnott and Ozga (2016), it can be argued that educational systems are the institutional frameworks and spaces for the construction of national identities. This is a consequence of the perceived powerful socialising effect of Education within a state-led universal education system and national curriculum framework. Education is the means to create citizens that serve the interests of the state and its ambitions (Swanson, 2013). With reference to the educational policy advocated by the Scottish
government, this is marked by efforts to mobilise “some of the resources of nationalist sentiment” (Arnott and Ozga, 2016, p. 253) through the deployment of two master discourses (Arnott et al., 2010). The first is an economy-driven discourse which expresses a neoliberal agenda and is supported by a range of policy documents that aim to position Scotland as a player in the global competitive economy. This outward referencing discourse emphasises economic growth, ‘smartness’, effectiveness, and success in respect of the development of a skilled workforce and nation of global citizens. The second master discourse, discursively references inwardly and “promotes the nation to itself” (Arnott and Ozga, 2016, p. 347). A key aspect of this discourse is the idea of a ‘flourishing Scotland’, one in which the emphasis is on ‘community, fairness and inclusiveness.’ However, what is striking about this inward referencing and the collective narratives, tropes, sentiments, and historiography these mobilise is that they foster a romanticism and nostalgia in the main, invoking nationalist sentiments of a more ‘traditional’ and exclusionary nature. They are therefore invested in contradiction.

Consider, for example, a novel from the prescribed Higher English list “Sunset song” by Lewis Grassic Gibbon. The novel dramatises the process of modernisation, which over the past decades has transformed most of the population from a rural society into city-dwellers. What is significant about this is that Gibbon, along with other writers such as Hugh MacDiarmid, Neil Gunn and Edward Muir, represent what is commonly called the Scottish Literary Renaissance. During the inter-war period, these writers were involved in a grand nation-building scheme, which was meant to teach the Scots to think of their country in terms of an imaginable community and thus implicitly provide an ideological basis for nationalism. A key aspect of this reconstruction is the
destruction of past stereotypes as well as the creation of a new mythology. In particular, these Renaissance figures asserted their Scottishness through such elements as language (through the re-Gaelification of Scotland), history (by creating a new historiography) and geography (by seeking a specific landscape to represent Scotland: whether it be the Highlands, Kailyard - pastoral lowland villages - or the industrial belt). They articulated a vision of Scotland and Scottishness that is different from the Scottishness portrayed in the nineteenth century through the work of Sir Walter Scott, for example (Tange, 2000).

Inherent to Walter Scott’s novels is a Scottishness confined to the past. His historical novels, such as *Waverly* and *Old Morality*, centre on romantic episodes of Scottish history: the 1745 Jacobite uprising and the Covenanting wars. Scott depicted Scotland as a nation bedevilled by turmoil, poverty and strife (Tange, 2000). He juxtaposed this violent past with his contemporary period, characterised as enlightened and relatively peaceful. In contrast, Gibbon, as well as other Renaissance figures, made Scottish identity a concern for the present within which they wrote. To this effect, they evoked a particular historiography of that present, of a Scottish nation that was politically, economically and culturally bankrupt. Accordingly, most Renaissance accounts of Scottish history culminated in a call for the nation to put a halt to ‘the decay’ and participate in building a Scotland anew. This historiography gives a romantic account of Scotland as a nation that once prospered.

However, three crucial historical events ushered in the political, spiritual, cultural and economic decline of Scotland. Firstly, the reformation and the Calvinist creed of predestination split the nation into two factions and consequently undermined the
project of building a homogenous Scottish nationhood. Secondly, the Union of 1707 fractured the sense of Scottish identity along political and national lines: a national identity that was Scottish and a political identity that was British. In the latter sense, the subsequent Highland clearances contributed to this political fracture. The land clearances occurred in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries with the removal and relocation of the rural population. The main objective of the clearances was to give the land over to sheep farming in order to supply the growing factories with wool. The third factor, related to the second, was the industrial revolution, which destroyed the fabric of Scottish society through ensuing urbanisation and the problems this engendered (Tange, 2000). In an essay, entitled “The Antique Scene”, Gibbon summarised these in the following terms:

[Prince Charles’s] final defeat at Culloden inaugurated the ruthless extirpation of the clan system in Highlands, the extirpation of almost a whole people. Sheep farming came to Highlands, depopulating its glens, just as the Industrial Revolution was coming to the Lowlands, enriching the new plutocracy and brutalising the ancient plebs. Glasgow and Greenock were coming into being as the last emblems of the old Scots culture flickered and fuffed and went out. (Gibbon, 1934, p.36)

This reading of history invokes a nation in peril. This can perhaps be better explored with reference to what Hearn (2002) referred to as “the trope of elegiacism” that depicts a loss of national agency, engendering a feeling of victimisation and disempowerment. This sentiment, exemplified in Gibbon’s quote, crystallises around a range of seminal events or national tragedies - to use John Prebble’s catalogue -
such as Darien, Glencoe, Culloden, and the Highland Clearance. By invoking these, a sense of long-running grievances that re-invigorate nationalism is equally evoked with a view to redressing the consequences of these tragedies. A spirit of cultural independence from the aesthetic, political, cultural and economic centre of England is asserted.

Within the prescribed list, the trope of elegiacism is underscored by the following examples: In the *The Cheviot, the Stag and the Black, Black Oil* by John McGrath, the trope is articulated through charting a historical narrative whose starting point is the Highland Clearance in the nineteenth century. Aristocratic landowners discovered the profitability of sheep farming, enforcing a mass emigration of rural Highlanders, burning their houses for the express purpose of making way for Cheviot sheep. The play dramatises the capitalist’s exploitation of resources and repression of rural folk through the estates of the stag-hunting landed gentry. The narrative culminates in the exploitation of the North Sea Oil. Cutting across this narrative is the erosion of the Gaelic culture and language. Similarly, the poetry of Sorely MacLean articulates the same concerns. In *Hallaig*, MacLean strongly evokes through this poem the Highlanders’ expulsion from their homes and both laments and celebrates a once-thriving community and way of life, displaced by the Highland Clearances.

As indicated by these examples, the common theme coalesces around the issue of what the historian Tom Devine refers to as the “relentless violation of the values of clanship”, which “caused enormous collective disorientation through the Gaelic world” (1999). The issue of religion, notably the deleterious effect of Presbyterianism on the Highlanders’ communal identity, is equally articulated in
some of the prescribed texts. Iain Crichton Smith in his short stories depicts an oppressive and stifling life in Presbyterian communities, where people are intellectually and emotionally isolated. This unfavourable depiction of Presbyterianism is perhaps best illustrated in his novel *Consider The Lilies*. In this novel, Iain Crichton Smith, portrays a Presbyterian minister as ironically motivated by a desire to “spread the Kingdom”, and thus promulgating “a concept of God Himself as a harsh absentee landlord, undoubtedly bent on eviction” (Schoene, 1998, p.63).

Industrialisation is equally appropriated as undermining and causing Scottishness to disintegrate. This pivots around the representation of the city as a “denaturalized” and “denationalized” urban space that has disrupted and distorted social arrangements passed down through traditions (Whyte, 1998). In *Men Should Weep*, the playwright Ena Lamont Stewart dramatises the deleterious effect of urbanism and industrialisation. Her play is set in the 30’s, a decade of huge political and social upheaval. Scotland, like so much of the industrialised world, was plummeted into deep economic recession. This resulted in wide-spread unemployment, social deprivation and a crisis of confidence in the existing political and social structures. Stewart depicts an urban setting characterised by poor quality housing, overcrowding, extreme poverty, domestic violence and dysfunctional urban males. The narrative gives emphasis to the hopes and ideals of a Scotland that transcends these lived oppressions, and can confidently rise to earlier glory in a modern context. These novels and narratives contribute to a nostalgic popul(år)ism that is nationalistic and centres around the reinvention and sustenance of a particular style of mythologising that formulates Scottishness in these particular terms. There is
nothing by way of the prescribed list of texts to contest or stand in contradiction to these nationalist formulations, and so the list becomes *de facto* the Scottish literary cannon to youth studying within Scottish schools, and a means by which they are to read their histories and understand their role and identities in the Scottish nation-building project.

**Exclusionary imaginary, silences and elision**

What is significant about the inward referencing deployed, the cultural and symbolic representations it mobilises, and the orthodox genealogy of Scotland it articulates, is that it not only “effectively establishes a (literary) canon by fiat” (Elliott, 2014) but also generates an “exclusionary imaginary” (Sayegh, 2008). This imaginary, as Sayegh (2008) avers, “allows for the reproduction of nationalism” and “also promotes forms of exclusion, which foster introverted assertions of identities” (p.1).

The narrative propagated by the prescribed texts emphasises the primacy of ‘the national’ by focussing on a number of relevant developments in history that are presented as essential to Scottishness. This primacy is articulated through a range of discursive practices that pivots around a “nation-centric” (Ichigo, 2009) worldview, contesting the idea of Britishness as a coherent identity. Simultaneously, the cultural nationalism advocated in these texts is exclusionary to the extent that it does not recognise multiple attachments to specific traditions, values, language and other cultural practices (Moskal, 2016). It does not foster plural ways of belonging and being, as it portrays Scotland as a homogeneous cultural domain. The denial of relationality is equally evident here, especially in the privileged space given to
national frames of reference perpetuated through recourse to a particular

historiography.

In apparent contradiction, a number of official pronouncements from the Scottish
government articulates an inclusive and diverse Scottish identity. This is evidenced by
a policy document titled *The International Lifelong Learning Scotland's Contribution
(2007)*. It states that “we take pride in a strong, fair and inclusive national identity”
and “there is no future, at least not one that we would want, for a parochial Scotland”.

Whilst these pronouncements ostensibly articulate and “even promote cultural
diversity”, the identity mobilised is “still a territorial, historically pre-encoded and
hence potentially essentialist” one, “which serves to identify, isolate and exclude”
(Schoene, 1998, p. 55). It also does nothing to make accountable a Scotland that
enabled slavery and participated in wars of empire. It is a national identity in which
“we take pride” only.

In contrast, Stuart Hall reminds us that “identity does not signal that stable core of the
self, unfolding from beginning to end through all the vicissitude of history without
change” (2005, p.17). Rather, identities need to be understood “as produced in
specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and
practices, by specific enunciativie strategies” (Hall, 2005, p.17). Yet, this attempt in
the prescribed texts to fix identities by endorsing “an inward process of
homogenization” (Schoene, 1998, p. 55), not only forecloses and obscures the nature
of identities as “social arrangements” that are always “assertions, always contingent,
always negotiable” (Tilly, 2003), but perhaps more importantly, this fixing is a
powerful discursive practice in creating and sustaining the idea of a homogeneous Scottish identity. As Bhabha (1994, p. 194) argues:

For the political unity of the nation consists in a continual displacement of the anxiety of its irredeemably plural modern space – representing the nation’s modern territoriality is turned into the archaic, atavistic temporality of Traditionalism. The difference of space returns to the Sameness, turning Territory into Tradition, turning the People into One.

In explicitly and implicitly invoking Scottishness as a “solid, historic monolith of unmistakable, traditional characteristics” (Schoene, 1998, p.55), the prescribed texts function as points of identification and “attachment … because of their capacity to exclude, to leave out, to render ‘outside’…” (Hall, 2005, p.18) other facets of Scottishness. In particular, these texts abjure key developments that are relevant “in many personal or group histories of contemporary British citizen” (Sayegh, 2008, p. 17): issues of hybridity, nomadism, exile, migration and the postcolonial condition that articulate different forms of consciousness and “dislocation” and “its attendant discomforts and disagreements” (Hughes, 2002). Consequently, the notion of Scottishness exemplified by the introverted and exclusionary philosophy of “ourselves alone”, rather “than entrenching a coherent sense of national identity, is more likely to deform the idea of Scottishness itself - to mistake a complex, forward looking, heterogeneous identity for one that is narrow and reductive in its nativism” (Carruthers, 2004, p.15).
A necessary consequence of this exclusionary logic is a range of elisions and silences. As Morris (2013) suggests, the orthodox genealogy of Scotland national narrative consists of viewing Scotland “as ‘minor’ nation in its relation to England, whereby the colonial past remains largely outside the national narrative, not integrated into the collective memory” (p. 11). In other words, in the national narrative evoked by the prescribed texts, “there remain elisions, distortions and exceptionalism — common to any national ideology”, so that “issues of empire, race and slavery” (Morris, 2013, p. 2) are consequently evaded, as noted in the commentary:

Indeed, the most intense period of Scottish-Caribbean relations— the mid-eighteenth to early nineteenth centuries— exists problematically in relation to the seminal events of the Act of Union (1707), and the battle of Culloden (1746), that are perceived as rupturing the continuity of the national story, rendering Scotland a passive entity in historical processes. The historical responsibility for Caribbean slavery is then displaced onto the British state, in which Scots themselves were supposedly marginalized. (Morris, 2013, p.11)

The issue of historical complicity, national identity and the selective framing of what constitutes ‘the national’ is further advanced in the way in which ‘global citizenship’ as a discourse is appropriated and popularised within CfE. This leads to the discussion in the next section, which pays specific attention to how youth are to belong to a Scottish nation, one that is self-regarding and central to the constitution of global citizenship.

**THE POPULARIZATION OF A NATIONALISTIC GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP**
This section provides a critical discussion of global citizenship policy and curricular intentions within CfE, and articulates how these discursive constructions centralise Scottish nationhood and the framing of youth identities within these nationalist global citizenship discourses, also alluding to the effects of power in such discursive manoeuvrings. Global citizenship becomes popularised so that it acts as a catch-all concept that functions to support the disparate management systems and educational intentions in accordance with the ambitions of the state, while reinforcing the independence and centrality of Scotland as an imagined entity.

In the Scottish CfE, global citizenship is ‘embedded’ across the curriculum as an overarching theme and educational value. This means that subject areas need to embrace global citizenship as an internal theme, but also that school-wide, interdisciplinary projects can cohere around a designated global citizenship concept. Global citizenship acts as a broad umbrella to fulfil curriculum intentions across the school years, and it frames a stated ‘whole school’ and ‘integrated’ approach to learning thereby justifying modernist progressivity, which the term global citizenship has come to signify in general in the global domain. The ‘whole school’ and ‘integrated’ discourse is associated with governance and management discourses, and advocated through overtures to a ‘life skills’ and ‘relevance’. In advertising an online video, the language of CfE stipulates:

A coherent and holistic whole school approach to global citizenship is essential if we are to equip learners with the skills, knowledge, confidence and attitudes to thrive in our fast-changing globalised world. The short, animated videoclip captures the main ingredients of a whole school approach including leadership at all levels, a focus on ethos and values, the embedding of global
citizenship in the curriculum and an emphasis on pupil voice and community participation.

This video has been designed to support professional learning in schools and raise practitioners’ awareness about the importance of a whole school approach in helping schools move forward in a strategic way with this important theme across learning. (Education Scotland, a whole school approach to global citizenship).

In this way, an approach to school governance, and its internal operations, is justified and enabled through the linking of global citizenship – which carries an aura of positivity and asserts a notion of commitment to community interests – to school management systems, deflecting suspicion away from the implicit control exacted by this school management approach. Forms of school monitoring and evaluation cohere around discourses of ‘whole school approach’ and ‘school improvement’ mechanisms, yet they are tied to global citizenship unproblematically, suggesting that through these policies, governance approaches and institutional mechanisms, the ideals of global citizenship can be met within the ambit of each school’s management system and administrative processes. Technocratic and social justice mandates can be perfectly aligned without contradiction. The discourse of school management systems dominates so that global citizenship is co-opted and engulfed by it, divesting the term of any critical element. This is not a global citizenship that contests the injustice perpetrated by the state, or that grapples with ethical conundrums in the pursuance of a more just world, or that gives value to ‘difficult knowledge’ (Britzman, 2000) as ways of knowing that place the self in learning contexts of discomfort, contesting privilege and entitlement (Swanson, 2011). Rather, global citizenship education
simply and straightforwardly can ‘equip learners with the skills, knowledge, confidence and attitudes to thrive in our fast-changing globalised world.’ The agenda is set for how one is to engage with global citizenship, dictated by the dominance of school management systems, whose behavioural function serve to produce compliant, responsible, manageable/managed citizens. The ‘skills’ discourse, to which global citizenship is also tied, prevalent throughout CfE, belies the intentions of the state through its alignment with economic rationality, so that the ambitions of a ‘flourishing Scotland’ can be achieved within the prevailing neoliberal governance structures of the state in competition with global others (Swanson and Pashby, 2016). In a video clip on ‘about global citizenship, found on the CfE online site, the narration of ‘whole school approach’ and ‘School Improvement Plan’, utilises popularist global citizenship discourses to install an instrumentalist view of school management systems, transmitting the expectations that individuals should govern themselves via these management structures. An image of the school is included in the animated clip displaying a network of lines crossing classrooms and spaces of the school in parallel with a similar image of a networked globe with lines emanating out from Scotland at the centre of the world. By mapping this image onto the image of a school, not only is a nationalistic global citizenship popularised, but the popularist image of the school is used as an instrument to facilitate a particular nationalist and popularist worldview.

The strategic management systems rhetoric co-opting global citizenship ensures that this view accords with the intentions of neoliberal governance. Further, the reduced relationality, by having Scotland at the centre of global networks of relationality as depicted, prevents a critically-engaged global citizenship (Swanson, 2011; Andreotti, 2006), where Scotland shows outward political responsibility to the world. Instead, it
is inwardly referencing, self-regarding, and hence exclusionary, thereby reinforcing a nationalist populism inherent to the paradigmatic framings within CfE.

Returning again to the quoted excerpt, while ‘attitudes’ heralds a ‘character education’ orientation to global citizenship, ‘confidence’ suggests an individualistic psycho-social orientation, facilitating the latent behavioural dimension inherent in whole school approaches, rather than contesting them. These discourses are popular in the sense that they afford credence to the making of a ‘good’ law-abiding citizen, that behaves ‘responsibly’. The state takes on a behaviour management and moralising function, which is paternalistic, and is based on the assumption of a benign state that is justified in carrying such a role. The last part of the phrase quoted above refers to another stated purpose of global citizenship in the curriculum, the purpose of enabling pupils to ‘thrive in our fast-changing globalised world’, one which ties global citizenship unproblematically to the modernist project and where economic rationalities of competitive advantage and progressivism, invested in globalisation discourses, are validated. In CfE rhetoric, global citizenship elides with the economic functionalism of globalisation and modernism, and there is no discord presented in its alignment with a justice-oriented remit (Swanson and Pashby, 2016).

The language of CfE redefines global citizenship in terms of three wider educational discourses with which it is made to be associated. This approach serves the interests of what can be viewed as strategy of association that fits with the wider ambitions of the state, without being accountable to provide access to the educational decisions behind these curricular categories. The discourses hinged together by a theme of global citizenship are as follows:
Global citizenship brings together education for citizenship, international education and sustainable development education and recognises the common outcomes and principles of these three areas. All curriculum areas can contribute to developing the skills, attributes and knowledge that will create active global citizens. (Education Scotland, About global citizenship)

In this text, there is no indication of the underlying logic of these associations other than the hint of ‘common outcomes and principles’, which is left stated but not explained. There is no hint of how citizenship discourses, international education (which provides the avenue through which a focus on Scotland and ‘its place in the wider world’ is advanced), and sustainable development education, might raise particular and distinct political incompatibilities and paradigmatic tensions, but potential discordances are smoothed over, rendering the discourses politically neutral. This political neutrality might be argued as contributing to a strategy that deflects negative attention away from the state, enabling a popular nationalism to hold sway over less popular, but critical positions, and naturalising the uneven relations of power between state and citizen under a banner of good, responsible citizenship.

This strategy of association, nationalistic in nature, is never so evident than in the language describing international education. International education is stated as being a component of global citizenship, an international education in which Scotland is central. This position is celebrated under a subheading, National Support for International Education:
The Scottish Government recognises that international education can significantly improve the classroom experiences for children and young people:

“In order for Scotland and its people to succeed and flourish in the globalised 21st century that we live in, we must all become and live as global citizens.”

Mike Russell, Cabinet Secretary for Education and Lifelong Learning, Scottish Parliament on 4 March 2010

The Scottish Government's international perspective indicates that:

- The focus should be on Scotland and Scotland’s place in the world - challenging our ambitions against the achievement of other countries and aiming to have a confident sense of self.

- Learning in schools should promote an understanding of Scotland, our culture, heritage and history, our environment and our place in the world.

(Education Scotland, International Education)

‘For Scotland to flourish, we need to become global citizens’, is the main thrust of the message. The express purpose of promoting global citizenship is to prop up a confident and ambitious state. It is not about how we may assist others in the creation of a better, more just world, but how we help ourselves – how we help the Scottish state achieve its ambitions and maintain its global privileges. The interests and advantages Scotland may hold are not disturbed. It is a selective global citizenship that suits the interests of the state as the supreme entity to which the purposes of the curriculum, advocated under an uncriticisable ‘do-good’ theme of global citizenship,
are hinged. The stated purpose of international education is, after all, where ‘the focus should be on Scotland’ and ‘Scotland’s place in the world’. It is nationalistic, self-referencing and self-regarding mantra. Speaking for the citizen, the voice of the state is heard clearly in the definition of international education as the place where ‘we’ challenge ‘our ambitions against the achievement of other countries and aiming to have a confident sense of self’. Studying international education, therefore, provides Scotland with competitive advantage, rendering the learner a subject of these national ambitions and an instrument through which such ambitions are to be achieved. The confident, self-regarding state is a collection of confident individuals. Just as ‘confident individual’ is one of the ‘four capacities’ of CfE, so ‘responsible citizen’ is also one, further enabling the ambitions of the state to be advanced via popularist discourses within this curriculum text.

The responsibilities of global citizenship and discourses of responsibilisation are evident in a number of neoliberal governance systems in nation states across the world, and are embedded in many Western education systems (Hartung, 2015), so the Scottish national curriculum is not an exception. They serve the neoliberal agenda of creating citizens that are responsible for themselves (not burdensome to the state), for the rights of other citizens [and this mostly excludes, by definition and the repeated use of the term ‘citizen’ to refer to the state’s subject, decitizenized others (Abdi and Shultz, 2008), such as refugees or ‘illegal migrants’], and are responsible for the economic wellbeing of the state. Their cost is to be minimised reflecting a fiscally responsible state. This global citizen is individualistic, self-reliant, and compliant with their stated duties and needs of the market (Swanson and Pashby, 2016).
This recruitment of the Scottish citizen as subject of the state is also evident in the rhetorical devices deployed in the online version of C/E that refers to global citizenship. It reveals the strategy of nationalist populism in the rhetoric of the state, through the co-option of pupil voice. In the section on ‘about global citizenship’, the narrating voice is that of a child/youth. It tells us that “young people want to be ready; they want to build a better future”. This narration acts as a recruitment of the pupil voice, as if it were the pupil themselves speaking out in promotion of this version and interpretive construction of global citizenship, not the government (Swanson and Pashby, 2016). The curriculum therefore ‘knows’ what pupils feel, believe and say. It knows what a responsible youth citizen should think and want. The ‘voice’ then shifts to the nation state when speaking of the ambitions of the Scottish state and the importance for Scotland of international education. This conflation of messages achieved through the narrated voice of a representational ‘Scottish child/youth’ exemplifies a politics of convenience (Swanson, 2016) in the way global citizenship is appropriated to serve the intentions and ambitions of the nation state, so that C/E becomes the instrument by which rhetorical devices are deployed towards nationalist and popul(ar)ist dimensions through discourses on global citizenship.

CONCLUSION

Nationalist popul(ar)ism is not only attributable to Alt-Right fascism and Trumpianism in a post-truth era, as is popularly understood. Its traces can be recognised within the symbolic power of particular discursive practices and strategies within modernist policies and curricula that transmit the ambitions, values and intentions of a neoliberal state. This is exemplified in the global citizenship discourses and Scottish Higher English curriculum of Education Scotland’s C/E. These intention particular political effects in the way in which Scottishness and the Scottish national
subject is construed and imagined, as is the nostalgic nationalism attributed to Scotland as historical and geo-political place. There is continued global expansion and intensification of neoliberal institutional governance despite recent political events, borne out by the rise of Trumpianism and Alt-Right popul(ar)isms. While, these political turns have appeared to confuse the straightforwardness of neoliberalism’s common-sense-making effects, nationalist popul(ar)ism nevertheless finds root within educational institutions and mandates of the modern state. An economically-driven global citizenship education discourse, and curricula informed by it, reinforce nationalistic identities and the ambitions of the nation state through the construction of the national subject in ways that facilitate nationalist popul(ar)isms, rather than contesting them. Instead of openness and globally-focused responsiveness to global and local political responsibilities and complexities, the inward, self-regarding and economically-driven discourse of global citizenship serves a contradictory agenda within CfE that is exclusionary in effect. The inadequacy of such global citizenship discourses is revealed in the way in which they fall short of critical political engagement necessary to the processes and practices of holding the state to account. They therefore foster a troubling conservative agenda that maintains the status quo, one which holds the existing unequal geo-politic structures and relations in place. Of deep concern is the way in which a popular nationalist global citizenship acts as a front to global social justice, which is a dangerous political prevarication. While the lack of social justice education might more easily be noted and confronted, its assumed presence makes the absence of critical consciousness raising educational approaches less likely to occur and false neutralities and troubling nationalistic advocacies to be contested.
The way in which the Scottish government seeks to reassert the primacy of a popul(ar)ist nationalism in its citizens’ thinking and behaviour through the language and intentions of CfE, serves a specific ambition and economic agenda. This is underscored by a particular interpretation of global citizenship and facilitated through specific rhetorical devices. The inherent denial of relationality and multiple attachments produces a set of elisions, contradictions and denials that are crucial to sustaining nationalist sentiments. This imagined Scotland supports popul(ar)ist nationalism by evoking nostalgia and fostering self-regarding ambition, but it also produces a set of exclusions, elisions, contradictions, and silences. Constructing Scottishness, the Scottish citizen, and the imaginary of Scotland is as much a cultural practice of remembering and constructing that memory, as it is about what is rendered absent and forgotten. For as Ernest Renan once declared:

‘The essence of a nation is that all individuals have many things in common, and also that they have forgotten many things.’ (Renan, 1882)
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