

Movement and Stasis in the Neoliberal Re-Orientation of Schooling

Cameron McCarthy

Introduction:

Invoking the opposition between movement and stasis in modern life, Dennis Carlson, in his insightful book, entitled *Leaving Safe Harbors*, admonishes educators to move out of the “safe harbors” of settled educational practices and philosophies in order to better address the challenges posed to schooling by the dynamics associated with globalization and multiplicity. In this important book, Carlson offers a proper riposte to the atrophy of critical theoretical and empirical work within the field of Education and the Social Sciences generally and bell-whether ringing in the popular press of the following kind: “The era of big theory is over,” declared one *New York Times* columnist in a recent article. With great assurance and self-satisfaction, she continued, “The grand paradigms that swept through the humanities departments in the 20th century—psychoanalysis, structuralism, Marxism, deconstruction, postcolonialism—have lost favor or have been abandoned. Money is tight. And, leftist politics with which literary theorists have traditionally been associated have taken a beating” (Arts section of essay of April 19th *NYT*, quoted in Malagrecia, [2003, p. 1]). One is reminded here of a similar hand ringing and a similar denunciation of the amorphous Left in the *New York Times* in the late 70s by the senior anthropologist, Marvin Harris. It was the occasion of the American Anthropological Association’s Annual Meeting. On the eve of that meeting, Harris suggested, in an op-ed piece written for the *New York Times*, that anthropology was being taken over by mystics, religious fanatics, and California cultists; that the meetings were dominated by panels on shamanism, witchcraft and ‘abnormal phenomena’; and that ‘scientific papers based on empirical studies’ had been willfully excluded from the program” (Ortner, 1994, p. 372). The *New York Times*, the newspaper that the late Edward Said liked to call the “newspaper of record” has made it its business to periodically prognosticate about the ridiculousness of the Left & its last days. Fortunately, Dennis Carlson puts us in completely different territory inviting us to consider the seriousness of the malaise of mainstream life and mainstream education and our need to move beyond conventionalism and the institutional practices of confinement to embrace hope and possibility. Above all, *Leaving Safe Harbors* suggests movement like the movement in Herman Melville’s novel *Moby Dick*. It is the suggestion of movement in the context of stasis, where, as George Lipsitz (2004) notes, too many inner-city youth and their schools are “locked on this earth,” (p. 1). They are locked in the bureaucratic deployment of schooling that is articulated to a hierarchical organization of society and an unequal access to its social rewards, goods and services. This process is analogous to what Melville lays out on the deck of the Pequod in his magnificent novel, *Moby Dick*. Arrayed around Ahab, on the deck of the Pequod, is the projection of social classification: first mate, Starbuck; second mate, Stub; third mate, Flask. Then there are the first harpooner, Queequeg, the second harpooner, Tashtego and the third harpooner, Dago of third world, Native American and African backgrounds. We are familiar with this penchant for hierarchy and top-down leadership in the university and the school. We have, then, embodied in Carlson’s book, echoing Herman Melville, the

announcement of a Shakespearean story of tragic proportions on schools that is about to unfold. This is the story of movement and stasis—the vigorous turn in education toward neoliberalism and its false clarity and false promises of greater individual freedom and choice (movement) while consolidating and exacerbating the problems of access and inequality for the minority and working class disadvantaged (stasis). But the matter goes further as we shall see in what follows.

Movement and Stasis.

We must try to understand the context of this movement in stasis, this dizziness, this uncertainty that W.B. Yeats defines in “Sailing to Byzantium”...“the best lacked all conviction” BUT now the worst are in power... the neoconservatives living high on the hog and leaving no child behind in their perverse project of neo-liberalism—the unseemly handing over of schools to private enterprise. If I may be permitted, I will step back for a moment from Carlson’s specific reading of education and try to speak to the context in which we operate in schools, the ordeal of intellectual labor and the labor process of teaching and learning in general. I want to talk about the context, the network of new relations that define our times. This is the context of neoliberalism and the specific interpretation of globalization and multiplicity in the modern world undertaken by neoliberal policy-makers. It is a context that has generated a set of dynamics that has transformed modern subject relations to the state and society at the dawning of the twenty-first century. It is a world marked by movement and stasis but not entirely in the sense that is often invoked in the literature on globalization as a kind of technological determinism and associated binarism. By “binarism” I refer to the oppositional logic that is captured in, say, Zygmunt Bauman’s “tourist” versus “vagabond” or Anthony Giddens’ “radicals” versus “skeptics” (Bauman, 1998; Giddens, 2003) These binary oppositions, among other things, suggest that those with access to technology are on the move, free of containment and those who are pre or under-technologized are marching in place, marking time, while the world passes them by. Of course there is some truth to this. But what I want to identify most urgently here is the severe and deepening loss of theodicy and meaning in the educational enterprise generally—a process that is reflected in the broad tendency of neoliberalism to compromise educational institutions and practices.

But these neoliberal logics are even broader in reach and implications. Indeed, it might be argued that instead of the end to the game of totalization announced in the declarations of *New York Times* article I quoted earlier, that we, modern citizens, more than ever, are being seduced, inducted, incorporated into ever-larger discursive systems and materialisms, led forward as much by the state as by multinational capital. We are being seduced by large-scale programs of re-narration of affiliation and exclusion holding out the possibility of identity makeovers, place swapping, and material exchange and immaterial rewards. Our daily lives are being colonized by massive systems of textual production that transgress the boundary lines between private and public life and that seem to have at the same time the ambition to conquer all of global and planetary space. Here, I am talking about the US war on terrorism, new interoperable information technologies, such as digital face and eye-retina scanning, aimed at gaining fuller access

to human characteristics for the purpose of sorting human bodies in a vast domestic and international project of surveillance and human capital extraction, the rise of state-driven post-Fordist authoritarianism in the name of national security, the human genome project and the dream of human perfectability, the aspirations of corporate American sports like basketball and football to conquer the globe, one brand name after another, and one world series at a time.

How might we understand these developments? How might we theorize their conjunctural relationship to schools? What general organizing principles or terms might we deploy to both sum up these development and to identify their dominant vectors? It is not enough, as Carson suggests, to offer vain formulations at the level of abstraction of the mode of production. We need to pay proper attention to patterns of historical incorporation and the work of culture and identification practices in specific institutional contexts and programmatic applications.

Neo-liberal Re-articulations

One dominant (but under-diagnosed) complex or network of relations affecting schools can be conceptualized and identified as neo-liberal re-articulations and transformations. It is this context of neoliberal hegemony and moral and cultural leadership itself and its relationship to what Michel Foucault has called government (i.e, the regulation of conduct of populations through systems of administration and self management of everyday life) that we must examine in order to better understand the specific impact of current political, cultural and economic forces on education, understood here as the promise of the public good.

I want to talk briefly about neo-liberalism, its particular interpretation of globalization and multiplicity and its transforming impact on schools. How do we define neoliberalism? I want to talk about two aspects of this dynamic complex of relations. First, I want to talk about neo-liberalism's relationship to globalization. Second, I will discuss neoliberalism's re-orientation of domestic and public space and institutions of confinement such as schooling.

One way of talking about neo-liberalism as it has arisen in the social science and political science literatures of the last two decades has been to define neo-liberalism in terms of the universalization of the enterprise ethic. This is to see its logics in the context of multinational capital's strategic translation of globalization (globalization is understood here as the rapid intensification of migration, the amplification of electronic mediation, the movement of economic and cultural capital across borders, and the deepening and stretching of interconnectivity all around the world) and the usurpation of the role of the state in a broad range of economic and political affairs. Within this framework, neoliberalism is simply a new form of liberalism that marks the emergence of the New Right and its distinctive fusion of political and economic formulas—a fusion that integrates 18th /19th century notions of free market and laissez-faire into potentially all aspects of contemporary life. This is marked by policies, since Reagan and Thatcher, of the extensive deregulation of the economy and markets, the overturning of Keynesianism

and the disinvestment of the state in projects of welfare for the poor and the common good. There is, then, the systematic reordering of state priorities in which the state's accumulation function is predominant in the modern system of rule at a distance, subordinating the processes of legitimation and democratic involvement of citizens. Of course, many corporations like Nike, Starbucks, and Disney have appropriated Keynesianism, rearticulating it as an ironic substance or residue in the form of philanthropy and thereby morphing it into the role of state-like promoters of ecumenical feel good affiliation, self-help forms of involvement in community, and so forth. Disney, in fact provides a super model of community ("of the way we are supposed to be") in the form of the fabricated town, Celebration--the new urbanist heaven in Central Florida, that Andrew Ross insightfully calls "Privatopia." For as the state disinvests in the public sphere, corporations move in to redefine community in neo-liberal terms absorbing philanthropy into cause-related marketing and the building of new synergies and brand share. From this development, if we were, then, to follow the ideological direction of, say, Teach for America and the No Child left Behind Act for e.g., by this logic, IBM and Xerox and, earlier, Ross Perot can do more for schools than the government or the state or we the intellectuals in the university-- "the bright but useless ones."

The second logic of neo-liberalism, I want to argue, operates decisively through culture, at the point of integration of modern subjects into social institutions and the organization and architecture of domestic and institutional space. Here, neo-liberalism strategically addresses the new postfordist subject, the new cultural citizen of mobile privatization who exists within the self-contained unit of the home of the school, and so forth and who mediates his or her environment through the new smart technologies driven by computer hardware and software--the smart Zenith TV and VCR that we can program, the remote control, the cell phone, video/digital games (hand-held or console based), and the ultimate phenomenon since 9/11 of the flag car as the symbol of the nation riding on the back of the mobile patriotic citizen--the moving ground so to speak of a popular postfordist authoritarianism. These new technologies have helped to elaborate a discursive order and rearticulate time, duration, and the rhythm of production, consumption and leisure in the constitution of our everyday lives--mobile and sedentary. Further, the mobile digital gadgets, such as the cell phone, the car navigation system, the lap-top with wireless internet connection, the ipod, and so forth, which are already widespread in the US, complicate the existing negotiation process between movement and stasis by allowing continuous streams of electronic navigation, communication, transaction, entertainment and information retrieval for people on the move. In these digital appliances, the representation of others and environments looks simple, effortless, fast and shape-shifting. Because these devices provide prompt information about environments and others, users require less direct contact with their fellow citizens and need to take into account less and less of a meaningful relation to their locales and environments.

In the context of what Raymond Williams called "mobile-privatization," we now have the ability to look out from within, to be vicariously active, to move while staying in place, to intercourse with the world while hiding in the light and in a state of retreat. To these technologies, we can add the surveillance camera, the fax machine, scanning

machine, the PC, the cable network uplinks in the school that allow us the illusion of control over our physical environment while we monitor, often ourselves, from the safety inside.

It is through these new social densities associated with electronic mediation, computerization, and the new digitally and genetically-driven biometric technologies of surveillance, identification and verification that neoliberalism operates as a supported master code translating the new terminologies of the Age associated with globalization, movement and stasis, place-swapping and identity make-overs.

The Unmaking and Remaking of Schooling

The university and schooling are not inured from these dynamic material practices associated with neoliberalism. Indeed, neoliberalism has a privileged position in the educational field “as a technique of government, regulation and social control” (Silva, 1994 as cited in Gandin, 2007, p. 182). It is not surprising, then, that the market ethic has been introduced into the educational arena, replacing the public good ethic (Gandin, 2007). Education, Alex Molnar (1996) points out, has been colonized by marketization; school reforms are being discussed in commercial terms, and expressions such as “future consumers,” “future workers,” and “future taxpayers” are being used in reference to children and school youth. In sum, education is seen “as a product to be evaluated for its economic utility and as a commodity to be bought and sold like anything else in the ‘free market’” (Apple, 2000, p. 111).

The subordination of education to economic ends is evident when one looks at recent educational reform initiatives—not only in the U.S., but internationally—whose main rationales are arguments favoring a tighter link between “education and the wider project of ‘meeting the needs of the economy’” (Apple, 2006, p. 23). To this end, neoliberal efforts in education aim at reorganizing schooling so the needs of the local and global economy are met by producing human capital sufficiently skilled, adaptable and flexible. In addition to conceiving schools as producers of “human capital,” neoliberalism has an equally critical cultural agenda: “It involves radically changing how we think of ourselves and what the goals of schooling should be” (Apple, 2006, p. 23). Under neoliberalism, then, educational institutions are expected to form students for market competition by transforming them into entrepreneurs and to convince them that “competition is a natural phenomenon, with winners and losers” (Gandin, 2007, p. 182).

Nancy Cantor and Paul Courant (2003), for instance, identify three features of neoliberalism or the universalization of the enterprise ethic that are transforming the life world of schools and universities understood as institutions for the optimization of the public good and molding culture, economy, politics, and ideology into a template of a new educational order. These three neoliberal tendencies can be identified as follows. First, there is virtualization or the process of managing the university as an on-line community and a paperless world. Second, there is vocationalization or the insistence on consistently derived and derivable returns on education. The third tendency in the process of educational neoliberalization is the practice of fiscalization or bottom-line budgeting

as the ruling measure of viability of all departments and units of educational institutions. Cantor and Courant understand these trends as fiscal and budgetary dilemmas, I see them here as deeply cultural in the sense that they set off particular configurations of interests, needs, desires, beliefs, and system-wide behavioral practices in the life world of universities and schools with respect to ethos and milieu and the organization of knowledge, the regulation of individual and group relations in these institutions, and the sorting and sifting of social and cultural capital.

Virtualization

The first trend that I will discuss here is *virtualization*. Virtualization of educational processes involves the rise and intensification of virtual interactions in more and more of our institutional activities. It is driven forward by our on-line proclivity towards information craving, speed, efficiency, optimization and maximization that now as a set of dispositions is rapidly displacing face-to-face interaction and embodied decision making and community feeling in our institutions. Education in its virtualizing tendency is susceptible to the “Internet paradox”—the other side of deregulation as the centrifugal logic of neo-liberalism and laissez-faire—that is, “dependence on a social technology that often breeds social isolation” and insulation of knowledge and disciplines as much as it facilitates interaction (Cantor and Courant, 2003, p. 5). We now know more about each other’s group and society by the proxy of images than by experiential encounter. This is not a Luddite argument, it is as Cantor and Courant suggest the proper concern that “the delivery of education solely on the Internet may rob students of the experience of the clash of ideas out of which emerges empathy with others and a desire for compromise” (p. 5). The arrival of the Internet for some heralded yet another clean technological break with the past. But unlike car manufacturers and fashion designers, we in the humanities and in the social sciences need the past for more than nostalgia and the ephemeral. We cannot jettison it ruthlessly bringing on stream the latest gizmo or style. We need the past to study it to better understand the present and the future. This raises questions bearing upon the status and nature of the contemporary public sphere and the fact that we now seem to have a multiplicity of strongly-insulated publics in educational institutions in the Nancy Fraser sense—publics where conversations are shorn off by essentialism and tribalism (Fraser, 1997). Virtualization has not lived up to the promise of universalizing or flattening out our particularisms. Indeed, it may have helped to heighten these latter tendencies, breeding new cultural nationalisms that glow in the dark—each man turning his key of endless data, in his own door, to use the imagery of T.S. Eliot (“And each man fixes his eyes before his feet”[Eliot, 1954, p. 53]) . The fact is that virtualization within the university setting, as an example, has been more often than not dominated by the will to power of university administrations which now use “the” network for information and image control, surveillance, unidirectional communication, edicts and coercive demands on actors lower down. The promise of openness of the virtual network capacity has been replaced too often by the elaboration of defensive shields sealing off administrative personnel from the rest of campus.

Vocationalization

In the neoliberal scenario, vocationalization is now a ruling logic in curricular arrangements and the overall calculation of educational actors. And, “education is positioned in terms of its relationship with the economy and broader state policy [where] an instrumental rationality underlies education policy discourse, manifested in the pervasive rhetoric and values of the market in the representation of educational participants and practices” (Mulderrig, 2003 as cited in Hill, 2003: p. 7). This commodification of education is further advanced by policy documents that foreground the relevance of lifelong learning,¹ a key component developing *workforce versatility* which accommodates the needs of flexible production² and “ensures that responsibility for employment tenure belongs to individuals themselves, ensures the possibility for companies to offset responsibility for social and fiscal payments, and enhances the freedom of business in a global environment.” (Olssen, 2006, p. 222). In this context, information replaces knowledge in the interests of an ever-changing system of production and educational goals are assessed in terms of the quantitative appropriation of skills and information for the labor market. We are living in the era of a new Taylorism in which knowledge production processes are being bent out of shape for the purposes of information delivery, strategic planning, and value extraction from culture (see for example the strategic plans on globalization of the University of Illinois of both the Chicago and Urbana campuses [www.uillinois.edu/president/strategicplan/]) At all levels, education has become a market commodity. As Masao Miyoshi (1998) warned us a few years ago, in his essay “‘Globalization’ and the University,” transnational capital has overridden the line between the university and its outside enveloping its sinews, reorganizing its infrastructures, closing the distance between education and economy in the privatization of the organization of knowledge. As Miyoshi maintains, university students and administration seek to empty the rigorous and complex content out of curricular knowledge in the humanities, re-labeling it and putting it up for sale. The goal is to maximize returns on investment as in the marketplace: “Higher education is now up to the administrators. And, sooner or later, research too, will be up to the administrators. Of course, we know that administrators are merely in the service of the managers of the society and the economy who exercise their supreme authority vested in the transnational corporate world” (Miyoshi, 1998, p. 267).

This investment in the enterprise ethic within the university has meant that on many campuses there has been an eroding of support for humanities and humanistic social sciences. For example, as Cantor and Courant have pointed out, “representation in superior humanities programs at public universities has dramatically declined between 1982 [and the present]” (2003, p. 5). But, it is precisely these courses that provide the

¹ As Bert Lambeir (2005) argues, “lifelong learning is the magic spell in the discourse of educational and economic policymakers, as well as in that of the practitioners of both domains.” (p. 350)

² In relation to this, some scholars contend that the discourses on lifelong learning represent ‘a form of biopower’ (Marshall, 1995) or self-regulation aiming at reducing the ‘time lag’ between individual skills and economic and technological innovation (Tuschling and Engemann, 2006 as cited in Olssen, 2006).

best preparation for democratic citizenship and critical thinking. And, it is indeed the case, that humanities disciplines have consistently produced forms of knowledge that operate as a check on the worst aspects of societal modernization and industrialization. In undertaking our deep investment in the enterprise ethic, we have sacrificed this critical investment in knowledge for taking the pig to the market. One is reminded here of the *Ohio State Journal* of 1870, whose editorial cautioned educators and professionals at the time of the founding of Ohio State University: “[...]the lawyer who knows nothing but law, the physician who knows nothing but medicine, and the farmer who knows nothing but farming are on par with each other. They are all alike starved and indigent in the requirement of true culture” (Alexis Cope quoted in Cantor & Courant, 2003, p. 6). In regards to schooling, Richard Hatcher (2001) claims that global capitalism needs to ensure that schools produce effective and flexible workers and that they “subordinate to the personality, ideological and economic requirements of Capital” (Hill, 2003, p. 8). To guarantee this, neoliberalism creates institutional practices and rewards for enforcing the market rationale and competition in education³. For instance, World Bank loans to given countries have been conditioned to the implementation of school reforms in line with neoliberal formulations.⁴ Similarly, the No Child Left Behind Act in the U.S. contributes to the support of a “global” neoliberal agenda pushing towards an increased presence of market dynamics in education by rewarding managerial practices in schools and by setting rigid standards they should meet in order to receive financial support.

Fiscalization

The latter (vocalization) is closely tied to the process of fiscalization of the university and schooling, the application of “bottom-line” budgeting, and the proliferation of surveillance and control mechanisms—compulsory and nationally monitored tests, publication of schools and districts performances and “policy emphasis on ‘shaming and naming’, closing, or privatizing ‘failing’ schools” (Hill, 2001)—that are arising everywhere as illustrated by the “No Child Left Behind Act.” As we live in a context of chronic budgetary crisis within the economy generally and within education, there are increasing demands for accountability and fiscalization. For instance, in view of

³ A similar argument is found in Wendy Brown’s (2003) work, where he posits that neoliberalism involves a normative rather than ontological claim about the pervasiveness of economic rationality and takes as its task the development, dissemination, and institutionalization of such rationality.

⁴ In relation to this, Phillip Jones’ (1992) book provides a thorough description of the World Bank instrumental role promoting Western ideas about how education and the economy are—or should be—related. Terms such as “external inducement” (Ikenberry, 1990), “direct coercive transfer” (Dolowitz & Marsh, 1996), “exporting ideas” or “policy pusher” (Nedley, 2007) serve to illustrate the promotion of fiscal discipline and other neoliberal measures in poorer countries through donor agencies that condition their loans to the adoption of such measures. For instance, the World Bank demands curricular and structural change in education when it provides loans alleging that those changes contribute to rationalizing and equalizing the delivery of this social good (Weiner, 2005).

the strict limits placed by the state on public funding, income generation has become an increasingly powerful imperative among tertiary institutions (Henkel, 2005). Bruce Johnstone (2002) states that governments worldwide have to supplement their revenues, “not only with ‘cost sharing,’ but also with sale of faculty services, sale or lease of university facilities, vigorous pursuit of grants and contracts, and fund raising” (p. 4). Concomitantly, research agendas are being made the target of rationalization as public funding in universities becomes oriented to “strategic” researches (Rip 1997), that are “likely to make at least a background contribution to the solution of recognized current or future practical problems” (Henkel, 2005, p.160). From this perspective, basic or “pure science” may receive funding only if it is responsive to socially and economically strategic needs. Besides, “the pathway to innovation is now seen as often beginning in industry rather than the university and as entailing more variable, complex, uncertain and interactive patterns of communication and collaboration between the university and industry” (Henkel, 2005, p. 160). More importantly, these institutional constraints are “an insidious way of lessening academic independence” (Musselin, 2005, p. 146) as the nature of the relationship between universities and academics changes under the influence of a managerial perspective which dictates criteria and norms to be applied to academic activities, and ensure that these criteria and norms are respected.

Pervasive measuring, accountability and feasibility pressures have forced the humanistic disciplines to be on the defensive. Neo-liberals have proven themselves particularly adept at blurring and bending political, ideological, cultural faiths to achieve means-end rationalities. We live in such a time on campuses across the United States in which the pressure of rationalization has placed humanistic programs in doubt, forcing them to establish new codes and rules of the game. Programs, particularly in the humanities disciplines, that will never be profit making enterprises are feeling the pressure of the bottom line. We are trapped in the market place logic of student credit hours, the tallying of instructional units, and sponsored research objectives. More teaching, less time off, less pay. Our relevant models are now the business school, the law school, the natural sciences, wherever and however money is to be made there lies self-justification and validation. The immediate casualties are interdisciplinary research, collaborative writing projects, and innovative curricula projects. The more long term casualties are our students who now see us less as models of thoughtfulness and more as purveyors of knowledge fast food.

Likewise, disinvestment in public schooling has “destabilized and weakened its very own immunities as a secular institution in protecting and developing the public good.” (Paraskeva, 2007, p. 154) Scholars such as Jurjo Torres Santomé (2001), Michael Apple (2003), among many others, concur, pointing to the ill-fated effects of disinvesting in public education (i.e., deficient infrastructure, lack of material and intellectual resources, low quality teacher education programs, etc). In João Paraskeva’s view, state disinvestments in public education acted as the needed sign “for the market forces to hijack public schooling from a public social domain to an economic private sphere” (p. 154). Ultimately, education as a public good is being compromised to privatization. Alongside all of these transformations, neoliberalism in education functions by curtailing any kind of critical thinking. Education is reorganized in a way that intends to produce

skilled and flexible workers, but in so doing hinders a critical engagement with their reality (Harvey, 2000).

Conclusion

As I have shown, neoliberalism has reoriented educational institutions and has given a new meaning to learning and the goals of education. Equally important, “the commodification of education rules out the very critical freedom and academic rigour which education requires to be more than indoctrination.” (McMurtry, 1991, p. 215). As Jurjo Torres Santomé (2007) asserts, the school curriculum conveys information “that neither reveals nor problematizes the structural causes underlying the cases it appears to denounce.” (p. 12). The lack of sustained critical approaches to addressing social issues in educational institutions prevents students from realizing the human potential for the recreation of their own life world. Neoliberalism in education not only compresses critical spaces, but also hinders the likelihood of building democratic school communities as competition “stymies the potential for system-wide policies designed to equalize opportunities.” (Marginson, 2006).

Having said all of this about neoliberalism and education, then, our greatest challenge is to create the conditions “for solidaristic, movement-style relations” (Marginson, 2006, p 219) and counteracting a neoliberal language that “destroys social responsibility and critique, that invites a mindless, consumer-oriented individualism to flourish, and kills off conscience” (Davies, 2005, p. 6). We need to stop the neoliberal appropriation of education by safeguarding the autonomy of the teaching learning process, the autonomy of intellectual production, and the fostering of the reproduction of critical scholars. We need to work toward the conditions for widening access for those severely disadvantaged by the current formulas and who are being shunted around from bad educational options to worse ones. Educational discourses and practices need to be reconnected to a progressive emancipatory project based upon solidarity and social justice. These are the central issues at stake even as we set out with Carlson from the “safe harbors” of educational practice and custom, seeking movement in the context of constraint and refusing the stasis of administrative containment and neoliberal myopia.

References

- Apple, M. (2006). Understanding and interrupting neoliberalism and neoconservatism in education. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 1(1), 21-26.
- Apple, M. (2003). *The state and the politics of knowledge*. New York: Routledge.
- Apple, M. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. New York: Routledge.
- Brown, W. (2003) Neo-liberalism and the end of liberal democracy. *Theory and Event*, 7(1), 1-25.
- Ball, S. (1999). Performativity and fragmentation in postmodern schooling, in J. Carter (Ed.) *Postmodernity and the fragmentation of welfare*. London: Routledge.

- Barry, A., Osborne, T. and Rose, N. (1996) *Foucault and Political Reason: liberalism, neoliberalism and rationalities of government*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: the human consequences*. New York: Columbia University Press
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Acts of resistance: Against the tyranny of the market*. New York: The New Press.
- Cambridge, E. (2006). Relationships among globalization, development, primary education spending and brain drain in the developing world. 2007. *The Heinz School Review*, 3 (1)
- Cantor, N. and Courant, P. (2003). Scrounging for resources: reflections on the whys and wherefores of higher education finance. In, *New Directions for Institutional Research* no. 119, pp. 3-12.
- Dolowitz, D. and Marsh, D. (1996). Who learns from whom: A review of the policy transfer literature. *Political Studies*, 44(2), 343-57.
- Eakin, E. (2003). The latest theory is that theory doesn't matter. *New York Times*. (Art and Ideas, Section D), April 19, p. 9.
- Eliot, T.S. (1954). The wasteland I.: the burial of the dead. In, T.S. Eliot, *Selected Poems* (pp.51-53). London: Faber and Faber.
- Fitzsimons, P. (2002). Neoliberalism and education: the autonomous chooser. *Radical Pedagogy*, retrieved on 6/12/07 from: http://radicalpedagogy.icaap.org/content/issue4_2/04_fitzsimons.html
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. Afterword. In H. L. Dreyfus and P. Rabinow *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 208-226.
- Fraser, N. (1997). *Justice interruptus: critical reflections on the "postsocialist" condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Gabbard, D. A. (2003). Education IS enforcement: the centrality of compulsory schooling in market societies, in K. Saltman & D. A. Gabbard (Eds.) *Education as enforcement: the militarization and corporatization of schools*. London: Routledge Falmer, pp. 61-80.
- Gandin, L. A. (2007). The construction of the citizen school project as an alternative to neoliberal educational policies. *Policy Futures in Education*, 5(2), 179-193).
- Giddens, A. (2003). *Runaway world: how globalization is reshaping our lives*. New York: Routledge.
- Gordon, Colin (1991) Governmental rationality: an introduction, in Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1-51.
- Habermas, J. (1992). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: M.I.T. Press.
- Harvey, D. (2000). *Spaces of hope*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hatcher, R. (2001). Getting down to business: schooling in the globalized economy. *Education and Social Justice*, 3(2), 45-59.
- Henkel, M. (2005). Academic identity and autonomy in a changing policy, *Environment, Higher Education* (2005) 49: 155-176.

Hill, D. (2007). Critical teacher education, new labour, and the global project of neoliberal capital. *Policy Futures in Education*, 5(2), 204-225.

Hill, D. (2004). Books, banks, and bullets: Controlling our minds - the global project of imperialistic and militaristic neo-liberalism and its effect on education policy. *Policy Futures in Education*, 2(3), 504-522.

Hill, D. (2003). Global neo-liberalism, the deformation of education and resistance. *Journal of Critical Educational Policy Studies*, 1(1), 1-26.

Hill, D. (2001). State theory and the neo-liberal reconstruction of schooling and teacher education: a structuralist neo-Marxist critique of postmodernist, quasi-postmodernist, and culturalist neo-Marxist theory. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 22(1), 135-155.

Ikenberry, G. J. (1990). The international spread of privatization policies: Inducements, learning and 'Policy Band wagoning', in E. Suleiman and J. Waterbury (eds.) *The Political Economy of Public Sector Reform and Privatization*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Johnstone, D. B. (2002). *Chinese higher education in the context of the worldwide university agenda*, adapted paper from an address to the Chinese and Foreign University Presidents Forum held in Beijing, PCR, July 2002.

Jones, P. W. (1992). *World Bank financing of education: Lending, learning and development*. London-New York: Routledge.

Klees, S. J. (2002). Privatization and neo-liberalism: Ideology and evidence in rhetorical reforms. *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 1 (2), 19-26.

Kurtz, M. J. (2004). The dilemmas of democracy in the open economy: Lessons from Latin America. *World Politics*, 56, 262–302.

Lambeir, B. (2005) Education as liberation: the politics and techniques of lifelong learning. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 37(3), 349–356.

Lemke, T. (2001) The birth of bio-politics: Michel Foucault's lecture at the College de France on neo-liberal Governmentality. *Economy and Society*, 30(2), 190-207.

Lipman, P. & Hursh, D. (2007). Renaissance 2010: the reassertion of ruling-class power through neoliberal policies in Chicago. *Policy Futures in Education*, 5(2), 160-178.

Lipsitz, G. (2004). *Locked Here on This Earth: Spatial Politics and Black Expressive Culture*. University of California at Santa Cruz: Unpublished Paper).

Mahoney, P. & Hextall, I. (2000). *Reconstructing teaching standards, performance and accountability*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Marginson, S. (2006). Engaging democratic education in the neoliberal age. *Educational Theory*, 56(2), 205-219.

McChesney, R. (1999). *Profits over people: Neoliberalism and global order*. New York: Seven Stories Press.

McLaren, P., Martin, G., Farahmandpur, R. & Jaramillo, N. (2005). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

McMurtry, J. (1991). Education and the market model. *Journal of the Philosophy of Education*, 25(2), 209-217.

Miyoshi, M. (1998). "Globalization," culture and the university. In, F. Jameson and Masao Miyoshi (Eds), *The cultures of globalization*. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

- Molnar, A. (1996). *Giving kids the business: the commercialization of America's schools*. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Musselin, C. (2005). European Academic Labor Markets in Transition. *Higher Education*, 49(1/2), 135-154.
- Nedley, A. (2007). Policy transfer and the developing-country experience gap: Taking a southern perspective. Retrieved on 6/3/07 from <http://www.york.ac.uk/depts/poli/news/sem3esrc/nedley.pdf>.
- Ortner, S. (1994). Theory in anthropology since the sixties. In, N.B. Dirks, G. Eley, and S. Ortner (Eds), *Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University.
- Paraskeva, J. M. (2007). Kidnapping public schooling: Perversion and normalization of the discursive bases within the epicenter of New Right educational policies. *Policy Futures in Education*, 5(2), p. 137-159.
- Rip, A. (1997). A cognitive approach to relevance of science, *Social Science Information*, 36(4), 615–640.
- Ross, A. (1999). *The celebration chronicles: life, liberty and the pursuit of property values in Disney's new town*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Stiglitz, J. (2002) *Globalization and its discontents*. London: Penguin.
- Thomas, C. (2001). Global governance, development and human security: exploring the links. *Third World Quarterly*, 22(2), 159–175.
- Torres Santomé, J. (2001). *Educación en tiempos de neoliberalismo*. Madrid: Morata.
- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (2002). *No Child Left Behind: a desk reference*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Weiner, L. (2005). Neoliberalism, teacher unionism, and the future of public education. *New Politics*, 38, Vol. X, No. 2. Retrieved on 6/3/07 from <http://www.wpunj.edu/newpol/issue38/weiner38.htm>.
- Whitty, G., Power, S. and Halpin, D. (1998). *Devolution and choice in education: The school, the state and the market*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Williams, R. (1975). *Television: technology as cultural form*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Yeats, W.B. (1994). *Michael Robartes and the Dancer: Manuscript Materials*. Ithaca: Cornell University.