

Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Resistance: Notes on a critical theory of educational struggle

HENRY A. GIROUX

Penn State University, U.S.A.

I

What I want to defend above all is the possibility and necessity of the critical intellectual ... There is no genuine democracy without genuine opposing critical powers. The intellectual is one of those, of the first magnitude. That is why I think that the work of demolishing the critical intellectual, living or dead—Marx, Nietzsche, Sartre, Foucault, and some others—is as dangerous as the demolition of the public interest and that it is part of the same process of restoration.

(Pierre Bourdieu, 1998, p. 8)

Only one thing's sadder than remembering you were once free, and that's forgetting you once were free. That would be the saddest thing of all.

(Mathew King, Lakota Spiritual Elder)¹

I know wherein our most basic value judgments are rooted—in compassion, in our sense for the suffering of others.

(Herbert Marcuse)²

Times change. Different historical conditions posit different problems and demand a range of diverse solutions. While questions of possibility and change are crucial to acknowledge how politics is fashioned differently in multiple sites in order to understand, engage, and transform the diverse workings of power, such questions are also central to recognizing that politics cannot be treated like a commodity that can supply all of the answers or tell those of us who do political work precisely what to do. There is nothing pure about the meaning of politics, how it is constructed, or how it might be taken up (see Dean, 2000, pp. 1–19). Matters of historical contingency, context, and social transformation are both primary considerations in fashioning any viable form of cultural politics and crucial to developing a language of critique and possibility that is as self-critical as it is socially responsible. Changing historical conditions posit new problems, define different projects, and often demand fresh discourses. In some cases, theories fashioned in one historical moment seem hopelessly out of date, if not irrelevant, in another. Any critical theory both defines and is defined by the problems posed by the contexts it attempts to address.

The question of shifting politics and historical contexts is evident in looking back to a time historically when I wrote *Theory and Resistance in Education*: we cannot escape the issue of changing historical conditions. Written at the beginning of the 1980s, it attempted in the face of dominant views of education to reassert the fundamental political nature of teaching, the importance of linking pedagogy to social change, connecting critical learning to the experiences and histories that students brought to the classroom, and engaging the space of schooling as a site of contestation, resistance, and possibility. Right-wing versions of schooling at the time were heavily indebted either to teaching curricula that mirrored the assumptions of corporate America in which schools were viewed as simply adjuncts of the workplace, or to imposing forms of technocratic rationality upon schools that turned them into testing and sorting models of assessment that reproduced the wide range of inequalities that characterized a larger social order. Students marginalized by class, race, and gender were seldom invited to participate in the educational discourses, pedagogical practices, and institutional relations that shaped their everyday lives. Even worse, they were often marginalized and oppressed within such discourses and social formations. While the force and nature of this legacy has changed, it still exerts a powerful influence upon public and higher education within and outside of North America.

At that time, I believed that crucial to any radical theory of education was Paulo Freire's recognition that education was always directive, predicated on the assumption that human life is conditioned rather than determined.³ Freire's concrete utopianism was foundational to *Theory and Resistance in Education* and my early theories of radical education. First, it provided an important theoretical premise for overcoming a number of debilitating pessimisms that plagued educational discourses across a wide range of ideological positions. For example, in both progressive and conservative views, though for different reasons, schools were often seen as being locked into a future that could only repeat the present. For conservatives, the present was the dream of creating capitalist subjects, pliant workers, and conforming intellectuals. Schools in this perspective were about educating for accommodation. For many left-wing progressives, schools were as radical theorist Louis Althusser declared 'Ideological State Apparatuses,' powerful social structures actively involved in the process of moral and political reproduction (see Althusser, 1977). What these positions shared was the paralyzing assumption that schools were neither sites of conflict nor institutions that could link learning to social change. Within these perspectives, teachers and students lost their capacities to become critical agents, serving either as ideological gatekeepers or as spineless lackeys for the state. Similarly, pedagogy was either reduced to a sterile set of techniques or dressed up within the discourse of humanistic methods that simply softened the attempts by the schools to produce an insidious form of moral and political regulation.

Second, *Theory and Resistance in Education* embodied a view of radical pedagogical theory premised on a notion of utopianism that took seriously the supposition that in order for social arrangements to be otherwise, educators had to be able to think and act against the grain. Hope was a crucial precondition both for a healthy pessimism and as a source of revolutionary imagination in which the strategic gap

between the promise and the reality of democracy could be taken seriously as an object of critical learning and practical struggle. The politics of hope that fueled my educational views at that time was anticipatory rather than messianic; it suggested that 'conceiving freedom and justice on the terrain of capacities leads beyond mere dreaming: it links the ideal to the possibility of change and so to what is politically [and pedagogically] achievable' (Panitch and Gindin, 1999, p. 6). The utopianism that informed *my* early and present educational views had no interest in legislating the future nor was it concerned about abstract utopias that failed to operate on what Ernst Bloch called 'possibility as capacity' (Bloch, 1986, pp. 232–233). On the contrary, it was fueled by a concrete utopianism that provided both an ethical discourse for challenging an expansive cynicism regarding social change and a political referent for grounding critique and the possibility of social transformation 'in present tendencies and real historical possibilities' (Merifield, 2000, p. 45).

Against an enervating pessimism that seemed to unite both the left and the right in the early 1980s, *Theory and Resistance in Education* posited the 'utopian' notion that schools could play a productive role in educating students to think critically, take risks, and resist dominant forms of oppression as they shaped their everyday classroom lives. Central to such an assumption was the demand to make the pedagogical more political by identifying the link between learning and social transformation, provide the conditions for students to learn a range of critical capacities in order to expand the possibilities of human agency, and recover the role of the teacher as an oppositional intellectual—rather than as dutiful technician or deskilled corporate drone. Oppositional intellectuals in this scenario did not reject authority but engaged it critically in order to develop pedagogical principles aimed at encouraging students to learn how to govern rather than be governed, while assuming the role of active and critical citizens in shaping the most basic and fundamental institutional structures of a vibrant and inclusive democracy.

In what follows, I want to rethink my position on resistance and schooling. Times change. It has now been many years since I first formulated the notions of radical pedagogy and what it meant for teachers to be engaged intellectuals. The pessimism today, globally, is more pronounced. Teachers are under siege all over the world like they never have been in the past, and schools are assaulted relentlessly by the powerful forces of neo-liberalism, which want to turn them into sources of profit. What is good for Disney and Microsoft is now the protocol for how global capitalism defines schooling, learning, and the goals of education, especially as it is imposed through the dictates of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank abroad, and corporate power at home. Schools are no longer considered a public good but a private good and the only form of citizenship increasingly being offered to young people is consumerism. More than ever the crisis of schooling represents, at large, the crisis of democracy itself and any attempt to understand the attack on public schooling and higher education cannot be separated from the wider assault on all forms of public life not driven by the logic of the market. Moreover, any politically relevant notion of resistance cannot be reduced to what goes on in schools but must be understood—while having different registers—in

terms of wider configurations of economic, political, and social forces that exacerbate tensions between those who value such institutions as public good and those advocates of neo-liberalism who see market culture as a master design for all human affairs.

The breathless rhetoric of the global victory of free market rationality spewed forth by the mass media, right-wing intellectuals and governments alike, has found its material expression in an all-out attack on democratic values and on the very notion of the public. Within the discourse of neo-liberalism, issues regarding schooling and social justice, persistent poverty, inadequate health care, racial apartheid in the inner cities, and the growing inequalities between the rich and the poor have been either removed from the inventory of public discourse and public policy or factored into talk show spectacles that highlight private woes bearing little relationship either to public life or to potential remedies that demand collective action. As the laws of the market take precedence over the laws of the state as guardians of the public good, politics is increasingly removed from power, and the state offers little help in mediating the interface between the advance of capital and its rapacious commercial interests, on the one hand, and those non-commodified interests and non-market spheres—schools, churches, trade unions, non-profit media—that create the political, economic, and social conditions vital for critical citizenship and democratic public life on the other. Within the prevailing discourse of neo-liberalism that has taken hold of the public imagination, there is no vocabulary for political or social transformation, no collective vision, no social agency to challenge the privatization and commercialization of schooling, the ruthless downsizing of jobs, the ongoing liquidation of job security, or spaces from which to struggle against the elimination of benefits for people now hired on a strictly part-time basis. In the midst of this concerted attack on the public, the market-driven consumer juggernaut continues to mobilize desires in the interest of producing market identities and market relationships that ultimately appear, as Theodor Adorno once put it, nothing less than ‘a prohibition on thinking itself’ (Adorno, 1993, p. 290).

It is this context of the ongoing assault on the public, and the growing preponderance of a free market economy and corporate culture, that turns everything it touches into an object of consumption and it is more important than ever that educators and all those concerned about democratic public life provide an alternative vision of schooling that supports democratic forms of political agency and a substantive democratic social order. Of course, any theory of politics and resistance must be concerned with the conditions, the agents, and the current levels of struggle that lead to social transformation. This means that any viable theory of radical pedagogy must not only be concerned with issues of curriculum and classroom practices, but must also emphasize the institutional constraints and larger social formations that bear down on forms of resistance waged by educators, teachers, students, and others attempting to challenge dominant teaching practices as well as systemic forms of oppression such as tracking. It also means that while class analyses should always be a crucial part of studying how oppression works in schools, they should not take place at the expense of analyses of other forms of domination rooted in racism, sexism, and homophobia. In addition, educators need

to be clear, without being doctrinaire, about the political project through which we give meaning to our roles as teachers and the purpose of schooling itself. This suggests giving considerable attention to the important implications of tying schooling to the imperatives of radical democracy, the significance of extending the meaning of pedagogy into other cultural apparatuses such as the media, or what it meant to articulate the crisis of schooling to the larger crisis of youth in general—though I did take up these issues in my work in later years.⁴ Fortunately, within the last twenty years, a number of writers such as Roger Simon, Peter McLaren, and others have made it clear that any attempt to change the schools from within has to deal with the interrelated and diverse ways in which oppression is shaped and reproduced under the weight of wider institutional contexts which bear down on isolated and often fragmented forms of classroom resistance. It is crucial for educators to recognize that resistance is a multi-layered phenomenon that not only takes diverse and complex forms among students and teachers within schools but registers differently across different contexts and levels of political struggle. Resistance is no magic bullet that can be invoked whenever one wants to assert his or her political credentials. At best, theories of resistance are useful as highly nuanced theoretical tools for understanding and intervening within structures of power as they define diverse contexts across a range of institutional and ideological formations. In addition, theories of resistance involve more than simply registering models of oppression, they also point to the possibility of intervening productively in those educational contexts where reality is being continually transformed and power enacted in the interests of developing new democratic identities, relations, institutional forms, and modes of struggle. Theories of resistance become useful when they provide concrete ways in which to articulate knowledge to practical effects, mediated by the imperatives of social justice, and uphold forms of education capable of expanding the meaning of critical citizenship and the relations of democratic public life. Given the current historical conjuncture, which poses a new set of problems for educators, I want to invoke, briefly, the spirit of pedagogical and political resistance in addressing the current attack by corporate culture on public schools and democratic public life.

II

In opposition to the corporatizing of public schools, progressive educators need to define public and higher education as a resource vital to the democratic and civic life of the nation. At the heart of such a task is the need for academics, cultural workers, and labor organizers to join together and oppose the transformation of the public schools and higher education into commercial spheres, to resist what Bill Readings has called a consumer oriented corporation more concerned about accounting than accountability (see Readings, 1996, pp. 11, 18). Schools should provide students with possibilities for linking knowledge and social responsibility to the imperatives of a substantive democracy. Education is not training, and learning at its best is connected with the imperatives of social responsibility and political agency. The latter view points to defending public and higher education

as vital democratic spheres necessary to develop and nourish the proper balance between public values and commercial power, between identities founded on democratic principles and identities steeped in forms of competitive, self-interested individualism that celebrate selfishness, profit-making, and greed.⁵

Progressives should also reconsider the critical role educators might take up within public and higher education. In part, this suggests that as educators we must begin to reassess what it means to define the conditions under which full and part-time educators work in order for them to gain a sense of dignity and power. One response would necessitate that educators strongly oppose those approaches to schooling that corporatize and bureaucratize the teaching process, processes that deskill as they disempower. A radical pedagogy as a form of resistance should, in part, be premised on the assumption that educators vigorously resist any attempt on the part of liberals and conservatives to reduce them to the role of either technicians or multinational operatives.

Struggles over pedagogy must be accompanied by sustained attempts on the part of progressive educators to organize themselves collectively and oppose current efforts to disempower teachers through the proliferation of standardized testing schemes, management by objectives designs, and bureaucratic forms of accountability. This requires that radical educators and other progressives organize against the corporate takeover of schools, fight to protect the power of unions, expand the rights and benefits of staff personnel, and put more power into the hands of faculties and students.

Accordingly, educators and social activists should reject forms of schooling that marginalize students who are poor, black, and least advantaged. This points to the necessity for developing school practices that recognize how issues related to gender, class, race, and sexual orientation can be used as a resource for learning rather than being contained in schools through a systemic pattern of exclusion, punishment, and failure. Similarly, if curricular justice suggests that school knowledge be organized around the needs of the least advantaged then school and classroom authority should rest in the hands of teachers and communities and not be under the control of 'experts,' imported from the business community or the world of for-profit schools. In addition, assessments in schools should draw upon multiple sources, be attentive to the cultural resources of the communities in which students live their daily lives, and recognize that any viable approach to assessment is as much about the discourse of equitable and fair distribution of resources as it is about issues of testing and accountability. In this perspective, the conditions for teaching and learning cannot be separated from how and what students learn. Public schools don't need standardized curricula and testing. On the contrary, they need curricular justice, that is forms of teaching that are inclusive, caring, respectful, economically equitable, and whose aim, in part, is to undermine those repressive modes of education that produce social hierarchies and legitimate inequality. At the same time this teaching should provide students with the knowledge and skills needed to become well rounded critical actors and social agents.

The question of what educators teach is inseparable from what it means to invest in public life and to locate oneself in a public discourse. Implicit in this argument

is the assumption that the responsibility of educators cannot be separated from the consequences of the knowledge they produce, the social relations they legitimate, and the ideologies they disseminate to students. Educational work, at best, represents a response to questions and issues posed by the tensions and contradictions of public life and such work, when critical, also attempts to understand and intervene in specific problems that emanate from the material contexts of everyday existence. Teaching in this sense becomes performative and highlights considerations of power, politics and ethics fundamental to any form of teacher–student interaction. A radical pedagogy points to the connections between conception and practice, and it honors students' experiences by connecting what goes on in classrooms to their everyday lives. Within such an approach, theoretical rigor is connected to social relevance, knowledge is subjected to critical scrutiny and engagement, and pedagogy is seen as a moral and political practice crucial to the production of capacities and skills necessary for students to both shape and participate in public life.

At the level of higher education, it is crucial for progressive educators to wage battles over access for poor and minority students, shift power away from bureaucracies to faculties, and address the exploitative conditions under which many graduate students work—often constituting a *de facto* army of service workers who are underpaid, overworked, and shorn of any real power or benefits (see Nelson, 1997). Simply put, the what, how, and why of teaching cannot be separated from the basic conditions under which educators and students labor. This means rethinking how teaching functions as a form of academic labor within iniquitous relations of power and how schooling can be addressed as a crucial site of struggle.⁶ Teachers and students increasingly bear the burden of overcrowded classes, limited resources, and hostile legislators. Struggling over these issues demands collective rather than merely individual forms of resistance. One important possibility is for progressive educators and students to join with labor organizations, community people, and others, in forming social movements that resist the corporatizing of schools, the roll back in basic services, and the exploitation of teachers and students.

At the very least, radical pedagogical work proposes that education is a form of political intervention in the world and is capable of creating opportunities for social transformation.⁷ Rather than viewing teaching as technical practice, radical pedagogy in the broadest terms is a moral and political practice premised on the assumption that learning is not about processing received knowledge but about actually transforming it as part of a more expansive struggle for individual rights and social justice. This implies that any viable notion of pedagogy and resistance should illustrate how knowledge, values, desire, and social relations are always implicated in relations of power, and how such an understanding can be used pedagogically and politically by students to expand further and deepen the imperatives of economic and political democracy. The fundamental challenge facing progressive educators within the current age of neo-liberalism is to provide the conditions for students to address how knowledge is related to the power of both self-definition and social agency. Central to such a challenge is providing students with the skills, knowledge, and authority they need to inquire into and act upon

what it means to live in a radical multicultural democracy, to recognize anti-democratic forms of power, and to fight deeply rooted injustices in a society and world founded on systemic economic, racial, and gender inequalities.

Addressing the problems that many youth currently face suggests that rigorous educational work needs to respond to the dilemmas of the outside world by focusing on how young people make sense of their experiences and possibilities for decision-making within the structures of everyday life. The motivation for scholarly work cannot be narrowly academic; such work must connect with 'real life social and political issues in the wider society' (see Bennett, 1998, p. 538). This requires, in part, that progressive educators address the practical consequences of their work in the broader society while simultaneously making connections to those too often ignored institutional forms, social practices, and cultural spheres that powerfully influence young people outside of schools, especially within the ongoing and constantly changing landscape of popular culture with its shift away from a culture of print to an electronic, digitally constructed culture of images and high-speed hyper-texts. Moreover, it is crucial for critical educators to recognize that the forms of domination that bear down on young people are both institutional and cultural, and one cannot be separated from the other. Within this approach to cultural politics, the effects of domination cannot be removed from those wider pedagogical conditions and popular spheres in which such behavior is learned, appropriated, or challenged.

Committed educators must learn to respect the lives of young people by addressing important issues such as what schools and other public spheres should accomplish in a democracy and why they fail, and how such a failure can be understood within a broader set of political, economic, spiritual, and cultural relations. We should remind ourselves in this time of rapacious capitalist mergers and downsizing that market-driven knowledge should not be the only discourse that schools offer to young people, that citizenship is not an entirely privatized affair, and that capitalism and democracy are not the same thing. Against dominant corporate ideology and relations of power, progressives must enter a wider public conversation around school policy and begin to argue forcefully in multiple public spheres that schools should function to serve the public good and not be seen merely as a source of private advantage removed from the dynamics of power and equity. At the same time, such arguments should take place as part of a reconstituted defense of the welfare state and radical democracy. Educators need to re-appropriate the belief that academic work matters in its relationship to wider public practices and policies. In part, this points to the necessity for educators and others to link educational work, both within and outside of schools, to 'what it means to expand the scope of democracy and democratic institutions, [and to] address [how] the very conditions of democracy are being undermined' (West, 1994, pp. 41–42). Such work holds the promise for understanding not just how power operates in particular contexts, but also how the knowledge and skills produced and learned within diverse locations 'will better enable people to change the contexts and hence the relations of power' (Grossberg, 1997, pp. 252–253) that inform the inequalities that undermine any viable notion of democratic participation in a wide range of cultural spheres, including public and higher education.

Learning takes place in a variety of public spheres outside of the schools, and while it is urgent for progressives to defend public and higher education against the ravaging influence of corporate culture, which means defending it as a public asset rather than as a private investment, we must also connect what is taught in the larger culture to the problems of youth and the challenges of radical democracy in a newly constituted global public. Progressive education in an age of rampant neo-liberalism requires an expanded notion of the public, pedagogy, solidarity, and democratic struggle. Crucial here is a conception of the political that is open yet committed, respects specificity and difference without erasing global considerations, and provides new spaces for collaborative work engaged in productive social change. The time has come for educators to develop more systemic political projects in which power, history, and social movements can play an active role in constructing the multiple and shifting political relations and cultural practices necessary for connecting the construction of diverse political constituencies to the revitalization of democratic public life.

At the beginning of the new millennium, educators, parents, and others should reevaluate what it means for adults and young people to grow up in a world that has been radically altered by a hyper-capitalism that monopolizes the educational force of culture as it ruthlessly eliminates those public spheres *not* governed by the logic of the market. Such a task demands new theoretical and political tools for addressing how pedagogy, knowledge, resistance, and power can be analyzed within and across a variety of cultural spheres, including, but not limited to, the schools. Eduardo Galeano has stated that 'By saying no to the devastating empire of greed, whose center lies in North America, we are saying yes to another possible [world] ... In saying no to a peace without dignity, we are saying yes to the sacred right of rebellion against injustice.'⁸ Galeano speaks clearly to the urgent task of elevating the politics and possibility of resistance to address all those issues, spaces, and public spheres in which the intersection of language and bodies becomes 'part of the process of forming and disrupting power relations' (Patton, 1993, p. 183). Too many intellectuals and educators are disconnected from social movements and have trouble connecting their work both to pressing public issues and wider constituencies outside of the university. More often, intellectuals cut off from the wider society fall prey to forms of professional legitimating that not only deny the political nature of their own labor and theoretical work, but also cause them to reinforce a deep-rooted cynicism about the ability of ordinary people to take risks, fight for what they believe in, and become a force for social change. This suggests that educators should work to form alliances with parents, community organizers, labor organizations, and civil rights groups at local, national, and international levels to understand better how to translate private troubles into public actions, arouse public interest in pressing social problems, and use collective means to democratize more fully the commanding institutional economic, cultural, and social structures that dominate our societies.

George Lipsitz rightly argues that progressives need to challenge a key goal of conservative political work since the 1980s. He is referring to attempts on the part of conservatives to 'hide public concerns while foregrounding private interests—to

encourage people to think of themselves as taxpayers and homeowners rather than as citizens and workers, to depict private property interests and the accumulated advantages accorded to white men as universal while condemning demands for re-distributive justice by women, racial and sexual minorities, and by other aggrieved social groups as the “whining of special interests.” At the risk of over-emphasis, educators and others require a politics of resistance that extends beyond the classroom as part of a broader struggle to challenge those forces of neo-liberalism that currently wage war against all collective structures capable of defending vital social institutions as a public good. In times of increased domination of public and higher education it becomes important that academics—as well as artists and other cultural workers—do not become isolated ‘in their own abstract desires for social change and actual social movements. Taking a position is not the same as waging a war of position; changing your mind is not the same as changing society’ (Lipsitz, 2000, p. 81). Resistance must become part of a public pedagogy that works to position rigorous theoretical work and public bodies against corporate power, connect classrooms to the challenges faced by social movements in the streets, and provide spaces within classrooms for personal injury and private terrors to be translated into public considerations and struggles. For some educators this represents a violation of academic neutrality, a politicizing of the educational process, or a contamination of the virtues of academic civility and the principles of high culture. But the issue is not whether public or higher education has become contaminated with politics, it is more importantly about recognizing that education is already a part of politics, power, and authority. The crucial matter at stake is how to appropriate, invent, direct, and control the multiple layers of power and politics that constitute both the institutional formation of education and the pedagogies that are often an outcome of deliberate struggles to put into place particular notions of knowledge, values, and identity. As committed educators, we cannot eliminate politics, but we can work against a politics of certainty, a pedagogy of terrorism, and an institutional formation that closes down rather than opens up democratic relations. This requires, in part, that we work diligently to construct a politics without guarantees—one that perpetually questions itself as well as all those forms of knowledge, values, and practices that appear beyond the process of interrogation, debate, and deliberation. Against a pedagogy and politics of certainty, it is crucial for educators to develop pedagogical practices that problematize considerations of institutional location, mechanisms of transmission, and effects, as well as make room for ongoing student critiques of how teacher authority functions, by analyzing the ideological baggage and subjective investments that teachers bring with them to the classroom experience.

Neither democracy nor schooling should become synonymous with the language of capital, oppression, control, surveillance, and privatization. Interrogating how power works through dominant discourses and social relations, particularly as they affect young people who are marginalized economically, racially, and politically, provides opportunities for progressives to challenge dominant ideologies and regressive social policies that undermine the opportunities for connecting the struggles over education to the broader crisis of radical democracy and social and economic justice.

Notes

1. Cited in Peltier, 1999, p. 29.
2. Cited in Habermas, 1988, p. 11.
3. I am referring here to Freire, 1973. For a more recent elaboration of this position, see Freire, 1999a.
4. For instance, see the following works: Giroux & Aronowitz, 1993; Giroux, 1990, 1994, 1996, 1997a, 2000a.
5. I am not employing the word greed carelessly. Not only does the total wealth of the top 358 global billionaires equal the combined incomes of the 2.3 billion poorest people (45 per cent of the world's population), but 800 million people are permanently undernourished, and something like 4 billion—two thirds of the world population—live in poverty. In the United States, one man, Bill Gates, has personal wealth estimated at 90 billion dollars—more than the combined wealth of the bottom 40 per cent of the U.S. population or 100 million Americans. And this type of runaway power and wealth takes place in a country in which one out of every four children has fallen into poverty. For sources on the latter figures, see Bauman, 1998, pp. 70–71; Derber, 1998, pp. 12–13; James, 1999, p. A14. It is also worth noting that in addition to the sky-rocketing gap between the rich and the poor, I am also referring to a culture of greed in which conspicuous consumption and waste become the hallmarks of status and social climb. Monique P. Yazigi reported in *The New York Times* that there is so much money sloshing around among the top 1 per cent of the population that the rich are now flying their linens to Paris, France to be cleaned at the cost in some cases of \$6,000 a month. Some have jets on call at the price of \$80,000 a flight, others fly their plants across the country on private jets, and so it goes on. See, Yazigi, 1999, pp. 1, 4.
6. I have taken this up in great detail in Giroux, 2000a. See also Aronowitz, 2000.
7. I discuss this in great detail in Giroux, 1997b.
8. Eduardo Galeano cited in Espada, 2000, p. 29.

References

- Adorno, T. W. (1993) *Critical Models* (New York, Columbia University Press).
- Althusser, L. (1977) *Lenin and Philosophy, and Other Essays*, trans. B. Brewster (New York, Monthly Review Press).
- Aronowitz, S. (2000) *The Knowledge Factory* (Boston, Beacon Press).
- Bauman, Z. (1998) *Globalization: The Human Consequences* (New York, Columbia University Press).
- Bennett, T. (1998) Cultural Studies: A Reluctant Discipline, *Cultural Studies*, 12:4.
- Bloch, E. (1986) *The Principle of Hope*, trans. N. Plaice, S. Plaice, & P. Knight (Cambridge, MA, MIT Press).
- Bourdieu, P. (1998) *Acts of Resistance* (New York, Free Press).
- Dean, J. (2000) The Interface of Political Theory and Cultural Studies, in: J. Dean, (ed.), *Cultural Studies and Political Theory* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press).
- Derber, C. (1998) *Corporation Nation* (New York, St. Martin's Press).
- Espada, M. (2000) Viva Vieques! *The Progressive*, July 28, 2000.
- Freire, P. (1973) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York, Seabury Press).
- Freire, P. (1999a) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York, Continuum).
- Freire, P. (1999b) *The Pedagogy of Freedom* (Lanham, Rowman & Littlefield).
- Giroux, H. (1990) *The Mouse that Roared: Disney and the End of Innocence* (Oxford, Rowman & Littlefield).
- Giroux, H. (1994) *Disturbing Pleasures* (New York, Routledge).
- Giroux, H. (1996) *Fugitive Cultures: Race, Violence and Youth* (New York, Routledge).

- Giroux, H. (1997a) *Channel Surfing: Racism, the Media, and the Destruction of Today's Youth* (New York, St. Martin's Press).
- Giroux, H. (1997b) *Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope: Theory, Culture, and Schooling* (Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press).
- Giroux, H. (2000a) *Stealing Innocence: Youth, Corporate Power, and the Politics of Culture* (New York, St. Martin's Press).
- Giroux, H. (2000b) *Impure Acts: The Practical Politics of Cultural Studies* (New York, Routledge).
- Giroux, H. & Aronowitz, S. (1993) *Education Still Under Siege* (Westport, Bergin and Garvey).
- Grossberg, L. (1997) Cultural Studies: What's in a Name?, in: L. Grossberg, *Bringing It All Back Home: Essays on Cultural Studies* (Durham, Duke University Press).
- Habermas, J. (1988) Psychic Thermidor and Rebirth of Rebellious Subjectivity, in: R. Pippin, A. Feenberg, & C. P. Weber (eds), *Marcuse: Critical Theory and the Promise of Utopia* (South Hadley, MA, Bergin and Garvey).
- James, S. (1999) Rich Man Gates Just Keeps Getting Richer, *The Boston Globe*, June 21, 1999.
- Lipsitz, G. (2000) Academic Politics and Social Change, in: J. Dean (ed.), *Cultural Studies and Political Theory* (Ithaca, Cornell University Press).
- Merifield, A. (2000) No Exit? Dream On, *The Nation*, June 5, 2000.
- Nelson, C. (ed.) (1997) *Will Teach For Food: Academic Labor in Crisis* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press).
- Panitch, L. & Gindin, S. (1999) Transcending Pessimism: Rekindling Socialist Imagination, in: L. Panitch & S. Gindin, (eds), *Necessary and Unnecessary Utopias* (New York, Monthly Review Press).
- Patton, C. (1993) Performativity and Spatial Distinction, in: E. K. Sedgwick & A. Parker (eds), *Performativity and Performance* (New York, Routledge).
- Peltier, L. (1999) *Prison Writings: My Life is My Sundance*, edited by Harvey Arden (New York, St. Martin's Press).
- Readings, B. (1996) *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press).
- West, C. (1994) America's Three-Fold Crisis, *Tikkun*, 9:2, pp. 41–42.
- Yazigi, M. P. (1999) When You Got It, Flaunt It, *The New York Times*, Section 4, December 26, 1999.