

UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Globalization and Resistance in the United States and Mexico: The Global Potemkin Village

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7670s8qn>

Journal

Higher Education, 45(2)

ISSN

0018-1560

Author

Rhoads, Robert A

Publication Date

2003-03-01

DOI

10.1023/a:1022425614762

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Peer reviewed

Globalization and Resistance in the United States and Mexico: The Global Potemkin Village

ROBERT A. RHOADS

*Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, UCLA, 2131 Moore Hall, Box
951521, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521, USA (E-mail: rhoads@ucla.edu)*

The Empress Catherine the Great of Russia once decided to take a cruise down the Danube to view that part of her realm. Her prime minister, Grigori Potemkin, knowing that the poverty of this region would not be pleasing to the Empress, allegedly built fake villages along the banks of the river and forcibly staffed these with cheering peasants, in order to impress the Empress with how prosperous and thriving the area was. The term "Potemkin village" has since come to be used to refer to an "impressive façade or show designed to hide an undesirable fact or condition."

Joseph Maxwell (1996, p. 99)

Abstract. This paper explores resistance to globalization through an analysis of three movements in which university students played pivotal roles: the student strike at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM), global trade protests, and the graduate student union movement in the U.S. Of special interest are the effects of globalization on higher education and the relevance of the neoliberal critique offered by critical theorists and globalization protesters. The author reveals how anti-globalization rhetoric deriving from the three movements seeks to counter the hegemony of corporate globalism. Previous literature on globalization and social movements is called upon to inform the study.

Introduction: The global context of higher education

We exist in a momentous age defined more by paradox and ambiguity than by positivity and assuredness. Theories of multiculturalism, postmodernism, and now globalization, are, in part, efforts to make sense of these challenging, yet exciting times. Accordingly, and in the tradition of C. Wright Mills,¹ many scholars ask if we truly have entered a new epoch in the history and culture of the human kind. Some believe the shifts are too dramatic to think otherwise (Baudrillard 1994; Castells 1997; Foucault 1980; Giroux 1992; Lyotard 1984; McLaren 1995). And so, now we turn our eyes to globalization.

From foundationalists to relativists, modernists to postmodernists, Fordists to post-Fordists, capitalists to Marxists, neoconservatives to neoliberals, seemingly everyone seeks to make sense of the emerging global qualities of contemporary life.

The academy is often criticized for its tendency toward stagnation—recall the words of Nathan Glazer who once wrote that “in the end, it is rather easier to change the world than the university” (1970, p. 82). But despite its seemingly inherent inertia, in recent times we have witnessed widespread changes in higher education. Consider the following. The United Nations announces its plan to open the World Trade University. The university will be based in Toronto and will offer training in international banking, trade law, and other disciplines useful in advancing global trade (Bollag 2001). In Egypt, a French university opens its doors to counter the growing dominance of English. A spokesperson for the university notes, “The hegemony of the English language can give future economic and political relations in Egypt a monodimensional character by pushing it mainly toward Anglo-Saxon countries. . . . English has become the language of international transactions to such an extent that it no longer represents a language of distinction” (Del Castillo 2001). The new French university intends to offer academic programs in technology, engineering, computer science, information systems, and hotel management. Elsewhere, the World Trade Organization (WTO) considers a series of proposals to regulate the importing and exporting of higher education (Altbach 2001). The National committee for International Trade in Education, representing the likes of for-profit providers Sylvan Learning Systems, Jones International University, and the University of Phoenix support the proposals, while more traditional institutions of higher learning do not.

Representing a growing international trend, and despite significant student protests, universities in Great Britain implement annual fees for first-year, full-time students (Tugend 1998). Likewise, in Mexico City, massive student protests occur at the National Autonomous University of Mexico as the administration seeks to implement tuition payments, necessitated in large part by structural adjustments to the Mexican economy imposed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (Rhoads and Mina 2001). Elsewhere, private colleges and universities around the world find new sources of revenue and success, while many public universities struggle to keep pace (Cohen 2001). Finally, elite Ivy League universities move away from need-based financial aid at the same time that outgoing president of the American Council of Education, Dr. Stanley O. Ikenberry, warns that market forces are endangering access to higher education and limiting the opportunities of low-income students (Wheeler 2001). He urges college and university leaders to

push back harder against the commercialization of higher education, but fails to challenge the fundamental economic structure undergirding the enterprise.

The preceding events may seem unrelated at first glance, but a deeper analysis suggests far-reaching connections having serious implications for higher education. Astute observers may recognize the connective fabric to these seemingly disparate events as part of the larger phenomenon known as “globalization.” For example, the global movement toward privatization of higher education arguably is linked to the success of the private system in the United States. Similarly, as higher education institutions operating in a technologically advanced arena expand their influence beyond national boundaries, others seek to imitate their success and share in the potential revenue and international influence, as the case of the French university in Egypt clearly reveals.

One might argue that globalization is not the only explanation for change in higher education. Many of the trends bearing the globalization stamp also reflect the increasing corporatization of the academy, as capital and market forces take hold at the same time that public support for higher education dwindles. While some would argue that corporatization is in essence a globalizing project (such a view suggests that corporatization *is* globalization), there are a range of diverse definitions and understandings of globalization that might suggest alternative visions. For example, one might speak of globalization as a cultural phenomenon characterized by “the complexity of the multidirectional traffic of ‘flows,’ of homogenizing and heterogenizing forces that are mutually implicated” (Luke and Luke 2000, pp. 286–287). A report from the World Bank titled “Poverty in an Age of Globalization” suggests that globalization is not simply “the global exchange of goods, services, and capital,” but also involves an exchange of “information, ideas, and people” (World Bank 2000, p. 1). We might think of the U.S. Department of Education’s “Program for North American Mobility in Higher Education” coordinated by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) as designed to promote this sort of globalization.

One could also speak of globalization as centered on developing shared democratic systems and processes having the potential to alleviate world conflicts. The World Trade Organization in “10 Benefits of the WTO Trading System” claims that a world trading system “helps promote peace” as “disputes are handled constructively.” The document goes on to add, “Sales people are usually reluctant to fight their customers” (World Trade Organization 2000). Along this line of thought, the United Nations might be seen as serving a global governance function aimed at reducing conflict and promoting more democratic processes. Similarly, globalization also has been discussed as the idea of a shared community. Indeed, in a recent essay by

Burbules (2000) he asks the following question: Does the Internet constitute a global educational community? Regardless of the answer, simply posing the question suggests another possibility for how we might conceive of globalization.

Clearly, there are in fact a range of understandings associated with globalization. However, I argue in this paper that these alternative visions amount to nothing more than diversions. They help to conceal what lies at the heart of globalization – capitalist expansionism. In essence, globalization is a façade, a Potemkin village, for corporate-driven ventures seeking to limit resistance to ever increasing capitalist penetrations.

In terms of the higher education arena and the corporatization of the university, perhaps it is less controversial to employ the “globalization” rhetoric, given that the significations associated with such a construct are far ranging. Again, globalization seen as shared democratic and cultural forms may be far more palatable than the alternative – globalization as the outcome of unchecked, market-driven forces, taking hold of an increasingly international monetary arena, and concomitantly, leaving nation-states weakened by comparison to the multinational corporation. The conflation of globalization and democracy is most troubling. A skeptical Chomsky notes, “We are to understand, then, that democracy is enhanced as significant decision making shifts even more into the hands of unaccountable private tyrannies, mostly foreign-based. Meanwhile the public arena is to shrink still further as the state is ‘minimized’ in accordance with the neoliberal political and economic principles that have emerged triumphant” (1998, p. 95).

For an example of global corporatism challenging the autonomy of the nation-state one need not look far. Take for example Ricetec’s patent claim on Basmati rice. Here was an example of a U.S. company claiming not only the name “Basmati,” but the rice lines themselves, including the grains of these lines and the breeding methods as well. The challenge such a patent posed to India’s agriculture, which relies heavily on the production of Basmati rice, was quite real. Conceivably, Ricetec’s legally executed patent could have taken precedence over India’s agricultural traditions, leaving farmers in India to someday pay for the right to do what their ancestors had been doing for countless generations (Murallidharan 1998).

Hypothetically, and somewhat paradoxically, the savior in the Basmati rice case easily could have been the WTO, which at the time of the patent had rules against patenting “geographically indicated” products.² Heroes and villains are not so easily cast in a postmodern, postindustrial world. We see then the power of not only corporations such as Ricetec, but also of the multinational economic “referees,” in this case, the WTO. One can make the case that organizations like the WTO, the World Bank, and the

IMF mark the birth of a new form of organization – the “superorganization” – organizations transcending the power and scope of the nation-state. International non-government organizations (INGOs) as superorganizations challenge traditional forms of “organizational legitimacy” – “the degree of cultural support for an organization [or] the extent to which the array of established cultural accounts provide explanations for its existence, functioning, and jurisdiction” (Meyer and Scott 1983, p. 201). Consequently, higher education institutions around the world find themselves caught in a complex cultural and political drama being played out among nation-states, corporations, and superorganizations vying for organizational legitimacy. At times, universities are caught on the sidelines of multiple and triangular tug-of-wars waged over power, influence, and capital. From these struggles emerge winners, losers, beneficiaries, and victims. At other times, universities are in the heat of the battle, seeking superorganizational status themselves, just like their corporate counterparts. Examples are many: Pennsylvania State University’s “Virtual University” come to mind, as both seek to take the land-grant ideal of “extension” to a whole new level (perhaps intergalactic extension activities are within sight). But countless others also are seeking to expand their “customer base” and revenue streams, not to mention their global influence.

By now it should be fairly obvious that the intention here is to further explore the nature of globalization and its influence on the academy. The goal is to make sense of a particular strain of globalization, namely corporate-driven forms that are producing superorganizations and propelling other postindustrial organizations to restructure along similar lines. More specifically, the intent is to explore this phenomenon not from the perspective of the corporation, but from the counter-hegemonic position of the anti-globalization movement. In making sense of this movement, the sociological research and literature on “new social movements” and the more interdisciplinary work on student movements will be utilized. In the end, it will be suggested that anti-globalization rhetoric and resistance reflect a fundamental rejection of neoliberal views of both society and the academy, and instead seek to forge a more “progressive” vision grounded in a concern for democracy and the public good.

With the preceding in mind, this paper explores three critical issues relevant to understanding the globalization movement. First, the meaning of globalization, as defined from an oppositional discourse rooted in critical theory, is explored. Second, the nature of anti-globalization rhetoric and resistance is examined through studies of students and activists involved in progressive social movements. Specifically, I examine the student strike

at the National Autonomous University of Mexico (UNAM) and global protests against world trade initiatives. And third, I delve deeper into the anti-corporate discourse evidenced by the aforementioned movements through an examination of graduate student unionization in the United States. I conclude this paper by analyzing the anti-globalization movement and its contribution to social change in light of the academy's growing ties to corporate capitalism.

A critical perspective

Globalization may be understood as increasingly interdependent relationships between economies, cultures, institutions, and nation-states (Burbules and Torres 2000; Carnoy, Castells, Cohen and Cardoso 1993). This type of interdependence has been described by Castells (1997) as a "network society."

It is characterized by the globalization of strategically decisive economic activities. By the networking form of organization. By the flexibility and instability of work, and the individualization of labor. By a culture of real virtuality constructed by a pervasive, interconnected, and diversified media system. And by the transformation of material foundations of life, space and time, through the constitution of a space of flows and of timeless time, as expressions of dominant activities and controlling elites. This new form of social organization, in its pervasive globality, is diffusing throughout the world, as industrial capitalism and its twin enemy, industrial statism, did in the twentieth century, shaking institutions, transforming cultures, creating wealth and inducing poverty, spurring greed, innovation, and hope, while simultaneously imposing hardship and instilling despair. It is indeed, brave or not, a new world (p. 1).

And Carnoy (1993) argues that the growth of multinational enterprises (MNEs) has dramatically altered the economic and political landscape to such an extent that nation-states have no choice but to develop policies to guide their relations with MNEs or risk falling "deeper into the waiting arms of technology-bearing, capital-laden, multinational firms" (p. 48).

Similar to Castells and Carnoy, Burbules and Torres point out that globalization describes "the emergence of supranational institutions whose decisions shape and constrain the policy options for any particular nation-state; for others, it [globalization] means the overwhelming impact of global economic processes, including processes of production, consumption, trade, capital flow, and monetary interdependence; for still others, it denotes the

rise of neoliberalism as a hegemonic policy discourse" (2000, pp. 1-2). Burbules and Torres go on to add that globalization also shapes culture, primarily through the growing interdependence of media and communication technologies. Emerging cultural forms in turn "shape the relations of affiliation, identity, and interaction within and across local cultural settings" (p. 2). Finally, globalization may be understood as "a construction used by state policymakers to inspire support for and suppress opposition to changes because 'greater forces' (global competition, responses to IMF or World Bank demands, obligations to regional alliances, and so on) leave the nation-state 'no choice' but to play by a set of global rules not of its own making" (p. 2).

Burbules and Torres go on to provide a helpful schema for exploring the nature of globalization. They articulate three realms in which globalization has had significant impact: the economic, political, and cultural. From a globalization perspective, economic concerns are paramount, because "globalization effects employment," and necessarily, "touches upon one of the primary traditional goals of education: preparation for work" (p. 20). Political impacts are key because globalization poses constraints on nation-state policy making. The cultural impact has relevance because global changes affect educational policies, practices, and institutions. Cultural issues also become important as global societies take on multicultural and intercultural characteristics. Multiculturalism, in turn, poses new challenges to educational policy and practice as institutions struggle to support a diverse population (Rhoads and Valadez 1996; Tierney 1993; Torres 1998a, 1998b).

A key concern is raised by Burbules and Torres: "A major question today is the extent to which societies [interpreted in this context as nation-states] will be able to pick and choose the ways in which, and the degree to which, they can participate in a global world; or whether, as with other Faustian bargains, there is no halfway alternative" (p. 17). Such an interpretation suggests that globalization involves a redefinition of the nation-state as part of the global economic system that it has in fact helped to create. This view implies that the postindustrial nation-state no longer serves the needs of society, but must instead march to the beat of a different drum – global capitalism. Similarly, Touraine (1988) argues that society and the nation-state have become increasingly disconnected. "The idea of society," Touraine explains, "acquires a new meaning here, far less defined by institutions, a central power, values or permanent rules of social organization, than by this field of debates and conflicts which has as its global stake the social use of the symbolic goods that postindustrial society massively produces" (p. 33). In seeking to forge a postindustrial sociology, Touraine argues that the focus must turn to social movements, given that "social life loses its unity, its center, and its mechanisms of institutionalization, control, and socialization" (p. 27). He proposes

a "sociology of action," in which "the new actors, the new conflicts, and especially the new stakes" (p. 27) become central. Touraine offers a strong theoretical rationale for a study of the anti-globalization movement and the ways in which progressives desire to shape the nature of global endeavors.³

Globalization and education

Globalization holds significant implications for education. Apple (2000) argues that globalization claims have been used to support a "conservative restoration," in which both neoliberals and neoconservatives are part of the same alliance to promote stronger linkages between education and the international economy. The consequence is that democracy is no longer seen as a political idea, but instead "is transformed into a wholly economic concept" (p. 60). This, as Apple argues, centers around a consumerist mentality in which education is situated as a product exchangeable in an open market. "In effect, education is seen as simply one more product like bread, cars, and television" (p. 60). Democracy, in turn, becomes a series of self-regulated, consumptive economic practices, instead of a political and relational ideal in the classic manner suggested by Freire (1970) in *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* and Dewey (1916) in *Democracy and Education*.

In a very real sense, the discourse associated with the "conservative restoration" and linked to consumerist and capital-driven ideologies is replaced by the discourse of globalization. But the popularized globalization rhetoric is merely the façade of a Potemkin village that is indeed a consumerist assault on progressive education and social justice concerns. Globalization, as Morrow and Torres argue, is cleverly used to guide strategies of educational reform in which the "agenda is based more on ideology than on empirically justifiable analyses of the benefits of a 'flexible production' model that undercuts the larger cultural and humanistic tasks of education" (2000, p. 52).

The consequence of the dominance of consumerist practices and the prevalence of a market-driven mentality is that the nation-state and its ability to serve the broad social good, including the needs of the poorest of a given society, becomes seriously weakened. As Capella argues, "'Political' power has modified its basic structure with globalization; for the first time since the birth of modernity it cannot be described in terms of simple sovereignty and legitimacy" (2000, p. 236). From Capella's perspective, the nation-state becomes only one form of power situated within a complex force field that also includes private interests, which are increasingly dominated by large transnational corporations. Operating within the framework of global capitalism, transnational corporations challenge the power and authority of the nation-state, rendering it largely weak and ineffective. Essentially, the

nation-state loses its sovereignty as it becomes "bypassed by global networks of wealth, power, and information" (Castells 1997, p. 354). For colleges and universities, the result is increased control over educational policy by consumer-driven forces and decreased control by public-oriented structures.

The weak-state perspective conforms to the neoliberal position criticized by Apple: "They are guided by a vision of the weak state. Thus, what is private is necessarily good and what is public is necessarily bad" (2000, p. 59). In turn, educational policy making tends to react more and more to private forces and concerns articulated by global capitalism under the direction of multinational corporations and their investors. Lost among corporate-driven interests is any notion of democratic citizenship.

The advance of corporate globalist rhetoric has significant impact for the academy. For example, corporate globalism points to a shift from industrial production to a postindustrial economy. This shift demands refocusing higher education as the nature of employment becomes fundamentally altered. In fact, in a postindustrial society, where information and technology become increasingly vital to a nation-state's economy, the role of colleges and universities as training and development centers increases in importance and scope. As Slaughter and Lesley point out, "We have moved from an industrial to a postindustrial society, and higher education is more important to the latter. Postindustrial societies depend on higher education for training and research development (R&D) to a greater degree than do industrial societies" (1997, p. 25).

The shift to consumerist models of organization also challenges colleges and universities to become more entrepreneurial, as they seek to respond to competitive processes unleashed by a changing economic structure. Slaughter and Leslie argue that "the academy has shifted from a liberal arts core to an entrepreneurial periphery," in which "marketization" of the academy leads to the rise of "research and development with commercial purpose" (p. 208). The response to globalization is evident in Slaughter and Leslie's study of Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. These three countries developed national research and development agendas along with specific higher education policies as part of a strategy to capitalize on the changing economic environment. In the process, faculty work, graduate education, and perhaps most importantly, undergraduate education were significantly altered. As entrepreneurialism increased, national and state/provincial spending on higher education decreased as either a share of total higher education revenue or in terms of constant dollars per student. Thus, we have the classic case of the nation-state's declining ability to influence the public good through education, as their financial support dwindles in the face of privatization and entrepreneurialism (see Aronowitz and DiFazio

1994; Nelson 1997; Watkins 1989). A similar trend has been described by scholars conducting research in Latin America (see Torres and Schugurensky forthcoming; Boron and Torres 1996). Essentially, corporatization annihilates democracy as the defining project of education. In the end, capitalism taken to the extreme introduces new definitions of democracy and freedom: the pursuit of free markets and the practice of free enterprise.

Social movements and student activism

The dynamics of corporate globalization thus have contributed to social relations ripe for student resistance. As universities increasingly define themselves as corporations operating within the larger context of global capitalism, presidents as "CEOs" intentionally and unintentionally articulate a vision that for many students runs counter to the ideals of liberal learning, learning for learning's sake, and students as participants in the construction of knowledge. Instead, education and all that springs from the corporate university serves the grand enterprise – economic and technological development. This is most obviously the case at the large research universities, where students increasingly are situated at the consumer level of a complex knowledge factory, and where the organization seeks to "manage" its human resources by allocating its most prized "employees" – the star professors – to the more lucrative R&D enterprise. Indeed, Clark Kerr's "Multiversity" centered around knowledge production at the grandest scale has in many ways become Mary Shelley's Frankenstein. The teachers of the undergraduates are often their peers – graduate students with only a few more years of education than their students. Graduate students then become the "line workers in the production of knowledge" turning out undergraduates stamped with the seal of the entrepreneurial university (Rhoades and Rhoads, forthcoming).

In response to a corporatized university, many students, both undergraduates and graduate students, and especially those in disciplines far removed from the economic potential of science and technology fields, turn to activism as a source of resistance. Their activism seeks to alter a set of complex processes most students are ill-prepared to critique (Rhoads 1998a). Nonetheless, in an attempt to shape globalization at the grass-roots level, they resist tuition increases driven in part by structural adjustments called for by the superorganizations (INGOs), they protest the meetings of the WTO, IMF, and World Bank in an effort to challenge corporate-fashioned global economic relations, and as graduate students they organize unions as a means of resisting the knowledge factory and the steady movement toward the globalized corporate university. These efforts amount to what Kellner describes as "globalization from below," as "oppositional individuals and social move-

ments resist globalization and use its institutions and instruments [including the Internet] to further democratization and social justice" (2000, p. 301).

Although critical theory provides the primary lens for interpreting anti-globalization movements, the literature on the "new social movements" also is helpful. This body of work suggests that identity and ideology play key roles in the formation and endurance of social movements (Anner 1996; Calhoun 1994; Laraña, Johnson, and Gushfield 1994; Scott 1990). Hence, in thinking about the anti-globalization movement it is helpful to understand how identity and ideology help to construct a broad assault on globalization. This shift in theorizing is in line with criticism of past social movement research, especially theorizing in the U.S.: "Whatever the reason, the absence of any real emphasis on ideas, ideology, or identity has created, within the United States, a strong 'rationalist' and 'structural' bias in the current literature on social movements" (McAdam 1994, p. 36).

Additionally, there is a long history of interdisciplinary work on student movements that also informs this study. Empirical studies of student movements especially have proliferated as a consequence of campus unrest in the 1960s and early 1970s (Altbach 1973; Altbach and Laufer 1972; Altbach and Peterson 1971; Heineman 1993; Lipset 1976; Lipset and Altbach 1969; McAdam 1988; Miller 1994). More recently, Levine and Cureton (1998) and Rhoads (1998a, 1998b) have studied student activism, disagreeing though on the extent to which contemporary student organizing is a local or global phenomenon, with Rhoads arguing for a more global interpretation. For example, take the case of Chicano Studies and the efforts of Mexican-American students to advance such programs. Although one might label a Chicano Studies movement at a particular university as evidence of "localism," one must also recognize that more far-reaching connections are likely to be evident. More to the point, the case of Chicano Studies at UCLA as described by Rhoads and Martinez (1998) reveals that key elements of the Chicano Studies program envisioned by student activists involved advancing historical, political, and cultural connections between Mexico and the United States. To describe the efforts of these activists as "local" simply because their protests were centered at UCLA fails to acknowledge the complex ways in which events are shaped, configured, and re-configured as cross-cultural and cross-national phenomena. With this said, the analysis of the three movements covered in this paper also seeks to uncover global elements be they textual or subtextual.

The student strike at UNAM⁴

On April 20, 1999 students at the National Autonomous University of Mexico took over the campus, primarily as a response to the administration's efforts to implement significant tuition fees. The siege of Mexico's most famous and North America's largest university lasted until February 6, 2000, when some 2400 federal police raided the main campus and jailed close to 1000 striking students (Casanova Cardiel and Rodríguez Gómez 2000). An important facet of the complex political and economic dynamics at UNAM contributing to the strike was rooted in debates about Mexico's strategic initiatives relative to globalization, namely pressure from international banking organizations to reduce expenditures for public higher education (Casanova Cardiel and Rodríguez Gómez 2000; Consejo General de Huelga 1999). International pressure, combined with a vulnerable Mexican economy heavily dependent on the volatile petroleum industry, pushed the Mexican government to reduce the budget for UNAM (Dominguez Martínez and Pérez Cruz 2000).

The student strike at UNAM represented a response to a complex set of circumstances, including shifting political allegiances (the dominant and long-standing ruling party – the Partido Revolucionario Institucional [PRI] – was in decline), tough economic times, neoliberal restructuring, attempts to reform Mexican higher education, and a history of student insurgency at UNAM (The context for struggle at UNAM is far too complicated to explore here. For a quite thorough discussion of political conflict at UNAM see Ordorika [1996, 1999]). Furthermore, to claim that the student strike was essentially a response to globalization would be inaccurate. No such claim is made. The point here is that although the strike itself should not be described as a wing of the anti-globalization movement, it nonetheless contained strong anti-globalization elements. Consequently, student actions and commentaries at UNAM linked to a broad anti-globalization strain will be highlighted in this section.

There were a variety of explanations offered to support the implementation of student fees, but clearly a significant factor was pressure on Mexican president Ernesto Zedillo to decrease federal support for public higher education. For example, the IMF, controlled and managed by corporate leaders, had long demanded that the Mexican government reduce subsidies to public universities such as UNAM. Pressure from the IMF is symptomatic of a larger problem in which powerful international organizations such as the IMF and World Bank, along with corporations based primarily in the United States, increasingly have come to influence national policy in Mexico as "Americanization" takes a deeper hold on the country's economy. Although many of these international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) influence national economic policies in developing countries such as Mexico,

accountability is minimal if existent at all. The global economic pressures Mexico faces are common to other parts of Latin America: nation-states in the region are increasingly pushed by international corporatists to decrease public expenditures for higher education and channel revenue to areas that will promote aggressive economic growth and push these countries to the "Fast Track." One of the consequences of decreased support for public higher education is that significant populations of low-income families are blocked from key pathways to social mobility. These issues were paramount to the leaders of the student strike at UNAM.

To understand the passion students brought to their protests, one first must recognize the importance of UNAM to Mexico's broad political and cultural landscape. The political struggles at UNAM in many ways parallel the broader issues of Mexican political life. Indeed, Ordorika (1996, 1999) has demonstrated the strong ties between the Mexican political landscape and conflict at UNAM throughout its history. For example, he points out how administrative appointments at UNAM have been guided by the political agenda of the former ruling party, the PRI. Additionally, to most Mexicans, UNAM is seen as *la máxima casa de estudios*, which in English roughly translates to "the nation's university." Thus, in addition to serving a large segment of the college-going population in Mexico (UNAM enrolls some 250,000 students), UNAM holds a special place in the hearts and minds of the populace. One student offered insight into the importance of UNAM. "The University is the cradle of culture for the country, and the largest university in Latin America. And because it is *la máxima casa de estudios*, everything is related to national issues." A second added, "The University is the major center of professional preparation, of research, of education, and of culture for the country."

Given UNAM's importance to the broader society, efforts to raise tuition in light of international pressure from the likes of the IMF were interpreted by progressive and left-wing students as a slap in the face of not only the poor, but Mexico's status as an independent nation. The latter issue is of utmost concern to this paper, as the weakening of the nation-state as a governing body is one of the key issues the anti-globalization movement has raised.

Thus, key facets to the conflict at UNAM were issues related to access and autonomy, which swirled around contested views regarding the role of *la máxima casa de estudios*. The student strikers supported the position that UNAM should be tuition free and accessible to students from the lowest income groups throughout Mexican society. Their position is based on Article 3 of the Mexican Constitution, which declares that all forms of public education are to be free. One student elaborated on this position: "All the conditions of the strikers, the defense of autonomy, the defense of democratic education,

conform to Article 3 of the Mexican Constitution.” A second student stated, “We fight so that the government will not charge for schooling. We have participated in all the movements that call for payment in any public schools. It is unconstitutional to charge.” A third student supported similar views and in the process pointed a finger at the media for its negative portrayal of the student strikers, “The media obviously omits a lot of things. They make the students look like villains for ‘kidnapping’ the University, but let’s not forget how our ‘intelligent’ government from the very beginning began to cut back funding for the public universities so that they could pay the bankers. There is no doubt that this is a national issue, and that the students have to pay a price to sustain accessible schools. The fact is that this is a country where the majority of the people are poor and cannot pay.”

Fear that the country’s commitment to globalization poses a challenge to both UNAM’s fundamental identity and Mexico’s national autonomy was strong. A consistent concern expressed by the strikers reflected a belief that the increasing commitment of Mexico to market-driven forces is pulling the country and institutions such as UNAM toward privatization. At times the rhetoric from the students was inciting: “Everyone thinks that this is a problem between the authorities and the students, but it is not like that. This is not only a national problem but an international problem. The imperialist politics that have been planted in Mexico and abroad have driven privatization not only in education but in all public sectors. For the most part, and in the near future, all that is common to the people of the nation will no longer be. We will be in foreign hands, the hands of the United States.” The preceding student’s fear of Americanization is captured in a political cartoon created by the protesters and painted in bright colors on a wall at UNAM. The cartoon depicts Uncle Sam portrayed as a puppeteering devil standing over UNAM’s former rector, Francisco Barrié, controlling his behavior to suit the interests of the United States. The cartoon captures the sentiment of the progressive, anti-globalization movement: the wealthiest countries, guided almost entirely by corporate interests, give shape and meaning to globalization. The fallout, none too surprisingly, is that the least represented in globalization decision making, the poor, are left behind. A student voice from UNAM is helpful here: “We are students, not delinquents. We also want to study. No one wanted the strike. But understand that this has been a recourse to pressure the authorities. We want a university for everyone, for the people, not just for a certain sector of the population.”

The connection of the crisis at UNAM to the broad neoliberal agenda is made clear by the CGH (Consejo General de Huelga), the group of students officially charged with representing the student strikers. Writing in a special edition of the Mexican political magazine, *Proceso*, the CGH explained,

The past two decades have represented for UNAM and the country a confrontation with the neoliberal project that in concrete terms has signified the imposition of commercialized criteria throughout the entire scope of national life, a competition to the death in a savage version of social Darwinism The imposition of this model has signified a gradual loss of rights obtained through other social movements and established in the Constitution, such as the right to education, health, housing, employment, and sustenance; in summary, the right to a dignified life (p. 17).

The CGH went on to argue, “At the international level, the defense of public education leads to student movements, principally in Latin America, although these struggles still occur in an isolated manner. But all of them have the same objective: to curb the offensive that seeks to privatize education” (1999, p. 17).

Although a variety of complex forces helped to produce the student strike at UNAM, concerns linked to neoliberal globalism clearly were evident. The case of the student strike at UNAM sheds light on some of the tension between progressive student politics and the power of neoliberal economic policies. But to more fully understand anti-globalization sentiments perhaps it is best to turn to the heart of the movement.

The global economy protests

The anti-globalization movement has been brought to international prominence primarily as a consequence of three major protests: the December 1999 World Trade Organization summit in Seattle, the September 2000 IMF-World Bank summit in Prague, and the July 2001 G-8 summit in Genoa. In Seattle, over 50,000 demonstrators wreaked havoc in the streets of Seattle over a 4-day period. In Prague, protesters numbering close to 10,000 shut down the IMF-World Bank summit one-day early. And, in Genoa, the G-8 summit was marked by the death of protester Carlos Giuliani as countless anti-globalization protesters clashed in the streets with thousands of police and military troops.

The anti-global trade movement extends far beyond campus activism, although clearly college students are significant contributors to the vitality of the movement. Students at campuses around the country have been actively involved in organizing demonstrations, teach-ins, speaking engagements, and campus-based anti-globalization groups.⁵ This movement has been described by Burbach as a “virtually existing global revolution.” He explains, “The rigidity of formal political institutions and the blatant corporate bias of global rule-making institutions, such as the IMF, the World Bank, and the WTO,

have driven grassroots movements to improvise and create new alternatives from the bottom up" (2001, p. 92).

The "virtual" quality of the anti-globalization movement also reflects the tremendous reliance on the Internet and advanced communication technologies. This too is a central quality of student organizing in the new millennium (Rhoads 1998a). As students on campuses around the world form international links to battle sweatshop labor, anti-democratic forces in Myanmar (formerly known as Burma), and corporate control of the global economy, the Internet has become the central vehicle for organizing and coordinating direct action. Michael McPherson and Morron Schapiro address the use of the Internet by today's student activists:

The Internet is . . . a superb vehicle for mobilizing supporters and planning political action in diverse locations all across the United States and even the world. For example, the Seattle World Trade Organization protests, like those at the World Bank meetings in Washington, were largely coordinated through e-mail. As one of us can personally attest, the president at any institution that becomes involved in the sweatshop issue can count on receiving hundreds of e-mail messages – usually espousing an anticorporate position – from remote spots around the globe (2000, p. B24).

The Internet enables forms of direct action far more powerful than simply e-mail bombardment. Take, for example, the case of the "spiders" of the Free Burma Coalition (FBC). The FBC organized an international network of resistance against the oppressive and authoritarian regime in Myanmar, where in 1990 the democratically elected Aung San Suu Kyi, of the National League for Democracy, was placed under house arrest and denied her right to assume leadership. Led by college students operating around the world, and inspired by the Ethiopian proverb – "when spiders unite they can tie down a lion" – the FBC launched successful corporate boycotts against companies operating in Burma, including PepsiCo (Rhoads 1998a, p. 237). The FBC and its Pepsi boycott is but one example of how global resistance can be waged against multinational companies through the use of the Internet.

Perhaps the most prominent anti-corporate globalization protests were those that took place in Seattle in December of 1999, where protesters controlled the streets, forced confrontations with police, and paralyzed downtown retail, and, most importantly, frustrated WTO talks (Hendren 2000). The Seattle protests sent a wake-up call to globalization proponents operating in the corporate arena, who, until Seattle, had gone virtually unopposed and had convincingly advanced the position that economic globalization was inevitable and desirable. The activism in Seattle presented a public challenge to

globalization and served a pedagogical role in elevating consciousness around progressive oppositional perspectives.

From Seattle and meetings of the World Trade Organization, to Genoa and the G-8 summit, to Washington, DC and meetings of the World Bank and IMF, to Davos and the World Economic Forum (WEF), to Quebec City and the gathering of Western Hemisphere leaders, the forceful discourse from anti-globalization protesters is similar: "The violence comes from the WEF and its guests and their dangerous policies, such as sweatshops in Mexico and building dams. We don't want to improve them; we want to stop them" (Olson 2001). Terra Lawson-Remer, who helped to launch STARC (Student Alliance to Reform Corporations) in the United States, expressed similar concerns, in part, gleaned after a semester of studying in Latin America: "The problems the people in the rain forest were worrying about were the same problems the farm workers in California were worrying about. They were the same problems that the surfers where I grew up were worried about – not wanting to get sewage in their cars . . . The problem was corporate dominance and lack of democratic accountability" (Riccardi 2000).

Concerns expressed by anti-globalization protesters have been fairly consistent: fear that corporate interests have too much say in global economic politics and that the benefits of globalization are unevenly distributed. Relatedly, many are concerned that nation-states are losing their autonomy and decision-making ability when it comes to economic matters. Without the ability of nation-states to intervene in global economic decisions, fears of economic calamity perpetuate. As Went argues, "The problem is that there is virtually no international regulation or control to speak of that could replace the national control and regulatory mechanisms that have succumbed to deregulation, privatisation and financial innovation. The Mexican crisis at the end of 1994 and the crisis that broke out in mid-1997 in Asia show how unstable and unpredictable the globalised world economy has become" (2000, p. 6).

Organizations such as the Citizens Trade Campaign (CTC), Mobilization for Global Justice, and the Poor People's Campaign for Economic Human Rights in the Americas reject the notion that globalization is the natural outcome of contemporary economic relations and instead believe that powerful economic organizations create the climate and context for globalization. The issue is over the set of rules that should govern a global economy and whose interests those rules will serve. Accordingly, the CTC, whose member organizations include the United Steelworkers of America, the United Auto Workers, Friends of the Earth, and the National Family Farm Coalition, suggests particular principles that they believe ought to govern the global economy. Some of these principles include the strengthening of

public interest standards associated with labor and the environment; raising public interest standards in developing countries; respecting culture and diversity; allowing countries to give priority to sustaining family farms and achieving global food security; recognizing that sound national economies are essential to a healthy global economy; developing new rules for the global economy based on increased democracy, transparency, and accountability; and rejecting "Fast Track" policies.

In general, anti-global trade protesters seek an alternative to unchecked capitalism. They represent a range of ideological positions, including socialism, communism, environmentalism, unionism, anarchism, localism, and yes, even capitalism. The 2000 summit meeting of the IMF and World Bank in the Czech Republic was particularly telling, ideologically speaking. In Prague, "where the Lenin busts have been replaced by Pepsi logos and McDonald's arches," protesters saw the limitations of the struggle to fashion global economic policies (Klein 2000). One writer sought to capture the prevailing sentiment of the protesters: "Many of the young Czechs . . . say their direct experience with communism and capitalism has taught them that the two systems have something in common: They both treat people as if they are less than fully human. Where communism saw them only as potential producers, capitalism sees them only as potential consumers; where communism starved their beautiful capital, capitalism overfed it, turning Prague into a Velvet Revolution theme park" (Klein 2000).

In addition to challenging corporate capitalism's treatment of human beings as consumers, another key aspect of anti-globalization seeks to elevate the conditions of workers. In this regard, unions have played a key role in seeking to contain neoliberal economic strategies. One example is the effort of graduate students in the United States to unionize.

Graduate student unionization in the U.S.⁶

Both the student strike at UNAM and global trade protests offer insight into a progressive critique of corporate globalism. However, to understand the nature of the corporate critique in the academy, it may be helpful to turn to the graduate student unionization movement in the U.S. Once again, progressive and left-leaning students seem the most dissatisfied with the basic organizational structures of the postindustrial university. The following student offers some insight: "We are responding to the sorry state of the contemporary academy, to the labor exploitation, to the corporatization of the academy The university does a lot of its planning through cost-benefit analysis and they speak of students as clients and administrators and staff as service providers But in terms of teaching and learning, those questions don't really come

into the realm of upper-level administrations. [Those questions] get shoved down to the lower levels. Overall, what I'm saying is that they're adopting the culture of the corporate world and important issues related to the intellectual and academic life of the university get lost." A second graduate student offered a similar perspective: "Twenty-five years ago the big fight was to keep Dow Chemical off campus. But today, the campus is Dow Chemical. They've recognized that the way to take the academy was not simply to recruit, but to own, to possess the academy. The culture war was not simply fought at the ideological and cultural level. There is an economic level to it that is far more powerful."

The corporate model of the postindustrial, global economy, or what Castells (1993) describes as the "informational economy," demands a flexible work force. This is true in the more traditional fields as well as in the kind of positions that Reich (1991) describes as "symbolic analysts," workers whose jobs entail the construction of meaning as a form of production. As Touraine points out, "The passage to postindustrial society takes place when investment results in the production of symbolic goods that modify values, needs, representations, far more than in the production of material goods or even 'services.' Industrial society had transformed the means of production; postindustrial society changes the ends of production, that is, culture" (1988, p. 104). Nowhere is this more evident than in the academy, where the use of part-time, adjunct, and graduate student instructors is at an all-time high. This point is made quite clear by Rhoades (1998) in his study of academic labor. Through his analysis of faculty union contracts, Rhoades demonstrates how faculty have become "managed professionals," serving the management and capitalist structure of the academy and increasingly replaceable by part-time laborers: "Faculty are witnessing the development of forms of production and service delivery that are being staffed by emergent occupations of nonunion, nonfaculty skilled and professional workers. They also are witnessing the increased delegation of their work to part-time employees" (p. 279). Elsewhere Rhoades notes, "Unionized faculty are experiencing the effects of academic capitalism As colleges and universities seek to streamline products, services, and employees to increase productivity and efficiency, and to contain personnel costs, the negotiations accompanying academic capitalism are intensified" (p. 274).

There is no great leap of faith involved in arguing that the recent increase in graduate student unions is a reaction to the global, corporate academy and its efforts to restructure a workforce suitable to a postindustrial economy. Such a shift poses serious professional barriers to graduate students seeking careers as symbolic analysts within and beyond the academy. One student who participated in a national study of graduate student unionization pointed

to a strategy that assures a cheap labor force for the universities: "In our department alone there used to be an unbelievable number of Ph.D. candidates admitted to our program. They essentially glutted the market and so now it's quite easy to take advantage of us as workers, since we have so few options down the road. At the same time, more part-time positions are used to replace full-time faculty, which then leaves us with fewer options as well." This student organizer suggested that the solution lies not in closing the doors to individuals who want to pursue advanced studies, but in returning to a full-time faculty labor force.

The heavy reliance upon part-time labor has become a central concern of the graduate student union movement. Student organizers speak of part-time instructional labor as part of a critique of the corporate model that has come to dominate the academy. A graduate student explained, "The extent to which we have come to recognize and talk about the university as the corporate university has come up finally in the atmosphere of unionization. People have begun to recognize that the mythology of the ivory tower is just that — a mythology. The fact is that the university has become a business enterprise. Universities have learned a great deal from the business world and are doing a variety of corporate-kinds of things to compete, and, in this sense, they are employers. It's easier to see oneself as a cog in the wheel as an employee, potentially exploitable, when you see the university as a corporation."

Neoliberal globalization poses new challenges to unions. Most importantly, unions have struggled in the face of a hostile political environment. With globalization, as Burbules and Torres argue, the state has withdrawn to a significant degree "from its role as an arbiter between labor and capital, allying itself with capital and pushing labor into a defensive position" (2000, p. 5). Consequently, unions such as the United Auto Workers suffered during the 1980s as conservative business ideologies dominated. Then, in the 1990s, as neoliberalism embraced many of the fundamental ideals of conservative economic practice, including an even deeper commitment to the mythology of individualism, unions continued to take a big hit. The unions needed a new strategy to battle for workers' rights in the changing context of corporate mobility, global entanglements, and postindustrialism. A part of the emergent strategy has been to advance a postindustrial conception of "worker" and reach out to the symbolic analyst. Thus, unions have sought to represent more white-collar workers, including engineers and doctors, while recognizing the changing nature of the work force in a global, postindustrial economy. Graduate teaching assistants are one such group as well.

As a force challenging the dominance of the corporate model of the academy, graduate student unionization thus offers a counter-hegemonic position, seeking at times to educate the broader academic community. As

one student explained, "I'm very aware of the increasing corporate logic of the academy and of capital being the dominant logic, of trying to re-situate the relationship between labor and capital. I'm very interested in the idea of radical pedagogy and the classroom experience being a non-quantifiable experience. The site of the classroom as a form of resistance to the credentialization of the academy. This seems to me to be another kind of resistance to the corporatization of the academy." A second discussed the union's role in resisting the corporate academy: "I think there is a McDonaldization of the university and I think having a union was one way to have some control over that, some input, to slow it, or stop it, which I doubt would happen. So unionization is really an attempt to de-McDonaldize the classroom and pedagogy, kind of a Weberian assault on the iron cage of humanity."

Discussion

At the heart of the assault on higher education by capital-driven forces is a pedagogical refashioning of public discourse, operating at both the cultural and political levels. This refashioning, which Apple (2000) describes so well as the "conservative restoration," involves utilizing culture and power in ways that advance the logic of the market. As Giroux argues, "The defining principle of the current Right-wing attack against higher education and public schooling is the dismantling of all public spheres that refuse to be defined strictly by the instrumental logic of the market" (1999, p. 5). Thus, while conservatives drive the agenda of advancing higher education through anti-affirmative action strategies, merit-based financial aid, assaults on academic freedom, the deployment of part-time faculty and instructors, open hostility and aggression toward unions, decreased state support, increased corporate funding and entanglements, and a host of entrepreneurial practices serving to instill a capital-driven model of university life, neoliberals, wittingly and unwittingly, buy into the conservative restoration as they embrace economic hyper-rationality as the inevitable norm of organizational practice. "Efficiency and an 'ethic' of cost-benefit analysis [become] the dominant norms" (Apple, 2000, p. 59).

In advancing an entrepreneurial vision of the public good and the role of education, corporate-driven forces have assumed the hegemonic position, primarily through their control of public discourse (control of the media is key here). In essence, corporatists have waged a powerful assault on the broad culture through the use of pedagogical strategies made available to the masses through the media. Thus, the anti-globalization movement may be understood in a quasi-Granscian (1971) sense as a counter-hegemonic movement aimed at reclaiming the common good and redefining the broader cultural sphere.

Such a project may reflect an emerging identity among progressive-minded students amounting to what Castells (1997) describes as "project identity" – "when social actors, on the basis of whatever cultural materials are available to them, build a new identity that redefines their position in society and, by so doing, seek the transformation of overall social structure" (p. 8).

The role of culture is key to understanding the hegemony of the globalization movement. Groups gain and maintain dominance in part through pedagogical practices targeting the cultural level of consciousness. The importance of culture in today's global and technologically advanced societies is clearly evident in the battles over the media as neoconservatives and neoliberals seek to influence values, norms, identities, and even desires (Giroux 1999). Nowhere is this more evident than in the case of Elián González, in which the U.S. media portrayed the "miracle child" as a vehicle for waging an attack on Cuba's postrevolution social project and in the process reinforced the hegemony of U.S. capitalism (McLaren and Pinkney-Pastrana 2001). In essence, the media was used as a pedagogical weapon for reinforcing pro-capitalist ideology without so much as mentioning the word "capitalism."

Globalization then may be understood as a pedagogical strategy designed to advance particular economic relations on the part of multinational corporations. Globalization framed as the inevitable, worldwide economic revolution masks the detrimental effects of unchallenged market assumptions promulgated by powerful economic brokers seeking to position nation-states as sideline observers. Consequently, the most serious issues affecting workers, low- and middle-income families, indigenous populations, minorities, family farms, localism, and the environment are rarely part of the discourse of globalization. Instead, such concerns have been taken up by the anti-globalization movement, which, through organizations such as the Citizens Trade Campaign, Mobilization for Global Justice, American Lands Alliance, Mexico's *Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Nacional* (EZLN), and Nairobi's International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU), just to name a few of the countless such organizations and groups, have taken up the cause of those left behind by global economic forces.

In a very real sense, the anti-globalization movement serves a pedagogical function operating at both the cultural and political levels. The movement seeks to problematize the logic of globalization in a manner akin to how critical educators have sought to problematize knowledge, through criticism, interrogation, and political engagement (Giroux 1999). As a counter to the hegemony of corporatism, one may think of this movement as a subaltern, counter-hegemonic movement seeking to reconstitute public consciousness around definitions of the social good (Gramsci 1971).

The student movement at UNAM, the anti-global trade movement, and the graduate student unionization movement all offer a critique of corporate globalism, although obviously the degree to which these movements centered their struggles around anti-globalization sentiment varies widely. In the case of the student strike at UNAM, the anti-globalization discourse was simply an aspect of the student critique of the administration's and the federal government's economic decision making. Similarly, in the case of graduate student unionization in the U.S., the anti-globalization narrative lies beneath the surface, lurking in the shadows of the lives of student organizers who see the deep connections running throughout U.S. research universities. In contrast to the somewhat subtletal role of anti-globalization narratives in the UNAM student strike and the graduate student unionization movement, resistance to the world trade movement brings anti-globalization sentiments front and center.

Seeking to problematize corporate globalism, the emerging anti-globalization movement seeks to call neoliberalism into question. In embracing the basic principles of corporatization, including privatization, free markets, and individualism, neoliberals have in essence fallen prey to the conservative and neoconservative agenda. In the process, neoliberalism has contributed to a dismantlement of the academy's vision of the social good and in its place foisted a schema that is perhaps best understood as the corporate academy. Through the discourse of globalization, neoliberals and neoconservatives have shifted attention away from issues associated with diversity and multiculturalism, accessibility, social mobility, faculty disempowerment, academic freedom, and undergraduate instruction. This largely has been achieved through the rhetoric of economic inevitability, whereby globalization is seen to be imposed on the academy and the nation-state by uncontrollable forces from the great beyond. As Carnoy, Castells, Cohen, and Cardoso argue in the "Introduction" to *The New Global Economy in the Information Age*, "The nation-state functions mainly as a supplier of human capital to complement multinational investments in machines and technology. It does not help define the character of multinational companies as social and political actors. Such definition comes from the 'invisible hand' of a changing global economy" (p. 3). Of course, the academy's primary role in the global economy is to develop human capital, thus asserting its relevance as the training and development extension of the multinational corporation.

The student strikers at UNAM took issue with claims that the nation-state had few options but to cut funding at the university and implement tuition charges. They resented Mexico being forced to march to the beat of the IMF and corporate decision makers. Similarly, the anti-global trade movement has rejected notions that globalization is inevitable, and instead has called into

public consciousness the fact that decisions are being made by multinational corporations and superorganizations that favor or disadvantage various global participants, be they nation-states or particular social/cultural groups (few groups have raised these issues in more forceful and powerful ways than the Zapatistas in Chiapas, Mexico).

The graduate student unionization movement has sought to develop a complex critique of the corporate academy, challenging some of the fundamental assumptions and practices of the postindustrial university. Central to their critique is a challenge to the administrative claim that the university is a "collegial community," and necessarily ought not involve unions. Graduate student organizers have been quick to point out that the turn toward corporatization, evidenced by the university's mindset toward undergraduate education and its deployment of marginalized, part-time workers, clearly reveals a rejection of the collegium. Hence, it has been the work of high-powered administrators operating from the position of corporate capitalism who have laid to rest the collegial model. If the university has become a corporation, then from the perspective of graduate teaching assistants, they are necessarily low-level employees engaged in the production of knowledge. Therefore, it makes perfect sense to seek collective representation and become, in the tradition of Mario Savio, "clogs in the machinery."

In conclusion, part of the argument posed in this article is a relatively simple one: Resistance to globalization is not so much about the many complex facets to globalization, including the cultural and the social, but is really situated as anti-corporate capitalism. This is, of course, not much of a finding. Most thoughtful observers recognize as much. The contribution of this study then relates not so much to this fairly self-evident point, but instead rests with understanding the various manifestations of the counter-hegemonic movement and its pedagogical dimension, particularly within the context of the academy. Here, the argument presented has been fairly clear – the anti-globalization movement is largely a rejection of the neoliberal views that have come to dominate global economic politics. In this sense, the critique offered by the anti-globalization movement discussed herein resembles in many ways the arguments developed and advanced by critical theorists. Finally, in terms of the sociology of social movements, the anti-globalization movement reflects the coming together of progressive identities organized and motivated by critical views of culture, politics, and economics. Whether this movement has the potential to achieve significant social change remains to be seen.

Notes

1. Many attribute the first mention of the "post-modern" to Mills on page 166 of *The Sociological Imagination* (1959).
2. The real savior was the Indian government, which worked with the Agricultural and Processed Food Products Export Development Authority (APEEDA) in the US to pressure Riceet to withdraw the patent on the basis that the rice grains had long been produced in India.
3. Paradoxically, I describe these students as "progressive," and yet their actions seek to halt or alter a process already in motion. Thus, in one sense they may be seen as "conserving" that which already exists (they would likely argue that the globalization process under the influence of corporations is not "progress," and therefore, halting such an endeavor is "real" progress). But here my use of the descriptor "progressive" is more in line with the political identity of left-leaning students than with processes concerned with conserving present conditions or advancing progressive viewpoints.
4. The data for this section derive primarily from a case study of the student strike at UNAM conducted during the academic year 1999–2000. For a discussion of the methodology, see Rhoads and Mina "The Student Strike at the National Autonomous University of Mexico" as cited in the Reference section of this paper.
5. For those who may doubt my assertions here I suggest that such individuals check with their campus version of the Student Environmental Action Coalition (SEAC) and their likely role in organizing transportation to upcoming global trade meetings for the purpose of protesting such events. These students make aggressive use of e-mail and are prepared for mobilization "24-7."
6. The data for this section derive from a national study of graduate student unionization conducted collaboratively by Robert Rhoads and Gary Rhoades (University of Arizona). Specifically, the student comments in this section are from case studies conducted by Robert Rhoads at New York University, Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, and the University of California and were recorded as part of 42 formal, structured interviews.

References

- Altbach, P.G. (1973). *Student Politics in America: A Historical Analysis*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Altbach, P.G. and Lauder, R.S. (1972). *The New Pilgrims: Youth Protest in Transition*. New York: McKay.
- Altbach, P.G. and Peterson, P. (1971). 'Before Berkeley: Historical perspectives on American student activism', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 395, 1–14.
- Altbach, P.G. (11 May, 2001). 'Why higher education is not a global commodity'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, The Chronicle Review*.
- Amner, J. (1996). *Beyond Identity Politics: Emerging Social Justice Movements in Communities of Color*. Boston: South End Press.
- Apple, M.W. (2000). 'Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context', in Burbules, N.C. and Torres, C.A. (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 57–77.

- Aronowitz, S. and DiFazio, W. (1994). *The Jobless Future*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and Simulation* (translated by S. F. Glaser). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bolling, B. (25 May 2001). 'UC plans university to help developing nations participate in global trade'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Today's News*.
- Boron, A.A. and Torres, C.A. (1996). 'The impact of neoliberal restructuring on education and poverty in Latin America', *The Alberto Journal of Educational Research* 17(2), 102–114.
- Burbules, R. (2001). *Globalization and Postmodern Politics: From Zapatistas to High-Tech Robber Barons*. London: Pluto Press.
- Burbules, N.C. and Torres, C.A. (2000). 'Globalization and education: An introduction', in Burbules, N.C. and Torres, C.A. (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1–26.
- Burbules, N.C. (2000). 'Does the internet constitute a global educational community?' in Burbules, N.C. and Torres, C.A. (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 323–355.
- Calhoun, C. (1994). 'Social theory and the politics of identity', in Calhoun, C. (ed.), *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, pp. 9–36.
- Capella, J. (2000). 'Globalization, a fading citizenship', in Burbules, N.C. and Torres, C.A. (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 227–251.
- Casanova Cardiel, H. and Rodríguez Gómez, R. (2000). 'El Conflicto de la UNAM', *Cuadernos Americanos* 81, 31–40.
- Castells, M. (1997). *The Power of Identity*. Boston, MA: Blackwell.
- Castells, M. (1993). 'The information economy and the new international division of labor', in Canoy, M., Castells, M., Cohen, S.S. and Cardoso, F.H. (eds.), *The New Global Economy in the Information Age: Reflections on Our Changing World*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 15–43.
- Canoy, M. (1993). 'Multinationals in a changing world economy: Whether the nation-state?' in Canoy, M., Castells, M., Cohen, S.S. and Cardoso, F.H. (eds.), *The New Global Economy in the Information Age: Reflections on Our Changing World*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 45–96.
- Canoy, M., Castells, M., Cohen, S.S. and Cardoso, F.H. (eds.) (1993). *The New Global Economy in the Information Age: Reflections on Our Changing World*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1998). *Profit over People: Neoliberalism and Global Order*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Cohen, D. (9 March, 2001). 'The worldwide rise of private colleges', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A47–A49.
- Consejo General de Huelga (1999). 'El Grito de los Excluidos', *Proceso* (Edición Especial, No. 5), 1 de diciembre, 14–19.
- Del Castillo, D. (15 May 2001). 'New French university seeks to challenge English-language instruction in Egypt'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *Today's News*.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.
- Dominiguez Martínez, R. and Pérez Cruz, J.E. (2000). 'La Secuencia Oculata de la Huelga', *Cuadernos Americanos* 81, 41–53.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge* (translated by C. Gordon et al.). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Frere, Paulo (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

- Giroux, H.A. (1992). *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Glazer, N. (1970). *Remembering the Answers: Essays on the American Student Revolt*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (edited and translated by Q. Hoare and G. N. Smith). New York: International Publishers.
- Heineman, K.J. (1993). *Campus Wars: The Peace Movement at American State Universities in the Vietnam Era*. New York: New York University Press.
- Hendren, J. (16 April 2000). 'D.C. police, taking a lesson from WTO, are playing hardball'. *The Seattle Times*, *SeattleTimes.Com*.
- Kelner, D. (2000). 'Globalization and New Social Movements: Lessons for Critical Theory and Pedagogy', in Burbules, N.C. and Torres, C.A. (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 299–321.
- Klein, N. (2000). 'Capitalism and Communism Look Equally Bad in Prague', International Network on Disarmament and Globalization (<http://www.indg.org/prague.htm>).
- Larana, E., Johnston, H. and Gusfield, J. R. (eds.) (1994). *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Levine, A. and Curreton, J.S. (1998). *When Hope and Fear Collide: A Portrait of Today's College Student*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lipset, S.M. (1976). *Rebellion in the University*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lipset, S.M. and Altbach, P.G. (1969). *Students in Revolt*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Luke, A. and Luke, C. (2000). 'A situated perspective on cultural globalization', in Burbules, N.C. and Torres, C.A. (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 275–297.
- Lyotard, J. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Maxwell, J.A. (1996). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- McAdam, D. (1988). *Freedom Summer*. New York: Oxford University.
- McAdam, D. (1994). 'Culture and social movements', in Larana, E., Johnston, H. and Gusfield, J.R. (eds.), *New Social Movements: From Ideology to Identity*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, pp. 36–57.
- McLaren, P. (1995). *Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture: Oppositional Politics in a Postmodern Era*. London: Routledge.
- McLaren, P. and Pinkney-Pastrana, J. (2001). 'Cuba, Yanguización, and the Cult of Ethin Gonzalez: A View from the 'Enlightened' States', *Qualitative Studies in Education* 14(2), 201–219.
- McPherson, M.S. and Schapiro, M.O. (23 March 2001). 'When protests proceed at internet speed'. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, *The Chronicle Review*.
- Meyer, J.W. and Scott, W.R. (1983). *Organizational Environments: Ritual and Rationality*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Miller, J. (1994). *Democracy Is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mills, C.W. (1959). *The Sociological Imagination*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Morrow, R.A. and Torres, C.A. (2000). 'The State, Globalization, and Educational Policy', in Burbules, N.C. and Torres, C.A. (eds.), *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge, pp. 27–56.
- Muralidharan, S. (1998). 'A Claim on Basnati', *Frontline* 15(5) (<http://www.india-server.com/frontline/1998/03/07/15050930.htm>).
- Nelson, C. (ed.) (1997). *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Olson, E. (25 January, 2001). 'Davos Forum Is Braced for Round of Protests', *The New York Times: On the Web*.
- Ordorika, I. (1996). 'Reform at Mexico's National Autonomous University: Hegemony or bureaucracy', *Higher Education* 31, 403-427.
- Ordorika, I. (1999). 'Power, politics, and change in Higher Education: The case of the National Autonomous University of Mexico.' Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Reich, R.B. (1991). *The Work of Nations*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Rhoads, G. (1998). *Managed Professionals: Unionized Faculty and Restructuring Academic Labor*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Rhoads, G. and Rhoads, R.A. (forthcoming). 'The Public Discourse of U.S. Graduate Student Unions: Social Movement Identities, Ideologies, and Strategies', *The Review of Higher Education*.
- Rhoads, R.A. (1998a). *Freedom's Web: Student Activism in an Age of Cultural Diversity*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Rhoads, R.A. (1998b). 'Student protest and multicultural reform: Making sense of campus unrest in the 1990s', *Journal of Higher Education* 69, 621-646.
- Rhoads, R.A. and Martinez, J.G. (1998). 'Chicano/o students as agents of social change: A case study of identity politics in higher education', *Bilingual Review* 23(2), 124-136.
- Rhoads, R.A. and Mina, L. (2001). 'The student strike at the national autonomous University of Mexico: A political Analysis', *Comparative Education Review* 45(3), 334-353.
- Rhoads, R.A. and Valadez, J.R. (1996). *Democracy, Multiculturalism and the Community College: A Critical Perspective*. New York: Garland.
- Riccardi, N. (13 August, 2000). 'Hey Hey, Ho Ho, Catch Our Anti-Corporate Puppet Show!', *LA Times: Com*.
- Scott, A. (1990). *Ideology and the New Social Movement*. London: Unwin & Hyman.
- Slaughter, S. and Leslie, D.L. (1997). *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Politics, and the Entrepreneurial University*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tierney, W.G. (1993). *Building Communities of Difference: Higher Education in the Twenty-First Century*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Torres, C.A. (1998a). *Democracy, Education, and Multiculturalism: Dilemmas of Citizenship in a Global World*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Torres, C.A. (1998b). 'Democracy, education, and multiculturalism: Dilemmas of citizenship in a global world', *Comparative Education Review* 42(4), 421-447.
- Torres, C.A. and Schugartensky, D. (forthcoming). 'The political economy of Higher Education in the era of neoliberal globalization: Latin America in comparative perspective', *Higher Education*.
- Touraine, A. (1988). *Return of the Actor: Social Theory in Postindustrial Society*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tugend, A. (11 September 1998). 'British students adjust to paying tuition', *The Chronicle of Higher Education, International*.
- Wakins, E. (1989). *Work Time: English Departments and the Circulation of Cultural Values*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Went, R. (2000). *Globalization: Neoliberal Challenge, Radical Responses*. London: Pluto Press.
- Wheeler, D.L. (20 February 2001). 'Market forces endanger higher education, departing ACE president says', *The Chronicle of Higher Education, Today's News*.
- World Bank (2000). 'Poverty in an age of globalization' (<http://www.wto.org/>).
- World Trade Organization (1999). '10 Benefits of the WTO Trading System' (<http://www.worldbank.int/>).