"The Conflicts of Globalization and Restructuring of Education"

Douglas Kellner

The September 11 terrorist attacks have generated a wealth of theoretical reflection as well as regressive political responses by the Bush administration and other governments (Kellner, 2003b). The 9/11 attacks and subsequent Bush administration military response have dramatized once again the centrality of globalization in contemporary experience and the need for adequate conceptualizations and responses to it for critical theory and pedagogy to maintain their relevance in the present age. In this article, I want to argue that critical educators need to comprehend the conflicts of globalization, terrorism, and the prospects and obstacles to democratization in order to develop pedagogies adequate to the challenges of the present age. Accordingly, I begin with some comments on how the September 11 terror attacks call attention to key aspects of globalization, and then provide a critical theory of globalization, after which I suggest some pedagogical initiatives to aid in the democratic reconstruction of education after 9/11.[1]

September 11 and Globalization

The terrorist acts on the United States on September 11 and the subsequent Terror War throughout the world dramatically disclose the downside of globalization, and the ways that global flows of technology, goods, information, ideologies, and people can have destructive as well as productive effects.[2] The disclosure of powerful anti-Western terrorist networks shows that globalization divides the world just as it unifies, that it produces enemies as it incorporates participants. The events reveal explosive contradictions and conflicts at the heart of globalization and that the technologies of information, communication, and transportation that facilitate

globalization can also be used to undermine and attack it, and generate instruments of destruction as well as production.

The experience of September 11 points to the objective ambiguity of globalization, that positive and negative sides are interconnected, that the institutions of the open society unlock the possibilities of destruction and violence, as well as democracy, free trade, and cultural and social exchange. Once again, the interconnection and interdependency of the networked world was dramatically demonstrated as terrorists from the Middle East brought local grievances from their region to attack key symbols of US military power and the very infrastructure of Wall Street. Some see terrorism as an expression of "the dark side of globalization," while I would conceive it as part of the objective ambiguity of globalization that simultaneously creates friends and enemies, wealth and poverty, and growing divisions between the "haves" and "have nots." Yet, the downturn in the global economy, intensification of local and global political conflicts, repression of human rights and civil liberties, and general increase in fear and anxiety have certainly undermined the naïve optimism of globophiles who perceived globalization as a purely positive instrument of progress and well-being.

The use of powerful technologies as weapons of destruction also discloses current asymmetries of power and emergent forms of terrorism and war, as the new millennium exploded into dangerous conflicts and military interventions. As technologies of mass destruction become more available and dispersed, perilous instabilities have emerged that have elicited policing measures to stem the flow of movements of people and goods across borders and internally. In particular, the U.S. "Patriot Act" has led to repressive measures that are replacing the spaces of the

open and free information society with new forms of surveillance, policing, and restrictions of civil liberties, thus significantly undermining U.S. democracy (see Kellner, 2003b).

Ultimately, however, the abhorrent terror acts by the bin Laden network and the violent military response by the Bush administration may be an anomalous paroxysm whereby a highly regressive premodern Islamic fundamentalism has clashed with an old-fashioned patriarchal and unilateralist Wild West militarism. It could be that such forms of terrorism, militarism, and state repression will be superseded by more rational forms of politics that globalize and criminalize terrorism, and that do not sacrifice the benefits of the open society and economy in the name of security. Yet the events of September 11 may open a new era of Terror War that will lead to the kind of apocalyptic futurist world depicted by cyberpunk fiction (see Kellner 2003b).

In any case, the events of September 11 have promoted a fury of reflection, theoretical debates, and political conflicts and upheaval that put the complex dynamics of globalization at the center of contemporary theory and politics. To those skeptical of the centrality of globalization to contemporary experience, it is now clear that we are living in a global world that is highly interconnected and vulnerable to passions and crises that can cross borders and can affect anyone or any region at any time. The events of September 11 and their aftermath also provide a test case to evaluate various theories of globalization in the contemporary era. In addition, they highlight some of the contradictions of globalization and the need to develop a highly complex and dialectical model to capture its conflicts, ambiguities, and contradictory effects.

Consequently, I argue that in order to properly theorize globalization one needs to conceptualize several sets of contradictions generated by globalization's combination of technological revolution and restructuring of capital, which, in turn, generate tensions between

capitalism and democracy, and "haves" and "have nots." Within the world economy, globalization involves the proliferation of the logic of capital, but also the spread of democracy in information, finance, investing, and the diffusion of technology (see Friedman, 1999 and Hardt and Negri, 2000). Globalization is thus a contradictory amalgam of capitalism and democracy, in which the logic of capital and the market system enter ever more arenas of global life, even as democracy spreads and more political regions and spaces of everyday life are being contested by democratic demands and forces. But the overall process is contradictory. Sometimes globalizing forces promote democracy and sometimes inhibit it, thus either equating capitalism and democracy, or simply opposing them, are problematical.

The processes of globalization are highly turbulent and have generated intense conflicts throughout the world. Benjamin Barber (1996) describes the strife between McWorld and Jihad, contrasting the homogenizing, commercialized, Americanized tendencies of the global economy and culture with anti-modernizing Jihadist movements that affirm traditional cultures and are resistant to aspects of neoliberal globalization. Thomas Friedman (1999) makes a more benign distinction between what he calls the "Lexus" and the "Olive Tree." The former is a symbol of modernization, of affluence and luxury, and of Westernized consumption, contrasted with the Olive Tree that is a symbol of roots, tradition, place, and stable community. Barber (1996), however, is too negative toward McWorld and Jihad, failing to adequately describe the democratic and progressive forces within both. Although Barber recognizes a dialectic of McWorld and Jihad, he opposes both to democracy, failing to perceive how they generate their own democratic forces and tendencies, as well as opposing and undermining democratization. Within Western democracies, for instance, there is not just top-down homogenization and corporate domination, but also

globalization-from-below and oppositional social movements that desire alternatives to capitalist globalization. Thus, it is not only traditionalist, non-Western forces of Jihad that oppose McWorld. Likewise, Jihad has its democratizing forces as well as the reactionary Islamic fundamentalists who are now the most demonized elements of the contemporary era, as I discuss below. Jihad, like McWorld, has its contradictions and its potential for democratization, as well as elements of domination and destruction.[3]

Friedman, by contrast, is too uncritical of globalization, caught up in his own Lexus high-consumption life-style, failing to perceive the depth of the oppressive features of globalization and breadth and extent of resistance and opposition to it. In particular, he fails to articulate the contradictions between capitalism and democracy, and the ways that globalization and its economic logic undermine democracy as well as encouraging it. Likewise, he does not grasp the virulence of the premodern and Jihadist tendencies that he blithely identifies with the Olive tree, and the reasons why globalization and the West are so strongly resisted in many parts of the world.

Hence, it is important to present globalization as a strange amalgam of both homogenizing forces of sameness and uniformity, and heterogeneity, difference, and hybridity, as well as a contradictory mixture of democratizing and anti-democratizing tendencies. On one hand, globalization unfolds a process of standardization in which a globalized mass culture circulates the globe creating sameness and homogeneity everywhere. But globalized culture makes possible unique appropriations and developments all over the world, thus proliferating hybrids, difference, and heterogeneity.[4] Every local context involves its own appropriation and reworking of global products and signifiers, thus proliferating difference, otherness, diversity, and variety (Luke and Luke, 2000). Grasping that globalization embodies these contradictory tendencies at once, that it

can be both a force of homogenization and heterogeneity, is crucial to articulating the contradictions of globalization and avoiding one-sided and reductive conceptions.

My intention is to present globalization as conflictual, contradictory and open to resistance and democratic intervention and transformation and not just as a monolithic juggernaut of progress or domination as in many other discourses. This goal is advanced by distinguishing between "globalization from below" and "globalization from above" of corporate capitalism and the capitalist state, a distinction that should help us to get a better sense of how globalization does or does not promote democratization. "Globalization from below" refers to the ways in which marginalized individuals and social movements and critical pedagogues resist globalization and/or use its institutions and instruments to further democratization and social justice.

Yet, one needs to avoid binary normative articulations, since globalization from below can have highly conservative and destructive effects, as well as positive ones, while globalization from above can help produce global solutions to problems like terrorism or the environment. Moreover, on one hand, as Michael Peters argues (forthcoming), globalization itself is a kind of war and much militarism has been expansive and globalizing in many historical situations. On the other hand, antiwar and peace movements are also increasingly global, hence globalization itself is marked by tensions and contradictions.

Thus, while on one level, globalization significantly increases the supremacy of big corporations and big government, it can also give power to groups and individuals that were previously left out of the democratic dialogue and terrain of political struggle. Such potentially positive effects of globalization include increased access to education for individuals excluded from sharing culture and knowledge and the possibility of oppositional individuals and groups to

participate in global culture and politics through gaining access to global communication and media networks and to circulate local struggles and oppositional ideas through these media. The role of information technologies in social movements, political struggle, and everyday life forces social movements and critical theorists to reconsider their political strategies and goals and democratic theory to appraise how new technologies do and do not promote democratization (Kellner, 1995b, 1997 and 1999b; Best and Kellner 2001; Kahn and Kellner 2003).

In their book Empire, Hardt and Negri (2000) present contradictions within globalization in terms of an imperializing logic of "Empire" and an assortment of struggles by the multitude, creating a contradictory and tension-full situation. As in my conception, Hardt and Negri present globalization as a complex process that involves a multidimensional mixture of expansions of the global economy and capitalist market system, information technologies and media, expanded judicial and legal modes of governance, and emergent modes of power, sovereignty, and resistance.[5] Combining poststructuralism with "autonomous Marxism," Hardt and Negri stress political openings and possibilities of struggle within Empire in an optimistic and buoyant text that envisages progressive democratization and self-valorization in the turbulent process of the restructuring of capital.

Many theorists, by contrast, have argued that one of the trends of globalization is depoliticization of publics, the decline of the nation-state, and the end of traditional politics (Boggs, 2000). While I would agree that globalization is promoted by extremely powerful economic forces and that it often undermines democratic movements and decision-making, one should also note that there are openings and possibilities for a globalization from below that inflects globalization for positive and progressive ends, and that globalization can thus help promote as well as destabilize

democracy.[6] Globalization involves both a disorganization and reorganization of capitalism, a turbulent restructuring process, which creates openings for progressive social change and intervention as well as highly destructive transformative effects. On the positive ledger, in a more fluid and open economic and political system, oppositional forces can gain concessions, win victories, and effect progressive changes. During the 1970s, new social movements, new non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and new forms of struggle and solidarity emerged that have been expanding to the present day (Hardt and Negri, 2000; Burbach, 2001; Best and Kellner, 2001; and Foran, 2003).

The anti-corporate globalization of the 1990s emerged as a form of globalization from below, but so too did Al Qaeda and various global terror networks, which intensified their attacks and helped generate an era of Terror War. This made it difficult simply to affirm globalization from below while denigrating globalization from above, as clearly terrorism was an emergent and dangerous form of globalization from below that was a threat to peace, security, and democracy. Moreover, in the face of Bush administration unilateralism and militarism, multilateral approaches to the problems of terrorism called for global responses and alliances to a wide range of global problems (see Kellner 2003b and Barber 2003), thus demanding a progressive and cosmopolitan globalization to deal with contemporary challenges.

Moreover, the present conjuncture is marked by a conflict between growing centralization and organization of power and wealth in the hands of the few contrasted with opposing processes exhibiting a fragmentation of power that is more plural, multiple, and open to contestation. As the following analysis will suggest, both tendencies are observable and it is up to individuals and groups to find openings for progressive political intervention, social transformation, and the

democratization of education that pursue positive values such as democracy, human rights, literacy, equality, ecological preservation and restoration, and social justice, while fighting poverty, ignorance, terror, and injustice. Thus, rather than just denouncing globalization, or engaging in celebration and legitimation, a critical theory of globalization reproaches those aspects that are oppressive, while seizing upon opportunities to fight domination and exploitation and to promote democratization, justice, and a forward looking reconstruction of the polity, society, and culture.

Against capitalist globalization from above, there has been a significant eruption of forces and subcultures of resistance that have attempted to preserve specific forms of culture and society against globalization and homogenization, and to create alternative forces of society and culture, thus exhibiting resistance and globalization from below. Most dramatically, peasant and guerrilla movements in Latin America, labor unions, students, and environmentalists throughout the world, and a variety of other groups and movements have resisted capitalist globalization and attacks on previous rights and benefits.[7] Several dozen people's organizations from around the world have protested World Trade Organization (WTO) policies and a backlash against globalization is visible everywhere. Politicians who once championed trade agreements like GATT and NAFTA are now often quiet about these arrangements or example, at the 1996 annual Davos World Economic Forum its founder and managing director published a warning entitled: "Start Taking the Backlash Against Globalization Seriously." Reports surfaced that major representatives of the capitalist system expressed fear that capitalism was getting too mean and predatory, that it needs a kinder and gentler state to ensure order and harmony, and that the welfare state may make a come-back (see the article in New York Times, February 7, 1996: A15).[8] One should take such reports with the proverbial

grain of salt, but they express fissures and openings in the system for critical discourse and intervention.

Indeed, by 1999, the theme of the annual Davos conference was making globalization work for poor countries and minimizing the differences between the "haves" and "have nots." The growing divisions between rich and poor were worrying some globalizers, as were the wave of crises in Asian, Latin American, and other "developing countries". In James Flanigan's report in the Los Angeles Times (Febr. 19, 1999), the "main theme" is to "spread the wealth. In a world frightened by glaring imbalances and the weakness of economies from Indonesia to Russia, the talk is no longer of a new world economy getting stronger but of ways to 'keep the engine going.'" In particular, the globalizers were attempting to keep economies growing in the more developed countries and capital flowing to developing nations. U.S. Vice-President Al Gore called on all countries to spur economic growth, and he proposed a new U.S.-led initiative to eliminate the debt burdens of developing countries. South African President Nelson Mandela asked: "Is globalization only for the powerful? Does it offer nothing to the men, women and children who are ravaged by the violence of poverty?"

As the new millennium opened, there was no clear answer to Mandela's question. In the 2000s, there have been ritual proclamations of the need to make globalization work for the developing nations at all major meetings of global institutions like the WTO or G-8 convenings. For instance, at the September 2003 WTO meeting at Cancun, organizers claimed that its goal was to fashion a new trade agreement that would reduce poverty and boost development in poorer nations. But critics pointed out that in the past years the richer nations of the U.S., Japan, and Europe continued to enforce trade tariffs and provide subsidies for national producers of goods such as

agriculture, while forcing poorer nations to open their markets to "free trade," thus bankrupting agricultural sectors in these countries that could not compete. Significantly, the September 2003 WTO trade talks in Cancun collapsed as leaders of the developing world concurred with protestors and blocked expansion of a "free trade zone" that would mainly benefit the US and overdeveloped countries. Likewise, in Miami in November 2003 the "Free-Trade Summit" collapsed without an agreement as the police violently suppressed protestors.[9]

Moreover, major economists like Joseph Stiglitz (2002), as well as anti-corporate globalization protestors and critics, argued that the developing countries were not adequately benefiting under current corporate globalization policies and that divisions between the rich and poor nations were growing. Under these conditions, critics of globalization were calling for radically new policies that would help the developing countries, regulate the rich and overdeveloped countries, and provide more power to working people and local groups.

The Global Movement Against Capitalist Globalization

With the global economic recession and the Terror War erupting in 2001, the situation of many developing countries has worsened. As part of the backlash against globalization in recent years, a wide range of theorists have argued that the proliferation of difference and the shift to more local discourses and practices best define the contemporary scene. In this view, theory and politics should shift from the level of globalization (and its accompanying often totalizing and macro dimensions) in order to focus on the local, the specific, the particular, the heterogeneous, and the micro level of everyday experience. An array of theories associated with poststructuralism, postmodernism, feminism, and multiculturalism focus on difference, otherness, marginality, the personal, the particular, and the concrete in contrast to more general theory and politics that aim at

more global or universal conditions.[10] Likewise, a broad spectrum of subcultures of resistance have focused their attention on the local level, organizing struggles around identity issues such as gender, race, sexual preference, or youth subculture (see Kahn and Kellner, 2003).

It can be argued that such dichotomies as those between the global and the local express contradictions and tensions between crucial constitutive forces on the present scene. It may be a mistake to focus on one side of the global/local polarity in favor of exclusive concern with the other side (Cvetkovitch and Kellner, 1997). Hence, an important challenge for a critical theory of globalization is to think through the relationships between the global and the local by observing how global forces influence and even structure an increasing number of local situations. This requires analysis as well of how local forces mediate the global, inflecting global forces to diverse ends and conditions, and producing unique configurations of the local and the global as the matrix for thought and action in today's world (see Luke and Luke, 2000).

Globalization is thus necessarily complex and challenging to both critical theories and radical democratic politics. But many people these days operate with binary concepts of the global and the local, and promote one or the other side of the equation as the solution to the world's problems. For globalists, globalization is the solution while underdevelopment, backwardness, and provincialism are the problems. For localists, globalization is the problem and localization is the solution. But politics is frequently contextual and pragmatic, and whether global or local solutions are most fitting depends on the conditions in the distinctive context that one is addressing and the specific solutions and policies being proposed.[11]

For instance, the Internet can be used to promote capitalist globalization or struggles against it. One of the more instructive examples of the use of the Internet to foster movements against the

excesses of corporate capitalism occurred in the protests in Seattle and throughout the world against the World Trade Organization (WTO) meeting in December 1999. Behind these actions was a global protest movement using the Internet to organize resistance to the WTO and capitalist globalization, while championing democratization. Many Web-sites contained anti-WTO material and numerous mailing lists used the Internet to distribute critical material and to organize the protest. The result was the mobilization of caravans from throughout the United States to take protestors to Seattle, many of whom had never met befor being and were Internet recruits. There were also significant numbers of international participants in Seattle which exhibited labor, environmentalist, feminist, anti-capitalist, animal rights, anarchist, and other protests against aspects of globalization while forming new alliances and solidarities for future struggles. In addition, protests occurred throughout the world, and a proliferation of anti-WTO material against the extremely secret group spread throughout the Internet.[12]

Furthermore, the Internet provided critical coverage of the event, documentation of the various groups' protests, and debate over the WTO and globalization. Whereas the mainstream media presented the protests as "anti-trade," featured the incidents of anarchist violence against property, and minimized police violence against demonstrators, the Internet provided pictures, eyewitness accounts, and reports of police brutality and the generally peaceful and non-violent nature of the protests. Mainstream media framed the protests negatively and privileged suspect spokespersons like Patrick Buchanan, an extreme right wing and authoritarian critic of globalization, the Internet provided multiple representations of the demonstrations, advanced reflective discussion of the WTO and globalization, and presented a diversity of critical perspectives.

Initially, the incipient anti-globalization movement was precisely that -- an <u>anti</u>-globalization movement. The movement, itself, however, became increasingly global, linking a diversity of movements into global solidarity networks and was using the Internet and instruments of globalization to advance its struggles. Moreover, many opponents of capitalist globalization recognized the need for a global movement to have a positive vision and be for such things as social justice, a democratized globalization, equality, labor, civil liberties and human rights, and a sustainable environmentalism. Accordingly, the anti-capitalist and pro-social justice and democracy globalization movement began advocating common values and visions.

In particular, the movement against capitalist globalization used the Internet to organize mass demonstrations and to disseminate information to the world concerning the policies of the institutions of capitalist globalization. The events made clear that protestors were not against globalization per se, but were against neo-liberal and capitalist globalization, opposing specific policies and institutions that produce intensified exploitation of labor, environmental devastation, growing divisions among the social classes, and the undermining of democracy. The emerging anti-corporate globalization movements are contesting the neoliberal model of market capitalism that extols maximum profit with zero accountability and have made clear the need for democratization, regulation, rules, and globalization in the interests of people, not just profit.

The emergent movements against capitalist globalization have thus placed the issues of global justice, human rights, and environmental destruction squarely in the center of important political concerns of our time. Hence, whereas the mainstream media had failed to vigorously debate or even report on globalization until the eruption of a vigorous anti-globalization movement, and rarely, if ever, critically discussed the activities of the WTO, World Bank and IMF, there is now

a widely circulating critical discourse and controversy over these institutions. Stung by criticisms, representatives of the World Bank, in particular, are pledging reform and pressures are mounting concerning proper and improper roles for the major global institutions, highlighting their limitations and deficiencies, and the need for reforms like debt relief from overburdened developing countries to solve some of their fiscal and social problems.

Against capital's globalization-from-above, cyberactivists and a multitude of groups have thus been attempting to carry out globalization-from-below, developing networks of solidarity and propagating oppositional ideas and movements throughout the planet. To the capitalist international of transnational corporate-led globalization, a Fifth International, to use Waterman's phrase (1992), of computer-mediated activism is emerging, that is qualitatively different from the party-based socialist and communist Internationals. Such networking links labor, feminist, ecological, peace, and other anticapitalist groups, providing the basis for a new politics of alliance and solidarity to overcome the limitations of postmodern identity politics (see Dyer-Witheford 1999; Hardt-Negri 2000; Burbach 2001; and Best and Kellner, 2001).

Of course, right wing and reactionary forces can and have used the Internet to promote their political agendas as well. In a short time, one can easily access an exotic witch's brew of Web-sites maintained by the Ku Klux Klan, myriad neo-Nazi assemblages, including the Aryan Nation and various militia groups. Internet discussion lists also disperse these views and right wing extremists are aggressively active in many computer forums, as well as radio programs and stations, public access television programs, fax campaigns, video and even rock music productions. These organizations are hardly harmless, having carried out terrorism of various sorts extending from church burnings to the bombings of public buildings. Adopting quasi-Leninist discourse and tactics

for ultraright causes, these groups have been successful in recruiting working-class members devastated by the developments of global capitalism, which has resulted in widespread unemployment for traditional forms of industrial, agricultural, and unskilled labor. Moreover, extremist Web-sites have influenced alienated middle-class youth as well (a 1999 HBO documentary on Hate on the Internet provides a disturbing number of examples of how extremist Web-sites influenced disaffected youth to commit hate crimes).

A recent twist in the saga of technopolitics, in fact, seems to be that allegedly "terrorist" groups are now increasingly using the Internet and Web-sites to promote their causes. An article in the Los Angeles Times (February 8, 2001: A1 and A14) reports that groups like Hamas use their Web-site to post reports of acts of terror against Israel, rather than calling newspapers or broadcasting outlets. A wide range of groups labeled as "terrorist" reportedly use e-mail, list-serves, and Web-sites to further their struggles, causes including Hezbollah and Hamas, the Maoist group Shining Path in Peru, and a variety of other groups in Asia and elsewhere. The Tamil Tigers, for instance, a liberation movement in Sri Lanka, offers position papers, daily news, and free e-mail service. According to the Los Angeles Times story cited above, experts are still unclear "whether the ability to communicate online worldwide is prompting an increase or a decrease in terrorist acts."

There have been widespread discussions of how the bin Laden Al Qaeda network used the Internet to plan the September 11 terrorist attacks on the U.S., how the group communicated with each other, got funds and purchased airline tickets via the Internet, and used flight simulations to practice their hijacking (see Kellner, 2003a). In the contemporary era, the Internet can thus be used

for a diversity of political projects and goals ranging from education, to business, to political organization and debate, to terrorism.

Moreover, different political groups are engaging in cyberwar as an adjunct of their political battles. Israeli hackers have repeatedly attacked the Web-sites of Hamas and Hezbollah, while pro-Palestine hackers have reportedly placed militant demands and slogans on the Web-sites of Israel's army, foreign ministry, and parliament. Likewise, Pakistani and Indian computer hackers have waged similar cyberbattles against opposing nation's Web-sites in the bloody struggle over Kashmir, while rebel forces in the Philippines taunt government troops with cell-phone calls and messages and attack government Web-sites.

The examples in this section suggest how technopolitics makes possible a refiguring of politics, a refocusing of politics on everyday life and using the tools and techniques of new computer and communication technology to expand the field and domain of politics. In this conjuncture, the ideas of Guy Debord and the Situationist International are especially relevant with their stress on the construction of situations, the use of technology, media of communication, and cultural forms to promote a revolution of everyday life, and to increase the realm of freedom, community, and empowerment.[13] To some extent, the new technologies are revolutionary, they do constitute a revolution of everyday life, but they also promote and disseminate the capitalist consumer society and involve new modes of fetishism, enslavement, and domination, yet to be clearly perceived and theorized.

The Internet and emerging forms of technopolitics also point to the connection between politics and pedagogy. Paulo Freire has long argued that all pedagogy is political and politics contains a pedagogical dimension (which could be manipulative or emancipatory). Critical

educators need to devise strategies to use the Internet and information and communication technologies to enhance education and to produce more active democratic and global citizens.

The Internet is thus a contested terrain, used by Left, Right, and Center to promote their own agendas and interests. The political battles of the future may well be fought in the streets, factories, parliaments, and other sites of past struggle, but politics is already mediated by broadcast, computer, and information technologies and will increasingly be so in the future. Those interested in the politics and culture of the future should, therefore, be clear on the important role of the new public spheres and intervene accordingly, while critical pedagogues have the responsibility of teaching students the skills that will enable them to participate in the politics and struggles of the present and future.

Contradictions of Globalization and Challenges for Democratization

And so, to paraphrase Foucault, wherever there is globalization-from-above, globalization as the imposition of capitalist logic, there can be resistance and struggle. The possibilities of globalization-from-below result from transnational alliances between groups fighting for better wages and working conditions, social and political justice, environmental protection, and more democracy and freedom worldwide. In addition, a renewed emphasis on local and grassroots movements has put dominant economic forces on the defensive globally and in their own backyard. Often, the broadcasting media or the Internet have called attention to oppressive and destructive corporate policies on the local level, putting national and even transnational pressure upon major corporations for reform. Moreover, proliferating media and the Internet make possible a greater circulation of struggles and the possibilities of new alliances and solidarities that can connect

resistant forces who oppose capitalist and corporate-state elite forms of globalization-from-above (Dyer-Witheford 1999).

In a certain sense, the development of globalization replicates the history of the U.S. and other Western societies. In most so-called capitalist democracies tension between capitalism and democracy has been a defining feature of the conflicts of the past two hundred years. In analyzing the development of education in the United States Bowles and Gintis (1986), Aronowitz and Giroux (1993), and others have analyzed the conflicts between corporate logic and democracy in schooling; Robert McChesney (1996 and 1999), myself (Kellner 1990, 1992, 2001, and 2003a), and others have articulated the contradictions between capitalism and democracy in the media and public sphere. Joel Cohen and Joel Rogers (1983) argue that contradictions between capitalism and democracy are defining features of the U.S. polity and history, while Benjamin Barber (1996) argues that in the current international situation tensions between capitalism and democracy are a major feature of global conflicts and tensions.

Searching for emancipatory hopes, Hardt and Negri (2000) have stressed the openings and possibilities for democratic transformative struggle within globalization, or what they call "Empire". I am arguing that similar arguments can be made in which globalization is not conceived merely as the triumph of capitalism and democracy working together as it was in the classical theories of Milton Friedman or, more recently, in Francis Fukuyama and Thomas Friedman. Nor should globalization be depicted solely as the triumph of capital as in many despairing anti-globalization theories. Rather, one should see that globalization unleashes conflicts between capitalism and democracy. In its restructuring processes this creates new openings for struggle, resistance, and democratic transformation.

The model of Marx and Engels as deployed in the "Communist Manifesto" could also be usefully employed to analyze the contradictions of contemporary globalization (Marx and Engels, 1978: 469ff). From the historical materialist optic, capitalism was interpreted as the most progressive force in history for Marx and Engels, destroying a backward feudalism, authoritarian patriarchy, backwardness and provincialism in favor a market society, global cosmopolitanism, and constant revolutionizing of the forces of production. Yet, in Marxist theory, so too was capitalism presented as a major disaster for the human race, condemning a large part to alienated labor, regions of the world to colonialist exploitation, and generating conflicts between classes and nations, the consequences of which the contemporary era continues to suffer.

Marx deployed a similar dialectical and historical model in his later analyses of imperialism arguing, for instance, in his writings on British imperialism in India, that British colonialism was a great productive and progressive force in India at the same time it was highly destructive (Marx and Engels, 1978: 653ff). A similar dialectical and critical model can be used today that articulates the progressive elements of globalization in conjunction with its more oppressive features, deploying the categories of negation and critique, while sublating (Aufhebung) the positive features. Moreover, a dialectical and transdisciplinary model is necessary to capture the complexity and multidimensionality of globalization today that brings together in theorizing globalization, the economy, technology, polity, society and culture, articulating the interplay of these elements and avoiding any form of determinism or reductivism.

Theorizing globalization dialectically and critically requires that we both analyze continuities and discontinuities with the past, specifying what is a continuation of past histories and what is new and original in the present moment. To elucidate the latter, I believe that the discourse

of the postmodern is useful in dramatizing changes and novelties of the mode of globalization. The concept of postmodern can signal that which is fresh and original, calling attention to topics and phenomena that require novel theorization, and intense critical thought and inquiry. Hence, although Manuel Castells has the most detailed analysis of information and communication technologies and the rise of what he calls a networked society, by refusing to link his analyses with the problematic of the postmodern, he cuts himself off from theoretical resources that enable theorists to articulate the novelties of the present that are unique and different from previous modes of social organization.[14]

Consequently, although there is admittedly some mystification in the discourse of the postmodern, it signals emphatically shifts and ruptures in our era, as well as novelties and originalities, and dramatizes the mutations in culture, subjectivities, and theory which Castells and other critics of globalization or the information society gloss over. The discourse of the postmodern in relation to analysis of contemporary culture and society is just jargon, however, unless it is rooted in analysis of the global restructuring of capitalism and dissection of the scientific-technological revolution that is part and parcel of it.[15]

As I have argued in this study, the term "globalization" is often used as a code word that stands for a large diversity of issues and problems and that serves as a front for a variety of theoretical and political positions. While it can function as a legitimating ideology to cover over and sanitize ugly realities, a critical globalization theory can inflect the discourse to point precisely at these deplorable phenomena and can elucidate a series of contemporary problems and conflicts. In view of the different concepts and functions of globalization discourse, it is important to note that the concept of globalization is a theoretical construct that varies according to the assumptions and commitments of the theorist in question. Seeing the term globalization as a construct helps rob it of

its force of nature, as a sign of an inexorable triumph of market forces and the hegemony of capital, or, as the extreme right fears, of a rapidly encroaching world government. While the term can both describe and legitimate capitalist transnationalism and supranational government institutions, a critical theory of globalization does not buy into ideological valorizations and affirms difference, resistance, and democratic self-determination against forms of global domination and subordination.

Globalization should thus be seen as a contested terrain with opposing forces attempting to use its institutions, technologies, media, and forms for their own purposes. A critical theory of globalization should be normative, specifying positive values and potentials of globalization such as human rights, rights for labor, women, children, and oppressed groups; ecological protection and enhancement of the environment; and the promotion of democracy and social justice. Yet it should also critique negative aspects to globalization which strengthen elite economic and political forces over and against the underlying population, and specify in detail bad aspects of globalization such as destructive IMF policies, unfair policies within the WTO, and environmental, human rights, and labor abuse throughout the world. Thus a dialectic of globalization seeks both positive potential while criticizing negative and destructive aspects. Other beneficial openings include the opportunity for greater democratization, increased education and health care, and new opportunities within the global economy that open entry to members of races, regions, and classes previously excluded from mainstream economics, politics, and culture within the modern corporate order.

Globalization and the Reconstruction of Education

Consequently, critical educators need to develop transformative educational strategies to counter the oppressive forces and effects of globalization in order to empower individuals to understand and act effectively in a globalized world, and to struggle for social justice. This requires

teaching important skills such as media and computer literacy, as well as helping to empower students and citizens to deploy information and communication technologies for progressive purposes (Kellner, 1998 and 2002; Kahn and Kellner 2003). Globalization and information and communication technologies are dominant forces of the future and it is up to critical educators and activists to illuminate their nature and effects, to demonstrate the threats to democracy and freedom, and to seize opportunities for progressive education and democratization.

The project of transforming education will take different forms in different contexts. In the post-industrial or "overdeveloped" countries, individuals need to be empowered to work and act in a hi-tech information economy, and thus should learn skills of media and computer literacy in order to survive in the novel social environment. Traditional skills of knowledge and critique should also be fostered, so that students can name the system, describe and grasp the changes occurring in it as well as the defining features of the evolving global order, and can learn to engage in critical and oppositional practice in the interests of democratization and progressive transformation. This requires gaining vision of how life can be, of alternatives to the present order, and the necessity of struggle and organization to realize progressive goals. Languages of knowledge and critique must thus be supplemented by the discourse of hope and praxis.

In much of the world, the struggle for daily existence is paramount and meeting unmet human and social needs is a high priority. Yet, everywhere, education can provide the competencies and skills to improve one's life, to create a better society, and a more civilized and developed world. Moreover, as the entire world becomes a global and networked society, gaining the multiple literacies necessary to use a range of technologies becomes important the world over as media and

cyberculture become more ubiquitous and the global economy requires people with ever more sophisticated technical skills.

It is interesting that one of the godfathers of critical pedagogy, Paulo Freire, was positive toward media and technologies, seeing them as potential tools for empowering citizens, as well as instruments of domination in the hands of ruling elites. Freire wrote that: "Technical and scientific training need not be inimical to humanistic education as long as science and technology in the revolutionary society are at the service of permanent liberation, of humanization" (1972: 157).[16] Many critical pedagogues, however, are technophobes, seeing new technologies solely as instruments of domination. In a world inexorably undergoing processes of globalization and technological transformation, one cannot, however, in good conscience advocate a policy of clean hands and purity, distancing oneself from technology and globalization, but must intervene in the processes of economic and technological revolution, attempting to deflect these forces for progressive ends and developing critical and oppositional pedagogies to advance the project of human liberation and well-being.

A critical theory of technology maintains that there is utopian potential in the information and communication technologies as well as the possibility for increased domination and the hegemony of capital. While the first generation of computers were large mainframe systems controlled by big government and big business, later generations of "personal computers" and networks created a more decentralized situation in which ever more individuals own their own computers and use them for their own projects and goals. A coming generation of wireless communication could enable areas of the world that do not even have electricity to participate in the communication and information revolution of the emergent global era. This would require, of

course, something like a Marshall Plan for the developing world that would necessitate help with disseminating technologies that would address problems of world hunger, disease, illiteracy, and poverty.

In relation to education, the spread and distribution of information and communication technology signifies the possibility of openings of opportunities for research and interaction not previously open to students who did not have the privilege of access to major research libraries or institutions. The Internet opens more information and knowledge to more people than any previous technology and institution in history, despite its many problems and limitations. Moreover, the Internet enables individuals to participate in discussions, to circulate their ideas and work, and to access material that was previously closed off to many excluded groups and individuals.

A progressive reconstruction of education that is done in the interests of democratization would demand access to emergent technologies for all, helping to overcome the so-called digital divide and divisions of the "haves" and "have nots" (see Kellner, 2002). Expanding democratic and multicultural reconstruction of education forces educators and citizens to confront the challenge of the digital divide, in which there are divisions between information and technology "haves" and "have nots," just as there are class, gender, and race divisions in every sphere of existing of societies and cultures. Although the latest surveys of the digital divide indicate that the key indicators are class and education and not race and gender, nonetheless, making computers a significant force of democratization in education and society will require significant investment and programs to assure that everyone receives the training, literacies, and tools necessary to properly function in a hi-tech global economy and culture.[17]

As a response to globalization and technological revolution, transformations in pedagogy must be as radical as the technological transformations that are taking place. Education should be reconstructed in the light of the importance of citizenship and participation, thus linking, a la Dewey, education and democracy. A public pedagogy involves teaching citizens what is going on in their and other democratic and nondemocratic societies, threats to democracy, and the demands of citizenship. Training individuals for citizenship involves education in rhetoric, public speaking, and the fundamentals of reading and writing. It also requires cultivating critical tolerance in a multicultural society that affirms respect and tolerance for all, while being critical of social institutions and groups that themselves promote fundamentalism and assault tolerance, or that use terrorism, militarism, and violence to promote their ends.

Tolerance should be linked with cultural cosmopolitanism that affirms the value of world culture and multicultures and that is not chauvinistic and noncritical toward one's own culture and society. While democratic patriotism can help cultivate respect for the positive features of a culture or society and help create solidarities in times of trouble, a blind nationalistic patriotism can lead to submission to aggressive and nondemocratic policies and practices of political manipulation.

Critical citizenship thus involves cultivating abilities to read and critique the text of one's own and other cultures, including political and media discourses, television programming, popular music, advertising, and other cultural forms. Thus a public pedagogy articulates with critical cultural studies that together require critical educators to rethink the concepts of literacy and the very nature of education in any hi-tech and rapidly evolving society. Literacy must be expanded to develop novel forms of cultural and technological literacy for at the same time that the world is undergoing technological revolution, important demographic and socio-political changes are occurring in the

United States and elsewhere. Emigration patterns have brought an explosion of diverse peoples into the U.S. in recent decades and the country is now more racially and ethnically diverse, more multicultural, than ever before. This creates the challenge of providing people from diverse races, classes, and backgrounds with the competencies and tools to enable them to succeed and participate in an ever more complex and changing world.

In my previous work, I have delineated the multiple literacies necessary to utilize information and communication technologies, including an expanded role for media literacy, computer and information literacies, and multimedia literacies that provide literacy in reading, researching and producing in the evolving multimedia world (see Kellner 1998, 2000, and 2002). But radically reconstructing education requires a wide range of other literacies often neglected in the current organization of schooling. Since a multicultural society is the context of education for many in the contemporary moment, innovative forms of social interaction and cultural awareness are needed that appreciate differences, multiplicity, and diversity. Therefore, an expanded cultural literacy is needed, one that appreciates the cultural heritage, histories, and contributions of a diversity of groups. Whereas one can agree with E.D. Hirsch (1987) that we need to be literate in our shared cultural heritage, we also need to become culturally literate in cultures that have been hitherto invisible, as Anthony Appiah, Henry Louis Gates and their colleagues have been arguing in their proposals for a multicultural education (1998).

Social literacy should also be taught throughout the educational systems, ranging from a focus on how to relate and get along with a variety of individuals, how to negotiate differences, how to resolve conflicts, and how to communicate and socially interact in a diversity of situations. Social literacy involves ethical training in values and norms, delineating proper and improper individual

and social values (which may well be different in various regions and countries). It also requires knowledge of contemporary societies, and thus overlaps with social and natural science training. In fact, in the light of the significant role of science and technology in the contemporary world, threats to the environment, and the need to preserve and enhance the natural as well as social and cultural worlds, it is scandalous how illiterate some overdeveloped societies, like the US, are concerning science, nature, and even peoples' own bodies. An ecoliteracy should thus appropriately teach competency in interpreting and interacting with our natural environment, ranging from our own body to natural habitats, like forests, oceans, lakes, and deserts.

The challenge for education today is thus to develop multiple literacies to empower students and citizens to use emergent technologies to enhance their lives and to create a better culture and society based on respect for multicultural differences and aiming at fuller democratic participation of individuals and groups largely excluded from wealth and power in the previous modern society. A positive postmodernity would thus involve creation of a more egalitarian and democratic society in which more individuals and groups were empowered to participate. A great danger facing us, of course, is that globalization and emergent technologies will increase the current inequalities based on class, gender, and racial divisions. So far, privileged groups have had more direct and immediate access to new technologies. It is therefore a challenge of education today to provide access to multiple technologies and to the literacies needed for competence to excluded or oppressed individuals and groups in order to overcome some of the divisions and inequalities that have plagued contemporary societies during the entire modern age.

Radical educators must attempt to connect the phenomenon of evolving technologies and the technological revolution and the multicultural explosion and drama of conflicting ethnicities,

classes, genders, religions, and so on, so that differences can create diversity, tolerance, and an enhanced and strengthened democracy and society and not increasing conflict, intolerance, division, and violence. It is not just a question of talking about media literacy, computer literacy, or other multiple literacies from a technological viewpoint, but thinking together emergent technologies and multiculturalism, with technological and social transformation. Thus, a challenge for critical educators is to discover how multiple technologies and literacies can serve the interests of multiculturalism, making teachers, students and citizens aware of how the proliferating technologies are transforming everything from education to work to war, the challenges involved, the multiple literacies needed, and the opportunities for educational reform and social reconstruction.

To be sure, legitimate concerns have been raised in regard to the possibilities that emergent technologies will increase the regnant inequalities in relation to privileged class, gender, and racial groupings. As is well known, the original computer culture was largely a white, male middle to upper class "geek," or "nerd," culture that tended to exclude women, people of color, and members of classes without access to computer technologies. As multiple technologies become a more central aspect of schooling, work, and everyday life, however, more and more women and members of groups previously excluded from computer culture are now becoming participants as they gain access to computers and multimedia technologies in schools, in the workplace, and at home. Of course, the question of access to multiple technologies becomes increasingly important as work, education, and every other aspect of social life is undergoing transformation, making multiple literacies essential to work, cultural, educational, and political exigencies of the future. If the previously disadvantaged and marginalized groups will not gain access to the emerging

technologies, class, gender, race, and other divisions will exponentially grow, creating ever more virulent divisions and the prospects of social upheaval and turbulence.

Yet there are aspects of the forms of literacy being spawned by information technologies and multimedia culture that are potentially democratizing and empowering for individuals and groups previously on the bottom end of prevailing configurations of class, gender, and racial power. The increased informality, closeness to speech patterns, and spontaneity of e-mail composition and participation in chat rooms and computer-mediated communications and forums provide access to individuals and groups whose literacies and modes of writing were deemed inferior or deficient from more standard classical print-media perspectives. Indeed, the openness of many forums of computer-mediated communication, the possibility of ever more individuals able to produce their own Web-sites, and access to volumes of information previously limited to those who had access to elite libraries potentially democratize education, cultural production, and participation in cultural and political dialogue and movements.

Thus, issues of access and exclusion in relation to multiple technologies and literacies are crucial to realizing the promises of democracy. Yet, there are potential threats in the mushrooming of seductive technologies of information, communication, and entertainment. There is the danger that youth will become totally immersed in an alluring world of hi-tech experience and lose its social connectedness and ability to interpersonally communicate and relate concretely to other people. Informal modes of computer communication can create private languages and subcultures, and disadvantage participants in broader cultural communication and participation.

Statistics suggest that more and more sectors of youth are able to access cyberspace and that college students with Internet accounts are spending as much as four hours a day in the novel realm

of technological experience.[18] Increasingly, the media have been generating a moral panic concerning allegedly growing dangers in cyberspace with lurid stories of young boys and girls lured into dangerous sex or running away from home, endless accounts of how pornography on the Internet is proliferating, and the publicizing of calls for increasing control, censorship, and surveillance of communication -- usually by politicians or others who are computer illiterate. The solution, however, is not to ban access to those technologies, but to teach students and citizens how to use them so that they can be employed for productive and creative, rather than problematical, ends.

To be sure, there are dangers in cyberspace as well as elsewhere, but the threats to adolescents are significantly higher through the danger of family violence and abuse than seduction by strangers on the Internet. And while there is a flourishing trade in pornography on the Internet, this material has become increasingly available in a variety of venues from the local video shop to the newspaper stand. So, it seems unfair to demonize the Internet. Attempts at Internet censorship are part of the attack on youth, which would circumscribe their rights to obtain entertainment and information, and create their own subcultures.[19] Consequently, devices like the V-chip that would exclude sex and violence on television, or block computer access to objectionable material, is more an expression of adult hysteria and moral panic than genuine dangers to youth which certainly exist, but much more strikingly in the real world than in the sphere of hyperreality.

Throughout this century, there has been a demonization of new media and forms of media culture, ranging from comic books to film to popular music to television and now to the Internet. As Jenkins argues (1997), this demonization is supported by an assumption of the innocence of childhood, that children are merely passive receptacles, easily seduced by cultural images, and in

31

need of protection from nefarious and harmful cultural content. But as he also contends (1997: 30f), the myth of "childhood innocence" strips children of active agency, of being capable of any thoughts of their own, and of having the ability to decode and process media materials themselves. Of course, children need media education. They need to be involved in an active learning process concerning their culture. But censorship and vilification of media does not help young people become active critics, and participants in their culture.

Accordingly, Jon Katz (1996) has argued for children's "cyber-rights," asserting that our youth's access to Internet cyberculture and media culture in general is necessary for their participation in the larger culture and their own education and development. Mastery of the culture can be the difference between economic success and hardship, between social connectedness or isolation. The Internet, in particular, allows participation in many dimensions of social and cultural life as well as the cultivation of those technical skills that can help children in later life.

Therefore, it is necessary to divest ourselves of myths of childhood innocence and the passivity of children's media consumption, positing instead the possibility of active and creative use of media material in which media education is seen as part of youth's self-development and constitution. Accordingly, Henry Jenkins proposes "a new kind of radical media education based on the assumption that children are active participants within popular culture rather than passive victims. We need to help our children become more critically reflective about the media they use and the popular culture they embrace, yet we can only achieve this by recognizing and respecting their existing investments, skills, and knowledge as media users. In the end, our goals must be not to protect our children but to empower them" (Jenkins, 1997: 31).

Rather than demonizing and rejecting out of hand all new technologies, we should criticize their misuse, but also see how they can be used constructively and positively. In studying the kaleidoscopic array of discourses which characterize the evolving technologies, I am rather bemused by the extent to whether they expose either a technophilic discourse which presents new technologies as salvation, that will solve crucial contemporary problems, or they embody a technophobic discourse that sees technology as damnation, demonizing it as the major source of present day problems. It appears that similarly one-sided and contrasting discourses greeted the introduction of other new technologies this century, often hysterically. It is indeed curious that whenever an innovative technology is introduced a polarized response emerges in relation to its novelty and differences from previous technologies. New technologies seem to attract both advocates and champions and critics and detractors. This was historically the case with mass media, and now computers.

Film, for instance, was celebrated by early theorists as providing a marvelous documentary depiction of reality. Siegfried Kraucauer published a book on film as the "redemption of reality," and it was described early on as an innovative art form, as well as providing novel modes of mass education and entertainment. Likewise, it was soon demonized for promoting sexual promiscuity, juvenile delinquency and crime, violence, and copious other forms of immorality and evil. Its demonization led in the United States to a Production Code that rigorously regulated the content of Hollywood film from 1934 until the 1950s and 1960s -- no open mouthed kissing was permitted, crime could not pay, drug use or attacks on religion could not be portrayed, and a censorship office rigorously surveyed all films to make sure that no subversive or illicit content emerged.

Similar extreme hopes and fears were projected onto radio, television, and now computers. It appears whenever there are new technologies, people project all sorts of fantasies, fears, hopes, and dreams onto them. This is now happening with computers and multimedia technologies. It is indeed striking that the literature on computer and information technologies is either highly celebratory and technophilic, or sharply derogatory and technophobic. A critical theory of technology, however, and critical pedagogy, should avoid either demonizing or deifying emergent technologies and should instead develop pedagogies that will help teachers, students, and citizens use technology to enhance education and life, and to criticize the limitations and false promises made on behalf of ever proliferating technologies.

Certainly there is no doubt that the cyberspace of computer worlds contains as much banality and stupidity as real life. One can waste much time in useless activity. But compared to the bleak and violent urban worlds portrayed in rap music and youth films like Kids (1995) and Elephant (2003), the technological worlds are havens of information, entertainment, interaction, and connection where youth can gain valuable skills, knowledge, and power necessary to survive the postmodern adventure. Youth can create alternative, more multiple and flexible selves in cyberspace as well as their own subcultures and communities. Indeed, it is exciting to cruise the Internet and to discover how many interesting Web-sites that young people and others have established, often containing valuable educational and political material. There is, of course, the danger that corporate and commercial interests will come to colonize the Internet, but it is likely that there will continue to be spaces where individuals can empower themselves and create their own communities and identities. A main challenge for youth (and others) is to learn to use the Internet for positive cultural

and political projects, rather than just entertainment and passive consumption (see Best and Kellner 2001 and Kahn and Kellner 2003).

Reflecting on the growing social significance of computers and information technologies makes it clear that it is of essential importance for youth today to gain various kinds of literacy to empower themselves for the emerging cybersociety (this is true of teachers and adults as well). To survive in a postmodern world, individuals of all ages need to gain skills of media and computer literacy to enable ourselves to negotiate the overload of media images and spectacles. We all need to learn technological skills to use media and computer technologies to subsist in the hi-tech economy and to form our own cultures and communities. Youth, especially, need street smarts and survival skills to cope with the drugs, violence, and uncertainty in today's predatory culture (McLaren, 1995), as well as new forms of multiple literacy.

It is therefore extremely important for the future of democracy to make sure that youth of all classes, races, genders, and regions gain access to information and multimedia technology. This requires receiving training in media and computer literacy skills in order to provide the opportunities to enter the hi-tech job market and to full participate in the society of the future, so as to prevent an exacerbation of class, gender, and race inequalities. And while multiple forms of new literacies will be necessary, traditional print literacy skills are all the more important in a cyberage of word-processing, information gathering, and Internet communication. Moreover, multiple literacy involves training in philosophy, ethics, value thinking, and the humanities which is necessary today more then ever. In fact, how the Internet and emergent technologies will be used depends on the overall education of youth and the skills and interests they bring to the technologies,

which can be used to access educational and valuable cultural and political material, or pornography and the banal wares of cybershopping malls.

Thus, the concept of multiple literacies and the postmodern pedagogy that I envisage maintains that it is not a question of either/or, e.g., either print literacy or multimedia literacy, either the classical curriculum or a new hi-techcurriculum, but it is rather a question of both/and that preserves the best from classical education, that enhances emphasis on print literacy, but that also develops multiple literacies to engage the emergent technologies. Obviously, cyberlife is just one dimension of experience and one still needs to learn to interact in the "real world" of school, jobs, relationships, politics, and community. Youth -- indeed all of us! -- need to negotiate many dimensions of social reality and to gain a multiplicity of forms of literacy and skills that will enable individuals to create identities, relationships, and communities that will nurture and develop the full spectrum of their potentialities and satisfy a wide array of needs. Contemporary lives are more multidimensional than ever, so part of the postmodern adventure is learning to live in a variety of social spaces and to adapt to intense change and transformation (Best and Kellner, 2001). Education, too, must meet these challenges and both utilize new technologies to improve education and to devise pedagogical strategies in which technologies can be deployed to create a more democratic and egalitarian multicultural society.

In the light of the neo-liberal projects to dismantle the Welfare State, colonize the public sphere, and control globalization, it is up to citizens, activists, and educators to create alternative public spheres, politics, and pedagogies. In these spaces, that could include progressive classrooms, students and citizens could learn to use information and multimedia technologies to discuss what kinds of society people today want and to oppose the society against which people resist and

36

struggle. This involves, minimally, demands for more education, health care, welfare, and benefits from the state, and to struggle to create a more democratic and egalitarian society. But one cannot expect that generous corporations and a beneficent state are going to make available to citizens the bounties and benefits of the globalized information economy. Rather, it is up to individuals and groups to promote democratization and progressive social change.

Thus, in opposition to the globalization of corporate and state capitalism, I would advocate an oppositional democratic, pedagogical, and cosmopolitan globalization, which supports individuals and groups using information and multimedia technologies to create a more multicultural, egalitarian, democratic, and ecological globalization. Of course, the emergent technologies might exacerbate existing inequalities in the current class, gender, race, and regional configurations of power and give dominant corporate forces powerful tools to advance their interests. In this situation, it is up to people of good will to devise strategies to use technologies to promote democratization and social justice. For as the proliferating technologies become ever more central to everyday life, developing an oppositional technopolitics in alternative public spheres and pedagogical sites will become increasingly important. Changes in the economy, politics, and social life demand a constant rethinking of politics and social change in the light of globalization and the technological revolution, requiring critical and oppositional thinking as a response to ever-changing historical conditions.

References

Appiah, A.A. and Gates, H. L. (1999) Africana: The Encyclopedia of the African and

     African American Experience. New York: BasicCivitas.

Aronowitz, S. and Giroux, H (1993) <u>Education Still Under Siege</u>. Westport, Conn.: Bergin & Garvey.

Barber, Benjamin (1996) <u>Jihad vs. McWorld</u>. New York: Ballantine Books.

_____ (2003) <u>Fear's Empire. War, Terrorism, and Democracy</u>. New York: Norton.

Best, S. and D. Kellner (1991) <u>Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations</u>, London and New York: MacMillan and Guilford.

_____ (1997) <u>The Postmodern Turn</u>. London and New York: Routledge and Guilford Press.

_____(2001) <u>The Postmodern Adventure</u>, London and New York: Routledge and Guilford Press.

_____ (2003) "Contemporary Youth and the Postmodern Adventure," <u>The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies</u>, Vol. 25, Nr. 2 (April-June 2003): 75-93.

Boggs, C. (2000) <u>The End of Politics</u>, New York: Guilford Press.

Bowles, S. and H. Gintis (1986): <u>On Democracy</u>, New York: Basic Books.

Burbach, R. (2001) <u>Globalization and Postmodern Politics. From Zapatistas to Hi-tech Robber Barons</u>, London: Pluto Press.

Castells, M. (1996) <u>The Rise of the Network Society</u>, Oxford: Blackwell.

Cohen, J. and J. Rogers (1983) <u>On Democracy</u>, New York: Penguin.

Cvetkovich, A. and D. Kellner (1997) <u>Articulating the Global and the Local. Globalization and Cultural Studies</u>, Boulder, Col.: Westview.

Dewey, John (1997 [1916]) <u>Democracy and Education</u>. New York: Free Press.

Dyer-Witheford, N. (1999) <u>Cyber-Marx. Cycles and Circuits of Struggle in Hi-technology Capitalism</u>, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.

Foran, J. (ed) (2002) <u>The Future of Revolutions. Rethinking Radical Change in the Age of Globalization</u>, London: Zed Books.

Friedman, T. (1999) <u>The Lexus and the Olive Tree</u>, New York: Farrar Straus Giroux.

Fukuyama, F. (1992) <u>The End of History and the Last Man</u>, New York: The Free Press.

Giroux, H. (1996) <u>Fugitive Cultures: Race, Violence, and Youth</u>. New York: Routledge.

_____ (2000) <u>Stealing Innocence. Youth, Corporate Power, and the Politics of Culture</u>. New York: Saint Martin's.

_____ (2003a) "Neoliberalism's War Against Youth: Where are Children in the Debate About Politics?" (forthcoming).

_____ (2003b) <u>The Abandoned Generation. Democracy Beyond the Culture of Fear</u>. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hardt, M. and A. Negri (2000) <u>Empire</u>, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Harvey, D. (1989) <u>The Condition of Postmodernity</u>, Cambridge: Blackwell.

Hirsch, E.D. (1988) <u>Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know</u>. New York: Vintage.

Jenkins, H. (1997) "Empowering Children in the Digital Age: Towards a Radical Media Pedagogy," <u>Radical Teacher</u>, 50, (Spring): 30-36.

Kahn, R. and Kellner, D. (2003) "Internet Subcultures and Oppositional Politics", in D. Muggleton (ed), <u>The Post-subcultures Reader</u>, London: Berg.

Kellner, D. (1995a) <u>Media Culture</u>, London and New York: Routledge.

_____ (1995b) "Intellectuals and New Technologies", in: <u>Media, Culture, and Society</u>, Vol. 17, pp. 201-217.

_____(1997) "Intellectuals, the New Public Spheres, and Technopolitics", in: <u>New Political Science</u>, 41-42 (Fall), pp. 169-188.

_____(1998) "Multiple Literacies and Critical Pedagogy in a Multicultural Society", in: <u>Educational Theory</u>, Vol. 48, Nr. 1, pp. 103-122.

_____ (1999a) "Theorizing McDonaldization: A

Multiperspectivist Approach", in: <u>Resisting McDonaldization</u>, edited by B. Smart, London: Sage Publications, pp. 186-206.

_____ (1999b) "Globalization From Below? Toward a Radical

Democratic Technopolitics", in: <u>Angelaki</u>, 4:2, pp. 101-113.

_____ (2000) "New Technologies/New Literacies: reconstructing education for the new millennium", in: <u>Teaching Education</u>, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 245-265.

_____ (2002) "Technological Revolution, Multiple Literacies, and the Restructuring of Education," in Ilana Snyder, editor, <u>Silicon Literacies</u>. London and New York: Routledge: 154-169.

_____ (2003a) <u>Media Spectacle</u>, London and New York: Routledge.

_____(2003b) <u>From September 11 to Terror War: The Dangers of the Bush Legacy</u>.

      Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield.

____ (2003c) "Postmodern Military and Permanent War," in <u>Masters of War. Militarism

      and Blowback in the Era of the American </u>Empire, edited by Carl Boggs. New York

      and London: Routledge, 2003: 229-244.

Kahn, R. and Kellner, D. (2003) "Internet Subcultures and Oppositional Politics", in D.

      Muggleton (ed), *The* <u>Post-subcultures Reader</u>, London: Berg.

Lash, S. (1990) <u>The Sociology of Postmodernism</u>. New York and London: Routledge.

Luke, A. and C. Luke (2000): "A Situated Perspective on

      Cultural Globalization", in: *Globalization and Education*, edited by N. Burbules and C.

      Torres, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 275-298.

Males, Mike (1996) <u>The Scapegoat Generation</u>. Boston: Common Courage Press.

Mander, J. and E. Goldsmith (1996) <u>The Case Against the Global Economy</u>, San Francisco:

Sierra Club Books.

Marx, K. and F. Engels (1978) <u>The Marx-Engels Reader</u>, second edition, R. Tucker, ed.,

New York: Norton.

McChesney, Robert (1997) <u>Corporate Media and the Threat to Democracy</u>. New York: Seven

Stories Press.

McChesney, Robert (2000) <u>Rich Media, Poor Democracy</u>. New York: The New Press.

McLaren, Peter (1995) <u>Critical Pedagogy and Predatory Culture</u>. New York: Routledge.

Moody, K. (1988) <u>An Injury to One</u>, London: Verso.

_____ (1997) "Towards an International Social-Movement Unionism", in: <u>New Left Review</u>, 225, pp. 52-72.

Peters, M. (forthcoming) "War as Globalization: The 'Education' of the Iraqi People," in <u>Education in the Age of Terrorism.</u>

Ritzer, G. (1993 revised edition 1996): <u>The McDonaldization of Society</u>, Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Pine Forge Press.

Stiglitz, J. (2002): <u>Globalization and Its Discontents</u>, New York: Norton.

Waterman, P. (1992): "International Labour Communication by Computer: The Fifth International?", <u>Working Paper Series</u> 129 (The Hague: Institute of Social Studies).

Watson, J. (ed) (1998): <u>Golden Arches East: McDonald's in East Asia</u>, Palo Alto, California: Stanford Univ. Press.

<u>Notes</u>

[1] This study is part of a larger theoretical project. For my perspectives on globalization and new technologies which inform this study, see Best and Kellner 2001 and Kellner 2002. For my perspectives on education, new technology, and new literacies that I expand upon in this study see Kellner 1998, 2000, 2002, and 2003a. On 9/11 and the subsequent Terror War, see Kellner 2003b and 2003c.

[2] By "Terror War," I refer to both Islamicist terrorism and to the Bush administration's "war against terrorism" and its doctrine of preemptive and unilateral strikes against any state or organization presumed to harbor or support terrorism, or to eliminate "weapons of mass destruction" that could be used against the U.S. The rightwing of the Bush administration seeks

to promote Terror War as the defining struggle of the era, coded as an apocalyptic battle between good and evil, as do Al Qaeda and other terrorist Jihadist groups. For my theorizing of war and militarism in the contemporary era, see Kellner 2003b and 2003c.

[3] Barber's recent Fear's Empire (2003) sharply criticizes Bush administration policy of "preemptive strikes" and "preventive wars" as a unilateralist militarism, destructive of international law, treaties, alliances, and the multilateral approach necessary to deal with global problems like terrorism, a critique that I would agree with (see Kellner 2003b). I also am in accord with Barber's position that both bin Laden's terrorism and Bush militarism promote a politics of fear that is counter to building a strong democracy. Hence, while I find Barber's general categorical explication of globalization problematically dualistic and his categories of McWorld and Jihad too homogenizing and totalizing, I am in general agreement with his criticism of Bush administration policy.

4. For example, as Ritzer argues (1993 and 1996), McDonald's imposes not only a similar cuisine all over the world, but circulates processes of what he calls "McDonaldization" that involve a production/consumption model of efficiency, technological rationality, calculability, predictability, and control. Yet as Watson et al 1997 argue, McDonald's has various cultural meanings in diverse local contexts, as well as different products, organization, and effects. Yet the latter goes too far toward stressing heterogeneity, downplaying the cultural power of McDonald's as a force of a homogenizing globalization and Western corporate logic and system; see Kellner 1999a and 2003a.

[5] While I find Hardt and Negri Empire (2000) to be an impressive and productive text, I am not sure, however, what is gained by using the word "Empire" rather than the concepts of global

capital and political economy. While Hardt and Negri combine categories of Marxism and critical social theory with poststructuralist discourse derived from Foucault and Deleuze and Guattari, they frequently favor the latter, often mystifying and obscuring the object of analysis. I am also not as confident as Hardt and Negri that the "multitude" replaces traditional concepts of the working class and other modern political subjects, movements, and actors, and find the emphasis on nomads, "New Barbarians," and the poor as replacement categories problematical. Nor am I clear on exactly what forms their poststructuralist politics would take. The same problem is evident, I believe, in an earlier decade's provocative and postmarxist text by Laclau and Mouffe (1985), who valorized new social movements, radical democracy, and a postsocialist politics without providing many concrete examples of struggle or radical alternatives in the present conjuncture.

6. I am thus trying to mediate in this paper between those who claim that globalization simply undermines democracy and those who claim that globalization promotes democratization like Friedman (1999). I should also note that in distinguishing between globalization from above and globalization from below, I do not want to say that one is good and the other is bad in relation to democracy. As Friedman shows (1999), capitalist corporations and global forces might very well promote democratization in many arenas of the world, and globalization-from-below might promote special interests or reactionary goals, so I am criticizing theorizing globalization in binary terms as primarily "good" or "bad." While critics of globalization simply see it as the reproduction of capitalism, its champions, like Friedman, do not perceive how in many instances globalization undercuts democracy. Likewise, Friedman does not engage the role of new social movements, dissident groups, or the "have nots" in promoting democratization. Nor do concerns for social

justice, equality, and participatory democracy play a role in his book.

7. On resistance to globalization by labor, see Moody 1988 and 1997; on resistance by environmentalists and other social movements, see the studies in Mander and Goldsmith 1996, Burbach 2001 and Foran 2003, while I provide examples below from several domains.

8. Friedman (1999: 267f) notes that George Soros was the star of Davos in 1995, when the triumph of global capital was being celebrated, but that the next year Russian Communist Party leader Gennadi A. Zyuganov was a major media focus when unrestrained globalization was being questioned -- though Friedman does not point out that this was a result of a growing recognition that divisions between "haves" and "have nots" were becoming too scandalous and that predatory capitalism was becoming too brutal and ferocious.

[9] On the Cancun meetings, see Chris Kraul, "WTO Meeting Finds Protests Inside and out," <u>Los Angeles Times</u> (September 11, 2003: A3); Patricia Hewitt, "Making trade fairer," <u>The Guardian</u>, September 12, 2003; and Naomi Klein, "Activists must follow the money," <u>The Guardian</u>, September 12, 2003. On the collapse of the so-called "Free-Trade Summit", see Carol J. Williams and Hohn-Thor Dahlberg, "Free-Trade Summit Ends Without Pact," <u>Los Angeles</u> Times (Nov. 21, 2003). On the growing division between rich and poor, see Benjamin M. Friedman, "Globalization: Stiglitz's Case," <u>The New York Review of Books</u> (August 15, 2002) and "George Monbiot, "The worst of times" <u>The Guardian</u>, September 12, 2003.

10. Such positions are associated with the postmodern theories of Foucault, Lyotard, Rorty, and have been taken up by a wide range of feminists, multiculturalists, and others. On these theorists

and postmodern politics, see Best and Kellner 1991, 1997, and 2001, and the valorization and critique of postmodern politics in Hardt and Negri 2000 and Burbach 2001.

[11] In a report on the 2002 World Social Forum event in Porto Alegre, Michael Hardt suggests that protestors divided into anti-globalization groups that promoted national sovereignty as a bulwark against globalization and local groups connected into networks affirming an alternative democratic globalization. See "Today's Bandung?" New Left Review 14 (Mar-Apr 2002): 112-118. Not all countries or regions that oppose specific forms of globalization should be labeled "anti-globalization." Moreover, one might also delineate a category of localists who simply focus on local problems and issues and do not engage globalization. There is accordingly a growing complexity of positions on globalization and alternative political strategies.

12. As a December 1 abcnews.com story titled "Networked Protests" put it:

> disparate groups from the Direct Action Network to the AFL-CIO to various environmental and human rights groups have organized rallies and protests online, allowing for a global reach that would have been unthinkable just five years ago.
>
> As early as March, activists were hitting the news groups and list-serves -- strings of e-mail messages people use as a kind of long-term chat -- to organize protests and rallies.

In addition, while the organizers demanded that the protesters agree not to engage in violent action, there was one Web-site that urged WTO protesters to help tie up the WTO's Web servers, and another group produced an anti-WTO Web-site that replicated the look of the official site (see RTMark's Web-site, http://gatt.org/; the same group had produced a replica of George W. Bush's site with satirical and critical material, winning the wrath of the Bush campaign). For compelling

accounts of the anti-WTO demonstrations in Seattle and an acute analysis of the issues involved, see Paul Hawkens, "What Really Happened at the Battle of Seattle," (http://www.purefood.org/Corp/PaulHawken.cfm) and Naomi Klein, "Were the DC and Seattle Protests Unfocused, or Are Critics Missing the Point?" (www.shell.ihug.co.nz/~stu/fair).

13. On the importance of the ideas of Debord and the Situationist International to make sense of the present conjuncture see Best and Kellner 1997, Chapter 3, and on the new forms of the interactive technological society and Debordian critique, see Best and Kellner 2001 and Kellner 2003a.

14. Castells claims that Harvey (1989) and Lash (1990) say about as much about the postmodern as needs to be said (1996: 26f). With due respect to their excellent work, I believe that no two theorists or books exhaust the problematic of the postmodern which involves mutations in theory, culture, society, politics, science, philosophy, and almost every other domain of experience, and is thus inexhaustible (Best and Kellner 1997 and 2001). Yet one should be careful in using postmodern discourse to avoid the mystifying elements, a point made in the books just noted as well as Hardt and Negri 2000.

15. See Best and Kellner 1997 and 2001.

16. Freire also stated that: "It is not the media themselves which I criticize, but the way they are used" (1972: 136). Moreover, he argued for the importance of teaching media literacy to empower individuals against manipulation and oppression, and using the most appropriate media to help teach the subject matter in question (114-116).

17. The "digital divide" has emerged as the buzzword for perceived divisions between information technology have and have nots in the current economy and society. A U.S. Department of Commerce report released in July 1999 claimed that the digital divide in relation to race is dramatically escalating and the Clinton administration and media picked up on this theme (See the report "Americans in the Information Age: Falling Through the Net" at http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/digitaldivide/). A critique of the data involved in the report emerged, however, claiming that it was outdated; more recent studies by Stanford University, Cheskin Research, ACNielson, and the Forester Institute claim that education and class are more significant factors than race in constructing the divide (see http:cyberatlas.internet.com/big-picture/demographics for a collection of reports and statistics on the divide). In any case, it is clear that there is a gaping division between information technology haves and have nots, that this is a major challenge to developing an egalitarian and democratic society, and that something needs to be done about the problem. My contribution involves the argument that empowering the have nots requires the dissemination of new literacies and thus empowering groups and individuals previously excluded from economic opportunities and socio-political participation; see Kellner 2002.

18. Wired magazine is a good source for statistics and data concerning growing computer and Internet use among all sectors of youth and documents the vicissitudes of cyberculture. Studies of Internet addiction, however, raise concerns about negative implications of excessive usage. The Chronicle of Higher Education has reported that "Students are unusually vulnerable to Internet addiction according to a new quarterly journal called Cyberpsychology and Behavior" (Feb. 6. 1998: A25). The study indicated that students from 18-22 are especially at risk and point to a

correlation between high Internet use and a dropout rate that more than doubled among heavy users. Accordingly, the University of Washington has limited the amount of Internet time available to students to cut down on overuse and several other colleges have set up support groups for Internet addiction. But such studies do not record the benefits of heavy Internet use or indicate potentially higher productive uses than, say, watching television, drinking, or engaging in traditional forms of collegiate socializing.

19. On the attack on youth in contemporary society and culture, see Giroux 1996, 2002, 2003a and 2003b; Males 1996; and Best and Kellner, 2003.