

# Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies

<http://csc.sagepub.com>

---

## **Challenging Neoliberalism's New World Order: The Promise of Critical Pedagogy**

Henry A. Giroux and Susan Searls Giroux

*Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies* 2006; 6; 21

DOI: 10.1177/1532708605282810

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://csc.sagepub.com>

---

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

**Additional services and information for *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://csc.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://csc.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

# Challenging Neoliberalism's New World Order: The Promise of Critical Pedagogy

Henry A. Giroux  
Susan Searls Giroux  
*McMaster University*

Although critical pedagogy has a long and diverse tradition in the United States, its innumerable variations reflect both a shared belief in education as a moral and political practice and a recognition that its value should be judged in terms of how it prepares students to engage in a common struggle for deepening the possibilities of autonomy, critical thought, and a substantive democracy. We believe that critical pedagogy at the current historical moment faces a crisis of enormous proportions. It is a crisis grounded in the now commonsense belief that education should be divorced from politics and that politics should be removed from the imperatives of democracy. At the center of this crisis is a tension between democratic values and market values, between dialogic engagement and rigid authoritarianism.

Faith in social amelioration and a sustainable future appears to be in short supply as neoliberal capitalism performs the dual task of using education to train workers for service sector jobs and produce lifelong consumers. At the same time, neoliberalism feeds a growing authoritarianism steeped in religious fundamentalism and jingoistic patriotism encouraging intolerance and hate as it punishes critical thought, especially if it is at odds with the reactionary religious and political agenda pushed by the Bush administration. Increasingly, education appears useful to those who hold power, and issues concerning how public and higher education might contribute to the quality of democratic public life are either ignored or dismissed. Moral outrage and creative energy seem utterly limited in the political sphere, just as any collective struggle to preserve education as a basis for creating critical citizens is rendered defunct within the corporate drive for efficiency, a logic that has inspired bankrupt reform initiatives such as standardization, high-stakes testing, rigid accountability schemes, and privatization.

Cornel West (2004) recently argued that we need to analyze those dark forces shutting down democracy but “we also need to be very clear about the vision that lures us toward hope and the sources of that vision” (p. 18). In what follows, we want to recapture the vital role that critical pedagogy might play as

Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies, Volume 6 Number 1, 2006 21-32  
DOI: 10.1177/1532708605282810  
© 2006 Sage Publications

both a language of critique and possibility by addressing the growing threat of free market fundamentalism and rigid authoritarianism. At the same time, we want to explore what role critical pedagogy can take on in opposing these escalating antidemocratic tendencies and what it might mean to once again connect critical pedagogy to the more prophetic visions of a radical democracy.

Neoliberalism has become one of the most pervasive and dangerous ideologies of the twenty-first century. Its pervasiveness is evident not only by its unparalleled influence on the global economy but also in its power to redefine the very nature of politics and sociality. Free market fundamentalism rather than democratic idealism is now the driving force of economics and politics in most of the world. Its logic, moreover, has insinuated itself into every social relationship, such that the specificity of relations between parents and children, doctors and patients, teachers and students has been reduced to that of supplier and customer. It is a market ideology driven not just by profits but also by an ability to reproduce itself with such success that, to paraphrase Fred Jameson, it is easier to imagine the end of the world than the end of neoliberal capitalism. Wedded to the belief that the market should be the organizing principle for all political, social, and economic decisions, neoliberalism wages an incessant attack on democracy, public goods, the welfare state, and noncommodified values. Under neoliberalism, everything is either for sale or is plundered for profit: Public lands are looted by logging companies and corporate ranchers; politicians willingly hand the public's airwaves over to powerful broadcasters and large corporate interests without a dime going into the public trust; the environment is polluted and despoiled in the name of profit-making just as the government passes legislation to make it easier for corporations to do so; what public services have survived the Reagan-Bush era are gutted to lower the taxes of major corporations (or line their pockets through no-bid contracts, as in the infamous case of Halliburton); schools more closely resemble either jails or high-end shopping malls, depending on their clientele, and teachers are forced to get revenue for their school by hawking everything from hamburgers to pizza parties.

Under neoliberalism, the state now makes a grim alignment with corporate capital and transnational corporations. Gone are the days when the state "assumed responsibility for a range of social needs" (Steinmetz, 2003, p. 337). Instead, agencies of government now pursue a wide range of "deregulations, privatizations, and abdications of responsibility to the market and private philanthropy" (p. 337). Deregulation, in turn, promotes "widespread, systematic disinvestment in the nation's basic productive capacity" (Bluestone & Harrison, 1982, p. 6). As the search for ever greater profits leads to outsourcing, which accentuates the flight of capital and jobs abroad, flexible production encourages wage slavery for many formerly of the middle class and mass incarceration for those disposable populations (i.e., neither good producers nor consumers) at home. Even among the traditionally prounion, proenvironment, prowelfare state democratic party, few seem moved to challenge the pre-

vailing neoliberal economic doctrine that, according to Stanley Aronowitz (2003), proclaims “the superiority of free markets over public ownership, or even public regulation of private economic activities, [and] has become the conventional wisdom, not only among conservatives but among social progressives” (p. 21).

Tragically, the ideology and power of neoliberalism is not confined to U.S. borders. Throughout the globe, the forces of neoliberalism are on the march, dismantling the historically guaranteed social provisions provided by the welfare state, defining profit making as the essence of democracy, and equating freedom with the unrestricted ability of markets to “govern economic relations free of government regulation” (Aronowitz, 2003, p. 101). Transnational in scope, neoliberalism now imposes its economic regime and market values on developing weaker nations through structural adjustment policies enforced by powerful financial institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO). The effect on schools in postcolonial nations is particularly bleak, as policy reforms financially starve institutions of higher learning as they standardize—with the usual emphasis on skills and drills over critical thinking or critical content—the curricula of primary schools.

Secure in its dystopian vision that there are no alternatives, as England’s former Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher once put it, neoliberalism obviates issues of contingency, struggle, and social agency by celebrating the inevitability of economic laws in which the ethical ideal of intervening in the world gives way to the idea that we “have no choice but to adapt both our hopes and our abilities to the new global market” (Aronowitz, 1998, p. 7). Situated within a culture of fear, market freedoms seem securely grounded in a defense of national security, capital, and property rights. When coupled with a media-driven culture of panic and the everyday reality of insecurity, surviving public spaces have become increasingly monitored and militarized. Recently, events in New York; New Jersey; and Washington, D.C.; provide an interesting case in point. When the media alerted the nation’s citizenry to new terrorist threats specific to these areas, CNN ran a lead story on its effect on tourism—specifically on the enthusiastic clamor over a new kind of souvenir as families scrambled to get their pictures taken among U.S. paramilitary units now lining city streets, fully flanked with their imposing tanks and massive machine guns. The accoutrements of a police state now vie with high-end shopping and museum visits for the public’s attention, all amid a thunderous absence of protest. But the investment in surveillance and containment is hardly new. Since the early 1990s, state governments have invested more in prison construction than in education; prison guards and security personnel in public schools are two of the fastest growing professions. Such revolutionary changes in the global body politic demand that we ask what citizens are learning from this not so hidden curriculum organized around markets and militarization. As that syllabus

is written, we must ponder the social costs of breakneck corporatization bolstered by an authoritarianism that links dissent with abetting terrorism.

In its capacity to dehistoricize and naturalize such sweeping social change, as well as in its aggressive attempts to destroy all of the public spheres necessary for the defense of a genuine democracy, neoliberalism reproduces the conditions for unleashing the most brutalizing forces of capitalism. Social Darwinism has risen like a phoenix from the ashes of the nineteenth century and can now be seen in full display on most reality TV programs and in the unfettered self-interest that now drives popular culture. As social bonds are replaced by unadulterated materialism and narcissism, public concerns are now understood and experienced as utterly private miseries, except when offered up on *Jerry Springer* as fodder for entertainment. Where public space—or its mass-mediated simulacrum—does exist, it is mainly used as a highly orchestrated and sensational confessional for private woes, a cutthroat game of winner-take-all replacing more traditional forms of courtship, as in *Who Wants to Marry a Millionaire* or as advertisement for crass consumerism, like MTV's *Cribs*.

As neoliberal policies dominate politics and social life, the breathless rhetoric of the global victory of free market rationality is invoked to cut public expenditures and undermine those noncommodified public spheres that serve as the repository for critical education, language, and public intervention. Spewed forth by the mass media, right-wing intellectuals, religious fanatics, and politicians, neoliberal ideology, with its merciless emphasis on deregulation and privatization, has found its material expression in an all-out attack on democratic values and social relations—particularly those spheres where such values are learned and take root. Public services such as health care, childcare, public assistance, education, and transportation are now subject to the rules of the market. Forsaking the public good for the private good and representing the needs of the corporate and private sector as the only source of sound investment, neoliberal ideology produces, legitimates, and exacerbates the existence of persistent poverty, inadequate health care, racial apartheid in the inner cities, and the growing inequalities between the rich and the poor (Henwood, 2003; Krugman, 2003; Phillips, 2003).

As Stanley Aronowitz (2003) points out, the Bush administration has made neoliberal ideology the cornerstone of its program and has been in the forefront in actively supporting and implementing the following policies:

deregulation of business at all levels of enterprises and trade; tax reduction for wealthy individuals and corporations; the revival of the near-dormant nuclear energy industry; limitations and abrogation of labor's right to organize and bargain collectively; a land policy favoring commercial and industrial development at the expense of conservation and other proenvironment policies; elimination of income support to the chronically unemployed; reduced federal aid to education and health; privatization of the main federal pension programs, Social Security; limitation on the right of aggrieved individuals to sue employers and corporations who provide services; in addition, as social programs are reduced,

[Republicans] are joined by the Democrats in favoring increases in the repressive functions of the state, expressed in the dubious drug wars in the name of fighting crime, more funds for surveillance of ordinary citizens, and the expansion of the federal and local police forces. (p. 102)

Central to neoliberal ideology and its implementation by the Bush administration is the ongoing attempt by right-wing politicians to view government as the enemy of freedom (except when it aids big business) and discount it as a guardian of the public interest. The call to eliminate big government is neoliberalism's grand unifying idea and has broad popular appeal in the United States because it is a principle deeply embedded in the country's history and tangled up with its notion of political freedom—not to mention the endless appeal of its clarion call to cut taxes. And yet, the right-wing appropriation of this tradition is racked with contradictions, as they outspend their democratic rivals, drive up deficits, and expand—not shrink—the largely repressive arm of big government's counter-terrorism-military-surveillance-intelligence complex.

Indeed, neoliberals have attacked what they call big government when it has provided crucial safety nets for the poor and dispossessed, but they have no qualms about using the government to bail out the airline industry after the economic nosedive that followed the 2000 election of George W. Bush and the events of 9/11. Nor are there any expressions of outrage from free market cheerleaders when the state engages in promoting various forms of corporate welfare by providing billions of dollars in direct and indirect subsidies to multinational corporations. In short, the current government responds not to citizens, but citizens with money, bearing no obligation for the swelling ranks of the poor or for the collective future of young people.

The liberal democratic lexicon of rights, entitlements, social provisions, community, social responsibility, living wage, job security, equality, and justice seem oddly out of place in a country where the promise of democracy—and the institutions necessary for its survival over generations—have been gutted, replaced by casino capitalism, a winner-take-all philosophy suited to lotto players and day traders alike. As corporate culture extends even deeper into the basic institutions of civil and political society, buttressed daily by a culture industry in the hands of a few media giants, free market ideology is reinforced even further by the pervasive fear and insecurity of the public, who have little accessibility to countervailing ideas and believe that the future holds nothing beyond a watered-down version of the present. As the prevailing discourse of neoliberalism seizes the public imagination, there is no vocabulary for progressive social change, democratically inspired visions, critical notions of social agency, or the kinds of institutions that expand the meaning and purpose of democratic public life. In the vacuum left by diminishing democracy, a new kind of authoritarianism steeped in religious zealotry, cultural chauvinism, xenophobia, and racism has become the dominant trope of neoconservatives and other extremist groups eager to take advantage of the growing insecurity,

fear, and anxiety that result from increased joblessness, the war on terror, and the unraveling of communities.

As a result of the consolidated corporate attack on public life, the maintenance of democratic public spheres from which to launch a moral vision or to engage in a viable struggle over institutions and political vision loses all credibility—as well as monetary support. As the alleged wisdom and common sense of neoliberal ideology remains largely unchallenged within dominant pseudo-public spheres, individual critique and collective political struggles become more difficult.<sup>1</sup> Dominated by extremists, the Bush administration is driven by an arrogance of power and inflated sense of moral righteousness mediated largely by a show of certitude and neverending posture of triumphalism. As George Soros (2004) points out, this rigid ideology driven by missionary zeal allows the Bush administration to believe that “because we are stronger than others, we must know better and we must have right on our side. This is where religious fundamentalism comes together with market fundamentalism to form the ideology of American supremacy” (p. 1).

## II

As public space is increasingly commodified and the state becomes more closely aligned with capital, politics is defined largely by its policing functions rather than as an agency for peace and social reform. As the state abandons its social investments in health, education, and the public welfare, it increasingly takes on the functions of an enhanced security or police state, the signs of which are most visible in the increasing use of the state apparatus to spy on and arrest its subjects, the incarceration of individuals considered disposable (primarily poor people of color), and the ongoing criminalization of social policies. Nowhere is this more evident than in the nation's schools. Part of the reason for the continuing crisis in American public schooling is due to federal cuts in education ongoing since the Reagan administration. The stated rationale for such a shift in national priorities is that American public schools are bureaucratic, wasteful, and altogether ineffectual—the result of a “big government” monopoly on education. As a result of such inefficiency, the public school system poses a threat to national security and U.S. economic dominance in the world market. To be sure, some public schools are really ailing, but the reasons for this, according to David Berliner and Bruce Biddle (1996), authors of *The Manufactured Crisis*, have to do with the grossly unequal funding of public education, residential segregation, the astonishingly high poverty rates of U.S. school children relative to most other industrialized nations, coupled with inadequate health care and social services. Preferring the former diagnosis of general ineptitude, the current administration insists that throwing money at schools will not cure public school ills and will no longer be tolerated.

Rather than address the complexity of educational inequalities disproportionately affecting poor and minority students, the George W. Bush adminis-



tration sought solutions to troubled public schools in the much touted No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation, which afforded certain key advantages to constituencies in favor of privatization, all the while appearing sympathetic to the plight of poor and minority youth. Not only do they maintain the advantages accorded White students who perform better on average than Black and Latino students on standardized tests, the proposed school reforms were also very business friendly. Renamed “No Child Left Untested” by critics, the reform places high priority on accountability, tying what little federal monies schools receive to improve test performance. For additional financial support, public schools are left no other meaningful option than engaging in public/private partnerships, like the highly publicized deals cut with soft drink giants that provide schools with needed revenue in exchange for soda machines in cafeterias. And it is clear that media giants who own the major publishing houses will benefit from the 52 million-strong market of public school students now required to take tests every year from the third grade on.

The effect of NCLB also proved highly televisable, visibility now a key factor in the art of persuading a public weaned from political debate in favor of the spectacle. Thus, the media provide routine reportage of school districts’ grade cards, public—often monetary—rewards given to those schools that score high marks on achievement tests, liquidation of those that don’t. Media preoccupation with school safety issues, moreover, ensured highly publicized expulsion, sometimes felony incarceration, of troublemakers, typically students of color. In short, accountability for teachers and administrators and zero tolerance for students who commit even the most minor infractions are the new educational imperatives, all of which demonstrate that the federal government is “doing something” to assuage public fears about the nation’s schools that it largely created through financial deprivation and policies favoring resegregation. As a result, financially strapped schools spend precious resources on testing and prep materials as well as new safety measures, such as metal detectors, armed guards, security cameras, and fencing, in accordance with NCLB. In addition to draining public schools financially, both high stakes testing and zero tolerance policies have served to push out or kick out Black and Latino youth in disproportionate numbers, as has been extensively documented by Henry Giroux (2003) in *The Abandoned Generation*, Ayers, Ayers, and Dohrn (2001) in *Zero Tolerance*, and Gary Orfield and Mindy Kornhaber (2001) in *Raising Standards or Raising Barriers?* As democracy becomes a burden under the reign of neoliberalism, civic discourse disappears or is subsumed by a growing authoritarianism in which politics is translated into unquestioning allegiance to authority and secular education is disdained as a violation of God’s law.

Market fundamentalism increasingly appears at odds with any viable notion of critical education, and seems even more ominous as it aligns itself with the ideologies of militarism and religious fundamentalism. The democratic character of critical pedagogy is defined largely through a set of basic assumptions, which holds that knowledge, power, values, and institutions must be made



available to critical scrutiny, be understood as a product of human labor (as opposed to God-given), and evaluated in terms of how they might open up or close down democratic practices and experiences. Yet, critical pedagogy is about more than simply holding authority accountable through the close reading of texts, the creation of radical classroom practices, or the promotion of critical literacy. It is also about linking learning to social change, education to democracy, and knowledge to acts of intervention in public life. Critical pedagogy encourages students to learn to register dissent, as well as to take risks in creating the conditions for forms of individual and social agency that are conducive to a substantive democracy. Part of the challenge of any critical pedagogy is making schools and other sites of pedagogy safe from the baneful influence of market logics—ranging from the discourses of privatization and consumerism, the methodologies of standardization and accountability, and new disciplinary techniques of surveillance, expulsion, and incarceration aimed at the throwaways of global capital, principally poor youth and youth of color.

Resisting such a radical challenge to democratic principles and practices means that educators need to rethink the important presupposition that public education cannot be separated from the imperatives of a nonrepressive and inclusive democratic order and that the crisis of public education must be understood as part of the wider crisis of politics, power, and culture. Recognizing the inextricable link between education and politics is central to reclaiming the sanctity of public education as a democratic public sphere, necessarily free of the slick come-ons of corporate advertisers or, for that matter, Junior Reserved Officers Training Corps (JROTC). Central, too, is the recognition that politics cannot be separated from the pedagogical force of culture. Pedagogy should provide the theoretical tools and resources necessary for understanding how culture works as an educational force, how public education connects to other sites of pedagogy, and how identity, citizenship, and agency are organized through pedagogical relations and practices. Rather than viewed as a technical method, pedagogy must be understood as a moral and political practice that always presupposes particular renditions of what represents legitimate knowledge, values, citizenship, modes of understanding, and views of the future.

Moreover, pedagogy as a critical practice should provide the classroom conditions that provide the knowledge, skills, and culture of questioning necessary for students to engage in critical dialogue with the past, question authority (whether sacred or secular) and its effects, struggle with ongoing relations of power, and prepare themselves for what it means to be critical, active citizens in the interrelated local, national, and global public spheres. Of course, acknowledging that pedagogy is political because it is always tangled up with power, ideologies, and the acquisition of agency does not mean that it is, by default, propagandistic, closed, dogmatic, or uncritical of its own authority. Most important, any viable notion of critical pedagogy must demonstrate that there

is a difference between critical pedagogical practices and propagandizing, critical teaching, and demagoguery. Such a pedagogy should be open and discerning, fused with a spirit of inquiry that fosters rather than mandates critical modes of individual and social agency.

We believe that if public education is a crucial sphere for creating citizens equipped to exercise their freedoms and competent to question the basic assumptions that govern democratic political life, teachers in both public schools and higher education will have to assume their responsibility as citizen-scholars by taking critical positions, relating their work to larger social issues, offering students knowledge, debate, and dialogue about pressing social problems, and providing the conditions for students to have hope and believe that civic life matters, that they can make a difference in shaping it so as to expand its democratic possibilities for all groups. It means taking positions and engaging practices currently at odds with both religious fundamentalism and neoliberal ideology. Educators now face the daunting challenge of creating new discourses, pedagogies, and collective strategies that will offer students the hope and tools necessary to revive the culture of politics as an ethical response to the demise of democratic public life. Such a challenge suggests struggling to keep alive those institutional spaces, forums, and public spheres that support and defend critical education, helping students come to terms with their own power as individual and social agents, exercise civic courage, and engage in community projects and research that are socially responsible, while refusing to surrender knowledge and skills to the highest bidder. In part, this requires pedagogical practices that connect the space of language, culture, and identity to their deployment in larger physical and social spaces. Such a pedagogy is based on the presupposition that it is not enough to teach students to break with accepted ideas. They must also learn to directly confront the threat from fundamentalisms of all varieties that seek to turn democracy into a mall, a sectarian church, or a wing of the coming carceral state, a set of options that must be understood as an assault on democracy.

There are those critics who in tough economic times insist that providing students with anything other than work skills threatens their future viability on the job market. Although we believe that public education should equip students with skills to enter the workplace, it should also educate them to contest workplace inequalities, imagine democratically organized forms of work, and identify and challenge those injustices that contradict and undercut the most fundamental principles of freedom, equality, and respect for all people who make up the global public sphere. Public education is about more than job preparation or even critical consciousness raising; it is also about imagining different futures and politics as a form of intervention in public life. In contrast to the cynicism and political withdrawal that media culture fosters, a critical education demands that its citizens be able to translate the interface of private considerations and public issues, be able to recognize those antidemocratic forces that deny social, economic, and political justice, and be willing to give some

thought to their experiences as a matter of anticipating and struggling for a better world. In short, democratic rather than commercial values should be the primary concerns of both public education and the university.

If right-wing reforms in public education continue unchallenged, the consequences will reflect a society in which a highly trained, largely White elite will command the techno-information revolution while a vast, low-skilled majority of poor and minority workers will be relegated to filling the McJobs proliferating in the service sector. In contrast to this vision, we strongly believe that genuine, critical education cannot be confused with job training. If educators and others are to prevent this distinction from becoming blurred, it is crucial to challenge the ongoing corporatization of public schools while upholding the promise of the modern social contract in which all youth, guaranteed the necessary protections and opportunities, are a primary source of economic and moral investment, symbolizing the hope for a democratic future. In short, we need to recapture our commitment to future generations by taking seriously the Protestant theologian Dietrich Bonhoeffer's belief that the ultimate test of morality for any democratic society resides in the condition of its children. If public education is to honor this ethical commitment, it will have to not only reestablish its obligation to young people but also reclaim its role as a democratic public sphere.

Our insistence on the promise of critical pedagogy is not a call for any one ideology on the political spectrum to determine the shape of the future direction of public and university education. But at the same time, it reflects a particular vision of the purpose and meaning of public and higher education and their crucial role in educating students to participate in an inclusive democracy. Critical pedagogy is an ethical referent and a call to action for educators, parents, students, and others to reclaim public education as a democratic public sphere, a place where teaching is not reduced to learning how either to master tests or to acquire low level jobs skills, but a safe space where reason, understanding, dialogue, and critical engagement are available to all faculty and students. Public education, in this reading, becomes a site of ongoing struggle to preserve and extend the conditions in which autonomy of judgment and freedom of action are informed by the democratic imperatives of equality, liberty, and justice. Public education has always, although within damaged traditions and burdened forms, served as a symbolic and concrete reminder that the struggle for democracy is, in part, an attempt to liberate humanity from the blind obedience to authority and that individual and social agency gain meaning primarily through the freedoms guaranteed by the public sphere, where the autonomy of individuals only becomes meaningful under those conditions that guarantee the workings of an autonomous society. Critical pedagogy is a reminder that the educational conditions that make democratic identities, values, and politics possible and effective have to be fought for more urgently at a time when democratic public spheres, public goods, and public spaces are under attack by market and other ideological fundamentalists who either

believe that corporations in top competitive form can solve all human affliction or that dissent is comparable to aiding terrorists—positions that share the common denominator of disabling a substantive notion of ethics, politics, and democracy.

We live in very dark times, yet as educators, parents, activists, and workers, we can address the current assault on democracy by building local and global alliances and engaging in struggles that acknowledge and transcend national boundaries, while demonstrating how these intersect with people's everyday lives. Democratic struggles cannot underemphasize the special responsibility of intellectuals to shatter the conventional wisdom and myths of neoliberalism with its stunted definition of freedom and its depoliticized and dehistoricized definition of its own alleged inevitability. As the late Pierre Bourdieu (1998) argued, any viable politics that challenges neoliberalism must refigure the role of the state in limiting the excesses of capital and providing important social provisions. In particular, social movements must address the crucial issue of education as it develops both formally and informally throughout the cultural sphere because the "power of the dominant order is not just economic, but intellectual—lying in the realm of beliefs" (Bourdieu & Grass, 2003, p. 66), and it is precisely within the domain of ideas that a sense of utopian possibility can be restored to the public realm. Pedagogy in this instance is not simply about critical thinking but also about social engagement, a crucial element of not just learning but politics itself.

Most specifically, democracy necessitates forms of education and critical pedagogical practices that provide a new ethic of freedom and a reassertion of collective identity as central preoccupations of a vibrant democratic culture and society. Such a task, in part, suggests that intellectuals, artists, unions, and other progressive individuals and movements create teach-ins all over the country in order to name, critique, and connect the forces of market fundamentalism to the war at home and abroad, the shameful tax cuts for the rich, the dismantling of the welfare state, the attack on unions, the erosion of civil liberties, the incarceration of a generation of young black and brown men and women, the attack on public schools, and the growing militarization of public life. As Bush's credibility crisis grows, the time has come to link the matters of economics with the crisis of political culture and to connect the latter to the crisis of democracy itself. We need a new language for politics, for analyzing where it can take place, and what it means to mobilize various alliances to reclaim, as Cornel West has aptly put it, hope in dark times.

## Note

1. Of course, there is widespread resistance to neoliberalism and its institutional enforcers such as the WTO and IMF among many intellectuals, students, and global justice movements, but this resistance rarely gets aired in the dominant media and, if it does, it is often dismissed as irrelevant or tainted by Marxist ideology.

## References

- Aronowitz, S. (1998). Introduction. In P. Freire (Ed.), *Pedagogy of freedom*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Aronowitz, S. (2003). *How class works*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ayers, R., Ayers, W., & Dohrn, B. (Eds.). (2001). *Zero tolerance: Resisting the drive for punishment*. New York: The New Press.
- Berliner, D., & Biddle, B. (1996). *Manufacturing crisis*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Bluestone, B., & Harrison, B. (1982). *The deindustrialization of America: Plant closings, community abandonment and the dismantling of basic industry*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Acts of resistance: Against the tyranny of the market*. New York: The New Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Grass, G. (2003, March-April). The "progressive" restoration: A Franco-German dialogue. *New Left Review*, 14, 63-77.
- Giroux, H. (2003). *The abandoned generation*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Henwood, D. (2003). *After the new economy*. New York: The New Press.
- Krugman, P. (2003). *The great unraveling: Losing our way in the new century*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Orfield, G., & Kornhaber, M. (2000). *Raising standards or raising barriers*. New York: Century Foundation Press.
- Phillips, K. (2003). *Wealth and democracy: A political history of the American rich*. New York: Broadway.
- Soros, G. (2004, January 26). The US is now in the hands of a group of extremists. *The Guardian/UK*. Retrieved from [www.commondreams.org/views04/0126-01.htm](http://www.commondreams.org/views04/0126-01.htm)
- Steinmetz, G. (2003). The state of emergency and the revival of American imperialism: Toward an authoritarian post-Fordism. *Public Culture*, 15(2), 323-346.
- West, C. (2004). Finding hope in dark times. *Tikkun*, 19(4), 18-20.

**Henry A. Giroux** is the Global Television Network Chair in English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University. His most recent books are *Against the New Authoritarianism* (Arbeiter Ring, 2005) and *Border Crossings* (2nd ed., Routledge, 2005).

**Susan Searls Giroux** is an assistant professor in the Department of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University. She is the coauthor of *The Theory Toolbox*, the coauthor of *Take Back Higher Education*, and the managing editor of *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies*.