

Encounters on Education Encuentros sobre Educación Rencontres sur l'Éducation

Volume 1, Fall / Otoño / Automne 2000

Building Common Spaces: Citizenship and Education in Canada and Spain

Construyendo espacios comunes: Ciudadanía y Educación en Canadá y España

Construisant des espaces communs: L'Éducation et la Citoyeneté au Canada et en Espagne

-A monograph series that attempts to initiate a critical dialogue among educational researchers from Canada, Spain and Latin America in light of the process of internationalization and economic globalization.

Serie monográfica que pretende establecer un diálogo crítico entre investigadores de la educación en Canadá, España y América Latina, a la vista de los procesos de internacionalización y de globalización económica.

C'est une Série monographique qui essaie d'inaugurer un dialogue critique parmi les chercheurs éducatifs du Canada, l'Espagne, et l'Amérique Latine à la lumière du processus de l'internationalisation et de la globalisation économique.

Encounters on Education/Encuentros sobre Educación/Rencontres d'Éducation is published once a year by the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba and the Departamento de Teoría e Historia de la Educación, Universidad Complutense, Madrid. Single issues are (Canadian) \$20. Changes of address and subscription information should be addressed to Julianna Enns, Co-Managing Editor, Faculty of Education, The University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, R3T 2N2 or Dr. David Reyer, Co-Editor Ejecutivo, Departamento de Teoría e Historia de la Educación, Facultad de Educación, Universidad Complutense, Calle Rector Royo Villanova s/n, 28040 – Madrid, España. All Encounters material is copyrighted. Written permission must be obtained from the editors for copying or reprinting tables, figures, or more than 500 words of text. Manuscripts and correspondence in English should be addressed to Dr. Rosa Bruno-Jofré, Dean, Faculty of Education, Queen's University, Duncan McArthur Hall, Kingston, Ontario, K7L 3N6; in Spanish should be addressed to Dr. Gonzalo Jover, Departamento de Teoría e Historia de la Educación, Facultad de Educación, Universidad Complutense, Calle Rector Royo Villanova s/n, 28040 – Madrid, España. The submissions are subject to peer and Board review. Authors whose manuscripts are accepted for publication will be asked to supply a copy on diskette.

Canadian Higher Education and Citizenship in the Context of State Restructuring and Globalization

Jamie-Lynn Magnusson

OISE/University of Toronto

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the reshaping of higher education within a neoliberal paradigm of economic development and the implications for universities and colleges as sites of citizenship formation. The work of Torfing, in particular his critical integration of the work of Laclau, Mouffe, and Zizek, provides the theoretical framework for the analysis. After revisiting the relation between higher education and the development of the welfare state, the paper examines the restructuring that is taking place in curriculum, pedagogical method, governance, and administration. Constructivism, dominant paradigm in educational circles, the author argues, supports the neoliberal ideology within the global economy. The implications of the changes are also evident in the deregulation of fees and the sanctioning of private degree-granting institutions. The paper not only examines how the institutions are contributing to the expansion of the hegemonic discourse but also refers to emancipatory movements emerging from the areas of health, environment, social equity, and motivated by democratic concerns. Higher education has a role in political resistance.

RESUMEN

Este capítulo explora la reorganización de la educación superior canadiense dentro del paradigma neoliberal de desarrollo económico y considera las implicaciones para las instituciones de educación superior viéndolas como sitios de formación ciudadana. La integración crítica que hace Torfing de los trabajos de Laclau, Mouffe, y Zizek proveen la base teórica para la discusión en este capítulo. Después de visitar la relación de la educación superior con el desarrollo del estado del bienestar, el capítulo analiza la re-estructuración que se está llevando a cabo en los programas de enseñanza, método pedagógico, administración y gobierno. El constructivismo, paradigma dominante en círculos educativos, la autora argumenta, apoya la ideología neoliberal dentro de las economías globales. Las consecuencias son también evidentes a la vista del levantamiento de controles para las matrículas en al menos dos provincias, y el permiso dado a instituciones privadas para proveer

grados académicos. No sólo analiza cómo las instituciones están colaborando en la expansión del discurso hegemónico sino que introduce movimientos emancipatorios en áreas de salud, ambiente, equidad social, y relacionados por una preocupación democrática. La educación superior tiene un papel en la resistencia política.

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article examine la réorganisation de l'éducation supérieure dans un paradigme néolibéral du développement économique et les implications pour les universités et les collèges comme sites de la formation sur la citoyenneté. L'oeuvre de Torfing, en particulier son intégration critique du travail de Laclau, Mouffe et Zizek, fournit le cadre théorique pour l'analyse. Après avoir revisité le rapport entre l'éducation supérieure et le développement de l'Etat-providence, l'article examine la restructuration qui a lieu dans le programme d'études, la méthode pédagogique, le gouvernement et l'administration. Le constructivisme, paradigme dominant dans les cercles éducatifs, l'auteur soutient, appuie l'idéologie néolibérale à l'intérieur de l'économie globale. Les implications des changements sont aussi évidentes dans la libération du contrôle des frais scolaires et l'approbation accordée aux institutions privées de fournir des diplômes académiques. L'article examine non seulement comment les institutions sont en train de collaborer avec l'expansion du discours hégémonique mais aussi fait référence aux mouvements émancipateurs qui émergent des domaines de la santé, de l'environnement, d'équité sociale, et qui sont motivés par des préoccupations démocratiques. L'éducation supérieure a un rôle dans la résistance politique.

Introduction

Given that the Canadian higher education system as we know it today evolved within the imperatives of the capitalist nation state during the postwar years, the sparse attention paid to issues of citizenship and higher education is quite surprising. The development of Canadian higher education during the postwar years served very particular purposes in the expansion of the Keynesian welfare state. As a result of the ways in which the system was formed within these political and economic relations, the issue of citizenship is complex. For example, although higher education is often represented as a valuable resource by which civic literacy can be enriched, this literacy is nevertheless culturally conditioned by progressivist discourses that propose reforms while keeping intact the basic economic framework characterized by "private property, free markets, and the emphasis on individual achievement."¹ That citizenship and higher education has not been the subject of much scholarly study is very likely due to the ways in which the field of studies we call "higher education" has been constituted through hegemonic progressivist discourses. These discourses emphasize issues such as

1 C. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State*, (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1999), 49.

access to postsecondary education and individual achievement motivation rather than question the citizenship assumptions inherent in the ways in which these questions are framed. The reason that the question of citizenship emerges now is likely due to the restructuring of the political economy in ways that interrogate the meaning of nation, national identity, citizenship, democracy, civil rights, and civic responsibilities within an emerging discursive arena of neoliberal transnational economics.

The framework used in this paper is grounded in Torfing's critical integration of the works of Laclau, Mouffe, and Žižek.² A key characteristic of this framework is that political economies are conceptualized as discursive formations. This framework permits questions of identity and citizenship to be theorised in terms of constructs such as nation state, as an historically contingent category constituted through discursive practices. The work of Žižek is useful with respect to recasting the ways in which higher education is implicated in ideology, such that higher education is viewed not so much as a state ideological apparatus in an Althusserian sense, but rather as functional in constructing and maintaining ideology as fantasy.³

Žižek proposes that ideology is social fantasy that masks its own constitutive impossibility: capitalism is productive of exploitative relations, yet through ideological fantasies, we participate in these social relations as if they were the highest forms of egalitarian social arrangements (e.g., neoliberal freemarket ideology). To the extent that capitalism and egalitarian participation in social reality are inherently antagonistic, Žižek concludes that ideological fantasy is a necessary counterpart to Laclau and Mouffe's concept of antagonism, which in turn is an important concept in theorizing social construction of identity and citizenship.⁴ Their notion is that hegemonic discourse is always established antagonistically through political struggle, and necessarily entails oppression and repression. Social identity, then, is constructed through hegemonic discourses that are theoretically embedded within the political economy as a discursive formation. This paper examines these dynamics in relation to higher education and citizenship, emphasizing the shift from welfare state economics to neoliberal transnational economics.

Canadian Higher Education and the Expansion of the Welfare State

The transition from a Keynesian paradigm of national economic development to a neoliberal transnational paradigm has forced an exploration of issues of citizenship that can be examined with specific reference to higher education in Canada. To promote the understanding of Canadian economic restructuring the works of

2 J. Torfing, *New Theories of Discourse: Laclau, Mouffe, and Žižek* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999); and S. Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (London: Verso, 1989).

3 Žižek, *Sublime Object of Ideology*.

4 E. Laclau and C. Mouffe, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* (London: Verso, 1985).

Teeple and Bakker will be discussed.⁵ Additionally, the works of Amin will be used to contextualise the Canadian experience from a global perspective.⁶

In this discussion Teeple's view is taken, that the social welfare state is an aspect of the development of "industrial capitalism and the subordination of landed property to capital within the political framework of the nation-state."⁷ According to this view, the social justice concessions made by organized capital were predicated on a delimited labour market confined within national boundaries, and, as well, the relatively closed national economy that existed prior the era of restructuring. The interventionist state functioned to protect the labour market for the needs of industry through an elaborate structure of education, healthcare, employment insurance, and so on. Moreover, it mediated class conflict, prepared new members to enter the market, and took care of workers during low points of natural economic cycles when unemployment was high.

Teeple suggests that state interventions occurred in four overlapping arenas of social reproduction. The first arena involves "the physical propagation of the working class and its preparation for the labour market"⁸ Included within this arena would be education systems, health care, and various social benefits. The second arena is the labour market, within which the state intervenes by way of regulating minimum wage and labour practices in order to maintain an adequate supply of fresh workers. The third arena involves what Teeple refers to as the "point of production": "the point of contact between the workers and the representatives of capital and the point at which labour has submitted to the dictates of capital."⁹ That is, the state intervenes to provide a framework for negotiating class conflict through labour laws and state mechanisms related to collective bargaining. Finally, the fourth arena involves state interventions that provide social welfare for the "unproductive" or "post-productive" segment of the population.

Often referred to as the Keynesian welfare state, after John Maynard Keynes, an economist who outlined many principles associated with developing a national welfare state, the welfare state was primarily a post-WW II economic paradigm.¹⁰ The paradigm was a way to reconstruct capitalism in industrialized countries during a time in which industrialism showed signs of frailty in the aftermath of the war and the great depression.

5 G. Teeple, *Globalization and the Decline of Social Reform* (Toronto: Garamond Press, 1995); I. Bakker, ed., *Rethinking Restructuring: Gender and Change in Canada* (Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1996). Also see Bakker, *The Strategic Silence: Gender and Economic Policy* (London: Zed Books in association with The North-South Institute, Ottawa, 1994).

6 S. Amin, *Capitalism in the Age of Globalization* (London: Zed Books, 1997).

7 Teeple, *Globalization*, 11.

8 *Ibid.*, 15.

9 *Ibid.*

10 J.M. Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money* (Cambridge: University Press, 1973).

An important consequence that the development of the welfare state had for higher education in Canada, as well as most industrialized nations, was the transition from elite higher education to mass higher education. From the perspective of capital accumulation, the Keynesian welfare paradigm was successful, and the welfare state, including access to higher education, expanded. According to Sayer, the needs of the welfare state involved an increasingly advanced, unprecedented division of labour and stratified labour market.¹¹ As the national social welfare state evolved, higher education had to be expanded to provide the kind of training required for people to take up positions within the growing private and public sectors. The university sector continued to expand into the 1960s and early 1970s in Canada, and in the 1960s the community college systems developed to meet the technical skill needs of the growing industrial sector.¹² The capitalist state as a regulating agent of higher education, then, pursued the expansion of higher education such that it became an extension of state bureaucracy, which, in terms of its increasingly elaborate welfare structure, was an extension of the needs of a nationalistically organized industrial economy predicated on Keynesian-like policies.

Financing the Keynesian welfare state required several requisites: 1) state indebtedness and expenditures during and after the war, 2) globalized labour market supply exploiting countries that had become economically marginalised as a result of colonialism, and (3) mass consumption through development of domestic markets.¹³ This last characteristic was achieved through advancement of Fordism, which allowed for a means of mass production reproduced through wage increases that allowed, as Torfing suggests, "workers to purchase the standardized consumer goods they themselves produced at the semi-automatic assembly lines".¹⁴

Torfing suggests that these features of the modern welfare state can be examined in terms of discourse theory by conceptualizing political-economies as discursive formations. Within the discursive formation of the welfare state, higher education was productive of social science knowledges - theories and methodologies - that were to serve the growing need to "rationally" manage and plan the public and private sectors. Torfing writes:

The concrete mode of organization of administrative and economic institutions was informed, first, by discourses of Weberian bureaucracy (hierarchical control) and Taylorism (scientific management) and, later, by the discourses of Human Relations (manipulation of informal norms and habits). Common to these discourses was the attempt to increase efficiency, maximize control, and unify complex and fragmented institutions. However, complexity and

11 A. Sayer, *Radical Political Economy: A Critique* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1995).

12 J.D. Dennison, *Challenge and Opportunity: Canada's Community Colleges at the Crossroads* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1995).

13 Teeple, *Globalization*, 18.

14 J. Torfing, 228.

fragmentation were inevitable consequences of the growing size of public and private institutions, which was motivated by economists' appraisal of economies of scale. Indeed the largest Fordist factories were constructed as the exemplary model for the design of both public and private organizations.¹⁵

The Fordist-bureaucratized formation described above is relevant in only certain respects to Canadian postwar economy in terms of the ways in which higher education evolved. For example, Canada's political economy has been shaped by the interrelated themes of colonial origins, layers of staple trade industries, hinterland economics, and in the more industrialized areas such as southern Ontario, branch plant economics.¹⁶ These uniquely Canadian characteristics make it difficult to grossly over-generalize, for example, the characteristics of the United States welfare state formation to Canada. Nevertheless, the comparison is relevant to a certain extent in that Canadian universities developed primarily during the post-war years and adopted the institutional form of the U.S. universities. These had been systematically shaped by United States capital, particularly through the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, to emphasize research and graduate education infrastructure and to support technology and innovation in both the sciences and social sciences.¹⁷ The institutional form of these universities, with the loosely organized departmental structure, allowed for knowledge production to be regulated through national funding bodies that could exert influence on the nationally organized professional and research societies, which were dominated by corporate interests.¹⁸

Hence, in Canada, the university sector of the higher education system was developed just after the United States undertook a nationally orchestrated reform of its universities, and adopted the institutional form of the departmentally organized research institution. Barrow suggests that this departmental structure was further reinforced by Cooke, who was hired by the Carnegie Foundation to undertake a major study of United States higher education from the vantage point of Taylor's scientific management.¹⁹ Cooke, an engineer by training and a disciple of Taylor's, developed social engineering and statistical concepts which were published in his report "Academic and Industrial Efficiency". The report achieved for the first time the proletarianization of academic faculty. Rather than having research and teaching

15 *Ibid.*, 229.

16 An especially helpful series of discussions on characteristics of the Canadian economy can be found in *Rethinking Canadian Political Economy*, a special issue of *Studies in Political Economy: A Socialist Review* (1981).

17 See, for example, R.L. Geiger, *To Advance Knowledge: The Growth of American Research Universities, 1900-1940* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986); C. Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State*; and D. Noble, *America by Design* (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1977).

18 Barrow, *Universities and the Capitalist State*.

19 *Ibid.*

remain in the control of individual professors, Cooke's notion was to achieve greater regulation of what was taught, how it was taught, and what type of research was conducted.²⁰

In the United States, national councils and societies had emerged that were influenced by governing bodies which represented corporate interests. Through this organizational structure, the interests of the capitalist state could steer the curricula of undergraduate, professional, and graduate education in accordance with corporate imperatives. As Canadian universities developed, they not only followed the United States' institutional model, but were as much influenced, in many respects, by American national research councils and societies. For example, achieving legitimacy as a Canadian scientist or social scientist often entailed presenting one's work in United States research/scholarly societies, and publishing in the highly regulated, peer-reviewed research journals affiliated with these societies. Of course, Canadian universities could also be steered to address particularistic needs through the national funding bodies that eventually emerged. Examples of particularistic interests in the social sciences include the various strands of research and scholarship that fed into the discourse of multiculturalism (within a bilingual framework) emerged during the 1970's.

As industrialism proceeded within a Keynesian policy paradigm, Canadian universities could be regulated according to the needs of the capitalist welfare state. The community colleges were designed at the outset to be highly regulated through state bureaucracy in terms of their governance, administration, and curricula. Hence, Canadian higher education was discursively constituted through the welfare state, and could serve as an important site of citizenship formation through science, technology, and social science education which were productive of knowledges and skills required by the bureaucratized structures of both the public and private sectors. These knowledges included, as suggested above, methodologies and theories of hierarchical control, scientific management, and human resources. Of course, the epistemological and methodological companion to scientific management was logical positivism, which dominated the social sciences during these years. These were discursive practices characteristic of Fordist-bureaucratic welfare state formations and expanding through the universities.

An important point made by Noble in *America by Design* is that technical education, in terms of its pedagogy and curricula, involves much more than cultivating technical skills. Hence, hegemonic discourses associated with Fordism were likewise advanced through the community colleges that were primarily technical institutes. As Noble suggests:

The notion of a "citizen army" greatly expanded the scope of military activities which were now aimed at the preparation of the entire citizenry for possible military service: the new military creed, which identified training for

20 Ibid.

industry with military training, coincided nicely with the corporate need for an “industrial army” of properly adjusted and assembled “economic units.”²¹

“Proper adjustment” in technical education entailed attitudes and dispositions appropriate to the industrial setting: “corporate responsibility, teamwork, service, and loyalty” as well as “proper training in the social sciences and humanities which was increasingly being perceived as the key to effective management.”²² Hence, both the university and college sectors of the higher education system were viewed by the capitalist state as important in terms of citizenship formation.

The higher education system, through its curricula and institutional organization, was used to achieve expansion of hegemonic discourses of progressivism that supported the development of the welfare state. As mentioned earlier, progressivism refers to a conservative program of reform that achieves improvements in labour through regulated business practices and the like, but at the same time leaves intact the basic economic framework. Progressivist discourses in the social sciences, for example, emphasize individual achievement, which supports an economic framework of “free market,” and, at the same time, occludes systemic inequities in terms of how much achievement is allowed. Progressivism is therefore ideologically aligned with corporate interests and the corporate establishment, but is cast as a liberal democratic discourse. Hence, through discourses of progressivism, notions of citizenship and democracy are aligned with the interests of the capitalist state. However, since “democracy” in the liberal bourgeois sense - structured through capitalist imperatives - is a constitutive impossibility, individual freedom and an unfettered terrain of individual achievement are fantasies sustained by, as Zizek would argue, “the ideological *jouis-sense*, enjoyment-in-sense (enjoy-meant), proper to ideology.”²³

Zizek prefers the Lacanian-grounded notion of ideological fantasy to that of Althusser’s process of ideological interpellation through which meanings generated by the ideological machine - State Apparatuses - is internalized. The reason, he argues, is that interpellation does not fully succeed, and the ideological proposition (e.g., “a free market ensures individual freedom and democracy”) is not believable; in fact the ideological proposition is irrational and senseless. Even though we don’t really “buy in” to the ideological proposition, we continue to participate in social reality “as if” we believed the proposition to be true. Therefore, even though at a certain level we are often confronted with the fact that the free market is not really “free,” and is in fact inherently productive of inequities, we continue to participate in social reality “as if” the free market were synonymous with democracy and freedom. As Zizek points out “An ideology really succeeds when even the facts,

21 Noble, *America by Design*, 226.

22 Ibid., 170.

23 S. Zizek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (London: Verso, 1989), 44.

which at first sight contradict it, start to function as arguments in its favour."²⁴ Indeed, we participate in this democratic fantasy with a certain irrational enjoyment in our impossible freedom.

Participation in higher education constituted through the welfare state encourages interpellation of Fordist sensibilities, including social rationality and an aesthetic of consumption that hegemonically articulates consumerism with individual freedom, with individual choice, and therefore with democracy. This sensibility ensures the further expansion of the welfare state by deepening, or cultivating, the domestic market. Like the individualist constructed through psychological theories of motivation, the Fordist subject becomes a mythical, omnipotent consumer of his/her industrial achievements, endowed with near mystical agency and self-determination to excel beyond material barriers and class boundaries.²⁵ Each person is equal in terms of her or his ability to achieve, and also in terms of how he or she benefits from the social welfare state in terms of welfare entitlements.

In the discursive field of the Canadian capitalist welfare state, citizenship is linked to the nation state as a matter of national identity, with notions of entitlements and achievement/consumer opportunities constructed through liberal democratic discourse. That is, everyone is treated the same by the welfare state regardless of other discursively constituted categories such as race or ethnic origin or social class or religion or gender. This equality is constructed through the pluralistic and progressivist discourse of multiculturalism which, in Canada, ideologically casts social identity and difference as liberal and democratic practice bounded by the nation state, which in turn is constructed as a transcendent, essentialist category.²⁶ Multiculturalist discourse constructs hyphenated social identities, thereby reinforcing the nation state as the primary or privileged discursive framework within which identity and citizenship are constituted: Jamaican-Canadian, Irish-Canadian, Chinese-Canadian, German-Canadian, and so on. Social identities that represent categories of political-economic marginalization are constructed as equivalent to social identities of relative economic privilege. Moreover, the hyphenated social identity of Canadian multiculturalism erases Canada's colonial history, and therefore also the racial violence discursively constituted through the construction of the Canadian nation state. For example, we seldom use labels such as "Cree-Canadians" or "Ojibway-Canadians," because that would force an acknowledgement of colonial violence as an inherent aspect of the construction of the Canadian nation state.

Multicultural discourse, then, as mediated through institutions of education, legitimates discursive practices that actively structure relations in ways that are raced, classed, and gendered, and assists us in experiencing our participation

24 Ibid., 49.

25 J. Magnusson, "Higher Education Research and Psychological Inquiry," *Journal of Higher Education*, 68 (1997): 191-211.

26 Magnusson, "Examining Higher Education and Citizenship in a Global Context of Neoliberal Restructuring," *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, in press for 2000.

in these oppressive practices as enjoyable. The hyphenated social identity of Canadian multicultural discourse is constructed antagonistically through hegemonic discourses of liberalism and nationalism that are inherently oppressive and violent. That is, the hyphenated social identity, and the re-articulation of citizenship it achieves, necessarily entails structuring social relations in ways that are productive of economic and political marginalisation.

An important dimension to this discussion entails analysing multiculturalism as capitalist discourse; that is, multiculturalism is a discourse that has proven to be useful in the expansion of the Canadian welfare state. Development of the nationally organized economy was enhanced through immigration, creating an ethnically and racially stratified labour market. By constructing all groups as equal, multicultural discourse eases social antagonisms produced by racist practices, and further legitimates the practice of maintaining a labour market framework characterised by inequitable economic opportunities. Canadian higher education reinforces this practice by making those parts of the system associated with working class skills and knowledges the most accessible to economically marginalized people, and at the same time making other parts of the system (e.g., professional education) least accessible. The higher education system, then, is raced, classed, and gendered, while at the same time is very active in expanding hegemonic discourses of progressivism within a multicultural discursive framework that socially constructs the system as fair and equitable.

Moreover, the bilingual framework of Canadian multicultural policy privileges the nation state as the primary social identity category defining citizenship, thereby politically repressing the sovereignty issues raised by the Francophone community in Quebec. Indeed, the province of Quebec resisted many of the federal economic policies, creating its own welfare state framework with a higher education system that was and still is unique in Canada. In many respects, then, the "Canadian nation state" is itself a contentious political construction, and one that is hegemonically reinforced through the bilingual framework of multiculturalism.

Neoliberal Economic Restructuring

The decline of the social welfare state is often placed in and around the 1970's, and was precipitated by a number of factors and events that will not be described in detail here. Bakker suggests that the restructuring of the Keynesian welfare state was a response to the inevitable pressures of the internationalization of production. As she states:

Broadly referred to as globalization, what it signals is a transformation of the methods and locations of production. Technological and managerial changes are taking place that allow firms to divide different aspects of their operations globally in order to take advantage of the lowest-cost raw materials, the best research and development, the highest quality assembly, and the most effective marketing."²⁷

²⁷ Bakker, *Rethinking Restructuring*, 3.

She goes on to say:

Nation states' responses to transnational production are increasingly circumscribed by a neoliberal consensus that imposes the same demands on all governments: the need to reduce state spending and regulation, maximize exports, and enable market forces to restructure national economies as parts of transnational or regional blocs.²⁸

Teepel further suggests the following policies as particularly characteristic of neoliberalism:²⁹

1. Promoting in an unprecedented manner the primacy of private property rights. Scientists such as Hubbard and Shiva, for example, have contested the extension of private property to include life itself, through the corporate control of genetic engineering research.
2. Advocating "the market" as the means by which all social needs, including social distribution of power and wealth, can be addressed.
3. Establishment of "free market zones" which include special arrangements to encourage corporations to invest. These arrangements could include, for example, duty-free importing, income tax concessions, minimizing employment or environmental regulations, generous state provision of infrastructure, among other things.
4. Deregulation of the economy in terms of minimizing state interventions in the activities of corporations.
5. Privatizing public corporations.
6. Advancing "popular" or "participatory capitalism" which can include: offering shares in a public corporation that is undergoing privatization; employee stock ownership; offering tax incentives to those who use privatized services rather than government services and programs. Teepel suggests that strategies of popular capitalism undermine trade unions and builds public support and consensus for privatization.
7. Tax reforms and reduction of national debt.
8. Downsizing government, restructuring local governments, and dismantling the welfare state.

Neoliberal restructuring has advanced quite a different notion of citizenship, civil rights, and democratic participation than that characterized by the welfare state. Within neoliberal hegemonic discourse, the interventionist state is articulated as a curtailment of individual freedom, thereby achieving a rearticulation of the relation between the state and civil liberties. Specifically, responsibility for social welfare is shifted from the interventionist state and onto private individuals who pay for services that were once public.

²⁸ Ibid., 4.

²⁹ Teepel, *Globalization*.

The importance of Bakker and colleagues' critical examination of restructuring in Canada is that it foregrounds the gender implications of globalization.³⁰ As Bakker argues, standard economic theory conceptualises markets in ways that are imbued with structural power relations.³¹ Her analysis of gendered power relations, moreover, theorizes how these relations are structured by the interplay of race, class, and sexuality. As Brodie argues, the postwar welfare state, although gendered, nevertheless involved social policy that offered some protection to members who were marginalized within market relations.³² That is, the state could impose some limitations on market activities that threatened the health and safety of citizens; the welfare state culturally conditioned notions of entitlements in terms of what citizens could expect by way of state support. Women, particularly those who conformed most to dominant cultural models, benefited from the state in terms of support for mothering and homemaking roles that underscored the social organization of the postwar labor market. However, under neoliberal restructuring, welfare recipients, and especially single mothers, have been singled out as employable, and undeserving of state support. As Brodie suggests, these policy reforms succeed in transforming social and cultural production of social identity, and culturally conditions notions of entitlements.³³

The notion of universal benefits and entitlements, such as postsecondary education, health care, and the like, are being undermined. Within the discourse of restructuring, in an era of fiscal restraint, the "rich" should not benefit from these kinds of universal entitlements, and only the most disadvantaged should receive support. In the case of postsecondary education, for example, a common tactic is to justify increased tuition fees by reforming policies for student aid. In Ontario, for example, a certain percentage of monies from increased tuition fees are to be allocated to back student funding. The idea is to reform student funding, moving away from a philosophy of universal entitlements (i.e., low and accessible tuition fees) to one that is "targeted"; that is, targeted at economically disadvantaged students who are, at the same time, deemed "meritorious."

These kinds of neoliberal reforms to public policy concerning postsecondary education succeed in erasing how education is structured through interlocking systems of oppression. The discourse of individualism and merit were a part of the progressivist discourse of the welfare state; however that discourse articulated certain relations between citizen, entitlements, and state against a backdrop of public policy practices such as universal entitlements. The new progressivist discourse of neoliberalism achieves a rearticulation of these relations in a manner that justifies the further dissembling of the welfare state, shifting public

30 Bakker, *Rethinking Restructuring*.

31 Bakker, *Strategic Silence*.

32 J. Brodie, "Restructuring and the New Citizenship," in Bakker, *Rethinking Restructuring*, 126-140.

33 *Ibid.*

responsibility onto private “meritorious” individuals. The meritocratic backdrop to the social construction of “deserving” citizens, reinforces and exacerbates economic and political marginalization constitutive of the capitalist state. As national economic relations are restructured onto an unfettered terrain of corporate-regulated globalized markets, this discourse justifies minimizing civic responsibility for the destructive and violent consequences of neoliberal globalization: poverty, starvation, environmental destruction, and so on. Rather than contributing to a social imaginary relevant to global issues of equity, peace, sustainability - that is, a global citizenship framed by emancipatory imperatives - the discourse of neoliberal restructuring at the level of local politics facilitates a destructive and oppressive framework for citizenship at a global level.

The impact of neoliberal restructuring on Canadian higher education has been documented by several writers. Fisher and Rubenson argue that the conservative administrations between the years 1984 and 1993 set the stage for neoliberal economic policies. A national commitment with respect to nurturing connections between universities and industry had been established through position statements and initiatives such as the Corporate-Higher Education Program established during the same time period. Although expansion of neoliberal discourse occurred to some degree during the Mulroney era, the “death blow”, in Brodie’s words, to Canada’s welfare state occurred in 1995 under Liberal federal leadership. She writes:

Instead of redesigning the national system, Finance Minister Paul Martin used the so-called debt crisis and the budget process to shift federal responsibility for social welfare, health care, and postsecondary education onto the provinces. The budget set a two-year limit to phase out the Canada Assistance Plan (CAP) and Established Program Financing (EPF) and to introduce a new block-funding program called the Canada Health and Social Transfer. Under the proposed new regime, the federal government indicated that its contribution to these programs would decrease in future years - indeed by an estimated \$7 billion in the 1995-7 period alone.³⁴

The above reform to federal block-funding policies resulted in funding reductions to postsecondary education that set the stage for restructuring, not only of education but other aspects of the social welfare state. The responses to these cutbacks have varied somewhat from province to province. Characteristics of neoliberal restructuring of the postsecondary system are most pronounced in provinces such as Ontario and Alberta, for example. In these provinces, populist

34 *Ibid.*, 139.

rightwing administrations responded to federal cuts by issuing even further cuts. Both provinces have introduced postsecondary funding contingent on performance appraisals, much like what was used in the United Kingdom to achieve restructuring of its higher education system. Finally, reinvestment strategies through targeted funding have been used to foster close partnerships between universities and corporations.

In most provinces tuition fees have increased significantly, and in the Province of Ontario tuition fees for professional and graduate programs have been completely deregulated. A substantial part of the financial burden to educate students has therefore shifted from the state to private individuals, constructing a framework for inequitable participation in higher education, and particularly in those programs that pay the highest career dividends. Deregulation of designer degrees, such as executive MBAs, IT's (information technology), etc., sets the stage for commodity fetishism with regard to higher education as a consumer commodity.³⁵ Private for-profit publicly traded institutions such as the University of Phoenix is poised to compete for student enrollments in certain provinces that have taken the unprecedented step of sanctioning these private degree-granting institutions.

The implications of these changes to Canadian higher education can be evidenced in research, curricula, pedagogy, institutional form, governance and administration. One interesting study of curricular changes was reported by Shanahan in her comparison of the graduate curricula of a traditional law degree program situated on campus, and a more recent off-campus part-time program offered by the same law school.³⁶ She shows that the off-campus courses, offered in downtown office space, are more oriented to practical skills, legal needs of corporations, and so on. In addition, these courses are taught by practicing lawyers on a contract basis who do not necessarily have advanced degrees themselves. This focus on pragmatic skills, she feels, is a shift away from understanding law practice within a broader framework of social justice, civic life, etc. Similarly, professional and graduate programs of various kinds are becoming more entrepreneurial in terms of packing together curricula in ways that emphasize pragmatic skills; these are marketed to professionals with ample financial means who are willing and able to pay the high, unregulated tuition fees. The focus on pragmatic skills is the result of changes in what constitutes professional knowledge and professional practice in a changing and increasingly market driven landscape: private services that had once been public, the impact of technological innovations, and so on.

35 In my own graduate program, for example, a significant proportion of graduate students (80%) are academic physicians who, in addition to being excellent practitioners, must now earn advanced degrees in education to maintain their academic positions in the faculty of medicine.

36 T. Shanahan, "Corporate Influence on Professional Curriculum: A Case of the Professional Development Program at Osgoode Hall Law School," (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Canadian Society for Studies in Higher Education, Edmonton, AB, May 2000).

Newson has developed a number of insightful discussions concerning the transformation of Canadian universities in terms of: (1) the deterioration of collegial decision-making, (2) the adoption of corporate culture and institutional forms, (3) the subordination of democratic process to market imperatives, and (4) the pervasive impact of globalizing practices on intellectual work³⁷. Meaghan has shown how similar themes related to globalization have impacted community colleges in terms of administration, curricula, and pedagogy.³⁸

These changes to the institutional characteristics of higher education are important in themselves in terms of achieving expansion of neoliberal discursive practices. Moreover, these transformations are supported by changes in social science paradigms that reinforce “new” progressivist discourses associated with the transition from modernist, bureaucratic structures to restructured institutions.

Popkewitz uses Foucault’s notion of governmentality to argue that changes within the educational arena in terms of dominant theories and endorsed practices related to teaching educational management are conditioned by governance patterns and state regulating technologies.³⁹ As he suggests, the construction of subjectivities through local and historically specific practices get taken up as scientific or scholarly discourse that further legitimizes the practice. Kenway argues:

As states struggle to transform their national economies and as they direct their resources accordingly, what we see is a shedding of the welfare responsibilities. In the case of education, then, what we see is a transfer of certain responsibilities and costs away from the state to civil society. Accompanying this shift is an organizational and psychological reorientation of the educational community within the state, encouraging a market/consumer orientation which feeds into the state-sponsored privatization momentum, which then feeds back into it.⁴⁰

The ways in which these transitions manifest in particular kinds scholarly discourses in education include the discursive construction of social science theories of teaching and learning that produce dispositions, rationalities, and competencies that are consistent with the needs of capital in an emerging global

37 For example, refer to J. Currie and J. Newson, *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives* (Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1998).

38 D. Meaghan, “Community Colleges and Globalization,” (paper presented at a guest seminar sponsored by the Higher Education Group, Department of Theory and Policy Studies, Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, University of Toronto, winter, 2000).

39 T. Popkewitz, “Rethinking Decentralization and State/Civil Society Distinctions: The State as a Problematic of Governing,” *Journal of Educational Policy* 11 (1996): 27-51.

40 J. Kenway, C. Bigum and L. Fitzclarence, “Marketing Education in the Postmodern Age,” *Journal of Educational Policy* 8 (1993): 114.

economy. Ball, for example, points out that economically oriented policy makers or ideologically aligned with the so termed 'progressivist' theories of teaching, learning and motivation. These progressivist theories include an emphasis on cooperative participation, process orientation, problem-solving, open-ended investigation, and such.⁴¹

Popkewitz develops a similar argument in his analysis of the ideological implications of constructivism as a conceptual practice in theories of learning:

But the constructivist pedagogies are not neutral strategies to teach 'problem-solving'; they politicize the body through connecting power/knowledge. There is a shift from the individual defined by having particular sets of competencies, skills, knowledge (such as those for cognitive mastery) to the individual who embodies pragmatic capabilities and dispositions.⁴²

Captured in this statement is the general movement away from modernist, bureaucratized forms of social organization, and a concomitant shift away from the social sciences that supported these forms. Post-Fordist emphasis on flexible production, niche marketing, and the dissembling of bureaucratic structures has ushered in a new era in the social science related fields. Within the social sciences, qualitative inquiry within a constructivist epistemology has come to occupy centre stage - or at least a significant portion of centre stage - in the areas of education and evaluation research. The use of focus groups as an inquiry form blends nicely with practices such quality circles and corporate teams, and is discursively supported by constructivism. The constructivist epistemology dissolves authoritative perspectives, placing more emphasis on multiple perspectives, or constructions; this epistemological characteristic blends nicely with the notion of flattened hierarchies, egalitarian participation, and decision-making by consensus. Moreover, within global economies, constructivism, with its notion of plural realities constructed through social and cultural frames, supports neoliberal ideology in that the notion of subjugated realities is absent from the discourse. To capture these realities, inquiry methods such as narrative research are used to capture 'lived experience' as 'storied' (constructed) from the frame of reference of the research participant. The academic legitimation of narrative research, qualitative research, postmodern sensibility, and so on, within a constructivist epistemological framework, signal a shift from positivism as the dominant inquiry paradigm, to the legitimation of other conceptual practices that are equally ideologically motivated.

To summarize this section, postsecondary education in Canada, in terms of its institutional forms, knowledge production, etc., was an important institution by which discourses associated with the ideology of the capitalist welfare state could be expanded. Throughout the period of restructuring, postsecondary education

41 S. Ball, *Foucault and Education: Disciplines and Knowledge* (London: Routledge, 1990).

42 Popkewitz, "Rethinking Decentralization," 40.

has been transforming in ways that are consistent with the “new” ideology of neoliberalism. This transformation is critical not only with respect to the changing needs of the labour market, but also in terms of achieving an expansion of hegemonic discourses associated with neoliberalism. That is, where once the postsecondary system supported nationalistic strategies of capital accumulation, it now supports the interests and imperatives of transnational corporations which are increasingly able to organize their activities beyond any kind of interventionist framework of social equity imperatives. An important contribution of Žižek was to suggest how we can be complicit in continuing to structure social relations consistent with this ideology, even though we recognize the constitutive impossibility of the ideological propositions that structure neoliberal discourse. The social construction of “entitlement,” critical to a framework of civil rights, has been restructured in a way that subordinates these ideas and discursive practices to neoliberal market relations. These relations construct social identities and a framework for citizenship in ways that are inherently antagonist to principles of egalitarian participation. Neoliberal discourse supports our fantasy of egalitarian participation, allowing us to construct and participate in social relations that are structured by the market, and that are inherently productive of systemic oppression, violence, and environmental destruction.

Continuities and Discontinuities

The discussion so far has emphasised the role of higher education in achieving expansion of hegemonic discourses associated with ascendant forms of capitalism. For illustrative purposes the above discussion painted a landscape of neoliberal restructuring and postfordism; the disadvantage of using such broad brush strokes, however, is that the picture is oversimplified. In fact, Fordism, Statism, and Interventionism coexist with emergent characteristics of capitalism in an era of global capital and neoliberalism. Also coexistent with the themes discussed herein are important and influential emancipatory movements in areas such as health, environment, social equity, and democracy. These movements have been occurring at both global and local levels. The main purpose of the paper, then, was to show how postsecondary education can be theorized in relation to citizenship, and also to point to trends that suggest how universities and colleges are complicit in achieving expansion of neoliberal hegemonic discourse. In doing so, the intention here is to increase vigilance with respect to redirecting the activities organized through postsecondary education toward cultural work that is consistent with the various emancipatory movements. This kind of redirection needs to take place through cooperative resistance and coalition building, thereby achieving expansion of an alternative populist discourse that is able to coordinate the social imaginary of local and global emancipatory efforts. Higher education, after all, has been important in many kinds of political resistances, and can continue to play this role in an era of global capital.