

The Corporate, Social Cohesion and Ethnic Models: Initiatives for Educational Policy Framing

JOSÉ ANTONIO E. AUREADA, OP

No matter how violent the demonstrations were: from the debacle in Seattle, the riots in Melbourne, the street protests in Prague, the sporadic street marches in Davos, Genoa, the simultaneous mock-summits in Evian and the flop in Cancún of late, since the inception of the World Economic Forum (WEF) founded by Klaus Schwab in 1971, this eerie image of an ember simply refuses to die down: the debate surrounding the issue of globalization.¹

Globalization – an idol-word or an idiot word? A terrible curse or a great blessing? A global village or a global pillage builder? Is it really globalization or “gobbledization?” Even in the crafting of this series of two-edged inquiries the lights and shadows of globalization are paradoxically obvious.

Now, after two decades (1980-2000)² of swirling the world towards its direction, globalization still is THE buzzword. The

¹ For the origins of the globalization discourse, see M. Marcussen, 2003: “Globalization: A Third Way Gospel that Travels World Wide” in <http://www/ciaonet.org/isa/mam01/>, pp. 7-9.

² For a socio-economic investigation of the last twenty years of globalization (1980-2000) compared to the previous twenty years (1960-1980), see *The Scoreboard on Globalization 1980-2000: Twenty Years of Diminished Progress* at http://www/cepr.net/globalization/Scoreboard_on_globalization.htm

debate continues. Blistering. Enlightening. Entertaining. The optimists "deify" it; the pessimists "demonize" it. No global phenomenon other than globalization has elicited such a diverse "emotive force."³ However, something new has developed in the processes and actions by institutions of globalizations: the riots and protests no longer are coming from underdeveloped and developing countries; but are coming from developed countries as well, as Stiglitz vindicates.⁴

Globalization, aided for its dizzying speed by modern telecommunications, has swirled the world in its own paradoxical axis by a simple mouse click away! Bill Gates once remarked: "If the 1980's were about quality and the 1990's were about re-engineering, the 2000's will be velocity."⁵

For one, the knowledge explosion through optoelectronic technologies or ICTs has innovated extensively as well as intensively knowledge content and pedagogy towards being inter/multi/trans/disciplinary. No longer is the *academia* the sole proprietor of knowledge accumulation, production, and distribution. No wonder, the university has to maintain her competitive edge against private knowledge providers, fierce and aggressive competitors, maybe more

³ IMF 2002: *Globalization: Threat or Opportunity* at <http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/ib/2000/041200.htm>, p. 1.

⁴ See J. E. Stiglitz, 2003: *Globalization and Its Discontents* (W.W. Norton, New York/London), p. 3. Stiglitz, serving as an economic adviser under Pres. Bill Clinton (1993-1997) and as the chief economist and senior vice-president of WB (1997-2000), gives us, in this book, an insightful and penetrating analyses of the insensitive decisions that went through the halls of the IMF and the WB; thus, remaining unfaithful to the original commitment for which they were founded, namely, to help the struggling nations of the South in order to combat global poverty. (particularly pp. 11-22) See also his article "Public Policy for a Knowledge Economy," Remarks at the Department for Trade and Industry and Center for Economic Policy Research (London).

⁵ Chairman and CEO, Microsoft, in A.P. Co, 2002: "Expanding Worldview in a Shrinking Planet: Reading Postmodernism in the Age of Globalization," *Karunungan: A Journal of Philosophy* 19, p. 53.

W. Grulke's lecture "Lessons from the Future" (founder and CEO of Future World, a global business and technology think-tank) equates the year 2000's as the age of Seth, the god of chaos and disorder. His tenth lesson from the future is: "It's one world, one mind, one time wrapped in a digital skin with one internal clock that runs 24 x 7 x 52, the global economy resource base known no boundaries and time zones. Instant response is becoming the norm." (see clmanabet@deloitte.com.ph)

innovative and engaging, mostly multinational corporations.⁶ Some state schools have gone even into the practice of contracting out themselves to private corporations. Corporate universities are in the ascendant bringing with them research and development as a vital component of their core business processes. The aggressive presence of the multinational knowledge providers, the external stakeholders and the corporate universities in the likes of McDonald, Motorola and Procter and Gamble make the status of universities today jittery and insecure! Now, the demands for a knowledge-based society/economy is matter of destiny. Knowledge is the key factor for one to survive in the economic jungles of globalization.⁷

To the delight of globalization fanatics, universities have been demoted from their "Ivory Tower" status to mere "service providers" of this knowledge-based society or knowledge economy of ours. Gone are the watershed "Ivory Tower" years,⁸ therefore, of the *academia*

⁶ See "World Declaration on Higher Education for the Twenty-First Century: Vision and Action and Framework for Priority Action for Change and Development in Higher Education" adopted by World Conference in Higher Education (WCHE), October, 1998, UNESCO Headquarters, Paris.

⁷ In this evolving circumstances, as Bernard Crick, in a provocative vein, has pointed out, universities have become "promiscuous and frenetic department stores." (F. Roversi-Monaco, Aug 22, 2000: *Today's Universities and the Challenges of the Future*, Keynote Address, Presented at Plenary Session, International Association of Universities (IAU), Eleventh General Conference, Tuesday, [Durban, S. Africa], p. 2) "Whereas the expression of Universitas refers to a global attempt to formulate coherent views of the world, today Universities represent (in the words of the chemist and Nobel prize winner Prigogine) 'a mosaic of fragmented professional approaches'." (Ibid.)

⁸ A reversal of the meaning of "universalism" as one of the central and abiding values of the university now dawns. Whereas in its heyday of Ivory Towerism "when classical learning and the Humanities stood as the referential paradigm," continues Neave, "universalism derived from the essential commonality in the qualities which brought individuals together through their shared humanity and reason, [i.e., solidarity]." (Guy Neave, 2000: "Voices of Constancy, Voices of Change: Higher Education Discussed Across a Turbulent Half-Century" in *Abiding Issues, Changing Perspectives: Visions of the University Across A Half-Century*, Guy Neave (Ed.) [International Universities Bureau of the International Association of Universities, Paris], p. 20) In other words, the transcendence of universalism has now been reconstituted substantially through the pervasive neo-corporate rhetoric: "In their revised form, these qualities serve not to identify community but to determine employability. They are, in fine, not collective but individual." (Op. cit.,

and as such is included "in a new panoply of institutions so broad that they range from banks to the Internet."⁹ Education services are now being commercialized, privatized and commodified. Yet, these new knowledge providers retain their titles as "universities." This change of education status has been even institutionalized by WTO's education agenda in agreement with the General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS)¹⁰ – thus birthing, once and for all, the paradoxical status it shares with globalization: It is a university but not quite!

Be that as it may, as Guy Neave points out, over the past half-century, views on higher education were marked by shifting priorities, rhetoric, and disciplinary perspectives – a general shift in the basic disciplinary perspective within which the evolution, contemporary and future, of the university was set out, debated, disputed and advanced.¹¹

p. 21) The revised transcendental character of universalism goes hand in hand with revising the notion of the universality of knowledge: "Knowledge that is universal is that knowledge which opens the door to universal employability, irrespective of regime, language, culture or history of territory, country or state. ...The demand that universities should assume a greater degree of responsibility for the conditions that determine employability is ... one of the most radical innovations to settle upon higher education in the course of this half-century." (Ibid.)

⁹ Op. cit. p. 13.

¹⁰ Raja, 2003: *Globalization and Education* at <http://www.boloji.com/analysis/068.htm>/ p. 1.

¹¹ See Neave, "Voices of Constancy," pp. 9-36.

To set the discussion into its proper historicity, Neave divides the educational era into three phases following the kind of "services" the *universitas* rendered *societas*. (see Ibid., p. 20) The first is the elite stage (the "Ivory Tower") of development in the mold of the Humboldtian/Newmanian theory (see the latter's *The Idea of a University, 1858*, Dis. III, 2; Dis. VII, 1). Based on this, the university was tasked to modernize and reconstruct the nation-state and the historical professions concerned with the administration of law, health and public order from the ashes of WWII. Already perceptible in the late fifties was a shift of analytical perspective from the humanities to anchoring the merging Human Capital theory on the social sciences more particularly on the Economics of Education.

The second phase (raging from the early sixties to the mid-70's) is called the "massification" of education in the advanced North. Called the "golden era of growth," whose dominant model was the Fordist-Taylorist development model, this stage saw the different forms of education reforms guided by policy principles of economic nationalism under the broader housing on Keynesianism (for the "Keynesian Revolution" log on to <http://distance-ed.bcc.ctc.edu/econ100/ksttext/keynes/keynes.htm>). During this stage, there was a spectacular rise on student enrolment

In all indication, you will agree with me that globalization has impacted on education so strongly that its very foundation has been jolted up to the hilt.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The new global free market ideology has moved the world into one biased orientation and direction: "liberalization" so much so that where the *commercium* used to be embedded in *societas*, the *societas* is now embedded in the *commercium*, which has become the world's latest *deitas*!¹² But before allowing *academia* to be held hostage by the clutches of globalization in education in its persistent encroachment, shouldn't the *academia* ask first the vital question that probes into the invisible hands – the "who" – those responsible for the "writing on the wall" so as to integrate the world into one global information society?

This paper explores the contours of the on-going processes of globalization as they impact on a public sector (i.e., service provider) of *societas* called education. Throughout its presentation, for illustrative purposes, the paper is biased towards a greater discussion on the role of transnational corporations – with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) as our basket case – specifically on the educational processes that enter into the

pumping life and advancing prosperity to national economies as evidenced in the North; thus, such demographic pressure pushed the following problematic to the fore: Whether or not elite higher education did supply and could continue to supply the necessary highly qualified manpower in numbers sufficient enough to meet the demands of the spiraling, booming economic activities.

In some systems, the third phase refers to post-massification characterized mainly by internationalizing educational aims and purposes and processes as well. This phase (beginning mid-70's), when globalization was beginning to have its visibility felt worldwide, the economists now consider as the post-Keynesian era. Post-Keynesianism dictates that education policy be reframed within the combination of globalization and neo-liberal ideology. Post-Keynesianism has broken through economic protectionism and is on fire to pursue a meta-policy for internationally competitive economies and with its new educational policy consensus. When "pre-Keynesianally," education was considered simply as residual, "post-Keynesianally," education now is considered the key force for economic success; thus, began the "commodification" of knowledge birthing the creation of knowledge economy/society along its way.

¹² Francisco Tatad, 17 Aug. 98: "Has Globalization Begun to Hurt?" in *The Philippine Star*.

inner structures of educational policy framing. In part, this paper will provide some insights into its beacon document *Redefining Tertiary Education* (already being implemented since 1998) and the corporate model it proposes; and to offer other alternative ones: one, arising from the social cohesion issue; and the other, from the rise of ethnicity all over the world.

However, before exposing the core content of this paper, it is in order first to define what globalization is/is not; and to describe the multi-layered nuances that enter into its proper and adequate understanding through a three-fold leitmotif.

GLOBALIZATION IS NOT

Even up to now it has not acquired a universal meaning, like a cold, insipid Church dogma. As a matter of fact, the term has now become increasingly elastic and arguably contradictory *au contraire*.

For whatever global multi-directional concerns it covers, it brings major historical paradigm shifts away from power exclusivism and protectionism towards "the spread and connectedness of production, communication and technologies across the globe."¹³ Below is not an exhaustive but representative listing of some negative descriptions of globalization that have fallen into common usage.

Hence, globalization is quite distinct from *globalism*, which "points to aspirations for a state of affairs where values are shared by or pertinent to all the world's more than 5 billion people, their environment, and their role as citizens, consumers, or producers with an interesting collective action to solve common problems."¹⁴ It is not quite the same as the concept of *universalism*, which "refers to those values that embrace all of humanity (such as the values that science or religion draws on), at any time or place."¹⁵ Nor is it

¹³ M.K. Smith, 2002: "Globalization" *The Encyclopedia of Informal Education* at www.infed.org/biblio/globalization, p. 10.

¹⁴ James N. Rosenau 1997. "The Complexities and Contradictions of Globalization," *Current History*, (96/613), pp. 361.

¹⁵ Ibid.

to be confused with sheer *complex interdependence* that "link people and communities in various parts of the world."¹⁶ Globalization is also not to be readily equated with *worldisation* which is "the process by which all citizens of the world share certain specific experiences, certain specific values or a certain specific good" for it has not, despite its limitless coverage, connect all peoples of the world due to the digital divide it has simultaneously created.¹⁷ To complete these distinctions, we add that globalization is not mere *internationalization* since: Where the latter conjures up ideas of relations between nations or between States, the former, on the other hand, denotes ideas of relations between peoples of varying nationalities and/or groups of different countries without passing through the usual diplomatic *cordon sanitaire*.¹⁸ Nor is it to be simply identified with *liberalization* which refers to "a process of removing government-imposed restrictions on movements between countries in order to create an 'open', 'borderless' world economy"¹⁹ the result of which is the emergence of an economic global order called "global governance"²⁰; nor is it presumed to be merely a process of *Westernization* or *modernization* (in the guise of Americocentrism) which alludes to a dynamic "whereby the social structures of modernity (capitalism, rationalism, industrialism, bureaucratism, etc.) are spread the world over, normally destroying pre-existent culture and local self-determination in the process"²¹; finally, nor is it to be equated with *deteritorialization / supraterritoriality* intimating here trans-geographical interconnectedness "so that social space is no longer wholly mapped in terms of territorial places, territorial distances and territorial border."²²

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Serrano, 2001: *Globalisation*, Cristianisme I Justicia Booklets 100 (Barcelona), p. 26.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ J.A. Scholte, 2000: *Globalization: A Critical Introduction* (Palgrave, London), p. 16. See also an earlier article, J.A. Scholte, 1997: "Global Capitalism and the State" *International Affairs* 73/3, pp. 427-452; log on to <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/scholte.htm>.

²⁰ M.M. Alam, *Globalization and Its Impact on Education in India* at <http://www.iosworld.org/reoim.htm> / p. 1.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Scholte, *Globalization*, p. 16.

In many discussions on globalization, this term is regarded the very opposite of *localization/particularization*. Whereas the global processes are transterritorial or transjurisdictional, contrariwise, localizing processes are territory or jurisdiction based. Said differently, the contrast, thus: "globalization is boundary-broadening and localization is boundary-heightening."²³

Presuming that the prime characteristic of globalization is change, then it is foremost, a process and not a prevailing desired end in itself, as, according to David Held et al, globalization is a "process (or set of processes) which embodies a transformation in the spatial organization of social relations and transactions – assessed in terms of their extensity, intensity, velocity and impact – generating transcontinental or inter-regional flows and networks of activity."²⁴

TRIPLE-DOMAINS OF GLOBALIZATION

One may say that techno-economics is the locomotive engine of the globalization process; that's why Jurado considers globalization as "the contemporary term given to that old stuff called international economics."²⁵ And yet for the sake of its analytical usefulness, and relative to the main orientation of this article, I shall now spotlight the specific features of globalization only according to the following three-fold approach.²⁶

²³ Rosenau, "The Complexity," p. 361.

²⁴ D. Held et al, 1999: *Global Transformations, Politics, Economics, and Culture* (Polity Press, Cambridge), p. 16.

²⁵ G.M. Jurado, April 4, 2003: "On globalization" in *The Manila Times*.

²⁶ Serrano, *Globalization*, p. 6-25.

One may proceed to dissect the global forces along two dimensions: globalization and the role of the state; and come up with four groups of globalization scholars: the structural determinists, structural moderates, actor pessimists, and actor optimists. Structural determinists "do not leave the state in its present form much leeway when it comes to changing the course of the so-called irreversible forces of globalization," (M. Marcussen, "Globalization: A Third Way," p. 5. This kind of globalization is heavy on economics baptized by neo-liberalistic principles.

For Held, global governance may be interpreted from a globalist, traditionalist and/or transformationalist account. (See D. Held, 2000: *A Globalization World? Culture, Economics, Politics* (Routledge, London), pp. 169-177.

I. Techno-Economic Globalization

The outreach of globalization is facilitated by the establishment of optoelectronic technologies such as Internet, World Wide Web, Integrated Systems Digital Network (ISDN), Asynchronous Transfer Mode (ATM), Electronic Data Interchange (EDI) and a host of other digitization technologies. Virtual telecommunication networking has impacted the most on economic and business transactions. This strain of globalization is sometimes called "corporate globalization."²⁷

The ICTs Networking

In broad outline, this modern telematics has:

1. accelerated the production and distribution of goods, services and capital very rapidly bringing along economic boom or bust. Daunting, it has introduced a new but sad word into the ICT dictionary – "infopoverty." Techno-economic globalization has, indeed, made product/idea hunting across the world most convenient by e-shopping through the Web; indeed, "the world is becoming a global shopping mall in which ideas and products are available everywhere at the same time."²⁸
2. restructured radically macro-economic fundamentals. Once installed as a built-in infrastructure into core business processes (like R&D, manufacturing, testing, back-office operations through outsourcing abroad, marketing, distribution, surveillance and accountability), global enterprises are faced with tremendous pressures but fantastic opportunities. On the other hand, those incapacitated financially to construct ICTs network infrastructure based on an optic cabled network of networks called Global Information Infrastructure (GII) have to resort to corporate downsizing or lamentably close shop for lack of capital outlay. Hence,

²⁷ See Peoples' Summit, May 2000: *Facing the Challenges of Globalization: Equity, Justice and Diversity* at <http://globalpolicy.org/ngos/role/globalact/challeng.htm>.

²⁸ J.A. Scholte: 1997: "A Globalization World" in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, J. Baylis and S. Smith (Eds.), (Oxford University Press, Oxford), p. 15.

“unequal access, and use of, ICT may be reinforcing existing inequities through a new ‘digital divide’”,²⁹

3. introduced new human resources qualifications in the workplace in terms of ICT literacy, multi-skilling, and values in risk-taking, flexibility, problem-solving, teamwork and life-long learning – the ultimate effective crutches of survival within the globalization connect;
4. introduced concomitantly new dualities in workplace status such as: ICTs self-programmable/well-skilled; and on the other, those who are generic; unemployed vs employed; full-time vs part-time; gender sensitivity; native vs immigrant workers; and between legal and illegal migrant-workers; and, finally, the mobile elite and the immobile mass in the so-called post-Fordist-Taylorist work order dislodging the historic classic Fordist-Taylorist divide between executives and laborers; and most importantly,
5. quickened the advent of knowledge economy/society or conceptual age; or sometimes referred to as the Global Information Society (GIS) through its commodification processes, a truism captured by Castells’ remark when he said: “Productivity and competitiveness are, by and large, a function of knowledge generation and information processing; firms and territories are organized in networks of production, management and distribution; the core economic activities are global – that is, they have the capacity to work as a unit in real time, or chosen time, on a planetary scale.”³⁰

Willingly or unwillingly, ICTs, spreading its wings over these diverse activities, have made the whole wide world an asynchronous and interactive *cosmos* simultaneously founding the “World Factory” phenomenon, indeed.³¹

²⁹ D. J. Johnston, OECD Sec-Gen in *Education Analysis 2001 Edition* at <http://atac.org/fra/orga/doc/ocdeen2.htm>, p. 2.

³⁰ M. Castells, 2001: “Information Technology and Global Capitalism” in *On the Edge: Living with Global Capitalism*, W. Hutton and A. Giddens (Eds.), (Vintage, London), p. 52.

³¹ D. L. Cogburn, 1998. *Globalization, Knowledge, Education and Training* at http://www.unesco.org/wrdworld/infoethics_2/eng/papers/paper_23.htm, p. 3.

New Capital Ownership

As stock markets in the big capitals of the world operate twenty-four hours a day in borderless digital transactions, capital ownership has become more anonymous totally separated from countries of origin.

This new way of transacting business eventuated in the creation of a new mobile elite of politicians/business tycoons; the "new rich" in the likes of Billy Gates or George Sohos, (regarded by some anti-globalization critics as the virtual manipulators of regional economies); and in the entrance of the ever-growing and influential communities of transnational corporations (TNCs) and multinational corporations (MNCs) making way for the rise of a transnational capitalist class (TCC) "which, it is argued, in effect acts a global ruling class,"³² – all competitors in the merging high-tech industries. These have left nation-states almost powerless to effectively regulate these new merging global destabilizers; and highly vulnerable for the unexpected twists and turns of the unpredictability of global trends and directions.³³

Ideology of Globalization: Neo-Liberalism

The shift of ideological concerns from pre-Keynesian to post Keynesian (stretching sometime from 1954 to mid-70s) is the espousal of neo-liberal economic constructs parading in various titles of liberalism, or in France ultra-liberalism spurring the economic policy options of the nation-state to be subsumed and reconfigured into the system by international business transactions. In this way, TNCs have become the greatest beneficiaries netting

³² A.R. Welch, 2003. "Blurring the Borders: Finding a New Balance in S.E. Asian Higher Education" in *ad Veritatem, Multi-Disciplinary Research Journal of the UST Graduate School*, 2/2, p. 283. See also L. Sklair, 2001: *The Transnational Capitalist Class* (Blackwell Publishers, London).

³³ The Asian crisis in 1997 is a case in point. The economic vulnerability of a country depends largely on the "private controllers of capital" who would invest as quickly as they would withdraw them. (J.A. Winters, 1998: "Asia and the 'Magic' of the Marketplace" in *Current History* 97/623, p. 419. For Stiglitz, the IMF has so much explaining to do with regards to this debacle which almost brought the world to the "verge of a global meltdown." (see Stiglitz, "Globalization and Its Discontent," Chapter 4, pp. 89-132.

incomes larger than those of mid-range nation-states. Of the world's one hundred largest economies, forty-seven are multinational conglomerates.³⁴

The self-imposing presence of the TNCs (IMF-WB, WTO and OECD with their respective hidden agenda) in underdeveloped/developing countries intimidates small and medium enterprises, the backbone economic engine of local industries to the point of submission to them as subcontractors for survival.³⁵ These TNCs are one in realizing a political project called free market economy through a tripod of global connectedness in terms of expanding market relations, downsizing state interference and creating a global market.

This new economic theory, as the new universalism,³⁶ now in place is mathematically formulated by Frank, quoting Luttwak, in this fashion: privatization + deregulation + globalization = turbo-capitalism = prosperity.³⁷

³⁴ M. Latham, 1998: *Civilizing Global Capital: New Thinking for Australian Labor* (Allen & Unwin, Sydney), p. 11.

For the past 25 years, these TNCs have increased by leaps and bounds: "No less than 30 percent of present world exports consists of transactions within these companies. Sales of TNCs in 1996 was US \$7 trillion, higher than the total exports of the entire world which amounted to US \$5.2 trillion only. 87 percent of the world's most powerful TNCs are owned by the United States, Europe and Japan." (O. Firth 1997. "Globalization: A Christian Perspective on Economics," *Dialogue (NS)*, XXIV, pp. 102-103) In addition, according to Gray, recent logistics shows MNCs now accounting for over 33% of world output, and 66% of world trade – something like a quarter of world trade is transacted among MNCs alone. (See J. Gray, 1999: *False Dawn: The Decisions of Global Capitalism* (Granta, London), see particularly p. 62) Sebastián is quick to have given this incisive remark: "[This] phenomenon which we are witnessing is new in the sense that poverty which is an eternal reality of the human race *has never lived side by side with such enormous wealth*." (L. de Sebastian, 2001: *Capitalism and Democracy in the XXI Century* Booklets 10 [Barcelona], p.11) Worse, the volume of money daily transacted in the world markets make of the currencies of small nation-states appear like "loose change." A feeling of inhibitions is created; thus arresting nation-state to come up with effective policy options.

³⁵ M. Fernando, 2001: "How Christian is Globalization?" *Religious Life Asia*, III/12, pp.41-42.

³⁶ Neave, *Voices of Constancy*, pp. 20-21.

³⁷ T. Frank, 2002: *One Market under God: Extreme Capitalism, Market Populism and the End of Economic Democracy* (Vintage: London), p. 17.

When all is said and done, Gaudi states that the forces behind globalization are neo-liberal capitalism (a return to the *laissez faire* principle advocated by Adam Smith, the father of capitalism) for its ideology; and individualism or self-seeking as its proto-handmaid³⁸ where one asserts his Protagorean dictum: "I am the sole measure of all things" – the bedrock of individualistic rights for self-reliance, self-sufficiency, or mastery of one's destiny. And this is economic individualism: competition; emancipation of science from ethics; consumerism; profit-motivation; lack of sense for the *summum bonum*; expandability and mobility of manpower; free market.³⁹

True to its worth, for Heredia, "the basic engine behind the emergence of a globalized world economy lies not in goods, people, money, and ideas [but] rather, in capital becoming historically more portable and more internationally mobile than anything else."⁴⁰

II. Socio-Political Globalization

With the scepter of statism demolishing the Berlin Wall; the end of the USSR; the infusion of economic aids to Russia in the many forms of capitalism; the specter of neo-liberalism lurching dominantly forward; and money dealings through digital technology – all these serve as the linchpin of restructuring the socio-political dimension of nation-states unprecedentedly.

Restructuring the Nation-States

International politics no longer is a tag of war between two geopolitical ideologies: democracy and communism; but, according to geopolitico-*economic* blocks like the USA and Northern American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the European Union (EU) and Japan and the ASEAN block. Already existing postnational political structures such as the Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs), and the reconstituting old international organizations such as NGOs, and

³⁸ H. Gaudi, 1997: "One Gospel: Globalisation and Pacific Regional Theology," in *The Pacific Journal of Theology*, II/17. p. 54.

³⁹ M. Amaladoss, 1997: *Globalization from the Perspective of the Victims of History: A Project for the Seminar*, p. 1.

⁴⁰ B. Heredia, "Prosper or Perish? Development in the Age of Global Capital" in *Current History*, 96/163, p. 384.

MNCs/TNCs/TCC are examples of the dynamics of socio-political globalization.⁴¹ They are referred to as the non-state actors.

Hence, besides shrinking the world into a global village, socio-political globalization has also expanded the welfare/nation-states into ever growing global interrelatedness or networks. In more than one way, these create an interlinking of complex and unmanageable relationships transcending national boundaries.⁴²

New State Structures and Forms of Governance

From this transition new state structures and new forms of governance evolved: "One of the features of contemporary Western Society is the tendency under neoliberal philosophy to define social, economic, and political issues, as problems to be resolved through management."⁴³ The newness came by way of the public sector, e.g., education and health, adopting some managerial practices performed by the private sector, i.e., business, under the rubric of "corporate managerialism" or "new public management" (NPM). For his part, Fitzsimons elaborates the structure of NPM in this way:

⁴¹ Examples of global policy-making bodies are: International Telecommunication Union (ITU), World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), World Trade Organization (WTO); UN Commission on Trade and Development (UNCTAD); International Programme for Development of Communication (IPDC) and Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

With these new political actors performing their respective roles in the global political stage drama, Wiseman, in search of a crude model, selects the Russian Babushka dolls as the most appropriate to demonstrate this ever widening political arena wrought by globalization. He states: "the processes of globalisation are helping to create a world of 'nested locales' in which households, neighbourhoods, cities, provinces, nations and regions sitting inside the wider global relationships like Russian Babushka dolls." (J. Wiseman, 1998: *Global Nation: Australia and the Politics of Globalization* [Cambridge University Press, Cambridge], p. 14)

⁴² The result is that "we are faced with a 'deficit of governance' in an international situation which is characterized by 'turbulence', by oscillations between different power regimes, between sovereign states and transnational new institutions (such as multinational companies)." (U.L. Businaro, 1992: *Globalization: From Challenge Perception to S&T Policy* at <http://users.libero.it/ulbusi/pdfeng/92uglob.pdf>, p. 1)

⁴³ P. Fitzsimons, 2003: *Managerialism and Education*, at <http://www.vusst.hr/ENCYCLOPEDIA/managerialism.htm>, p. 1.

Under NPM, there is an elaboration of explicit standards and measures of performance in quantitative terms that set specific targets for personnel, an emphasis on economic rewards and sanctions, and a reconstruction of accountability relationships. It promotes a reduction in scope for ministerial discretion in the administration of government agencies, it separates the funding agencies from providers of services as well as separating advisory, delivery, and regulatory functions. NPM introduces accrual accounting, capital charging and a distinction between the state's ownership and purchasing interests. There has been a decentralization of management control towards what is often referred to as the doctrine of self-management.⁴⁴

The rubric of self-management is designed to abandon the old practice which was heavy on due process of proceduralism or red-tapeism and to embrace the twofold goals of efficiency – doing things at the lowest cost and greater effectiveness – achieving the goals set. In other words, good performance is measured not so much by process as by results/outputs/products.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

Kickert shows this doctrine of "self-management" in terms of the relationship between the policy generating core of an organization and the implementation/practice-based periphery. (see W. Kickert, 1991: *A New Paradigm of Public Governance in Dutch Higher Education*, Paper presented to European Consortium for Political Research, [University of Essex] in M. Henry et al, 2001: *The OECD, Globalisation and Education Policy* [Elsevier Science, Oxford], p. 31) This process of realigning is called "steering at a distance" or remote steering. The core (e.g., the government) is the determining agent of setting the goals strategically while the policy-practicing periphery (e.g., the public sector, education) is responsible for achieving these goals. However, the periphery is given more leeway to determine the means instead of the policy ends because these are rather set tightly by the core as part of a new regime of outcomes accountability. Accordingly, some scholars on globalization consider this policy the world-systems model dividing nation-states into categories of core, semi-peripheral or peripheral status. (see I. Wallerstein, 1979: *The Capitalism World Economy* [Cambridge University, Press: Cambridge]) What is new here in this alternative scheme is a networking of practices about how individual workers also implicate themselves in their own self-governance in the spirit and practice of devolution of responsibilities. This accounts for calling this brand "new" managerialism; thereby reconstituting the concept of "governance" as constituting the culture and structure of interconnectedness or networking of functions. Advocates of the "global society model" use and popularize expressions such as "global awareness" and "planetary perspectives." Nonetheless, this much has to be reemphasized: Governance through new managerialism is totally dependent on the market logic of efficiency.

The aim, then, today is "to make governments at all levels more efficient and cost-effective, to increase the quality of public services, to enable the public sector to respond flexibly and more strategically to external changes, and to support and foster national economic performance."⁴⁵ This is what it means to be "globally competitive."

But, adopting private, business schemes by the public sector, is not without fundamental problems: "The real danger is that unthinking adoption of the private sector model prevents the development of an approach to management in the public services in general or to the social services in particular based on their distinctive purposes, conditions and tasks."⁴⁶

New Destabilizing Factors

Just like the mobility of global finances accelerated by ICTs, so also are the policy ideas of top-level bureaucrats and politicians, policy makers/advisers/intellectuals through the TNCs. In the end, eventuates a kind of a socio-political supra-body, post-national policy community sitting on top of any nation-state and its policy apparatus endemic to it, i.e., supraterritorially. This emerging policy community has the invisible, political will to influence and dictate. It is a new context of influence. The result is introducing some destabilizing factors into the traditional, political comfort zones of nation-states.

Appadurai sees, in this inevitable restructuring, at least, the beginning of the disassociation of politics from its vestigial understanding of being attached mainly to territorial/geographical sovereignty,⁴⁷ or, simply, from the politics of localization. Virtual interconnectedness has made macro-actions-at-distance bear imma-

⁴⁵ OECD Report, 1995: *Governance in Transition: Public Management Reforms in OECD Countries*.

⁴⁶ J. Stewart, 1992. "Guidelines for Public Service Management: Lessons not to be Learnt from the Private Sector," in *Changing Social Work and Welfare*, P. Cater et al (Eds.), (Open University Press: Buckingham, p. 27).

⁴⁷ A. Appadurai, 1996: *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis) in M. Henry et al, 2001: *The OECD, Globalisation and Education Policy* (IAU & Elsevier Science, Oxford), p. 23.

nently on the micro-histories of nation-states. In Waters' estimation, globalization is a "social process in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding."⁴⁸

Hence, for Holton, nation-states have to suffer the discomfort of issues of networking with other multicentered "cobweb" of global relations.⁴⁹ This brings us to log in other reasons besides economics (foremost, *inter alia*, is cultural) in order to justify the creation for another multi-centered cobweb of social relations.⁵⁰

For some sectors, a destabilization factor is felt in the existence of the so-called "region states" within the mother country where economic activities are more open to global markets than the host country itself. Providing a sort of polycentric situations, these regional states facilitate more rapidly the mobility of global capitals all over the world, e.g., Vancouver and Seattle. Mega-cities are erupting with the likes of Shanghai and Beijing in China – thus, birthing the growth of inequality within nation-states as well as among nations.⁵¹

⁴⁸ M. Waters, 1995: *Globalization* (Routledge, London), p. 3. Take the case of Australia: The benefits of globalization have made 20% of its urban population in globalized cities prosperous, i.e., the globally connected elites; while the rest 80% (of country dwellers and outer suburban laborers) have to suffer the loss of jobs and the burden of job insecurities. (See Henry et al, *The OECD*, pp. 23-24)

⁴⁹ R. Holton, 1998: *Globalization and the Nation-State* (MacMillan Press, Basingstoke), pp. 132-133.

⁵⁰ The complexity of geo-political blocking requires that its sub-units bind themselves together in the sub-state levels for special projects. For example, the 1992 Barcelona Olympics Games committee was responsible for getting the Town Hall of Barcelona, the *Generalitat* (Autonomous Government) of Cataluña, the Spanish Government and the Government of the European Union to establish a close collaboration to meet the international demands of hosting it; something similar to S. Korea and Japan of late when both co-sponsored the World Football League. The European Union is headed towards what Castells terms as "Network State." (see M. Castells, 1998: "Entender nuestro mundo," *Revista de Occidente* 205, (Madrid), p. 142; also M. Castells, 1996: *The Rise of the Networked Society* (Blackwell, Oxford).

⁵¹ R. Axtmann, 1998: "Globalisation, Europe and the State: Introductory Reflections," in Axtmann, R. (Ed.), *Globalisation and Europe: Theoretical and Empirical Investigation* (Pinter, London); see particularly p. 4.

Lest we forget, the explosion towards a global village are implosions from within of large states into fragmented political entities such as the once-upon-time Yugoslavia, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia. Even small states in the name of ethnic cleansing have asserted their own nationhood. These paradoxical opening up and closing in, according to Bauman, are the spokes of the same wheel of globalization.⁵² Hence, "there seems to be an intimate kinship, mutual conditioning and reciprocal reinforcement between the 'globalisation' of all aspects of the economy and the renewed emphasis on the 'territorial principle'."⁵³ In other words, socio-political globalization has made the political axis of the world spin in its own contradictories.

In all indication, the eventual creation of network/region states has introduced flexibility in network organization in regional, state and sub-state levels, jeopardizing the well-tested benefits accruing from welfare state, destabilizing it for the most part; and, thus, affecting its policy salience.

Another destabilization seeps in when territories are marginalized simply because of incapacity to get connected in global networks. They are the losers, the excluded members described as belonging to the *black holes of informational capitalism*.⁵⁴

⁵² See Z. Bauman, 1998. *Globalization: The Human Consequences* (Polity Press, Cambridge), p. 67.

⁵³ Ibid.

Said differently, "The scale of the globalization problem suggests the need to *develop virtuous circle of wealth generation* (resources) while the interdependence suggests the need to disentangle the situations to go to the core of the problem to be solved. Globalization requires more than ever to dedicate efforts to define the terms of the problem before trying to solve it. It blurs the *dimension* of any given problem. A problem pertaining to a class up to now considered as *local*, might – because of globalization – have shifted to a *broader dimension*. Viceversa, we might be tempted (because of the increased complexity in problem solving) to shift to a broader scale a problem that still pertain to a narrower dimension." (Businaro, *Globalization: From Challenge*, p. 3.)

⁵⁴ Ibid. Why? "Black holes" is a sordid description of those who cannot escape certain societal structures of degrading human conditions. These marginalized are not only found in underdeveloped countries but even in the First World where, despite economic prosperity, there is this sense of psychological emptiness felt due to the following deficiencies: lack of or no qualifications/habits for new work forms, psychological disfunctioning due to parental absenteeism, technological

Therefore, a possible escape is by going underground as members of network of illegal activities using the same ICTs strategies: networks of drug-trafficking, of arms shipment, children and women, of illegal immigration and of international traffic of toxic waste, ecological abuses, drug/flesh trafficking, film/video piracy, money laundering; and the greatest menace, global terrorism – all illegal underground movements facilitated by transterritorial financial flows. In these illegal activities, success and wealth are key premiums with no consideration for the ethos of the *summum bonum*.⁵⁵

Since the end of the Cold War era with the Fall of the Berlin geo-politics is less dictated exclusively by political ideologies as it is by neo-liberal mercantile pontification today. And the world is no longer perceived as one coherent world order. In the name of liberalization, it would be extremely difficult to predict and detect which forces will galvanize when and where and if ever they do succeed, how to arrest the momentum. This is the case of the problem with global terrorism.

parental surrogatism, a lack of language skills in a foreign country where one is found a new immigrant and the lack of capacity for global cultural inputs to name but a few. In these territories there is less fiscal capacity to foment an effective guarantee of social rights that give rise, for, all you know, to global criminal economic sabotage. (See M. Castells, "La era de la información economía, sociedad, cultura," *Fin de Milenio Alianza* 3 (Madrid), pp. 188-191).

⁵⁵ Prior to the 9/11 horrible tragedy (about mid-90's), the fastest growing economic organized criminal syndicate was estimated to be at \$500 billion a year; was calculated to grow by 35% by the year 2000. The clandestine shipments of heroin around the world market was estimated to have grown by 20 times from 1970 to 1990 while cocaine trade went up more than 50 times. Immigrants smuggled alone, according to US authorities, have brought in 2.5 billion dollars in annual profits to the Chinese triads. (See Tatad, "Has Globalization")

Speaking of global terrorism, the greatest economic destabilizer, the fight against global terrorists under the cloak of championing democratic ideals and liberation from oppressive political regimes is actually, to anti-American critics, to promote American global leadership/colonialism. Disgruntled by USA's hegemonic posturing as the self-confessed and proclaimed global police that she is today, these critics go so far as to state fiercely that global terrorism is America's own creation; it has simply boomeranged back to the creator of terrorism herself, the USA. (See Co, "Expanding Worldview," pp. 55-60; S.J. Noumoff, 1998: *Globalization and Culture*, Working Papers Series in Cultural Studies, Ethnicity, and Race Relations, Dept. of Comparative American Cultures (Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, pp. 2-6)

On the other hand, the functioning of liberal democracies in other countries has not been wanting in some lights especially in terms of fighting for human rights. At the end of the twentieth century, the case of Pinochet and now, the ongoing trial of the president of the former Yugoslavia in Da Hague in an International Criminal Court have offered bright prospect for the advancement of an effective and universal fight for the declaration of human rights that transcends color, creed and social background. The same befalls Saddam Hussein of Iraq now that he has been captured.

New Social Movements (NSMs)

This fact is a bright note on globalization – the emergence of independent *New Social Movements* (NSMs) where social concerns are now addressed. They are characterized in the following manner:

1. While concerned with local problems, they, too, are engaged in global problems like environmental concerns, human rights, feminism and exploitation of children in the labor force, economic concerns for the Third world countries, etc.
2. The practice of democratic processes in their internal affairs boasted by the use of ICTs through which they voice out to the international communities their global concerns. In this sense, ICTs has been a powerful instrumental for international solidarity.
3. Their fight for global rights may get themselves involved with some diplomatic protests. Say, for example, a European NGO working in a foreign land and disappears for human rights violation may spark a diplomatic protest between his country of origin and his country of disappearance.⁵⁶

III. Cultural Globalization

Liberalization of goods and services escalated as well the exchange of human resources or manpower. Inevitably, individuals bring with them their own respective cultural baggage. But there is more to cultural globalization than this simple narrative.

⁵⁶ Serrano, "Globalisation," p. 17.

According to Sklair's typology of globalization accounts, this domain refers to "global culture model."⁵⁷ Debates surrounding this global culture model centers on the so-called "global-local nexus," the confrontational dialectics between the local/national identity and the emerging global culture.⁵⁸

Brecher et al see in this confrontational dialectics a mode of thinking called "globalization-from-above" espoused by the burgeoning giants of the global markets, e.g., MNCs/TNCs, and political elites as distinct from "globalization-from-below,"⁵⁹ a mode of thinking arising from an aggregation of NSMs in collaboration with the marginalized formed out of a social conscience – or "the global social reformists" versus "the laissez-faire economists" for Deacon et al.⁶⁰ Far from a vision of the former's "New World Order" reflective of the geo-politics model of the USA or the technological and marketing model of, for example, McDonald's or Procter and Gamble, the latter's thinking would rather envision in the near future a "One-World Community."

Symbolically, in Friedman's imagination, it is the dialectic between "The Lexus and The Olive Tree," the former representing anything that is of robotic machine or technology; and the latter, anything that is of history and heritage.⁶¹ The vagaries and crises wrought by cultural globalization have torn the human person between to loves: the love for sustenance, improvement, prosperity and modernization – all offered on the silver platter of globalization; and the love for preserving one's sense of self-identity and self-worth, both as an individual and as a collective whole – all endemic to one's cultural heritage.

⁵⁷ See L. Sklair, "Globalization: New Approaches to Social Change" in *Sociology: Issues and Debates*, S. Taylor (Ed.), (McMillan, London), pp. 321-245.

⁵⁸ For the role of culture within world systems analysis, see M. Featherstone, 1990: *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Identity* (Sage, London).

⁵⁹ J. Brecher et al, 1993: *Global Visions: Beyond the New World Order* (Southend Press, Boston), pp. ix-xvii; see also R. Falk, 1993: "The Making of Global Citizenship" in *Global Visions: Beyond the New World Order*, J. Brecher et al (Eds.) (Black Rose Books, Montreal), p. 39.

⁶⁰ B. Deacon et al. 1997: *Global Social Policy. International Organizations and the Future of Welfare*. (Sage, London).

⁶¹ See T. Friedman, 1999. *The Lexus and the Olive Tree* (Harper Collins, New York).

In this connection, other globalization discourse scholars have introduced another word "glocalization" to suggest "a dichotomy, even a radical disassociation, between the 'global' (multinational corporations, international terrorism, the entertainment industry, CNN, the Web) and the 'local' (the sense of place, neighborhood, town, locale, ethnicity, and the other, traditional sources of identity. The term 'glocalization' denotes a more dynamic relationship between these two realms, especially as they are brought into contact on Web sites, on television, and in other media."⁶²

*The Rise of Ethnicity*⁶³

Despite the asynchronous and interactive convergences of technology and global economy, recent studies reveal, as Huntington observes, a certain renaissance or resurgence of ethnicity.⁶⁴ According to Smolicz, a case in point is Australia.⁶⁵

For many years, Australia was rather strict in implementation of its immigration laws and policies until she was faced with a serious crisis: the case of asylum seekers whose category was never included in the list of its immigrant categories. Faced with waves of about 10,000 Afghan boat people (in the year 2000) who were washed ashore to Australia, repatriating them was an impossibility since Australia did not have any diplomatic ties with Afghanistan. In the end, Australia bowed to the pressures of the

⁶² The University of Minnesota-Duluth, *Defining Globalization*, Web Pages, Application and Presentation at <http://www.d.umn.edu/~cstroupe/comp5230f01/glocalization.html>, p. 1. See also *Glocalization*, Craig Stroupe Ideas at <http://www.d.umn.edu/~cstroupe/ideas/glocalization.html>; F. Riggs, *Glocalization, Diasporas and Area Studies*, at <http://webdata.soc.hawaii.edu/Fred/R/glocal.htm>; R. Roland, 1995: "Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity" in *Global Modernities*, M. Featherstone et al (Sage Publications, London), pp. 25-44.

⁶³ For Friedman, for an extensive understanding of its nature, four major trends must be deciphered: indigenization, naturalization, regionalism, and immigrant ethnification. (see J. Friedman, 1999: *Transnationalization, Socio-Political Disorder and Ethnification As Expressions of Declining Global Hegemony*, Management of Social Transformation – Most, UNESCO).

⁶⁴ See S. Huntington, 1996: *The Clash of Civilization and the Remaking of World Order* (Simon & Schuter, New York).

⁶⁵ See J.J. Smolicz, 2002. "Globalization and Resilient Cultural Diversity – An Australian Multicultural Achievement" in *ad Veritatem* 2/1, pp. 33-54.

international community especially the UN and softened its stand against illegal immigrants in favor of humanitarian reasons.

This, according to Smolicz, exemplifies downsizing the regulatory power of a state when faced with such crisis paradoxically generating, however, "forces that counteract the homogenizing effects of globalisation."⁶⁶ In the wake of ever becoming denser multiculturally/multi-ethnically, Australia faces the rising ethnic demands of minority groups asking respectively their just places in the multicultural canvas that she has now become. Such emerging scenario brings us to this dilemma: "While political boundaries are tending to become more permeable, especially in places like Western Europe, cultural boundaries are becoming accentuated *within* countries. In this context, it is important to realize that the cultural and political boundaries between states do not necessarily coincide and that the very few countries in the world today are culturally homogeneous: most are multi-ethnic."⁶⁷

In this connection, migration of people, which accompanies globalization, has urged the government of such ethnically diverse nation-states to legislate laws relative to the emergence of this other kind of political party. Fraser refers to it as "recognition politics."⁶⁸ Perceived by some as inadequate and highly biased, this "recognition politics" has drowned the nation-state further into the quagmire of more social unrest and political resentment in the wake of growing inequalities and pervasive insecurity. For one, the ugly faces of xenophobia, in the likes of the One Nation in Australia, Lepenism in France, white working class militia movements in the USA and neo-Nazi groups in Germany as well as in Italy, have again resurged in recent years.⁶⁹

⁶⁶ Ibid., p. 34.

⁶⁷ Op. cit., p. 35.

⁶⁸ N. Fraser, 1995. "From Redistribution Arena: The Global Village" *Journal of Educational Policy* 9(5/6), pp. 89-102.

⁶⁹ As globalization shrinks the world into a global village, this village finds itself ironically suffused with and fragmented by cultural diversifications through waves of migrations of people, or through influence of multi-media especially electronic technologies, which, according to Appadurai's own coinage, are rendered "ethnoscape," "mediascape," and "technoscape," respectively. The process of socialization still exists but currently retailored by shifting global cultural scapes.

The Culture of Global Consumerism

In the context of global advertising, companies pour in lots of money for image-building so that image counts more over and above the content of the product. The name of the game is seduction by image so that the consumer is conditioned to patronage the brand irrationally; thus, blurring the stark distinction between basic wants and made-up needs: "Nike, Levi, Coca Cola and other major companies spend huge sums of money in promoting and sustaining their brands. A key strategy is to attempt to establish their particular brand as an integral part of the way people understand, or wish to see, themselves."⁷⁰

In this way, certain patterns of addictive or obsessive behavioral patterns for "state-side" products/ideas are subconsciously nurtured. Lamentably, "it is time to recognize that the true tutors of our children are not school teachers or university professors but filmmakers, advertising executives and pop cultures purveyors. Disney does more than Duke, Spielberg outweighs Stanford, MTV trumps MIT."⁷¹

The USA Hollywood style movies have been strong vehicles in fomenting Western values such as the Manichean division between the good and the bad⁷² (coincidentally, anything pro-American/

Thus, the emerging rubric of cultural globalization brings to the fore a dramatic and healthy, but intriguing confrontation between heterogeneity, i.e., the integration of foreign cultural practices; and homogeneity, i.e., the resurgence of a sense of nationalism anchored on one's native cultural roots. (see Appadarai, 1996: *"Modernity at Large,"* p. 24).

What is needed, as insisted by the Roman Catholic tradition, is a genuine dialogue in defense of cultural pluralism. Dialogue brings us to the full awareness of acceptance of our being equal in the eyes of God, our common origin, but diversified due to different cultural heritage. Through dialogue, our differences are overcome with due respect and sincerity of purpose without renouncing our respective identities. (see Paul VI, *Ecclesiam suam* for the Christian characteristics of true and genuine dialogue). See also the Buberian concept of academic dialogue, M. Buber, 1965: *Between Man and Man*, Ronald Gregor Smith (Trans.) [MacMillan Publishing, New York]).

⁷⁰ M.K. Smith, 2002. "Globalization," p. 10.

⁷¹ Benjamin R. Barber quoted by H.A. Giroux 2000: *Stealing Innocence. Corporate Culture's War on Children*, (Palgrave New York), p. 15.

⁷² See Serrano, *Globalisation*, p. 22.

Westernized is good; the others bad) with the division Americans/foreigners); conflict resolution by will power (recall: TV programs such as "Fear Factor" and "American Idol") or by brute force; and search for success as the prime motivation. Theme parks focus on the "Mickey Mouses" of Disney or include a "variety of hidden cultures" among which the West is normally never lacking. CNN/BBC transmits "live" event practically from all over the world converting themselves in this way as "creators" of mainstream, current news-bits.⁷³

No doubt, the moneyed superpower countries overspend; they overconsume, and obesity is the resulting malady. Now, more than ever before, pharmaceutical companies are pouring lots of money to search for drugs to cure obese individuals!⁷⁴

The Emergence of One Global Culture

In spite of the rebirth of the drive for ethnicity worldwide, Barber is of the opinion that these new cultural underpinnings do not really come from distant cultures but from a global one.⁷⁵ Barber baptizes it as the "McWorld" culture with reference both to the commercial brands of McDonald and McIntosh and the world reach these Mcs have attained. Barber thinks that this culture is now

⁷³ See "Communication and Cultural Transformation: Cultural Diversity, Globalization and Cultural Convergence," 1998: A Project Presented to the European University, Barcelona at <http://www.stephweb.com/capstone/3.htm>.

⁷⁴ The majority of 20% rich are more or less concentrated in USA, Canada, Western Europe, Saudi Arabia and Japan. This 20% rich consume over 70% of the world natural resources and own over 80% of its generated wealth; one-third of its consumption comes from USA. Prone to overspending, these 20% or 1.2 billion people overeat with overweight/obesity as its resulting malady. This malady requires the cost for its treatment of 100 billion dollars annually for the 23% obese adults and 55% overweights. A 30 billion is spent in diet drug production. (See Fernando, "How Christian," p. 51) "However, while many may be critical of certain aspects of consumer culture, they are far less likely to be critical of consumption itself." (M.K. Smith, 2002: Globalization and the Interpretation of Education at http://www.infed.org/biblio/globalization_and_education.htm, p. 9).

⁷⁵ B. Barber, 1998: "Cultura McWorld contra democracia," in *Le Monde diplomatique* (1998), p. 28. See also G. Ritzer, 1993: *The Mcdonalization of Society* (Forge Press, Thousand Oaks, CA).

shaping the world making peoples of different persuasions homogenized and Westernized somehow, economically and politically.⁷⁶

However, this global culture has somehow “to land” in various geographical cultures; and connect with the public, which, in turn, has to consume it and relate to it.⁷⁷

From a New York Times headline “Japanese Enjoying Thinking American” a reader cannot fail in interpreting rightly the Japanese experience as a reawakening to Western ideals as something messianic, late it might seem. Therefore, up-close, globalization is simply the disguised old ideal of Americanization, i.e., “caving in to American culture and even political imperialism!”⁷⁸ Or, better yet, perhaps, to describe this phenomenon as “Americocentrism,”⁷⁹ where friendship is fostered “on America’s terms.”⁸⁰ The global terrorism campaign seems to hasten and disguises this Americocentrism masquerading as championing democracy and freedom from all types of political oppressions.

On the other hand, global culture is not always that alienating and culture difference ignorant. Take the case of Sophiatown

⁷⁶ See L. Quisumbing, 1998: “The Use and Misuse of the New Information and Communication Technology (ICT)” in *A Reader on Information and Communication Technology Planning for Development*, F. Rosario-Braid and R. Tuason, (Eds.) (Katha Publications, Manila).

⁷⁷ From a minority who do not speak English, American films have to be dubbed. But up to what extent goes the distinctiveness? To what point is this distinctiveness substantial, or, perhaps, it remains always to be incidental in the sense of it as a strategy so as to hide the true distinctiveness? For example, the Latin American telenovelas of Thalia or the rising popularity of “chinovelas” (from Taiwan) and “kimchinovelas” (from Korea) in the Philippines, transcend some cultural biases found in the country of origin and do not dwell in certain themes as economic differences or ethnic differences. So, we find ourselves before a culture of in-difference: This culture leaves out of the screen the strong differences in an unequal and diverse world. (See J.M. Berbero, “La globalización desde una perspectiva cultural,” *Letra* 58 (1998), p. 16) You may be listening to them in different Asian languages or they may be made from local raw materials, but they are the same bottom-line hip-hop music and mode of fashion from the West respectively.

⁷⁸ T.R. Machan, *The Ethics of Globalization* at <http://zolatimes.com/V4.41/globalization.html>, p. 1.

⁷⁹ Co, “Expanding Worldview”, p. 56.

⁸⁰ Op. cit., p. 58.

in Johannesburg South Africa.⁸¹ Here black American culture, as Serrano reports, was able to penetrate the market (black cinema, jazz, Afro-American culture) and galvanized the blacks into anti-apartheid protests that won in the end the democratization of South Africa. A good adoption of "global" products can help, then, to liberate forms of oppression by adapting an imported culture to a specific social or political situation. Also, the impact of globalization in the Oceania has reawakened a new consciousness on the part of the local Church so as "to seriously consider the centrality of the economy to the livelihood of the Pacific peoples, and hence, its relevancy to theological reflection."⁸²

In a way, there exists, therefore, this bright, sobering prospect, i.e., that global cultural patterns will adapt themselves to local cultures and help the humanization of the groups that receive these patterns.

The only way to go is to accept globalization in its three-layered over-powering manifestation, ever conscious and cautious about the lights and shadows endemic to it: "Amongst the major contradictions shaping the events of the world today are trends and concepts of globalization, integration and convergence, on the one hand, and of national and cultural redefinition, fragmentation and disaggregation, on the other,"⁸³ and, therefore, "to deny the complexities and contradictions in order to cling to a singular conception of what globalization involves is to risk the many dangers that accompany oversimplification."⁸⁴

For educationist policy makers eager to go global in the academe, these complexities in understanding globalization should be in place otherwise the economic beast that globalization can assume

⁸¹ Serrano, "Globalisation," p. 23.

⁸² M. Paunga, 1999: "Globalization and Culture: A View From Oceania," in *Globalization and its Victims*, M. Amaladoss (Ed.), (Vidyajyoti Education and Welfare Society, ISPCK, Delhi) p. 154.

⁸³ Teran Dutari, 2000: "Local Priorities, Global Values: The University between Economic Development, Solidarity and Social Progress, in *Abiding Issues, Changing Perspectives Visions of the University Across A Half-Century*, Guy Neave (Ed.) (International Universities Bureau of IAU, Paris), p. 295.

⁸⁴ Rosenau, "The Complexities," p. 364.

will escape proper and adequate sanitation in order to put it in the service of the humanization, or socialization processes for the *summum bonum*.

Indeed, these evolving circumstances open lots of opportunities for the *academia* to reassert her unique role as a socializing agent in society and its critical conscience.

GLOBALIZATION AND KNOWLEDGE SOCIETY

According to Elmandjra (based on the UNDP reports – reproduced in NY Times, Sept 27, 1998 issue), “the total amount required to provide basic education for everyone in the world is \$6 billion dollars – it represents 75% of what the Americans spend on cosmetics and 50% of what Europeans spend on ice cream.”⁸⁵ Based on the *1999 UNESCO Statistical Year book*, “we note that 18% of the population of the planet accounts for almost half of the total number of students (88 million) enrolled in universities throughout the world. Only one out of ten persons of university age in the South manages to attend an institution of higher learning whereas one out two manage to do so in the North.”⁸⁶ This is a yawning divide accelerated by “knowledge capitalism”⁸⁷ where “knowledge management” plays a vital role.⁸⁸

Yet, despite this stark discrepancy in terms of educational equity, following Castells’ remark that productivity and competitiveness, to a certain extent, is a function of knowledge production and information within this new information-intensive economy, “knowledge has become perhaps the most important factor determining the standard of living – more than land, than tools, than labour. Today’s most technologically advanced economies are truly

⁸⁵ M. Elmandjra, Aug 22 2000: *Changing Priorities – Constant Values*, Key-note Note Speech Presented at Plenary Session, IAU Eleventh General Conference, (Durban, S. Africa), p. 5.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ See M. Peters, Oct 2002: “Education Policy in the Age of Knowledge Capitalism,” Keynote Address Presented at World Comparative Education Forum (Beijing) at M.Peters@educ.gla.ac.uk.

⁸⁸ See D. Hargreaves, 2000: *Knowledge Management in the Learning Society*. CERI. OECD (Paris: OECD), p. 3; see also <http://brint.com/knowhatis.htm>.

knowledge-based.”⁸⁹ This knowledge-based economy mania has made us, nonetheless, realize that, indeed, “knowledge is power” cannot be underestimated.⁹⁰ “So, it is not surprising that education emerges everywhere as the major pre-occupation of citizens and of governments. It should be our priority of priorities.”⁹¹

Universities are called or rather pressured to disrobe the cloak of the elite Ivory Tower image and don the new robe tailored-cut to follow the neo-liberal fashion: “To an increasing degree, changes in university mission and patterns of organization drew their justification as steps necessary and preparatory to the university’s playing a very different role – that of one of the driving forces in a technical construct known to its adepts as the ‘Knowledge Society’.”⁹²

“‘Knowledge Society,’” Neave continues, “appears to be an amalgam of three currents of thought within the world of [the *academia*] which hitherto had each pursued its own agenda. The first redefined the mission [of the *academia*] in terms of ‘life-long

⁸⁹ World Bank, 1998.

“According to the 1999 World Trade Organization’s *Education Service Report*, the global market for higher education and training was estimated at \$27 billion in 1995. IDP Education Australia estimated that in 1999, there were 48 million learners in the world. They also projected that in the year 2025, there will be 159 million learners. In 1997, U.S. education and training services totaled more than \$8.5 billion and ranked among the country’s top five service exports, according to U.S. Department of Commerce statistics, placing the United States among the top three higher education exporters worldwide (the other two being the United Kingdom and Australia).” (M.P. Lenn, 2000: “Sustaining Educational Quality in the Global Marketplace,” *The Advising Quarterly*, for Professionals in International Education, at http://www.amideast.org/publications/aqAQ_Fall_2000_Sustaining_Educational_Quality.htm, p. 1.

⁹⁰ See A. Tofler, 1980: *The Third Wave* (Bantam Book, New York).

⁹¹ Johnston, *Education Analysis 2001 Edition* in p. 2.

As a result, “while education used to be exclusively a matter of national and local interest before, there is now a growing concern for international comparisons of educational performance, and a demand for international indicators for success. This is due to the increasing international mobility of skilled labour and students, as well as the growing concern for the ‘digital divide’ created by globalization.” (*Inequality and Education*, Press Release, United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE), July, 2001), p. 1 at <http://www.unece.org/press/pr2001/01stat08e.htm>.

⁹² Neave, *Voices of Constancy*, p. 31.

learning'. The second turns around the incorporation of information and communications technologies as an integral part of the transmission of knowledge and thus of the act of learning. The third element builds steadily upon the doctrine of economic liberalism."⁹³ The facility of communication wrought by ICTs boasted the speed and exchange of ideas. Hence, "knowledge capitalism emerged only recently to describe the transition into the so-called 'knowledge economy'."⁹⁴ Burton-Jones adds: "Knowledge is fast becoming the most important form of global capital – hence 'knowledge capitalism'."⁹⁵

Henry *et al* list down the following as the special features of the knowledge-based economy: "An exponential increase in the amount of knowledge; an acceleration in the rapid movement of knowledge globally; a growth in the centers of knowledge creation; a huge development in knowledge-mediated industries and services; changes in the access to, and control over, knowledge; the emergence of new ways of thinking about the links between knowledge and innovation."⁹⁶

Thus, "the transformation of knowledge production and its legitimization,... [is] central to an understanding of globalization and its effects on education policy. If transformation in knowledge production entails a rethinking of economic fundamentals, the shift to a knowledge economy also requires a profound rethinking of education as forms of knowledge capitalism, involving knowledge creation, acquisition, transmission and organization."⁹⁷

GLOBALIZATION AND EDUCATIONAL POLICY FRAMING

Nature of Policy Framing

Policy framing involves both process and text: as *process*, it covers the following tasks: identifying/inventing the problem, recog-

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ M. Peters, "Education Policy," p. 4.

⁹⁵ A. Burton-Jones, 1999: *Knowledge Capitalism: Business With and Learning in the New Economy* (Oxford University Press, Oxford), p. vi.

⁹⁶ Henry et al, *The OECD*, p. 151.

⁹⁷ M. Peters, "Education Policy," pp. 3-4.

nizing the context/setting of the problem (which includes political and bureaucratic exchanges), discovering solutions to the problem, implementing them and outcome assessment.⁹⁸ Ball adds this important addendum: policy processes are cyclic in nature.⁹⁹ And as *text*, it is interpreted in terms of discourse, that is – a struggle among meanings and over meanings.¹⁰⁰ Policy framing is, thus, similar to creating a patchwork of competing micro-discourses of multi-interests but aware of setting these discourses against broader macro-discourses within which they are located.¹⁰¹

Globalization Issues: Roadmaps for Educational Policy Framing

The influence of the so-called new managerialism, as a new implied mode of governance, has reformed education by significantly shifting it away from *administration* and *policy* to *management* emphasis. This form of managerialism," Fitzsimons continues, "has been used both as the legitimating basis and instrumental means for redesigning state educational bureaucracies, educational institutions and even the public policy."¹⁰² In a way, managerialism has usurped unto itself the power for social decisions, a prerogative normally identified with politics, democracy and ethics. It has blurred, if not totally eradicated, the distinction between public and private sector; and so, has robbed of these public sectors a kind of management style commensurate to their distinctive purposes, conditions and tasks.

⁹⁸ See T. Seddon, 1994: *Context and Beyond: Reframing the Theory and Practice of Education* (Falmer, London); S. Taylor et al, 1997: *Educational Policy and the Politics of Change*, (Routledge, London); A. Yeatman, 1990: *Bureaucrats, Technocrats, Femocrats: Essays on the Contemporary Australian State* (Allen & Unwin, Sydney).

⁹⁹ See S. Ball, 1994: *Education Reform: A Critical and Post-Structural Approach* (Open University Press, Buckingham).

¹⁰⁰ See Yeatman, *Bureaucrats, Technocrats, Femocrats*.

¹⁰¹ See S. Ball 1994: "Policy Sociology and Critical Social Research: A Personal Review of Recent Education Policy and Policy Research," *British Educational Research Journal* I, 23/3, pp. 257-274.

¹⁰² Fitzsimons, "Managerialism and Education," p. 1.

In summary, like a domino effect, the following set of consequences herald a new way of doing policy framing in the academe:

1. "The corporatization in schooling and non-formal education".¹⁰³ This effect is enfolded by adopting the following strategies: Authority figures are encouraged to be "managers"; and so are classroom teachers: "The main role of the teacher-turned-classroom manager is to legitimate through mandated subject matter and educational practices a market-based conception of the learner as simply a consumer of information."¹⁰⁴ Education problems must be result-delivery oriented; marketing procedures must be employed in the "selling" the school, thereby, strengthening the theory of dematerialization of Serrano¹⁰⁵ where a new added value is introduced not so much on content as on the product's brand imaging (i.e., school image) like product design, patenting, packaging, advertising – this is designed for the school to develop its own "brand"; at any rate, schools have become a captive market. Central to these initiatives are moves to dismantle centralized educational bureaucracies and to create in their place devolved systems of education entailing significant degrees of institutional autonomy and a variety of school-based management and administration.¹⁰⁶ This kind of institutional autonomy through devolution of functions (in other words, deregulated status) recalls to mind adopting Kickert's core/peripheral distinction in matters of "steering-at-a-distance."¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ M.K. Smith, 2002: *"Globalization and the Incorporation of Education,"* pp. 2-5.

¹⁰⁴ Giroux, *Stealing Innocence*, p. 2.

¹⁰⁵ Serrano, "Globalisation," p. 8.

¹⁰⁶ G. Whitty et al, 1998: *Devolution and Choice in Education: The School, the state and the Market* (ACER Press, Melbourne), see particularly p. 3.

¹⁰⁷ See supra, footnote no. 44, p. 9.

Impacting substantially, then, on educational processes, globalization requires of the *academia* to realign its educational aims – based on Coln Ley's list – according to the following four conditions: "The reconfiguration of the goods and services in question so that they can be priced and sold; the inducing of people to want to buy them; the transformation of the workforce from one working for collective aims with a service ethic to one working to produce profits for owners of capital and subject to market discipline; and the underwriting of the risks to capital by the state." (See Coln Ley, 2001: *Market – Driven Politics: Neoliberal Democracy and the Public Interest* (Verso Book, London), p. 4).

2. The “commodification” of the *academia*, specifically, of knowledge: Smith lists down the following strategies germane to it: the restructuring of course programs according to marketing principles such as marketing MBA courses; the modulization of some courses so as to target economies of scale; the use of open learning in the form of distance education to target those already working; the increase of student loans and course fees; thus, putting the burden of costs on the students, thereby, eradicating the old conception of students as “participants” in favor of “consumers.”¹⁰⁸

In the course of 90’s, because of the neo-liberalist anchorage of the market-driven economy, the idea of equity has been reshaped by competitive and individualistic ideology. Dictated by a kind of a market logic, the idea of equity then is premised upon productivity and contribution of the state workers to national economic growth. In other words, the idea has now been overtaken by consumerist considerations.

3. The privatization of education in a number of countries: This means, according to Monbiot, over 1000 state school being contracted out to private corporations.¹⁰⁹ For example, the Lambeth Zone supervised by Shell; and the Cambridge-MIT merger. Side by side with this emergence is the upsurge of corporate universities in the likes of McDonald University and Motorola. By the way, a significant number of the companies engaging themselves in this movement have been TNCs. Also, the subsequent inability of state to fund this massification of knowledge, and the subsequent parsimonious discharge of public fund especially for certain kinds of state scholarships have “simply to do with governments’ recognizing two unpalatable facts: first, that higher learning could no longer be funded with

¹⁰⁸ The consequence was the tremendous increase in student population from 13 million in 1960 to 82 million in 1995, (UNESCO, 1998) in the early stages of this transformation not so much in virtue of government policy as of the consumers’ fear of being disadvantaged in the labor market. If the figure takes into account the participation rate of mature students, in England, notes Wagner (1998), the probability in participating in tertiary education spread over a life time may be above 60%; in Finland, the figure could have gone beyond the 65% reached way back in 1994. (see A.Wagner, 1998: *Redefining Tertiary Education* at 4-eng.htm” <http://www/oecd.org/publication/observer/2/d/article/4-eng.htm>, p. 1)

¹⁰⁹ See G. Monbiot, 2001: *Captive State: The Corporate Takeover of Britain* (Oan, London), p. 336.

the same generosity as it was when smaller in scale; second, ... that acceleration in the pace of change was no longer compatible with tried and tested methods of administrative control."¹¹⁰

This evolving weakness to fund led to new issues in the education policy like the world rise of private colleges: "As the world's hunger for higher education had outstripped the ability of many governments to pay for it, a type of institution had come to the rescue that is well-established in the United States, but a stranger in many other countries: private colleges."¹¹¹ Second, this huge demand for knowledge (course content and instruction as well) has reaped a bounty of knowledge-providers, most of which, if not all, are private business corporations, emerging as the stiff competitors of university-providers.

4. The role of transnational organization such as the OECD, and, in some cases, at the supranational level, e.g., the case of the European Union: Within the connect of globalization, transnational as well as supranational organizations assume an enhanced policy role. They contribute towards an emergent global policy community. Although at a distance, their influence are felt imminently in local educational policy framing. Hence, educationist policy framer must be alert and sensitive to the subtle maneuverings of this global policy community. By all means, members of this elite community are bureaucrats, politicians, media moguls, policy intellectuals and other policy framers who, by virtual accessibility, are more frequently interconnected; and so can call the shots, so to speak, consensually through international conferences, symposia, or through e-communication. A policy framer should, then, take into account this polarization between the globally mobile and the immobile with the former being more blessed with global accessibility to their co-partners in the globalized cities of other countries than their own immobile countrymen.

5. The treatment of education much less a social benefit as an individual benefit: This justified introducing the principle of

¹¹⁰ Neave, *Voices of Constancy*, p. 29.

¹¹¹ D. Cohen, 2001: "The Worldwide Rise of Private Colleges," in *Global Issues in Higher Education, Articles from the Pages of The Chronicle of Higher Education* (Washington), p. 3 at <http://chronicle.com>.

“user pays” in education, an adoption further of some mercantilist approaches. With the intoxication by the wine of new managerialism, the individual that is created is imbued with the entrepreneurial qualities of self-autonomy, individualism, self-interestedness, and transparency. In this respect, seen closely as a form of subtle domination, managerialism, apparently does not aim to create a social actor out of the individual, i.e., one who is the central actor or agent of social change to the extent of even directly questioning the rationale behind the theory of this new managerialism in which he finds himself embrangled. That is why, for Fitzsimons, managerialism “leaves us wondering about the ‘who’ that is engaging in its required performances.”¹¹²

6. Most significantly, the active role of the stakeholders: Less state intervention signified outsourcing school funds other than the government through varied forms of strategic academic alliances/linkages/partnerships; thus, emerged the politically powerful concept of the “Stakeholder Society.”¹¹³

Its emergence signaled the arrival of another destabilizing factor in running the university: “Under this revaluation of the ties between university and [the Stakeholder Society], the time-honored view that learning should be independent of any particular form of society was severely mauled. It was, on the contrary, henceforth to be determined by what a society composed of group interests, present outside the university, could negotiate with academia – and what academia was prepared – to deliver.”¹¹⁴ “As the number of ‘stakeholders’ expand, so the university becomes more central to public debate. By the same token, as the range of

¹¹² Fitzsimons, “Managerialism and Education,” p. 4.

¹¹³ A rudimentary understanding of the term urges us to distinguish it readily from the term “stockholder” as Serahelgin notes: “A Stockholder is somebody who holds stock and, therefore, has a voting power within a corporation. A Stakeholder is someone who has a stake in the outcome. Therefore, you can say a community, within which a company operates, has a stake in the manner in which the company is operating for the health and safety of the community. ... Similarly, what we are talking about here, in building partnership, is recognizing that broader sense of stakeholders.” (Seraheldin, 2002: at <http://www.unesco.org/iau/gc-speeches/pp3-discussions.htm/>, p. 15)

¹¹⁴ Neave, *Voice of Constancy*, p. 26.

stakeholders becomes more diverse, so the range of demands will follow the same path because the interests they represent – or claim to represent – are similarly diverse.”¹¹⁵

But, what appears to be worrisome, a matter of serious reflection and concern is: “The most powerful stakeholders are those whose ambitions reach out to include the control over the transmission of knowledge – those for whom knowledge is a saleable commodity and knowledge itself a source of revenue.”¹¹⁶

We are, therefore, faced with the following consequences due to the adoption of quasi-market approaches in educational processes: the drive towards output-achievement; the adoption of standardized models of instruction; less emphasis on community and equity but more on individual advancement; and the investor/consumer satisfaction/customization. All in all, education had come to resemble a private good and not as it used to be, public. In this knowledge-based or informational society of ours, it has become today’s smartest investment whose economic worth is assayed, by and large, according to rate of return appraisal, human capital theory and the like.¹¹⁷

On the whole, “the university under these circumstances has become more than a creator of knowledge and a transmitter of culture, as Cardinal Neumann envisaged. It has also become an engine for economic production through its research and development work and, as we move more and more into knowledge economies; it also [has become] an incubator of ideas.”¹¹⁸

Summary Points

To recap, in this section we echo, in part, Asmal’s observations regarding the tremendous and substantial changes that have

¹¹⁵ Op. cit., p. 33.

¹¹⁶ Op. cit., p. 34.

¹¹⁷ See T. Schultz, 1981: *Investing on People, The Economics of Population Quality*, (University of California Press, Berkeley).

¹¹⁸ G. Dhanarajan, Aug 23 2000: “Universities and the ‘Knowledge Society’” Keynote Address Presented at Plenary Sessions, IAU Eleventh General Conference (Durban, S. Africa), p. 2.

reconfigured the educational landscape towards the propagation of neo-liberal idealism. The impact of these changes may vary from one local educational system to the other due to variation in micro-histories, traditions and culture. But one of the most striking features of this cluster of changes is that they are, independently considered or in a conjoint manner, homogenously perceivable across the globe.¹¹⁹ Since the 60's, the roadmaps for educational policy framing are:

1. Rapid expansion of student participation rate in higher education as well as in the number and size of universities. This has been termed the *massification* of education – a shift from elitist to mass higher education;

2. Simultaneous, international decrease in the state sponsored public funding for universities and the subsequent parsimony in public spending;

3. The need to outsource funding in any other than the state government encouraging the notion of private *partnership/linkages/alliances*, i.e., to enter into memoranda of agreements with other social, proactive players mostly non-academics, e.g., state, corporate world (industry and business), NGOs, etc; in other words, with stakeholders; thus birthing the “Stakeholder Society” phenomenon;

4. Adaptation of the powerful notions of surveillance/accountability for funds. They have become subject to elaborate systems of quality control-audits and reviews based on the performativity logic;

5. The introduction of commodification of knowledge most especially through e-production, transmission, preservation and application; thus, birthing private and corporate “knowledge providers” other than those of the universities;

6. The growth of private higher education institutions due to the state government's inability to fund; and transnational higher education through establishment of satellites campuses abroad or through open distance learning like virtual universities. To support outlay, some higher education institutions resort to establishing some business enterprises.

¹¹⁹ See K. Asmal, Aug 22 2000: “Opening Keynote Address” Presented at Plenary Session, IAU Eleventh General Conference (Durban, S. Africa), pp. 2-4.

7. The rise of other educative practitioners in matters of policy framing: they are those resultant conglomeration of partnerships arising from state school contracting out themselves to private corporations; and the upsurge of competing, corporate universities having adopted the research and development component of the university into their core business processes.

8. The search for various kinds of financial arrangements to help students cope up with the impact of financing one's schooling especially for life time;

9. Most importantly, the reconfiguration of the student profile as client/consumer according to the doctrine of entrepreneurialism and individualism; and

10. Substantial changes in university governance and leadership through the steering-at-a-distance mechanism based on the principles of the new managerialism; thus giving birth to the corporatization of higher education institutions. There are three main changes:

- 1) For some forty years, a shift from collegiality/participation towards more managerial practices;
- 2) Especially in the last 20 years, a new emphasis on stakeholders interests – both internal and external stakeholders; and
- 3) Especially in the last two decades, the rise of socio-political suprabodies like MNCs/TNCs/TCC sitting on top of local state governance whose subtle worldwide transactions transcends territorial and jurisdictional boundaries.

Any educational policy deliberated and implemented along these significant changes since the 60's will, indeed, be policy initiatives reflecting "movement toward a tertiary education system that fully welcomes demand, encompasses systemwide and lifelong participation, and relies on flexible boundary-spanning partnerships and networks."¹²⁰

(To be continued)

¹²⁰ A. Wagner, 2001: "From Higher to Tertiary Education" International Higher Education, *The Boston Center for International Education Newsletter*, 22, at www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/cihe/newsletter/ine_pdf/ihe22.pdf-255k-, p. 3.