This paper explores orthodox and unorthodox, or hegemonic and counter-hegemonic (Gramsci, 1971) conceptions of the global economy/economics and the individual as represented in selected educational materials and literature, relating these to differing conceptions of citizenship. On the hegemonic side, I look at literature which deals with, principally, orthodox economics’ conception of the individual in the economy. On the counter-hegemonic side, I contrast this literature with selected popular and labour education curricula and resources dealing with issues of the global economy, again highlighting conceptions of the individual within these texts. By extension and as a summative exercise, I link these differing representations of economy, global economy and globalization with distinct modes of education for citizenship, where I conceive the popular and labour education materials analyzed to be representative of an ‘education for counter-hegemonic citizenship’. Throughout this comparison and analysis, I keep in mind - in the spirit of Freire’s (1968, 1973) critical pedagogy - a ‘generative theme’ of ‘globalizations’ to serve as an integrating idea for the research as a whole.

This generative theme draws on the framework offered by Brecher et al (2000) of ‘globalizations’ from ‘above and below’. These writers, as well as others who share this perspective (e.g., International Forum on Globalization (IFG), 2002), work from a context of concern with activist social movements critical of economic (or specifically ‘corporate-driven’) globalization. The term ‘above’ in their framework refers to a globalization based on what I would sum up as hegemonic neoliberalism, with its perspective of economics and of the individual in an economy (global economy). The term ‘below’, in contrast, refers to a counter-hegemonic conception and perspective of economics and the individual in the global (capitalist) economy, a conception which accords with critical modes of citizenship (and education for citizenship) offered by other educational researchers (Osborne, 2001, 1998; McLaren, 2002). Brecher and his co-authors make the important distinction of complexifying ‘globalization’ as a moniker representing a broad array of potentially opposing frames of analysis and action. Their interpretation of ‘above and below’ frameworks capture a way of thinking about issues of the global economy which emphasizes the notion of perspective. That is to say, what is ‘globalizing’ about issues of the global economy is dependent on one’s stance; different values and goals are sought to be ‘globalized’ through different, contrasting and even oppositional perspectives and frames. Neoliberalism and its constituent ‘profit myopic’ trends of privatization, deregulation, and the like, are one stance which accords with a notion of ‘globalization from above’. Human and natural security, equality, satisfaction of needs, equity and social justice are another, represented through a notion of ‘globalization from below’.

Taking into account this generative theme for the paper, I also choose to focus on two central analytical modalities in my analysis of the selected curricula/resources in popular and labour education (around issues of the global economy). The first modality for analysis concerns the
pedagogical approach and ‘genre’ of each resource, appreciated with respect to a general frame of critical pedagogy in the Freirean mode. The second deals with each text’s particular representation of a ‘critical’ approach, something defined for this paper’s purposes as a text’s particular degree of ‘naming’ capitalism (as the present global economic system) as an integrating theme and significant step in ‘objectification’ of hegemonic notions of economics and the global economy. All of the popular and labour education materials/curricula analyzed take steps toward encouraging dialogically a level of ‘criticality’ in the spirit of attempting critical pedagogies. In the case of the Economic Literacy Action Network (ELAN, 2000) ‘tool kit’, direct reference is made to Freire and his idea of a popular education rooted in critical pedagogies of ‘subjectification’ and ‘liberation’ (1968). Appreciating that as we try to engage in ‘critical pedagogic encounters and experiences we ourselves are working from and within “cultures of silence” (Freire, 1968), critical pedagogies aim to concretize education within social experience toward intersubjectively discovering - critically - our social worlds. It is my belief that the popular and labour education materials looked at here aim to achieve just such a ‘critical consciousness’ - what Freire called ‘conscientization’ (1968, 1973) - around issues of the global economy, its shape, and our place in it. Such a dynamic, in my view, represents significant steps toward establishing modes of learning toward a counter-hegemonic citizenship.

On that note, it is also important to note that the intended audience for all the texts considered here are Canadian and American citizens, more of whom stand in a relatively privileged position as citizens of richer nations in terms of both the global economy and these countries’ regional contexts. However, as the writers of the United For a Fair Economy (UFE) materials persistently observe, many of the inequities which can be seen through macro-perspectives in global terms can be observed just as easily in sociological ‘effects’ of the global economy in richer nations. Put succinctly, the growing gap between rich and poor has not exempted rich nations, although it is in the poorer nations of the world where these gaps are most obvious (United Nations Development Program, 1999). Similarly, the Canadian Autoworkers (CAW) texts emphasize the similarity in struggles and challenges for workers across national boundaries in solidarity, emphasizing how issues of the global economy affect all nations, never in uniform ways, but through consistent themes of neoliberal policies, transnational corporate actors, and the preference for wealthy concerns in capitalist societies. In general, Sassen’s remarks in a comment on the back of Brecher et al’s book (2000) sum up this process well. Rather than the global economy (through ‘sustained economic growth’) causing ‘all boats to be lifted’ with the ‘rising tide’, she thinks ‘all yachts being lifted’ is a more apt metaphor to describe the shape and effect of the current global economy (under ‘globalization from above’).

As per the methodology I employ in making this review/analysis, then, I have balanced an appreciation of the ‘generative theme’ of ‘globalizations’ with an acknowledgement of the materials’ context in terms of critical pedagogy. The latter analytical category also relates more specifically to the issue of each text’s pedagogical focus and structure. This issue relates to each piece’s ‘genre’ and what Fairclough calls “texture” (1995, p.5), or the significance of the form of each text. I have selected the UFE and CAW texts to enable a contrast, where applicable or possible, between approaches within labour education and popular education traditions. My purpose is not to argue a sharp or substantive difference/distinction between these two traditions, but rather to look at them both to appreciate how these approaches differ from and problematize the global economy thought of in orthodox economic terms (with an emphasis on the individual
in this economy). In this spirit, the texts are comparatively viewed in an overall thematic of counter-hegemony as well as critical pedagogy in a Freirean mode, as well as through Brecher et al’s frame of ‘globalization from below’.

Finally, it should be mentioned that this analysis and overview represents a textual analysis only, and as such cannot appreciate the essentially dialogical social interaction which occurs when these texts are used in various educational contexts. This is an important point to note, as I may hope to enrich this research later on by balancing this textual analysis with a more ‘participant-observation’ or critical-ethnographic approach in an attempt to appreciate the social nature of the examples of popular and labour education discussed here. Even as a textual analysis of sorts this paper does not make pretensions at being exhaustive. Within the context of this survey and comparison, the principal theme of this paper is to appreciate the two methodological (as well as ‘generative’) themes mentioned above in looking at the four selected popular and labour education texts (CAW, 2001a, 2001b; Giecek & UFE, 2000; ELAN, 2000).

As a point of contrast to this discussion, I offer a brief summary of orthodox economics’ conception of the individual in a capitalist economic system. Peters (1997) argues that restructuring efforts under neoliberal policy regimes (MacEwan, 1999; George, 1999; Teeple, 2000) are based on a ‘market’ view of the individual, a conception he terms something he calls “neoliberal individualism” (Peters, 1997, p. 80). *Homo economicus*, or the orthodox-economic idea of the economic person, defines rationality by stating that the individual acts rationally when they act toward the realization/maximization of their personal preference. Hausman and McPherson (1994) argue that this ‘core of moral theory’ in economics serves to equate ‘preference satisfaction’ with ‘well-being’ in general, which in their opinion is a central mistake resulting from an ignorance of the role of moral and ethical commitments in economics. More radical and renegade economists such as Ormerod (1994) contest this orthodox view of economic rationality precisely because of its pretension to recognize a general ‘lawlike’ rule behind human behaviour in general, regardless of circumstances.

McMurtry (1998) ties the history of the economic concept of rationality back to what he describes as a revolution in the history of economic thought, in Adam Smith’s writings. Theorizing the individual’s work toward the realization of their preferences as beneficial to a broader social good, Smith’s idea of the ‘invisible hand’ sums up a picture of market regulation of atomistic individuals’ pursuits of desire into an aggregate maximization of economic and societal benefit (McMurtry, 1998, pp. 125-128). One can see in this ‘classical antecedent’ to the economic theory of rationality the same ‘smuggling in’ of moral and ethical values into the orthodox conception of the individual economic actor and its constituent broad idea of ‘social good’. The idea of ‘market equilibrium’ in neo-classical economics utilizes this concept. The *Routledge Critical Dictionary of Global Economics* sums the idea up by stating that “all individuals are assumed to look after their self-interest, and in doing so they utilize all social resources optimally” (Beynon, 1999, p. 276). Consequent to this kind of view, notions of economic welfare – the domain of ‘normative’ economics – remain tied to a regnant neoclassical economic view of human rationality.

In near-complete contrast to orthodox economics’ formulation of the individual as ‘rationally’ self-maximizing, the participant and individual in the light of the UFE and CAW popular/labour
education materials is seen as an ‘invitee’ toward critical discovery of what the global economy is. All of these resources, for example, use the term ‘globalization’ problematically and as a means of opening up issues of the global economy to inquiry and discussion. Both the ELAN (2000) document as well as both CAW course binders (2001a, 2001b) employ exercises which aim at getting at what ‘globalization’ is, toward a differentiation of ‘globalizations’ in the spirit of Brecher et al (2000). Significantly, all of these materials start from an appreciation of the individual as a critical entity capable of conscious reflection and discovery of critical perspectives on the global economy.

The CAW course binders represent two distinct courses offered at workplaces themselves or at the CAW’s ‘family education centre’, affiliated with the McMaster University labour studies certificate. Both course binders ‘genre’ is noteworthy in comparison with the other materials looked at here. Both, for example, are highly intertextual in the explicit sense of including whole articles - or in one case, one entire book - within the ‘text’ of the binders themselves. The ‘globalization and democracy’ course, for instance, contains 48 distinct articles (newspaper, web, book chapters, magazines/journals, and one book) as part of the readings for the various sessions of the course.

To compare these two CAW courses, I would submit that the course ‘globalization and democracy’ comprises a general introduction to the comparison and differentiation between market forces of neoliberalism on the one hand, and social justice concerns (the public good in a broad sense) on the other. The second course, ‘globalization and solidarity’, focuses specifically on education for action/praxis in terms of building critical capacities for worker struggles against the imperatives of ‘globalization from above’. In this sense, the former course is structured more as an openly-accessible educational experience aimed at not only activists, but workers in general. The latter course takes a stance which is appealing to, I believe, workers who take an active interest in union activism. This can be seen in the ‘objectives’ sections of both courses. For the first course (‘globalization and democracy’), course objectives are introduced as follows:

The objective of this course is to build a critical understanding of what ‘globalisation’ is and its impact. We will do this by:

1. Looking at different views of what globalization is, and thinking about the consequences of these views.
2. Studying the ‘globalisers’ - the different organizations and institutions which are pushing globalization.
3. Thinking through how ‘globalisation’ affects our lives, health, work, unions, communities, class interests and struggles.
4. Talking about how ‘globalisation’ affects working people in other parts of the world.
5. Putting recent protest movements against globalisation in context. (CAW, 2001a)

The course objectives for the other CAW course, ‘globalization and solidarity’, are listed in the following way:

Course objectives:

- To deepen our understanding about globalization and neoliberalism and its effects on workers in Canada and workers around the world.
- To learn about how workers in other countries are fighting for social justice and workers’ rights.
- To become more familiar with the CAW Social Justice Fund, our links with other trade unionists, and our international campaigns.
- To discuss concrete strategies for building international solidarity in our locals. (CAW, 2001b)

The difference between these two ‘course objectives statements’ follows from a direct concern with union activism in this latter statement, to a more generalized introduction to issues of the global economy and popular struggles in the former. In this way the two courses can serve two different audiences, those of union activists or workers interest in such activism on the one hand, and a more general audience of workers on the other. They are complementary courses if thought of in terms of ‘information and action’ - that is, ‘globalization and democracy’ as a text seems to flow well into the ‘worker praxis’-related concerns of ‘globalization and solidarity’.

Accordingly, the structure of both courses reflects a level of specificity in concerns of the global economy and its ‘impact’, although certain issues and concerns (naturally) overlap. ‘Globalization and democracy’ is designed to be completed as a three-day full time seminar, although each of the three ‘sessions’ as they are constructed could easily be expanded into a broader (longer) course structure. The three sessions are 1) ‘Globalisation and democracy - Key Issues’, 2) ‘Globalisation and TNCs’ [transnational corporations], and 3) ‘Globalisation and Free Trade Regimes’ (CAW, 2001a). The sessions of the ‘globalization and solidarity’ course are designed to be completed in a similar timeframe, with each session more specific and of shorter duration. They are, in order: introduction, ‘globalization’, ‘solidarity’, ‘neoliberalism’, ‘transnationals (TNCs) and unions’, ‘free trade and fightbacks’, ‘communication’, ‘social justice fund’, and wrap-up (CAW, 2001b). The level of specificity across these sessions as compared with the ‘globalization and solidarity’ course is noticeable. Take, for instance, the use of the technical/academic term ‘neoliberalism’ in the solidarity course as opposed to the more generalized language of the other course. Free trade as a central idea of globalization comes up in both courses, although issue-specific applications and explorations of this and other topics are undertaken in the solidarity course. For example, while the readings for the ‘globalization and democracy’ course are divided according to each of its three sessions (thematic groups), the readings section of the ‘globalization and solidarity’ binder is grouped in an issue-specific fashion for the most part: ‘globalization’, ‘poverty and basic human rights’, ‘corporate agenda’, ‘unions’, ‘trade’, ‘currency and crisis’, ‘military and arms trade’, ‘women’, and ‘environment’ comprise all of the readings sections.

Phrased and written as more of an ‘invitation’ to consider ‘globalization’ problematically, the ‘globalization and democracy’ course seems not to presume as much prior knowledge as its counterpart course. In the introductory presentation for the former course, a language is used which frames the educational experience at hand as one of comparing views of globalization, and considering from this comparison/contrast how globalization impacts people and the environment (CAW, 2001a). In contrast, the overhead sheet suggested for use in the introductory presentation for the ‘globalization and solidarity’ course seems to presume enough
background knowledge to take an openly ‘pejorative’ stance on the issues (cf. Appendix 1, ‘globalization and solidarity introductory overhead’).

As per the pedagogic approach and structure of these two CAW courses, both of them seek in a critical pedagogic style to invite participants to problematize issues of the global economy, to ‘conscientize’, in Freire’s terms. They seek to achieve this in dynamic ways which attempt to involve participants to the most extent possible. With both courses condensed into the space of full-time three day seminars, their ‘character’ as educational experiences would lend to intensity and immersion in the issues over the time allotted. In addition to the recommended and optional (all included) readings provided with each course, videos are utilized as well as games and activities which involve participants physically. In commenting on this aspect of the course texts’ pedagogy I am moving slightly away from an appreciation of the courses’ ‘texture’, if you will, to their content and implementation. Of course, any detailed appreciation of the pedagogy involved in these courses requires what I have already acknowledged as an ethnographic component to research. The principal point of reviewing the course texts’ ‘implementation’ or coordination with critical-pedagogic approaches here is to draw the link between Freire’s (1968, 1973) critical pedagogy and the type of learning experiences worked toward in the context of the texts looked at. In the case of both of the CAW courses (similar, as will be discussed, to the UFE materials), the everyday ‘limit-situation’ (Freire, 1968, p. 89-90) which is problematized and queried, ‘objectified’ for critical analysis, is the global economy itself and aspects of its social and environmental impact, as well as its tension with political systems of democracy.

In accord with this suggested Freirean link, the ‘globalization and solidarity’ course raises several issues which relate to Freire’s critical pedagogy in a section entitled ‘approach to learning’, which lists the following points as themes for CAW education courses:

- build on the experiences and knowledge of worker participants
- present ideas and information in a variety of ways to accommodate different learning styles
- focus on critical thinking (raising more questions than answers)
- approach issues, history, and strategies from a working-class perspective
- include a broader human rights and social justice perspective
- encourage further learning and activism (CAW, 2001b)

All in all, the CAW courses take a survey-type approach which attempts to cover as much ground as possible relating the global economy in an intensive style. Integrating topical areas which are specific on the one hand, yet relate to an integrating whole in terms of ‘globalization’ as a theme, these course texts emphasize the interpretation of social justice issues in a broad sense, integrated as a whole field of concern which relates to the global economy and our place in it. Subsequently, and in contrast with orthodox economics’ framing of ‘homo economicus’, these texts emphasize the individual as social and critical, as a ‘becoming subject’ in Freire’s terms. Finally, with respect to the ‘generative themes’ set out for analysis in the context of this paper, it is worthwhile to note that both CAW course texts openly cite and subscribe to Brecher et al’s ‘globalizations’ from ‘above and below’ framework. In this sense, the struggle for social justice highlighted through problematization of issues of the global economy represents these texts’ efforts at a ‘globalization from below’, resisting ‘globalization from above’.
The United For a Fair Economy (UFE) materials⁴ accord with a Freirean approach in a broad sense as well. The principal difference between them and the CAW course binders is that while the CAW texts are meant to be employed with workers specifically (thus I arbitrarily term them ‘labour education’ materials), the UFE materials are constructed with a wider array of possible participants or audiences in mind (‘popular education’), although it should be noted that these categories are by no means mutually exclusive and can be seen as inter-related and even fluid categories. Coincidentally, with the term ‘popular education’ having its roots in aspects and parts of Freire’s writing specifically, it is appropriate that Giecek and UFE (2000) refer to Freire specifically a section devoted to ‘popular education principles and practices’ (p. 3). Perhaps the most forceful statement from this section is one under the heading ‘education is not neutral’:

In societies with huge inequities in power, resources, and opportunities, education either reproduces the status quo (“domestication”), or it aims at liberation. Education for liberation means helping people to become active, critical, and creative in shaping their lives.

(Economic Literacy Action Network, 2000, p. 3)

As a statement of ‘educational principle’, we find here a commitment to framing this document’s popular education process in a Freirean critical pedagogy. The other document (Giecek & United For a Fair Economy, 2000) distributed by UFE also commits itself similarly to a program of ‘popular education’, though its intended audience or specific ‘design concern’ is with high school audiences. Perhaps this latter document comes the closest, of all of the texts examined this paper, to confronting some of the central precepts of orthodox economics of which ‘homo economicus’ is perhaps the most significant.

Working through activities organized through twenty-one discrete lesson plans, Giecek and UFE cover important territory utilizing dynamic participant-focused methods in confronting some of the core myths of orthodox economics, particularly as it relates to the issue of economic inequality in the United States. Using perspectives which appreciate how race and gender figure into class issues in capitalist society (Lessons 6, 17; cf. Appendix 2, ‘Giecek & UFE table of contents’), as well as tackling the common conflation of capitalism with democracy, the writers offer a significant and concrete problematization of economics as it is commonly taught. In this light, the counter-hegemonic character of this document can be related to that of the CAW texts - in their problematization of ‘economics as it is currently/dominantly conceived or practiced’. While a hegemony of neoliberalism is sustained by core orthodox economic precepts - including that of homo economicus - these documents (taken together) utilize a critical conception of the individual, as well as a counter-hegemonic problematization of economics and the economy itself (seen locally and globally).

Some specific mention of my use of the terms ‘hegemony’ and ‘counter-hegemony’ is necessary at this point. I use hegemony here in the sense of a marxist reading of Gramsci (1971), similar to

⁴Giecek, T. and United for a Fair Economy (2000); Economic Literacy Action Network (2000). I refer to these as ‘UFE materials’ because UFE distributes them. It is more accurate to refer to the latter publication as one of the ELAN, but for the purposes of simple reference, I refer to them both as ‘UFE materials’ throughout (except when citing each).
the interpretation offered by Ashman (1991). In my view, Gramsci worked within a socialist and marxist context, advocating means by which socialist-led working classes might gain ‘hegemony’ in terms of a ‘leadership of ideas’ in a capitalist society. In this sense, the ‘ruling’ or ‘leading’ ideas in today’s capitalist context are neoliberal ones, which make up what Pannu (1996) properly, I believe, terms a ‘neoliberal policy hegemony’ (p. 87). Counter-hegemonic ideas and practices, then, seek to ‘critically encounter’ the current hegemony and to problematize it toward offering critical alternatives. Emphasizing human needs and environmental integrity over the profit margin of leading transnational corporations, the popular and labour educational materials discussed here work toward just this type of counter-hegemonic praxis.

The ELAN publication is unique among those looked at in this paper in its composition as an ‘anthology’ of sorts. The whole ‘tool kit’ is comprised of shorter units created by distinct groups and organizations (cf. Appendix 3, ‘ELAN Unpacking Globalization’ table of contents’). Contributors to the publication include 2 groups from Berkeley, CA, and others from Knoxville, TN, Chicago, Atlanta, New Brunswick, NJ, and Boston (where UFE itself is based). The ELAN is also itself comprised of constituent organizations, including those listed in the table of contents and several others. As such, the ELAN document is highly ‘intertextual’ in the sense of being completely made up of ‘standalone’ units or documents in their own right. Topics covered include women and sweatshops, the World Trade Organization, the Asian currency crisis of 1997, privatization, and social rights and programs, as well as globalization and the global economy in general.

This ‘anthology approach’ has its advantages in its presentation as a true ‘heteroglossia’ - Bakhtin’s term (1981; Morris, 1994) for a collection of diverse voices - around issues of globalization and the global economy. Rather than tightly integrated around a specific audience and perspective as in the CAW documents, the ELAN publication represents a broad array of organizations and particular interests. I offer this point not to prefer one approach over the other, however. The diversity of the very social movements offering perspectives of ‘globalization from below’ warrants a diversity of voices, forms and texts dealing with the problematization of the global economy. The social organization of workers in unions comprises an extremely significant aspect, or voice, within the ‘heteroglossic whole’ which is ‘globalization from below’. The ELAN document reflects this diversity directly in its textual structure (its ‘texture’).

Having looked at both orthodox economics’ representation of the individual and contrasted this with that set out or represented in the popular and labour education texts analyzed, it is possible now to draw some analogies in terms of how these divergent views serve to represent distinct modes of education for citizenship. Certain conceptions and terms recur in literature on citizenship which represent contested areas of defining what citizenship means and entails. Competing notions of rights and responsibilities, for example, have always been front-and-centre in many contemporary debates and discussions of citizenship (e.g., Kymlicka, 1992; Beiner, 1995). Another fundamental area of conceptual contest in this arena as the notion of freedom. Adding to this terrain of debate in terms of modes and definitions of citizenship, I have focused in this paper on another distinct category of human action and thought, that of rationality. Along these lines I have contrasted orthodox economics’ ‘rational self-maximizer’ with the dynamic and dialogical ‘critical consciousness’ and ‘conscientization’ of Freirean critical pedagogy, represented in varying ways through the popular and labour education texts selected. These
divergent representations of rationality and human action and thought, I submit, relate to modes of citizenship and education for citizenship. To frame this observation as a set of questions, I ask you the reader to consider: what type of citizen – bearing in mind a generative theme of globalizations from above and below – is represented and engendered by the idea of *homo economicus*? In contrast, what type is represented by conscientization? I view the primary difference as residing in the latter’s willingness, its ‘mandate’, if you will, to problematize dominant ideas and conceptions, where the former simply reifies a hegemonic way of thinking about the individual in a global capitalist society. The modes of critical pedagogy attempted by the popular and labour education materials analyzed here seek to ‘objectify’ this hegemonic view, offering their own counter-hegemonic way of representing an education for citizenship in the same process.

The sets of approaches represented by these divergent frameworks in terms of both issues of the global economy and modes of citizenship fundamentally differ. While one set of conceptions situate the individual as a ‘self-maximizing’ agent in a competitive market capitalist society, the other locates the individual as a critical entity, working toward the conscientization that Freire conceived of as a prerequisite to liberation, in a mode of what I view as counter-hegemonic citizenship. In a stark sense, the difference between orthodox economics and the critical-pedagogic texts looked at here – between hegemonic and counter-hegemonic modes of citizenship and education for citizenship – is between an appreciation of the world, economy and citizenship which is essentially functionalist and one which is critical and problematizing. In the context of my M.Ed thesis research, I proposed an ‘additional component of citizenship based on problematizing current economic globalization’ (Davidson-Harden, 2001). In sum, I offer the suggestion that the materials looked at in this paper embody just such a problematization of the global economy as it is shaped currently - as ‘globalization from above’. Working toward a real ‘globalization from below’, these efforts at popular and labour education seek to conscientize participants, to invite us to consider the global economy in a critical way. In turn, such an attempt to frame materials toward critical perspectives of current economic globalization seeks to problematize and conscientize modes of citizenship, inviting workers and citizens to take a critical look at how dominant conceptions of the issues frame our activity as individuals in society. I believe that in working with the resurgent social movements challenging ‘globalization from above’ in recent years, these types of educational efforts stand to contribute in a significant way to the development of a critical and ‘conscientized’ citizenry. This type of process is increasingly crucial in a world of increasing social inequity, war, and strident global capitalism.
Appendix 1: ‘globalization and solidarity introductory overhead’
GLOBALIZATION
(what’s going on?)

the global bottom line
transnational corporations
free trade
attacks on unions
democracy deficit
racist exploitation
sexist exploitation
environmental
degradation/devastation
structural adjustment
currency speculation

SOLIDARITY
(how do we fight back?)

at the bargaining table
Social Justice Fund
union to union links
supporting union education
project support
solidarity messages
pressuring governments
worker exchanges
sectoral info exchanges
human rights campaigns
Appendix 2: ‘Giecek & UFE table of contents’

Contents

Foreword: What is Prosperity For? ................................................................. iv
Introduction ......................................................................................... v
Tips for Using These Lesson Plans ........................................................... vi
Lesson 1: Defining Economics ................................................................. 1
Lesson 2: What is Income and Why Do Some People Earn So Much More of It Than Others? ................................................................. 5
Lesson 3: Signs of the Economic Times ..................................................... 10
Lesson 4: Distributing Income: You Be the Judge ....................................... 24
Lesson 5: Income Levels and How They’ve Changed Over the Past 20 Years ........................................................................... 27
Lesson 6: Viewing Income Through Gender and Race Lenses ......................... 38
Lesson 7: How Much More Do CEOs Make Than the Average Worker? .......... 43
Lesson 9: Monetary Policy and the Role of the Federal Reserve Board .............. 60
Lesson 10: What is Wealth and Who Owns How Much of It ......................... 66
Lesson 11: How Savings Accounts and Stocks Function .......................... 73
Lesson 12: Born on Third Base ................................................................ 77
Lesson 13: Economic Boom for Whom? ................................................... 85
Lesson 14: Power Shift Led to Rule Changes ............................................. 95
Lesson 15: Globalization: The Race to the Bottom .................................... 106
Lesson 16: America: Who Really Pays the Taxes? ...................................... 118
Lesson 17: Closing America’s Racial Wealth Gap .................................... 133
Lesson 18: Democracy, A Game for the Elite? ........................................... 149
Lesson 19: The Consequences of Economic Inequality and What’s Been Done about Them in the Past .................................................... 154
Lesson 20: Economic Inequality, Why Should We Care? Because Knowledge Without Action Leads to Despair ............................................... 164
Lesson 21: What Can You Do: Real Policies that Lift the Floor, Level the Playing Field, and Address the Concentration of Wealth and Power .......... 170
Notes .................................................................................................... 177
Resources .............................................................................................. 178
Unpacking Globalization: A Popular Education Tool Kit

Table of Contents

I. Introduction .................................................................................................................. 1
II. Popular Education: Principles & Practices ................................................................. 3
III. Tips for Using this Book .......................................................................................... 5

IV. Sessions:

Are My Clothes Clean?: Women and the Global
Assembly Line .................................................................................................................. 7
*Women of Color Resource Center

A Global Economy Workshop and a Globalization Glossary ...................................... 29
* Tennessee Industrial Renewal Network &
  Highlander Research and Education Center

The Korean Tiger- Analyzing the Asian Financial Crisis ........................................... 51
* Center for Ethics and Economic Policy &
  JustAct- Youth ACTion for Global JUSTice

Privatization ..................................................................................................................... 63
* American Friends Service Committee

Sweating it Out with the WTO - a Trainer’s Guide ..................................................... 75
* United for a Fair Economy
References


