
RE-THINKING RE-PRODUCING CONSUMPTION: HANNAH ARENDT,
PAULO FREIRE, AND THE PEDAGOGY OF POSSESSION

Trevor Norris
University of Toronto

Three days after the attacks of September 11, 2001, George W. Bush strode across the White House lawn to a sea of cameras and microphones. He needed to provide reassurance, strength, and direction to a disoriented American people. His inspiring words galvanized a nation and reflected what has become the defining spirit of the American people. Joining a long tradition of great orators in times of struggle, he looked confidently into the cameras: “We can’t let the terrorists stop us from shopping.”

Amid the tumult and distress of those shocking days the peculiarity of this statement was easily overlooked and forgotten. That it would be the responsibility of a democratically elected leader to call upon the people to shop is surely a perversion of the meaning of political leadership. It is radically different from the slogans of World War II about courage, frugality and the virtue of investing in war bonds. Today a trip to Wal-mart is said to perform the same political function and express equivalent love of country. But for Dick Cheney it is not only an act of patriotism but also an act of military aggression: within a week of the event he described shopping as a way for ordinary citizens to “stick their thumbs in the eye of the terrorists.”¹ And on September 24 NBC’s Tom Brokaw insisted that “Americans need to go out and spend.”² Grieving and consuming are in turn conflated.

While international politics increasingly takes on the tone of apocalyptic fervor some have argued that the centrality of consumption to the American way of life is itself responsible for widespread resentment and anti-Western sentiment. In “Jihad vs. McWorld”, democratic theorist Benjamin Barber asserts that the proliferation of Western consumerism constitutes a new “soft” power of “McWorld’s assiduously commercialized and ambitiously secularist materialism”³ and “inadvertently contribute[s] to the causes of terrorism.”⁴ All too often the West has been more successful at spreading consumer goods and values than the institutions and practices of democracy.

In its quest to establish new markets and satiate our own consumer society the Western World extends its reach globally and draws all nations into its orbit. But consumer society is not only a new force in the evolving international system. It can also be considered a colonial force in our backyard- or rather in our schoolyards. The inroads made by advertisers into the school environment to gain access to the student body are possibly the most compelling evidence of the fact that our society has become a consumer society. It is undeniable that today’s youth market is worth billions, and advertisers are aggressively pursuing this

target audience through “school-business partnerships,” by which schools become an opportunity to secure a new market of consumers. Education is ideally considered a means of critically intervening in society, constructively enabling the development of a robust democracy and active citizenry. Consumerism, however, *undermines* the critical task of education, reducing it to a process by which students become increasingly *acquisitive* yet decreasingly *inquisitive*.

I shall begin this paper by exploring the rise of consumer society and proposing a theory of consumption based on the notion of “possession”. I will then turn to the inroads made by corporations and advertisers into the educational environment and their deleterious impact on pedagogical practices and models of learning. I will then consider two significant contemporary thinkers, a political philosopher and philosopher of education: Hannah Arendt outlines the rise of the private concerns of consumption which she links with labor and work, while Paulo Freire identifies “possessive consciousness” as a central characteristic of the oppressors, which in turn is a feature of the “banking model of education”. Both thinkers recognized fundamental problems inherent to the direction of modern industrial society. Their works are well known for this recognition, but have never before been used together specifically to critique *consumer* society.⁵ Connecting their analyses of consumerism will better illuminate this trend and its implications for educational theory and practice. In essence, consumerism’s penetration into education must be tempered, as it negates education’s critical and liberatory possibilities.

CONSUMPTION AND CONSUMER STUDIES

In this paper I will argue that consumerism entails the institutionalized production of need and the invention of new desires, the systematic inculcation of inadequacy and yearning for completion through material gratification. Yet consumption entails more than the mere fiscal transaction of physical acquisition. I will critique but not stop at this common understanding of the term, and will examine it instead as an archetypal activity of contemporary society by which the model of consumerism extends itself into all aspects of human life, from the teacher-student relationship to our experience of citizenship. In this sense, consumerism constitutes a process which expands beyond the purchasing of a product to include the transformation of all things in the world into objects for human consumption.

There is wide debate among theorists of consumer society about the origin of consumerism. Some scholars argue that it has always been an integral part of human social existence since the earliest stages of history. Yet more recently it was a marginal issue in perhaps the most important and influential text on political economy of the eighteenth century, Adam Smith’s *The Wealth of Nations*, where there is only one reference to consumption in its 900 pages.⁶ Others point to distinctive features associated with the emergence of modern capitalism during

the Industrial Revolution, when consumption was considered a response to the homogenizing forces of mechanization and technology caused by industrialization and growing urbanization.⁷ People began to consume as a principal mode of self-expression, a common language through which we communicate and interpret shared cultural signs and meanings. Others have argued that consumerism is a twentieth century phenomenon associated with the rise of mass communication, growing affluence, and the monolithic modern corporation.⁸ Several theorists have argued that there has been a gradual shift this century from the political and cultural importance of the production of goods to the production of needs, and that the modern subject is thus experiencing a shift in forms of identity and its expression, from the workplace to consumption.⁹ People decreasingly identify themselves with respect to traditional work-related social groupings and more so with consumer products and the messages and meanings conveyed about them. For example, Thorstein Veblen proposed “conspicuous consumption”¹⁰ as a way to express affluence. Several theorists have also pointed towards an important distinction between the consumer and the customer, who embraced a more personalized set of long term relationships rooted in familial and communal contexts, and that the latter is being eclipsed by the former.¹¹

Perhaps a deeper understanding of this activity can be pursued through an etymological account. The English word “consume” can be in part derived from two distinct Latin verbs: *consummare*, from *summa*, which means to complete, sum up, or fulfill in a teleological culmination, as in “to consummate”. The second verb is *consumere*, from *sumere*, meaning to take in, or be taken up by. We can speak of being consumed by anger, that it has taken possession of us and we are swept up and compelled towards action. But it also implies that it has overtaken us, and by extension has negated our autonomy. We could say that we are consumed by consuming, or possessed by consuming. Today even time itself is being consumed: we often speak of activities as being “time consuming”. My concern is that we are not only consuming products, but selling out something fundamental within ourselves and essential to our social existence and pedagogical practices such that in our pursuit of possession we experience absence rather than completion.

Consumerism and the pursuit of possession has been linked to two key features of liberalism: contract and choice. In *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism*¹² noted Canadian political philosopher C. B. Macpherson argues that the very birth of modern liberalism in the early British social contract theorists John Locke and Thomas Hobbes was based largely on the drive towards private acquisition. For these thinkers, humans are compelled to enter into civil society and submit to a social contract largely because the state of nature is characterized by great uncertainty concerning the protection of private property. Yet while the notions of possession and private property were originally construed as a way to protect oneself by contract against the power of the state and one’s other citizens,

many liberal critics argue that this attempt at protection has radically different implications. Thus, Macpherson asserts that “the original seventeenth-century individualism contained [a] central difficulty, which lay in its possessive quality.”¹³ The liberal emphasis on the importance of the individual is bound up with the “possessive quality” of that individual; the liberal theory of politics is intended to safeguard the autonomous sphere of the possessing individual. This emphasis is also associated with the capacity to autonomously assess one’s needs and deliberate rationally about one’s desires, and to make choices on the basis of this autonomous deliberation. Autonomy and deliberation, desire and needs are construed as existing prior to society as inherent features of the individual preoccupied with the consumer activities of choice and the satisfaction of ideologically defined personal preferences. The philosopher of education Ruth Jonathan argues that liberalism is “a social philosophy defined by the *priority given to preference satisfaction*.”¹⁴

In addition to the links with liberalism, consumerism presents new challenges to the notion of citizenship: just as the political categories of democracy, the public realm, and citizenship are being eroded, corporate institutions are gaining political status: corporations have been humanized as ‘persons’, and now speak of themselves as ‘corporate citizens’. This humanization of the corporation as citizen parallels the decline of active “human” political citizenship—we are asked to shop as a means of supporting our country in a time of need—and the transformation of human relations into consumer relations. The consumer replaces, or rather even “consumes” the citizen.

CONSUMING SCHOOLING

Having surveyed the historical rise of consumerism and explored its various theoretical underpinnings I will now turn to trends in contemporary schooling. Once a relatively protected and de-commodified public good, education is being swept up by globalizing forces, transformed into a commercial enterprise, and reoriented towards a thoroughly integrated relationship with commercial interests. This is not to evoke a golden era when schooling and society were not impacted by consumerism, but rather to suggest that constructing young consumers has become a growing element of the socialization process and a central component of the educative project. Schoolchildren are daily exposed to thousands of advertising images, and the educational environment is itself now drawn into this trend as desperate schools turn to corporate advertisers for revenue. To mention two recent examples, one Philadelphia school board president and self-proclaimed “director of corporate development” talks about “peddling the naming rights to the district’s only school on eBay” and “instituting a school uniform policy and selling ads on the uniforms.”¹⁵ In some cases corporations have sought to directly influence teachers: General Mills offered teachers \$250 per month to act as “freelance brand managers” and promote its

products in the classroom.¹⁶ These examples may explain why according to the Millward Brown Global Market Research Agency, “nowhere else in the world [but America] are 8- to 12-year-olds more materialistic or more likely to believe that their clothes and brands describe who they are and define their social status.”¹⁷

Corporations seek access to public schools for several reasons. First, youth spent in excess of \$170 billion dollars in 2002.¹⁸ Second, advertisers face the challenge of how to effectively reach a market in an environment of growing “clutter” from other advertisers. Schools provide a much more targeted market than that available to TV broadcasters; they contain not only a specific age group, but also reflect the local ethnicity and economic status of the surrounding population. Third, children exert tremendous sway over their parents’ spending habits, and become corporate representatives within the family. Schooling is thereby used not only to access youth but also their parents through what marketers term the “Nag Factor” or “Pester Power”. Children become the “Trojan Horse” of the home market, and influenced total family purchases to the tune of \$500 Billion in 1999.¹⁹ Lastly, youths have been called “consumers in training”; they are developing “brand loyalties” which may last for their entire lifetime and may include life-long addiction to tobacco, cola, and other physical substances.

While corporations might describe their relations with schools as “partnerships,” and might emphasize the advantages schools reap, they are motivated only by profit. This is not corporate benevolence: first, the cost of school advertising is factored into the price of the consumer product; it is we who pay for it. Second, corporate involvement in education is done only if they expect to make more money than they pay. Furthermore, corporations will prevent any opposition or criticism within schools.²⁰ This dynamic blurs the line between educating students and acquiring new consumers, between schools as commercial spheres and educational environments.

Contemporary experiences of childhood and adolescence are increasingly the construct of consumer culture. Schools and parents are portrayed as the negative “Other” and resented as authority figures, while the icons of consumption and entertainment are elevated as symbols of rebellion to identify with and emulate. What has been referred to as Generation X or Y could in fact be increasingly called the branded generation. In *Consuming Children: Education-Entertainment-Advertising*,²¹ Jane Kenway outlines the changing conceptions of the child and finds that the prevalence of consumer culture has dramatically altered the contemporary project of schooling. In eroding the demarcations between education, entertainment and advertising it has brought schooling into what she calls the “age of desire.”²²

Through the influence of consumerism, student empowerment is translated into strengthening purchasing power, and the development of self-esteem is reduced to the development of consumer confidence. And yet the prevalence of

consumerism and the inroads made into the educational environment do not only influence spending habits, but in fact alter the entire educational experience. First, the student body itself becomes represented as a “consumable” which is sold as a commodity to advertisers. Second, the student is increasingly described as a “consumer” of educational services, purchased in a financial transaction in which the classroom becomes a site of commercial exchange. The student’s self-understanding becomes that of a consumer of educational services, as implied in the discourse of “school choice”. Fourth, knowledge becomes a “consumable” and learning itself an act of consumption.

The Disneyfication,²³ McDonalidization,²⁴ and Coco-colonization of contemporary schooling reinforces students’ role as consumers, spectators, and passive citizens. As Deron Boyles argues, this trend “reduce[s] searching, being, and thinking to objectified and reductionistic particulars.”²⁵ Consumerism may lead students to no longer value their own curiosity and learning for its contribution to a richer democratic society, and instead focus on stimulation and extrinsic material rewards. Thus, consumerism reduces education to the reproduction of private accumulation, turns social resistance into political apathy, and transforms human relations into commercial transactions of calculated exchange. When corporations go to school what they learn is how to undo schooling; schools thereby facilitate the transformation of our culture into a *consumer* culture.

HANNAH ARENDT: THE ECLIPSE OF POLITICAL LIFE

I will now consider how an influential political philosopher and a philosopher of education have theorized consumerism, beginning with Hannah Arendt’s *The Human Condition*.²⁶ In this work she documents the historic ascent of consumption to a place of political dominance and the resulting eclipse of what she terms the “public realm.” Arendt holds a unique place among contemporary philosophers for her compelling and insightful critique of modern society. She has become of growing interest to philosophers of education in recent years, beginning with the work of Maxine Greene²⁷ and continuing with the recent publication of Mordechai Gordon’s collection of essays.²⁸ Although *The Human Condition* contains a section called “The Consumer Society”, the concept has been often overlooked by Arendt scholars. I will outline the place of this key concept within her work and connect it to contemporary trends in education.

Arendt develops a distinction between public and private, drawn from three key human activities. Within Arendt’s typology, these are labor, work and action. Labor is grounded within what Arendt calls the human condition of life, the biological life-process to which we are bound simply by virtue of being human, compelled to submit to and preoccupy ourselves with species-preservation. Labor, “the source of all property,”²⁹ is the interaction between the

human and nature, the endless taking from nature and returning to it through consumption. It is the private activity that provides for the biological continuation of life, in which the human body “concentrates on nothing but its own being alive.”³⁰ Because none of the products of human labor are lasting, she describes labor as “futile,” while privacy implies “privative,” or deprivation. We remain isolated within ourselves so long as we are bound up within this process and restricted to our own privacy, deprived of engagement in political action in the realm of human affairs. We are pulled into the cyclical process of consumption and exist in a “mere togetherness” where we are neither seen nor heard in our full humanness.

Between action and labor Arendt situates work, the activity which corresponds to the human capacity to build and maintain those physical things essential for political life. Work differs in terms of duration: its products last long enough to provide the physical stability required for the public realm to emerge. However, in a consumer society the products of work are increasingly “consumed,” and no longer provide a lasting and stable structure for political community. The form of community which arises from work is a community motivated by “the desire for products, not people”, where humans express themselves “not [as] persons but producers of products.”³¹ Human relations become mediated through objects, and we only appear to - and through - our objects, and human community becomes merely “an organization of property-owners.”³² The activities of labor and work are thus anti-political, and eclipse - even consume - the public realm.

In contrast, action expresses our highest potentialities, through which we are known by others and participate in something larger than ourselves. It is through action that our uniqueness can be disclosed and made known to others, through which we “insert ourselves into the human world”³³ of the public realm. In contrast to work and labor, the “products” of action are not objects to be consumed but rather constitute the very fabric of human relations, which depends upon “the constant presence of others who can see and hear and therefore testify to their existence.”³⁴ Thus, action is not lost to decay or the maintenance of life, but rather constitutes the process by which we present ourselves and appear to others.

For Arendt, the public and private realms and their corresponding activities are not historically static: that is, they may change in relative importance throughout history. The rise of labor and consumption to a place of political dominance “began when Locke discovered that labor is the source of all property.”³⁵ What emerged in the place of the public realm is a community centered around consumption in which human self-understanding became based on possession, action reduced to acquisition, and self-disclosure reduced to

consumption. Instead of experiencing action in the public realm humans were reduced to mere adjuncts of the cycle of consumption.

Within Arendt's framework there is thus a hollowness to this transitory character of possession, as objects rapidly become irrelevant and "unfashionable", passing through use into decay. In a consumer society the pursuit of possession means that the products of fabrication no longer provide the lasting and durable physical world within which humans can engage in politics and self-disclosure, but are instead themselves consumed. This becomes a self-perpetuating dynamic: just as the rise of consumption erodes the public realm, consumerism is strengthened when we are denied meaningful political life. We are no longer Aristotle's *zoon politikon*, or political animal, but live as if merely *zoon*: according to our possessive proclivities. Work and labor are mistakenly thought to transcend the imperatives of biological preservation, and political life is replaced by the accumulation of goods rather than political action. It is for these reasons that Arendt observes "it is frequently said that we live in a consumer society."³⁶

PAULO FREIRE: PEDAGOGY OF POSSESSION

As a political philosopher, Hannah Arendt provides an account of how the public sphere itself has been consumed and political action reduced to consumption. Yet a critique of consumerism can also be gleaned from perhaps the most influential educational thinker of the second half of the twentieth century and contemporary of Hannah Arendt. Paulo Freire has provided us with a compelling account of the dialectical relationship between the oppressed and oppressors in his influential *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*.³⁷ It might seem odd to discuss this work in this context as consumerism does not initially appear as a central concept. Yet in a footnote on the first page can be found a reference to our "consumer civilization." I will link the notion of consumerism to several key concepts in this text, including possessing, having, and being, which will suggest important links with Arendt's critique of politics as possession and the consumption of the public realm.

A central attribute of Freire's account of the oppressors is their "possessive consciousness," that their entire being is oriented around and dependent on the experience of possession, that the oppressors are therefore compelled to possess: "without possessions they would lose contact with the world".³⁸ Freire is worth quoting at length on this matter:

In their unrestrained eagerness to possess, the oppressors develop the conviction that it is possible for them to transform everything into objects of their purchasing power...For the oppressors, what is worthwhile is to have more-always more-even at the cost of the oppressed having less or having nothing. For them, *to be is to have* and to be the class of the "haves".³⁹

For the oppressor, being is contingent not only on having, but also on the process of transforming objects into possessions. Freire outlines how paradoxically in their compulsion to possess, in their objectivizing orientation towards the world, oppressors in fact negate themselves: “in the egoistic pursuit of *having*...they suffocate in their own possessions and no longer *are*; they merely *have*.”⁴⁰ Thus, while those characterized by possessive consciousness must *have* in order to *be*, they in fact *become* what they *have*, undermining the very possibility of being; in their attempt at ontological affirmation they have in fact negated themselves—they no longer are, in a world they have in turn consumed. Their having negates their own being, and their being is consumed by having. But their possessive orientation towards the world is not only limited to physical objects, but includes an entire category of persons: the possession of the oppressed: “the oppressed feel like ‘things’ owned by the oppressors.”⁴¹ Thus for Freire, possessive consciousness entails an ontological negation of both the oppressor and the oppressed.

But Freire’s analysis is not limited to a discussion of this ontological and dialectical relationship of possession, but to its presence within pedagogical practices. The trait of possessiveness is apparent when knowledge becomes a “consumable” to be possessed as an object by the learner, and when teaching becomes the delivery of measurable bits of information. Thus emerges Freire’s notion of the banking model of education, within which learning “becomes an act of depositing, in which the students are the depositories and the teacher is the depositor.”⁴² This model encourages a passive role for the student: “The more complacently they accept the passive role imposed on them, the more they tend simply to adapt to the world as it is and to the fragmented view of reality deposited in them.”⁴³ The banking model “transforms students into receiving objects,”⁴⁴ turns ideas into “consumables”, learning into consuming, and pedagogy into possession. Ultimately, “the educators’ task is...to ‘fill’ the students by making deposits of information,”⁴⁵ simply digested by students in a passive process of consumption. Freire contrasts this model of the teacher-student relationship with the dialogical relationship of problem-posing education, which “cannot... become a simple exchange of ideas to be ‘consumed’ by the discussants.”⁴⁶

Pedagogy of the Oppressed is concerned with the unveiling of systemic oppression, with drawing the human subject as a being of possibility into the world, working towards humanization through critically intervening in reality. For Arendt, action is how we disclose our uniqueness and “insert ourselves into the human world” of the public realm. By linking these two thinkers we see pedagogy as a form of political action, the communicative insertion of the subject into the world. Today this unveiling, transformation, and insertion, as described by Arendt and Freire, is profoundly compromised by the conflation of schooling and consuming and the invasion of the educational environment by commercial interests.

CONCLUSION: RESISTANCE AND DISCOMFORT

Consumerism is today our new ideology, the paradigm of post-modernity. The commodity and the brand can be considered our new idolatry. From Arendt to Freire, consumerism has been identified as corrosive of political life, a deformation of human consciousness, and a reduction of pedagogy to possession. Consumption is thus a process by which the human being is dehumanized and depoliticized, an active citizenry replaced with complacent consumers, and engaged learners with passive and possessive spectators. Globalization and the commodification of all aspects of human life, the “Malling of America,”⁷⁷ are increasingly the unchallenged assumptions of our times, accepted as inevitable and irreversible. Consumption has become our primary language, literacy the interpretation of commercial symbols, and the act of consumption our primary mode of insertion into the world. We internalize the act of purchasing and translate this experience onto all other human activities and aspects of our social existence, from political engagement to pedagogical practices.

Yet consumption is not action, and consumer society is not a public realm. Consumerism imposes a profound passivity under the illusion of political action, and emphasizes individual gratification at the expense of collective action. But instead, the expansion of consumer choice is paralleled by the contraction of the public realm. This narrowed vision of political life and contracted understanding of pedagogy profoundly changes our cultural landscape and radically alters the unfolding of democracy.

Although the images of commercial culture are a part of the daily life of students of all ages, the classroom can be a place for their analysis and critique rather than complicit incorporation. Concrete pedagogical action such as “culture jamming”⁷⁸ can allow students to engage in activities to decode and deconstruct the messages they are continually bombarded by. This enables students to creatively express their daily experiences with the images of consumption and thereby become active producers of meanings, contributing to culture rather than merely consuming it. The development of “critical media literacy” allows students to break out of the monologue of advertising and initiate a dialogical response based on the students’ own creative appropriation and subversion of the messages of consumption. Such practices will allow schools and the classroom to remain sites of critical engagement and political resistance rather than simply smooth the progress of accelerating consumerism. However, the classroom is not only a site for opposition and resistance but one in which opposition and resistance will itself be encountered by any teacher who attempts to challenge internalized commercial values. Megan Boler explores the dynamics of resistance and refusal in her account of the “pedagogy of discomfort,” which “begins by inviting educators and students to engage in critical inquiry regarding values and cherished beliefs.”⁷⁹ Not all students will be receptive to a critique of their

way of life, and may themselves resist knowing the extent to which they are caught up in this process and have internalized its values.

It could be said that consumer culture is the consumption of culture. But it is also the consumption of the next generation at the hands of schools. Yet it is inadequate to simply argue that we should stop spending, never go shopping, live without money, and have no possessions. Rather, I hope to have revealed certain political and pedagogical problems which consumerism entails so as to draw attention to the dangers of various trends occurring in contemporary schooling, problems which Freire and Arendt anticipated and articulated. The “epoch” of consumerism calls the entire project of modernity into question, revealed as a process of possession rather than action or humanization. If schooling assists the students’ subjugation to the images and values of consumerism, and is appropriated and undermined by consumer values, then critical pedagogy and political action are jeopardized. Ultimately, we must rethink the extent to which education is complicit in the reproduction of a society centered around consumption, and actively resist its relentless proliferation, so that our era is not remembered as one so insightfully described by Freire as a “consumer civilization”.

NOTES

1. *L.A. Times*, 17 September 2001. Quoted in <http://www.familyresource.com/lifestyles/10/322/> [cited 12 November 2004].
 2. Janine Jackson, “Patriotic Shopping: ‘Neither caring nor moral,’” <http://fair.org/index.php?page=1088> [cited 12 November 2004].
 3. Benjamin Barber, *Jihad vs. McWorld: Terrorisms Challenge to Democracy* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2001), xxvi.
 4. Barber, *Jihad vs. McWorld*, xi.
 5. In a PES paper Eduardo Duarte describes dialogical parallels between Arendt’s account of thinking and Freire’s “critical consciousness.” Eduardo Manuel Duarte, “Thinking Together as One: Freire’s Rewriting of Husserl,” in *Philosophy of Education 2000*, <http://www.ed.uiuc.edu/EPS/PES-Yearbook/2000/duarte%2000.pdf>, [cited 29 October 2004].
 6. Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations* (Modern Library: New York, 1936), 625.
 7. See for example Alan Aldridge, *Consumption* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2003).
 8. See John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Affluent Society* (Penguin: New York, 1968) and Joel Bakan, *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Power* (New York: Free Press, 2004).
-

-
9. Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 1976).
 10. Thorstein Veblen, *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions* (New York: Modern Library, 1899).
 11. Robert Bocoock, *Consumption* (London: Routledge, 1993).
 12. C. B. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1962).
 13. Macpherson, *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism*, 3.
 14. Ruth Jonathan. *Illusory Freedoms: Liberalism, Education and the Market* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997), 6.
 15. Kristen A. Graham, "Is This Any Way to Pay for Public Education?", *The Philadelphia Inquirer*, 22 February 2004.
 16. Michael Sandel, "Are We Still a Commonwealth?" <http://www.mfh.org/specialprojects/chl/CHL%20Sandel%202004.pdf> [cited August 15, 2004].
 17. Juliet Schor, "Those Ads Are Enough to Make Your Kids Sick," *Washington Post*. 11 September 2004, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A13374-2004Sep11.html>. [cited 12 September2004].
 18. Robyn Greenspan, "The Kids Are Alright With Spending," www.clickz.com/stats/big_picture/demographics/article.php/5901_30775. [cited 12 August 2004].
 19. Kim Campbell and Kent Davis-Packard, "How ads get kids to say I want it!" *Christian Science Monitor*, 18 September 2000. <http://csmonitor.com/cgi-bin/durableRedirect.pl?durable/2000/09/18/p1s1.htm> [cited 21 July 5005].
 20. Numerous examples of the ways in which corporations enforce their presence, from suspending students who criticize the corporations to preventing teachers from turning off Channel One, can be found in Henry Giroux, *Disturbing Pleasures: Learning Popular Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994); Joe Kincheloe & Shirley Steinberg, ed. *Kinderculture: The Corporate Construction of Childhood* (Boulder: Westview, 1997); and Naomi Klein, *No Logo: Taking Aim at the Brand Bullies* (Toronto: Vintage Canada, 2000).
 21. Jane Kenway & Elizabeth Bullen, *Consuming Children: Education-Entertainment-Advertising* (Philadelphia: Open U P, 2001), 59.
 23. I borrow this term from Henry Giroux, *The Mouse that Roared: Disney and the End of Innocence* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1999).
 24. I borrow this term from Deron Boyles, *American Education and Corporations: The Free Market Goes to Schools* (New York: Garland Publishing,
-

1998), 43-44; George Ritzer, *The McDonaldization of Society* (Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press, 2001).

25. Deron Boyles, *American Education and Corporations: The Free Market Goes to Schools* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1998), xv.

26. Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1958).

27. Maxine Greene, *The Dialectic of Freedom* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1988).

28. Mordechai Gordon, *Hannah Arendt and Education: Renewing Our Common World* (Boulder: Westview Press, 2001).

29. Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1958), 101.

30. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 115.

31. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 209.

32. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 68.

33. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 176.

34. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 95.

35. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 101.

36. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, 126.

37. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York: Continuum, 1970).

38. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 40.

39. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 40.

40. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 41.

41. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 48.

42. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 53.

43. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 54.

44. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 58.

45. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 57.

46. Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, 70-71.

47. Stephen H. Baird, "The Malling of America: The Selling of America's Public Parks and Streets—The Economic Censorship and Suppression of First

Amendment Rights,” <http://communityartsadvocates.org/saamall.html> [cited 14 November 2004].

48. I borrow this phrase from Kalle Lasn, *Culture Jam: The Uncooling of America* (New York: Eaglebrook, 1999).

49. Megan Boler, *Feeling Power: Emotions and Education* (New York: Routledge, 1999), 176.
