

Syracuse University

SURFACE

Dissertations - ALL

SURFACE

December 2017

The Post-Neoliberal Citizen: Immigrant Identity as the New Service Learning Center

Michael Lasley
Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://surface.syr.edu/etd>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lasley, Michael, "The Post-Neoliberal Citizen: Immigrant Identity as the New Service Learning Center" (2017). *Dissertations - ALL*. 832.
<https://surface.syr.edu/etd/832>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the SURFACE at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations - ALL by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

Abstract

In my dissertation, *The Post-Neoliberal Citizen: Immigrant Identity as the New Service Learning Center*, I analyze the language of service-learning initiatives, particularly the language these initiatives use regarding global citizenship, through the lens of the rhetorics of neoliberalism. Much of service-learning scholarship has, I argue, taken for granted the idea of citizenship; that is, the political subjectivity of participants in these programs has been articulated from the perspective of American citizenship. I begin the dissertation by tracing the early conversations about citizenship within service-learning scholarship, and I then note how these conversations shift when second-wave service-learning scholars reframed service-learning to engage directly with neoliberal logic.

I then analyze the rhetoric of two organizations: Santa Clara University and Justice for Immigrants. I argue that while the rhetoric of the service initiatives at SCU are often framed with language of social justice and global citizenship, the programs themselves are informed by the rhetorics of neoliberalism. They are, in other words, not providing students with an alternative to neoliberal political subjectivity. The rhetoric of Justice for Immigrants, on the other hand, provides a different, more global, understanding of how neoliberal logic has rapidly changed the idea of global citizenship. I analyze the archives of a JFI project to understand ways that immigrants articulate their experiences of being global citizens. Drawing on the rhetoric of these two organizations, the differences between how these groups experience citizenship, I argue that reframing our service learning initiatives around the identity of the immigrant provides universities with more meaningful ways to understand social injustices created by neoliberal policies, and more importantly, help students begin to envision a post-neoliberal political subjectivity.

The Post-Neoliberal Citizen: Immigrant Identity as the New Service Learning Center

By Michael Lasley

B.S., Harding University, 1997
M.A., University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, 2001

Dissertation
Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in
Composition and Cultural Rhetoric.

Syracuse University
December 2017

Copyright © Michael Lasley 2017
All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgements

Both of my parents were educators. My mother, Nancy, taught English, and my father, Raymond, taught science and math. They never forced me to study any particular subject; they did not even demand that I go to college. They simply encouraged me to find what I wanted to do that would make me happy. I ended up modeling my education after each of them, studying Biology for my undergraduate degree and English for my graduate degrees. From watching the ways they approached teaching and mentoring, I learned that education is a demanding career, but I know they would not have chosen to do anything else. I am thankful that I got to learn from two excellent teachers. Thank you for your encouragement and support.

My sister, Stephanie Jill Stewart, always paved the way for me. Since she was two years older than I was, she had to experience everything first. I got to learn from watching her as she got on the bus for the first time by herself, as she moved into high school, and as she moved away from home for the first time to go to college. I am thankful for her letting me learn from her example. I'm also thankful for my niece and nephews: Jenna, Joshua, Jude, and Justus. You're the four most inquisitive people I know, and I hope you never lose that spirit.

I grew up in a small town, and I do not think I would have had the courage, at least at a young age, to explore the world outside of our town had it not been for my friends Torre and Terry Austin, Shannon Beasley, and Trent Austin. You were always curious about what was beyond the edges of our world, and I am thankful that you have always shared this curiosity with me. Joel Henderson was my first academic mentor. I still look forward to our conversations, which never seem to have any specific direction, but they always get somewhere interesting. Thank you, Joel. And thank you Ryder Kerrigan, Reagan Kerrigan, and Justina Arvanitakis.

Every time I got a case of writer's block, you were there to listen to why I was stuck, and you asked me questions that helped me find a way out.

I have been very fortunate to be a part of three great departments: The Composition and Cultural Rhetoric Program at Syracuse, the Humanities Division at Pepperdine, and the English Department at Santa Clara. I am thankful for the friends and mentors I have in each of these departments. Because I worked on this project from afar, I relied so very much on Kristen Krause in CCR at Syracuse. Thank you for all of your help, Kristen. When I moved to Pepperdine, Stella Erbes and her family made me feel at home – thank you Stella, Richard, Joshua, and Jacob for giving me a family in California. I am also thankful for Paul Contino, Rodney and Dee Honeycutt, and Maire Mullins at Pepperdine. Thank you Simone Billings, Jill Goodman-Brown, Melissa Donegan, and Tim Myers at Santa Clara. I am a better teacher, scholar, and friend because of my all of you.

There are several people who have helped directly with this project. Thank you Paul Feigenbaum, Marcelle Haddix, and Brice Nordquist for your thoughtful readings of this dissertation. I sincerely appreciate your comments and your suggestions for how to develop this project moving forward. I enjoyed our conversations, and I hope we can continue to have these conversations in the future.

Finally, I would not have completed this project without the encouragement and guidance from my committee: Steve Parks, Becky Howard, and Eileen Schell. Thank you, Steve, for chairing the committee and for mentoring me throughout this process. My initial thoughts for the dissertation were incredibly vague, but you helped me find a way to focus and develop these ideas. You have always been so generous with your time – I have tried to become more generous with my own time because of your example. I have truly enjoyed working with you, and I look

forward to continuing to do so. Eileen Schell has helped me at every point in the doctoral program. She gave me a ride to campus when I was visiting as a prospective student; she was my advisor as I worked through the coursework; she chaired my comprehensive exams; she challenged me to finish my degree. Thank you, Eileen, for your constant support for 16 years. Rebecca Moore Howard took an interest in my work long before I took one of her courses. I think it was the Southern accent – she wanted to help a kindred Southerner. I am very thankful that you were a mentor for me, Becky. I am also thankful that you taught me that life in the academy is not just about work, that it was important to have balance in life. I know all three of you made a larger time commitment to this project than is normal, as I was living and working 3,000 miles away from campus. I am sincerely grateful.

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Introduction.....	1
Chapter Two: Contextualizing the Competing Rhetorics of Neoliberalism.....	38
Chapter Three: Justice for Immigrants.....	58
Chapter Four: The University.....	113
Chapter Five: Conclusion.....	152
Appendix.....	188
Works Cited.....	193
C.V.....	204

Chapter One: Introduction

It is impossible to trace the recent history of community-based teaching and learning without understanding its symbiotic relationship to a broader set of developments in the contemporary academy. Edward Zlotkowski.

Creating new generations of citizens is not a discretionary activity. Benjamin Barber.

When I began graduate school in 1999, I had not heard of service learning. If it hadn't been for a glitch in the system, I may very well have made it through my Master's program without knowing about service learning. However, because of this mix-up, I received funding through a program called AmeriCorps. This organization was created in 1994 as part of President Clinton's National and Community Service Trust Act. This was a signature piece of legislation during Clinton's first term. The idea behind this Act could be seen in his inaugural address, in which he called young Americans to a "season of service." The program gave AmeriCorps members a (very) small stipend and relieved some college loan debt. I had not heard of this program before I became involved in it, and I did not know it at the time, but the program was the subject of quite a bit of political debate. Unsurprisingly, the discussions of the program broke down along party lines, but the discussions focused on funding rather than an ideological fight over what a program such as AmeriCorps meant for political subjectivity. The program itself was simply the latest expression of the shift of political subjectivity in the age of neoliberalism. In this instance, citizens were expected to become volunteers providing services traditionally provided by the government itself (at a fraction of the cost).

The political debates over government funding of “service” programs like AmeriCorps were occurring at the same moment as universities were going through, at least in public perception, a crisis. The public perception of the academy had become one of disconnection – universities researched and taught what often seemed to be irrelevant for the type of citizens that the public wanted universities to produce. This was especially true of the humanities, as there is not always an obvious practical application for the information learned in courses on literature, art or philosophy. The public began to expect graduates to leave college with immediately marketable skills rather than with a well-rounded education. Donald Kennedy, a former president of Stanford, argued that despite the scientific and technological breakthroughs that universities had provided, there was an “underlying malaise” about the academy that “amounts to a questioning of the role of higher education and a challenge to the respectful view our society has [historically] taken of it” (10).

This crisis in higher education is related to the larger political moment, a moment when neoliberal economic and political policies were changing the relationship between citizens and states. One important response from both the government and the academy involved service. Service learning began to emerge at a fairly rapid pace on college campuses in the 1990s in part because it seemed a good way to address both of these crises. Service learning could help address issues of civic engagement, issues of poor university-community relationships, issues of activism, and issues of pedagogy. Kennedy argued that if universities were going to address the underlying malaise, there would need to be a revolution in the academy, but this would be difficult because “colleges and universities are so well structured to resist change” (8). So, early service scholars were in a difficult position: they were trying something that was often described as a revolution, and they were simultaneously trying to find a way to institutionalize it.

While discussions of the larger political moment were present in the first wave of service learning scholarship, a lot of the scholarship was an attempt to explain how service learning fit into existing educational conversations, to find the best approaches service learning, and to find ways to have service learning recognized as a legitimate program of study. In this chapter, I will trace those early conversations in order to understand how they are, in many ways, responding to a larger political discussion, even if those responses do not always make this connection explicit. I will then move into later service learning scholarship, as well as composition and rhetoric scholarship more generally, that begins to engage with neoliberal policies more directly. Theorizing service learning within this political context complicates the ways we think about citizenship. I am particularly interested in the ways that neoliberal policies have shifted our conversations about social justice and citizenship. When thinking about political citizenship, we have traditionally thought of citizens in relation to a specific nation-state. However, as neoliberal policies shift power away from nation states and toward corporations, the traditional idea of citizenship begins to erode. The idea of citizenship in the neoliberal era is no longer tied to issues of national interest or the public good; it is increasingly determined by market logic. Because service learning initiatives are attempts to create the habits of good citizenship, I think it is important to understand how neoliberal logic is influencing the ways that we design service learning programs. I will also attempt to further complicate our understanding of citizenship by centering our conversations not on students (the good citizens) but rather on the counterpart of the citizen: the immigrant.

Institutionalizing a Revolution

In one of the earliest essays on service learning, Benjamin Barber and Richard Battistoni discuss service learning explicitly in terms of political subjectivity. It is very interesting to see how these political scientists discuss citizenship in its technical political sense rather in some vague notion of civic engagement. For 30 years, they point out, political participation had been on the decline: “Individuals regard themselves almost exclusively as private persons with responsibilities only to family and job, yet possessing endless rights against a distant and alien state in relationship to which they think of themselves, at best, as watchdogs and clients and, at worst, as adversaries and victims” (235). That trend was possibly beginning to reverse with the election of President Clinton, which represented a “defeat for privatization and exclusively market thinking and may reopen the way to seeing in government a public ally of public goods” (235). Indeed, engagement in civic activities had begun to increase among young people in the early 1990s, but the increased activity was not discussed in terms of political citizenship. It was, instead, tied to the ideas of altruism or charity. For Barber and Battistoni, this was representative of the way our government was reshaping the idea of political subjectivity: “Many of the bills revolving around service offered in the last session of Congress embraced a spirit of private sector volunteerism that seems at best indifferent and at worst hostile to the responsibilities (and rights) of citizenship” (235). Barber and Battistoni argue that if service learning initiatives are going to be successful, they must push students beyond the idea volunteerism or altruism. The programs need to think explicitly about political subjectivity, and in turn, service learning can help us rethink citizenship: “A successful resuscitation of the idea of service is then unlikely to proceed without a concomitant refurbishing of the theory and practice of democratic citizenship”

(235). While service was successfully resuscitated, the call for the refurbishment of citizenship was not immediately answered.

I begin with that particular essay because the idea of citizenship comes up often in the early scholarship, but while citizenship is often mentioned, it is not the primary focus of the scholarship. (In fact, the citizenship of students appears to be viewed as a given: students are assumed to have a uniform (U.S.) political identity.) Many early service learning scholars are very interested in issues of social justice and engaged citizenship, but they also wanted to find a way to create a movement that would have staying power. Scholars who were enthusiastic about service learning needed to find a way to appeal to a broader audience than just those interested in the political moment, which could be (or would be) seen as an ideological project. As Edward Zlotkowski argues in 1996, there have been different waves of service or volunteer movements in the history of the academy. Those earlier politically driven movements could not sustain their momentum because they had a primarily ideological focus. While Zlotkowski is keenly aware of the political climate – he opens the essay “Linking Service Learning and the Academy” by discussing the role of the midterm elections on programs such as AmeriCorps – he argues that the emphasis of service learning scholarship should be on the ways that it enhances student learning: “Unless service-learning advocates become far more comfortable seeing ‘enhanced learning’ as the horse pulling the cart of ‘moral and civic values,’ and not vice versa, service-learning will continue to remain less visible – and less important – to the higher education community as a whole than is good for its own survival” (24). In order to survive, in other words, the revolution had to become decidedly less revolutionary.

Five years later, Zlotkowski is still trying to find a way to get people interested in service learning, this time appealing to how it can help meet the educational goals of liberal arts

colleges. At the heart of “Humanistic Learning and Service-Learning at the Liberal Arts College,” is a deep concern that service learning is not going to take root. Rather than thinking about service projects as they relate to a particular class or a particular learning objective, Zlotkowski urges scholars to show how service learning can be linked to other institutional values. His primary argument is that service learning is a form of Humanistic learning that fits well with the mission of Liberal Arts colleges: “application and experience are not incidental to in-depth understanding. When what students learn in their courses can be deliberately reflected, refracted, and refined in nonacademic experiences, many discover for the first time what being liberally educated is all about” (95). Once scholars link service learning to existing institutional values, “its appeal will be immediately enhanced” (92). The interesting thing in this essay is that Zlotkowski keeps hinting at how things are changing on college campuses – there is the mention of globalization, and there is the mention about education being practical (leading directly to a job), so the idea of neoliberal political subjectivity is present in his argument.

Much of the early scholarship shares Zlotkowski’s concerns, which is clearly seen in the student-centered, pedagogical focus of that scholarship that demonstrated how service learning could change the educational experience for both students and teachers. The pedagogically-focused concerns built on the tradition of progressive educators such as John Dewey. For progressive educators, experience and experiment were seen as a central part of learning. In *Experience and Education*, Dewey explains his approach to education: “I take it that the fundamental unity of the newer philosophy is found in the idea that there is an intimate and necessary relation between the processes of actual experience and education” (7). Experiential learning was not simply the act of having students do something; rather, experiences helped

students understand why they were learning. “There is, I think, no point in the philosophy of progressive education,” Dewey argued, “which is sounder than its emphasis upon the importance of the participation of the learner in the formation of the purposes which direct his activities in the learning process” (77). You can hear echoes of this in early service learning scholarship: “What intrigues me most,” wrote R. Eugene Rice, “about service-learning is the promise it holds for the quality of student learning. I am convinced that we are – as rash as it sounds – on the threshold of a pedagogical revolution...Experiential learning – which is at the heart of the service-learning model – will complement and merge with these other powerful pedagogies to transform the faculty role and the way we organize for learning” (xii). Robert Bringle echoed this sentiment by arguing that service learning “increases student interest in the subject, teaches new problem solving skills, and makes teaching more enjoyable” (222). And Thomas Deans wrote that one of the main reasons a lot of teachers began embracing service learning is that they are intrigued by the “prospect of students writing for an authentic audience beyond the classroom” (67).

Thinking “beyond the classroom” played a significant part in helping institutionalize service learning¹. Service learning would help students understand how what they learn in class relates to the world outside of the university. Linda Adler-Kassner, Robert Crooks and Ann Watters write that those who have participated in service learning report “radical transformations of their experiences and understanding of education and its relation to communities outside the

¹ While I focus specifically on the ways that composition and rhetoric scholars worked to develop service-learning initiatives, disciplines across the academy were also working on ways to incorporate service learning into their curricula. The American Association for Higher Education’s book series on service-learning in the disciplines provides a good insight into the concerns different disciplines had. While some of those concerns are discipline-specific, many of those conversations dealt with student engagement and learning, best methodological approaches, reciprocity, and how to create institutional support. The books in that series tend to break into a couple of different sections: theoretical explanations and practical examples of courses.

campus” (1). Paul Heilker argues that service learning can make rhetoric real for students. While Heilker’s classes address political issues – they write for non-profits – they do so in ways that the political aims “while significant, are more modest, and therefore more readily attainable, than those versions that strive for cultural transformation to the left” (75). This connection between our classes and the world outside would not be limited to students. Deans argues that while “service-learning cannot collapse the gap between our work as academics and our responsibilities as citizens...it does represent a vital bridge between inquiry and action” (171).

This is not to suggest that scholars are not thinking about the political moment or the idea of citizenship at all; they are. In discussing pedagogy and what they want from their students, the idea of citizenship is, of course, important for scholars. In fact, in many articles, the two are interwoven in such a way that they become two sides of the same coin. The arguments based on students and education overlap with the arguments about citizenship. In most of the scholarship, the two are inextricably interwoven, and for good reason. The relationship between universities and citizenship has been, historically, a close one: “Colleges and universities have long embraced a mission to educate students for citizenship” (College Compact).

Campus Compact is a good example of both the re-emergence of service learning and the ways in which education and citizenship are linked together. In 1985, three university presidents created Campus Compact as a way to counter the seemingly prevalent image of college students as privileged and self-absorbed. The presidents noticed that there were students who had independently become involved in community service, and the presidents “believed many others would follow suit with the proper encouragement and supportive structures” (Mission). The goal of Campus Compact was to support such initiatives and to provide an institutional structure for them. While the organization has expanded from three universities to more than 1,100, the goal

remains the same: “As the only national higher education association dedicated solely to campus-based civic engagement, Campus Compact enables campuses to develop students’ citizenship skills and forge effective community partnerships” (Who). While the organization never defines citizenship in a specific way, the qualities of a citizen are engagement and a shared concern about community life. These qualities are emphasized because they challenge students to resist pressure to focus solely on personal achievements and to learn “to think, speak, and act in the service of the public good” (Action Statement). The literature produced by the organization does, in places, mention global citizens, but this term is not interrogated or defined, and on the whole, the discussion of citizenship is very much rooted in American citizenship (they even state that their initial discussions revolved around a concern for American democracy). Our students are assumed to already be (U.S.) citizens – we’re just preparing them to be better (U.S.) citizens. Because of this historical connection between education and citizenship, I think it is important to think more about the role that education – and language education specifically – plays in shaping the way we see ourselves as political subjects.

Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* began as his attempt to understand why it was that since World War II, every successful revolution had defined itself in nationalistic terms. Political subjects thinking of themselves in relationship to a nation is a relatively new phenomenon, a product of modernity. The concept of a sovereign nation, Anderson argues, “was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm” (7). Speaking specifically of the nationalisms that arose inside Europe, Anderson argues that they were historically impossible; they only became possible “after the appearance of popular linguistic-nationalisms” (112). For Anderson, literacy education, in particular, was important for unifying a population: “The general growth in

literacy, commerce, industry, communications and state machineries that marked the nineteenth century created powerful new impulses for vernacular linguistic unification within each dynastic realm” (77-8). Note the connection Anderson makes between education, jobs and citizenship. They are all linked, and they were all important in helping create what Anderson termed imagined political communities. Literacy education was a way to unify people, to “arouse popular support” for national ideas (80). However, it is not just that nations are defined by linguistic unity. It is the language itself that creates the imagined political communities: “It is always a mistake to treat languages in the way that certain nationalist ideologues treat them – as emblems of nation-ness, like flags, costumes, folk-dances, and the rest. The most important thing about language is its capacity for generating imagined communities, building in effect particular solidarities” (136). The rise of literacy was in part responsible for forging national consciousness, and this, in turn, helped reshape the ways that societies organized themselves. The idea of nation-ness has become so firmly entrenched in the way we imagine ourselves that “nation-ness is virtually inseparable from political consciousness” (137). This nationalistic framework has been the operating framework for understanding citizenship for the past two centuries. Indeed, for a good deal of the last century, even the NCTE viewed education through this framework; in “The National Interest and the Teaching of English,” the organization argued that English studies should be a central part of education because it would aid in morality, civic participation, and utility.

Historically, then, we have linked education – particularly education in English – with citizenship. Early service learning scholarship often addresses the idea of citizenship or civic participation. However, unlike Barber and Battistoni, the use of the term citizenship is not necessarily a political one. Barber and Battistoni were concerned about scholars not re-theorizing

citizenship in the current political climate. Specifically, they noted the legislation taking place in the late 1980s and early 1990s that adopted the values of the private sector, and this legislation “seems at best indifferent and at worst hostile to the responsibilities (and rights) of citizenship” (235). Later in this chapter, I will discuss how part of the neoliberal project involved changing the relationship between individuals and the state, but I want to touch on it briefly here.

Democratic citizenship has traditionally been defined by a social contract between an individual and the state. Richard Bellamy argues that when we think about the relationship between citizens and states, we need to keep two ideas at the front of our minds: rights and responsibilities. The defining criterion of citizenship is that citizens have rights, and in order to secure these rights, citizens have certain responsibilities to their political community. Neoliberalism shifts the balance of the rights and responsibilities – citizenship is defined more by an individual performing their responsibilities rather than their legal status. Thinking about citizenship in political terms, as Barber and Battistoni suggest, is an important way to help refurbish the idea of democratic citizenship.

The term citizenship was important in early service learning scholarship, but the term was often used in a very vague way. Thomas Deans summarizes one early service learning study: “The study measured students' self-assessments of citizenship skills (including listening and verbal skills, leadership skills, and capacity for tolerance” (1). These skills are good, but they do not necessarily have anything to do with citizenship, at least not in a legal or political sense. Even when scholars attempted to be more political and turn to Dewey and his ideas of education and democracy, Deans points out that for Dewey, the relationship between education and citizenship was not necessarily a political one. At least, Dewey was not theorizing citizenship in a traditional way. As Raymond Boisvert points out, Dewey attempted to re-theorize the idea

democratic citizenship; for Dewey, “Democracy...is ‘more than a form of government.’ It is, fundamentally, a ‘mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience.’ This emphasis on the social dimension of democracy means that a special responsibility befalls democratic citizens: thinking through the implications of our actions for others before engaging with them” (55). Dewey’s work was an attempt to counter a highly individualistic image of being a citizen: “The realization of democratic ideals cannot be premised on the supposed preexistence of individuals as completed selves in a state of nature. Democratic principles must be brought to life within a human context which is inherently and ineluctably social” (Boisvert 54). Deans’ critique of how some scholars were drawing on Dewey appears to be that they emphasized the communal aspects of Dewey’s work over the ways that his work was attempting to shift the political conversation: “While most definitions of democracy hinge on political factors – government structures, individual civil rights, or social contract – Dewey’s definition emphasizes cultural factors – civic participation, open communication, and social interaction... Therefore the Deweyan conception of democracy is communitarian in character, emphasizing the possibilities of cooperative life rather than the dangers of unchecked power or conflicting interests” (33-4).

Communitarian views on democracy are not apolitical, but they do emphasize local, shared traditions over a relationship between individuals and the state. This emphasis is valuable because it challenges communities to work cooperatively to solve problems based on a common value system. However, there are some potential problems with this. “Historically,” Richard Bellamy argues, “citizenship has been linked to the privileges of membership of a particular kind of political community – one in which those who enjoy a certain status are entitled to participate on an equal basis with their fellow citizens in making the collective decisions that regulate social life. In other words, citizenship has gone hand in hand with political participation in some form

of democracy” (Bellamy). Bellamy argues that when we broaden the meaning of citizenship to include general human relations that it detracts from “the importance of the distinctively tasks citizens perform to shape and sustain the collective life of the community.” Amy Wan argues that when we discuss citizenship in a communitarian way, we risk developing “ambient assumptions” about what citizenship actually means. These ambient assumptions seem to lead “to the belief that one only needs to act as a citizen through participation in a community or society in order to become a citizen” (33). The problem with this assumption of good-citizenship-through-participation is that it “elides citizenship’s other definitional possibilities as status or standing, possibilities not easily accessible to all...merely through participation” (36). When we teach students in our classes and in our community-based learning programs that being a good citizen is something that is easily achievable through actions, “the term becomes merely palliative, at the risk of ignoring issues of inequality” (Wan 39). This is particularly important when we speak of global citizenship. Thinking about citizenship-through-participation does not necessarily address the larger economic and political policies that are shaping the relationship between citizens and states, and it does not address the issue of those global citizens who are undocumented or unrecognized in the country they live.

Not all early scholars were using citizenship in the Deweyan sense. Bruce Herzberg, Paul Heilker, Nora Bacon, David Cooper and Laura Julier all showed how the work service learning courses were doing were in fact tied to the shifting political landscape. Herzberg, working at a business college, quotes his college's President's desire for America to create a model of “Capitalism with a human face” (57). Herzberg did not want service classes to simply work on the local issues; rather he wanted to link them to the larger political sphere: “But what are they learning about the nature of the problems that cause these organizations [non-profits] to come

into existence? How do they understand the plight of the people who need these services?” (58). Heilker uses the work of Crooks to try to theorize a way to help students move beyond just thinking compassionately but to critique the larger systemic issues. Without such critique, students’ service-learning experiences serve ‘only to repair the safety nets that serve as apologies for the inadequacies of late capitalism’” (Heilker 74, quoting Crooks). While these scholars are engaging with larger political issues, as I mentioned above, they do not do much to problematize the citizenship of the students – students are assumed to already be citizens.

An early example of thinking about citizenship in a more global way comes from Nora Bacon’s work with Stanford’s Community Service Writing program, a program that worked with a church-based organization that helps Central Americans “fleeing political persecution” (40). And the interesting thing about this program is that it uses a local organization to understand U.S. foreign policy. Cooper and Julier attempt to position their courses in a way to understand how the conversations we hear each night on the news, the debates over values or cultural issues, “reflect long-standing assumptions about how to order social life in America” (81). In order to challenge these assumptions, they ask students to think of democracy as an act of discourse: “The writing assignments that we have shaped in connection with or as preparation for our students’ agency placements grow out of the classroom discussions and readings that block in a fundamentally rhetorical model of democracy. That model, simply put, imagines democracy as a conversation” (84). The assignments for the class ask students to learn how to practice “the arts of public discourse that communities use to debate controversial issues” (91).

This early scholarship is interesting because there is a lot of tension created by the competing logics driving service learning scholarship. I mentioned earlier that they were trying to institutionalize something that has the potential to be radical. This scholarship was trying to

change the way universities educate students by having them work within communities that the university has traditionally neglected, but finding a way to do this without exploiting these communities is a difficult task. It wanted to form and talk about partnerships with the communities, but it knew the partners in the relationships get very unequal rewards from the partnering with each other. Furthermore, the early scholarship had a shifting center: it was at times student learning; it was at times (various ideas about) citizenship; it was at times the community. The tension in first wave scholarship was an attempt to answer a new set of questions about the role of the academy in a rapidly changing world. Part of the reason for this shifting center in the scholarship is because of the questions that scholars were dealing with. Joseph Kahne and Joel Westheimer summarized the questions: “What values do service-learning curricula model and seek to promote? What kind of social and political relationships do they ask students to imagine? What kinds of relationships develop between students and those they serve? What kind of society is it that service-learning students work to achieve?” (594).

These questions did not shift the center of service learning, but they did lead scholars to think in different ways about service learning. As scholars were trying to find a way to best articulate what service learning meant for students – what they would get out of the programs, what kind of citizens we were creating – they also began to think more critically about the positionality of students (and scholars), as well as the relationships between the university and the communities in which they worked. The initial work dealt with institutional identity, reciprocity, and the power dynamics involved in service projects. This work then led to scholars connecting service learning to our current political moment. I mentioned the general malaise the public felt toward higher education earlier, and that general feeling could be seen specifically in the immediate relationships between many universities and communities. Brooke Hessler argued

that service learning was a way for universities to redefine their institutional identity because it offered “a way to demonstrate institutional generosity and historical ties with the local community, presumably in contrast with the soul-less online and proprietary enterprises that will grant credentials without extending nourishing roots into the communities they enroll” (28). Hessler was well aware that service learning could simply be used as a marketing ploy or a way to appeal to potential students (customers). In order to avoid, universities needed to think about ways they could develop better relationships with the communities in general. To do this, scholars would need to create programs “with strong institutional support” that could “sustain long-term reciprocal relationships with community members who share a stake in the local problem-solving” (30). Reciprocity is an idea that would become central to service learning scholarship. Linda Flower’s work with the Community Literacy Center in Pittsburgh was an example of how the long-term relationships could work. In order to create lasting relationships with the community, Flower argued, the university must be willing to not just impose their own framework onto projects: “it calls for reciprocity in multiple forms: in recognizing the history and contributions of community institutions, in commitment to a relationship not defined by a one semester project, and in a respect for community expertise that is expressed in the active practice of dialogue” (47).

Note that institutionalizing service learning is still a priority, both to Hessler and Flower – if service learning was going to succeed, it would need to be more inclusive when it comes to the community, and it would need stronger institutional support. One important way that scholars could help do this would be to begin shifting the ways that scholarship is valued. Rather than seeing scholarship on service as merely pedagogical, this work should be “scholarship of

application, a rigorous form of applied scholarship that engages consequential social problems and advances human knowledge” (33).

This shift of focus for scholarship – away from pedagogy and toward engaging consequential social problems – marks a move toward thinking more explicitly about political subjectivity. Ellen Cushman was one of the earliest scholars to attempt to propose a methodology for rhetoricians working in communities. Cushman’s methodology was, in part, a response to Edward Schiappa’s challenge to rhetoricians to not believe that being political in class was a substitute for active civic engagement, and it was, in part, an attempt to engage in public discourse, to show that what we study can enact change: “One way to increase our participation in public discourse is to bridge the university and community through activism. Given the role rhetoricians have historically played in the politics of their communities, I believe modern rhetoric and composition scholars can be agents of social change outside the university” (7). Having an explicit activist research agenda would counter the history of professionalization that Cushman believes has isolated scholars from the more democratic mission of education – to create engaged, well-rounded citizens. Furthermore, an activist agenda “brings to light ways in which we might begin to close some of the social distance between researchers and participants through reciprocity, dialogue, and collaboration. With activist methods, we begin to see how researchers can facilitate residents’ literate goals, at the same time as residents teach us how politics and language emerge in their day-to-day encounters with wider society” (Struggle xv). By attempting to understand how community members develop and share rhetorical strategies that help them navigate their way through various political or legal structures, Cushman’s work was an early example of developing a project that addresses the current political moment, which I will return to shortly.

This emphasis on reciprocity was important because it highlighted the power dynamics involved in service learning projects. Margaret Himley, for example, used postcolonial theories of ethnography to discuss the privilege involved in service projects. Himley draws heavily on the work of postcolonial theorist Sara Ahmed. For Ahmed, the figure of the stranger was an important way for us to understand how we organize our communities. A stranger, rather than being someone we do not recognize, is someone we recognize as not truly belonging. In the classical model of ethnography, researchers went into “strange” environments and wrote about the traditions and people they found, and they emphasized those things that differed from the Western norm. This approach, and specifically the label of “strange,” is a way to reveal the power dynamics between researchers and communities: only one group has the power to name another as different. This label implies that something is wrong with the community – there is something about them that makes them strange. Service projects, if they were truly going to be reciprocal relationships, have to find a way to deal with their own version of *the Stranger*. The roots for service are “the volunteerism of white middle- and upper-class women in this country, where these hopeful and idealistic (and perhaps naïve) volunteers went out into poor and working class neighborhoods to improve the material and moral lot of the less fortunate they found living there” (419). Just like the ethnographers, these women represented what they found and what they did in ways that often cast themselves as the good citizens who were “taking care of those who were weaker and more vulnerable and (believed to be) more dangerous” (420). Earlier, I mentioned Amy Wan’s concerns about defining citizenship as citizenship-through-participation. Wan warned against this definition because the participation could become “merely palliative” and not challenge us to think about issues of inequality. For Himley, concentrating on the image of the *Stranger* was a way to reveal these issues of inequality, to

reveal “the power asymmetries, social antagonisms, and historical determinants that are all too often concealed by discourses of volunteerism or civic literacy or active citizenship or experiential learning or rhetorical training – or, now patriotism – and that are ‘managed’ (or not) by methodology or curriculum” (417). Although the idea of reciprocity is important, unless we work to help students think about how they represent and interpret their experiences, we may not help to disrupt the image of the Stranger.

One of the problems with much of service learning scholarship, Tracy Hamler Carrick, Margaret Himley, and Tobi Jacobi argued, was that it relied so much on a narrative of progress. The courses were often designed in such a way that it framed the students’ experiences for them in ways that often led to a positive interpretation of the experience. To counter this tendency, they urge teachers and scholars to actively look for the moments when students and community members do not see eye to eye. We need to seek out the tensions and study those. “We have to remain alert to the power asymmetries and different discursive and material realities of the people involved in community-based projects. We risk confusing our ethical and political desires for reciprocal and mutually beneficial relations with the much messier realities that those relations often (re)enact. We risk masking rather than unmasking power dynamics” (59).

Foregrounding the positionality of students – and emphasizing the tensions created by the power asymmetry of power between students and community members – sets the projects up in a way that can help us deal with the “difficult” stories, argues Ann Green, that we could choose to ignore if we wanted to ignore them. Building on the work of Flower and Cushman, Green argues that service projects offer a great opportunity for students to begin to theorize race, class, and writing. Green’s experiences, as Barber and Battistoni mentioned above, made her skeptical of service learning’s ability to help dispel the myth of meritocracy that is so deeply ingrained in

students: “Students often seek service-learning classes because they want to ‘feel good’ about ‘helping others,’ and because students select service-learning courses to feel good personally, it may be even more difficult to explore with students how cultural and systemic racism and classism create the need for service-learning in the first place” (Green 282). By explicitly talking about the ways that race and class impact service projects, “it is possible to open the door for more complex theorizing about the relationship between those who serve and those are served” (277). This push to continually think about the servers and the served is important, and while the scholarship continues to assume that students are already (U.S.) citizens, this work is a step toward thinking of service within a larger political context.

This emphasis on reciprocity was initially a reminder from scholars to not think of what we were doing as serving a community (a tricky thing to do when the word serve is part of the name for this branch of scholarship). It also pushed scholars and teachers to rethink the relationship between universities and communities. Adler-Kassner argued that service-learning was a way for universities – which had spent decades trying to distinguish themselves from communities – to rethink that positioning: “The most immediate effect of service-learning is to rearticulate the college or university as part of rather than opposed to the local community” (4).

Part of this rearticulation and repositioning meant, as Hamler Carrick, Himley and Jacobi discussed, rethinking the ways that students and scholars represented the communities in which they engaged. But it also meant rethinking the projects that we developed within communities. As Linda Flower and Shirley Brice Heath pointed out, “While educators and scholars in this dialogue were directing attention outward and down the road, voices from the community were also gently reminding us that new relationships are always built within an existing social history” (45). Flower’s work with the Community Literacy Center in Pittsburgh was an attempt to

position a service-learning project within that existing social history. The CLC was a place that practiced shared knowledge making. So rather than thinking about how students learn from personal reflection, Flower attempted to turn the tables: “to transform service into a collaboration with communities and learning into a problem-driven practice of mutual inquiry and literate action” (43). In other words, community-members and students would locate some problem or issue and find a way to work on this problem together. This approach would pose a new set of problems for students and faculty members – it would require loosening control on the projects, and it would require potentially approaching projects in unfamiliar and uncomfortable ways. It would ask members of the university to draw on a different kind of expertise, expertise “that may come to us in a language, argument style, or discourse we find...discomfiting” (44).

Deinstitutionalizing Service Learning

This history – particularly this emphasis on the role of the community in service projects – is important for several reasons, but one reason is that it opened up new ways for scholars to think about how these projects are tied to the larger political moment. Eli Goldblatt’s work, for example, argued that service projects should emerge from the needs of communities and build on ways that communities are already responding to social and political issues: “Because the [service learning] literature is so oriented toward student- and faculty-based outreach into underserved communities, we seldom hear of community-based learning projects initiated by community partners themselves” (122). In other words, rather than focusing on what is good for the university, what establishes us as good, engaged citizens, we need to understand how citizens

within underserved communities are responding to the larger political moment in order to work with them more effectively.

Other scholars, such as Paula Mathieu, Nancy Welch, and Stephen Parks, were also interrogating how the communities in which students are working envision and theorize citizenship. Mathieu critiques service learning programs for being developed by – and even for – universities rather than by and for communities. Mathieu challenges scholars to reevaluate the way they study communities by shifting the focus away from the values, rules, and rhetorical practices of the academy and toward the rhetorical practices of communities. Welch’s work goes one step further – offering students tools to organize with disempowered communities. Welch is interested in studying voices that are often neglected in traditional scholarship. Studying community organizing, Welch argues, provides examples of how people with no real political power have found a way to have their voices heard in the public sphere. Welch’s work is more overtly connected to a critique of neoliberal political policies – she is looking at how people have approached and resisted specific political moments in the past century. Welch’s work also challenges the way we get students to approach political moments. She does this by blurring the line between the personal and the public, by showing how larger political issues shape students’ lives.

Parks’ work attempts to rethink the community-university relationship by turning it upside down. Rather than thinking more carefully about how scholars and students interact with or represent the community, Parks wanted to tell “about classrooms where the community takes a seat and becomes part of the conversation – sharing their knowledge and unique historical perspectives” (xiv). Although service learning programs were successful in becoming institutionalized and funded, most of this institutional support was focused on students rather

than the communities. Parks and other progressive scholars wanted to challenge that, wanted to design programs that supported students *and* communities: “For progressive scholars, the question increasingly became how to develop a set of pedagogical, curricular, and institutional strategies that would support marginalized students and their community’s self-defined educational and economic goals” (xv).

For Parks, inviting the community to take a seat in the class was a way to engage in the current political moment: “I believe we can learn a great deal about how to interact with the national context by focusing on how local classroom moments, existing within larger institutional structures, enact a political positioning of our discipline in the current moment” (xvi). Earlier I mentioned Barber and Batistoni’s early essay that urged scholars use service learning as a way to refurbish the theory and practice of democratic citizenship. Parks sees the work with communities is already political: “at every moment we are also part of the larger debate structuring the contours and context in which education as a national (and nationalist) project is constructed. And although we might not speak at national conventions and create scenarios where the literal figure of literacy sponsors carry our larger social vision of education into the classroom, we are always already implicated in these debates” (xvi). Through his work, Parks began to see how the theoretical work that universities provided could inform and empower the political work within the community. All of this work represents an important moment when service learning scholarship – and the university more broadly – was rethinking its relationship with the community, the power dynamics involved in service projects, and how to best incorporate the voices of the community into service projects. However, as I’ve mentioned throughout this chapter, while scholars mention citizenship and discuss the larger political moment, citizen remains an uncontested term. The idea of citizenship, and the experiences of

citizens, seems to be theorized through the framework of American citizenship. This is, I believe, an issue that needs to be addressed. Thinking about global citizenship in a transnationally – by not simply focusing on American students as potential global citizens – provides an alternative perspective on the possibilities of the idea of global citizenship. As I will discuss below, this is a concern for scholars in composition and rhetoric. Composition and rhetoric scholars, as Wendy Hesford points out, have been concerned with the relationship between “pressures of globalization and the consequences of the new United States nationalism” (Hesford 788). Scholars have begun, as Aihwa Ong has, to use the term transnationality “capture...movements across space, time, and discourses to disrupt totalizing top-down views of globalization” (Hesford 797). Thinking about citizenship from a more global, transnational perspective should allow for ways of thinking about political subjectivity in a more complicated, nuanced way. This transnational perspective should help expose different problems that neoliberal policies create for political subjects.

Situating Service Learning Within Neoliberalism

Framing our conversations about service learning within composition and rhetoric with a more clearly articulated understanding of political subjectivity would be an important way to help us both understand what we mean when we say we are teaching students to be good citizens and, to address Wan’s concern, expose the inequalities created or exacerbated by the very neoliberal policies that are rapidly changing what it means to be a citizen of a state. As I mentioned above, for political scientist Richard Bellamy, when we think about citizenship, it is important to understand the relationship between the rights of citizens (which are provided by the

government) and the responsibilities that citizens have (to their political community). Neoliberals, however, have distrusted and continue to distrust the government as the best provider of these rights, so they began to argue that the free market was “sufficient to show individuals equality of concern and respect with regard to their social and economic rights” (Bellamy). The goal of neoliberalism from the beginning, then, was to change the role of states. This process involved several different aspects, such as reduced taxes, limited business regulation, and a flexible labor market (Kus 6). I’ll briefly focus on flexible labor for a moment because it is a good illustration of how political subjectivity has changed under neoliberalism. The economic theory behind a more flexible labor market was that more flexibility would increase the efficiency of the overall system. This shift toward flexibility also represented a shift in the way we viewed rights and responsibilities; a flexible labor market focused on the self-sufficiency of workers (responsibilities) rather than on guaranteed protections (rights). This was a beneficial change for corporations, but with the removal of certain protections for and rights of laborers, the number of people with job insecurity grew rapidly. While neoliberal policies increased the number of people with job insecurity, they simultaneously began dismantling the traditional social safety nets the state would have used to address these issues.

Neoliberals successfully framed discussions about citizenship so that the “responsibilities of citizenship gained precedence over and above rights in the contemporary post-welfare state” (Smith-Carrier 30). As long as a person is responsible and self-sufficient, they are considered good citizens. Citizenship in neoliberal terms comes not necessarily from legal standing but one’s ability to sustain their end of the social contract with the state. “This contractual approach,” Tracy Smith-Carrier and Rupaleem Bhuyan argue, “debunks the myth that all...citizens have equal access to social entitlements” (9). Instead, neoliberalism creates “a

continuum of deservedness, one which favours some groups and their claims to social rights, while inhibiting access for others” (Smith-Carrier 1). This is not an inconsequential shift. While a neoliberal framework reshaped how we see the relationship between the individual and the state, W. Kymlicka points out that this framework reshapes much more than this one relationship. Neoliberal economic policies

also reshaped the structure of social relationships, including relationships in the family, workplace, neighborhood, and civil society. It may even have reshaped people’s subjectivities – their sense of self, their sense of agency, and their identities and solidarities. According to its most severe critics, the cumulative impact of these changes is a radical atomization of society. In the name of emancipating the autonomous individual, neoliberalism has eroded the social bonds and solidarities [including those forged in the family] upon which individuals depended, leaving people to fend for themselves as ‘companies of one’ in an increasingly insecure world (99)

Placing our discussions of service learning explicitly within the context of neoliberal policies should challenge us in a couple of ways. It will help us rethink issues of social inequalities and injustice; it will remind us of how civic engagement became the fundamental characteristic of a good citizen; and it will help us resist thinking of citizenship in a national context. This last point is important, and it is worth discussing more fully. As economies between nations become ever more entwined and multinational corporations begin to spread across the globe, migrations around the world are no longer governed by nation-states as much as

they are by markets. In short, the very idea of citizenship begins to change. Neoliberal economic policies may change the way people move around the world, but these policies do not do anything to reframe discussions about immigration or about who is allowed to be recognized as citizens of a given state. Aihwa Ong argues that “this cluster of neoliberal logic...rights, and ethics has become the problem-space of American citizenship, with outcomes yet unknown” (3). The outcomes are unknown because the market-driven approach to governing “realigned citizenship elements in different ways, thus challenging unified models of citizenship, on the one hand, and the national framework of its claims, on the other. It is becoming increasingly clear that the temporal dimension of citizenship is less fixed than we had previously presumed, as flows of people and ideas attenuate citizenship protections, and new articulations of claims emerge in novel political spaces” (Ong 15).

If service learning scholars want a more nuanced understanding about the citizens we are producing, then service learning and community partnership scholars need to frame our discussions more clearly within neoliberal policies. We should not, as Wendy Hesford warns, “take for granted the nation-state and citizen-subject as units of analysis and ignore the global forces shaping individual lives and literate practices” (788). Re-thinking the role of the nation-state and the role of the citizen-subject opens up some interesting questions. As D. Robert DeChaine states, globalization forces us to ask “important questions regarding political and cultural citizenship – that is, the nature of the relationship of a people or peoples to each other and to the institutions that represent them. What are the rights and responsibilities of the citizen, both to the state and to others with whom the state interacts?...[D]oes globalization entail an ethic of ‘universal citizenship,’ and if so, given the pull of national and cultural identities, how is the global citizen supposed to negotiate his or her allegiances and responsibilities?” (40).

DeChaine's talk of allegiances and rethinking how we interact both with the state and with each other is important. If we want to find a way to resist neoliberalism and resist becoming (or creating) neoliberal political subjects, we need a different analytical approach to understanding political subjectivity. Guy Standing argues that one way to do this is to resist using the same economic lenses that helped us analyze and critique industrial capitalism. As neoliberal policies spread and the inequalities began to become apparent, "the class structure that underpinned industrial society gave way to something more complex" (Standing). But the mainstream left, Standing argues, continues to rely on the traditional categories that defined the class structure. This has prevented the left from developing an agenda for change: "For the first time in history, the mainstream left has no progressive agenda. It has forgotten a basic principle. Every progressive political movement has been built on the anger, needs and aspirations of the emerging major class. Today that class is the precariat" (Standing). Standing's category of the Precariat is one that encompasses a broad range of social positions – from laborers and migrants in low-wage positions, to college graduates and professionals with little job security and few opportunities. The unifying factor of the precariat is that "[i]t consists of people who have minimal trust relationships with capital or the state... And it has none of the social contract relationships of the proletariat, whereby labour securities were provided in exchange for subordination and contingent loyalty, the unwritten deal underpinning welfare states" (Standing). For Standing, this is an important way of looking at political subjectivity because it emphasizes how certain members of society have a more limited range of rights than those of citizens.

While our students are often attempting to address issues of inequalities created by neoliberal policies, there is not always a push to see how the plight of those within the academy are very much tied to those within the communities. For Standing, however, one of the important

groups comprising the precariat is the one with the highest level of education. The most progressive members of the precariat “consists largely of educated people who feel denied a future, a sense that they can build their lives and careers, after being promised their qualifications would lead to that. They experience a sense of relative deprivation or status frustration. This is becoming a source of immense stress” (Standing). Service learning scholarship has long been concerned with reciprocity and solidarity, but one of the problems has been overcoming the artificial feeling to this reciprocity. Thinking of how the same forces that are impacting our communities are negatively shaping the political subjectivity of our students opens up a new way for students to theorize their own subjectivity. For Standing, this is the first step to change: “only when enough people in the precariat see themselves as part of a group facing similar challenges will they gain the social strength to demand a common set of changes” (Standing).

As I mentioned earlier, the neoliberal policies that are changing citizenship – and changing how people move around the globe – are very much related to the perceived crisis in education. Henry Giroux explains the relationship between the two when he explains the ways neoliberal policies have impacted our pedagogy: “Four decades of neoliberal policies have resulted in an economic Darwinism that promotes privatization, commodification, free trade, and deregulation. It privileges personal responsibility over larger social forces, reinforces the gap between the rich and poor by redistributing wealth to the most powerful and wealthy individuals and groups, and it fosters a mode of public pedagogy that privileges the entrepreneurial subject while encouraging a value system that promotes self-interest, if not an unchecked selfishness” (1). While service learning is an attempt to help students become citizens who think about civic engagement, social justice, and how to form reciprocal relationships with communities to enact change, those goals are undercut by neoliberal logic. Again, Giroux: “economic Darwinism

attempts to undermine all forms of solidarity capable of challenging market-driven values and social relations, promoting the virtues of an unbridled individualism almost pathological in its disdain for community, social responsibility, public values, and the public good” (2). Giroux’s dire assessment is that neoliberalism’s insistence on the market’s ability to solve issues of social injustice has reframed our discussions of social justice in a way that makes it almost impossible to critique the ethics of neoliberal economic policies. Because universities have embraced this neoliberal model, the education we provide does not enable students envision an alternate form of political subjectivity.

Towards a Post-Neoliberal Subjectivity

I am suggesting that in the same way conservatives had to invent a new form of citizen to insert themselves into political debate, progressive scholars need to develop a post-neoliberal citizen from which to base their service learning/community literacy work. Composition scholars such as Rebecca Dingo have started this work. When analyzing the work of microlending organizations, for instance, Dingo argues that the “fleeting transnational exchange is troubling because it prompts donors to act as neoliberal subjects who reinforce the notion of personal agency and monetary exchange over a broader understanding of the transnational contexts and relationships that make donations, charity work, and development programs necessary in the first place” (184). Her work attempts to envision an alternate, more empowering, form of political subjectivity. Jason Edwards and Jaime Wright analyze ways that our politicians have framed discussions of globalization in such a way that it seems beneficial for all involved: “As a result, the United States’s perception of globalization’s process belied the actual and material

drawbacks of such policies” (55). Understanding how our ideas of citizenship have been shaped is an important step in envisioning a different sort of subjectivity.

Service learning scholarship needs to build upon this work, and to do this I am suggesting immigration as an important framework because it can provide us with unique insights into the types of political subjects created by neoliberal systems of governance. Saskia Sassen argues that “[i]mmigration is...one of the constitutive processes of globalization today, even though not recognized or constituted as such in mainstream accounts of the global economy” (xxi). One of the main reasons why discussions about immigration are so controversial is that those discussions often focus on individual immigrants and the immigration process itself while ignoring “the broader international forces, many of them generated or at least encouraged by the United States, that have helped give rise to immigration flows” (34). The same neoliberal economic policies that have benefited business interests in the United States have often had a devastating impact on the economies in other countries; this, in turn, has pushed people to search for new ways of making a living. NAFTA, for instance, created economic conditions that encouraged (or forced, even) people to cross the border into the United States for economic reasons. While these economic policies addressed the legality of how businesses move around the world, they did nothing to address the legality of how people move around the world. Immigration in our current moment, then, provides an important way to understand how citizens are constructed – or reconstructed – by the state. In “Rescaling the ‘Alien,’ Rescaling Personhood: Neoliberalism, Immigration, and the State,” Monica Varsanyi points to some of the contradictions of neoliberalism: “observers of contemporary migration, particularly undocumented migration, increasingly point to a contradiction in our neoliberalizing political economic system: Barriers to the flow of capital are rapidly falling, at the same time as enhanced

border enforcement and militarization increasingly stanch the flow of labor and people” (879). Varsanyi's analysis is worth quoting at length because it highlights the contradictory ways we view capital and the ways we view individuals:

On the one hand, liberal nation-states such as the United States...increasingly operate according to a logic of neoliberal economic openness, privileging and creating institutions to enable the free movement of goods, technologies, currencies, and ideas between nation-states. On the other hand, the nation-state is still a membership community, which must necessarily maintain a distinction between insiders and outsiders. Under this political logic, the liberal nation-state simultaneously operates under conditions of closure, carefully selecting would-be immigrants and excluding undesirable ‘others.’ These competing logics lead nation-states into what Hollifield calls the ‘liberal paradox,’ but which we might also call the neoliberal paradox: How can nation-states manage the tensions that emerge between the seemingly contradictory forces of economic openness and political closure? (879).

Saskia Sassen argues that we cannot hope to understand immigration or citizenship without understanding neoliberal economic and political policies. The reverse is also true: we cannot properly understand neoliberal economic and political policies without understanding immigration and citizenship. Sassen is especially interested in what she calls global cities, the space where there is both a high concentration of money and power, as well as a correspondingly high population of immigrants. Global cities are important places to study: they are “strategic site(s) for disempowered actors because it enables them to gain presence, to emerge as subjects”

(xxi). Understanding these spaces where the disempowered gain presence challenges us to reframe the way we talk about or understand the process of immigration, and it can help us rethink the ways in which we discuss citizenship more generally.

As I mentioned earlier, neoliberalism and the production of neoliberal subjects are integral to the mission of the academy in America. If we want our students to be agents for social justice in a post-neoliberal world, we need to provide them with the most effective tools to accomplish this. After all, if the point of service learning projects is to create citizens who can address issues of social justice, then we need to provide students with a clearer understanding of the forces creating or exacerbating social injustices. While scholars such as Welch provide a framework for understanding what neoliberal subjectivity means within our national borders, we still need a broader framework: we need to understand neoliberal subjectivity in its global context. There are several ways to frame service-learning studies in order to investigate neoliberal policies and global citizenship. The deregulation of labor rights, the erosion of social safety nets, and the privatization of education, for instance, are all important aspects of the neoliberal agenda. Because service-learning projects are often framed as projects to create global citizenship, I believe investigating how neoliberal policies have impacted the idea of citizenship is an important way of understanding the idea of citizenship in the age of globalization.

Specifically, framing a service learning project around the issue of immigration should make the inequalities created by neoliberal policies more apparent and, subsequently, should offer ways to address them in a more effective way. Furthermore, it should help us begin to articulate a different vision of what it means – or could mean – to be a political subject in a post-neoliberal world. I believe this will help us understand what service learning scholarship needs to do to respond more effectively to a quickly evolving notion of citizenship. Centering the

conversation on immigrant identity can help us not just think about citizenship in a parochial way, i.e., bound by national context. Instead, it will help us think about citizenship in a transnational way, which has not been done in previous service learning scholarship. My dissertation centers its discussion of political subjectivity around immigrant identity.

Specifically, I will study how the idea of citizenship is theorized by two different groups within a global city: The (Immigrant) Community and The University. As Sassen noted above, global cities are sites with high concentrations of wealth and power, as well as sites with a large number of disempowered actors. While the communities I've chosen to study do not have a singular theory of citizenship, studying the language they use to discuss citizenship helps reveal some of the contradictions of neoliberalism that Varsanyi discusses. Understanding the ways that these key groups of people theorize citizenship in our current neoliberal moment should provide important insights into how we can begin theorizing a new type of political subject: the post-neoliberal citizen.

I will begin with a discussion of methodology in chapter 2. This chapter begins with a discussion some of the methodological concerns of existing service learning scholars. One of the challenges that service learning scholars have faced is working with methodologies unfamiliar to traditional composition scholarship. While my dissertation relies heavily on rhetorical analysis, as I focus primarily on the promotional literature of the university and an oral history project, understanding how service learning scholars have worked to develop hybrid methodologies provided insights into ways I could complicate a traditional rhetorical analysis. My analysis is informed by methods traditionally used in the social sciences. Specifically, while analyzing the

university's literature and the oral archive, I use a method of coding to help provide a structured framework for my rhetorical analysis.

I began developing the project at the same moment I began working at Santa Clara University, a Jesuit school in the Silicon Valley. As a teacher interested in service learning, I met with the Arrupe Partnerships, the institutional program that coordinates most of the service learning programs on campus. I was particularly interested in the way that the university, as well as Arrupe, emphasized their vision for creating global citizens. It was a vision that was built on a Jesuit philosophy of education, about which I knew very little. While researching this tradition of education and how it might inform the university's approach to service learning, I also became involved with an immigrant advocacy group, Justice for Immigrants. JFI was not associated with the university, but it was a Catholic organization that, like the university, was developed based on a specific set traditions and social teachings. Working with these two groups – a Catholic university and a Catholic advocacy group – whose ideas of citizenship were informed by the same general philosophical principles, seemed like a unique opportunity. How can these organizations working from the same theoretical perspective, but with two different types of global citizens, help complicate our understanding of citizenship at this particular moment? How might Justice for Immigrants help expose some of the ideas about political subjectivity that the academy ignores or takes for granted? (How) are the problems facing immigrant identity in the age of neoliberalism related to the problems facing college students?

In chapter 3, I look at a specific oral history from the Justice for Immigrant archive. This project involved a series of interviews conducted primarily in the Bay Area. The goal of the oral history was to help create educational materials for local churches and schools, to help create art projects for local communities, and to help the local community understand something about the

experiences of many of their neighbors in the Silicon Valley. Because the JFI interview project began as a response to a pastoral letter by the bishops in the Americas, I open the chapter with a discussion of the Catholic social teachings that deal with immigration. These teachings are often at odds with our current political policies regarding national borders and migrations, so understanding them is important to understanding the approach taken by JFI during the interviews. As I read the interviews, there were certain themes that emerged, and in the last half of the chapter, I discuss the stories of 6 immigrants. Their experiences serve as good examples of how individual lives are impacted by global political policies. I specifically look at the experiences of laborers, the experiences of undocumented teenagers, and the experiences of crossing the borders between countries. Understanding the experiences of unrecognized global citizens highlight the U.S.'s contradictory – and unjust – approach to immigration policy.

Most of the students at Santa Clara University have a much different perspective of global citizenship than the immigrants in chapter 3. In chapter 4 I look at the ways the university theorizes citizenship. Specifically, I look at three university programs that are designed to help students think about issues of social justice and their role as citizens. One program is a traditional service learning initiative designed to take place over the course of a 10-week quarter. One program focuses on short-term (usually one to two week) immersion trips to impoverished communities. One program attempts to help entrepreneurs develop ideas and businesses that address some social justice issue. While these programs are attempting to address injustices, and while they are attempting to help create global citizens capable of addressing the world's greatest needs, they do not do much to problematize the idea of global citizenship. The language in the literature is often infused with neoliberal logic. This is clearly the case with the entrepreneurial approach to social justice, but the language of neoliberalism is also present in the more

traditional programs. This normalization of neoliberal thought is at times subtle, and, I argue, it masks some of the underlying problems the way we typically discuss global citizenship.

In the final chapter, I bring the conversations from the previous two chapters together. I argue that both the experiences of immigrants and the university's programs for social justice represent opposite sides of neoliberalism. One of the major problems with countering neoliberalism is that it seems an inescapable system. However, I believe that service learning initiatives are uniquely positioned to help students ask questions about global citizenship that will help them envision a different sort of political subjectivity. The programs I discuss in chapter 4 are all designed to help communities deal with social injustices, and they are all designed to help students become global citizens. As I mentioned above, discussing issues of social justice explicitly within a neoliberal framework, can help us understand how political subjectivity – and our conversations about citizenship – have been shaped by neoliberal logic for the past 40 years. Furthermore, thinking about how immigrant identity has been shaped by neoliberal policies pushes us away from a nationalistic view of citizenship towards a transnational view of political subjectivity. In this chapter, I discuss ways that I have attempted to reframe our conversations about citizenship in my service learning courses. I do this both with their placements (within an immigrant community) and through the readings on political subjectivity. By framing our discussions of global citizenship and social justice in this way, my goal is to help students begin to understand some of the illogic of neoliberalism. This is, admittedly, an initial step in resisting neoliberalism, but the initial step is a crucial one.

Chapter Two: Contextualizing the Competing Rhetorics of Neoliberalism

Much of service learning scholarship focuses on finding ways to develop the best approaches to working with communities. This work has been important for several reasons: it helped students and scholars think critically about the asymmetries between universities and communities; it attempted to reimagine what university-community partnerships could look like; it attempted to understand the rhetorical practices and strategies of different communities; it challenged the way we think about the public sphere. While my dissertation builds on this work – particularly the rhetorical analyses involved in those projects – it also takes a slightly different approach to thinking about service learning by contrasting the identities of good neoliberal subjects (students) and unrecognized neoliberal subjects (immigrants). I will discuss a specific course that I teach, but my major concern in this project is understanding how the rhetoric of different communities – specifically, university service learning initiatives and the communities with which they partner – have been influenced by neoliberal logic. In order to do this, I combine methods traditionally used in English studies – critical reading and rhetorical analysis – with qualitative methods traditionally associated with the social sciences. In the chapters 3 and 4, I analyze the rhetoric of communities who approach the same ideas from different political perspectives: I analyze an archive of interviews conducted with immigrants in the San Francisco Bay Area, and I analyze the rhetoric of global citizenship produced by the university where I teach, Santa Clara University. Analyzing how the issues of citizenship and social justice are discussed from these contrasting perspectives provides a way to understand how the rhetorics of global citizenship are being shaped by neoliberal logic. Understanding some of the flaws and

inconsistencies can, I believe, open up new ways of thinking about the types of citizens that we are creating.

I will begin this chapter by discussing some of the concerns and methods of existing service-learning scholarship; specifically, I will look at second wave scholars who challenge the ways institutionalized service-learning programs have either overlooked the concerns of communities or failed to offer students clear ways to resist systemic forces. I will then discuss my process of developing a method that combines qualitative research methods with the more familiar method of rhetorical analysis.

Existing Service Learning Scholarship

Because of the nature of service learning projects, service learning scholars have necessarily had to develop new and hybrid methods to address the unique scholarly problems that these projects posed. While early service learning scholars were concerned with the power dynamics involved in service learning initiatives, the scholarship focused primarily on pedagogical or administrative issues. Because of this focus, scholars drew heavily on the methods of experiential educators. As I discussed in the first chapter, this was important because it was a way to justify and explain these programs to university administrators. Second-wave scholars continued to think about the pedagogical aspects of service-learning initiatives, but they also began expand the scope of their projects to think more about how service learning initiatives were situated within – and were responses to – the rhetorics of neoliberalism. While these scholars approached their projects in diverse ways – looking at rhetoric produced by the community, analyzing the rhetoric of protest moments, inviting community stake-holders to help

initiate projects – scholars were attempting to understand different rhetorical strategies that can be used to critique the rhetorics of neoliberalism.

This shift of focus on pedagogical and administrative issues to analyzing the rhetorical and knowledge-making practices of different communities was important for my thinking about a methodology for this project; I wanted to understand how the rhetoric coming from both the university and the community could be analyzed within the context of neoliberal rhetorics. To do this, I turned to rhetorical scholars who focus on the complexities of rhetorical analysis. In “Rhetorical Analysis: Understanding How Texts Persuade Readers,” Jack Selzer argues that rhetorical analysis “can be understood as an effort to understand how people within specific social situations attempt to influence others through language” (280-1). Textual analysis is important because it results in a “heightened awareness of the message under rhetorical consideration, and an appreciation for the ways people manipulate language and other symbols for persuasive purposes” (281). Selzer breaks rhetorical analysis into two general categories: textual analysis and contextual analysis. Second-wave service-learning scholars combined these two methods in different ways. They were, of course, interested in the textual practices of the communities in which service-learning projects were taking place – what were the different rhetorical and knowledge-making strategies employed by different communities. But scholars such as Welch, Mathieu and Parks were also clearly situating their projects within the larger, neoliberal political moment; they were attempting to understand how different groups were using language for persuasive purposes.

Nancy Welch's *Living Room*, for instance, is an attempt to understand how individuals or groups can find a way to participate in the public sphere when the public sphere is becoming increasingly privatized. In order to find answers to this problem, Welch finds different ways to

contextualize the rhetoric produced by different groups. First, she analyzes the neoliberal moment that we live in to understand how neoliberal logic has shaped the way that we understand and theorize public and private spheres. Secondly, she analyzes different historical moments when groups who had no real public voice found a way to be heard anyway: “By recalling the creative responses of earlier generations to constraints on (or prohibitions against) public visibility and voice, we can learn how individuals and groups, especially those lacking official platforms, have effectively argued for wider participation and greater democratization” (5). Focusing on the rhetoric of working-class activists is particularly important when situated within this specific political moment: “when we examine current constraints as specific to our *neoliberal* moment and as impinging most heavily in the United States on groups whose economic and social gains from the twentieth-century labor and social movements are neoliberalism's prime targets” (7).

While Welch’s work focuses on the history of working-class rhetoric, I am interested in this work because of the way it discusses how neoliberal logic has reshaped the ways that people think about public and private spheres, how it has reshaped how we think about social activism, and how it has impacted the work of academics. For instance, while trying to understand some of her colleagues’ responses to the events following the September 11th attacks, Welch felt silenced: “Because feminist rhetorical theories and practices nurtured the early years of my teaching and research, I wish I could say they offered me in 2002 genuine alternatives to diffidence, opportunism, or embattled silence” (63). In order to find genuine alternatives, she had to look outside of traditional academic work. Working-class rhetoric offered some of the substantive challenges Welch was looking for. For Welch, if service-learning courses are not aware of how neoliberal logic is shaping our work, “we can miss that at the pedagogical heart of such a course

is *acceptance* of policies enacted from above, not consideration of what it would take to make a substantive *challenge* from below” (122). By analyzing the rhetoric of both contemporary and historical labor and social movements – specifically how they were responding to specific political moments, to specific political rhetoric – Welch is able to see how the rhetoric of working-class movements have been able to work against political forces that, at the time, seemed unstoppable. In my dissertation, I build on this work of rhetorical analysis, specifically by contextualizing the rhetoric produced by the university and the community within the rhetoric of neoliberalism, in order to understand how neoliberal logic has shaped the ways we speak about issues of social justice. Contextualizing the rhetoric in this way provides insights into how the rhetoric of immigrant identity can challenge the assumptions we make about political subjectivity, solidarity, and social justice.

Paula Mathieu’s *Tactics of Hope* uses multiple methods to analyze service projects. Mathieu is particularly concerned with what happens when these projects become institutionalized. She draws on Certeau’s theory of strategic and tactical thinking in order to disrupt the way we think about service projects. If we want to avoid forcing our vision onto communities, Mathieu argues, we need to resist institutionalizing these projects. While the academy’s strategical thinking is what helped establish service learning as a legitimate academic enterprise, thinking strategically carries with it the risk of dismissing the work already taking place in communities. A tactical approach would challenge scholars to work with the community on short-term, innovative projects. Throughout *Tactics of Hope*, Mathieu seeks out the voices of community members. By analyzing the rhetoric of different communities, by analyzing the different rhetorical choices that community members make, by situating these choices within the larger political moment, Mathieu provides an alternative perspective to the values and vision of

the university. She begins her project by questioning how well we (academics) understand what is going on in the communities with which we wish to work:

How well do we know our local communities and how well known are we in them? Are those outside the university eager or reluctant to work with us? How prepared are we to go through the process of learning how to understand and respond to local needs? Do we know how to frame questions in useful ways and listen for answers, even ones we might not like? How well do we understand how public discourse operates in our communities? How well can we present or represent local issues in our classrooms? In short, how well can academics see beyond our own good intentions to assess how our work resonates with those in the streets? As the field of composition turns its attention more and more to local street life, teachers and scholars will need to examine more questions like these in order to evaluate how our missions, projects, research, writing, and teaching play to those in the streets whom we purport to serve. (Mathieu xi)

Mathieu's project continually contextualizes the different rhetorical practices within the rhetorics of neoliberalism – what are their rhetorical approaches to their circumstances? How do they find ways to express their point of view in an environment that often dismisses their voices? In order to analyze these voices, Mathieu attempts to develop a method that intentionally does not use the language of earlier composition and rhetoric scholars – for instance, she doesn't want to use terms such “community” or “contact zones” if at all possible. Instead, she wants to understand the rhetoric of the “streets” on its own terms. While Mathieu understands that using the term “streets” is problematic, she argues that it can be beneficial because of the ways it helps contextualize the rhetoric produced by community members. The tactical acts of hope employed

by street artists, Mathieu argues, can disrupt our traditional framework for thinking about writing instruction and community partnerships. I am particularly interested in Mathieu's work because of the challenge it offers to institutionalized service-learning programs. I am concerned that our institutionalized programs are not reflective about the assumptions we make about citizenship and social justice. While Mathieu draws on the tactical logic of existing programs within communities to understand how their goals might challenge the way we plan our programs, I believe that analyzing Justice for Immigrants' interview project can offer ways to rethink some of the foundational terms and ideas of service-learning initiatives.

Both Welch and Mathieu are interested in activists and activist movements, specifically in how these activists situate their rhetoric within the larger political moment. While Mathieu focuses on local activists and politics, Welch explicitly situates her work within the larger neoliberal moment. This alignment with activism is something that Steve Parks argues should happen within service learning projects. For all of the talk of politics and activism within the field, there is a curious absence of action. It is curious because "the movement toward community partnership/literacy work is intended to recognize the potential of oppositional rhetoric in community literacy patterns and to bring academic and community members together around a common cause" (203). While there are scholars and teachers who create community partnerships in which "communities are understood as possessing important political insights as well as possessing the oppositional literacy strategies that might improve their conditions on a micro- and macro-level...these types of commitments...remain somewhat on the fringe of the general community partnership landscape" (203). Recognizing the power differences between the university and the community – and incorporating the voices of community members into projects – is not the same thing as activism. For instance, Parks discusses Flower's work with the

Community Literacy Center in Pittsburgh. Her work to create a rhetorical space for intercultural inquiry is not intended to create change: “As Flower herself notes, however, the goal of her ‘community dialogues’ is not to create change, but to sponsor a dialogue rich in its complexity – not so much reaching a consensus for action, but enhanced nuance for understanding a community issue. In this way, our expertise as writing/rhetoric teachers, focused on how language can shape community interactions, is directly pulled into communal situations and presented as valuable for changing how an issue is discussed” (204). The current approach to community partnerships, then, represents the “grand compromise of composition studies: politics minus actual political action” (204).

Parks uses his own experiences as a way to distinguish between appearing to engage in political action and actually engaging in political action. Parks developed a course in which his students talked with and wrote with a union group, and they appeared to be engaging in political action. However, when Parks analyzed the project, he realized that his students were helping members of the union “make more nuanced arguments which would appeal to middle-class students” (205). Not that making nuanced arguments is not valuable, but it isn’t the same thing, Parks argues, as engaging in “grassroots systemic efforts aimed at structural change” (205). Parks’ critique of this project is similar to Mathieu’s objections to institutionalizing service learning: it frames projects around what is valued and endorsed by the university. Rethinking the project and re-contextualizing the rhetorical strategies students used when writing with union members was an important way for students to construct different arguments. In a second instantiation of this class, Parks asked students to “align themselves with the political and economic interests of the residents” (206). This project challenged what a community partnership could be by enabling work within the framework of the community – working for

their goals for justice rather than the university's. Parks' activist approach to community partnerships distinguishes between politics with action and the politics offered by the traditional community partnerships, and this distinction begins with positioning the rhetorics from different groups within neoliberal logic. In traditional community partnerships, "the model of politics...is only rhetorical and not actual, a model that endorses neo-liberal versions of volunteerism and not progressive challenges to structural power, challenges based on collective action" (207).

I mention these three scholars because they are good examples, I believe, of the second wave scholarship's attention to analyzing the rhetoric of communities in order to find better ways of addressing social injustices. Welch's study of working-class rhetoric gave her an alternate way to think about resisting neoliberal logic. Mathieu's study of the tactics of resistance used by communities attempted to challenge the frameworks of institutionalized programs. Parks is concerned with how our community partnerships can give the appearance of political action without actually challenging structures of power; looking to the ways that communities address injustices offer an alternative way of envisioning political action. My dissertation will build on this second wave scholarship's attention to the community. Specifically, I am interested in how community members articulate and theorize citizenship, as well as how they articulate their experiences with neoliberal economic and political policies. Second-wave scholars were not only interested in hearing the voices of different communities, they were interested in situating those voices within the current political climate in order to understand how those voices were either resisting or reinforcing the rhetoric of neoliberalism. I want to shift these discussions to the very idea of citizenship – how can we contextualize it within the rhetorics of neoliberalism? The initial wave of service learning scholarship seemed to have an assumed idea of what it meant to be a citizen – it was an individual who was engaged in her community. However, that

scholarship did little to actually define the term citizen, and it did little to think about the political subjectivity of community members. The second wave scholarship discussed above has done much more to think about the political subjectivity of members of the community or of those people who are hurt most by neoliberal policies, and by doing so, they have challenged us to begin thinking of new ways to resist neoliberal logic. I believe there is still a need to think more specifically about citizenship and political subjectivity, and I want to do so by thinking about political subjectivity in a transnational way. This shift is important, I believe, because it helps reveal some of the contradictions of neoliberal logic that are not as apparent when thinking solely in national terms.

Developing a Methodology

In the summer of 2012, I began working with an organization called Justice for Immigrants. This was my first exposure to thinking about interviews as an approach for research. Because none of the members of JFI had any experience conducting interviews, we asked a researcher who had trained at Stanford University to give us some basic training for how to best approach the interview process. The one day of training that we received concerned the interview process, but the training did not address the issue of analyzing the interviews. Because I work with the JFI interviews in chapter 3 and literature from the university in chapter 4, I wanted to have a systematic way to organize the material for this rhetorical analysis. To do this, I turned to qualitative methods to provide a structure that is particularly helpful for my project. In *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*, Saldana argues that there is not a single “best” way to code qualitative data. Scholars can even “take moderate liberty with adapting and even

renaming prescribed coding methods for clarity or flexibility's sake" (2). Rather than having a set approach, scholars should take a more pragmatic approach and find the best methodological tools that can help answer specific research questions. An important tool used at the beginning of this process is coding. "Coding is a heuristic (from the Greek, meaning 'to discover') – an exploratory problem-solving technique without specific formulas to follow" (8). While there are not specific formulas, there are different styles of coding – some scholars like to keep the coding in the language of the interviewees (In Vivo coding), while others use their own language to categorize what participants said (Descriptive coding). Regardless of the style, the goal of coding is to begin assign a word or short phrase to different parts of the interview, some word that captures the important idea or essence in a given passage. After coding, then, scholars begin looking through the codes to look for some sort of pattern – similarities, differences, frequencies, etc. This process of codifying and categorizing is important, Saldana explains (drawing on Grbich), because it "permits data to be 'segregated, grouped, regrouped and relinked in order to consolidate meaning and explanation'" (8).

While coding is an important methodological tool, Barbour warns that we should not think of the interview itself as a tool; rather, it offers a way "into the discursive structures that frame the worlds of 'subjects'. It is as much a way of seeing, or rather a condition for seeing anything at all" (43). Analyzing interviews is anything but a straightforward endeavor. There are several concepts to keep in mind when analyzing interviews: "the 'messiness' of encounters; the 'performances' of those involved; 'truth'; 'reality'; 'suspicion'; hidden agendas" (Barbour 41). These issues clearly revolve around the social positions of the different participants and how this positionality impacts the power dynamics between participants. All of these things point to a central issue with interviews: what value do we place on the words of those speaking?

In addition to coding, I drew on another qualitative research method – Grounded Theory – because of its emphasis on understanding patterns within data. Grounded theory, as defined by Corbin, “is an integrated theoretical formulation that gives understanding about how persons or organizations or communities experience and respond to events that occur” (49). Just as with coding, the first step in Grounded Theory is to begin locating specific concepts within the data: “Concepts are identified from distinct events/incidents in the data, which may be actions and interactions, or meanings given to events or emotions that are expressed about certain events” (50). Grounded theories emphasis on concepts is an important one for this project because it helps provide a way of “discovering patterns of action/interaction with changes in conditions” (52).

These qualitative methods provided a systematic way for me to break down the different types of texts I planned to analyze; the coding process provided a way coherent way for me to identify the central concepts in both the immigrant interviews and the university literature. Having a coherent structure, I then began to draw the methods of rhetorical scholars to analyze the language, to see how it is shaping the worldview of the different participants. Sonja Foss’s *Rhetorical Criticism* discusses several different rhetorical methods, and at the heart of each method is an attempt to understand how rhetoric shapes the way we see the world: “Reality is not fixed but changes according to the symbols we use to talk about it” (5). Traditional rhetorical methods are important for this project because I am trying to understand how terms such a citizen, volunteer, and immigrant have fluid meanings. For Foss, these meanings we assign to individual words shapes our values and world views: “The frameworks and labels we choose to apply to what we encounter influence our perceptions of what we experience and thus the kinds of worlds in which we live” (6). There are two particular – and closely related – methods of

rhetorical analysis that are most useful for this project: Cluster Criticism and Ideological Criticism. Cluster Criticism is an attempt to understand the worldview of the rhetor – particularly things of which the rhetor might not be consciously aware. By analyzing different phrases and repeated words, by understanding how those words are defined by the rhetor, critics can begin to understand what Kenneth Burke termed a terministic screen. The terms and phrases we choose “constitute a kind of screen that directs attention to particular aspects of reality rather than others” (63).

While Cluster Criticism helps understand the terministic screen of rhetors, Ideological Criticism attempts to understand the pattern of beliefs that shapes how certain groups see interpret different events or situations. Foss defines ideology as “a mental framework – the language, ‘concepts, categories, imagery of thought, and the systems of representation’ that a group deploys to make sense of and define the world or some aspect of it” (209). The reason it is important to try to understand an ideology is that some ideologies are privileged over others, which creates hegemony. Foss defines Hegemony as “the privileging of the ideology of one group over that of other groups. It thus constitutes a kind of social control, a means of symbolic coercion, or a form of domination by more powerful groups over the ideologies of those with less power. When an ideology becomes hegemonic in a culture, certain interests or groups are served by it more than others. The hegemonic ideology represents experience in ways that support the interests of those with more power” (210). Because hegemony is maintained using rhetoric, the goal of ideological criticism is to reveal how an ideology is embedded in the rhetoric or actions of the dominant group: “a critic seeks to explicate the role of communication in creating and sustaining an ideology and to discover whose interests are represented in that ideology” (213). Because of the power differential between the different organizations and

speakers that I will analyze, it is important to understand the ideologies that shape each speaker's world worldview, as well as if one group's ideology is privileged more than another's.

As I discussed above, contextualizing the ideology of different groups has been an important aspect of second wave service-learning scholarship. Each of the scholars I discussed above was doing this in some way; they were trying to understand how the ideology of the dominant group was shaping the ways that students (or scholars) responded to the political moment. The rhetoric of the academy did not offer Welch an effective way to critique political policies; Mathieu critiqued the way that the ideology of the academy often ignored the values of the community; Parks attempts to address the ways that our political rhetoric conceals the lack of political action that might lead to actual change. This ideological analysis is a first step in developing programs that can enable students to resist adopting the ideology of the academy. The primary work of my dissertation is to understand the idea of citizenship and how it has evolved under the influence of neoliberal logic.

*Analyzing the Rhetoric of Citizenship from the Perspectives of the University and an Immigrant
Community*

In order to understand this evolution, I will focus on the perspectives of two different groups: a set of interviews from the Justice for Immigrants project and the literature for three of Santa Clara University's service programs. The goal is to see how these different experiences shape the way that people talk about and theorize citizenship. As I mentioned in the first chapter, I chose these two specific organizations because they are ostensibly informed by the same set of Catholic social teachings. These social teachings are very clear on issues of social justice,

solidarity, and global citizenship. However, these two groups have competing visions of what it means to be a global citizen and what it means to address social injustices. Because I was familiar with both of these organizations, I believed it would be informative to understand why they each approached these ideas in differing ways.

The interviews I analyze were conducted by Justice for Immigrants, which is an organization associated with the Catholic Church with branches throughout the U.S. The Bay Area organization wanted to address the issue of immigration in a variety of ways – they wanted to develop curriculum for churches that addressed issues of justice and immigration, they wanted to create plays that told the stories of immigrants, they wanted to host art exhibits that expressed these experiences. To find participants for the interviews, JFI worked with local parishes as well as with local unions that represent undocumented laborers. The JFI interviews took place throughout the Bay Area; however, I focused my analysis on the interviews conducted near Santa Clara. There was a basic script for the interviews² – they focused primarily on what life was like in their hometowns, the experience of crossing the border, and what life has been like in the U.S. I was one of the interviewers (two of the interviews I conducted are included in Chapter 3) – but the interviews were conducted by a variety of volunteers, most of whom were inexperienced with interview techniques. Because of this, the quality of the interviews varies; some interviewers were confident enough to follow up on answers that might lead to a deeper discussion, but some interviewers would stick strictly to the script. The interviews were primarily held at union headquarters, a local church, or the home of a JFI member.

JFI offered me access to the archive, which included 57 interviews, totaling close to 400 pages. With the exception of two interviews, the participants were from Mexico. There was an

² The questions for the interview are located in the Appendix.

even distribution of men and women, and although the age of participants was not always specifically asked, most of the participants were in their 30s and 40s. My initial step was to quickly read through the interviews to find the interviews that seemed to offer the most depth. During this initial reading, I worked on precoding, which Saldana recommends; this process involves “circling, highlighting, bolding, underlining, or coloring rich or significant participant quotes or passages that [seem to be] ‘codable moments’ worthy of attention” (16). This process was helpful because it helped me narrow down the interviews, focusing on those that offered the most interesting insights. The quality of the interviews varied greatly. There was a specific set of questions with which the interviewers had been provided – some interviewers stuck very closely to the script and did not really ask follow-up questions or clarifications. However, because there was a general script, the interviews contained consistent themes and patterns – what was life like before coming to the U.S., what was the experience of crossing the border, and what has life been like in the U.S. The differences in the answers typically depended on age – children had much less recollection of life before – or the process of coming to – the U.S. Some of the interviewers were much better at recognizing interesting stories and spending a lot of time digging more deeply into that story. Those are the interviews that I chose to read more closely and code. During this initial pre-coding process, I narrowed the set of interviews down to 15.

During the subsequent readings, I began to look for recurring ideas and phrases from the different interviews. The most interesting interviews, I found, focused on a specific topic rather than attempting to cover a broad range of topics. Looking back over the codes, three different concepts emerged – the experience of teenagers, the experience of crossing the border, and the experiences in the labor market – so I chose to look at the interviews that most clearly discussed these concepts. These particular themes stood out because they are all important aspects of

citizenship in our current national conversations – protections for the children of immigrants has become a contentious political issue; economic borders are dissolving, but national borders have not; protections for; and the rights of laborers have been weakened. But I was also interested in the ways these themes coincided with many of the same concerns of the university. Students at SCU have, for the most part, had a much different educational background from immigrant teenagers; the university speaks about the issue of mobility, of global citizenship, from a much different perspective from the interviewees; and the language of the university about students should think about how their careers can benefit humanity comes from a much different position within the global labor market. I chose these six interviews because they were the most in-depth interviews, and they provided different experiences of education, of crossing the border, of the labor market. In order to get a nuanced discussion of these different concepts, I chose two interviews that discussed these ideas in different ways.

After the initial coding process, I moved to a more traditional rhetorical analysis. How does each group discuss a specific concept? What are the values shaping the way they use specific terms and ideas? Building on the work of second-wave scholars, I began contextualizing the language of the interviews and the literature within the specific neoliberal moment. What was the ideology that was determining how these terms were used? How were the communities of the university and the community responding to this ideological moment? I attempt to understand how the terms and ideas used by both the university and the surrounding community are influenced by, and speaking to, our current political moment. While my work focuses on different types of texts than the scholarship I discussed above, it is an attempt to build on their work uncovering the rhetoric of different communities. Specifically, it is an attempt to

understand how these two communities discuss the same general idea – global citizenship – in competing ways.

In order to tell the stories of these six participants, I drew on Seidman's idea of creating a narrative from each interview: "I have found that crafting a profile or a vignette of a participant's experience is an effective way of sharing interview data and opening up one's interview material to analysis and interpretation" (119). Seidman inspiration for creating these profiles came from the work of Studs Terkel, who created powerful narratives from interviews that often focused on people whose stories are not traditionally told or valued. Creating these profiles is important for Seidman because it "allows the interviewer to transform this learning into telling a story" (120).

I approached the study of the University's service programs in a very similar manner. Santa Clara has numerous service initiatives, and I wanted to look at programs that would offer the most nuanced understanding of how the university envisions the type of citizens they want their students to become. One of the Centers of Distinction at SCU is the Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education. This center houses several different interdisciplinary programs, and there are several programs that involve service learning. Just as with the interviews, I began this analysis by pre-coding the websites for the different programs to see which programs might provide interesting insights into citizenship from the university's perspective. From this initial reading, the programs that seemed most important to the university were the Global Social Benefit Incubator (GSBI), Immersion Trips, and the Arrupe Partnerships. I chose these three programs because they have such different approaches to the idea of service. The GSBI is a program that is very clearly influenced by neoliberal political theory – it helps people develop business ideas that can help address some social issue. The Immersion Programs are brief trips (typically one to two weeks) to areas with particularly high rates of poverty – some of these immersions are with local

communities, but many of the trips are to other parts of the country, as well as a few international places. The Arrupe Partnerships is a traditional service learning center; it helps arrange the partnerships between SCU students and various local non-profit organizations.

As I mentioned in the first chapter, I believe that analyzing the ways that these two particular groups discuss citizenship can prove useful. Both organizations have the same theoretical foundation – the Catholic social teachings – so they approach issues of social justice and global citizenship with the same intellectual framework. However, the experiences of each of these groups with neoliberal policies differs greatly. Because of these vastly different experiences, the ways that they speak about citizenship – what they see as the biggest problems we face, how they perceive their role as a “good” citizen – reveals some disconnects in the system.

As I discussed early in this chapter, second-wave service-learning scholars have for the past decade worked to analyze the rhetoric of different groups (particularly groups from outside of the academy), and they have done so by situating that rhetoric within a neoliberal framework. I wanted to develop a methodology that would allow me to build on this work in an effective way. As I mentioned above, both the interviews from JFI and the literature from the university covered a lot of ground. The qualitative methods – coding, isolating concepts, creating narratives – provided a focus for my analysis. Those initial methods helped locate the ways that the participants in the interviews and the programs at the university spoke about specific issues that I could then contextualize within the rhetorics of neoliberalism. As Paul Mathieu argues, rhetorical analysis is an important way to disrupt the ways that we think about the dominant narratives in the world. My hope is that the rhetorical analysis of the immigrants who were interviewed can

help disrupt many of the assumptions that the academy makes about what it means to be a “good” global citizen.

Chapter Three: Justice for Immigrants

“My fellow Americans, tonight, I’d like to talk with you about immigration.” In November of 2014, almost six years into his presidency, Obama gave a primetime speech outlining his plans for addressing the issue of immigration. Despite widespread support, Congress was refusing to act on a bipartisan proposal to reform immigration, so President Obama decided to issue an executive order. “But today, our immigration system is broken – and everybody knows it.” Obama’s attempt to fix the broken system consisted of three parts: border security, creating better ways for high-skill immigrants to come to the U.S., and creating some path to citizenship for undocumented citizens already in the U.S. The first two points appear to be direct appeals to conservatives, as they address two of their most consistent concerns: a militarized border as a way to decrease the number of immigrants crossing into the U.S. and an entrepreneurial spirit to improve the American economy. Those two parts of his plan were mostly lost, though, because of the third part of the plan. What do we do about the undocumented who are already living in the U.S.?

Obama gave that brief outline in the first third of his speech, but that is not the interesting part of his speech. The interesting part of his speech is how he tries to sell these ideas to the American public. At times, he talks tough: “We expect people who live in this country to play by the rules. We expect that those who cut the line will not be unfairly rewarded.” But he also appeals to issues of fairness and justice: “Are we a nation that tolerates the hypocrisy of a system where workers who pick our fruit and make our beds never have a chance to get right with the law? Or are we a nation that gives them a chance to make amends, take responsibility, and give their kids a better future?” He appeals to family values: “Over the past few years, I have seen the

determination of immigrant fathers who worked two or three jobs without taking a dime from the government, and at risk any moment of losing it all, just to build a better life for their kids. I've seen the heartbreak and anxiety of children whose mothers might be taken away from them just because they didn't have the right papers. I've seen the courage of students who, except for the circumstances of their birth, are as American as Malia or Sasha; students who bravely come out as undocumented in hopes they could make a difference in the country they love." He even appeals specifically to Christians: "Scripture tells us that we shall not oppress a stranger, for we know the heart of a stranger – we were strangers once, too."

Despite the fanfare that the speech received and the stir that it created among politicians and political pundits, any recent president could just as easily have delivered it. Obama's immediate predecessor had a very similar approach to immigration reform: militarize the border, increase guest worker visas, and provide a path to citizenship. When Bill Clinton was campaigning for his second term, his platform on immigration began with border security and ended with increasing resources to handle applications for citizenship. What Obama does not directly address – and what his two immediate predecessors failed to address – is the political and economic policies that drive people to migrate in the first place. When it comes to immigration, politicians do not address root causes. This is typical of how we discuss immigration in the U.S. Most people acknowledge there is a very real problem, but most discussions and proposals revolve around these same general ideas. Peppered throughout Obama's speech, however, are moments where he touches on the larger political and economic policies that impact immigration. He talks quite a bit about labor, as above when he mentioned our hypocrisy concerning labor. Later in the speech, he goes further: "I know some worry immigration will...stick it to middle-class families at a time when they already feel like they've

gotten the raw deal for over a decade.” While U.S. citizens may be worried about getting a raw deal when it comes to job security, undocumented immigrants have it worse: “They work hard, often in tough, low-paying jobs.”

Obama uses these two issues of economic insecurity and labor conditions as a way to appeal to the emotions of listeners, to elicit compassion. However, they are much more relevant to the discussion of immigration than most of his other points, such as border security or attracting entrepreneurs from other countries. These two points are more important because they represent the underlying problems that drive immigration – an economic and political system that has had a negative impact on the economic and labor conditions for the working classes in the U.S. and abroad. While economists and politicians celebrate (and protect) the global economy, and while universities strive to create global citizens, it is important to make the connections between these economic policies and the ways that they have forced people from their homes, leaving them with no choice but to migrate.

While scholars studying migration often discuss the impact that economic policies have on migration patterns, as I mentioned above, these connections are absent from the general debates we have about immigration and citizenship. Thinking about how these economic and political policies are reshaping the notion of political subjectivity is crucial to understanding how we can move towards a more just understanding of citizenship. If we want a more nuanced understanding of the issue of immigration, of global citizenship, we need to frame these discussions within their neoliberal context. I believe the same thing is true of service learning. As I discussed in chapter 1, I believe that if universities want a more nuanced understanding of the citizens we are producing, we need to frame our discussions of service learning and social justice more clearly within a neoliberal context. One important way to do this framing is to think about

how the same forces that are shaping the political subjectivity of immigrants are shaping the political subjectivity of our students. Doing so, I believe, will help complicate our how we think about global citizenship. Furthermore, I believe it provides a way to help students understand how their lives are linked politically to the lives of those in the community. To this end, this chapter will focus on a set of interviews conducted by the group Justice for Immigrants. I chose this particular group because, as I mentioned in chapter 1, JFI is informed by the same principles and ideas that inform Santa Clara University's vision of social justice. They both draw on Catholic Social Teachings to theorize global citizenship and issues of social justice. Despite the common foundation, JFI has a much different mission and a much different approach to understanding and theorizing global citizenship. These interviews focus on the experiences of immigrants from Mexico.

Working with programs such as Justice for Immigrants is also a way to answer the challenge of second wave service scholars such as Goldblatt, Mathieu, Welch, and Parks. For these scholars, it became increasingly important to understand how community members were responding to the current political moment rather than how the academy might respond to the same issue. Goldblatt wanted scholars to develop service learning projects that were initiated by the community. Mathieu argued that successful programs would listen to and learn from the rhetorical practices of the community. Welch wanted to study the voices of community organizers that are not often found in scholarship. The stories of crossing borders are important for immigrant communities in the Bay Area. Justice for Immigrants chose to highlight these stories because they offer insights into the immigrant experience about which most U.S. citizens have very limited knowledge. JFI believed that hearing these individual experiences would help the rest of the community understand the issue of immigration in a personal way – it would no

longer be a statistic. This personal connection, even if just in the form of a story, is, JFI believes, what will lead to political action. These stories of crossing the border are also important in the political campaigns of immigrant communities. They are a strategy used by organizations to appeal directly to politicians to address the issue of immigration reform. Understanding the rhetorical constraints that immigrant communities face can offer insights into the political and rhetorical strategies that can help challenge neoliberalism. For universities in global cities, developing reciprocal relationships with nearby immigrant communities should challenge the way we speak about global citizenship.

I will begin this chapter with a brief discussion of neoliberal economic theory and what those theories mean for the economies of both developed and developing countries when they are implemented. I then move into a discussion of immigration and Catholic social teachings. I will then use the lens of neoliberal rhetorics to read the narratives of the immigrants. Hearing the stories of these immigrants, the ways their lives have been impacted by systemic forces, and the way that they discuss their political subjectivity provides an important contrast to the typical U.S.-centric discussions of citizenship that take place on university campuses, to which I will turn in chapter 4.

Neoliberal Economics

When neoliberal theories began to emerge in the 1970s, proponents argued that they would make capitalism more efficient. As Robert Pollin argues in *Contours of Descent*, “a classical liberal would favor minimal levels of government spending and taxation, since private individuals, rather than governments, should be ‘free to choose’ as the Nobel Prize winning

classical liberal economist Milton Friedman puts it, how they spend their income. Moreover, as private individuals, we spend our own money in a much more efficient way than when the government spends on our behalf, since a government cannot possibly care as much as we do about how to make the best use of what we earn” (7). This idea of minimal government interference extended to every facet of governance, including international trade agreements. If the trade barriers between countries were dissolved, the theory goes, then free market competition – rather than governmental protections – would help drive economic growth:

“Classical liberals favor free trade between countries rather than countries operating with tariffs or other barriers to the free flow of goods and services between countries. Restrictions on the free movement of products and money between countries only protects uncompetitive firms from market competition, and thus holds back the economic development of countries that choose to erect such barriers” (8).

Neoliberal theories did not just concern consumers and national economies. Because of their emphasis on competition and efficiency, neoliberals continually searched for ways to increase competition. One of their major targets was labor. Neoliberals argued re-theorizing the role of labor in the economy would spur job creation and reduce poverty. As Leiva explains, “Neoliberals argued that, by removing ‘rigidities’, labour market deregulation would lead to increased employment, reduced wage inequality and a decline in poverty levels” (342). Making labor more flexible allowed jobs to move from traditional (inefficient) sectors of production and into emerging sectors of production: “The theory behind labor flexibility is that if labor is treated as a commodity like any other, with companies able to hire and fire workers just as they might buy and sell a piece of machinery, then markets will function efficiently. Efficient functioning markets will then facilitate economic growth” (Carlson 13). These ideas became so pervasive

that by the 1990s, even nominally liberal politicians embraced them. Pollin points to Clinton and the ways his administration relied heavily on neoliberal economic theories: “Clinton’s administration was defined by across-the-board reductions in government spending as a share of the economy’s total spending, virtually unqualified enthusiasm for free trade, only tepid, inconsistent efforts to assist working people in labor markets, and the deregulation of financial markets” (6).

The rhetoric explaining and justifying neoliberal theories of economics has proven to be very persuasive. The effectiveness of this rhetoric, Kim Hong Nguyen argues in “Rhetoric in Neoliberalism,” is because “neoliberalism has fundamentally changed cultural literacy” (2). Nguyen quotes Pierre Dardot and Christian Laval to explain how this change in cultural literacy: “Neoliberalism is the *rationality of contemporary capitalism* – a capitalism freed of its archaic references and fully acknowledged as a historical construct and general norm of existence” (Nguyen 4). Without this understanding of neoliberalism as a historical construct, people begin to accept “capital as essential to the biopolitical production of life,” which leads to “the acceptance and adoption of capitalism’s values, tenets, and logics permeate political, juridical, legal, social, and cultural realms of life” (4). This shift in cultural literacy, this adoption of capitalism’s values, stems from the way that the rhetorics of neoliberalism have framed discussions surrounding economic and political policies. As Rebecca Dingo and Blake Scott argue in the introduction to *The Megarhetorics of Global Development*, these policies are framed as commonsense policies. Dingo and Scott point to Arturo Escobar’s work with development metaphors, which “often draw from commonsense colonial arguments about...saving the ‘natives’ from their ‘backward’ (and amoral) cultural practices” (5). These commonsense

policies are not necessarily logical, yet “neoliberalism has become a way of thinking, orienting, and organizing all aspects of life” (Nguyen 9).

Each of the essays in *The Megarhetorics of Global Development* discusses how rhetoric has been used to normalize the neoliberal agenda, to make it seem commonsense. Rebecca Dingo looks at how the rhetoric of women’s empowerment is framed through the lens of economic investment, which “depend[s] upon presumed affective links between individual philanthropists-investors and women from poor nations” (174). Empowerment is a term, Dingo explains, that has a history within feminist grassroots movements and has traditionally involved “already ‘empowered’ people reveal[ing], mainly through consciousness-raising, how empowerment might be found within individual people and communities” (175). However, “empowerment,” when reshaped by the rhetoric of economic development, becomes unmoored from that history and loses coherency. This is an example of neoliberal logic changing cultural literacy. When tied to development, empowerment “is at once intangible and something that is given, exchanged, felt, or taught” (175). Reducing empowerment to economic development and economic exchanges is “troubling because it prompts donors to act as neoliberal subjects who reinforce the notion of personal agency and monetary exchange over a broader understanding of the transnational contexts and relationships that make donations, charity work, and development programs necessary in the first place” (184).

Just as the rhetoric of empowerment has been used to justify or promote neoliberal ideas, the idea of corporate social responsibility is indicative of, Robert DeChaine argues, “a vigorous blurring of the boundaries between politics, morality, and commerce” (75). The idea that corporations should think about the ways they were engaging with communities emerged in the early 1970s at a moment when human rights became “a guiding discourse in twentieth-century

international politics” (75). The rhetoric of CSR quickly became an integral part of how the corporate world discussed business ethics. The impact of CSR, however, has not been limited to the corporate world. In the 40 years since the idea emerged, “CSR rhetoric has expanded its reach...to inform a breadth of public discussion regarding proper relations between corporations, national governments, nonstate actors, cultural collectivities, and individuals” (76). For DeChaine, analyzing CSR is an important way to understand the ways that neoliberal logic has shifted human values. Attempting to understand the “polymorphous conceptualization and definitional ambiguity” of CSR is a way to begin untangle the “shifting constellation of discourses and practices that materialize according to particular social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental exigencies” (79). CSR is also an example of how neoliberal logic became to be seen as commonsense. Terms and ideas that were once limited to the vocabulary of corporate leaders now permeate our cultural vocabulary: “No longer an arcane language of business managers, terms germane to CSR – ‘community stake-holders,’ ‘socially responsible investing,’ ‘fair trade,’ ‘green design,’ ‘sustainable development,’ ‘compassionate capitalism,’ and ‘long-range social return’ – are now invoked in popular media, community forums, advertisements, political campaigns, and classrooms” (82).

While Dingo and DeChaine analyze how neoliberal logic has shifted the way we talk about empowerment and corporate responsibility, Eileen Schell examines the difficulty of resisting this seemingly commonsense shift in cultural literacy by analyzing two competing philosophies of agricultural development. Archer Daniels Midland’s industrialized agriculture model attempts to create, as their advertisements state, the “supermarket to the world” (149); Vandana Shiva, on the other hand, draws on “sustainable agricultural development model of food democracy” (149). These two approaches, Schell argues, are both “interested in making

larger cultural, social, and political arguments for their model of agricultural development and do so by drawing on common tropes of the local connecting with the global, [but] they ultimately construct and rely on different rhetorical *networks* and thus link the local and global in dissimilar ways” (150). By analyzing these two models of development side-by-side, Schell is able to show “how the rhetorics of agricultural development are caught in contradictions and uneven power relations,” and because of these uneven power relations, each model, then, leads “to vastly different material effects and consequences for different stakeholders” (151).

The work of these scholars is important because it begins to expose the tensions at the heart of neoliberal policies. The rhetorics of neoliberalism do not always reflect – but often obfuscate – reality. Analyzing this rhetoric is an important way to begin to unmask the tensions at heart of neoliberalism: “These tensions include the struggles of postcolonial independence, the degradation of natural resources, civil unrest due to the lack of adequate resources for citizens, financial planning imposed by an outside entity, corporate development, and the recurring argument that globalization will be the great equalizer” (Scott and Dingo 3).

While neoliberal economic policies are often framed with rhetoric that emphasizes global economic growth, the realities of those policies are often devastating for local populations. The focus of this chapter is a set of interviews from immigrants from Mexico – these interviews provide a counter-perspective to this rhetoric of economic growth that fueled the push for global trade agreements, such as NAFTA. Before discussing the interviews, I want to discuss the ways that globalization, and NAFTA in particular, were framed as engines for prosperity. Part of the effectiveness of the rhetoric is because some of the accomplishments sound so positive when discussed in isolation – the rhetoric focused very specifically on parts of the “prosperous” U.S. economy while omitting the larger global implications.

Robert Reich, the Secretary of Labor under President Clinton, frames the discussion of the U.S. economy in the era of neoliberalism in this way: “Since the 1970s, and notwithstanding three recessions, the United States economy has soared. Consumers have been treated to a vast array of new products...while the prices of standard goods and services have declined, adjusted for inflation...Companies have also become far more efficient and the stock market has surged. In 1975, the Dow Jones Industrial Average hovered close to 600” (4). Reich’s assessment, of course, does not tell the entire story. As I mentioned at the beginning of the chapter, economists endorse free trade and liberalizing markets because, they argue, liberalizing markets help the overall economy. Here, Reich is focusing specifically on the U.S. economy, and he looks at very specific economic indicators – new products, prices of standard goods, the stock market. However, the overall impact of neoliberal policies is, when viewed from a global perspective, much less positive. In fact, despite his praise above, even Pollin admits that economic growth has slowed during the era of neoliberalism: “The overall growth pattern is unambiguous: there has been a sharp decline in growth in the neoliberal era relative to the developmental state period, from 5.5 to 2.6 percent, measured on average annual basis” (131).

In addition, looking at the impact of neoliberal policies in ways other than the overall economy reveals larger problems with the policies. Reich concedes that the economic gains that he points to come at a cost: “these gains have been accompanied by widening inequalities of income and wealth. The gains have also accompanied other problems such as heightened job insecurity, and environmental hazards” (4). Again, Reich is speaking specifically about America and how what he terms Supercapitalism impacts American democracy. While these accompanying problems were bad in the U.S., they were much more pronounced in developing countries. Pollin: “since the period beginning around 1980, the eclipse of state-directed

development policies and the ascendancy of neoliberalism have produced dramatic upheavals in the world's poor and middle-income countries" (125). In addition to an increase in income inequality, developing nations were prone to financial market crises. While the wealthiest in these countries were able to ride out these crises, the impact on majority of people in the developing world was an increase in poverty. Leiva notes the trends in Latin American labor markets: rising unemployment (despite growing economies); growing inequality; falling wages; increasing wage polarization; growing precariousness of jobs; persistently high number of working poor (349-51).

There are several reasons for these trends. Neoliberal policies meant that developing countries transitioned rapidly from agricultural to manufacturing economies. This fundamental shift in the economic philosophy was beneficial for multinational corporations, but it wreaked havoc on the labor market: "when neoliberal governments in poor countries reduce their support for agriculture – through cuts in both tariffs on imported food products and subsidies for domestic farmers – this makes it more difficult for poor farmers to compete with multinational agribusiness firms...The net result is that the number of people looking for jobs in developing countries grows faster than the employers seeking new workers" (Pollin 14). I mentioned Schell's analysis of the rhetoric of agricultural development above. The collapse of the agricultural sector in developing countries is not an aberration – it is a result of powerful multinational corporations framing conversations of development around their ability to meet the demands of global nutritional needs. This rhetoric, however, does not reflect the on-the-ground realities: "the reality is that often such products are dumped on international markets, preventing local farmers from selling their own products" (Schell 155).

This shifting labor market has very direct impact on the ways that people move around the globe. Looking at NAFTA, for instance, provides a good insight into how these policies have impacted labor and migration. Proponents of NAFTA “promised it would create hundreds of thousands of new high-wage U.S. jobs, raise living standards in the U.S., Mexico and Canada, improve environmental conditions and transform Mexico from a poor developing country into a booming new market for U.S. exports” (Public Citizen 1). The Mexican government assured workers that the trade agreement would lower the prices of food for everyone and that the jobs in the manufacturing sector would offer higher wages than farming had offered. Shortly after signing NAFTA, the Mexican government boasted that 800,000 manufacturing jobs had been created. The problem with these jobs was that, as Pollin points out, the number of people looking for new jobs outpaced the number of workers that employers needed. Even for those who had been able to find employment, the jobs did not last. An assessment of employment in Mexico on the ten-year anniversary of NAFTA showed that “one third of the 800,000 manufacturing jobs that the Mexican government says were initially created...have disappeared as companies have raced downward to take advantage of still cheaper labor in such countries as China, Malaysia and Guatemala” (Public Citizen 2). That number, in fact, only reflects jobs within the manufacturing industry. Each job within the manufacturing sector “indirectly supports 3.5 more jobs in suppliers, transport companies and other service providers” (Carlson 23). Those workers who were lucky enough to maintain their jobs saw their hours cut. Because of these job losses, in 2001, “the Mexican economy shrank by 1.6% in the third quarter and by 1.2% in the last quarter” (Carlson 23).

The trend that began in the early years of NAFTA has continued well into the 2000s. While exports and foreign investment has increased significantly in Mexico, the labor market has

suffered: “from 1994 through 2009 employment growth in the formal economy averaged 387,000 jobs per year—absorbing only 38 percent of Mexican youth leaving school for the labor market” (Cypher 62). Even those who are employed in the formal sector are impacted by policies that help employers keep wages low. The average worker in the formal sector, according to Roman and Velasco, earn “\$2.60 per hour as compared to \$12.50 per hour of foreign-born Latino workers within the United States. If we only looked at blue-collar workers within Mexico's formal sector, the hourly wage would only be \$1.30 per hour” (25). Of these workers, only 51.6% receives health benefits (Cypher 63). These are the workers who have the good jobs. At least 47% of the work force in Mexico is employed in the informal sector. In order to have a comprehensive understanding of the impact neoliberal policies have had on labor in Mexico, Cypher’s analysis incorporates the years leading up to NAFTA, years when Mexico began liberalizing its economy: “Using the entire neoliberal period (1982-2008), the cumulative growth in per capita income was only 18.7 percent. If the analysis is extended through 2010, the overall (cumulative) average increase in per capita income since 1982 was a pathetic 14.1 percent—amounting to an annual average growth rate of 0.47 percent” (65).

While the overall economy was weakening in Mexico, prices for consumers increased. The economic theory behind NAFTA predicted that consumers would benefit from the agreement, as competition would drive costs down. The reality for Mexican consumers was quite different: “the prices of goods in the basic food basket increased 257% during the NAFTA era, while the prices paid to agricultural producers for all goods combined rose only 185%. The price of the staple food corn tortillas actually has risen since NAFTA — by 50% in Mexico City and even higher in rural areas” (Public Citizen 2). As mentioned above, Reich pointed out how the U.S. economy has soared in recent years, but this has not been the case in Mexico: “Despite the

increased investment and exports, Mexican per capita income only grew at 9% under NAFTA, less than one-fifth of its growth rate in the 1960s and 1970s” (Public Citizen 2). Once neoliberal policies began to take root, the governments of developing countries had a hard time fighting the impact of these policies. The multinational corporations quickly became wealthier than many of the countries in which they were operating. Carlson points out that “as many as 22 of the multinational corporations are larger than half of the Latin American and Caribbean economies in the region, and that does not include its 12 very small economies” (17).

When our politicians talk about immigration, they do not mention these economic conditions. Politicians can point to isolated instances of violence along the border and rally support for increased security. Politicians appeal to our sense of compassion for children in an attempt to help children who were brought across the border when they were very young. They can, as Obama did in his speech, speak to the idea of fairness: “We expect that those who cut the line will not be unfairly rewarded.” When they make these appeals, they are thinking about immigration as an isolated problem rather than a reflection of a larger systemic issue. Chantal Thomas argues that this is a mistake: “few commentators recognize or understand that a significant part of the surge in illegal labor from Mexico—the source of the majority of undocumented workers in the United States—stems from reforms that Mexico undertook in cooperation with the United States to liberalize trade flows across the Mexico-United States border” (867). Earlier, I discussed different ways that scholars in composition and rhetoric were analyzing different aspects of neoliberal logic – from empowerment to development to humanitarianism to how rhetorics neoliberalism have reshaped our cultural literacy. I want to build on these projects to understand how rhetorics of neoliberalism have reshaped the way we theorize global citizenship. In order to rethink what it means to be a global citizen, I am arguing

that we need to think of how the prevailing economic and political theories are changing what it means to be a citizen. When American universities theorize the types of global citizens they want to create, they speak of citizenship from a very American perspective. If we are going to talk about global citizens, though, it is important to have different perspectives on what citizenship means in the era of globalization. Just as Dingo looked at the impact of the rhetoric of empowerment and Schell looked at the impact of the rhetoric of development on local populations, I want to look at the ways that the rhetoric of global citizenship has been shaped by neoliberal logic. Kim Hong Nguyen argues that one of the difficulties that rhetorical studies face is understanding how marginalized subjects articulate their experiences: “While rhetorical studies is uniquely equipped to analyze neoliberalism as the rationality of modern-day capitalism, the study of rhetoric in its more quotidian forms and among marginalized subjects is long overdue but necessary in order to understand how rhetoric organizes everyday life in the neoliberal era” (Nguyen 8). The remainder of this chapter is an attempt to do just that. By hearing the narratives of these six immigrants, I hope to provide a different perspective for how we might “destabilize the megarhetoric that development always leads to growth, progress, one-way assistance, and empowerment” by exposing the disconnect between the positive justifications for neoliberal economic and political policies and the material realities of those whose lives are uprooted by those same policies. The perspectives that follow come from a set of interviews with immigrants from Mexico. The following chapter will then turn to the ways in which universities think about and theorize global citizens.

Justice for Immigrants

In 2003, U.S. and Catholic bishops published a pastoral letter: *Strangers No Longer: Together on the Journey of Hope*, which attempted to show how Catholic Social Teachings should provoke a much different response to the typical ways of understanding immigration and immigrants. The U.S. bishops, then, started a campaign in order to create a larger network of people working toward comprehensive immigration reform: Justice for Immigrants: A Journey of Hope. The campaign had lofty objectives: educating people – particularly the Catholic community and Catholic officials – about Church teachings on migration, changing Church policies and organizing networks within the Church in order to assist immigrants, and working toward reforming legal protections for immigrants. The campaign wanted to address both the systemic issues driving immigration and to help Catholics think about the immigrants living in their communities. In order to be able to address the systemic aspects of immigration, the bishops teamed JFI with an existing global campaign, the Catholic Campaign Against Global Poverty. The Global Poverty campaign wanted to reform trade agreements and to find more effective ways to provide aid and debt relief. Together, JFI and Global Poverty could, it was hoped, find a new way to think address immigration – JFI focusing on the rights and needs of immigrants in the U.S., while GP focused on the rights and needs of people in poverty-stricken nations. As I discuss below, the social teachings driving JFI are important because of the way they theorize citizenship. Their version of citizenship is different from the type of citizens theorized by NAFTA, and it is different from the type of citizen theorized by the university.

Catholic Social Teaching

Strangers No Longer is a pastoral letter written by the U.S. Catholic bishops and the Mexican Episcopal Conference. Because the letter addressed the issue of migration between the U.S. and Mexico, it had specific messages for citizens of each nation. To the migrants crossing from Mexico to the U.S., the bishops primarily wanted to express solidarity: “We speak to the migrants who are forced to leave their lands to provide for their families or to escape persecution. We stand in solidarity with you. We commit ourselves to your pastoral care and to work toward changes in the church and societal structures that impede your exercising your dignity and living as children of God” (315). Most of the letter, however, was an attempt to explain to citizens in the U.S. how Catholic teachings should shape the way that Catholics view immigration. I will spend a little time discussing these social teachings because they attempt to challenge the traditional notion of thinking about immigration from a state-based perspective; they attempt to think of migration as a reflection of larger systemic issues.

In the Catholic social tradition, people have the right to migrate if their country of origin does not provide the protections and opportunities that states are supposed to provide for citizens. This right to migrate “is rooted in an understanding of the universal destination of created goods and a social mortgage on private property, such that state sovereignty ‘cannot be exaggerated’ to the point that access to land is denied to needy people from other nations, provided that the national common good ‘rightly understood’ does not forbid it. A key component of the right to migrate, then, is its inclusion of economic rights violations alongside political oppression as legitimate causal factors” (Heyer 434). The Catholic social tradition does recognize state sovereignty, but the rights of people are given priority “over the right of state

control on the twin premises of the common good and human rights” (434). These social teachings extend beyond the state from which people are forced to leave if they want to provide for themselves; they apply to states to which people immigrate. States wishing to close their borders and exclude immigrants must make a moral case for this exclusion.

While Catholic social teachings recognize citizens as belonging to states, they also recognize a broader form of citizenship: world citizen. Heyer quotes Pope John XXII: “Every human being has the right to freedom of movement and of residence within the confines of his own state. When there are just reasons for it, he must be permitted to emigrate to other countries and to take up residence there. The fact that he is a citizen of a particular state does not deprive him of membership to the human family, nor of citizenship in that universal society, the common, world-wide fellowship of men” (439). This idealistic version of the global citizen is based on the assumption of specific universal rights, and although these are the official teachings of the Church, it is clearly an aspirational theory of citizenship.

While Catholic social teachings are in part based on a specific theological tradition, they are also informed by traditional political theories. In “Rights of Passage: The Ethics of Immigration and Refugee Policy,” O’Neill and Spohn take a comparative approach to the social teachings. The teachings, they argue, are an attempt to balance the “politics of rights” of liberalism and “politics of the common good” of communitarianism (98). Liberalism has traditionally had problems effectively addressing immigration because of the value it places on the liberties of existing citizens: “Why, after all, should citizens accept limitations on their liberty arising from the social, economic, or cultural claims of those not party to their social contract?...Beneath public fears about immigration lies the conviction that the newcomers will not accept the American way of life, will never take responsibility for its foundations. And even

if they did accept it, why should citizens be burdened for their benefit” (93). While liberalism values the rights and liberties of existing members, communitarianism has a different problem addressing immigration – the emphasis it places on shared history and culture: “The starting point of communitarian ethics... is the ‘situated self,’ embedded within a particular political community and endowed by birthright with a distinctive cultural heritage. Knit together by shared history and sentiments, ‘we have,’ in Burke’s words, ‘given to our frame of polity the image of a relation in blood, binding up the constitution of our country with our dearest domestic ties.’ The underlying image is not the autonomous citizen but the extended family” (95) ³

In order to navigate between these two schools of thought, the Church argues for a different framework. Rather than thinking about the “members or strangers” of communitarianism or the “abstract citizens” of liberalism, the Church reframes political subjects as near and distant neighbors; it teaches that we should “make ourselves the neighbor to absolutely every other person” (98). Rather than thinking about the common good of each individual state, states should think about how their immigration policies serve the global common good. Rather than thinking only about the rights of their citizens, states “are morally bound to respect and promote the basic human rights of both citizen and resident alien, especially the most vulnerable. Persons are entitled to be treated in accordance with their equal dignity. Such respect justifies preferential attention to those whose rights are most systemically imperiled” (99).

³ While communitarian philosophy is an important political philosophy that serves as a critique of both leftist political thinking (particularly the role of government to create a social safety net) and libertarian strands of conservative thought (that places so much trust in the free market), the idea of a shared common culture on which communitarianism relies can be used to justify a fear of immigrants. This can be seen in our current political rhetoric, from the “bad hombres” immigrating from Mexico to the potential “terrorists” refugees from Syria. Because these immigrants and refugees are not seen as part of our extended family, it is easy for some people to justify preventing their entry into the U.S. (or other receiving countries). One of the major ironies of globalization is that while it has helped erase the economic borders between countries, it has increased a sense of nationalism within many countries.

This framework is potentially problematic. Scholars such as Richard Bellamy argue the thinking of citizenship in terms of neighbors is harmful in that it depoliticizes political subjectivity. Catholic social teachings attempt to address this by framing migration as a systemic issue. Rather than thinking about immigration as a problem that only impacts the U.S., they contextualize the issue by thinking about the neoliberal “trade agreements that have contributed to migratory patterns from Latin America into the US” (Heyer 439). While we largely benefit from the trade agreements, the workers in poorer countries suffer: “even if the maquilas’ pay and pollution practices conform to the laws of host countries and tariff reductions adhere to free trade agreements, the related international economic order may be judged unjust at least in light of its impact upon the small farmer or unwilling migrant” (439). Heyer argues that because US citizens reap the benefits of global citizenship, they need to find ways to challenge the economic inequities created by the system. Catholic teachings hold that we are not just citizens of a state: “even in national affairs we must act as world citizens” (439, quoting Christiansen).

In addition to challenging people to think about the systemic economic inequalities involved in immigration, *Strangers No Longer* addresses the role of immigration policy in making immigration issue worse. In most public discussions of immigration, immigrants are seen as the problem – they are illegal; they are breaking the law. The bishops refocus the issue by discussing the responsibilities that U.S. has when it comes to controlling their border. The bishops recognize the right of nations to control their borders, but they believe the enforcement of the laws controlling the borders has been inhumane: “We do not accept...some of the policies and tactics that our governments have employed” (336). In fact, rather than being productive, the enforcement strategies employed by the U.S. have actually made things worse: “rather than significantly reducing illegal crossings, the (U.S.) initiatives have instead driven migrants into

remote and dangerous areas of the southwest region of the United States, leading to an alarming number of migrant deaths” (338). But the bishops are not just concerned with border control; they place a lot of responsibility for immigration on broader U.S. policies. These policy makers spend time thinking about border control rather than thinking about economic policy. *Strangers No Longer* is, in part, a “call to transform national and international social, economic, and political structures so that they may provide the conditions required for the development for all, without exclusion and discrimination against any person in any circumstance” (343).

Strangers No Longer was an initial attempt by Catholic bishops to think about the inequities at the heart of immigration. Kerwin describes the letter “as a response to the deepened interdependence of people created by globalization. It speaks to the need to reduce poverty and inequality, expand living-wage jobs, target development assistance to communities that have been depleted by emigration, and shore up Mexico’s agricultural sector and small businesses. It places development in the context of a larger vision of human flourishing, and contemplates an ideal in which nations create the conditions that allow their members to prosper at home” (143). This emphasis on interdependence – and specifically the emphasis on how neoliberal policies create this interdependence – is an important aspect of Catholic social teaching’s approach to immigration and citizenship. The connections between neoliberal policies and immigration are apparent throughout the interviews conducted by JFI. While the participants do not discuss political theory, their stories provide important insights into ways that the rhetorics of neoliberalism have shifted our (American) cultural literacy. These narratives reveal some of the disconnects between the rhetorics of neoliberalism and the realities of the policies those rhetorics justify.

Catholic Social Teachings on the Ground

In chapter one, I discussed Sassen's argument that we cannot understand immigration or global citizenship without thinking about neoliberal economic and political policies. The inverse of that is also true: understanding immigration can help us understand neoliberal policies, and it can shed light on neoliberal political subjectivity. For Sassen, global cities are important sites for doing this work because they are a place where the disempowered begin to "emerge as subjects" (xxi). JFI's storytelling project was an attempt to hear the stories of the disempowered, to hear a different version of global citizenship. San Francisco is a global city with large populations of immigrants from around the world, so JFI wanted to hear the stories of these immigrants. Most of the JFI members working on the Story-Telling Project were not necessarily concerned with the larger political moment that these interviews were addressing. Most of the people who signed up to interview the immigrants in the community had no experience with conducting interviews (myself included), and most participants were primarily interested in hearing and recording the personal stories. We spent a day with an Ethnographer from Stanford University who talked about how to balance sticking with a script with following up on questions. There was an expert to help interviewers understand what types of questions were appropriate to ask – especially regarding the issue of documentation – as well as assurances of anonymity. There were two major rules listed on the interview guidelines. The first was that this particular interview project was not intended to solve any particular problem: if the people being interviewed expected some concrete help, the interviewer should point out that this project was simply an attempt to record stories. The second rule was to not suggest any answers to those being interviewed.

Because the interviews were conducted in a very short amount of time, and were conducted by several different people, JFI wanted to find a way to create some consistency in the interviews. In order to do this, the interviews were designed to follow a general progression – life at home in the country of origin, the reasons for leaving, the process of crossing over to the U.S., the experience of living in the U.S. without documentation, the things they have learned from reflecting on their experiences, and the things they wish for in the future. Because the interviews were conducted by a diverse group of people – ranging from community activists to high school students – the quality of each interview varies greatly. Some interviewers follow up on lines of inquiry that are particularly interesting; some stick to the script fairly closely; some push the interviewees to talk more about painful experiences; and some are quick to move away from potentially painful stories.

Possibly because of the scripted nature of the interviews – or possibly because this is the nature of migration in the age of globalization – there are certain trends that begin to emerge when reading through the transcripts. There is an intense sense of dislocation – most of the immigrants interviewed expressed a longing for home. In fact, that was how each interview began. After signing an “Agreement to be Interviewed,” the first series of questions was Labeled: “Family.” The questions are all about “home”: tell us about your immediate family and your extended family; tell us about the community you come from; what was your life like before you decided to immigrate; what was your education like; what were your working conditions like. The answers to these questions were very similar. Most of the interviewees came from small communities in Mexico, and most of those interviewed missed home and hoped to someday go back. This portion of the interview is often the shortest – most interviewers didn’t press too much about conditions at home, so it is often hard to develop a clear idea of what community life

is like or what the working conditions are in these communities. The most common answer to questions about life in the community is that there were no opportunities for any sort of economic independence at home.

After asking about life at home, the questions turned toward the process of crossing the border. What was it that made them decide to immigrate? Some of the answers were of a private nature (disputes with family members), but the vast majority of the responses dealt with the economic realities of life at home. Rarely were interviewees asked to provide much detail about what this meant, which would have been very helpful in providing a more nuanced understanding of neoliberal political subjectivity from the perspective of those who are forced to migrate because of economic policies. Most interviewees simply state that they wanted to come to the U.S. in order to provide a better life for their families. The primary goal for the Story-Telling Project was to hear the stories of crossing the border, so it is understandable why most interviewees were more interested in the crossing stories than the conditions in the countries of origin.

JFI also worked with several unions who represent undocumented workers in the area, so the third part of the interview process dealt with what life was like once they reached their final destination. Some of the interviewees focused more on the social and cultural aspects of trying to become part of their new community and country, but several of them spoke about their experiences with the labor market and the troubles they faced from employers who took advantage of them. The final sections of the interview sheet dealt with reflecting on their experiences in a broader sense: do they want to return home or want to stay; were there things that they'd wanted to discuss but hadn't been asked; and what do they want Americans to understand about immigration and their experiences?

While reading through the interview transcripts, there were three trends that began to emerge: the experience of being an undocumented teenager, the experience of crossing into the U.S., and the experience with the labor market. The participants being interviewed tended to focus on one of these aspects more than the others, and the interviewers tended to dig deeply into one specific topic rather than trying to cover everything. In order to represent each of these experiences, I have chosen two representative interviews for each of these topics. Each of these themes speaks to different problems with political subjectivity in the age of neoliberalism. The experiences of the teenagers speak to Obama's concern about students who are as American as their classmates except for the circumstances of their birth, as well as to the ongoing political debates surrounding the DREAM Act. The stories of crossing to the U.S. provide concrete examples of the ways that the rhetorics of neoliberalism worked to dissolve the economic boundaries between states without addressing the issue of how people move between states. The experiences of the workers show how the theory of flexible labor impacts the lives of actual laborers. I mentioned above that understanding the experiences of immigrants in relation to neoliberal policies is important to help challenge the American-centric notions of citizenship typically assumed by universities. The themes that emerged during the interviews also emerge in the rhetoric of the university, which I discuss in the next chapter. Thinking about the contrasting ways that these groups approach the same issue should help disrupt the way we think about neoliberal political subjectivity.

Undocumented Teens and the DREAM ACT

In the opening chapter, I discussed the ways that universities talk quite a bit about how they are creating global citizens or global leaders. For this reason, the experiences of immigrant teenagers are particularly helpful in thinking about global citizenship. The teenagers interviewed by JFI are drastically different from those of most of the students at Santa Clara University. As I have argued above, this is an important perspective because it offers an important counter to the traditional perspectives about citizenship. In the first chapter, I discussed the ways that literacy and citizenship have, historically, been tied together. In *Minor Re/Visions*, Morris Young discusses the complicated ways that literacy, race, and citizenship are linked: historically, “a person’s literacy...has been key in the construction of a person’s identity, legitimacy, and citizenship when the person is racially marked as Other” (2). If a person is able to participate in public discourse, in English (and without an accent, Young notes), that person is “perceived as fully literate,” which “often becomes a marker of citizenship and legitimacy” (6). While Young’s work focuses specifically on literacy narratives, *Minor Re/Visions* is an attempt to challenge the ways that we think about belonging, about citizenship, and about what it means to speak against the dominant rhetorics of citizenship. While the narratives analyzed here do not focus on literacy, they can complicate the way that we think about global citizenship in important ways by disrupting the rhetoric of citizenship. What can we learn from her experiences with global citizenship and social justice that can push us to rethink political subjectivity? How are neoliberal policies impacting the ways that they are able to be political actors? And how does that experience differ from how the university articulates the rhetoric of citizenship? When discussing *Minor Re/Visions*, Wendy Hesford noted that the narratives were an important reminder “of the differential conditions and experiences of mobility: travel adventures,

immigration, and the restriction of movement because of internment and exclusion” (788). I believe these two narratives offer a similar reminder.

In his speech on immigration in November 2014, President Obama discussed the undocumented students who were just like his daughters in every way but one: the circumstances of their birth. Since 2001, there has been a proposal to address this specific issue – children who were brought to the United States by their parents. Although this particular idea has bipartisan support, the DREAM Act has failed to pass through Congress. The DREAM Act would provide certain undocumented children access to federal funding for higher education and a path to citizenship, among other things. Although there are vocal opponents to the DREAM Act, the “moral position that children should not be punished for their parents’ choices inspires frequent attempts at the federal and state levels to make those unlawful aliens who came to the United States as children eligible for financial aid” (Whaley 626). In 2011, California became the third state to pass some version of the DREAM Act. While the California DREAM Act does not provide a path to citizenship, it is important because, among other things, it provides access to state funding for higher education. The importance of this funding cannot be overstated; before the CDA was signed into law, “most unlawful aliens could not attend college even though they qualified for in-state tuition...because two-thirds of unlawful aliens come from poor families who do not have the resources to pay even the reduced tuition, which is still very expensive” (Whaley 633). Thinking about the experiences of teenage immigrants helps expose an enduring economic myth surrounding immigration: the economic burden immigrants create. While the political rhetoric surrounding immigrants tends to gravitate towards how much immigration hurts taxpayers, the facts do not support this rhetoric: “a majority of economists surveyed by the Wall Street Journal agree that unlawful aliens are...beneficial to the economy” (637). Undocumented

students who receive a higher education contribute even more to the economy: “the CDA’s findings and declarations state, ‘Increased access to financial aid . . . increases the state’s collective productivity and economic growth.’ Studies show that college graduates pay nine thousand dollars more per year in taxes” (637).

The two interviews I focus on fit well with Obama’s description of his daughters’ classmates. Both K and M came to the U.S. from Mexico when they were young. K was 16 when his interview was recorded. He came to the U.S. when he was 4 with his mom and sister, who was a toddler at the time. His dad had come to the U.S. a year before, which meant his mother had to bring the two young children across on her own. Because he came to the U.S. when he was so young, he really has no real memories of his life in Mexico: “I remember some things, like, I remember some toys that I would play with and stuff. Like, I remember riding a bike, a little wheel-barrel I’d play with. I remember my mom’s mom a little bit, and her house.” He also doesn’t remember much about the journey to the U.S. Part of this was his youth, but part of it was because in order to keep the kids calm, the people bringing them to the U.S. gave the kids some medicine. “I remember me and my sister came in a car, and I remember we were . . . waiting in a long row of cars, like in a line of cars or something, I don’t remember. I remember that my sister was crying, and the person who was bringing us over here gave her some kind of pill and she fell asleep. And I think they might have given me the same pill, and when I woke up we were . . . in L.A. at some house.” Those are the only two memories he shared of either Mexico or his journey here. And when asked why his parents decided to take such a chance of migrating to the U.S. with two very young children, K’s response was a fairly succinct and complicated one. The move was not simply an economic one. Although the devastated economy in their hometown was the most pressing reason, there was also the way that citizens in his hometown

were not valued as global citizens: “they thought that we would have a better... future over here. You know... be someone.”

This quest to be someone is important to both K and his sister. While his sister is still unaware of her status as a citizen, K is now dealing with what this means, and when he discusses the process of understanding his identity, there is a sense of longing for the ignorance of youth: “as a child, you don’t realize you are moving to another country. So, you are like oh we’re just going to somewhere else for a bit. But it didn’t really hit me that we were going to go move somewhere...’til middle school, ‘cause it was like oh we just live here. I didn’t realize that I was a foreigner.” The decision to tell K about his documentation status was the result of his educational goals. Teachers and counselors at his school had begun discussing college with his class, and they were encouraging him to apply for scholarships – both academic and athletic. “they [began] talking about college...in my sophomore year, and I play soccer and they were like, you know, you could probably get a scholarship. And then I was talking about that to my mom, and she said, well, if you do get a scholarship, you probably, like, won’t be able to use it since, like, you don’t have papers.” K then paused to think for a moment, and then seeming to return to the idea that his parents wanted him to be able to be somebody, he says, “it makes me think, like, you know, why am I here then? You know?” K’s language here is important. His family moved here so he and his sister could “be someone,” yet he was here for years before he realized he was a “foreigner.” In the first chapter, I discussed Amy Wan’s warning about the “ambient assumptions” often made about citizenship: that “one only needs to act as a citizen through participation in a community or society in order to become a citizen” (33). K is a participant in his community, yet he is unable to be recognized as “someone” because he is a “foreigner.”

It's not just K's future that is at stake here; since finding out about his status, his everyday life has changed. He no longer feels free to do the things that he was once allowed to do. When his soccer team is traveling, especially if they are going to travel near the border, he is no longer able to travel with them. "I play soccer outside of school, and our team travels a lot, and just...two, three weeks ago, for Thanksgiving, my team was going to go to a tournament down in San Diego, and I didn't know it was in San Diego. I thought it was in L.A., so I told my mom, 'we're going to L.A.' She said, all right, well go with your team. Then they talked to my coach, and my coach ended up saying it was in San Diego, so then my mom got scared [because] that's close to the border and there's like a [station] where they check for immigration status." The fear of being caught, though, is something he lives with even when he is home. When asked if he has concerns about someone asking about his documentation status here, he says he worries about it quite a bit, and he is particularly worried that he will do something that might attract the attention of the police. Since learning of his status, he has become somewhat afraid of the police: "It's not that much that I'm afraid of the police – I'm afraid of what they could do. I have friends who have gotten in trouble with the police. I've never gotten in trouble with the police, but I've been close to, and it's scary."

K's experiences have changed the way he thinks about his schoolwork. His favorite subject is History because it helps him understand how nations are formed and how citizens have the power change things. He thinks understanding history could help citizens in the U.S. understand more about the somewhat arbitrary nature of citizenship. K's experiences with borders and documentation have clearly led him to think about citizenship in a nuanced way. Citizenship and belonging are impacted by the overall political moment. Borders "are lines drawn by people," and he thinks Americans needs to be a better understanding of how the

political decisions of where to draw these lines impact the lives of those who find themselves on the wrong side of the line. His experiences have led him to a communitarian idea of citizenship. Rather than asking about where people come from or what their status is, we should ask a different question: “Why doesn’t everyone just come together?” He mentions this several times, and he is clearly frustrated that the immigration policies are crafted in such a way that will keep him from pursuing his dreams, and when asked, this is his biggest dream: “That one day I’ll get my papers and be legal here. Because...we have, actually, signed paper work to one day get our papers. We’re just waiting for that day to come. We’ve been waiting around 10 years.”

Service learning scholars have been very concerned with what it means when we send students into communities that have been marginalized – how do we deal with the power differential between the university and the community? How can we develop projects *with* communities? While we may be concerned with creating the best projects with communities, there has not been much discussion of whether or not our students have the ability to move freely in communities without fearing legal repercussions. In the next chapter, I will look at some global programs that Santa Clara students participate in – there is simply the assumption that students can move around the globe freely. K’s experiences speak to different version of global citizenship; without documentation, he knows that his ability to live in the U.S. is not he can assume to be guaranteed.

M had already graduated from high school when he was interviewed, so he was in a slightly different position from K; he was already having to navigate the troubles that were still a couple of years away from K. While their experiences are similar, M provides an interesting challenge to the idea of an active global citizen because his goal is to become the type of global

citizen our universities envision. M's journey began when he was 4 or 5. He doesn't remember much about his life before coming to the U.S.: "I remember [a few] events, and one time I was at my aunt's house, and I was kicking a tree, and my shoe got stuck on a branch. I remember blurry images, nothing is very clear. Nothing is too set in my mind of what Mexico was." M's experience was different from K's in that his mother had several family members who already lived in the San Jose area. In fact, that's the reason they decided to come to America. In the 1990s, the economy in his hometown became so bad that his mother was having problems supporting the family financially, so her family in the States encouraged the move. This time in his life was fun because he and his mother lived with other members of the family, which included several kids his age to help with his adjustment to the U.S.

M began thinking about his identity when he was in junior high. He noticed that most of the students at his school would hang out with their own ethnic group, but he found that he liked hanging out with American kids because he felt he had more in common with them. This experience forced him to think about who he was, where he was from, and what that meant. "I guess the really Mexican kids at my school were like the really brown ones who were into really Mexican things. I was really the white one who no one thought was Mexican, so I might as well stick to them. And when they asked 'where are you from?' I would say I was born in Mexico, and they would say no you aren't. And they wouldn't believe me that I was a foreigner. I had to know that I had to clarify it, so it created a consciousness." While that was the beginning of his consciousness about his identity, the complexity of his situation increased as he entered high school and his friends began getting their licenses and planning for college: "that was when I figured out, oh, I don't get those things." His awareness came in stages. Freshman year was when his teachers began to talk about college. Sophomore year they were encouraged to start

looking at what colleges looked for in applicants. This is when he began hearing from some of his friends from Mexico that it was difficult to receive funding for college if you didn't have a Social Security Number, which prompted him to have the conversation with his mother about his status. None of this discouraged him, and during his junior year, he went on several field trips to different campuses. "I was so pumped [when I] saw these colleges and [thought] I could actually go to college, was like, oh, I can go here!" During his senior year, he began applying to different colleges and quickly realized that in order to receive financial aid for college, he needed a SSN. "I got really, really sad... Even if I have the grades, and I apply to the schools there is a chance I am not going, because I have the grades, but my parents can't afford it." This was the moment that he realized that his status as an undocumented immigrant was going to be a major obstacle in his life. While all of his other friends from his school – a Catholic college preparatory school – were talking about which 4-year university they were going to the following year, he started to just give up. "I was like, oh, I should just move back to Mexico. There is no point."

There is no point. Just as K came to realize that he was a "foreigner," M realized that regardless of his grades, regardless of his ambition, he was not recognized as a global citizen. A major concern for service learning scholars within composition has been challenging students to not think that citizenship simply means participation – a good citizen is one who is active in a community. As Amy Wan argues, citizenship is more complicated, and we must take into account "citizenship's other definitional possibilities as status or standing, possibilities not easily accessible to all... merely through participation" (36).

Because M went to a private college-prep high school, discussions about college were limited to 4-year universities. It was only late in his high school career that he found out he had the option of attending a community college. It took some time for him to find a way to work

through his disappointment, but “towards the end, that was when I was like, fuck it, I will just apply to a community college.” This turns out to have been a great decision for him, but that doesn’t mean he is at peace with the forces that are limiting his opportunities: “I haven’t made peace with it. I am still bitter about my high school building me up and putting all these ideas in my head of things I wanted to do. Eventually I will get over it, but it still hurts.”

M’s ambitions to be an active global citizen formed in high school. He was nominated to study abroad, but during the interview process, the issue of his status became an issue: the program was only open to citizens. When he received his rejection letter, he was told “you would have been a great candidate for it but certain things limit you from it.” He hasn’t given up on his dream. His ideal job is to work for a fashion magazine in “Europe or London or Holland.” He wants the freedom to move around the world, but he knows that is not going to happen soon: “My concerns are that things won’t happen at the time I want them to happen. I want my residency right now. I really want it because with the California dream act and now financial aid, I know I can pay for school now. But I really want to study abroad. Limitations, I don’t want to stay stuck. Staying stuck is my big concern.”

Both K and M would qualify as good citizens to most people. They are ambitious and involved in their communities. They are educated and thoughtful. They want to go to college and be productive members of their communities. The circumstances of their births, however, prevent them from (currently) being considered a good global citizen. While many early service learning scholars were interested in issues of social justice, Thomas Deans argued that the idea of citizenship was not always connected to political subjectivity. The early scholarship, in particular, drew on the work of Dewey, and in Dewey’s work, citizenship was not only framed in

terms of democratic citizenship – it was, as Raymond Boisvert argues, fundamentally a “mode of associated living, of conjoint communicated experience” (55). This approach to the idea of citizenship in the early scholarship is understandable, as scholars of service learning were really trying to figure out how they could incorporate issues of social justice into their classes. As Kahne and Westheimer argued, scholars were trying to find the best way to answer some important questions facing the academy: “What values do service-learning curricula model and seek to promote? What kind of social and political relationships do they ask students to imagine? What kinds of relationships develop between students and those they serve? What kind of society is it that service-learning students work to achieve?” (594).

In chapter 1, I mentioned Barber and Battistoni’s early warning to scholars that service learning would not be successful unless it did more than just get students involved in communities; rather, in order to be successful, service learning needed to rethink the “theory and practice of democratic citizenship” (235). The experiences of K and M show the need for service learning to think more explicitly about democratic citizenship in the age of neoliberalism. What happens when participation actually does not impact one’s standing as a citizen? What does it mean to be a democratic citizen in the age of neoliberalization? K and M may act as good citizens, but they are not, as currently theorized in our scholarship, good global citizens. In chapter 1, I also discussed Ong’s argument that neoliberal logic is reshaping American citizenship: “neoliberal logic...rights, and ethics has become the problem-space of American citizenship, with outcomes yet unknown” (3). In chapter 4 I will look at some of the problems that arise when service learning programs do not question this neoliberal logic. K and M help expose these problem spaces in ways that studying citizenship from an American perspective cannot.

Crossing Over into the U.S.

While the experiences of M and K help show how students experience citizenship without documentation, neither of them have clear memories of their journey into the U.S. An important aspect of neoliberal policies, as I mentioned earlier, is dissolving the economic borders between nations. While these economic borders have become less regulated, the physical borders have become more so. This militarization of the border is an important aspect of neoliberalism. Thinking about the physical border and the policies that govern those borders is an important way of understanding the disconnect between the policies we create and the realities of the lives impacted by them. Chantal Thomas discusses the impact that neoliberal policies have had on migration patterns within Mexico. The liberalization of the market in Mexico “proved to be a peculiar concept. While liberalization was evident in the rapid removal of barriers to cross-border trade, when it came to the domestic market, the government adopted corporatist measures that reduced the ability of labor unions to resist...wage controls” (875). The liberalization of the Mexican economy led to large migrations of people searching for livable wages. While most discussions of immigration within the U.S. focus on crossing the border in isolation, Thomas places crossing the border into a larger context of the neoliberalization of the Mexican economy. There is a distinct pattern. Migrants initially move internally in search of work. If and when the internal search fails, they look further: “illegal migrants may follow a pattern of internal-then-external migration: pursuing new work in domestic border-area export processing zones, from which cross-border migration—increasingly facilitated by human smuggling operations—is a short step. This internal-then-external migration, strikingly, often reverses but otherwise mirrors transnational capital flows” (884). The ways that migration patterns are mirrors in reverse of

transnational capital flows is the missing element in most discussions of immigration reform. In fact, discussions of transnational capital are largely absent from these discussions.

The human-smuggling operations Thomas mentions – the informal networks many immigrants use to cross the border – are often dangerous and expensive, but when workers begin to feel they have no other options, they are willing to take on that risk. Many who attempt to get in are caught at the border. In 2013, 235,000 people were detained by border patrol and deported to Mexico. Getting caught by border patrol, however, is not the greatest risk. According to Public Citizen, a human rights organization, more than 1,600 Mexican migrants died attempting to reach the U.S. between 1998 and 2003. The number of deaths has remained fairly steady for the past 20 years. According to the New York Times, there were 463 deaths in 2013. Understanding the experiences of those who risk their lives to cross the border provides an important perspective to our traditional ideas of what it means to be an active global citizen. The laws governing the flows of transnational capital have been reformed; the laws governing transnational people have not.

The crossing stories told in the JFI interviews did not vary much – they would find an agent (coyote), pay a lot of money (often going into deep debt), and walk for days in the desert with little or no food or water. There were often brushes with border patrol, and there were daring escapes. The experiences of L and C give two different perspectives of crossing the border. L's story is the most detailed in the JFI interviews. He gives a very stark picture of the process: hunger, thirst, rape, and walking and sleeping in the desert for days. C had a much better experience, but her story highlights how the destination for immigrants is much more important than the journey.

L grew up in a small village in Michoacán, México, a region west of Mexico City. Agriculture is the main occupation in the region, and before moving to the U.S., L worked on his family's farm. It wasn't until he married his wife when he was 25 that he began to think about economics and how to provide for his family. "I was always with my family. Whatever we had was for the family. After I was married, I started to see the difference." Crops in Michoacán have to be planted during the rainy season in order to thrive, and the crops they raise – corn and beans – have to last the entire year. "All that we ate was what we harvested because if we didn't, we wouldn't eat. We needed to plant beans to eat, corn to eat. [We raised] chickens for eating. If we wanted meat, we'd kill a chicken. If we wanted pork, we'd kill the pig." The crops were also the sole source of income for his family, but the profit from their crops did not provide much. It was usually enough to buy one new pair of clothes and a couple of pairs of shoes. "We needed to patch whatever we had, the clothes, shirts, sandals. You had to keep patching so that they would last for the whole year."

The economies in the villages in which both L and his wife grew up worsened rapidly. This was typical of rural regions of Mexico after NAFTA policies began to take hold. L's family raised corn, which was one of the crops hardest hit by the trade agreement. As cheap corn from the U.S. began to flood the Mexican market, farmers in Mexico saw their revenue decrease by 70% (Public Citizen 1). Because of the worsening economy, people in L's village began leaving to look for jobs either in a city or in the U.S. In his wife's village, most of the men had left, some of them leaving their wives and children behind while they worked to afford to pay for them to join them in the U.S. Initially L wanted to hold out and stay in his home village and work on his family's farm, but when he finally realized that there simply wasn't enough money for him to survive, he and his wife decided to leave. The problem with leaving somewhere because of

economic problems is difficult because if you rely on a smuggler, it costs a lot of money. L was fortunate in this regard. His older sister lived in the U.S. for 13 years and had managed to gain citizenship, so she was able to help finance his journey. While getting the money for the journey was relatively easy for L, the journey itself was very difficult.

The journey began by flying to Tijuana to meet the smuggler. His brother-in-law, who had made this journey several times, joined L and his wife to help them survive in the desert. When they met the smuggler at a hotel, they were joined by about 30 other people. The smuggler had contacts at the corner of each block, so they would go from one block to the next, stopping at each corner to make sure the coast was clear. When they finally reached the bus terminal, they were each handed a gallon of water, three bags of white bread, and three bags of rolls. These were their rations for the journey. "So, the bus came and we all got on, heading from Tijuana to Mexicali. There was a very famous...a Cuesta la rumorosa...I think that is what it is called, very dangerous with lots of curves. And there were some 18-wheelers – many of them I remember seeing many of them –turned over down below in the gorge. It was really dangerous. And here we went on the bus...we were going super-fast, and about half way down, you felt a screech. He stopped and they told us all to get off. So, we all got off and [the bus] left us." They walked about half an hour and then were told to hide on one side of a set of train tracks to wait until it was dark. The coyote had told L's sister that they would be walking for 3-4 hours, but the journey would, in fact, turn into a 2-day experience in the desert. When it got dark, "we had to walk until about 2:00 in the morning, in the pitch black, and we walked up and down the mountains. And we got to a place where there was a cliff, really steep, hill after hill, no trees, nothing, pure caves, I don't know how you call them in English. So, we got here. It was really cold. And the coyote said here we are going to rest." They rested until the sun came up –

presumably so the coyote could scout the path in the daylight – but because they couldn't travel during daylight, they had to stay hidden all day.

The experience of crossing the border has multiple dangers – injuries from the rough terrain, injuries from exposure to extreme heat during the day and extreme cold at night, injuries caused by lack of food or water. Sometimes, however, the danger comes from those who are leading you across the border. This is one of L's most vivid memories. "I remember, I will never forget, that there were two young women with us in the group, about 25 years old, and I remember that with the young men, the coyotes, they were walking and talking, and [on the journey], 'you lose your judgment' (se va el coco), they slept together." The father of one of the women had crossed over before and knew that smugglers could take advantage of those they were helping, so he'd asked someone in the group to make sure this didn't happen. The women, though, "felt that they were being protected by the coyotes, so they didn't pay any attention to the friend from the village." When they began the journey again at dark the next day, they had to sprint across different highways. "There were a lot of thorns and prickly pear cactus that we were bumping into. We had to duck down when cars came, and every time there were not many cars, that's when we would run to cross the eight lanes. You'd have to run as fast as you could. The curious part is that one doesn't know this side. It was really dark, and there were ups and downs, holes, and I don't know what, and when we were running along the ditches alongside the freeway, we would fall or run into each other or cactus... And you wouldn't know what was on the other side [of the freeway], a 'zanja de agua'" By this time, most of the group was very weak, and the coyotes had to start carrying some of them.

They were finally met by a van that took them across the border into the U.S., but the journey was not quite over. The smugglers knew they would at some point be spotted, and when

that happened, they would have to leave the van and start running through the desert again. By this time, they had been traveling for 36 hours on one meal and very little sleep. When the driver saw a border patrol car in the distance, he stopped the van and told everyone to get out and run as fast as they could. They were chased for 3 hours, running as fast as they could through the rough terrain of the desert. “We could see the migra coming for us on motorcycles, following our footprints. When we crossed this trajectory, I remember that there was one guy that carried and jug of water that was empty; there wasn’t any more water in it. We passed by a ranch, with a little shed, and there he filled his jug, so we could all drink water. So, I followed him, helping him carry the water so I could have a drink also.” They finally reached a hill that provided some places for them to hide, so the guide told them to spread out in pairs and hide for the next few hours. This was the point when L was ready to quit. “I couldn’t take any more. My mouth was dry. I decided not to walk any more. I was ready to just turn myself in because I didn’t want to die.”

After a few hours of rest, the group reformed and began the hike to a nearby town where the van would meet them once again. One of the guides brought them some water that he’d picked up at a ranch. “I think it had chemicals that they have to bathe the animals. Chemicals...it was bad water. But we were all so thirsty – dying of thirst. There was no other option, so we drank it.” They finally met up with the van around 10 at night, and the van drove them to Long Beach, CA. They arrived at a house around 3 in the morning, ending the 56-hour journey. His sister came to pick him up shortly after he made it to the safe house.

The journey is not a glitch in the neoliberal system – it is an under-recognized part of the system. Reece Jones, author of *Violent Borders*, studies borders and the impact they have on migration. Border walls do not prevent displaced people from migrating; rather, tight border

controls simply push people to seek ever-more dangerous paths to their destination. As I've noted earlier, one of the contradictions of neoliberalism is that while neoliberal policies dissolve the economic borders between nations, there has been a simultaneous resurgence in nationalistic rhetoric. This rhetoric helps justify building borders, and I think it is important to see how the urge to build walls has emerged in the era of neoliberalism. Jones points out that at the end of World War II, "there were only 5 border walls in the world" (Border Walls). Today, there are 65, and "three-quarters of them built within the last twenty years" (Border Walls). L's story is an important example of the disconnect between the rhetorics of neoliberalism and the lived reality of those marginalized by the policies those rhetorics justify. Border Walls are a popular topic because "despite their high cost and low efficacy...[t]hey provide imposingly tangible evidence that something is being done about migration" (Border Walls). For service learning scholars, thinking about borders – who is allowed to cross them; how are these crossings connected to neoliberal policies of migration; how are they issues of human rights and social justice – is an important way that immigrant identity can challenge our ideas of crossing into communities.

C's story is very similar to L's, but as I mentioned above, her journey was much smoother. C grew up in Guadalajara, Mexico, a city that was impacted greatly by NAFTA. Because Guadalajara had a well-developed infrastructure, it was an attractive target for many International Firms. When these firms began locating in the city, it forced many local companies out of business. While the unemployment rate in Guadalajara is fairly low, most of the jobs in the city are very low-wage manufacturing jobs. A high level of job insecurity accompanies the low-wages: anytime the economy slows down, there is a high layoff rate. C decided to leave Guadalajara because of the working conditions. "Unlike here in the States, mothers do not have

many opportunities for work. When I was 3 months pregnant, I got laid off because I was pregnant and my boss wanted someone who would not have to miss work in order to take care of her children.” Even though C was educated and had attended business school, the job market was very volatile, and there was no job security. This job insecurity also impacted her husband. While her husband continued to work, C stayed at home, but when his company went bankrupt, he also lost his job. When they had both been unemployed for 3 months, they ran out of money and became desperate. Her husband decided to come to the States, save money, and bring her over later.

C’s husband had a friend who lived in San Jose and offered to help him find a job. Once he’d saved enough money to pay for C to cross, this same friend found people to help bring C here safely. They initially tried to get a passport, but her application was denied, so they found a smuggler – “the famous coyotes!” She did not specify how much she was charged, but she said it was a lot. C’s take on the smugglers is a complicated one. “Coyotes get bad press, but I don’t think that they are all bad, at least mine wasn’t bad.” Her coyote treated the entire group well – gave them food and didn’t try to extort more money from them once they reached their destination. But however nice she was treated by the coyote, the journey was not an easy one. “My journey was a little difficult. I entered on the 23rd of December, just before Christmas, and [there] was...a huge frost...I came across on the coldest night, and I had my little boy in my arms. My coyote had told me that we were only going to walk for half an hour, but we ended up walking straight through the night.” The cold temperature was bad, but it became worse when she lost her balance and fell in a river. “I was wet, and my feet were freezing. I felt as if I couldn’t continue walking, but I motivated myself to continue walking [by] reminding myself that I couldn’t stay here, that [the other migrants and coyotes] were going to leave me if I

stopped walking. I continued walking, with much sacrifice, and finally we got to our destination.” While C and her husband have been in the U.S. for several years now – only returning once when her father died – she misses being surrounded by her family, her language, and her culture. Despite this, she does not think she’ll ever be able to return home because she doesn’t think the economy would allow for her and her husband to support her family. “We were always happy [in Mexico] because we were with my parents and my brothers. We were happy because we could wrap ourselves in our language and we were surrounded by people we knew. We never had to be afraid of anyone. We were happy...you need happiness, but you also need money.”

The stories of L and C fit the pattern described by Thomas. Economic policies reshaped the Mexican economy. In L’s case, the agricultural economy dried up drastically; in C’s case, the suppressed wages and job insecurity made earning a living difficult. Discussions about immigration reform so often revolve around border security without addressing the larger economic conditions that impact migrations. Jorge Casteneda argues that “[d]efining and passing comprehensive immigration reform is not rocket science; it requires straightforwardly intelligent substance and skillful politics” (Casteneda). Understanding more clearly *why* people cross borders points to the (often ignored) relationship between transnational capital and global citizenship. Understanding *who* is allowed to cross borders (and how) is also important to understanding who is allowed to be a global citizen.

The issue of how national borders define people is important for composition scholars. Hesford argues that we need to be more aware of the ways that global forces shape “our individual lives and literate practices” (788). Understanding various experiences with global

citizenship forces us to ask different questions about political subjectivity. In chapter 1, I discussed some of the questions that globalization raises concerning citizenship. DeChaine argues that globalization has (and is) changing the way that people relate to each other. In the era of globalization, “[w]hat are the rights and responsibilities of the citizen, both to the state and to others with whom the state interacts?...[D]oes globalization entail an ethic of ‘universal citizenship,’ and if so, given the pull of national and cultural identities, how is the global citizen supposed to negotiate his or her allegiances and responsibilities?” (40). As I will discuss in the next chapter, the issue of who is allowed to cross borders is an important issue for universities, as they encourage students to become involved in international programs. Understanding the perspective of immigrant experiences with global citizenship, and with crossing borders, provides different answers to DeChaine’s questions, I believe, than those of university students. The experiences of crossing borders help us rethink the idea of rights and responsibilities, as well as challenging us to complicate the notion of global citizenship.

The Labor Market

One of the foundational principles of neoliberal theory is rethinking the role of labor in the economy. Earlier, I mentioned that neoliberals continually seek to remove the “rigidities” of the labor market (Leiva 342). Having a flexible labor force allows, the theory goes, jobs in inefficient elements of the economy to be replaced by jobs in emerging sectors. Although neoliberal theorists and NAFTA proponents argued that free trade would lead to higher employment and higher wages, the reality has been much different. In Mexico, 47% of the work force is employed in the informal sector (Cypher 63), with few protections from abuse. Many of

the workers who are able to cross into the U.S. are forced to continue working in the informal sector. Studying the informal labor sector helps expose some of the contradictions in our thinking about immigrants. In “Strangers in Our Midst,” Kristen Heyer studies the issue of day-laborers in America: “The wider context of day-labor exploitation...is a complex one: it involves a schizophrenic public that simultaneously depends upon and vilifies day laborers” (426). We vilify them because, as Mahatmya mentions, we value those we see as educated and industrious, labels we don’t often extend to laborers.

The two interviews in this section speak to the very tenuous nature of the job market for many immigrants. They labor under sometimes-harsh conditions, they fear the power their bosses have, and they know that any injury, no matter how small, can jeopardize their ability to provide for their family. Z has been routinely intimidated by her bosses and fired when she attempted to defend herself; her story highlights the important role that labor unions play in fighting for the basic rights of workers. X has suffered from injuries in different jobs, and her lack of insurance and medical care has placed her and her four children in a precarious financial position. Her story is a stark reminder of how financial insecurity impacts the education of and opportunities for children.

I interviewed Z, and I immediately had to abandon the scripted questions. JFI wanted to understand where the interviewees had come from and to hear their experiences of crossing over, but Z was not all that concerned with JFI’s agenda. She wanted to tell about her experiences working. Z had been fired 4 years earlier from her job at a grocery store because she was accused of stealing. When she was initially accused, she simply asked, “Why are you accusing me of that?” She was told that they had a security DVD that showed her stealing from the store. They even showed her the DVD case, but they refused to let her see the actual footage. She was not

the only person fired for this reason. They fired around 80 people during a short period of time, and they wouldn't show the security footage to any of them. When she got mad and demanded to see the footage, they threatened to have her kicked out of the country. "You have no right to complain," they told her, "you're an immigrant, an undocumented immigrant, and people like you have no rights here." She finally called her husband who came up talk to the managers. The response of the managers was to accuse him of stealing, as well. They finally had to leave because the store told them they were calling the cops.

After she was fired from this store, she worked for another store. She worked there for 2 years, and she actually enjoyed her job. The managers were good to her. The problem came when the store began to struggle financially. There were rumors that the store might be having problems, so she asked someone what was going on. When the managers found out that she was asking questions, they told her to stop spreading rumors or they would fire her. She remained quiet, but it wasn't long before the store closed. It closed abruptly, and the company initially refused to pay the workers for their last few weeks of work. At this point, they had no resources to help them. There was no union, and they did not know how to speak for themselves, especially when speaking out would get them fired or even deported. Finally, someone from the community put them in touch with a representative from a union. Z some of the other workers from the store "got very, very involved and...got a lawsuit against the store...hoping to get paid for the money that the store didn't pay them when they closed." The union is not just helping them with the back pay. They helped Z file a lawsuit for an injury she sustained when she fell on the job. She won the lawsuit, but she still hasn't received the compensation, as her former employer is appealing the decisions. Z notes the positive side to this: she "learned a lot with getting involved with the union, fighting for rights, not being quiet and afraid [like] she was before."

Even though there are unions in the area, many companies do not allow their workers to belong to a union. She currently works for another store, a place where the managers verbally abuse the workers: “They speak to [the workers] really badly. They use really bad vocabulary. They are very rude, and they do that not only when they are with workers, but when they are in front of customers, too. They use obscene language.” She hates working in these conditions, but there isn’t much she can do about it. However, the fact that she has worked with union representatives in the past makes a difference. While the managers treat other workers badly, they treat her with more respect. And although she doesn’t know for sure, she believes this is because of her involvement with a union. “[I] suspect that they might know that [I] belong to the union from previous jobs because they do respect [me].”

In Chapter 1, I briefly discussed the neoliberal theory to labor. The theory is that by having a “flexible” workforce, the overall economic system would become more efficient. Just as with the rhetoric surrounding borders, the neoliberal rhetoric of flexibility and labor does not reflect the lived realities of laborers who do not have protections or job security. I believe this represents something important for service learning scholars. A flexible labor market is not simply a change in how corporations are allowed to treat employees or how the market will respond to labor costs; it represents a shift in the relationship between citizens and the state. Rather than the state providing a protection of the rights of workers, the state is protecting the rights of employers at the expense of its citizens. The rhetorics of neoliberalism create, Tracy Smith-Carrier argues, “a continuum of deservedness” (30). On this continuum, some are able to appeal to their human rights, while others are denied that opportunity. *Z*’s experiences are an example of how neoliberal policies have eroded protections that would have traditionally worked to ensure that everyone “has equal access to social entitlements” (9). Understanding how this

shift in citizenship – in access to social entitlements – impacts the communities in which we work is important if we want to help students understand more clearly how the policies of neoliberalism are impacting (or have impacted) their own lives.

Z's husband works in construction, and even though his job security is closely linked with trends in the economy, with two incomes, they are able to make enough money to send a little money back to their families in Mexico. X does not have the luxury of a two-income house. X is a single mother of 4 who has been in the States for 18 years. She was a hair stylist in Mexico, but being a single mother, she had problems making ends meet, so she decided to come to the U.S. She had hoped to get a job as a stylist when she got here, but she was unable to find work in that field, so she began working at different stores in the community. X didn't speak too much about her early years in the States. She was married, but her husband died 6 years ago. Since then, she has had problems maintaining a job. Part of this is because of her age, as the managers at different stores prefer to hire younger workers. Because of the age difference between her and her co-workers, she does not have a strong network of people to support her at work. Part of her struggle to maintain a job is because of injury. She has been injured on different occasions. She sliced her hand on a meat slicer. She fell and hurt her wrist. She had boxes, totaling over 200 pounds, fall on her. X told her manager, but they "didn't do anything. They didn't report it [so] I told the sub-director [that] I had an accident. The person in charge was there and didn't make any report." She was eventually in so much pain that, even though she did not have insurance, she went to the doctor. She was told that she had "shattered tendons." Even with an official diagnosis, her employers did not do anything. She was in extreme pain, but she knew she could not do anything. The attitude of the company was: "the door is open, and you can leave because every day, people come and go."

Because of the pain, X had to take time off from her job, and she is not sure when – or if – she will be able to work again. Her hands are in such pain that she has problems even brushing her teeth and her hair. This uncertainty weighs on her, and it is taking its toll on her children, as well. Her 9-year-old son is stressed and already thinking that he needs to get a job. X's neighborhood is helping take care of her at the moment, which has helped give her family some hope. She is clearly passionate about the unjust environments in which she had to labor for years, and this begins with the basic right to speak in the face of injustice. "I think that in this country there has to be a freedom of speech without fear, without dread because this is what happened to me...what they've done is not just."

Earlier, I mentioned that creating a flexible labor force – and by removing many of the protections that laborers receive – was an important part of the neoliberal project. This can be seen in each of these stories. While the stories of the undocumented teens and the experiences of crossing borders offer a way for us to gain insights into the personal stories of immigrants, the stories of the labor market offer insights into political activism. A major concern in service learning scholarship has been understanding how communities respond to political challenges. What are the rhetorical strategies that community members use to address systemic issues? What are the resources available to them? Cushman was one of the first scholars to propose a methodology for scholars to start thinking of ways to connect the theories we study with the work performed in communities. "Given the role rhetoricians have historically played in the politics of their communities," Cushman argued, "I believe modern rhetoric and composition scholars can be agents of social change outside the university" (7). By developing an activist methodology, Cushman was able to study how activists in community used different rhetorical strategies and literate practices to attempt to create political change. As I mentioned above, this

is work that later service learning scholars built on in order to develop projects that prioritize the rhetorical practices of community members. The experiences of Z and X complicate this emphasis on community rhetorical practices. They are both constrained by multiple forces – they are both trying to navigate the labor market in a language that is not their own, and they are doing so in an environment in which they are not afforded the same legal protections as citizens.

Conclusion

For the past 25 years, service learning scholars have worked to develop programs that address issues of social justice in the most responsible ways possible. There has been a continual revision of what these programs could look like, how they can challenge students to think about citizenship, and, more importantly, who is involved in planning the programs. Scholars were asking students to think about political relationships, and they were challenging students to think about the ways that they could shape society. In important ways, scholars did begin to re-theorize the types of citizens that service learning programs might produce: citizens who are reflective about their own positionality, who are aware of power asymmetries, who are concerned with the larger political moment, and who want to address social injustices. Scholars also began to think more explicitly about the first of Kahne and Westheimer's questions: what values do service-learning curricula seek to promote? This led to scholars thinking more explicitly about the values of the communities in which students were working. By doing so, scholars began to understand more about how citizens within underserved communities were responding to the larger political moment.

As I mentioned throughout chapter one, while scholars discussed the political moment in which we live, and as they tried to find ways to help students address the social injustices created by current political policies, they did not necessarily re-theorize (or refurbish) the idea of democratic citizenship as Barber and Battistoni warned we must do. Most of the scholarship seems to think about citizenship in terms of national (U.S.) identity. As scholars begin to position service learning projects within a neoliberal framework, it opens new opportunities to think about citizenship beyond national borders. This helps destabilize our assumptions about what it means to be a citizen in the era of globalization. The participants in the Justice for Immigrants storytelling project provide some important insights into how the notion of citizenship has evolved rapidly in the past three decades. They are global citizens in ways that are not valued. They are global citizens living in America with no political standing. Their lives have been uprooted by neoliberal policies that have devastated the economies in their country of origin. As they work long hours for little money, their lives are impacted by labor laws and protections shaped by neoliberal logic. Because laws governing the physical borders between nations did not evolve along with the laws governing the financial borders between nations, a shadow industry of human smuggling has become a poorly kept secret. The political standing of children means that their rights, resources, and opportunities are limited. It is clear throughout the interviews that the experiences of these immigrants are tied directly to neoliberal policies. They are neoliberal political subjects as much as our students; they just lack political standing granted to those born within the U.S.

If service learning programs want to create global citizens who are capable of addressing issues of social injustice, then I believe the identity of the immigrant can disrupt the assumptions we might make about global citizenship. I also believe it provides a way to help students

understand how their lives are linked politically to the lives of those in the community. In chapter one, I mentioned Guy Standing's call for new ways to critique neoliberalism. Historically, progressive movements have been "built on the anger, needs and aspirations of the emerging major class" (Standing). The emerging class today is not strictly an economic class – neoliberal policies have impacted the immigrants in this chapter, but they have also made the futures of college students uncertain. Standing argues that an important way to understand how to resist neoliberalism is to understand how neoliberal policies impact these various groups in similar ways. In the next chapter, I will look at the ways that neoliberal logic has influenced service learning projects, which limits the ways that students might envision a different form of political subjectivity.

The response to President Obama's executive order on immigration was, sadly, predictable. House Speaker Jon Boehner accused him of cementing "his legacy of lawlessness." Sarah Palin said that the order amounted to Obama "giving the finger" to the American voter. Representative Lamar Smith described Obama's actions as "declaring war on the American people." These are clearly political statements appealing to certain elements within conservative political circles. They are easy to dismiss, even if they do represent the views of many people. A more important critique came from Senator John McCain, a politician who has at different points in his career been serious about addressing our broken immigration system in bipartisan ways. "The President's unilateral action announced... fails to address the root causes of the dysfunction in our immigration system, including an insecure border, the absence of a rational, efficient guest worker program to meet America's urgent labor needs, and a broken system for legal immigration." This statement received a lot of attention because it mentions root causes. The problem is that, as I've mentioned in the chapter, this statement still addresses the issue of

immigration as an isolated problem. Hearing the voices of those whose lives are disrupted and displaced by the economic and political policies is an important step in beginning to rethink what we mean when we talk about root causes. They provide an important reminder that the idea of a global citizenship is not enjoyed by everyone equally.

Chapter 4: The University

In the Fall of 2015, the University of Iowa appointed a new president. The decision came at the end of a nationwide search that included “notable candidates from the field of higher education, like the president of Oberlin and the provosts of Tulane and Ohio State” (Vara). The Board of Regents, however, chose a candidate with very little experience in higher education. While J. Bruce Harreld had lectured for 5 years at Harvard, most of his experience came as an executive at “I.B.M, Boston Market, and Kraft” (Vara). The response to this decision was overwhelmingly negative. The Faculty Senate gave the Board of Regents a vote of no confidence: “Whereas the Board of Regents has failed in its duty to take care of the University of Iowa and citizens of Iowa and shown blatant disregard for the shared nature of the university governance, whereas the regents have failed to act to their own strategic plan and core values ... we therefore have no confidence in the ability of the Board of Regents ability to wisely govern our institution” (Miller). The AAUP issued a statement “deploring the actions of the Iowa Board of Regents in appointing Mr. Bruce Harreld to be the next president of the University of Iowa” (AAUP). The union representing the graduate students at the university saw the appointment as an example of “how far the ... board is willing to go to destroy public education at the University of Iowa” (Bryant). Both the graduate and undergraduate senates issued similar responses.

While these responses might seem strong, they were not surprising. The tension between the Board and the larger university community has been increasing in recent years over “two competing visions of how financial considerations should influence the future of higher education” (Vara). The outgoing President, Sally Mason, had not agreed with the Board’s vision, so the Board refused to renew her contract in 2012 – she had worked the previous three years

without a contract. The disconnect between the Board and the larger university community became very clear during the Presidential search. After Harreld's campus visit, he "received only 1.8 percent approval from the university's faculty and a 2.6 percent positive response from the entire university" (Tendall). Just as the Board had dismissed Mason's concerns when she was President, and just as the Board dismissed the university community's concerns about Harreld, the Board dismissed the criticisms after they made their decision: "The Board of Regents issued a statement responding to the faculty motion that stressed the changing nature of the landscape of higher education and expressed disappointment that 'some stakeholders have decided to embrace the status quo of the past over opportunities for the future'" (Miller).

In chapter one, I discussed ways that service learning initiatives were one way that the academy responded to the 'crisis in higher education'. The Board's decision to hire someone from the corporate world is another response to this same crisis. As public funding for higher education dries up, universities have increasingly borrowed language and models from the corporate world as a way to remain competitive. When asked why Harreld was chosen for the job, the President of the Board emphasized Harreld's track record of generating revenue for companies. Harreld does have a reputation for this: "At I.B.M., in the eighties and nineties, he was responsible both for cost-cutting and for finding and overseeing 'emerging business opportunities' that could generate more growth" (Vara). Thinking of the academy as a corporation is an increasingly popular idea for politicians, even though the idea doesn't hold up to close scrutiny. "There is a lot of hypocrisy in this idea that we're going to be thinking about a university or any higher ed as a business since, in business, the point is the profit of the business and those who hold shares in the business. At a university, presumably the point is the well-being of those who are being served by the institution. Those are radically different goals" (Davidson).

Kembrew McLeod, a professor at Iowa, argues that this business mindset is not compatible with the academy: “Universities are one of the few areas of American culture—and, really, Western culture—where market logic doesn’t trump everything else” (Vara).

Market logic, however, is beginning to trump everything else: “the last years have seen an organized, orchestrated, serious effort not just to defund public education but to shift the mission of higher education—politically motivated, economically motivated, fiscally motivated” (Davidson). Iowa’s decision to hire someone from the corporate world to run the state’s flagship university is an obvious way that neoliberal market logic has infiltrated the academy. I want to argue that this logic also extends to service learning programs. While the new President at Iowa is expected to generate revenue and streamline the budget, service learning initiatives are incorporating terms and logic from the corporate world, as well. There are some obvious examples, such as service projects that take entrepreneurial approaches to issues of social justice. I would also argue that neoliberal logic has also infiltrated traditional service learning projects. In chapter 1, I discussed how service learning projects emerged at a moment when neoliberalism was redefining the role of the citizen. The responsibilities of the citizen were emphasized while the rights of the citizen were diminished. A good citizen was redefined as one who can fulfill her social contract with the state. This redefinition extended beyond political relationships. Will Kymlicka argues that neoliberal logic “also reshaped the structure of social relationships, including relationships in the family, workplace, neighborhood, and civil society” (99). In this redefinition process, the term citizen became ill-defined; we developed what Amy Wan calls “ambient assumptions” about what the word actually means. I believe that many of the terms used to describe or justify service projects have also become ambient terms. Service learning

programs use terms such as solidarity and public good and social justice without accounting for how those terms operate under neoliberal logic.

In the previous chapter, I discussed how we could understand the idea of global citizenship in more nuanced way by framing it within a neoliberal context. The experiences the immigrants described showed how their lives have been shaped by neoliberal policies. The participants in those interviews are global citizens; they are just not recognized as such. In this chapter, I will continue to look at how neoliberal logic is shaping the lives of global citizens. To do so, I will turn my focus to service learning initiatives at Santa Clara University. I will begin the chapter by discussing the ways that neoliberal logic has posed a challenge to the traditional goals of the academy. This discussion helps show how some key terms used in service learning programs have been redefined. Because SCU is a Catholic university, I will then discuss the influence of Catholic social teachings on their approach to education. As we saw in the last chapter, these social teachings often seem incompatible with neoliberalism. I will end the chapter with an analysis of three service learning initiatives at SCU to see how neoliberal logic has shaped them. Analyzing the programs through the lens of neoliberalism helps show some of the ways that service learning initiatives, while attempting to create global citizens who are equipped to address social injustices, might be producing neoliberal subjects who address social injustices in ways that are well-intentioned but are, simultaneously, ineffective.

Neoliberalism and Educating Citizens

In *Undoing the Demos*, Wendy Brown devotes a chapter to neoliberalism's impact on higher education. Brown's immediate concern is public education, but much of her argument

applies to higher education more generally. Brown's argument is that as neoliberal principles increasingly govern the academy, it is fundamentally changing the types of citizens we create, and this change poses a threat to democracy as we know it: "It is commonplace that broadly accessible and affordable higher education is one of the great casualties of neoliberalism's ascendance in the Euro-Atlantic world...this casualty in turn threatens democracy itself. Citizens cannot rule themselves, even if that means only thoughtfully choosing representatives or voting on referenda...without understanding the powers and problems they are engaging" (175). For Brown, neoliberalism is not just economic policies or rethinking the role of the state in our lives. Instead, it is "a normative order of reason developed over three decades into a widely and deeply disseminated governing rationality...neoliberalism transmogrifies every human domain and endeavor, along with humans themselves, according to a specific image of the economic. All conduct is economic conduct; all spheres of existence are framed and measured by economic terms and metrics, even when those spheres are not directly monetized" (9-10).

I opened chapter three with President Obama's executive order on immigration in 2014 to highlight that even though the neoliberal economic and political forces shaping immigration have changed in the past 30 years, the way we frame our discussions of immigration have not evolved. Brown analyzes another of Obama's speeches, his second inaugural address, to show just how extensively neoliberalism has impacted our ideas about social justice. Paragraph after paragraph, Obama stressed that we needed to address issues of social justice because it would drive the economy: "every progressive value — from decreasing domestic violence to slowing climate change — Obama represented as not merely reconcilable with economic growth, but as driving it" (25). Thinking of issues of social justice in economic terms, however, undermines the democratic project because it means that "democratic state commitments to equality, liberty,

inclusion, and constitutionalism are now subordinate to the project of economic growth, competitive positioning, and capital enhancement” (26). When our reasons for addressing an issue are driven by economic growth or competitive positioning, “the foundation vanishes for citizenship concerned with public things and the common good” (39). Neoliberal logic, Brown argues, is reshaping the very terms that have traditionally been used to address issues of social justice. The idea of a public good, the idea of citizenship, has become subservient to the neoliberal project.

The Entrepreneur, Solidarity, and the Public Good

While the academy has increasingly modeled itself after the corporate world, the impact is not just on revenue streams and budgets. Neoliberal logic has shifted the focus of the university; in recent years, the goal of higher education has become a way of developing human capital: “Neoliberalism...does not merely privatize...what was publicly supported and valued. Rather, it formulates everything, everywhere, in terms of capital investment and appreciation, including and especially humans themselves” (Brown 176). Rather than thinking of higher education as something that benefits the public, the focus of higher education has shifted to become “personal investment in individual futures, futures construed mainly in terms of earning capacity” (181). When we think about education as an investment in individual futures, students are “expected to comport themselves in ways that maximize their capital value in the present and enhance their future value, and [they] do so through practices of entrepreneurialism, self-investment, and/or attracting investors” (22).

Supporters of neoliberal logic would, I suspect, defend this focus on individual futures because it emphasizes self-reliance and responsibility. The reason Brown believes that this shift is a dangerous one is because it represents a much larger shift in the way we organize our societies. Rather than organizing around the idea of equality, neoliberalism's focus on individual competition legitimates inequality:

In neoliberalism, competition replaces the liberal economic emphasis on exchange as the fundamental principle and dynamic of the market. This is another of those seemingly trivial replacements that is a tectonic shift, affecting a range of other principles and venues. Most importantly, equivalence is both the premise and the norm of exchange, while inequality is the premise and outcome of competition. Consequently, when the political rationality of neoliberalism is fully realized, when market principles are extended to every sphere, inequality becomes legitimate, even normative, in every sphere (64)

As evidenced in Obama's speech, this emphasis on competition, this restructuring the way we think to be primarily in economic terms, changes the way we think about issues of social justice. As a nation, we have privatized our approaches to social justice, and we have done so, it seems, without considering the ways that the emphasis on competition has contributed to or exacerbated social injustices. While service learning programs are seen as an important way of educating students about social injustices, there is a need to think about how the idea of social justice has evolved under neoliberal logic. As Brown states, we have failed to think about how neoliberal policies legitimize inequality. A related casualty of this emphasis on competition is our sense of solidarity. After all, when we "are figured as human capital in all that we do and in

every venue, equality ceases to be our presumed natural relation with one another” (38). When equality ceases to be our presumed relation with each other, the idea of a people concerned with a common good disappears.

The tectonic shift that Brown mentions above is a shift in both how individuals relate to each other and how individuals relate to the state. Neoliberalism as it is often portrayed in the media means that the government has a limited role in the national economy. Brown argues that this is not an accurate portrayal of the true extent of neoliberalism. Rather than keeping its hands off of the economy, “neoliberalism activates the state on behalf of the economy, not to undertake economic functions or to intervene in economic effects, but rather to facilitate economic competition and growth and to economize the social, or, as Foucault puts it, to ‘regulate society by the market’” (62). When this happens, an individual’s “investment value, rather than their productivity, becomes paramount; moral autonomy and hence the basis of sovereign individuality vanishes; and the space and meaning of political citizenship shrink” (78).

Catholic Social Teachings and Social Justice

I want to take a brief detour away from neoliberalism in order to see how neoliberal logic impacts service learning programs in order to look at the ways that Santa Clara University frames its service initiatives. In the previous chapter, I discussed the Catholic social teachings and the ways they informed the Justice for Immigrants interview project. Just as those teachings were an important way to contextualize that project, a brief background on the Jesuit tradition will be helpful to understand the ways that SCU thinks about civic engagement and education. The Jesuit tradition emphasizes the idea of solidarity; much of the language in the university

literature revolves around how we can address issues of social injustices by finding ways to create solidarity.

In his speech “The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice in American Jesuit Higher Education,” Father Peter-Hans Kolvenbach provides a history of how the Jesuit tradition has traditionally viewed its role in the communities in which they lived and worked. Kolvenbach was the Superior General of the Society of Jesus (Jesuits) from 1983 until 2006, and he was a central figure in challenging Jesuit schools to think of how the education they provided could help address issues of social justice. Jesuit schools were “originally founded to serve the educational and religious needs of poor immigrant populations” (1). Kolvenbach, speaking in 2000, on Santa Clara’s campus, argues that Jesuit institutions lost sight of this initial focus somewhere along the way. Kolvenbach frames his speech with Catholic social teachings and the Jesuit philosophy of education, but as I will discuss below, his speech touches on many of the major threads in service learning scholarship. He was concerned with thinking about how to help students understand social injustices, thinking about the relationship between universities and marginalized communities, and thinking about how the idea of citizenship was changing.

It was only in 1975 that the Jesuits began to refocus their attention to issues of social justice, as a response to Jesuit delegates from around the world for the 32nd General Council. During the General Council “the Congregation slowly realized that the entire Society of Jesus in all its many works was being invited by the Spirit of God to set out on a new direction” (1). One of the founding principles of the Jesuits was “the service of faith,” but the GC wanted to expand this to also include “the promotion of justice” (1). There were, of course, different organizations within the Jesuit community that were working with the poor, but the General Council wanted to find a way to expand this to educational institutions, as well. Kolvenbach’s own experiences

showed the disconnect between education and issues of justice. He worked in the Province of the Near East. There were a few Jesuits who “worked in very poor villages, refugee camps or prisons, and some fought for the rights of workers, immigrants, and foreigners” (2). This work, however, was not really seen authentic Jesuit work. In that Province, the Jesuits had focused most of their attention on creating a famous university and some respected high schools. But the schools did not worry about producing citizens who thought about issues of social justice: “In Beirut we were well aware that our medical school, staffed by very holy Jesuits, was producing, at least at that time, some of the most corrupt citizens in the city, but this was taken for granted” (2) The school did not concern themselves with this too much because of the political climate in the area. The big social issue in the region was the liberation of Palestine. While there were a few charities that churches sponsored, Jesuit schools feared that “involvement in the promotion of justice would have tainted them by association with leftist movements and political turmoil” (2).

The timeline of this renewed interest in social justice, as well as the concerns about potential criticism to this interest, is important to note. The interest of Jesuit educators in social justice mirrors the trend in the academy that I discussed in chapter 1. Scholars in the academy were concerned that they were producing students ill-equipped to respond to the current political moment; service learning was one response to the perceived crisis in higher education. However, the Jesuit leadership feared that if they changed their mission to address issues of social justice, their ideas would be dismissed as radical. This echoes Zlotkowski’s warning that scholars should avoid making service learning overtly political as a way to avoid seeming too leftist.

The General Council held by the Jesuits was part of a larger movement within the Catholic Church during the 60s and 70s. The Second Vatican Council had ended in 1965, and while much of that Council dealt with internal Church issues, part of its purpose was to find

ways to help the Church be more relevant in modern times. In 1966, Father Arrupe, a very influential Jesuit, criticized the Society for not addressing issues of social justice and social equity. He specifically targeted the Provincials in Latin America because of “how the socioeconomic situation throughout the continent contradicted the Gospel” (2). Jesuits were initially concerned that Arrupe was asking them to abandon education, something that was at the heart of the Society, but that wasn’t the case – he wanted education to incorporate issues of social justice into the curriculum. In 1975, integrating “the promotion of justice” into the traditional educational mission of Jesuit schools was seen as a radical move. It has since become a point of pride for the Jesuits. Kolvenbach quotes Father Ignacio Ellacur’a: “A Christian university must take into account the Gospel preference for the poor. This does not mean that only the poor study at the university; it does not mean that the university should abdicate its mission of academic excellence – excellence needed in order to solve complex social problems. It does mean that the university should be present intellectually where it is needed: to provide science for those who have no science; to provide skills for the unskilled; to be a voice for those who do not possess the academic qualifications to promote and legitimate their rights” (4).

Again, it is interesting to see how the concerns facing Jesuits that Kolvenbach outlines here – being relevant in a changing world, what this change would mean for the mission of the order – are concerns that were much discussed in early service learning scholarship. Donald Kennedy helped found Campus Compact because of the perceived disconnect between the values of the academy and the values of the general public. Kennedy argued that there would need to be a revolution in our approach to teaching if there was going to be real change. Eugene Rice believed that service learning could be at the heart of a pedagogical revolution, and scholars soon began studying ways that service learning programs were changing student learning. In the

introduction to *Writing the Community*, Lillian Bridwell-Bowles described what was going on in the academy as an identity crisis. That collection provides a good insight into some of the pedagogical challenges and opportunities that concerned early service learning scholars. While laying out the different types of programs that they felt were successful – or not – these scholars were also making the argument that these programs could enhance the work that we do in the academy. Just as Father Ellacur'a had to reassure the Jesuits that an emphasis on social justice would not change the overall mission of Jesuit education, this collection could be seen as a reassurance that service learning would not detract from student learning.

Kolvenbach's speech was a challenge to the university. Santa Clara is located in an area of the world with one of the largest gaps between the rich and the poor. He notes the fact that the Silicon Valley is one of the driving forces behind the globalization of the economy, and then turns to how globalization impacts our local communities: "Thousands of immigrants arrive from everywhere: entrepreneurs from Europe, high-tech professionals from South Asia who staff the service industries as well as workers from Latin America and Southeast Asia who do the physical labor — thus, a remarkable ethnic, cultural and class diversity" (5). Although Kolvenbach never mentions the word neoliberalism, he spends a good deal of time discussing the ways that the world economy had changed since the 1975 General Council's report, and the economies of developing nations were suffering from the neoliberal policies that began to take hold in the 1980s. Importantly for this discussion, Kolvenbach also looks at how these policies are also shaping the types of citizens that we are producing in our universities: "Today's predominant ideology reduces the human world to a global jungle whose primordial law is the survival of the fittest. Students who subscribe to this view want to be equipped with well-honed

professional and technical skills in order to compete in the market and secure one of the relatively scarce fulfilling and lucrative jobs available” (5).

Kolvenbach’s concerns here – rethinking the type of citizen that the academy produces – are concerns that run throughout service learning scholarship. Deans noted that many early initiatives were driven by the desire to teach students understand their citizenship skills. Herzberg tried to understand the shifting global reality by helping students see how the work they did in the local community was connected to larger societal issues. Barber and Battistoni urged scholars to explicitly address the ways in which the very idea of political subjectivity was shifting. Cushman worked to find ways for scholarship to be a form of activism. Mathieu, Parks, Goldblatt, and Welch were working to understand how the communities with which we work respond to the shifting global reality. Dingo, Edwards, Wright, Hesford, and DeChaine, among others, began trying to understand how neoliberal logic was impacting the idea of global citizenship. In short, service learning scholars were struggling to understand the same issues Kolvenbach articulates in his speech.

While Kolvenbach’s speech is, in part, an attempt to think about how the idea of citizenship is changing, it’s interesting that the language he uses draws heavily from the corporate world: entrepreneurs, market competition, and lucrative jobs. Kolvenbach is pointing to the same problems that Brown argued were changing the mission of the academy. In that way, his assessment of higher education aligns with Brown’s analysis of the ways that neoliberal logic has changed the mission of the academy. Brown discussed how the emphasis on the individual, the emphasis on competition, reflects the types of citizens we strive to create. Brown: “Many professions today...require analytical capacities, communication skills, multilingualism, artistic creativity, inventiveness, even close reading abilities. However, knowledge is not sought for

purposes apart from capital enhancement, whether that capital is human, corporate, or financial. It is not sought for developing the capacities of citizens, sustaining culture, knowing the world, or envisioning and crafting different ways of life in common” (177-8).

This ideology, however, does not mesh with to the Jesuit ideals. If universities (or at least Jesuit universities) want to create citizens who do not think only of the marketable skills they are learning, then universities must evaluate the larger political moment. The Jesuit theory of education, as I mentioned earlier, revolves around educating “the whole person,” but the whole person in today’s world is different than when Jesuits began educating people 450 years ago: “in the emerging global reality, with its great possibilities and deep contradictions, the whole person is different from the whole person of the Counter-Reformation, the Industrial Revolution, or the 20th Century. Tomorrow’s ‘whole person’ cannot be whole without an educated awareness of society and culture with which to contribute socially, generously, in the real world. Tomorrow’s whole person must have, in brief, a well-educated solidarity” (Kolvenbach 6).

Kolvenbach is hopeful that service programs can help students create a sense of solidarity. In order to educate students in a way to be the whole person who is able to contribute generously to the world, universities “must let the gritty reality of this world into our lives, so [students] can think about it critically, respond to its suffering and engage it constructively. They should learn to perceive, think, judge, choose and act for the rights of others, especially the disadvantaged and the oppressed” (6). Kolvenbach’s hope is similar to that of early service learning scholars – by thinking about issues of social injustice, by working with traditionally marginalized communities, students will begin to understand social justice in a different way. While Kolvenbach is hopeful that experiencing the “gritty reality” will help students create a sense of solidarity, he does not complicate what this might mean. Thinking, judging, choosing

and acting for the rights of others is not necessarily compatible with neoliberal subjectivity: “the idea of a well-educated public, one that has the knowledge and understanding to participate thoughtfully in public concerns and problems, has gone the way of public goods and provisions themselves. As it dispenses with the very idea of the public, neoliberal rationality recognizes and interpellates the subject only as human capital, making incoherent the idea of an engaged and educated citizen” (Brown 182-3).

Santa Clara University’s Strategic Plan

In the introduction to Santa Clara University’s 2011 *Strategic Plan*, President Michael Engh, S.J., argues that the plan “reflects Santa Clara’s vision of creating an academic community...that educates citizens and leaders of competence, conscience, and compassion and cultivates knowledge and faith to build a more humane, just, and sustainable world.” The goals in the plan will empower students to “shape the world that humanity deserves.” Two of the five steps to this strategic plan involve engagement with communities outside of the university. The first of these is engaging with communities within the Silicon Valley. The second involves global engagement. The remainder of this chapter will explore the ways that the university discusses citizenship on its website and in its promotional literature. An analysis of the rhetoric reveals the tensions at work in the historical mission of the university – which focuses on issues of justice – and the mission of the university to create good (neoliberal) citizens. I will begin by discussing the history and philosophical underpinnings of Santa Clara. I will then look at the way the university discusses and theorizes global engagement and what it means to be a global citizen. I will then turn to the ways the university situates itself within the local community.

In the Jesuit tradition of education, there is an emphasis placed on educating the whole person – mind, body, and soul. As the Strategic Plan states this: “A Santa Clara education is distinguished by its attention to the formation of the whole person – one who has the knowledge and skills to act effectively (competence), the determination to reason morally (conscience), and the capacity to feel solidarity with the poor and powerless as well as the will to relieve suffering (compassion)” (5). The university attempts to do this in a variety of ways. It begins with what is called the Core Curriculum, the general requirement courses. This sequence of courses is designed to do a few of things. First, the Core wants to provide students the traditional foundations of a liberal arts education – a well-rounded understanding of different disciplines. The second goal of the Core is to allow students to study topics they are interested in from a variety of perspectives. If a student is interested in the issue of justice, for instance, she may choose to take classes that study justice from different departments – History, Philosophy, English, etc. The curriculum is designed to, as the Strategic Plan states, help students “use knowledge for the common good” and to encourage “creative engagement with culture and society” (5). The website for the Core Curriculum states explicitly why the curriculum and the different sequences of courses are designed the way they are: “By engaging in the learning offered in these courses, students prepare themselves for civic dialogue in an increasingly global and technological world and challenge themselves and others to ask how to transform the world for the better” (Core). The tension between the rhetoric of social justice and the reality of neoliberal logic is evident here. The Strategic Plan devotes a lot of time thinking about the common good, solidarity, and civic dialogue. Informed by Catholic social teachings and Jesuit ideals, I believe these are genuine goals, but as I have discussed above, neoliberal logic undercuts these goals.

The ways that neoliberal logic undercuts these goals becomes evident when looking at the focus of the programs. Despite the use of the words justice and solidarity and the common good, and despite having a center that focuses on community-based learning, the language about engaging with the local community is not primarily justice-related. The second priority in the Plan is *Engagement with Silicon Valley*. The focus here, though, is not on issues of social justice within Silicon Valley; rather, it is on how the university can capitalize on this unique location: “Silicon Valley is more than a location; it is a state of mind characterized by an innovative and imaginative approach to creating new opportunities in our globalizing world” (6). There is a mention of the marginalized communities within the Valley, but the primary focus appears to be on networking with the industries in the area: “By strengthening ties with our surrounding communities and our local alumni network, the University can offer students, faculty, and staff opportunities to think in new ways, and to learn from and contribute to both the leading institutions that make Silicon Valley attractive, and to the most marginalized groups in Silicon Valley that call out for help” (6). The terms used in the Strategic Plan – and other literature produced by the university – makes it clear that they are drawing on the language of Catholic social teachings. They emphasize solidarity, humanity and the common good. However, the influence of market logic also creeps into the language. The focus here seems to be the benefit that students get from being in close proximity to so many international corporations; those corporations can teach us how to think in imaginative ways.

Throughout the discussion of social justice and the common good, there is also an emphasis on creating human capital. This becomes even more explicit in the “metrics” section of the Plan. When detailing how this priority will be measured, the first metric is to create “Formal Partnerships with Silicon Valley companies and other organizations for learning, service, and

research” (13). The second metric is even more explicit about this particular priority and what type of citizen the university wants to create. The goal is to design “Academic programs that address the needs of Silicon Valley for specialized knowledge and competencies” with the hope of increasing the “[n]umber of SCU graduates employed by Silicon Valley corporations and organizations” (13). This is, of course, a common concern for academic institutions. This concern is not necessarily incompatible with a traditional liberal arts education that is concerned with educating the whole person. However, Brown argues that this is symptomatic of the ways that neoliberal logic has infiltrated the academy: “[The] economic and cultural shifts, the new college ranking systems that endorse them, along with the dismal contemporary economics of higher education itself exert enormous pressures on colleges and universities and especially on liberal arts curriculums to abandon all aims and ends other than making students ‘shovel ready’ when they graduate” (192).

While service is mentioned in that first metric, it isn’t until the third metric that the Engagement priority mentions the common good or the Jesuit goals of the university. It is interesting to see how Santa Clara thinks about globalization and how it positions itself and its students in a global context. The third priority in the Strategic Plan is *Global Understanding and Engagement*. The goal of the university is to “offer our students a deeper understanding of the global context of their lives and work. Through our existing study abroad and immersion programs, our academic curriculum, our membership in the global network of Jesuit universities, and our Silicon Valley location and its global reach, we are well-equipped to promote understanding of global issues and prepare students to use their knowledge and skills to help address these issues” (7). While some of these programs – particularly the immersion programs – deal directly with issues of social justice, there is still an emphasis placed on the global reach of

the transnational companies in the Valley and how our relationship with these corporations (or the Silicon Valley state of mind the university shares with these corporations) can help students address these issues. This continual emphasis on the Silicon Valley keeps the idea of employment – of shovel readiness – in the minds of parents and students who are trying to decide whether to spend more than \$50,000 a year for an education. This sort of decision is also a symptom of neoliberal logic. Rather than thinking about getting a traditional Jesuit education, the university has to assure parents that this is a good investment; parents and students need to believe their investment will be profitable. Under neoliberal logic, Brown argues, “institutions and students alike will not be vaguely interpellated or ‘incentivized’ but forcefully remade by...metrics, as universities, like any other investment, are rated in terms of risk exposure and expected yield” (Brown 23).

Santa Clara University and the gritty reality

SCU has several different ways that it attempts to let the gritty reality into the lives of their students. Students are required to take a course that involves community-based learning. This particular requirement is called Experiential Learning for Social Justice (ELSJ). There is a residential learning community – *Communitas* – that provides students with opportunities to become civically engaged. The university also provides funding for activist groups that are organized by students, such as the Santa Clara Community Action Program (SCCAP). The most prominent way that the university attempts to address issues of social justice (the gritty reality) is through the Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education. The Ignatian Center, according to the mission statement, “promotes and enhances the distinctively Jesuit, Catholic tradition of education at

Santa Clara University, with a view to serving students, faculty, staff, and through them the larger community, both local and global” (About). From this statement, there is clearly a religious aspect to the way that the university is going to think about the larger community and global citizenship. Part of this is because of the way the Center was established. It was created by merging two existing programs on campus: The Bannon Institute and the Arrupe Partnerships. The Bannon Institute had been established in the early 1980s as a way to “improve and enhance the Ignatian spirit in the whole University community: faculty, students, staff, alumni and friends” (History). The Arrupe Partnerships was formed in 1986 and developed into the community-based learning center on campus. The reasons for the merger were to bring the two missions together – the faith and contemplative aspects of the Bannon Institute and social justice aspects of the Arrupe Partnerships.

However, the goals for the Center are not strictly religious. Two of the five priorities for the Center involve issues of citizenship: Engaging a Neighbor and Forming Active Global Citizens. In the previous chapter, I discussed the ways that Catholic Social Teachings challenge people to ask: who is my neighbor? This priority most easily lines up with traditional community-based learning objectives – creating relationships with communities, developing some concrete plan of action (that the community desires), and finding ways so that the university and community feel equally invested in the relationship. The priority of Forming Global Citizens is still a work in progress, but the goal is to “expand and deepen its community-based learning programs, locally and globally, in order to reach out to a more diverse group of students” (Forming). This priority is forward-looking, as it attempts to think of community-based learning means on a global scale. While both of these priorities include the faith component, the projects in which they engage do not necessarily have a religious element to them. For my

purposes, the language in the strategic plan and the priorities of the Center are important because they illustrate the conflicted position that a university such as Santa Clara is in when it is both attempting to create shovel-ready neoliberal subjects and global citizens who are concerned with issues of social justice. The conflict between neoliberal logic and social justice can be seen, I believe, in looking at three specific service learning initiatives hosted by the university. The first is Global Social Benefit Incubator (GSBI), the second is an Immersion program, and the third is the Arrupe Partnerships, a more traditional course-based service learning initiative. The GSBI is clearly informed by neoliberal logic – it is founded on the very idea that social injustices are best handled through the market. Because this assumption is taken for granted, there is little room for questioning the system creating the injustices. While the immersion programs and the Arrupe Partnerships do attempt to incorporate discussions of systemic issues into their programs, because of their emphasis on the ways that students can grow from these programs – particularly how these experiences can help them make decisions regarding their careers – they are not designed to create a sustained critique of the neoliberal logic at the heart of the system. Understanding how the rhetoric of these programs is informed by neoliberal logic is important if we want to create programs that can offer better critiques of neoliberalism.

The Global Social Benefit Incubator

The Global Engagement Office “provides leadership, coordination, strategic planning, and resources for the internationalization of the campus” (Global Engagement). The office works with different departments on campus as well as with different organizations around the world. One of the departments that they partner with is the Center for Science, Technology, and Society,

which developed the GSBI program. The GSBI was developed in 2002 and “sought to engage the Valley's creative energy, its products, services and business leaders in the challenges faced by the poor in resource-constrained environments” (History). The founder, Jim Koch, had served as a judge at different tech innovation contests. A problem that he noticed over and over was that there were some great ideas and innovations that would benefit a lot of people, but the communities they would benefit were simply unable to afford these innovations. Koch worked with a professor in the business school, Albert Bruno, who had developed several MBA classes on entrepreneurship. Together they adapted these course materials to meet “the needs of social mission entrepreneurs” (History). The program, as Esha Chhabra describes it, combined “the talents of the valley with the activism of emerging social entrepreneurs to see if social impact and profit-making could be combined” (Chhabra).

The GSBI describes itself as “a hub for accelerating global, innovation-based entrepreneurship in service to humanity” (Overview). They help entrepreneurs at different stages of the development of the projects – from early stage project that require more basic business knowledge to projects that are in more advanced stages. According to their website, 232 enterprises have completed GSBI programs, 90% of GSBI alumni are still in business, 107 million people have been positively impacted by these social enterprises, and \$96 million has been raised by GSBI alumni social entrepreneurs. The success rate of GSBI alumni is impressive – 40% of GSBI Alumni are scaling and financially stable, which is three times the standard rate of for-profit ventures.

Interestingly, this program is mostly held online, and it is not targeted at undergraduate students. Most of the participants in the program are only on campus for 10 days. In the Accelerator Program, which is for projects in more advanced stages, participants work with

mentors from the Silicon Valley and complete online modules. The mentors are a group of more than 60 executives, ranging from “leaders of NASDAQ companies [to] CEOs and Founders of start-ups and venture capitalists” (Mentors). After 10 months of mentoring and completing the modules, participants from around the world come to SCU’s campus for 10 days, during which “[c]ontent experts teach a customized curriculum to address a financing plan for scaling⁴, organizational development, talent management, marketing strategy and execution, and operational excellence at scale. The in-residence culminates in a pitch to a room full of impact investors” (Overview). There is also a separate program for entrepreneurs in earlier stages of their project. GSBI Online is a 6-month program that helps develop business models and strategies. The ultimate goal of this program is “a refined business plan, an on-point elevator pitch, a solid annual operating plan, and creative marketing collateral” (Overview). Although the project has only been around for a little over a decade, it has recently begun expanding to other Jesuit universities and other “mission-aligned institutions with the common goal of leveraging social enterprise for social benefit” (Overview).

I think it is important to think about how social entrepreneurialism developed and what the implications for this approach to social justice are. In 2000, Alan Fowler analyzed the role of non-governmental organizations to see how their missions shifted with the rise of neoliberalism. While we often think of NGOs as organizations concerned with social justice, this was not the reason many NGOs began: “Non-governmental organisations arose or became motivated by 'development' as a political project, rather than out of compassion for those who were suffering” (639). The NGOs that emerged in the 1950s and 60s were really attempting to help with structural issues in countries emerging from centuries of colonial rule. At the turn of the 21st

⁴ Scaling = accelerating growth.

century, these organizations, Fowler argues, began to look like “the product of an era that is rapidly passing” (639). The era was rapidly passing because donor nations began to rethink the ways they distributed aid to developing countries. Just as neoliberal policies impacted the way that we thought of addressing societal ills domestically, those policies began to influence how we approached foreign policy: “more clearly than before, domestic policies being pursued in donor countries—particularly economic liberalization and the privatisation of government services—spilled over into foreign policy and into official aid as one instrument of that policy” (640). For donor countries then, privatization became the “central tenet of official development policy” (641). This changed the way that NGOs thought. Funding from donor countries began to disappear, and they needed to find a new model of self-sufficiency. To do this, many adopted an entrepreneurial model.

Fowler’s essay is in no way a takedown of this entrepreneurial shift; rather, it is an attempt to understand what this shift represents. For Brown, this would be another example of economizing a formerly political aspect of life: “neoliberal reason, ubiquitous today in statecraft and the workplace, in jurisprudence, education, culture, and a vast range of quotidian activity, is converting the distinctly political character, meaning, and operation of democracy’s constituent elements into economic ones” (17). The initial shift to an entrepreneurial model for NGOs was born out of necessity – funding was disappearing. In the 15 years since his essay, however, there has been another shift. Entrepreneurialism is no longer just a model for survival for NGOs; it has become the reason for an NGO’s existence. Returning to Brown’s analysis of Obama’s speech, she lamented that “every progressive value — from decreasing domestic violence to slowing climate change — Obama represented as not merely reconcilable with economic growth, but as driving it” (25). The potential problem with programs such as the GSBI is not that the products

they design are not interesting or helpful so much as that it perpetuates a system of thinking that is not always compatible with the ideas of social justice. Fowler ends his essay with a warning of the potential pitfalls of social entrepreneurialism:

the scenario before us is one where NGDOS' past complex motivations and legitimacy are coming to an end in favour of a market discourse and its values. It would appear that NGDOS are about to succumb to the homogenising forces of economic globalisation in favour of a market-inspired model of NGDO identity and behaviour. Such a model gives highest merit to values of individualism, competition, extraction, accumulation, exploitation and rivalry as the normative mode for relations between people and between people and nature. The negative social effects are manifest and manifold: for example, destabilising social relations, eroding social capital and undermining virtuous values, such as trust, reciprocity, mutuality, co-operation and tolerance of difference. There are also unwelcome political effects in the accumulation of power within a few corporations whose practical accountability to and through shareholders to society at large is grossly overstated. (652)

The logic informing social entrepreneurialism is at odds with some of the very things it says it values. Neoliberal logic values individualism, competition, and accumulation. As Fowler suggests, there is a danger in thinking that these values are capable of addressing social injustices.

Immersion Trips

One of the programs that emerged when the Arrupe Partnerships began thinking about how to expand community-based learning to include a global component was a series of Immersion Trips. The Immersions take place during each break during the academic calendar, and during these 5- to 10-day trips, “students, faculty, staff, and alumni immerse themselves into domestic and international communities that have little access to wealth, power, and privilege” (Immersion). Some of the communities in which the students and faculty immerse themselves are local – Oakland, San Francisco, San Jose. Some of the communities are domestic – Yuba City, AZ, The Appalachians, Los Angeles, and New Orleans; and some of the communities are abroad – India, El Salvador, Ecuador. Each of these experiences are “designed to help participants see the world with new eyes, to recognize the unjust suffering of marginalized communities and individuals, and to allow those experiences to inform their vocational discernment” (Immersion).

The Immersion Program does not want students to think of these trips as vacations, and they do not want the programs to simply be a form of charity. In order to do this, there are a series of steps leading up to the actual Immersion. After the initial application phase, accepted students enter the pre-immersion preparation. This involves each team meeting 4-5 times and having a weekend retreat. This is partly to make sure the team members are comfortable with each other, but they also use this time to “learn about the community [they] will be visiting and the current issues facing that community” (Overview). Each team works with an existing organization at their immersion site, but in theory at least, they are supposed to work to make connections with community members rather than just with the organizations. For example,

during the first week of Winter Break, students travel to Tucson and spend a week working with a group called Borderlinks, which is a non-profit that attempts to create solidarity between the U.S. and Central American countries. The goal of this particular immersion trip is for students to learn about how our immigration policies impact the people living on the border between the U.S. and Mexico. They explore this from a variety of perspectives. According to the Arrupe website, students learn about “agricultural policies, labor issues, environmental impacts, international trade policies and practices, poverty and food access” (Student Immersions). During that same week, another immersion group visits a local site – the Tenderloin District in San Francisco, “the area in the city with the highest population density and the greatest percentage of poor and homeless women, men, and children” (Student Immersions). The students work with a homeless shelter, St. Vincent de Paul, which hosts over 150,000 homeless each year. Again, this is not set up to be a trip that focuses on volunteering. Students meet with social workers, case managers, and educators in order to learn about the structural issues that have led to such a high rate of poverty in one of the richest places on earth.

One final example of the Immersion Programs will give a bit of insight into how SCU wants students to think globally. Shortly before school starts each Fall, a group of students goes to Ecuador for eleven days. Ecuador is a country where “rich resources interface with desperate poverty” (Student immersions). The program is designed for students to spend much of their day working in an afterschool program for the local children, but they also spend time learning about the educational and healthcare problems that the community face. The overall goal of this particular immersion is for students to begin thinking about “how they can work with the Ecuadorian people to find long term solutions to the problems of poverty and together seek

opportunities to improve the lives of the people, most of whom are a part of the world's 3 billion people who live on less than \$2 a day" (Student immersions).

Just as understanding the context in which the GSBI program emerged, I think it is important to understand the context in which these immersion programs have developed. In the past few years, an entire industry of voluntourism has emerged. Last year, more than 1.5 million people spent more than \$2 Billion dollars on vacations that incorporated some sort of volunteering (Kahn), and it has become "one of the fastest growing trends in travel" (Kahn). Tourists travel to impoverished areas and spend a week or more building homes or working in an orphanage or working for a medical clinic. Many of the same problems that service learning scholars wrestled with – reciprocity, effectiveness, equitable relationships – are magnified in this industry because there really is not much of an effort to create sustained relationships. "Many volunteer projects," J.B. MacKinnon argues, "serve the egos of the tourists more effectively than they serve the locals. Even the idea that it creates a pool of people committed to ending global poverty is questionable" (2). In "The White Tourist's Burden," Rafia Zakaria offers a harsh critique of this trend: "As admirably altruistic as it sounds, the problem with voluntourism is its singular focus on the volunteer's quest for experience, as opposed to the recipient community's actual needs. There is a cost associated with such an endeavor." As this type of tourism continues to grow, the communities in which they serve are sometimes impacted in unexpected ways. For instance, in Bali, this type of volunteerism has led to an entire industry that more or less creates orphans:

Children leave home and move to an orphanage because tourists, who visit the island a couple of times a year, are willing to pay for their education. These children essentially work as orphans because their parents cannot afford to send

them to school. Instead of helping parents cater to the needs of their children, the tourist demand for orphans to sponsor creates an industry that works to make children available for foreigners who wish to help. When the external help dries up, these pretend orphans are forced to beg on the streets for food and money in order to attract orphan tourism. (Zakaria)

Orphan tourism is not an isolated problem. UNICEF reported that since 2005, Cambodia has seen “a 75 per cent increase in the number of orphanages, with the number of children therein increasing from 6,254 to 11,945. Over 75 per cent of these are not orphans but placed by parents desperate for care and education for their children” (Annual Report). According to Robert Carmichael, even though UNICEF attempts to keep track of the orphanages in Cambodia, no one really knows how many there are. In 2015, for instance, UNICEF found more “than 30...orphanages had not even registered with the government, which meant they operated out of sight. Another 6,663 children were living at a further 134 institutions such as group homes and boarding schools” (Carmichael). Carmichael argues that the “reason so many *are* there is that many orphanages are a racket – businesses run by unscrupulous individuals who promise impoverished, uninformed parents that their children will be housed, fed and schooled.” UNICEF Cambodia even urges people who are interested in helping children in Cambodia to avoid working with any residential facility for children (Cambodia).⁵

⁵ The same thing is happening in many developing or war-torn nations. In Nepal, for instance, “there are over 16,000 children living in ‘orphanages’ in Nepal, yet at least two thirds of these children are not orphans” (NGN). Traffickers target poor families and promise them that they can provide their children with a good education. Traffickers then “take the children to urban and tourist areas where they are placed in orphanages and children's homes” where they “fundraise and solicit foreign volunteers to work for free to support their profit-making enterprises” (NGN).

Not all of the problems of travel tourism are as drastic as creating an orphan industry. Zakaria argues that most people see the problems in the lives of other cultures as somehow easier to fix than the problems in their own culture: “the decontextualized hunger and homelessness in Haiti, Cambodia or Vietnam is an easy moral choice. Unlike the problems of other societies, the failing inner-city schools in Chicago or the haplessness of those living on the fringes in Detroit is connected to larger political narratives. In simple terms, the lack of knowledge of other cultures makes them easier to help.”

The criticism that surrounds college students using their breaks to go enter into marginalized communities is slightly different. While students do have to spend between \$200 and \$2000, they are going to communities with which the university has a pre-existing and ongoing relationship. The main concern is that of sincerity. As Kahn reports, “some people who work in the industry are skeptical of voluntourism's rising popularity. They question whether some trips help young adults pad their resumes or college applications more than they help those in need.” Even organizers of immersion programs are not content with the current structure of the programs. Kahn interviewed Theresa Higgs, the head of an immersion program based in Boston: United Planet. Higgs is concerned with the number of non-profits that are forming in these marginalized communities, as well as the volunteers who are working with them: “What I think often gets lost is the host communities...Are they gaining? Are they winning? Are they true partners in this? Or are they simply a means to an end to a student's learning objective, to someone's desire to have fun on vacation and learn something?” (Kahn).

The concerns over resume padding, reciprocity, and equity are, of course, concerns in traditional community-based learning or service projects. The Immersion programs at SCU attempt to address these problems by, once again, drawing on Catholic Social Teachings. In a

recent report by *In This Together*, a group that attempts to rethink economic equality in light of Catholic Social Teachings, they challenge the idea of charity or volunteerism. It may be popular, but it isn't enough:

Millennials are the most service-oriented generation ever – spending spring breaks and summers volunteering here at home and around the world – so it's natural that we immediately think of charity, soup kitchens, and homeless shelters. But charitable works are not enough when inequality is at record levels, unemployment is high, and parents working minimum wage jobs cannot lift their families out of poverty. Saint Augustine, even in the 4th century, recognized this truth. 'Charity is no substitute for justice withheld'. (Orozco 5)

This statement captures a problem at the heart of my project. We are creating citizens that are, according to Orozco, the most service-oriented generation ever. We have immersion programs that expose them to the gritty realities of the world. Yet, inequality, unemployment, and homelessness are rising. Our approach does not seem to be working. For Brown, one of the major problems with neoliberal logic is that the emphasis on individual attainment of human capital makes solidarity increasingly hard to create. The Immersions may attempt to not be volunteer projects, but clearly, students are gaining human capital in this program. In the strategic plan, the university emphasized the marketability of their students. The tone is much different in the literature for the Immersion Programs. There is not the same type of shovel ready emphasis that Brown criticized above; however, the idea of a career is still present these programs, and having that as part of the logic of the program, I would argue, reflects a faith that the private sector (whatever vocation they choose) is going to be able to address the needs of these communities with little wealth, power, and privilege.

The Arrupe Partnerships

As I mentioned above, in 1986, Santa Clara began thinking in a more systematic way about how students were (or were not) involved with the surrounding communities. This program – the Eastside Project – was initially a small program created in partnership with a local community. By 2000, this program had expanded beyond this one community, and when it became a “center for distinction” at the university, it was renamed the Pedro Arrupe, S.J., Center for Community-based Learning. Today, the center partners with 50 different organizations, approximately 1,200 students participate in the community-based learning each year. This center operates in much the same way community-based learning centers at most universities and colleges – students enroll in a course that partners with some local non-profit or school. I have taught classes linked to the center for the past 4 years, and it mostly serves as a liaison between the university and the community organizations, providing some structure for how students and communities interact with each other.

The major differences between the Arrupe Partnerships and community-based learning centers at other (particularly secular) schools is that the major donors for the center are faith-based organizations. The center is named after the former Superior General to the Jesuit Order, and the language the center uses to describe their philosophy begins by stating that their interest in community-based learning “stems from Santa Clara’s Jesuit educational philosophy that what we learn is connected intimately to how we learn it” (About). The language of faith is found throughout the literature discussing this program: “Rooted in a faith that does justice” (Overview CBL); “drawing deeper connections with key intellectual resources of the distinctively Jesuit,

Catholic tradition of education” (Overview CBL); “These opportunities advance the Jesuit tradition of the service of faith and the promotion of justice” (About). This language is to be expected, of course. About half of the students at Santa Clara identify as Catholics, and many come to the university because of the Jesuit affiliation. Those students often frame their experiences within the language of their faith, but the work they do in the community – as well as the courses to which these projects are linked – are not (necessarily) religious organizations or courses.

Despite the community-based learning requirement as part of the Core Curriculum and despite the language of justice that pervades the literature for the Arrupe Partnerships, most of the work that students do in their communities does not look much different from traditional volunteerism. I say this for a couple of reasons. First, Santa Clara is on the Quarter System, which means that students are only involved with their community for 2 hours a week for 8 weeks. While students are given the opportunity to work in marginalized communities, the partnerships do not allow time for students to create long-term relationships with members of the community. Second, many of the programs are after-school programs or working with homeless shelters, and a few focus on issues such as immigration or healthcare. These programs, necessary as they are, emphasize the idea that good citizenship involves participation. As I’ve mentioned in earlier chapters, this emphasis on good-citizenship-through-participation is problematic because it does not address the root causes of injustices. While the Arrupe Partnerships do want students to understand root causes, the language on their website emphasizes the idea of “justice as participation” (Weekly Engagement). This is a mindset with which many students approach their community-based learning courses. In my experience, the Arrupe Partnerships is a great resource for the university, and the community partners are tireless advocates for the communities in

which they work. However, many of these programs exist because of the neoliberal policies that have eroded the social safety net for the most vulnerable of people⁶. The schools where students work in afterschool programs need tutors because their schools are not adequately funded and staffed. The nursing homes where students work with patients need extra hands because they are desperate for help. The food banks in the area are an important resource for communities because the social safety nets helping the hungry have disappeared. While individual courses may address some of the systemic issues at the heart of these social injustices, there is no sustained critique of these systemic forces built into the partnerships.

While I am concerned with the way that the language of neoliberalism creeps into the design of the programs, I do believe that SCU is uniquely positioned to create programs that will offer students an alternative way of thinking about their political subjectivity. One way to do this is to understand the disconnect between neoliberal logic and the Jesuit ideals that are guiding the university's mission. Specifically, I think it is important to think about how the Catholic social teachings' emphasis on solidarity is at odds with the neoliberal emphasis on competition and self-reliance. The programs at Santa Clara do challenge students to try to understand the problems they see as systemic problems. However, the learning objectives for the students are focused on how students can find a solution to the problem or how students can use these experiences to think about their futures. In the immersion programs I discussed earlier, for instance, students are expected to work with the communities in order to find long-term solutions to the problems of those communities. In the Arrupe partnership placements, one of the key objectives is for students to think about how their future career can help address issues of social

⁶ Additionally, the university does not model this sort of reflection – it does not examine how its own governance is influenced by neoliberal logic, from creating a more flexible workforce (at every level) to “streamlining” budgets to an increased interest in the relationship between the university and the corporate world.

justice. My critique of the service learning programs here is not the work they are doing; it is the way they are framed. They are framed in a way that does not ask students to question their own political subjectivity. While solidarity is a key idea for Jesuit thinking, my concern is that because students are asked to think about their own skills or futures, they are not asked to create the type of solidarity with members of the community that can lead them to think differently about what political subjectivity means.

In my service learning courses, which I will discuss in greater detail in the next chapter, I attempt to bring the different conversations surrounding political subjectivity together. How is our political subjectivity being shaped by the powerful actors in both the private and public spheres? How are those conversations shaping our ideas of what it means to be a responsible global citizen? Throughout the course, we attempt to understand the relationship between the rhetoric about citizenship – about social justice – and the lived realities of those impacted by private initiatives or public policies. To do this, I draw on the work of some of composition and rhetoric scholars that I discussed in Chapter 3. The rhetorical analyses from Rebecca Dingo, Eileen Schell, and D. Robert DeChaine, for instance, provide students with different ways to question the systemic issues at the heart of these conversations social justice and global citizenship. The work that the students do often reveals the contradictions between the neoliberal rhetoric driving private initiatives or public policies. I also draw on the Catholic social teachings because of the ways they speak about social justice and solidarity in ways that can disrupt the neoliberal narrative; they do this in a way that focuses on the humanity of the vulnerable rather than the “goodness” of our students or the benefits our students might receive.

One of the things that the community I partner with each year stresses is that they do not actually want students to work to help the community change. While there are serious problems

that the community is addressing, the community leaders simply want to connect students with individual community members. They want students to hear personal stories, to begin to understand something about experiences of people who live 10 minutes from our campus. While some SCU students tutor kids, the community does not want the experience to be about math or reading. Some students may work with different community members fixing buildings, but the experience is not about remodeling. The community, in other words, does not want help; they want connection. This connection, they argue, is what will change the way students view solidarity and social justice.

The issue of solidarity is particularly important for this community; solidarity is continually emphasized during our time in the community. Early each quarter, the parish pastor, Father Jon Pedigo, visits our class. He speaks about the harsh economic circumstances in the community, the constant feelings of fear the immigrant families' feel, the architectural exclusion that cuts the community off from the rest of San Jose. He also discusses the pride that community members take in their community. They may be neglected by the rest of the city, but they are resilient and politically active. They want change, but they want change on their own terms. Because we read about solidarity and social justice, that is one of the questions students ask Jon: what can we do to create solidarity with the community? The answer is a bit disheartening for students: for this particular community, solidarity means living and struggling with them every day. The community does not actually expect this to happen, but they want students to resist thinking that solidarity is not merely visiting a few hours throughout the quarter. They do, however, want students to become allies – people who have a personal connection to the community and will think about how the stories they hear from community members connect with larger political issues. This sense of connection is emphasized again when

we have an orientation session in the community. The director of community-outreach introduces the various programs that students will participate in, but that is a relatively small part of the orientation. The focus is on the history of the community. Several members of the community attend these sessions and discuss the history of activism in the community (which is where Cesar Chavez began his activist work with farm workers); they discuss the poverty and the ways that they are excluded from other parts of San Jose. Having our assumptions about solidarity challenged early in the quarter, hearing the stories of immigrants and laborers who are impacted by global political agreements, introduces students to complicated realities of the issues that we are going to discuss in the course; the issues are no longer abstract or theoretical.

While the Catholic social teachings can help us rethink the issue of solidarity, Santa Clara is also in a unique position because it is in a global city. Because the community my classes connect with is predominantly immigrant community, it offers a unique way to think about the idea of global citizenship. As I have argued throughout this project, I believe that thinking about immigrant identity in the age of neoliberalism offers a way to rethink global citizenship. In the last chapter, I discussed the way that immigrant identity is theorized in the Catholic social teachings. Rather than thinking about citizenship in the national sense, the social teachings conceive of a broader global citizenship. Rather than fighting for immigrant rights in the legal realm, the teachings approach immigration as an issue of human rights. This is an important shift. It moves the focus away from the individual and toward the policies that are creating the problems associated with immigration. In other words, it challenges us to rethink what it means to be a global citizen.

While a major part of my argument in this dissertation is that immigrant identity can help expose some of the contradictions in neoliberal logic, I also want students to see how their

own subjectivity is being shaped by this same logic. We look at how the policies are impacting the community in which we work are also impacting our lives. We interrogate the language of the service learning initiatives to see how they envision us as citizens, as well how they envision (or do not envision) the citizens in the communities. Rather than thinking about the ways that students can change a community, rather than thinking about how a student can think about how to think about their own long-term career goals, framing the goals of the programs around the idea of solidarity can help students begin to see how their lives are connected to those of community members. As Guy Standing argues, if we want to address the structural issues that we face, we need to find a new framework. Thinking about how the neoliberal policies that are impacting impoverished communities and immigrants are also impacting our students can challenge students to begin resisting simply becoming a good neoliberal political subject.

I opened this chapter with the turmoil created when the Board of Regents of the University of Iowa openly endorsed a corporate approach for governance at their school. McCleod, in a statement opposing this move, said that the academy is one area where market logic does not trump everything else. I believe that looking at how market logic has found its way into service learning initiatives shows how quickly neoliberal logic has changed the ways we think about social justice, solidarity, and the public good. Neoliberalism's influence over the way we frame our approach to education and, I argue, over the way we frame our service learning initiatives, does not provide students with alternatives to neoliberal political subjectivity. The need for an alternative, Brown argues, has important implications for democracy: "The effect of neoliberal rationality is to reduce the desire for democracy... Thus

democracy hollowed out by neoliberal rationality cannot be counted on to renew liberal arts education for a democratic citizenship” (200).

Chapter 5: Conclusion

On December 1, 2015, Mark Zuckerberg and his wife Priscilla Chan released a letter to their infant daughter, Max. The letter was, more or less, an overview of their philosophy toward the issue of social injustices, a philosophy that rests on two pillars: advancing human potential and promoting equality. Their vision for the future includes goals and ideas that most people would agree with; indeed, many prominent people “liked” the letter on Facebook. Zuckerberg’s letter seems to say all the right things. We have “a moral responsibility to all children”; our society “has an obligation...to improve the lives of all those coming into this world”; we need to “collectively direct our resources at the biggest opportunities and problems” (Letter). He even uses language very familiar to community-based learning scholars: **“We must engage directly with the people we serve.** We can't empower people if we don't understand the needs and desires of their communities” (Letter, emphasis in original). What fascinates me about the letter is how it seems to capture a lot of issues I discuss in the previous chapters. There are really important social justice issues that we need to find some way to address, but the solutions that Zuckerberg and Chan come up with are heavily influenced by neoliberal logic, a logic that has created some of the very problems Zuckerberg wants to fix. Want to advance human potential? “[C]ultivate entrepreneurship so you can build any business and solve any challenge to grow peace and prosperity.” Want to end poverty and hunger and provide everyone with basic healthcare? “If our generation makes the right investments, the answer to each of these questions can be yes.”

For Zuckerberg’s part, he and his wife established the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative and pledged 99% of their shares in Facebook (about \$45 billion) to help address these issues. In

many initial reports, Zuckerberg was praised for being so generous with his fortune. Many compared him to his mentors, Bill Gates and Warren Buffet, who have also pledged large parts of their fortunes to charitable causes. However, Zuckerberg's decision to create the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative did draw some sharp criticism. Jesse Eisinger argued that Zuckerberg did not donate \$45 billion to anything; rather, he "created an investment vehicle" (Eisinger). A limited liability company can invest in companies that do good things, but it is still a company: "An LLC can invest in for-profit companies (perhaps these will be characterized as societally responsible companies, but lots of companies claim the mantle of societal responsibility). An LLC can make political donations. It can lobby for changes in the law. He remains completely free to do as he wishes with his money. That's what America is all about. But as a society, we don't generally call these types of activities 'charity'" (Eisinger). Creating this LLC also allows Zuckerberg to shield much of his fortune from taxes by exploiting loopholes in the tax code. While that seems like a cynical view of Zuckerberg's intentions, his company has a history of exploiting these loopholes: "In 2012, Facebook paid no corporate income tax in the US, and last year in the UK it paid only £4327" (Srinivasan).

As Eisinger points out, Zuckerberg is free to do what he wants with his own money. He is not breaking the law by trying to minimize the taxes he pays. However, there were a few things missing from the majority of the conversations about the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative. There was little discussion about how the tax codes, codes shaped by neoliberal logic, greatly benefit the wealthy. Eisinger again: "Any time a superwealthy plutocrat makes a charitable donation, the public ought to be reminded that this is how our tax system works. The superwealthy buy great public relations and adulation for donations that minimize their taxes." There was also little discussion about how charitable donations by the wealthiest in our society can actually hurt the

common good. Donations to charitable causes have increased dramatically in the last 30 years, and while the wealthiest people get big write-offs for their donations, those write-offs are “subsidized by US taxpayers. Every year, an estimated \$40 billion is diverted from the public treasury through charitable donations” (Massing). While Zuckerberg gets attention for his philanthropic endeavors, the very fact that the superwealthy feel the need to donate so much money is an “explicit acknowledgment... that the money should be plowed back into society” (Eisinger).

Zuckerberg responded to the criticism of the decision to create an LLC rather than a non-profit foundation. His explanation was, unsurprisingly, couched in neoliberal logic. An LLC, he argues, allows them more flexibility in how they invest their money. They can invest in non- or for-profit organizations, depending on which one they think will do the best work. While this Initiative is supposed to benefit the common good, Zuckerberg, rather than the body politic, defines the common good. Rather than elected officials deciding how to best approach issues, we have a small group of superwealthy investors making these decisions. This means that a select few people have an enormous influence on what constitutes a problem worth solving, as well as the best way to solve that problem. The causes that people give money to reflect certain values rather than the public good, and donations to these causes (or investments in them) are often an attempt to persuade others to value that particular cause: “much of today’s philanthropy is aimed at ‘intellectual capture’—at winning the public over to a particular ideology or viewpoint” (Massing). Wealthy donors also impact the ideology of the organizations they choose to give their money. Nicholas Lemann, a former dean of the Columbia School of Journalism, says that

when wealthy donors speak with nonprofit organizations, “they are more likely to say not ‘How can I help you?’ but ‘Here’s my agenda’” (Massing)⁷.

We live in a moment in which many people believe that issues of social justice are most effectively addressed in the private sphere. This sort of thinking praises the super wealthy when they make large donations. Zuckerberg and Chan, the Gates, and Warren Buffett are seen as philanthropists and visionaries. This inspires many students at SCU to want to be entrepreneurs and philanthropists, and many of our service learning programs are designed to encourage that way of thinking, or at least they are not designed to question this way of thinking. However, they could be: “Instead of lavishing praise on Zuckerberg for having issued a news release with a promise,” Eisinger argues, “this should be an occasion to mull what kind of society we want to live in. Who should fund our general societal needs and how? Charities rarely fund quotidian yet vital needs. What would \$40 billion mean for job creation or infrastructure spending? The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has a budget of about \$7 billion. Maybe more should go to that. Society, through its elected members, taxes its members. Then the elected officials decide what to do with sums of money. In this case, it is different. One person will be making these decisions.” I think Eisinger’s questions are important for service learning programs. Rather than adopting an entrepreneurial or philanthropic approach, we should use this opportunity to ask what kind of society we want to live in; it should challenge us to interrogate a system that is increasing income inequality and weakening the ability of governments to provide for those most in need.

⁷ Zuckerberg actually did try to influence educational reform with a donation a few years ago. He gave the Newark, NJ, public school system \$100 million and proposed a four-part program to turn the school around, including making teacher contracts more flexible. The plan failed to improve the school system, but he received a lot of positive press.

Questioning the type of society we want to live in – and the types of citizens we want to develop – is, of course, at the heart of service learning initiatives. As Eisinger points out in her critique of The Chan Zuckerberg Initiative, the need for this sort of philanthropy points to a problem in the larger system shaped by neoliberal theories. One of the things I have argued throughout this dissertation is that we need to give students a different way to think about political subjectivity; we need to find a way to help students resist simply becoming good neoliberal subjects. Providing a way to think differently about what it means to be a global citizen can, I believe, help find more effective ways for students to address both local social justice issues and the system that is creating those injustices. Service learning programs can offer students a way to reframe the narratives surrounding global citizenship and social justice. In order to do so, I argue they need to ensure that students understand more clearly the ways in which that their political subjectivity is being shaped by neoliberal policies and rhetoric. In this chapter, I am going to bring the conversations in the previous two chapters together. I will do this by discussing a service learning course I teach that analyzes the rhetoric of neoliberalism. Because universities place so much emphasis in creating global citizens, I believe that contrasting the immigrant identities discussed in Chapter 3 with the language we use to shape community-based learning programs in Chapter 4 can expose some of the contradictions created by neoliberal logic. The course draws on the discussions from the previous two chapters together in an attempt to help students begin to see some of the contradictions of neoliberalism and, more importantly, begin to imagine an alternative form of political subjectivity. Immigrant identity forces us to think about citizenship in an explicitly political way, it challenges our ideas about the mobility of global citizens, and it helps highlight ways neoliberal policies that benefit investors come at the expense of laborers.

Disrupting the Neoliberal Narrative

Each year, I teach an Advanced Writing course called “Good Citizens,” which is a service-learning course⁸. For the course, I draw on some of the essays that I have used in this dissertation, and I ask students to think about many of the same questions I have asked in the previous chapters. What does it mean to be a good citizen? How is the university envisioning students as citizens? How does the university think about the relationship we have with members of the surrounding communities? Is our current approach to addressing issues of social injustices the best approach? How can we, as this section is ambitiously titled, disrupt the neoliberal narrative of citizenship? This is what students know when they sign up for the course. From the university’s course catalog:

What does it mean to be good citizens in the 21st Century? Although the idea of citizenship has become increasingly important in American public life in the last few decades, the public discourse surrounding what citizenship means reveals that we do not really know how to answer that question. The ways individuals relate to states, the ways populations move around the globe, and the ways communities are formed have all changed dramatically in the past 40 years. When politicians, economists, and academics struggle with theories of global citizenship, they are labeled visionary. When laborers struggle with the realities of global citizenship, they are often labeled differently. Both of these groups are trying to answer the question of what it means to be a good citizen. We

⁸ The Learning Objectives for this course are located in the Appendix.

will read texts that analyze the idea of global citizenship from a variety of perspectives in an attempt to understand what it means to be Good Citizens in the 21st Century.

Students in this course are usually juniors and seniors, so they usually have a good idea of how the university discusses social justice, as well as the relationship between the university and the surrounding communities, but few students have been asked to question the idea of citizenship or to think about their own political subjectivity. Few students have heard of, and fewer still could define, neoliberalism. As I mentioned earlier, the task of disrupting the neoliberal narrative is further complicated because many students (as well as the university) idolize entrepreneurs and philanthropists. However, this is what I attempt to do in this course each year.

While the course description for “Good Citizens” does not mention neoliberalism specifically, the assignments for the course are designed to help students begin to question the neoliberal narrative of citizenship. The course is divided into 2 halves, each half analyzing the rhetoric of citizenship from (potentially) competing perspectives: the private sphere and the public sphere. In the first half of the course, students choose either a corporation or non-profit to see how those organizations use rhetoric to create the narrative of what it means to be an engaged citizen⁹:

In this unit, we will analyze the rhetoric of citizenship used by universities and/or corporations. Why are these private entities concerned with citizenship? (How) do they define citizenship? How do they define community? How do they view responsibility?

The goal of this unit is to begin to understand the ways in these organizations are creating

⁹ The entire assignment is located in the appendix.

a specific narrative about what it means to be a good citizen. For instance, when a corporation has initiatives concerning education, they are making an argument that their approach to education is the best approach to education (or is addressing some unfulfilled need in our society). When a corporation has sustainability initiatives, they are attempting to shape the way that we view environmental issues. The goal of this assignment is to attempt to understand the ways in which these organizations are shaping the conversation about some specific aspect of citizenship... What are the characteristics of a good citizen? Who is allowed to be a good citizen?

As I have argued in previous chapters, I believe it is important to think about citizenship in political terms. To do this, we begin read portions of Richard Bellamy's *Citizenship: A Very Short Introduction*. Bellamy's history of the development of democratic citizenship argues that in order for a strong democracy to exist, we must continually think about how different issues in our society are really arguments over the relationship between individuals and the state. Discussions about education, for instance, involve competing visions for the role that the government plays in providing citizens with an education. Bellamy's work is helpful for this course because he stresses the relationship between the rights of individuals and the responsibilities of the state. Furthermore, he stresses the idea of the common good, arguing that the more we privatize, the more we lose a sense of the common good.

With this political framework for citizenship, we then begin to think about how actors in the private sphere are creating their own narrative of citizenship. This is when students begin to look at different corporations, non-profits, or universities to see how they discuss citizenship, community, or responsibility. The rhetoric of corporate social responsibility is easy to dismiss as

a shameless public relations ploy, but it serves an important rhetorical purpose. It shifts conversations about citizenship away from the rights and responsibilities at the heart of political subjectivity toward an emphasis on citizenship through investments and actions. This shift can be seen, for instance, in the Chan Zuckerberg Initiative with which I opened the chapter. Their idea of being a responsible global citizen helps reinforce a privatized, neoliberal narrative of citizenship. Zuckerberg was widely praised for his generosity because this narrative naturalizes the theory that the best way to address societal problems is through entrepreneurship and private investments. As I pointed out above, the critiques to this approach seem somewhat obvious. Eisinger pointed out that this sort of initiative is an acknowledgement of the need for investment in the public good. Yet these initiatives are not working. As Marilynne Robinson recently remarked in *Harper's*, “[t]hat this economics could be so overbearingly sure of itself ought to be remarkable given recent history, but its voice is magnified in the void left by... traditional centers of authority” (33). However, these critiques fail to take hold because so few are willing to, or equipped to, think outside of the neoliberal narrative frame. In this Advanced Writing class, students analyze the rhetoric of these private organizations or individuals through the lens of political citizenship in order to see how (and in what ways) the rhetoric is defining (or redefining) citizenship.

It is an interesting moment when students choose a corporation or non-profit to analyze. Most are initially really impressed with the programs that these corporations promote. Taken at face value, these initiatives are impressive – corporations invest what seems to be a lot of money into their own education or diversity or sustainability initiatives. I am continually surprised that the default position of many students is to trust that these corporations should be taken at their word. I have found that attempting to challenge the motives or ethics of a corporation – are they

really sincere? are they attempting to atone for, or to cover-up, some bad practices? – is not the most effective way of getting students to question the rhetoric of corporate social responsibility. A more effective approach is to build on the work of scholars, such as Paula Mathieu and Robert DeChaine, who analyze the rhetoric of citizenship presented by corporations. Mathieu analyzes Starbucks's rhetoric of economic citizenship, and DeChaine analyzes the ways that the humanitarian doxa has become the lens through which we see issues of social justice. Rhetorical analysis is, as Mathieu argues, an important way to begin to think outside of the accepted narrative framework. I have students read these two essays as examples of ways we can analyze the narratives presented by corporations in order to understand how they are shaping our ideas of citizenship.

In the essay “Economic Citizenship and the Rhetoric of Gourmet Coffee,” Mathieu discusses the way that global capitalism has created a narrative framework that defines “the boundaries in which citizens can act and effect change in their local communities” (112). This framework, she argues, naturalizes global capitalism, making it difficult to critique. Mathieu analyzes the literature produced by Starbucks to demonstrate “the powerful role language and symbolic representations play in creating subjects who overlook gaps between the ‘news’ about the economy and everyday realities” (113). To understand these contradictions, the gap between the narrative and everyday realities, Mathieu uses the idea of *scotosis*. She defines scotosis as “rationalized acts of selective blindness that occur by allowing certain information to be discounted or unexamined” (115). Scotosis is an important concept because it offers an explanation for the way that rhetoric helps shape subjectivity. In examining the rise of gourmet coffee, for instance, Mathieu argues that we haven't been fooled by Starbucks into thinking we need this product that didn't exist 40 years ago. Instead, we have accepted a certain narrative

framework: “One isn’t duped, nor are false needs created. Rather, one is persuaded by the justifications offered within the narratives to remain, perhaps only momentarily or uncomfortably, within its parameters. It is thinking and acting within the frame offered” (115).

Mathieu’s essay is an attempt to disrupt that narrative through rhetorical analysis. This analysis is an attempt to understand how Starbucks’s narrative positions consumers as good citizens. How does this narrative shape the ways that we see ourselves, our needs, and our abilities to act? Rhetorical analysis is an important first step finding ways to think outside of the generally accepted narrative: “corporate scripts encourage the beliefs that all human needs can be satisfied within the commodity form and that the unpleasant realities of the commodity system are either nonexistent or inconsequential. To combat this scotosis, it is necessary to go outside the frames, take off the blinders, and consider ways of desiring differently” (124). Just as our conversations about human needs have been shaped within a specific narrative, our conversations about global citizenship have been shaped by a neoliberal narrative.

One of the things that becomes immediately clear as students begin to investigate the ways that corporations or non-profits discuss citizenship or community is that there are very specific issues on which the private sphere likes to focus: education, sustainability, healthcare, and hunger. These are the same issues on which most of SCU’s service-learning engagements focus. The focus of this first assignment, then, is to analyze the ways in which the private sphere frames the conversations around specific issues. What are the initiatives that the corporations set up? What are their major concerns? What is the language they use to describe the issue, to describe those people impacted by this issue? What is the narrative that they are creating about how they are addressing a problem? How are they positioning their organization – and their employees – as good citizens? This last question is an important way for students to understand

how they are being positioned as good citizens through the initiatives sponsored by the university.

Politicizing Global Citizenship

While we analyze the narratives created by the private sphere – and while we think about how the university is positioning us as good citizens – we are working in predominantly immigrant community. This is a community in which the issues of education, healthcare, and hunger are not abstract ideas; this is the type of community that the corporate initiatives are, theoretically, designed to help. In the last chapter, I mentioned that community members do not want students to come into the community to solve a problem; rather, they want students to make a connection, to get to know the stories of some of the community members. As students begin to make connections, they begin to hear how members of the community think about their own political subjectivity, about their own role as a global citizen. Students begin to hear how these very issues impact the lives of community members. This experience offers quite a contrast to the ways in which corporations or universities theorize citizenship, which is often citizenship-through-investment; the community members are engaged in the same types of programs, the same types of initiatives, yet rather than being recognized as good citizens, they remain in vulnerable positions.

When corporations speak about their role as a good member of the community, as a good citizen, their definition of citizenship is, to return to Amy Wan's term once again, an ambient one. One of the most compelling reasons that immigrant identity helps challenge the assumptions about what it means to be a global citizen is that immigrant identity is always a political one. It is

political in several senses. It is a politicized identity. It is an identity that is directly formed by political policies. It is never not a political identity. Because of the ambient assumptions surrounding the term citizen, our conversations about being good citizens are not always political conversations. As I discussed in the first chapter, in much of service learning scholarship, citizenship is almost exclusively discussed from a U.S. perspective. The political nature of the immigrant can be seen throughout the interviews in chapter 3. When the two teenagers spoke of their experiences, much of their identity was wrapped up in their documentation status. Their status kept them from attending the schools they want to attend: although M attended a college prep high school, a school that emphasized going to prestigious colleges, while his classmates were applying for colleges and scholarships, his political standing limited his opportunities. Their status caused them to fear those who are supposed to serve and protect citizens: K was afraid of what the police could do to him if they wanted to. Finally, and ironically, their status limited their ability to be recognized as a global citizen. M's career goal is to study abroad and eventually work abroad, but he knows that is not an option for him. Rather than feeling like a global citizen, he feels stuck. Both of these teenagers participate in the same types of programs that the students at Santa Clara participate in; they are both concerned with the same issues that the corporate initiatives are designed to address. They are active in their schools, their churches, and their communities. They are good students. However, the nation-state in which they reside does not recognize them as good citizens.

The students participating in the Arrupe Partnerships at Santa Clara (as well as the corporations they analyze for this assignment) are, simply through their involvement, defined as good global citizens. One of the goals of requiring students to participate in community-based learning projects is, according to the literature, to encourage students to be reflective about their

citizenship. It is unclear, however, if “citizenship” refers directly to political subjectivity, or if this is thinking of citizenship in a communitarian way. In Chapter 1, I discussed how service learning programs emerged at a moment when there was a perceived decline in civic participation. Around the same time that service learning programs began to take root, there was a notable increase in civic participation among young people. This civic engagement, however, was not thought of in political terms; instead, it was viewed through the lens of volunteerism. This theorization of engagement as volunteerism rather than political was itself the result of the political moment. Benjamin Barber noted in 1993 that the government was actively reshaping the way we defined citizenship: “Many of the bills revolving around service offered in the last session of Congress embraced a spirit of private sector volunteerism that seems at best indifferent and at worst hostile to the responsibilities (and rights) of citizenship” (235). This emphasis on responsibilities is an important one. A good citizen is a citizen who is self-sufficient, who does not require help from the government. I noted in the first chapter neoliberalism de-politicizes citizenship. Citizenship in neoliberal terms comes not from legal standing but from one’s ability to fulfill their part of the social contract with the state. Smith-Carrier argues that “[t]his contractual approach debunks the myth that all...citizens have equal access to social entitlements” (9). Rather, neoliberalism creates “a continuum of deservedness, one which favours some groups and their claims to social rights, while inhibiting access for others” (1).

The corporations that students analyze create the image of responsible political actors who are acting in the best interest of their communities. Because we are in the Silicon Valley, many students choose to analyze tech companies for this assignment. Apple is particularly popular, and they have a number of initiatives for students to analyze. For instance, one popular

Apple initiative is their (RED) Campaign, a line of products that have a unique design, and a portion of the profits from the sales of (Red) items contribute to a campaign to treat HIV/AIDS in Africa. Another initiative began as a response to the reports of the working conditions at the factories of their sub-contractors in China – this initiative touts the money they are investing in protecting the workers in the factories around the world to which they subcontract. These programs are attempts to shape how we think about healthcare and labor rights, and as I mentioned above, students are often initially impressed with these initiatives. A donation of \$130 million to HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention, for instance, sounds impressive. Factory inspections to insure worker safety sounds responsible. However, as students begin to analyze the rhetoric, to think about the narrative that is being created, they begin to ask some of the questions from the readings. The (RED) Campaign creates the narrative that as consumers, we can contribute to the cause of eradicating HIV/AIDS. However, Apple is not very transparent about how much of their profits end up helping provide treatment, and when students begin to investigate the (RED) campaign itself, they learn that it is in large part, a marketing campaign. Harry Browne points out that “far more money is spent by the partners in advertising their (RED)-branded products than ever reaches anyone in Africa: the widely publicized 2007 analysis by *Advertising Age* magazine that estimated a \$100 million (RED) marketing spend, compared to the \$18 million raised for the Global Fund¹⁰” (90). When students begin to ask questions about the logic behind such initiatives, they begin to discover some of the flaws in neoliberal logic.

The same goes for worker-safety initiatives. Reading through the facility inspection reports that Apple provides raises more questions than it answers for students. Who defines the rules of safety they are judging their suppliers on? Who are the inspectors? What are the

¹⁰ The Global Fund is the non-profit to which (RED) Campaign contributes its funds to fight HIV/AIDS.

penalties if a supplier is found to have unsafe working conditions? Apple claims transparency on all of these issues, yet when students begin analyzing the reports, they realize that none of these questions are answered. The rhetoric is effective, though, because it creates the image of a corporation that is being an active, engaged, and caring citizen, even if these actions leave the underlying causes of labor safety (a lack of standardized protections for workers) unquestioned. Apple's narrative is that they are fulfilling their end of the social contract – a responsibility for those who might not be able to care for themselves. A major criticism of each of these initiatives is that they do not invite the voices of those who are in positions of weakness. Both of these issues – healthcare and labor – are political issues, but they are addressed by corporations in non-political ways. In fact, these are examples of programs specifically designed to remove politics from the discussion.

Students participating in community-based learning programs are, likewise, able to fulfill their end of the social contract (as re-defined by neoliberal logic), and, furthermore, they are able to work in those areas of the Bay Area where people are not seen as fulfilling their part of the social contract. The identity of the immigrant, however, challenges this argument. Neoliberalism, when viewed through the lens of U.S. citizenship does create a continuum of deservedness: there are good citizens and there are undeserving – or bad – citizens. Where does an undocumented immigrant fit into this? By their actions, K and M are good citizens, but as I mentioned above, they are at best invisible and at worst labeled “illegal.” In previous chapters, I discussed the concerns that Barber and Battistoni expressed in the early days of service learning scholarship: if we think of citizenship in a depoliticized way, we will miss an opportunity to understand how citizenship is being reshaped by political policies. When analyzing the narratives created by corporations about what it means to be a good citizen, students can begin to see how

these narratives discuss citizenship, specifically issues addressing social injustices, as something that is accomplished through participating – through donating money, time or effort. I think it is helpful to have students think about how this narrative has informed how we have learned to think about citizenship, and I challenge students to think about how the narratives of the private sphere align with, or do not align with, the ways that the university positions them as citizens. When thinking about the citizenship of our students – how they are constituted as good global citizens – next to the citizenship status of an actual, if unrecognized, global citizen, we are forced to think of citizenship in political terms. Asking students to think explicitly about who is constituted as a good neoliberal political subject, a good citizen, as they work next to those who should be considered good citizens, should open new avenues for questioning the status quo. It should help students, and faculty, question the policies and theories that have reshaped citizenship in the age of neoliberalism.

The Mobility of Global Citizens

In the second half of the course, we look at how citizenship is theorized in the public sphere. How are different policy issues an attempt to shape (or reshape) the relationship between the government and the state? How do different policy positions – on healthcare or education or hunger or sustainability – represent different theories of political subjectivity? I introduce this assignment¹¹ with excerpts from the inaugural addresses of President John F. Kennedy and President Bill Clinton. In those addresses, they issued challenges for young Americans to dedicate themselves to service. JFK wanted to establish the Peace Corps as a way to fight

¹¹ The full assignment is located in the Appendix.

poverty (and Communism) in the developing world: “To those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.” Clinton wanted to create a domestic version of the Peace Corps, asking young people to devote a season of service working in impoverished communities – “reconnecting our torn communities” – in the U.S.

The assignment for the unit asks students to choose a specific policy discussion and analyze how that discussion represents different ideas of the relationship between the state and citizens:

In the first unit, we looked at how private organizations attempt to create good citizens. In that unit, the idea of citizenship was somewhat abstract. In this unit, we will look at something more specific: how States define citizenship; how States control (or don't) the way individuals enter or leave a country; who is seen as a good citizen, and who is seen as a burden. In this unit, you will choose a specific political moment or policy (e.g. education, immigration, healthcare) and attempt to understand how in that moment the political sphere was shaping the idea of citizenship.

When thinking about which political moment to analyze, I ask students to take one of two approaches. I ask them to either build on the work from the previous essay – looking at the same issue they analyzed in the private sphere – to see differences between the way the private and the public spheres theorize solutions to education, for instance, or I ask them to choose an issue that

is important to the community in which we are working to see how the policy issue impacts the relationship between community members and the state.

In this unit, we also begin thinking more about our experiences in the community. What relationships are we developing? How are those relationships challenging (or not challenging) the ways we think about citizenship? How are the lives of members in the community impacted by specific policy issues, whether it is healthcare policy or, more often, immigration policy? As I discussed above, one of the ideas that the rhetoric from the private sphere seems to reinforce is that to be a good citizen, one needs to be able to create programs or can afford the time to volunteer with different charitable initiatives. When those in positions of power create programs, they enhance their standing as a “good citizen.” The rhetoric they use obscures the fact that they are, often, avoiding important responsibilities to their fellow citizens – as I mentioned earlier these private initiatives divert \$40 Billion from publicly funded programs each year. Despite this, these initiatives create the image of an active citizen, one who freely moves around the globe fighting injustices. These private initiatives influence how we think about global citizenship; they influence how we think of what it takes to be seen as a “good” global citizen.

Just as immigrant identity highlights the political nature of global citizenship, immigrant identity highlights the issue of mobility. For good global citizens, such as the students at SCU, mobility is an issue of choice, and travelling from one place to another is a safe exercise performed at times that are convenient for them. For many global citizens, however, mobility is not a choice. In 2013, the UN estimated that there were more than 230 million migrants worldwide, a number that has increased steadily for the past 25 years. In order for this many people to cross borders without documentation, human smuggling operations have become a lucrative business. The United Nations Office of Drugs and Crimes estimates that “two of the

principal smuggling routes - leading from East, North and West Africa to Europe and from South America to North America - generate about \$6.75 billion a year for criminals” (UNODC). For unrecognized global citizens, then, the journeys they are forced to take are incredibly expensive. They are also very dangerous. As I mentioned in Chapter 3, in 2013, 463 people died attempting to make the journey from Mexico into the United States. The Justice for Immigrants interview project discussed in Chapter 3 was, in large part, an attempt to shed light on the what mobility means to immigrants. This would, JFI hoped, provide a different perspective on what it means to be a global citizen.

While the two interviews I discuss in Chapter 3 had different experiences with the process of crossing into the U.S., they both were forced to leave their homes because of economic reasons, and neither wanted to become global citizens. C’s story of coming to the U.S. was the least harrowing of the two, and although she said it was not that bad, it was not an easy experience: “I came across on the coldest night, and I had my little boy in my arms. My coyote had told me that we were only going to walk for half an hour, but we ended up walking straight through the night.” At one point in the night, she fell in a river, so she had to continue walking in freezing temperatures with wet shoes. However, her journey only lasted a night. L’s journey was much harsher, and it lasted much longer. His story involved hunger, thirst, rape, and walking and sleeping in the desert for days. The land they crossed (mostly on foot) was treacherous, and the smugglers bringing them to the U.S. took advantage of them. C had been happy in Mexico, and she wishes she could return, although she knows that the economy will never allow for that. “We were always happy [in Mexico] because we were with my parents and my brothers. We were happy because we could wrap ourselves in our language and we were surrounded by people we knew. We never had to be afraid of anyone. We were happy...you need happiness, but you also

need money.” L had the same experience; he resisted coming to the U.S. for as long as he could. Even as his friends and family began moving away, he wanted to continue living and working on his family farm. It just was not an option. Immigrant identity challenges our ideas about the mobility of global citizens. Why do people cross borders? Who is allowed to move freely using legitimate forms of transportation? How much choice do they have in where and how they move? How are the movements of people tied to the economic and political policies?

The second half of the course involves fewer shared readings – students spend most of their time researching the specific policy they are interested in. We draw on the same set of questions we used in the first unit: what is the narrative that is being created by this policy? What are the competing conversations, and how are those competing visions an attempt to shape the way we envision the relationship between citizens and the state. Not all of the policy issues that students analyze are directly related to mobility, but because we work in a community with a large immigrant population, many students choose to look at immigration policies (either current policies or historical ones).

I encourage students to think about our national discussions about immigration because, as I’ve argued throughout this dissertation, I think it offers a clear example of how the neoliberal narrative of mobility does not connect with reality. I began this project before President Trump announced his candidacy, a candidacy based largely on the fear of immigrants and refugees. As he emerged as a leading candidate and then won the election, this issue became a particularly heated one on campus. In the Fall of 2016, there were instances of students painting swastikas in blood in a dorm elevator¹² and of students vandalizing a memorial for 43 students from Mexico

¹² This was captured on the security camera in the elevator, which was then published on YouTube.

who were “disappeared” in 2014.¹³ The night of the election, pro-Trump supporters began chanting “build a wall” in a watch party hosted by the library, prompting campus safety to create a separate space for students who were being intimidated by these supporters. This is not a new problem for Santa Clara. In 2007, a group of students hosted a “South of the Border” party, to which “students came dressed as Latino janitors, gardeners, gangbangers and pregnant homegirls” (Rodriguez). When students begin to analyze the political rhetoric that creates these stereotypes, that embolden students to paint swastikas and vandalize art exhibits, they begin to see the falsehoods on which this political rhetoric relies. As they research statistics about crime, jobs or the economy, they begin to see how our discussions about immigration are not always based on actual facts. More importantly, students begin to see how their own experiences in a largely immigrant community do not fit within the rhetorical framework that we hear from often hear politicians.

The issue of mobility is important even for students who are interested in education, healthcare, or sustainability. When looking at issues of education, for instance, students are challenged to think about how we fund schools and how that funding is impacted by the location. Santa Clara County has some of the wealthiest public schools in the country, but as happens everywhere, students in poorer neighborhoods are not offered the same programs and opportunities as their wealthy counterparts.

While we think about the issue of mobility, we think a lot about how the university positions students as good citizens through mobility. The Immersion Trips, for instance, the

¹³ This is an annual art exhibit in front of the building in which the English Department is housed. It is “a tribute to 43 students who were kidnapped in Iguala, Guerrero, Mexico in 2014... The art installation was comprised of 43 black-painted wooden silhouettes of people and a forty-fourth silhouette constructed out of a mirror, inviting people to imagine themselves as one of the students, who all attended a teacher’s college.” This was also caught on surveillance cameras.

students at SCU participate offer a different view on the mobility of a global citizen. As I discussed in Chapter 4, the Immersion Trips are “designed to help participants see the world with new eyes, to recognize the unjust suffering of marginalized communities and individuals” (Immersion). Understanding the injustices that communities face is important, but these types of programs are potentially problematic. As I mentioned in the last chapter, Rafia Zakaria criticizes this type of program because it focuses on the experiences of the volunteers rather than on the underlying problems of the marginalized communities. Because of the SCU student participant’s status as a citizen of the U.S., they are able to move freely, both within the U.S. and to international destinations, and as they do so, they are able to gain human capital. While the term human capital is not mentioned in the literature of the Immersion Program, one of the primary goals is for these experiences to shape the way students think about their vocational goals. I expressed a concern in Chapter 4 that these types of programs seem to reflect a faith in the private sector to address issues of injustice. In the immediate sense, it emphasizes the role of volunteers and non-profits to address these issues. In the long-term sense, the goal of these immersions is to help students to think about how they might design their future careers to address injustices. It is possible for students to do this work without interrogating the type of global citizen they are becoming. Once again, a focus on immigrant experiences with mobility would raise questions about political subjectivity. Why is mobility a privilege only enjoyed by a select few? Why are some people who cross borders considered good citizens, while others who cross the same borders are considered criminals? What are the political structures that create these distinctions? How are the lives on both sides of a border interconnected? Because our lives are impacted by the same economic system, how can we create a greater sense of solidarity with

each other? And most importantly, how can we resist perpetuating this? What are the alternatives?

The Labor of Global Citizens

The Final Assignment for the course is an in-class exam. Throughout the term, we read different chapters from the book *Invisible Hands: Voices from the Village Economy*. This book is a collection of narratives from laborers around the world; the interviews are of people working in different industries – the garment industry, agriculture, resource extraction, and electronics. The collection offers counter-narratives to each of the previous assignments. The narratives coming from both the private and public sphere are narratives theorized and created by those in power. The stories told by the laborers in these different industries are those of the lives most impacted by these very issues. Corinne Gorla, the editor of the collection, explains the problems that laborers around the world have face when they attempt to address issues of injustices (whether from the private or public sphere): “Many of our storytellers were faced with an impossible dilemma, one oft repeated in economic debates: Can workers bargain for better job conditions – including the banning of child labor – without losing their jobs altogether? Can communities speak out against environmental degradation, political corruption, and unfair land acquisition without losing economic investment? And perhaps most importantly, can those individuals most impacted by the global economy ask for change without facing dire consequences?” (19). The final assignment asks students to attempt to put these conversations in contact with each other. The (wealthy) private sphere is talking about how to solve specific issues of social injustice. The (powerful) public sphere is creating laws that impact the lives of citizens around the globe. In

this unit, we hear the stories of those people who are impacted the decisions made by both the private and public spheres, and we do this by building on the questions that Gorla mapped out.

Kalpona Akter opens the book by discussing her experiences as a laborer in the garment industry. When she was twelve, she began working in a factory: “I earned less than \$7 a month, yet often worked eighteen hour days in a chaotic, unhygienic, and unsafe environment” (13).

Akter is an activist who has been jailed for speaking against a system that allows unsafe working conditions. She speaks against the relationship between the private and public spheres – they are both contributing to a neoliberal agenda that exploits those in vulnerable positions. In the introduction to the collection of essays, Akter talks about her experiences addressing laborers around the world: “I feel connected to them even though I’ve never met them, even though I don’t speak their language. There may be differences in our circumstances but we’re united in our common struggle to seek justice, whether from our employers, multinational corporations, or the state” (14).

Neftali Cuello talks about his experiences working in tobacco fields in North Carolina. Cuello was 17 when he was interviewed, but he started working in the fields when he was twelve. While there are laws that prevent corporations from employing children, the “laws are much looser regarding child labor on farms – a standard designed to allow children of independent farmers to help their parents starting at a young age. Large commercial growers are able to take advantage of the legal loophole by hiring children...to work long hours for minimum wage” (Gorla 111). Low wages are only part of the problem; there are a lot of health risks involved, as well. First the tobacco itself is dangerous to handle: “Workers absorb nicotine from tobacco plants through their skin, and one in four every harvest season suffers from acute nicotine poisoning” (181). Then there is the heat. Cuello: “Every year it gets hotter. It’ll get to

one hundred degrees, but what people don't know is that if you're working in a field of tobacco, the leaves reflect the sun, so it's ten to fifteen degrees hotter in the fields" (183). Heat is a major problem, and in North Carolina, "farm workers suffer the highest rate of heat-related fatalities in the nation" (183). Additionally, there are chemical-related health risks: workers are exposed to pesticides that are used to protect the crops.

While Cuello's story addresses labor issues in the U.S., Pourina Akokar's narrative addresses the global reach of the agricultural industry and how global policies impact people in drastically different ways. The subsidies and protections that agricultural corporations receive give them an enormous competitive advantage: small farmers "who do not own enough land to take advantage of globalized mono-cropping, or enough capital to invest in the latest high-yield seeds or fertilizers and pesticides, have found a way of life passed down through the centuries suddenly threatened" (109). For Akokar, as for many others in India, this has resulted in tragedy. Akokar and her husband were cotton farmers, but she "lost her husband to suicide¹⁴ in the midst of spiraling financial pressures resulting from a convergence of factors: the cost of new strains of genetically modified seeds, paltry harvests, and mounting debt to seed and loan brokers" (109). Each of the narratives in this collection addresses the same issues that the private initiatives and the public policies attempt to address. Each interviewee is fighting the injustices in the best way they can. These narratives are important, just as the interviews in the Justice for Immigrants project are important, because they illuminate the impact these issues have on the most vulnerable.

Neoliberal logic creates interesting contradictions. On the one hand, it dissolves the economic borders between nations, which depoliticizes the importance of national identity; on

¹⁴ "According to the Center for Human Rights and Global Justice, in 2009 alone, 17,638 Indian farmers committed suicide, or one farmer every thirty minutes" (Goria 113).

the other, because it does nothing to dissolve physical boundaries, it increases a sense of nationalism. It forces people to move around the globe, yet mobility is only a privilege for the few. When it comes to business, it places an almost unwavering faith in the ability of the free market to effectively address issues of social justice. Yet, it removes the protections that would ensure that laborers are not treated unjustly by corporations competing in the free market. Again, one way to highlight these contradictions is to look at how neoliberal policies impact immigrant labor experiences. In Chapter 3, I looked at the ways that neoliberal policies have reshaped the economic landscape in Mexico. Neoliberal theory held that the North American Free Trade Agreement would lead to higher levels of employment in Mexico because it would remove the rigidities of the labor market. The Mexican government sold the trade agreement to their country by promising hundreds of thousands of high-wage jobs plus a cheaper standard of living. These promises never became a reality. There was an initial increase in employment, but those jobs were short-lived as businesses continued to seek ever-cheaper labor in other countries. Twenty years after NAFTA was signed, the formal labor sector in Mexico could only absorb 38 percent of youths leaving school to enter the market each year (Cypher 62). Because of the dismal job market in Mexico, and because the low-wages of the available jobs, many had no choice but to come to the U.S.

Although there are opportunities to make more money in the U.S., these workers are still very vulnerable. Despite providing services that are needed, immigrant laborers are so often vilified. Kristen Heyer describes the U.S. view of immigrant labor as schizophrenic – we depend upon it, and yet we vilify it. In the JFI interviews I analyzed, the volatile nature of the labor market was apparent. The jobs were hard, there was no job stability, and there was no network to provide protections for workers. Z's experiences were an example of how few protections

workers have from their employers. Z lost her first job when she fired for allegedly stealing from the store where she was a clerk. She maintained her innocence, but she had no way to prove a negative, so she was forced to look for another job. She was able to find work, but because she was in a vulnerable position, the new company did not always pay her. In addition to not receiving a paycheck, she was injured on the job. It was only through community organizers that she found a way to fight for her back pay and for compensation for her medical bills. Z maintained a positive attitude from her experiences. She “learned a lot with getting involved with the union, fighting for rights, not being quiet and afraid [like] she was before.” Her willingness to fight has made a difference. Her managers now treat her with respect; they know that she is aware of her rights and will fight for them. However, these are basic protections for which she should not have to fight.

X had similar experiences. She was a stylist by trade, but was unable to find a job in that area in the States. As a single mother, X’s experiences highlight a different aspect of the immigrant experience: a lack of any network to help make ends meet. While Z had the support of her husband and the support of a community organizer, X felt alone with her children. She was older than her fellow workers, so it was hard to create a bond with them. When she shattered the tendons in her wrist, her employers gave her an option: deal with the pain or leave. Unable to continue working, X had to take time off from her job, which has impacted her children. Her 9-year-old son is already thinking of what job he might take to help the family. X is passionate about the unjust treatment that she experienced for years in the labor market, but she knows that the system is set up to silence those who would speak out: “I think that in this country there has to be a freedom of speech without fear, without dread because this is what happened to me...what they’ve done is not just.”

Neoliberal logic has a very clear view on labor. In order for the free market to function efficiently, labor must be flexible. The protections for laborers have slowly eroded over the past three decades, which leads to very little job security or safety protections for those in the labor market. While neoliberalism devalues labor, it places a premium on executives and entrepreneurs. One important argument of neoliberal thought is that the free market is the most efficient way to address issues of social justice. Ideas such as corporate social responsibility have become commonplace (and are often left un-interrogated). In the last 15 years, this faith in the free market has expanded beyond corporations being responsible citizens to thinking of how we can develop corporations with the express purpose of addressing social justice issues. This can be seen in the Global Social Benefit Incubator discussed in Chapter 4. The GSBI was created as an attempt to “engage the [Silicon] Valley’s creative energy, its products, services and business leaders in the challenges faced by the poor in resource-constrained environments” (History).

The Silicon Valley is a great place to analyze in order to understand the winners and losers in the age of neoliberalism. There is a strong belief that entrepreneurialism can effectively address social injustices. Yet, there is a disconnect between the discussions that take place in the world of tech and what lies in the shadow of Silicon Valley. This focus on how entrepreneurs can solve the problems in resource-constrained environments involves highlighting the enormous profits that entrepreneurs can generate while ignoring the economic inequalities created in the local community. While salaries within the tech industry are good, the wages of those who provide services for the industry illustrate the economic inequality in the Silicon Valley. Recently, the cafeteria workers at Intel started trying to bring these inequalities to light: “The average annual salary in Santa Clara County, where Intel is located, is \$93,500. Nahima Aguiniga, a single mother of two who works in the Intel cafeteria, said her roughly \$14-an-hour

wage puts her at less than \$30,000 a year” (O’Donovan). This gap in pay is only part of a larger problem. The wealth generated by the tech industry has driven housing prices up, making it hard for families to afford housing. Despite high revenues, the tax loopholes for the wealthy have drained the funding for public projects. The creative energy of the Silicon Valley has not led to a more equitable system:

According to an analysis by Working Partnerships, Santa Clara County’s wealth gap has expanded amid a flush of tech investment: ‘From 2000 to 2010, real median household income in the Valley has fallen by 19 percent—more than three times the national decline.’ Housing costs have surged with the gentrification and displacement of longstanding working-class communities. Meanwhile, next door to the hub of the Knowledge Economy, a local public-school district’s budget bled about \$15 million between 2007 and 2011. About a fifth of Silicon Valley high school students do not graduate on time. (Chen)

Housing and public funding for social programs has become such an issue in the Valley that one of the local bus routes serves as an informal shelter for the homeless. In 2015, Elizabeth Lo made a short documentary, “Hotel 22,” for the *New York Times*. The Line 22 bus route runs directly in front of Santa Clara University: “Line 22 is a bus route that runs 24 hours in Silicon Valley, shuttling between San Jose and Palo Alto. The homeless pay the fare to ride the bus at night along its hour-and-a-half route, getting off at each end, and often riding several times back and forth. The practice has gone on for years, and the bus is known colloquially as ‘Hotel 22’” (Lo). While we often focus on the technology the innovators in the Silicon Valley create, and while we glorify the ability of entrepreneurs to create great wealth, Lo’s documentary argues that this glorification involves forgetting about “the populations that have been displaced or neglected

by the recent tech boom. Rising property prices in the area have created unsustainable living costs, especially for the poor. At the same time, Silicon Valley lacks sufficient affordable housing and homeless shelters” (Lo).

In Chapter 4, I discussed some potential problems with programs like the GSBI. Because they are rooted in neoliberal logic, they reflect a worldview that is not always compatible with the ideas of social justice. In that chapter, I discussed Fowler’s investigation of Non-governmental development organizations, which ended with his warnings about the dangers of relying on social entrepreneurialism to solve our problems. When the model for addressing issues of social justice comes from the world of free market capitalism, that model will “give...highest merit to values of individualism, competition, extraction, accumulation, exploitation and rivalry as the normative mode for relations between people and between people and nature” (90). This approach would, Fowler continued, have multiple negative effects, but one that I think is particularly important is the impact it has on solidarity; a free market approach undermines “virtuous values, such as trust, reciprocity, mutuality, co-operation and toleration of difference” (90).

The logic informing social entrepreneurialism is at odds with some of the very things it says it values. Programs such as the GSBI, as well as philanthropic endeavors such as the Chan-Zuckerberg initiative, reflect a worldview that has come to dominate social justice issues in the past few decades. It is a worldview that is so predominate that it is accepted as gospel: “Free markets have long been promoted as the most efficient approach for an economy to be managed, with the laws of supply and demand resulting in optimal prices for all goods and services. This perspective has dominated mainstream economics and has long influenced policy makers, particularly during the 1980s” (Oxfam 15). They emphasize investment and innovation, which

are, of course, good things. However, the systemic structures that enable the wealthiest individuals to invest and innovate do so at the cost of everyone else. Oxfam notes that after 30 years of believing that free markets are the most efficient way of managing social issues, we now “live in a world with levels of inequality we may not have seen for over a century” (2). The numbers for this inequality are grim: “The richest 1% now have more wealth than the rest of the world combined” (1). The disparity is not just between those in wealthy nations and those in the developing world. Joseph Stiglitz analyzed what this looks like in the United States: “The upper 1 percent of Americans are now taking in nearly a quarter of the nation’s income every year. In terms of wealth rather than income, the top 1 percent control 40 percent. Their lot in life has improved considerably. Twenty-five years ago, the corresponding figures were 12 percent and 33 percent” (Stiglitz). This inequality continues to grow at an increasing pace. Since 2010, “[t]he wealth of the richest 62 people in the world has risen by 44%...an increase of more than half a trillion dollars (\$542bn), to \$1.76trillion. Meanwhile, the wealth of the bottom half fell by just over a trillion dollars...a drop of 41%” (Oxfam 2). Again, this is as true for the U.S. as it is for the rest of the world. Paul Krugman’s analysis of rate of income growth over the period of 1979-2005 found that “inflation-adjusted, after-tax income of Americans in the middle of the income distribution rose 21 percent. The equivalent number for the richest 0.1 percent rose 400 percent” (Krugman).

There are several reasons for this increasing gap, but they all come back to the central fact that the wealthy are using their increasing power to perpetuate an economic system that favors them at the expense of the rest of us. Part of this has to do with tax loopholes. Part of this has to do with tax avoidance by storing money in off-shore tax havens. Oxfam estimates that at the moment, there is roughly \$7.6 trillion hidden in tax havens. Regardless of how the wealthy

shield their money from taxes, the result is that it drastically reduces the money that nations have to help address issues of poverty and health. Tax avoidance has become such a problem that the International Bar Association has labeled it a human rights issue (5). When the wealthiest do not pay their taxes – regardless of the reason – the burden then falls to the rest of society.

Governments are “left with two options: either to cut back on the essential spending needed to reduce inequality and deprivation or to make up the shortfall by levying higher taxes on other, less wealthy sections of society and smaller businesses in the domestic economy. Both options see the poorest people lose out and the inequality gap grow” (20). None of this is news. Yet, the approaches to fixing the problem seem to never involve rethinking the neoliberal policies at the heart of our economic system. In fact, the response for the past 25 years or so has been to double-down on these policies. As Ed Miliband points out, “The rise in inequality should not...be brushed aside as an inevitable effect of irresistible forces such as globalisation or developments in technology. It is driven by political choices” (LRB). Oxfam’s report concludes with a very clear message for those who believe in the neoliberal policies: they don’t work. In order to fix the greatest problems that our world faces, we need to “[r]efrain from implementing unproven and unworkable market reforms to public health and education systems” (34).

As I mentioned in the last chapter, and as I have discussed throughout this chapter, I think the Santa Clara University is in a position to offer students a way to rethink both their political subjectivity and the way they think about social justice. Because the mission of the university, as well as the language of the social justice initiatives, is shaped in part by Jesuit thought, the university already offers – theoretically, at least – an alternative framework for understanding social justice. I am in no way advocating that this be the framework that everyone adopts; this is

just a framework that happens to be in place at Santa Clara, and it offers an alternative way of thinking about social injustices.

Because the service learning programs at SCU are informed by Catholic social teachings, I use some of those teachings in the Advanced Writing course to highlight some of the contradictions of neoliberal rhetoric. The teachings are particularly insightful when it comes to immigration – they offer an alternative framework of thinking about global citizenship and social justice. These teachings, as I mentioned in chapter 3, do not think of citizenship in a traditional way. Rather than thinking of citizenship in national terms, they offer an alternative form of political subjectivity: world citizen. This form of citizenship is founded on the ideas of justice and solidarity. What this means for immigrants, then, is that if their country of origin cannot provide them with the proper security, financially or physically, they have the right to move to a country that can do so. Receiving countries, on the other hand, must provide a justification if they want to deny entry to a migrant. Furthermore, a state's obligation to immigrants goes well beyond simply admitting entry; they are obligated to give preferential treatment to these vulnerable populations. In the pastoral letter "Strangers no Longer," the bishops argued that states "are morally bound to respect and promote the basic human rights of both citizen and resident alien, especially the most vulnerable. Persons are entitled to be treated in accordance with their equal dignity. Such respect justifies preferential attention to those whose rights are most systemically imperiled" (99).

The teachings do not simply challenge the way that states think about political subjects; they challenge the way individuals see each other. For instance, they challenge neoliberal tenants such as self-reliance and individualism by focusing on the ways in which the lives of those in receiving countries are tied to the lives of migrants. Heyer used the example of trade agreements

and transnational economic policies. When countries create these agreements, they are connecting the lives of the citizens within those states. Rather than thinking about Zuckerberg's global initiative in isolation, then, we need to think of it in relation to the immigrants who are also responding to the same economic system. Zuckerberg clearly benefits from the current economic policies; the immigrants we connect with, on the other hand, have been uprooted by those same policies. In my courses, I attempt to help students see how our lives, as well as the lives of those in the community, have been shaped by neoliberal policies. This intellectual work is accompanied by the connections in the community. As I mentioned in the last chapter, the main thing that this particular community wants from our class is a connection. They want us to hear the stories of how their lives have been systematically imperiled. They want us to hear the stories behind the statistics and rhetoric of immigration. Hearing these stories, they hope, is a step toward solidarity between the community and the university, and solidarity is what will help us rethink social justice and global citizenship.

The goal of the rhetorical work that students do throughout the course is to begin seeing how neoliberal logic is shaping our political subjectivity. This rhetorical analysis may seem like a small step, but it is an important step in resisting simply producing, or becoming, good neoliberal subjects. This analytical work, as well as the connections This analytical work, as well as the connections we make in the community, can disrupt the way we approach injustices, and it can help students begin to imagine alternatives.

The hope that service learning initiatives offer is that, at their best, they can provide students with the tools to reflect on their citizenship. Many students want to be involved in these programs. As Theresa Orozco argues, "Millennials are the most service-oriented generation ever – spending spring breaks and summers volunteering here at home and around the world" (5).

Composition scholars have been challenging the ways that we approach helping students become more reflective citizens who can use their desire to be involved in communities in more effective ways. Scholars have approached this from several perspectives. Scholars have attempted to understand how communities (rather than the universities) define problems and respond to the political moment (Goldblatt, Mathieu, Welch, Parks); they have begun emphasizing the transnational contexts and relationships that have created need for service programs (Dingo); they have done this by challenging the U.S. centric view of globalization that ignores the material drawbacks for others (Edward and Wright); they have begun questioning the ways that global forces rather than national ones are shaping subjectivity (Hesford, DeChaine, Ong). As I have argued throughout this dissertation, thinking specifically about how immigrant identity parallels the identity of the student-citizens in our programs provides another lens through which to understand how neoliberal policies have reshaped political subjectivity. Marilynne Robinson argues that “every generation is in effect colonized by its assumptions, and also by the things it reveres” (29). If our thinking is now colonized by neoliberal logic, and if we reverse the self-sustaining entrepreneur, then understanding the direct impact of this logic on the lives of others offers a way to challenge our colonized thinking. It should offer us a way to begin to move toward a post-neoliberal political subjectivity.

Appendix

I. Justice For Immigrants: Conducting the Interview

Review Protocols for pre- and post-interview practices

Pre-interview:

- Introductions
- Walk interviewee through purpose and security protocols (do not assume he or she can read)
- Obtain interviewee's agreement to be interviewed

Major Rules:

1. We are not here to solve the problems our immigrant interviewees are experiencing, although AFTER the interview, we can direct them to sources when known.
2. Be Careful. Do not suggest answers. Do not share our experience. Do not agree or disagree with the interviewee's views. Restrict your responses to comments like "I see," "uh huh," and "could you say more about that?"

Sample questions:

1. Initial Phase (getting background information)

A. Family

- Who is in your immediate family and where are they?
- Where is your extended family (beyond parents, spouse, and children)?
- Where did you come from (place of origin)?
- Where have you lived on your way to U.S. or between periods of time in U.S.?
- When you moved, why? And what happened?

B. Life before immigration

- Tell me about your life before you decided to immigrate...
- Where did you live? What were your living conditions?
- Did you have a job? If so, what were your working conditions like?
- Did you have an opportunity to go to school? If so, where, for how long? What was school like?

2. Development Phase

A. The decision to immigrate

- What made you decide to immigrate to the U.S.?
- Did something happen in your life to spark your decision, or was it a gradual process?

B. Process of immigration

- Could you describe your immigration experiences from the time you left home?
- Please describe step-by-step what happened, from the time you left home to the time you arrived in the U.S.
- Who, if any, family came with you and what is their immigration status? (Again, we will not divulge any of this information unless you give us permission to do

so.)

-Did your faith or religion have an effect on your experience in leaving or living in the U.S.?

C. Settling in

-What were things like once you arrived in the U.S.?

-How did you find a place to stay?

-Were you able to find work? If so, how?

-Were there people in the U.S. who helped you?

D. Return home (if applicable)

-What made you decide to return home?

-What was that like?

-Have you returned home (migrated between the U.S. and your country) more than once? If so, how many times? What has that been like? What have been some of your experiences?

3. Reflection Stage

A. You told us about “abc” and “xyz” and how difficult it was to get through it. Could you say more about either event?

4. Wind down

A. Worries

-What keeps you up at night? What do you worry about?

B. Comforts

-What brings you comfort, hope, peace, and rest at night? What are your joys?

5. Closing

A. “If I could give you a microphone, and you could talk through it to every person in the United States, all at once, what would you say to them?” (Give us one or two sentences.)

II. Learning Objectives for Advanced Writing:

Goals: Critical Thinking, Complexity, Communication

Meta-Goals: Intentional Learning, Information Literacy

Objectives: Students will:

1.1: Read and write with a critical point of view that demonstrates depth of thought and is mindful of the rhetorical situation of a particular discipline. (Critical Thinking, Complexity, Communication)

1.2: Write essays that contain well-supported, arguable theses and that demonstrate personal engagement and clear purpose

1.3: Independently and deliberately locate, select, and appropriately use and cite evidence that is ample, credible, and smoothly integrated into intellectually honest argument appropriate for a particular discipline. (Complexity, Communication; Meta-Goal: Information Literacy)

1.4: Consciously understand their writing processes as modes of learning and intentionally manipulate those processes in response to diverse learning tasks. (Critical Thinking, Complexity; Meta-Goal: Intentional Learning)

The Learning Objectives for ELSJ

2.1: Recognize the benefits of life-long responsible citizenship and civic engagement in personal and professional activities (Civic Life).

2.2: Interact appropriately, sensitively, and self-critically with people in the communities in which they work and appreciate the formal and informal knowledge, wisdom, and skills that individuals in these communities possess (Perspective).

2.3: Recognize, analyze, and understand social reality and injustices in contemporary society, including recognizing the relative privilege or marginalization of their own and other groups (Social Justice).

2.4: Be able to make vocational choices in light of both their greatest gifts and the world's greatest needs (Civic Engagement).

III. Good Citizens Unit 1: The Private Sphere's Construction of Good Citizens

On Santa Clara University's website, one of the 4 main links – gateways, they are called – is to a video called “Engaged Community.” When we follow the link, we learn that at Santa Clara, “Learning is not limited to the classroom, labs, and library. At Santa Clara, your coursework connects you to life outside the University in ways that enrich what you learn and how you think. Community-based learning integrates academics, imagination, compassion, and reflection, and reaches into all disciplines and majors.” Santa Clara seems genuinely interested in being engaged in their community – I don't doubt the sincerity of this at all. In fact, the university has been recognized for its efforts. Following another link on the SCU website finds a news release: “During the 2008–09 academic year, students at Santa Clara University completed more than 100,000 hours of academic service learning and community service, and these efforts were recognized when Santa Clara University was named to the 2009 President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll.” The idea that universities need to be involved in community service projects is so prominent that the President has an honor roll dedicated to it!

On Wal-Mart's corporate website, the very first gateway is: Community. Wal-Mart partners with local programs around the country in an attempt to fight hunger. They are committed enough to this project that they have invested \$2 Billion dollars in this project. Wal-Mart is also involved in other community projects. In fact, their entire “Press Room” tab is dedicated to press releases about different ways Wal-Mart is raising money or awareness for different service projects.

One of the five gateways on the website for Goldman Sachs is: Citizenship. They are committed to...

In this unit, we will analyze the rhetoric of citizenship used by universities and/or corporations. Why are these private entities concerned with citizenship? (How) do they define citizenship? How do they define community? How do they view responsibility? The goal of this unit is not to bash Wal-Mart or Santa Clara University. In fact, you do not need to make a judgement concerning their intentions. We really just want to begin to understand the ways in these organizations are creating a specific narrative about what it means to be a good citizen. For instance, when a corporation has initiatives concerning education, they are making an argument that their approach to education is the best approach to education (or is addressing some unfulfilled need in our society). When a corporation has sustainability initiatives, they are attempting to shape the way that we view environmental issues. The goal of this assignment is to attempt to understand the ways in which these organizations are shaping the conversation about some specific aspect of citizenship. Our analysis of this rhetoric will be informed by our readings on citizenship and our experiences in the community. By understanding how the idea of citizenship has evolved and how universities and corporations employ this term, we should be able to better understand something about how the idea of a citizen is evolving. What are the characteristics of a good citizen? And who is allowed to be a good citizen? What attributes does a good citizen possess?

IV: Good Citizens Unit 2: The Political Sphere's Construction of Good Citizens

In his inaugural address, John F. Kennedy pledged that America was going to fight poverty and misery: “To those peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is right. If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.” A few months later, the Peace Corps was established, and for the past 50 years, volunteers have been sent around the world to address different needs.

In his inaugural address, Bill Clinton emphasized the “renewal of America.” One of the ways he wanted to do this was through service: “I challenge a new generation of young Americans to a season of service—to act on your idealism by helping troubled children, keeping company with those in need, reconnecting our torn communities. There is so much to be done—enough indeed for millions of others who are still young in spirit to give of themselves in service, too.” A few months later, Clinton signed The National and Community Trust Act, which, among other things, created AmeriCorps – a domestic version of the Peace Corps.

These two programs are obvious attempts by the US Government to change the way that citizens interact with the world. These programs signaled a change in what was expected of good citizens, and in some ways, they signaled a change in who was allowed to be good citizens. In short, these speeches signal that the relationship between citizens and states is evolving. While the two political programs I mentioned above are attempts to get US citizens to move through the world differently, other political policies – trade agreements, military operations, immigration policies – also impact the way populations move around the world. While the people who become involved in the Peace Corps and AmeriCorps are seen as good citizens, a lot of people impacted by other political policies are seen quite differently.

In the first unit, we looked at how private organizations attempt to create good citizens. In that unit, the idea of citizenship was somewhat abstract. In this unit, we will look at something more specific: how States define citizenship; how States control (or don't) the way individuals enter or leave a country; who is seen as a good citizen, and who is seen as a burden. In this unit, you will choose a specific political moment or policy (e.g. education or immigration) and attempt to understand how in that moment the political sphere was shaping the idea of citizenship.

The work of this unit will take place in a couple of stages. We will continue to read essays that I provide, and you will develop a specific research essay. You may choose one of two ways to approach this essay. First, you may draw on your experiences in the community. How is a local social reality connected to a larger political moment? What political decisions are impacting what it means to be a good citizen in this community? What does the term "good citizen" mean in this community? A second approach would be to choose some political moment, as I did above with the speeches. By researching and understanding something about the general moment when that speech was given, you will then argue how these speeches and/or programs were specific responses to that moment (and why that was important and what that means for us now and etc.). Either approach will be fine, and either approach will lead to the same goal, which is to gain a deeper understanding of how the idea of citizenship is evolving.

Works Cited

- “About the Ignatian Center.” *The Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 15 August 2014.
- Adler-Kassner, Linda, et. al., editors. *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*. AAHE, 1997.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, 2006.
- Ashbee, Edward, and Alex Waddan. “The Obama Administration and United States Trade Policy.” *The Political Quarterly*, vol. 81, no. 2, 2010, pp. 253-262.
- Bacon, Nora. “Community Service Writing: Problems, Challenges, Questions.” *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service-Learning in Composition*, edited by Linda Adler-Kassner, et. al. AAHE, 1997, pp. 39-56.
- Barber, Benjamin R., and Richard Battistoni. “A Season of Service: Introducing Service Learning into the Liberal Arts Curriculum.” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, vol. 26, no. 2, 1993, pp. 235-40.
- Barbour, Rosaline S., and John Schostak. “Interviewing and Focus Groups.” *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*, edited by Bridget Somekh and Cathy Lewin. Sage Publications, 2005, pp. 41-48.
- Bellamy, Richard. *Citizenship: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford UP, 2008.
- Belsey, Catherine. “Reading and Critical Practice.” *Critical Quarterly*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2001, pp. 22-31.

Bivens, L. Josh. "Trade, Jobs, and Wages: Are the Public's Worries about Globalization Justified?" Issue brief no. 244. Economic Policy Institute, 2008. Accessed 15 August 2015.

"Brief History." *The Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 15 August 2014.

Bringle, Robert G., and Julie A. Hatcher. "Implementing Service Learning in Higher Education." *Journal Of Higher Education*, vol. 67, no. 2, 1996, pp. 221-239.

Carlson, Beverley A. *Job Losses, Multinationals and Globalization: The Anatomy of Disempowerment*. Rep. no. 132. Santiago, Chile: United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, 2002. Desarrollo Productivo. Accessed 22 June 2015.

Casteneda, Jorge G. "Morning in Latin America." *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 87, no. 5, 2008, pp. 126-139.

Chen, Michelle. "Silicon Valley's Wealth Gap." *The Nation*. Accessed 12 February 2016.

Chhabra, Esha. "Global Social Benefit Incubator still strong." *San Francisco Chronicle*, 7 September 2012. Accessed 20 August 2014.

Cooper, David D. and Laura Julier. "Democratic Conversations: Civic Literacy and Service Learning in the American Grains." *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service- Learning in Composition*, editors Linda Adler-Kassner, et. al. AAHE, 1997, pp. 79-94.

"Core Curriculum for Faculty and Staff." *SCU Provost*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 15 August 2014.

- Cushman, Ellen. "The Public Intellectual, Service Learning, and Activist Research." *College English*, vol. 61, no. 3, 1999, pp. 328-336.
- _____. "The Rhetorician as an Agent of Social Change." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 47, no. 1, 1996, pp. 7-28.
- _____. *The Struggle and the Tools: Oral and Literate Strategies in an Inner City Community*, SUNY Press, 1998.
- Cypher, James M. "Mexico Since NAFTA: Elite Delusions and the Reality of Decline." *New Labor Forum*, vol. 20, no. 3, 2011, 61-9. Accessed 28 July 2015.
- Davidson, Cathy. "Why College Is Not a Business: U Iowa as Case Study and Action Plan." *The Futures Initiative*, 11 September 2015. <https://www.hastac.org/blogs/cathy-davidson/2015/09/11/why-college-not-business-u-iowa-case-study-and-action-plan>. Accessed 12 September 2015.
- Deans, Thomas. *Writing Partnerships: Service-Learning in Composition*. National Council of Teachers of English, 2000.
- DeChaine, D. Robert. "Ethos in a Bottle: Corporate Responsibility and Humanitarian Doxa." *The Megarhetorics of Global Development*, edited by Rebecca Dingo and J. Blake Scott. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012, pp. 75-100.
- Dingo, Rebecca. "Turning the Tables on the Megarhtoric of Women's Empowerment." *The Megarhetorics of Global Development*, edited by Rebecca Dingo and J. Blake Scott. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012, pp. 174-198.
- Edwards, Jason A., and Jaime L. Wright. "Meeting the Challenge of Globalization: President Clinton's 'Double Movement' Discourse." *The Megarhetorics of Global Development*,

edited by Rebecca Dingo and J. Blake Scott. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012, pp. 54-74.

Eisinger, Jesse. "How Mark Zuckerberg's Altruism Helps Himself." *ProPublica*, 3 Dec. 2015. Accessed 7 Jan. 2016.

Engh, Michael E. "Strategic Plan 2011." *SCU President*. Santa Clara University, 11 February 2011. Accessed 15 August 2014.

Flower, Linda, and Shirley Brice Heath. "Drawing on the Local: Collaboration and Community Expertise." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2000), pp. 43-55.

"Forming Active Global Citizens." *The Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 15 August 2014.

Foss, Sonja K. *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice*. Waveland Press, 2009.

Fowler, Alan. "NGDOS as a moment in history: beyond aid to social entrepreneurship or civic innovation?" *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 21, no 4, 2000, pp. 637-654.

Giroux, Henry A. *Neoliberalism's War on Higher Education*. Haymarket Books, 2014.

"Global Engagement Office Home." *The Global Engagement Office*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 15 August 2014.

Goldblatt, Eli. *Because We Live Here: Sponsoring Literacy Beyond the College Curriculum*. Hampton Press, 2007.

Goria, Corrine, editor. *Invisible Hands: Voices from the Global Economy*. San Francisco: McSweeney's Books, 2014.

Green, Ann E. "Difficult Stories: Service-Learning, Race, Class, and Whiteness." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 55, no. 2, 2003, pp. 276-301.

Hamler Carrick, Tracy, Margaret Himley, and Tobi Jacobi. "Ruptura: Acknowledging the Lost Subjects of the Service Learning Story." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2000, pp. 56-75.

Heilker, Paul. "Rhetoric Made Real: Civic Discourse and Writing Beyond the Curriculum." *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service- Learning in Composition*, edited by Linda Adler-Kassner, et. al. AAHE, 1997, pp. 71-78.

Heyer, Kristin E. "Strangers in Our Midst: Day Laborers and Just Immigration Reform." *Political Theology*, vol. 9, no. 4, 2008, pp. 425-453.

Herzberg, Bruce. "Community Service and Critical Thinking." *Writing the Community: Concepts and Models for Service- Learning in Composition*, edited by Linda Adler-Kassner, et. al. AAHE, 1997, pp. 57-70.

Hesford, Wendy. "Global Turns and Cautions in Rhetoric and Composition Studies." *PMLA*, vol. 121, no. 3, 2006, pp. 787-801.

Hessler, H. Brooke. "Composing an Institutional Identity: The Terms of Community Service in Higher Education." *Language and Learning Across the Disciplines*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2000, pp. 27-42.

Himley, Margaret. "Facing (Up To) 'The Stranger' in Community Service Learning." *College Composition and Communication*, vol. 55, no. 3, 2004, pp. 416-438.

"History." *The Center for Science, Technology, and Society*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 15 August 2014.

"Immersion Overview." *The Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 15 August 2014.

Kahn, Carrie. "As 'Volutourism' Explodes in Popularity, Who's it Helping Most?" *Money*. NPR, 31 July 2014. Accessed 1 August 2014.

Kahne, Joseph, and Joel Westheimer. "In the Service of What? The Politics of Service Learning." *The Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 77, no. 9, 1996, pp. 592-599.

Kennedy, Donald. "Another Century's End, Another Revolution for Higher Education." *Change*, vol. 27, no. 3, 1995, pp. 8-15.

Kerwin, Donald M. "Migration, Development, and the Right Not to Have to Migrate in the New Era of Globalization." *On "Strangers No Longer": Perspectives on the Historic U.S.-Mexican Catholic Bishops' Pastoral Letter On Migration*, edited by Todd Scribner and J. Kevin Appleby. Paulist Press, 2013, pp. 139-165.

Kolvenbach, Peter-Hans. "The Service of Faith and the Promotion of Justice in American Higher Jesuit Education." *Jesuit Colleges and Universities in the United States*. Santa Clara, CA. 8 October 2000. Keynote Speech.

Krugman, Paul. "We are the 99.9%." *New York Times*, 24 Nov. 2011. Accessed 1 Feb. 2016.

Kymlicka, Will. (2013). "Neoliberal Multiculturalism?" *Social Resilience in the Neoliberal Era*, edited by P. A. Hall & M. Lamont. Cambridge UP, pp. 99-125.

Leiva, Fernando Ignacio. "Neoliberal and neostructuralist perspectives on labour flexibility, poverty and inequality: A critical appraisal." *New Political Economy*, vol. 11, no. 3, 2006, pp. 337- 359.

Lo, Elizabeth. "Hotel 22." *The New York Times*, 28 Jan. 2015. Accessed 10 Feb. 2016.

- MacKinnon, J.B. "The Dark Side of Volunteer Tourism." *UTNE Reader*. November-December 2009. Accessed 1 August 2014.
- Mahatmya, Duhita, and Lisa M. Gring-Pemble. "DREAMers and Their Families: A family impact analysis of the DREAM Act and implications for family well-being." *Journal of Family Studies*, vol. 20, no. 1, 2014, pp. 79-87.
- Massing, Michael. "How to Cover the One Percent." *New York Review of Books*, 14 Jan. 2016. Accessed 15 Jan. 2016.
- Mathieu, Paula. *Tactics of Hope: The Public Turn in English Composition*. Boynton/Cook, 2005.
- Mattson, Sophie. "New Leak of Surveillance Footage Depicting Vandalism of 43 Students Memorial." *The Santa Clara*, 13 Oct. 2016. Accessed 16 June 2017.
- "Mentors." *Miller Center for Social Entrepreneurship*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 5 September 2015.
- Miliband, Ed. "The Inequality Problem." *London Review of Books* 4 Feb. 2016, pp.19-20
- "Mission and Vision." *Campus Compact*. 11 Feb. 2017, <https://compact.org/who-we-are/mission-and-vision/>. Accessed 11 September 2015.
- Nguyen, Kim Hong. "Rhetoric in Neoliberalism: Introduction." *Rhetoric in Neoliberalism*, edited by Kim Hon Nguyen. Palgrave Macmillan, New York, 2017, pp. 1-14.
- Obama, Barack. "Remarks by the President in Address to the Nation on Immigration." The Cross Hall, Washington D.C., 20 November 2014.
- O'Donovan, Caroline. "Cafeteria Workers at Intel are Protesting." *BuzzFeedNews*. Buzzfeed, 11 Feb. 2016. Accessed 11 Feb 2016.

O'Neill, William R., and William C. Spohn. "Rights of Passage: The Ethics of Immigration and Refugee Policy." *Theological Studies*, vol. 59, no. 1, 1998, pp. 84-106.

Ong, Aihwa. *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham: Duke UP, 2006.

Orozco, Theresa. "In This Together: Catholic Teaching and the Moral Economy." *Secular Order Servants of Mary*, 19 April 2014.

"Overview." *Community-Based Learning*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 15 August 2014.

"Overview." *Global Social Benefit Institute*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 5 September 2015.

Oxfam. "An Economy for the 1%." Issue brief no. 210. Oxfam, 18 Jan. 2016.

Parks, Stephen. *Gravyland: Writing Beyond the Curriculum in the City of Brotherly Love*. Syracuse University Press, 2011.

Pollin, Robert. *Contours of Descent: U.S. Economic Fractures and the Landscape of Global Austerity*. Verso, 2005.

Reich, Robert R. *Supercapitalism: The Transformation of Business, Democracy, and Everyday Life*. Alfred A. Knopf, 2007.

Rice, R. Eugene. "Forward." *Successful Service-Learning Programs: New Models of Excellence in Higher Education*, edited by Edward Zlotkowski. Anker Publishing, 1998, pp. xi-xiii.

Robinson, Marilynne. "America's Best Idea: In defense of our public universities." *Harper's*. March 2016, pp. 29-37.

- Rodriguez, Joe, and Julie Patel. "Race-themed party roiling Santa Clara University." *The Mercury News*, 16 Feb. 2007.
- Saldana, Johnny. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Sage Publications, 2009.
- "Santa Clara University Blood Swastika in Casa Italiana Elevator." *YouTube*, uploaded by SCUWatch, 22 Oct. 2016,
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=46mAwfjXPXA&spfreload=1>
- Sassen, Saskia. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. The New Press, 1999.
- Scribner, Todd, and J. Kevin Appleby. *On "Strangers No Longer": Perspectives on the Historic U.S.-Mexican Catholic Bishops' Pastoral Letter On Migration*. Paulist Press, 2013.
- Seidman, Irving. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*. Teachers College, 2006.
- Smith-Carrier, Tracy, and Rupaleem Bhuyan. "Assessing the impact of neoliberalism on citizenship: The stratification of social rights by immigration status in Toronto, Ontario." <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.454.3497&rep=rep1&type=pdf>
 Accessed. 17 November 2015.
- Srinivasan, Amia. "How to Reach Your Full Potential." *LRB Blog*. London Review of Books, 2 Dec. 2015. Accessed 7 Jan. 2016.
- Standing, Guy. *The Precariat: The Dangerous New Class*. Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Stiglitz, Joseph. "Of the 1%, by the 1%, for the 1%." *Vanity Fair*, May 2011.
<https://www.vanityfair.com/news/2011/05/top-one-percent-201105>.
- "Student Immersions." *The Ignatian Center for Jesuit Education*. Santa Clara University, n.d. Accessed 15 August 2014.

- “The Ten-Year Track Record of the North America Free Trade Agreement: The Mexican Economy, Agriculture, and Environment.” *Public Citizen*. Accessed 22 June 2015.
- Thomas, Chantal. “Globalization and the Border: Trade, Labor, Migration, and Agricultural Production in Mexico.” *McGeorge Law Review*, vol. 41, no. 4, 2010, pp. 867-889.
- United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Inc. and Conferencia del Episcopado Mexicano. “Strangers No Longer: Together on the Journey of Hope.” *On “Strangers No Longer”: Perspectives on the Historic U.S.-Mexican Catholic Bishops’ Pastoral Letter On Migration*, edited by Todd Scribner and J. Kevin Appleby. Paulist Press, 2013, pp. 313-349.
- UNODC. “Smuggling of migrants: the harsh search for a better life.” *Migrant Smuggling*. *United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime*.
<https://www.unodc.org/toc/en/crimes/migrant-smuggling.html>. Accessed 1 February 2016.
- Varsanyi, Monica W. “Rescaling the ‘Alien,’ Rescaling Personhood: Neoliberalism, Immigration, and the State.” Working paper no. 173. San Diego: U of California, 2009. The Center for Comparative Immigration Studies. https://ccis.ucsd.edu/_files/wp173.pdf. Accessed 3 September 2015.
- Wan, Amy J. “In the Name of Citizenship: The Writing Classroom and the Promise of Citizenship.” *College English*, vol. 74, no. 1, 2011, pp. 28-49.
- Welch, Nancy. *Living Room: Teaching Public Writing in a Privatized World*. Boynton/Cook, 2008.
- Whaley, William. “The California Dream Act: A Dream (not DREAM) Come True.” *McGeorge Law Review*, vol. 43, no. 3, 2012, pp. 625-643.

“Who We Are.” *Campus Compact*, 11 Feb. 2017, <https://compact.org/who-we-are/>.

Zakaria, Rafia. “The White Tourist’s Burden.” *Aljazeera America*. 21 April 2014.

<http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2014/4/volunter-tourismwhitevoluntouristsafricaaidsorphans.html>.

Zlotkowski, Edward. “Humanistic Learning And Service-Learning At The Liberal Arts College.” *New Directions For Higher Education*, vol. 114, 2001, pg. 89.

Zlotkowski, Edward. “Linking service-learning and the academy.” *Change*, vol. 28, no. 1, 1996, pp. 20-27.

Zuckerberg, Mark. “A Letter to Our Daughter.” Facebook. 1 Dec. 2015.

<https://www.facebook.com/notes/mark-zuckerberg/a-letter-to-our-daughter/10153375081581634/>. Accessed 7 Jan. 2016.

Michael Lasley
 2314 Park Avenue
 Santa Clara, CA 95050
 315.278.4206 / mlasley@scu.edu

Education

Ph.D., Composition and Cultural Rhetoric (2017)

Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY

Dissertation: "The Post-Neoliberal Citizen: Immigrant Identity as the New Service Learning Center"

Committee: Steve Parks (Chair), Rebecca Moore Howard, Eileen Schell

M.A., English (2001)

University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

B.S., Biology (1997)

Harding University, Searcy, AR

Teaching

2010-Present	Lecturer of English, Santa Clara University
2005-2010	Visiting Assistant Professor of English, Pepperdine University
2001-2005	Teaching Assistant, Syracuse University
2004	Summer Start Writing Tutor
2002-2004	Writing Tutor, Syracuse University Athletics Department
1999-2001	Reading Instructor, AmeriCorps

Academic Courses Taught

American Language and Culture

This First-Year Seminar is designed to help International Students as they transition into an American academic setting. This course simultaneously focuses on the conventions of academic writing and investigates American popular culture.

English 1: Citizenship and Identity

This course examines how and why communities are created. Why are certain people accepted as good citizens while others are labeled "strangers"? By investigating the written and unwritten rules of the communities in which we live (our university, our neighborhood), we learn something about our own values, beliefs and thought-processes.

Understanding our own values and beliefs enables us to be more reflective (and, ideally, more responsible) citizens

English 2: Education and Identity

This course investigates different ways the academy shapes our identities. While there is a wealth of scholarship investigating the relationship between educational practices and identity, but we will focus more on the informal aspects of academic life. How do the unwritten rules governing the spaces around campus determine which identities are welcome in those spaces? (How) do we value certain identities over others?

Critical Thinking & Writing: LEAD

The LEAD Scholars Program is designed for first-generation college students. This course is designed to help first-generation students as they transition into college. This course analyzes how the educational system has shaped their lives in different ways. This two-quarter sequence begins with an emphasis on close reading and rhetorical analysis. The course then moves into writing longer essays, culminating in a sustained research project.

Humanities II:

This is a general requirement course. This course focuses on six major historical events: Renaissance, Reformation, Intercultural Encounters, Science, Enlightenment, and the French Revolution.

Advanced Writing: Good Citizens

This is an Upper Division writing course with a community-based learning component. The course investigates theories of citizenship, and how the relationship between citizens and states (and with other citizens) is ever-evolving. Drawing both on the course readings and the work in the community, students develop research projects that attempt to understand citizenship in a nuanced way.

Publications

Essays Published

“Critiquing the Culture and Deconstructing the Agrarian Myth in Midwestern America: Jane Hamilton’s *A Map of the World*.” *Midamerica*. 27 (2000).

Essays Under Development

“Good Citizens: Immigrant Identity, Service Learning, and Global Citizenship.” Intended Journal: *Reflections*.

Conference Papers and Presentations

“Citizen Erased: Immigrant Populations in the Past, Present, and Futures of Jesuit Institutions.” *Commitment to Justice in Jesuit Higher Education*. Seattle, WA. August 2017.

“LEAD Scholars: First-Generation Students Achieving Excellence.” *Young Rhetoricians’ Conference*, Monterey, CA. June 2017

“Service Learning Reawakens Our Sense of Ourselves.” *Sigma Tau Delta International Conference*, New Orleans. 2012.

Respondent. “Crime Fiction, Science, and the Battle Between Good and Evil.” *Christian Scholars Conference*. Malibu, CA. 2011.

“Representations of the Served: How Students Learn to Represent Communities in Service Learning Programs.” *Christian Scholars Conference*. Nashville, TN. 2010.

“Who Owns Diversity?: Critical Encounters in Higher Education.” *The Fourth International Conference on Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations*. Los Angeles, CA. 2004.

“The Emergence of Networking in Communication.” *Conference on College Composition and Communication*. San Antonio, TX. 2004.

“The Rhetoric of Silence.” *Hawaii International Conference on Arts and Humanities*. Honolulu, HI. January 2004.

“Legislating Grammar: Stakeholders, Powerbrokers, and Pedagogy.” *Colloquium on Sentence Level Pedagogy*, Syracuse, NY. 2003.

“A Symbol of Contradictions: The Confederate Flag During the Civil Rights Movement.” *Conference on Popular Culture in the South*, Charlotte, NC. 2002.

“The Subversion of the Agrarian Myth in Jane Hamilton’s *A Map of the World*.” *Society for the Study of Midwestern Literature Conference*, East Lansing, MI, 2000

Grants

2013-14	Faculty Collaborative Grant for Enhanced Teaching with Technology. “Making Connections: Using ePortfolios to Enhance Learning, Writing, and Reflection.” \$1,500.
---------	---

Service

Department

2014-2016	Faculty Adviser for the English Club
-----------	--------------------------------------

- 2010-2016 Faculty Adviser for Sigma Tau
Sigma Tau is the academic honor society for English Studies.
- 2010-2016 Graduate School Adviser
I work with students as they prepare for graduate school application process.
- 2011-2012 Student Activities Sub-Committee for the English Department
As part of our department's program review, this subcommittee documented and highlighted the work our students have done over the past five years.
- 2010-2011 Judge for the Katherine Woodall Prize in Literary Criticism
This prize is awarded to the outstanding critical or theoretical essay written in an Upper Division English course.
- 2003-2004 Co-Chair of the Student Advisory Board
In an effort to listen to and understand students' needs and expectations from their writing courses, I coordinated a committee of undergraduates who met four times a semester to discuss ways in which the Writing Program could be more effective for students.
- 2003-2004 President of the Writing Program's Graduate Student Organization (Elected)
- 2003-2004 Diversity Committee, The Writing Program
This committee was designed and funded by the Vice-Chancellor to investigate ways in which 'diversity' is used in classrooms in the University. The ultimate goal of this committee was to make recommendations to the university on ways to improve and complicate our existing ideas of 'diversity.'
- 2003-2004 Lower Division Curriculum Committee, The Writing Program
I was the elected graduate student member on this committee.

Profession

- 2011-Present Referee for the Sigma Tau Delta International Conference
- 2012-2013 Referee for the journal *Christianity and Literature*

Community

- 2011-Present Justice for Immigrants.
- 2013-Present P.A.C.T. (People Acting in Community Together) San Jose.

Teaching Awards

- 2009 Women's Basketball Team Outstanding Professor.
- 2008 Kappa Kappa Gamma Professor of the Year.
- 2008 The Brett Love Teaching Award. This award is given each year to one professor in the Humanities. A committee of professors decides upon the recipient.

References

Steve Parks

Associate Professor of Writing and Rhetoric
 Huntington Beard Crouse Hall
 Syracuse University
 Syracuse, NY 13244
 sjparks@syr.edu

Simone Billings

Senior Lecturer of English
 Director of Core Writing
 323 St. Joseph's Hall
 Santa Clara University
 Santa Clara, CA 95053
 sbillings@scu.edu

Rebecca Moore Howard

Professor of Writing and Rhetoric
 Huntington Beard Crouse Hall
 Syracuse University
 Syracuse, NY 13244
 rehoward@syr.edu

Eileen Schell

Professor of Writing and Rhetoric
 Huntington Beard Crouse Hall
 Syracuse University
 Syracuse, NY 13244
 eeschell@syr.edu