

Nails, Rivets, and Brass Tacks or Windmills and Castles In The Sky: Vision and Focus
As Choices Facing Caribbean Policymakers in the Era of Globalization

Philbert Aaron
Coppin State University
Baltimore, Maryland

Abstract

This paper seeks to demystify both globalization and US educational policymaking in response to globalization. Rather, it portrays globalization as an autonomous form that is not headed by a world government and the US as not being immune to globalization's ill effects. If there is one rule of globalization is that of innovation. The paper draws on these portrayals to derive lessons for policymakers in small islands like Dominica. Overall, the paper argues for a tempering of grand political visions that are the legacy of Caribbean geopolitical realities and a realistic and focused vision for education's symbiotic interplay with the economy. Most specifically, the paper argues against using schools as a panacea for all social ills, particularly the current scourges of drugs and criminality.

Keywords: Education; Dominica; USA

Topics:

8. Issues of social capital—education
5. Governance
2. Crime and violence.

*God, grant me the serenity
to accept the things I cannot change;
the courage to change the things I can;
and the wisdom to know the difference.*
The Serenity Prayer - Reinhold Niebuhr

As a schoolboy in the Commonwealth of Dominica in the 1970s, that period of constant political upheavals, I was seduced by politics. When in 1979, less than one year after the attainment of political independence, Dominica's first Prime Minister, Patrick Roland John was overthrown and elections were called to replace John, at age seventeen, I addressed a political rally in the village of Cottage, north of Portsmouth, the island's second town.

It was an inauspicious beginning in politics. It was totally unplanned. Dr. William Bill Para Riviere, the Dominica Liberation Movement Alliance's (DLM) candidate for the Cottage constituency was locked in a tight contest with the candidate for the Dominica Freedom Party (DFP), Alleyne Carbon, now deceased. It happened a few yards from Carbon's home and in the heart of Carbon's stronghold. The situation called for a show of strength. The youth vote appeared critical. I was asked to deliver a message of support from the youth of the southern part of the electoral district. A school friend was

asked to deliver a similar message from the youth in the northern part of the district. Wearing white t-shirts bearing slogans to the effect that “Alliance is the Answer,” we delivered our lines, bringing greetings from our respective neighborhoods. It was our political baptism. I, however, would become a backslider, opting instead for the study of policy rather than the practice of politics. He who brought greetings from the north is currently an elected Member of Parliament for the Cottage constituency and a government minister. He is the Honorable Reginald Austrie.

I would learn something about the realism of Dominicans when in 1980, promising that foreign investors were sitting on ships that were idling in wait just over the horizon, the DFP, led by barrister Mary Eugenia Charles would sweep the polls in a landslide victory. In the Cottage constituency, Alleyne Carbon a public works machinist had defeated Dr. Bill Riviere who had spent several years building labor unions, agricultural cooperatives, and such public works projects as the very popular Para Bridge. The local populace regarded with a measure of suspicion the saintly self sacrifice of a Para Riviere. Here was a man, they said, who was a doctor (Ph.D.), apparent heir to a plot of land and house who was totally absorbed in The Struggle. Here was a big man casting his lot with the little man. Somehow, they, the masses did not buy that vision of socialist utopia in the Caribbean. Or probably they had had their fill with that original little man, Patrick Roland John. From that day on, I have respected the realism of the Dominican masses. They sure know a grand adventure when they see one.

Charles served three five-year terms, each on a smaller majority. Even as her local political fortunes waned, Charles grew larger than life, larger than Dominica, apparently a player in global politics. Charles’ high point in international politics would be her famous eclipsing of President Ronald Reagan in the wake of the invasion of Grenada. Yet, those who have intimate knowledge of goings-on behind the scenes during those heady days of international fame suggest that Charles was surprised by the attention she received during that brief period of rapidly unfolding events on the world stage. However, the economic windfall that Dominicans expected from Charles’ role in the Grenada affair did not materialize. IMF, otherwise known to stand for International Monetary Fund came to mean ‘It’s Mary’s Fault.’ Dominica’s national debt would balloon. Except for a few large projects at the end of her leadership, Charles’ own constituency, Roseau Central would appear to have benefited little from Charles’ national and international prominence. Charles’ DFP would tumble from power in her absence and is presently in its last death throes. The sense was that Dominica was the Judas that got much less than his thirty pieces of silver.

1995 saw the rise of the most spectacular political phenomenon in electoral politics in the Caribbean when a newly formed political party, the United Workers’ Party (UWP) came to power under the leadership of Prime Minister Edison James. UWP’s victory was credited to the personality of its leader, Edison James. James was the antithesis of Charles. Whereas Charles was a Don Quixote of a barrister who had entered political life in defense of the civil rights of Dominicans in the face of an increasingly autocratic DLP, James was a Marlow, Joseph Conrad’s character in *A Heart of Darkness*, obsessed with the proverbial rivets or as we say in Dominica, ‘brass tacks.’ In fact, James had almost no political experience at all, never having been elected even Parent Teacher Association president. James seemed to have heeded the advice to study hard and stay out of politics.

James' background was in the management sciences. Until then, James occupied Dominica's most prominent civil service position, chairman of the island's banana exporting agency, the island's largest export by far. Relieved from his management position by Charles, James came to power after a political crusade that promised Dominicans that they would "Fear No More" the wrath of Eugenia Charles and go from "Crisis To Recovery" with UWP. 'Crisis' referred to the challenges facing the banana industry that were associated with increasingly unfavorable trade relations with a unifying European Union. In short order, however, James, too, would fall out of political favor in large part because not even Mr. Banana could save the banana industry any longer. Ironically, James' government, like Charles' before his, would also be tarnished by association with dubious economic schemes with unsavory local and foreign actors who were redolent of Dominica's first Prime Minister, Patrick Roland John's misadventures with apartheid South Africa and the Ku Klux Klan.

By the year 2000, the formerly anti-communist, anti-Castro Dominica of Eugenia Charles and the pragmatic Dominica of Edison James had a crisis of confidence and of identity. Former Black Power radical, a former friend to Panama's Manuel Noriega and Libya's Muammar Quaddafi, Roosevelt Douglas came to power. Dominica was once again ready to play Cold War politics, that game of grand symbolic gestures in world forums in favor or against East or West as a strategy for receiving economic assistance. Except that the world was no longer bipolar. There was one super power. And economics was the only game in town. Douglas' tenure was marked by personal disappointment. Confidants have suggested that in his final days in office as the documents requiring his signature piled up on the Prime Minister's desk, Prime Minister Douglas recoiled from the pile, promising that he would sign the first one that might have some material impact on the life of Dominicans. Douglas would soon die in office a tragic figure. He seemed at the time to be the last of our Don Quixotes.

Douglas was succeeded in office by a pragmatic Pierre Charles. Pierre Charles seemed the antithesis of Douglas. Pierre Charles brought a deliberate style to his decision-making, leading the country through a series of agreements with the International Monetary Fund. By then, however, Dominicans' appetite for the shallow grandeur that the Trinidadian novelist V. S. Naipaul has depicted so well in his character of Blair in the novel *A Way In The World* was in full effect. The local calypsonians, taking a hint from their audience, parodied Charles' contemplative style, making him say in one popular refrain, "I will look into it" to the point of absurdity. At best, Pierre Charles seemed contemplative, not charismatic. At worst, Pierre Charles appeared to be a man who was overtaken by economic events. Pierre Charles, too, died a tragic figure in public office. Observing twenty years of Dominican politics, sometimes from very close range, at other times from afar has given me cause to reflect on the quality of policymaking on the island. I have come to see the policymaking processes in Dominica as lacking in both vision and focus.

By 2005, I felt that something historic had occurred in Dominica. For the first time in Prime Minister Skerritt, leader of the DLP, someone had come to office who did not grow up in or participate directly in the symbolic politics of Decolonization, Labor Unions, Black Power, Independence or the Cold War. At last, there was a chance for real pragmatism in policymaking in the areas of the economy, education, and foreign affairs. Moreover, my generation had risen to take the reins of political power on the island. My

path had diverged from that of my political peers. I had become an academic. Marked by the symbolic politics of my generation, I studied US education policy especially its relation to social class on the one hand. However, increasingly marked by the Dominicans' disappointments with the large symbolic politics of earlier generations described above, I study how *The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, a signature national policy response to economic globalization is translated into teachers' practice, delivered to students, and why it has failed to close the achievement gap between poor and rich students on the other hand. Today, when I read through Dominica's recent policymaking by the light of the US *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, I hear the admonitions of an older generation of Dominican citizens with a new sense of respect. What I had heard then as an invitation to utter self-absorption, I now regard as pragmatic realism.

Back then, dabbling in politics was as unwise as it ever was. It was downright dangerous to one's personal health. Yet amidst, the campaigns, the slogans, the cheers, jeers, boos, etc. were moments of sober conversation. It was in those more sober moments that an older person, usually a supporter of the rival DFP, probably Mr. A. M. Angol, a shopkeeper, therefore a Marlow, now deceased might warn against the dangers of dabbling in politics. It might cost you a job in the Civil Service, they might say. Beyond the broad warnings of potential victimization, however, was an appeal of a more profound kind, an appeal to the concrete, the mundane, the details. Theirs was an invitation to differentiate between my 'zone of influence' and my 'zone of concern.' To put it crudely, I was not to put my mouth in what did not concern me. It was all well and good to be concerned about the fate of the nation, indeed the world, especially the Third World. However, what I had control over were my study habits. I would be better served studying hard at school and staying out of politics. Or to put it even more crudely, 'hungry man can't share food.'

I find this piece of advice regarding converging one's zone of influence with one's zone of concern to be echoed in Niebuhr's Serenity Prayer cited above:

*God, grant me the serenity
to accept the things I cannot change;
the courage to change the things I can;
and the wisdom to know the difference.*

Today, I find this prayer by an American liberal social justice crusader in the turbulent 1920s in Michigan, the home of the American auto industry, to have particular resonance for the policy environment of the Caribbean in general and Dominica in particular.

*God, grant me the serenity
to accept the things I cannot change;
the courage to change the things I can;
and the wisdom to know the difference.*

I do not mean to equate the individual with a nation. However, there is some validity in the comparison. Just as my concern about the course of elections at which I was too young to vote represented a zone of concern that far exceeded my zone of influence, I see nations of the Caribbean, particularly when acting unilaterally, expending scarce resources in zones of concern that at best strain their capacity to be influential in those zones. This is most pointedly the case with globalization and its ramifications for international relations.

Purpose

This paper acknowledges without reservation the SALISES Call For Papers' assessment of disjuncture in a Caribbean Region comprising, "island economies ...grappling with the consequences of globalization and the accompanying changes in rules of international trade...and facing a serious threat from climate change..." (SALISES Call For Papers, 2006) on the one hand yet displaying optimistic exuberance over the imminent attainment of developed nation status on the other. This paper responds directly to the questions regarding the likelihood of imminent attainment of developed nation status and the paths by which such status may be attained. However, this paper questions the assumption of "limited policy space" that is available to these countries, rejecting both its basis in objective reality and its role as a negative factor in policymaking. As stated above, this paper assumes that the region's concerns already strain the reach of their influence.

Specifically, this paper presents the Commonwealth of Dominica as a case of an island economy that by typifying SALISES' assessment of dissonance illustrates my argument that political and policy entrepreneurs in the Caribbean have at their own peril neglected to play in their zone of influence and have instead focused for too long on a zone of global concern. In so doing, Caribbean political actors from Marcus Garvey through Michael Manley, from Maurice Bishop through Mary Eugenia Charles, and from Patrick Roland John through Roosevelt Skerrit have courted international political adventures that carry serious political and economic risks for the development of their local constituents. In short, this paper calls on Caribbean leaders to transform themselves from Don Quixotes who tilt their lances at global windmills and become Marlows who are obsessed with rivets. What are the windmills? What are the rivets? I will illustrate using examples from multiple sectors.

Background

A small island (300 square miles, 65,000 inhabitants), Dominica is a post-colonial (since 1978), British Westminster-style democratic micro-state (Prime Minister, Cabinet of Ministers, Representatives) with an emerging agricultural economy, a class society, and twenty-eight years as a nominally independent actor in world affairs. As if this political and policy landscape were not sufficiently complex for a twenty eight-year old nation, culturally, Dominica is officially English-speaking. Geopolitically, Dominica is located in the Caribbean Basin, therefore, within the 'backyard' or sphere of political influence of the US which is a receiving country of Dominican immigrants. Further, Dominica, like former Prime Minister Roosevelt "Rosie" Douglas used to say, "is in France." Douglas meant not only that Dominica is situated between the French Departments, Guadeloupe to the north and Martinique to the south and therefore direct administrative regions, not colonies of France. Douglas was referring to the political, economic, social, and cultural pressures that France as a developed economy exerted on Dominica through Guadeloupe and Martinique which are receiving territories for generations of Dominica migrants. Moreover, Dominica is a neighbor of two Spanish-speaking regional geopolitical adventurist powers, Venezuela, with whom Dominica has had territorial issues over Bird Island or Aves Island and Cuba which for all of twenty years has hosted significant numbers of Dominican students. In short, the island's small area, population, and economy mask its political and cultural complexity.

For example, culturally, Dominica is bilingual and bicultural. English is the official language of the country according to the 1978 Constitution, English and the gift

of sight being two criteria for membership in Parliament. However, a French-lexicon Creole is spoken by large segments of the population. There are an *Academie Francaise*-style Creole Committee or *Konmitye Pou Etid Kweyol* within the Cultural Division and a Creole Day on the cultural calendar. Creole usage seems to have widened across the populace since Independence. Creole is the language of its most vibrant cultural and economic product ever, Kadans music or Cadance Lypso, created in the 1970s in Guadeloupe by Dominican migrants Gordon Henderson and Exile One, Jeff Joseph and Grammacks, and others. Gordon Henderson is probably the most recognizable Dominican personality. Cadance music is the basis of the current World Creole Music Festival (WCMF) held in Dominica as part of Independence celebrations. Dominica is therefore a member of both the French Commonwealth, *Agence de Cooperation Culturelle et Technique* and the British Commonwealth. This, however, does not exhaust Dominica's complexity.

Geopolitically, Dominica has been involved in important transnational political movements. Dominica was a major recruitment center for Garvey's United Negro Improvement Association (UNIA) under local leadership, the Black Power Movement and its attendant threats to foreign, read White life and property (recall Desmond Trotter), and part of a second wave of political Independence. Dominica is more than a footnote in the Cold war, having overthrown and replaced its first Prime Minister, Patrick Roland John in a popular uprising that was in part spearheaded by the political Left and sparked by the offer of political asylum to Reza Pahlavi, Shah of Iran. It must not be forgotten, however, that a major cause of John's downfall was his vigorous pursuit of economic relations with then apartheid Republic of South Africa. Dominicans would eventually replace John with Mary Eugenia Charles, the Caribbean Iron Lady who would famously give cover to US President Ronald Reagan, 'inviting' US forces into Grenada in the wake of the bombing of US Marine barracks in Beirut, Lebanon in 1983. Today, Dominica features in seismic shifts on such international issues as the environment, for example in international whaling, in foreign affairs, for example the abandonment of 'friendship' with the Republic of China on Taiwan in favor of the People's Republic of China, and also of President Hugo Chavez' Venezuela.

The demise of Marcus Garvey is known to all informed laypersons in the Caribbean. He was "buried three times," according to the lyric by Burning Spear. The demise of the regional Black Power Movement is also well-known. The meaning of political independence remains quite open today. Dominica was scarred by its involvement with Apartheid. Mary Eugenia Charles would quickly become a spent force, having made little contributions either to women's lives or to the quality of Dominican life in general.

Today, due in part to globalization, the Dominica Freedom Party of former three-term Prime Minister, Mary Eugenia Charles is out of political office and in tatters. Today, its former archenemy, the Dominica Labor Party of former Prime Minister Patrick Roland John is in political office although under new management.

I have summarized this litany of seemingly disparate events in various sectors, trade, foreign relations, the environment, immigration, culture, education, etc. as background to this reading of the events. In each of these events, Dominica, like the dashing figure that dared to ride the tiger without planning on how to get off its back, was overtaken by the events that it chose to participate in. African nations' independence

meant precious little to Caribbean struggles. African Americans' gains were similar. In a matter of years, the US would turn its back on its Cold War allies and extend enormous economic assistance to the former Soviet Union. However, a closer look at the life cycle of a major piece of US education policy that is a response to globalization holds lessons for Dominica and the Caribbean. That piece of policy is *The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) otherwise known as accountability or systemic reform. When seen through the conceptual framework that is presented next, NCLB begins to reveal the mighty US as similarly buffeted by the tides of globalization as Dominica and the Caribbean seem to lament being.

Conceptual Framework

Educational systems have been conceptualized as collegial organizations and as bureaucracies. Alternatively, they have been conceptualized as political organizations and their policymaking systems have been analyzed as forms of political decision-making in which power and social movements play a critical role in policy formation (Baldrige, 1983). For example, Bernstein's (1971, 1973, 1975, 1982, 1990, 2000) theory of symbolic control provides a perspective that explains policy formation as political decision-making. Therefore, the justification of policy entrepreneurs and theorists within the educational accountability movement in the US is that the new accountability is a response to changes in the global economy.

Educational policy shifts are points of sociological interest: they are prisms that reflect the interplay between power and knowledge in society. Bernstein's theory explains the social origins of educational policy shifts in advanced industrialized countries including the USA since the 1960s. The impetus for educational policy change, explains the theory, arises from differentiation in the structure of knowledge, differentiation in the division of labor (for example, automation), the struggle over educational equality, and crisis in social control (crime, drug use, etc.). When seen in this light, globalization either takes on the shades of a larger beast or appears to be a less formidable foe. I choose the latter read.

The Case Of Educational Accountability in the US

In the next few lines, I present the life cycle of a major piece of US policymaking that is a response to globalization. Through its life history, I hope to make the following argument self-evident: that globalization knows no rules but the economic rule of constant innovation. While I wish to lay out similarities in the policy discourses of NCLB with those of the SALISES conference and globalization discourses in the Caribbean in general, for the sake of brevity, I describe conditions that go back only to the 1970s.
Before The Accountability Movement

In the 1970s, the US Civil Rights Movement mounts sustained attacks on the structure of knowledge. The neutrality of knowledge is questioned within critiques of Western rationality and in the search for justice as variously conceptualized within progressive social movements.

In educational policy circles, curriculum integration, the community school movement, multiculturalism, Afrocentric education, and critical education would provoke a backlash among cultural conservative thinkers (Hirsch, Jr., 2000, 1998a, 1998b, 1987; Ravitch, 2001, 1999, 1997; Bloom, 1994) who would attribute to traditional forms of organizing Western knowledge the role of maintaining social solidarity in a nation whose

social fabric they perceived to be under threat by tribal interests. They advocated that its codified form be positioned as official school knowledge.

Working from positions of influence in government, the academy, and think tanks, that is, not from the field of production or economics but from culture and in reproduction, their agenda is realized largely in the disciplinary form (for example, English and Math) of socially organizing knowledge that can be seen at the center of curriculum frameworks (Content Standards, Learning Outcomes, Voluntary State Curriculum), standards, etc., including those of Maryland State.

Contemporaneous with attacks on the structure of public educational knowledge, in the 1970s, pressures for re-organizing educational knowledge such that it become more instrumental are growing. The concept of skill in the American manufacturing sector where operations were atomized and control is displaced towards supervisors is shown to be woefully inadequate in the face of the competitive Japanese style of creating high-trust workers within famously flat organizations. The subsequent decline of the American car industry and the related rise of its Japanese counterpart would rally big business to seek to influence public policy formation in the policy arenas of the State. This is therefore the intersection of economic and disciplinary power. Business' goal would be to regulate education as a way of ensuring a so-called high-quality labor supply. In an alliance between economic and disciplinary power, high-quality labor would be seen as the result of high curriculum standards where standards were a borrowing or re-contextualization of discourses from the world of business and industry.

Finally, the streets of American cities were witnessing successive waves of crime that were highlighted by so-called race riots and the destruction of neighborhoods in several major American cities including Baltimore, Maryland. This crime wave would propel security or law and order and therefore social and political control to the forefront of the American public policy agenda. Schools, the panacea of social ills (Walker, 1977) would be seen as a site from which to rectify or reverse this perfect storm of economic, cultural, and security crises.

Social, cultural, economic, and political strains in American society would be converted into pressures on the educational policymaking structures for closer relationships between schools and their publics. By the mid-nineteen eighties, the accountability movement with its amalgam of cultural, social, and fiscal conservatives and big business would rise quickly and helped to focus attention on teaching, and specifically on its inefficiency, particularly with the poor.

The Rise of The Accountability Movement

Under the umbrella of the accountability movement, signs emerged that the American people had reached a consensus that action was needed to correct the decline of American public education. Finally, the political will to act against this crisis seemed to exist (Barton, 2004). The approach to action, however, would be new. In the last two decades of the twentieth century (1980-2000), broad grass-roots social movements had declined in effectiveness. Instead, policy, a peculiarly elite discourse when compared to broad and direct political involvement in education now seemed to be the preferred tool for remedying working class educational disadvantage. Standards moved to the center of educational policy that is geared at improving the performance of working class students.

Standards, themselves, their origins, their validity, and whether they were practical, have been controversial (Marzano & Kendall, 1996). Yet, from a historical

political perspective, they have been singularly effective in shaping the discursive struggle over what education means in America in the 21st century. Thanks to the accountability movement, education is now largely conceptualized by citizens as a competition for social mobility (Labaree, 1997) by local educational authorities as an amenity that will help tip the balance in attracting desirable companies and workers, and by the State and nation as a factor in comparative economic advantage (NCEE, 1983).

In the 1980s, accountability came to be associated with the notion of “risk,” (NCEE, 1983) and by extension a danger to the most valuable public good, national security (Cohen, 1996). National security is, “one of the most enduring sources of passion in policy controversies” and, “probably the most fundamental political claim” (Stone, 1997, p. 87). Therefore, this framing of education as an economic and cultural pillar of national security raised the political stakes around school performance.

Consequently, standards, specifically higher standards came to be viewed by policymakers and citizens alike as the stand-alone solution to what is purported to be America’s declining political and economic standing in the world.

A key federal impetus for the search for standards was the U.S. Department of Education’s National Commission on Excellence in Education’s Nation At Risk (NAR) report of 1983. Interpretation of the performance of American students on international assessments provided data for that report. “Our nation is at risk,” the report concluded. “Our once unchallenged preeminence in commerce, industry, science and technological innovation is being overtaken by competitors throughout the world.”

By 1996, nearly all States were engaged in drafting curriculum standards. By then, standards as the key tool in improving educational quality had been reformulated into the search for equally higher standards (as expressed through state-wide curriculum frameworks, performance targets, etc.) for all schools and student groups, irrespective of social class background. Further, teachers were hardly brought into the conversation over standards. If anything, teachers seemed to be positioned as the roadblocks to educational reform (NCEE, 1983). In spite of those weaknesses, political support for standards and testing would deepen within the national culture, attaining their high point ten years later, in the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. In short, education researchers agree that the movement comprised at least three waves.

Accountability: The first wave.

Accountability movement seeks to create closer links between schools and society. These early reforms focused on the policy value of accountability or responsibility and required State-wide testing of students and sometimes of teachers. They called for a change to the rhetoric of schooling from a focus on inputs, for example, teachers, instructional materials, etc. to a focus on outputs, for example, standardized test scores (Hess, 1999). The change in focus is referred to as deregulation and results from the belief that regulation failed to produce good schooling (Center for Policy Research in Education [CPRE], 1992).

As part of this early wave, first, students were tested. Next schools were tested. Eventually testing was proposed for school staff (Hess, 1999). However, this accountability-as-testing period was soon characterized as a period of ‘intensification.’ The aim was to do more of what had long been done in schools. Researchers quickly judged this first, so-called accountability wave to be an insufficient response to the calls to deeply reform American schools (Cibulka & Boyd, 20003, p. viii). From this first

wave of reforms, no significant improvement in working class academic performance was perceptible.

Restructuring: The second wave.

The second wave of accountability reforms was centered on restructuring schools. It aimed to restructure schools by improving the professionalism of principals and teachers, for example, by calling for greater teacher involvement in decision-making about school activities such as curriculum (Hess, 1999). Researchers soon came to judge this wave as inadequate to the calls for deep reform. By 1990, researchers were characterizing this wave or so-called restructuring as a “piecemeal” effort (Cibulka & Boyd, 2003, p. viii). Once again, no significant improvement in working class academic performance was perceptible from this second wave of reforms.

Lay decision-making: The third wave and emergence of the new accountability.

The third wave of reform focused on putting schools’ clients in charge of important educational decision making, for example over enrollment. Policies that made it possible for clients to choose the schools that their charges would attend were enacted and community control of schools was attempted (Hess, 1999). For example, in Chicago, Illinois, parent-dominated school boards were constituted that participated in hiring staff (Sebring & Bryk, 2000).

By 2002, systemic reformers were “trying to maintain the momentum of their wave via the vast accountability movement that was coupled to state academic standards and high-stakes testing” (Cibulka & Boyd, 2003, p. viii). By then, accountability-related policymaking was largely a State-level activity.

Federalization of the new accountability: 2002-Present.

A fourth wave of the new accountability is proposed here to account for the federalization of the new accountability in the wake of the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. In 2002, Public Law 107-110 passed into law with overwhelming support from the 107th Congress. The law is sub-titled, “An act to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind (emphasis, mine).” Its passage registered as the high-water mark of the accountability movement. President Bush, Jr. characterized NCLB as, “the cornerstone of my administration” (2002). Others consider it to be, “the most significant federal education law in a generation” (Archer, 2004, p. 1). What a difference five years make!

Today, in 2007, in the run up to the reauthorization of NCLB, the consensus is that the policy is seriously flawed and will need adjustments in several areas. Further, by 2006, the influential National Center on Education and the Economy had already found the NCLB-type reforms had been taken by economic conditions on the ground. Whereas the earlier assumption was that in the 1990s the only segment of the labor market that was globalized was that for low-skill labor, in 2007, a follow-up report found “large numbers of highly educated workers willing to work for low wages” (NCEE, 2006, p. 4, Executive Summary). Economic leadership, the report found, “depends on a deep vein of creativity that is constantly renewing itself” (NCEE, 2006, p. 6).

As if the implications for education were not clear, the report spells it out: “The core problem is that our education and training systems were built for another era, an era in which most workers needed only a rudimentary education” (NCEE, 2006, p. 4).

Nehring (2007) identifies several factors that doom high quality education or as he calls it, ‘thoughtful school practice.’ They are:

- The tendency to view schools as factories.
- The tendency of community fears to drive school reform.
- The tendency to impose plans that look great from above and make little sense at ground level
- The tendency of the system to crush promising innovation.
- The tendency of schools to say yes to all legitimate requests.
- The tendency to promote favored groups to the detriment of others.

The notion of fear driving school reform, that of the education system not being capable of or crushing innovation, and the temptation to use schools to cure all that ails society are particularly relevant for the topic of globalization.

Discussion

When looked at closely, justification for US policy reforms begins to sound familiar. In fact, America ceases to appear to be the giant that it seems to be when viewed from the Caribbean. America even appears to be victimized by world events. Why?

I contend that the principal reason is that globalization is an autonomous force with no world steering body, no world government. This is a seismic shift in international relations. It immediately multiplies the access points into the global economy. However, it reduces political access because there is no longer a major portal to which less fortunate actors may take their begging bowls. Yes, there may be bilateral and multilateral relations, even a multiplicity of transnational partnerships. However, if they are based solely on politics, they will be built on shifting sand. To be sustainable, those relationships have to be built on economic bedrock. Economics, especially efficient production is to be the major game in town. The policy implications for Dominica and the Caribbean are clear. To be surefooted in the global economic marketplace is to be competitive. As Carlson and Troppe (2006) put it, innovation is the key to long-term global competition” (p. 3). What are the policies that might create innovative schools?

This is where we come back to nails, rivets, and brass tacks or windmills and castles in the sky. Be it diplomatic overtures with the two Chinas, with Venezuela, Libya or others, much policy activity appears to be a political response to an economic question. Further, this political response seems to be based in symbolism that unites far flung actors with geopolitical interests, resources, and strategies that seem to strain small islands’ resources for comprehension. The question is what happens when regimes or national self-interest change in Cuba, Venezuela, and China? Moreover, policy activity seems to directed at the symptoms not the causes of the global challenges that the islands face.

Finally, it must be understood by policymakers and policy entrepreneurs as a whole what is called globalization is like the Industrial Era a radical re-inscription of man in the social and economic world. Therefore, it seems that the only credible strategy for coming to terms with this radical reformulation of postmodern man is to reformulate man’s deep structure through education, to think globally but to act locally. Beneath the political demands for a world citizen, the economic demand for an innovative worker, the social demands for a compliant individual, and cultural demands for the information age is the code for a new kind of man. In other words, as was illustrated above, the multiple demands of the State, the economy, society, and culture cannot be met by the surface structures of education, for example curriculum content that exhorts citizens to refrain from criminality, drug use, or political divisiveness. There is not enough time in a school

day for this. Instead, these goals, if adopted by school systems will have to be pursued through integration into the deep structures of schooling, for example innovative forms of curriculum organization and teaching, for instance promoting self-directed learning rather than teacher control of all learning agendas. While the notion of the deep structure may bump up against the specificity of nails, rivets, and brass tacks, this is only in appearance. To respond to the calls for a new man that is delivered through the deep structure of innovative education systems is to first read one's local political, social, and economic, and cultural realities in very precise and realistic ways. For example, it is to know very intimately what the barriers to Dominican hucksters trading in Guadeloupe are. It is to know what the tools of the trade of Tour Guides working in the tourist trade in Portsmouth are. It is to investigate what the challenges of ecotourism in Dominica are. It is to listen to Dominican musicians regarding the challenges they face in reaching their audiences and to respond appropriately. In other words, it is to respond to the world not with fear or anxiety as is suggested by the Guadeloupean folk song that was re-inscribed into pop music to express the region's fear of the EU:

Voici le loup!

[Here comes the wolf!]

Instead, it calls on policymakers to make policy with:

.....*the serenity*

to accept the things I cannot change;

the courage to change the things I can;

and the wisdom to know the difference.

The Serenity Prayer - Reinhold Niebuhr

Bibliography

- Archer, J. (June 9, 2004). Postcard from Independence, MO. Education Week. Retrieved June 06, 2004, from <http://www.edweek.org>
- Barton, P. E. (Ed.). (2003). Parsing the achievement gap: Baseline for charting progress. Princeton, NJ: Education Testing Service.
- Bernstein, B. (1971). Class, codes and control, Volume 1: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (Ed.). (1973). Class, codes and control, Volume 2: Applied studies towards a sociology of language. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). Class, codes and control, Volume 3: Towards a theory of educational transmissions. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1982). Codes, modalities, and cultural reproduction: A model. In M. W. Apple (Ed.). Cultural and economic reproduction: Essays on class, ideology, and the state (pp. 304-355). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). Class, codes and control, Volume 4: The structuring of pedagogic discourse (Rev. ed). Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. & Solomon, J. (1999). Pedagogy, identity and the construction of a theory of symbolic control: Basil Bernstein questioned by Joseph Solomon. British Journal of the Sociology of Education, 20(2), 265-279.
- Bloom, H. (1994). The Western canon. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Cohen, D. K. (1996). Standards-based school reform: Policy, practice, and performance. In Helen F. Ladd (Ed.). Holding schools accountable: Performance-based reform in education (pp. 99-127). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Hirsch, E.D. Jr. (2000). You can always look it up—Or can you? EducationNews.org (Retrieved 03/30/2000).
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1998). The core knowledge series. New York: Doubleday.
- Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1998). The core sequence. Charlottesville, VA: Core Knowledge Foundation.

Labaree, D. (1997). Public goods, private goods: The American struggle over educational goals. American Educational Research Journal, 34, 39-81.

Marzano, R. J. & Kendall, J. S. (1996). A comprehensive guide to designing standards-based districts, schools, and classrooms. Alexandria, VA & Aurora, CO: ASCD & McREL.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Walker, W. G. (1977). What on earth is accountability? In P. R. Chippendale & P. V. Wilkes. (Eds.), Accountability in education. Queensland: University of Queensland Press.