NEO-LIBERAL DAN PRAKTIK PENDIDIKAN
At least three…

Far Left  Centre-Left  Centre  Centre-Right  Far Right
Spectrum Idiologi Politik:
The standard **linear** model
Ideas associated with different fields of political spectrum

The Right:
Conservatism – preserve the status quo, oppose change
Reaction – throw back the forces of change, restore the old order
Fascism – mobilize the nation for war, suppress pluralism to achieve unity through orthodoxy

The Left:
Radicalism – go to the roots of problems, change the foundations of society
Socialism – advance the interests of society against the interests of elites
Communism – abolish private property to achieve equality and social harmony, suppress pluralism to achieve unity through orthodoxy

The Centre:
Liberalism – expand the scope of freedom, accept change, assert the primacy of individual rights, develop market economy and political pluralism
Borrow ideas from Left and Right
Spectrum Idiologi Politik:
The \textit{2-dimensional} model

- Market
  - Welfare state liberalism
  - Social democracy
  - Market socialism
  - Neoliberalism
  - Market authoritarianism

- State
  - State socialism
    - (Communism)
  - Fascism
White – elitist (discourage popular participation in politics)

Red – populist (mobilize the masses)

Elitism vs. populism
For or against liberal democracy

White - reject liberal democracy

Red - support liberal democracy

Neoliberalism

Welfare state liberalism

Social democracy

Democratic socialism

Reform communism (market socialism)

Totalitarian communism

Fascism (national socialism)

Neoconservatism

Traditional conservatism

Ultraconservatism
• Class and Capital: incessant capitalist demand for cheaper and cheaper labour and labour power. The essential class-based (albeit ‘raced’ and gendered class) nature of capital
• Class War from Above. (ref David Harvey book). Neoliberal and Neoconservative Capitalism and its aims and policies
• Ideological and Repressive State Apparatuses (ref. Althusser). How Capitalism reproduces it
• The (‘raced’ and gendered) class impacts of neoliberal capital policy: impoverishment, immiseration, hierarchicisation of provision (education, health, pensions), assault on individual pay, work conditions, trade unions
• Neoliberalism and Education: common features: commercialisation, pre-privatisation, privatisation, conservative conforming, technicist vocational non-critical education.
• Impacts of Neoliberal Capital on Workers’ pay, rights, conditions: casualisation, pay, reductions in the social wage (benefits/pensions), assault on trade union rights
• Resistance to neo liberal capital: Latin America, Western Europe, in Australia
• Ideological/Organisational forms: Social Democracy cf Marxist analysis; qualitative change in social democracy (eg Blair’s New Labour)
• Idea dari neo-conservative → kurikulum nasional, ujian nasional, standarisasi
• Neo-Liberalisme sbg kebijakan ekonomi telah berkembang amat pesat 30 tahun terakhir
• Liberalism can refer to political or economic ideas
• the abolition of government intervention in economic matters, encouraged "free" enterprise," "free" competition, free for the capitalists to make huge profits as they wished
• Adam Smith
• the Great Depression of the 1930s led an economist named John Maynard Keynes to a theory that challenged liberalism as the best policy for capitalists → full employment → newdeal → Developmentalist
• Krisis ekonomi kapitalis → kembali ke liberal → neo liberalism
CIRI UTAMA NEO-LEBERALISME

1. THE RULE OF THE MARKET
2. CUTTING PUBLIC EXPENDITURE FOR SOCIAL SERVICES
3. DEREGULATION
4. PRIVATIZATION
5. ELIMINATING THE CONCEPT OF "THE PUBLIC GOOD" or "COMMUNITY" and replacing it with "individual responsibility."
Neo-liberalism

• Political economy
  – devotion to the market place
  – homogenization of culture
  – disregard of human rights
  – concentration of power
  – International Criminal Court, World Bank, Iraq…
  – fear of not participating in war (“alliance in the war against terrorism”) → enhanced patriotism
  – role of media
  – diminished distribution of resources (“Wall Mart(ization)”)
For neoliberals, `profit is the God', not the public good. Plutocrats are not, essentially, or even commonly, philanthropic.

In Capitalism it is the insatiable demand for profit that is the motor for policy, not public or social or good. With great power comes great irresponsibility.
Neo-liberalism in education

- Free-market support and ideology
- Standardization of testing, curriculum, outcomes (Conservatism)
- Privatization
- Efficiency
- Employability as an ideology
- Business involvement in all aspects of education
- Diminishing place for democracy, citizenship and social justice
- Military connection to education (recruitment, curriculum)
- Nebulous notion of accountability (i.e., BLBI)

MENGHADAPI KRISIS

Neo-liberal → kem
Bangkan daya saing

Neo-Conservatives →
Kembali dan kuasai
Ilmu pengetahuan
Neoliberal Global Capitalism and Education

Within Education the Agenda of Capitalist for/in Education comprises a:

1. Reduction in Expenditure on Public Education Services
2. Capitalist Agenda for Schooling and Education - the production of hierarchically skilled and ideologically quiescent labour power
3. Capitalist Agenda in Schooling and Education - through pre-privatisation and privatization, to make profits out of it
4. New Public Managerialism mode of organisation and surveillance/ control
5. Capitalist Agenda for Education Business - British and United States (and other leading local capitalist states’) based corporations in the vanguard of privatisation and profit taking internationally
6. Differentiated Schooling and Education
7. Cheaper Teachers and Workforce
BAGAIMANA DENGAN PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA ???

Cenderung mengikuti pola neo-liberal
Around the world, neo-liberalism has been imposed by powerful financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.

In the United States neo-liberalism is destroying welfare programs; attacking the rights of labor (including all immigrant workers); and cutting back social programs.
The beneficiaries of neo-liberalism are a minority of the world's people. For the vast majority it brings even more suffering than before: suffering without the small, hard-won gains of the last 60 years, suffering without end.

Restructuring of schooling and education has taken place internationally under pressure from local and international capitalist organisations and compliant governments.
The marketisation of education has deformed a number of aspects of education: its goals, motivations, methods, standards of excellence and standards of freedom in education.

The restructuring of the schooling and education systems across the world is part of the ideological and policy offensive by neo-liberal Capital. The privatisation of public services, the capitalisation and commodification of humanity.
The capitalist class in Britain and the USA have:

1) a Business Plan *for* Education: this centres on socially producing labour-power (people’s capacity to labour) for capitalist enterprises,

2) a Business Plan *in* Education: this centre on setting business ‘free’ in education for profit-making,

3) a Business Plan for Educational Businesses: this is a plan for British and US based Edubusinesses to profit from international privatising activities.

For neo-liberals, ‘profit is God’, not the public good.

Privatised utilities, such as the railway system, health and education services, free and clean water supply are run to maximise the shareholders’ profits, rather than to provide a public service.
Free-market model is not a free market at all

The 'market model' that we have today is really the system that benefits the 'global corporate market'

Thus, opening education to the market, in the long run, will open it to the corporate giants, in particular US and British based transnational companies - who will run it in their own interests.
the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and other `global clubs for the mega-capitalists´ are setting this agenda up in education across the globe, primarily through the developing operationalizing and widening sectoral remit of the GATS, the General Agreement on Trade in Services.
PERBEDAAN PEND & PASAR

- Tujuan
  - Terbuka, milik bersama, memperbanyak partisipan.
  - Motivasi utama adalah apa yang diinginkan atau tidak diinginkan untuk dipelajari.
  - Kebebasan bagi siap saja untuk menentukan dan mencapai apa yang telah ditentukan.
  - Bagaimana minat pesertadidik dan upaya untuk dapat memenuhi minatnya.
  - Kebebasan bertanya, menjawab, mengemukakan pendapat

- Motif
  - Akumulasi modal dan menyisihkan yang lain, sehingga bisa menguasai modal sendiri.
  - Pencapaian kepuasan yang diinginkan merupakan motivasi utama.
  - Jual beli dengan harga yang disetujui.
  - Bagaimana barang diproduksi dan dapat dijual.
  - Kebebasan untuk dapat menguasai dan memenuhi apa yang diinginkan

- Metod

- Stand excel

- Freedom
How does education fit into the neo-liberal agenda?

Teachers are dangerous because they are intimately connected with the social production of labour-power, equipping students with skills, competences, abilities, knowledge and the attitudes and personal qualities that can be expressed and expended in the capitalist labour process.
the State needs to control the process pendidikan for two reasons. First to try to ensure that this occurs. Secondly, to try to ensure that modes of pedagogy that are antithetical to labour-power production do not and cannot exist.

The capitalist State will seek to destroy any forms of pedagogy that attempt to educate students regarding their real predicament - to create an awareness of themselves as future labour-powers and to underpin this awareness with critical insight that seeks to undermine the smooth running of the social production of labour-power. This fear entails strict control, for example, of the curriculum for teacher education and training, of schooling, and of educational research.
Neo-Liberalism and its Effects

Neo-liberal policies both in the UK and globally have resulted in

- a loss of Equity, Economic and Social Justice
- a loss of Democracy and democratic accountability
- a loss of critical thought within a culture of performativity.

The gap between the richest and the poorest in the USA, expressed in terms of the income of CEOs in relation to the poorest groups in society was 30:1 in 1970, 60:1 in 1990, and by 1997-98 had grown to 500:1 - without perks (Myoshi, 2002). Susan George (2001) has pointed out that
The economic apartheid nature of capitalism has been widely exposed in the work of Peter McLaren (e.g. 2000). To give an USA example, the top 1 percent of the richest people have wealth—financial wealth—equal to the bottom 95 percent.

In Brazil the richest 10% of the population are 78 times better off than the poorest 10%, the 20 biggest landowners own more land than the 3.3 million small farmers (Socialist Worker, 2002).
Miyoshi has pointed out the exponential nature of the growth in inequalities, showing that in 1900 the gap in per capita wealth between the richest countries and the Third World was around 5:1, in 1970m it was still only 7:1, by 1990 it was 260-360:1, by 2002 it has become 470-500:1 (Miyoshi, 2002). Living standards in the least developed countries are now lower than thirty years ago. 300 million people live on less than a dollar a day.
Neoliberal Capitalism and Increasing Inequalities of Wealth and of Income

... a reflection of, firstly, a right-wing, neo-liberal social and economic agenda, aimed at:

- downsizing the state
- up fronting the role of big business in political and social affairs
- debilitating the unions
- lowering the cost of labour
- diluting the social support systems.
Impacts of Neoliberal Capitalism

The effects of neoliberal capitalism are:
1. increasing (racialised and gendered) social class inequality within states
2. increasing (racialised and gendered) social class inequality between states
3. degradation and capitalisation of humanity
4. environmental degradation impacting primarily in a social class related manner
5. suppression of critical and oppositional thought through both ideological and repressive state apparatuses
6. the sidelining and reduction of site-based, of local, and of national democracy and democratic control and governance
7. weakening key working class organisations such as trade unions and democratically elected municipal government
8. worsening pay, benefits and working conditions of workers in education- the intensification of labour and of the extraction of surplus value from workers’ labour power. (Hill, 2005a).
Once more on neoliberalization

- **Neoliberalization as process**
  - As an abstract tendency, this will be associated with unevenly realized effects (cannot simply be defined by empirical generalization)
  - And this process is contradictory; in practice, increasingly consumed in managing its own contradictions

- **Neoliberalism as discourse**
  - It rests on—and partly made coherent by—discursive formations organized around narratives of competitive progress, individual freedom, and state failure
  - These mobilize liberation narratives and market teleologies

- **Neoliberalism as practice**
  - While the rhetorics appeal to a utopian free-market system, in practice this requires continuous statecraft
  - Neoliberalization, consequently, is focused on the nexus of statecraft and market-making
Claims, contradictions, caveats

- Neoliberalism is not a force of nature, but a capital-centric political project
- It is contradictory and flawed, but at the same time deeply entrenched and adaptable
  - Local failures can be surmounted
  - The “rules of the game” have been neoliberalized
- Fault lines and contradictions
  - Contradictory dependency on the state power
  - Tensions between economic rationalism, social conservatism, and cultural liberalism
  - Proneness to financial instability
  - Erosion of working-class consumption
  - Contingent class formation?
  - Repoliticizing centers of neoliberal decisionmaking
Open questions (*after neoliberalism*)

- How far can we—and should we—stretch the concept of neoliberalization?
  - Beyond its political economic *essence*?
  - What if this “essence” is predicated on extra-neoliberal flanking mechanisms?
  - Does neoliberalism contain its own “double movement” of market-making and market-containment?

- What significance should we attribute to local failures or, or transformations in, neoliberalism?
  - Are some “hybrids” more extralocally significant than others?
  - What does the continued evolution of hybrids reveal about neoliberalization-in-the-abstract?

- Are “softer” variants of neoliberalism, often posing as third-way pragmatism, more or less pernicious?