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This essay examines two models of globalization—one that outlines forms of radical resistance to transnational corporate power structures, and another that instructs business people how to participate in transnational finance and commerce—in order to examine how postcolonial theory might usefully inform, transform, or challenge the teaching of communication in M.B.A. programs in the United States. In the 1990s, scholars and activists like Masao Miyoshi offered models of resistance to the development of top-down globalization while writers on business communication, such as David Victor, outlined what we might call avenues of accommodation to a global economy. We might, however, stake out a third option for the ways we negotiate solidarities and subject positions within university—one of the “sites of resistance” that Miyoshi identified in the 1990s: postcolonial haggling. In the specific pedagogical context of teaching management communication, haggling “over” national identities can help us challenge practices that work at the transnation level in order to keep postcolonial national movements in check. What we should recognize is that in an era of globalization, individuals and groups must often turn to national identity as an important if not the only form of self-determination.

I borrow the term “haggling” from Hamid Naficy’s writing on Iranian exile culture in Southern California. Focusing on the liminality of exilic subjectivity, Naficy explains, “Haggling stems from holding two essentially incompatible attitudes simultaneously involving the disavowal and recognition of difference” (Making 9). This ambivalence toward their place within culture allows exiles to avoid being directly hailed ideologically, and to create innovative forms of identity. Similarly, many
students and teachers in the field of management communication find that they must negotiate incompatible attitudes, and often to ignore or deny the dissonance between their nationally imagined experiences and their internationally oriented professional interests. Along with Naficy's concept of exilic identity, Partha Chatterjee's comparison of the spirituality of nationalism with the materiality of statecraft can help us understand how individuals negotiate seemingly incompatible solidarities. Together, Naficy's haggling and Chatterjee's spiritual/material (or interior/exterior) dichotomy can help us complicate multicultural discourses of globalization that tend to transform individuals' real political links to the nation into exchangeable cultural values in a global civil society that has strict economic controls but few or no ways of organizing these real individual political solidarities.

Masao Miyoshi describes transnational corporations (TNC) as the latest version of the international bourgeoisie, a class that erases national borders in order to accumulate more effectively the wealth of nations and peoples. Most importantly, Miyoshi identifies the university as a particularly important social space within which resistance can take place. However, most of us who work in universities are aware, as is Miyoshi himself, that these institutions are also sites where global networks of power converge. In most situations, especially in technical institutions and business schools, the kinds of resistance that Miyoshi calls for seem ineffective because they immediately alienate the audiences they address, and because they fail to engage the discourse of globalization from within its own parlance of commerce and capital. In International Business Communication, David Victor, who is writing at the same time as Miyoshi, defines multinational corporations (MNC) as any and all business groups—or individuals, a more important category for Victor—involved in any kind of cross-cultural or international transactions. The purposes of these two authors are very different. Miyoshi wishes to encourage global labor and student resistance to capital; Victor hopes to help students, teachers, and practitioners of business communication to be more aware of, and not incidentally to profit from, cultural difference. However, it is precisely because of these divergent purposes that I want to bring these two writers together. Reading them together can help us understand our own positions as students and teachers in a global economy that is most often described as a dystopia.

In "A Borderless World? From Colonialism to Transnationalism and the Decline of the Nation-State" and "Sites of Resistance in the Global Economy," Miyoshi argues, in the mid 1990s, that celebrations of a post-
national world society promote and perpetuate neocolonialism. Transnational corporations erase local cultures, destroy natural environments, and affect different regions of the globe unevenly. Furthermore, contrary to the political rhetoric at home, nations like the U.S. and England squelch rather than encourage and promote democratic movements in the Third World. According to Miyoshi, "In this age of technologically altered spatiality, it is now the mobile private corporations, and not the geographically rooted nation-states, that drive the world economy" ("Sites" 63).

This "global" economy is global in an unequal way, of course. First, it affects the North and South unequally (68). For example, the North American Free Trade Agreement's (NAFTA) effects on U.S. and Canadian workers were minuscule compared to its negative effects on South and Central American labor. And while Mexico is slightly better off than nations farther South in the Americas, the per capita income there is only $3,200. Secondly, the political stability required by TNC operations results in the suppression of democratic tendencies within nations whose markets are being tapped. Miyoshi offers the Newly Industrialized Economies of Northeast Asia as examples of how global capital requires local oppression. Thirdly, Miyoshi also discusses economic globalization's destruction of the natural environment as another important factor in uneven development. Again, environmentalist rhetoric at home in TNC-strong nations like Japan, the U.S., and England evinces a disregard for corporate destruction of rainforests in South America. Finally, Miyoshi argues that global businesses destroy local and regional culture. Traditional arts and artifacts become "staged, museumized, collected, or merchandised" (69). Ultimately, the "global" economy is global only in the sense that giant corporations have free access to every place in the world, if they so choose, but the profit motive restricts their expansion. Thus," continues Miyoshi, "there is a vast majority of humanity totally shut out from it. The 'global' economy is, in fact, nothing but a strategy for maximum exclusion" (71).

There is, however, hope for resistance. Since globalism "does not recognize the outside," even those areas that are exploited are on the map (71). Since the nation-state continues to be part of the global map, it can serve as a site of resistance against economic globalism. Despite its drawbacks—its tendencies toward chauvinism, ethnocentrism, and even fascism—the nation-state structure is necessary as a form of mediation between "people" and mobile capital. Miyoshi also identifies international forms of resistance such as possible alternatives to the U.N.,
nongovernmental organizations, and a transnational labor union. However, the first of these, and perhaps the one that will allow for the other three, is the "reclaimed state" (72).

In order to resist the power of TNC's, Miyoshi turns to the possible "uses of the university" (77). He claims that the university remains one of the most conservative institutions within TNC interests—the site of research that advances corporate expansion globally. For example, "British universities are encouraged to recruit more 'overseas' students and postgraduates to compensate for the capping of undergraduate numbers, very much like the state universities in the U.S., such as Michigan and Illinois, that are increasingly more dependent on the out-of-state students who are expected to pay the private-university-level full tuition" (79).

Anyone familiar with the mission of top business schools that award Master's degrees in Business Administration in the United States will find Miyoshi's comments useful and challenging. For example, the William E. Simon School's official profile of the class of 1999 states: "Seasoned with a distinct international flavor, 44 percent of the Class of '99 hails from outside the U.S., representing over 45 countries." Is it possible, in the context of this kind of cultural tourism in the service of global capital, to use the university as Miyoshi has suggested we do? Can those of us who, whether by choice or by necessity, teach in these contexts, "disturb exclusivism of any kind, to forcibly expand and include knowledge and learning, and thereby expose globalism for its exclusivism" as Miyoshi suggests we do (84)? Rather than challenging globalism, any specific course or pedagogy that attempts to disturb, expand, include, and expose in these ways will render itself so alien to the audience it wishes to educate that it will render its own praxis of resistance ineffective. However, a pedagogy of haggling might offer an alternative by which teachers and students become more consciously aware of their own national positionality—and, perhaps, of the internal tension between certain national loyalties within themselves as members of imagined communities, and the reduction of the cultural values and linkages of their ethnic or regional identities to strictly public-relations values and corporate linkages.

This kind of reduction of cultural difference is what Victor endorses in his model of the global economy, one that sees multinationalism as progress in the right direction: inclusiveness and, potentially, mutual understanding between businesses and individuals. My discussion of Victor's book will be more critical than my discussion of Miyoshi's model of the global economy, because I think that the guiding principle
in Victor’s work is what he himself calls “accommodation.” As a counterpart to Miyoshi’s notion of globalism’s “maximum exclusion,” Victor’s model of international communication constitutes a form of maximum ideological inclusion—getting the world to buy into Western conceptions of the individual in culture and civil state and global institutions and groups (rather then national, class, ethnic or other solidarities) as organizing relations between these generally abstract individuals in culture. Thus, while Victor’s approach to international business communication is useful, his universalizing of Western civil society can benefit from the corrective of a postcolonial critique.

Victor suggests that when it comes to international communication, business people become “ethnographers.” Using what he terms a “culture-general” rather than “culture-specific” approach, Victor wants to give business people insights and suggestions that will help them perform transactions and to interact more generally with individual members of or corporate formations from any culture on the globe. Quoting poststructuralist ethnographers and such theorists as James Clifford and Michel Foucault, Victor encourages his readers “to overcome stereotyping by understanding the logic of the way people communicate as a function of their cultures” (Victor 4). Victor points to what he calls a “mindset” (what Geert Hofstede, another theorist of international business communication calls, “mental programming”), a term that refers to the way an individual is “programmed” from infancy into a particular culture and/or ethnic group. Social-constructivist in his approach, Victor relies on Glen Fisher’s idea that “the infant mind is somewhat like a blank tape, waiting to be filled, and culture plays a large part in the recording process . . .” (qtd. in Victor 6). While Victor approaches international communication as an “ethnographer,” he approaches the globe as a Western ethnographer, and his use of Fisher’s “blank tape” analogy comes directly out of the Western notion of the tabula rasa of the abstract individual, and the complementary figure of the noble savage.

The blank-tape idea is anti-essentialist and argues that people are acculturated socially, not biologically, and Victor relies on “linguistic determinism,” not biological determinism to explain cultural and national difference. But while these are useful ways of looking at language and culture as open and contingent, they adopt a cultural relativism that ignores the real imbalances of power around the world and that never really turns the anthropological gaze upon the “Western” self as it looks out onto the world-as-market. Victor’s model—like Hofstede’s—is constructivist rather than essentialist, but it is precisely this aspect of the
theory that allows for the universal reach of a particularly Western and modern capitalist ideology, or what Gayatri Spivak has called “the financialization of the globe” (364).9

In establishing an abstract individual subject at the core of processes of socialization across the globe, Victor constructs culture in strictly Western anthropological and philosophical terms, while simultaneously naturalizing and rendering invisible this Western approach. At the close of his introduction to International Business Communication, Victor defines “international” and “cross-cultural” as synonymous. In effect, he opts for the “universalizing” trend in the dilemma he has just outlined. This universalizing trajectory of Victor’s work has important consequences because it falls back onto a Western notion of the self; it recognizes difference only in order to override it with “accommodation”; it defuses and diffuses national political culture into a general notion of “culture” that derives “value” from difference, circumscribing real and meaningful political differences within the metaphorical and, ultimately, material purview of finance. What I mean here is that Victor’s conception of the global economy is a strategy of maximum ideological inclusion that allows for what Miyoshi calls maximum material exclusion. In this model, specific politicized identities that fall outside Victor’s assimilationist agenda, and especially nationally imagined identities, begin to vanish from a world culture guided by one ideology: free-market capitalism that is assumed to be a natural bedrock of human commonality.

Unlike either Miyoshi or Victor, Partha Chatterjee suggests that national movements can and do borrow elements of the Western humanist tradition and mix them with national traditions of resistance. I want to show that nationalist sentiments bubble up, even in the hallowed halls of a top graduate school of business administration. In contrast to the way schools like NYU’s Stern School of Business and the University of Rochester’s (UR) Simon School define themselves and their international programs, many students retain marginalized national, regional, and even religious affiliations despite participating in TNCs. In accordance with students’ and teachers’ continued expression of sometimes political nationalism, we might redefine our approach to teaching business writing as negotiation or haggling rather than the liberal humanist model of “cross-cultural” communication that works on the level of civil society and interstate (material, external, institutional), rather than truly international (spiritual, interior, individual and social-group), relations. A critically informed pedagogy of haggling provides us with the possibility of getting graduate students in business to become aware of their own
subject positions within, rather than beyond, the nation, and this awareness can help to complicate the tendency in texts like Victor's to fall back on an assumed, naturalized, and invisible liberal humanism that calls for complete cooptation of "other" identities and loyalties.

Among postcolonial critics, there is a strain of anti-anti-essentialist theorizing that can help us question Victor's assumptions about the process of acculturation in a world in which different cultures are situated differently toward the "centers" of political and economic power. The anti-anti-essentialist argument is that the object of colonialism was to erase "essential" national traits of a people and to replace them with universalist ideas of civility. As part of this colonialist epistemology, the idea of a *tabula rasa* does not account for power and difference. However, recognizing effectively essential elements (elements that are really historical but affect self-conceptions that function as ontological essence) might allow for a more complete negotiation of language and identity in international business than is offered by Victor and other liberal pedagogues of business communication, as well as providing a more pragmatic way of negotiating or "haggling" over political concerns in the university than is offered by Miyoshi.

I derive my definition of "haggling" from Hamid Naficy's discussion of how Iranian exiles in Southern California negotiate between U.S. cultures and Iranian cultures to come up with a sense of identity. Haggling and hybridity are crucial to how Iranian producers of television in Los Angeles present themselves to their own community through cable TV "narrow-casting." What is important about Naficy's use of postcolonialism is that he applies it not just to the cultural texts—in this case the television programs—but also to business practices and contexts. His research includes numerous interviews with producers, advertisers, and viewers of Iranian programming. Haggling involves an outer ritual of courtesy and form, and an inner agenda, a hidden price that serves an inner desire for profit and also for self-respect. As we promote an internationalist pedagogy for business writing, we must continue to be aware of, and perhaps even privilege, national or cultural identities without promoting ethnocentrism, and these national concerns are often protected within this inner realm of identity.

While it is important that Naficy focuses on hybridity, liminality, and syncretism, it is more important that he uses the term "haggling" as opposed to "negotiation." Haggling was, and continues to be, an important practice in the bazaars of Iran, Turkey, India, and other West Asian countries. An approach to communication as a form of haggling may help
us understand how international students sometimes resist instruction in standard international business English. Also important in Naficy's use of the term "haggling" is that he is applying it especially to individuals' constructions of politicized national identity as opposed to cultural identities outside their political affiliations. In this way, he offers a way of challenging models of transnationalism that attempt to erase national cultures or to transform them simply into the terrain upon which free market capitalism is unproblematically conducted.

Chatterjee's discussion of anticolonial nationalism can further illuminate how politicized identities are negotiated in a postcolonial context. Chatterjee distinguishes between the colonial state and national culture in India, arguing that the latter potentially reintegrates an indigenous ethos into appropriated Western social forms. For Chatterjee, anticolonial nationalism creates its own domain of sovereignty within colonial society well before it begins its political battle with the imperial power. It does this by dividing the world of social institutions and practices into two domains—the material and the spiritual. The material is the domain of the "outside," of the economy and of statecraft, of science and technology, a domain where the West had proved its superiority and the East had succumbed. . . . The spiritual, on the other hand, is an "inner" domain bearing the "essential" markers of cultural identity. The greater one's success in imitating Western skills in the material domain, therefore, the greater the need to preserve the distinctness of one's spiritual culture. This formula is, I think, a fundamental feature of anticolonial nationalisms in Asia and Africa. (6)

I suggest we become aware of this duality between material (international) motivations and spiritual motivations (that sometimes arise out of national culture), and how this duality affects universities. I'm not arguing that we encourage cultural duplicity in the business communication classroom, but rather that we become aware of and encourage our students to explore the fundamentally incompatible identities they must often use simultaneously as they acquire literacy in the discourse of international commerce. Certainly, the liberal multiculturalist model of business communication across borders will lead to a kind of expertise in global economic discourse and in English as it crosses borders, but students are often aware of the ways in which their own inner spiritual links to the nation as political entity are at odds with their inclusion in crosscultural communities of commerce and economic control, and in an English that they have either not experienced, or experienced in its global
transformations and makeshift manifestations. Often, they want to avoid becoming part of globalization's maximum ideological inclusion. This duality is at the heart of what, borrowing from Naficy, I would call haggling over national identities.

In the context of the teaching of business communication, perhaps a clearer awareness of our own national interests—rather than international flavors—as teachers and students might invigorate our classrooms and allow for a negotiation of what communication standards are in international business. If, as Victor claims, language determines our reality, and if a culture exists in communication rather than through it, then we might help to educate more politically and internationally self-aware M.B.A. graduates if we are more aware of how haggling and negotiation already occur in our classrooms. Classrooms are never free of political stakes, and to reduce these political stakes simply to civil disagreements and cultural difference free of national loyalties is to lose what might be the most transformative and invigorating aspects of pedagogy available to us.

To take just one example, the Simon School of Business admitted the highest percentage of international students of all U.S. graduate schools of business in 1999. Despite this international “flavor,” Simon’s discussion of its place in an international market is fairly border-bound compared to how the Stern School at NYU defines itself. Simon’s mission was “to be a recognized leader in the creation and dissemination of an integrated body of knowledge that has significant impact on managerial education and practice. The School’s educational programs focus on graduating outstanding individuals who are prepared to excel in a dynamic and internationally competitive marketplace” (“Representing”). This focus on excellence and leadership in international competition suggests the legacy of the old mercantilist dream of controlling the earth’s resources—in this case, the world’s great management minds.

A kind of cultural tourism marks Simon’s vision of itself and can be clearly seen in the following passage from “Representing a Global Marketplace,” from Simon’s web information from 1999: “This series of lunchtime seminars is sponsored by students who serve traditional cuisine and provide a ‘flavor’ of what life is like in their home countries. By learning more about the unique aspects of the economies, cultures, politics and business practices of each region, students gain a newfound respect for each other that enhances their educational experience.” Simon, then, represented a marketplace rather than established a community. This description again gestures rhetorically toward inclusion, open-
ness, and cooperation, but it ends by almost dismissing the substantive effect the international community might have on conceptions of the global economy.

As part of Simon’s required course on Management Communication (MGC) 401—the first of a two-term sequence—students were required to give a “narrative presentation” as their first project for the course. The narrative was meant to assess the communication abilities that students brought to the class. The assignment was open-ended and un-graded, and it fell outside of the program’s otherwise intensely competitive and grade-conscious format. Finally, this was an oral presentation that did not require the use of PowerPoint or other information technologies. This assignment, more than any other in the program, allowed for expressions of identity that negotiate what Chatterjee would call the “inner” or “spiritual” often national, but also gendered or ethnic self of the student with the “outer” context of international business. While it would seem that more of this kind of assignment—perhaps a written narrative as well as this oral one—might detract from the more formal training in writing reports that is part of the management communication curricula of many M.B.A. programs, constructing more of these kinds of open-ended assignments might expose the business communication classroom to the kinds of transformative pedagogies (transformative of teacher and student, of context and of text) that we ought to be encouraging and practicing.

The usual purpose of professionalizing business students is to teach them either to erase their own cultural differences or to transform their identities into innocuous aspects of their international flavor that can be marketed in corporate contexts. And in Victor’s or in Hofstede’s approach, the pedagogical theory is to teach “sensitivity” to cultural difference and how others have been “programmed” into their various cultures. What might be more useful, and might allow for sites of haggling and negotiation of political and/or national identities (as opposed to sites of resistance) is to allow political solidarities and national linkages to become more a part of the discourse of the classroom. Negotiations of self-representation among participants of these classes do allow for haggling, a strategy of self-construction that should be encouraged rather than discouraged.

A few examples might help illustrate this point. One student, for example, expressed in her first narrative presentation her solidarity with fellow Dominican women entrepreneurs in New York City, where she was involved in a non-governmental organization that assisted women
who needed assistance in their education or in starting their own mall businesses. It is clear from this example that identitarian haggling *does* occur, and it does refer to national and, in this case, gendered political affiliations and solidarities that challenge the usual totalitarian trends of global capital.\(^\text{13}\) Another student “haggled” with Western notions of national and cultural “development” when, in his narrative presentation, he described his own nation—Guinea—as having, like the rest of Africa, to “catch up” with the West. While caught in the neocolonial discourse of progress, modernization, and development, this student’s language clearly represented an attempt to negotiate his national identity into the discourse of the course and to express a self that would otherwise go unrecognized. Finally, perhaps the most telling narrative account, one that attended not only to nation but also to narrative itself, was a presentation by a Turkish student who described the day when he, age nine, was saved from drowning, literally, by Yashar Kamal, one of Turkey’s foremost modern writers. The presentation led into a discussion of Kamal as a national writer, and thus opened the classroom up to haggle over the kinds of language that are important, what specific narratives of self are essential, and how cultural figures are also often *national* figures, a notion with which American students are often less familiar.

These remarks remain speculative, but they do point to a new and potentially transformative avenue of research in postcolonial theory and professional communication in the context of a global economy. While schools like NYU’s Stern School of Business giddily celebrated in the late 1990s the global economy as a “rapid[ly] moving vortex of diverse cultures, societies, and economies” we should remain wary of the universalizing and potentially new imperialist tendencies of this vortex (“Home”). Stern and other schools “relish” the “flavor” of the globe as the ultimate object to be consumed and traded. Those inside academe—those potential sites of resistance that Miyoshi has identified—should “disrupt” the comfortable contentedness of a global economy and a universalizing civil society, but we should do so in pragmatic ways that do not simply alienate us from the community of learners of which we are a part. But these forms of resistance must, as Miyoshi observes, be given sites of emergence. Obviously, the political is part of the economic, as Stern’s web-page unabashedly proclaims: “The International Business Area at Stern relishes this mix, studies its meanings, and contributes to its *policy* outcomes. We are a school without physical boundaries” (“Home”). Unless we try to challenge the tacit assumptions about the natural
environment, and the consumerization of cultural difference behind the idea of "relishing" the planet, the idea of a school without boundaries reads like a threat rather than a promise.

While Victor's notion of accommodation does provide some very useful groundwork for mutual understanding between diverse cultures, his theories can most often be used to co-opt and incorporate, or erase and suppress, the motivations and desires of those from peripheral cultures. On the other hand, while Miyoshi's notion of sites of resistance in American universities promises a grassroots challenge to the ravages of globalization, it seems out of touch with the day-to-day contingencies that many of us in the academy have to face. The concept of haggling might prove useful for understanding how we, as teachers and students, are implicated in global networks of power. It might also help us position ourselves as teachers and to engage students who are, in fact, part of transnational networks but who, undeniably, retain ethnic and national links not always aligned with their class links, and that have political as well as civil and cultural implications.

The business-writing classroom will certainly not overturn the massive material and ideological reach of transnationalism. However, awareness of national and even sub-national links in our own lives and in the lives of international students can allow for a kind of haggling that does not simply assimilate them into an internationalized civil discourse of globalization. Haggling can begin to transform the language of international trade so that it is less liable to erase the identities of workers and consumers with whom these international business students are linked through the still-important political formation of the nation.
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Notes

1. According to Bamyeh, global networks of capital encourage increasingly centralized and tightly controlled transnational economic coordination while at the same time fostering anarchy within national and across international politics (Bamyeh 5).

2. See also, Naficy, "Autobiography."

3. Naficy's idea is similar to what Michel de Certeau has called the "dispersed, tactical, makeshift creativity of groups or individuals," a kind of "antidiscipline" that allows users or consumers of a dominant ideological
machinery to "make do," to combine and utilize modes of consumption that cut against the grain of intended ideological purpose. See de Certeau, *Practice* xv.

4. In *The Ends of Globalization*, Mohammed Bamyeh argues that one of the strongest forms of resistance to global economic control is not the nation but, rather, *life-emancipatory movements* such as gay rights activism, youth culture, and truly alternative musical forms, among other movements. These links do, indeed, go beyond national boundaries, and are more effective than the other types of solidarity that Bamyeh mentions (spiritual movements, class solidarities, and global causes) (157). Bamyeh's ideas seem all the more pertinent today after September 11, 2001 and the Bush Administration's nation-building abroad and attack on civil liberties at home because Bamyeh's international links resist a reentrenchment of national chauvinisms and their resulting totalitarian tendencies that seem apparent today. However, a return to the nation can be an important step in transforming and challenging the economic controls of spaces and identities. Furthermore, these life-emancipatory movements themselves often work at the level of national policy change, so that my discussion of postcolonial haggling of national identity can complement international links like the ones Bamyeh and Gayatri Spivak examine.

5. Victor's text is representative of the more sophisticated books written in the area of international management communications. More traditional systems-based approaches include the work of Schultz and Kitchen, in which the authors reduce the international communication situation to four elements: digitization, information technology, intellectual property, and communication systems—all of which exclude complexities of culture. More critically informed texts in this field include O'Hara-Devereaux and Robert Johansen; Lewis; and Ali. This last title is closest, in its critical and theoretical rigor, to Victor's work. Ali presents a fairly critical sense of the colonial history of globalization. Nevertheless, he challenges the work of anti-globalization activists as being guided by "a dangerous obsession" (x). He argues that executives of MNCs can and should be viewed as potential benefactors of the global markets they manage: "Global executives, with their practical judgment and sensitivity to global concerns, are more qualified than any other leaders to assume new roles that ultimately will contribute to building a better world" (xi). These kinds of claims should be taken seriously by those, like Miyoshi, interested in formulating a critical praxis that seeks to identify the abuses of globalization. At the same time, those who teach management communication ought to consider postcolonial critiques of the liberal humanist assumptions underpinning all of the works I've sited in this note.

6. A view taken even by capitalist pundits like George Soros in *The Crisis of Global Capitalism*.

7. Miyoshi's account has its popular counterparts, and these have proliferated since the well publicized encounters between the World Trade Organization, and labor, environmental, and other anti-globalization activists in recent
years. See, for example, Walden Bello’s *The Future in the Balance*, Sarah Anderson’s *Views from the South*, and Chellis Glendinning’s *Off the Map*, to name only a few.

8. For a point of comparison with Victor, see Hofstede. Hofstede draws on modern and postmodern anthropology, positing the notion that all people are mentally programmed by family, institutions, and organizations. The book offers a catalogue of fifty nations and gives the would-be crosscultural manager the tools with which to effect what Victor would call total inclusion.

9. Spivak attempts to define sites of resistance to the “financialization of the globe” that avoid the dichotomy between transnationalism and multiculturalism—a dichotomy in which the latter does little to resist its cooptation into the former. She focuses on sites of resistance that are more local than the nation—such as Indian and Australian Aboriginals. However, she also suggests that in order to resist cooptation migrant gendered intellectuals like herself must keep their own national origins in mind as they challenge and critique the material culture produced by the link between TNCs and foreign direct investment: “It may be a material challenge to the political imagination to rethink their *countries of origin* not only as repositories of cultural nostalgia but also as part of the geopolitical present, *to rethink globality away from the U.S. melting pot*. The possibility of persistently redirecting accumulation into social redistribution can be within their reach if they join globe-girdling Social Movements in the South *through the entry point of their own countries of origin*. Liberal multiculturalism [like that espoused by Victor] without global socialist awareness simply expands the U.S. base, corporate or communitarian” (402; emphasis added).

10. This resistance occurs at a very real practical level as noted by Leki in. While the kind of pedagogical resistance that Leki identifies among ESL students is not *political*, we should consider how national identities, in addition to language-acquisition issues, enter into forms of practical classroom resistance.

11. Naficy’s “Autobiography” outlines his concept of haggling, but it is in *The Making of Exile Cultures* that this notion can take on added significance for teachers of business communication, because it is in the latter that Naficy shows us what is, at bottom, a marketplace—the world of ethnic cable, “narrow-cast,” and satellite television production and distribution in Southern California. Within this marketplace Naficy identifies distinctly ideological negotiations in which Iranian political groups, from exiled royalists to leftist Iranian Muslims, engage.

12. This information is based on Simon’s curriculum in 1999.

13. I use “totalitarian” here in the way that Bamyeh defines it: “not in the traditional and widely misused sense of the term but in reference to a vision of governance as an *embodiment in the last resort* of the meaning and mission of a collective social body” (3).
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