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Abstract  
This article reviews how introductory textbooks on criminology, geared toward the American market, have disproportionately ignored the subject matter of state crime. The authors present both qualitative and quantitative empirical evidence of coverage given to crimes of the state from leading introductory textbooks, and then pose several questions for future research that could provide answers as to why this is the case. Ross and Rothe then contacted the authors of these books to request feedback on their decision-making processes used for content inclusion and/or exclusion; specifically why their texts offered only limited coverage on state crime. The authors conclude that market dynamics, coupled with professional insufficiency, has contributed to this state of affairs.
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Introduction  
Textbooks serve various functions. One of the most important objectives involves framing the discussion in important academic disciplines by defining the boundaries for the inclusion and exclusion of appropriate discourse. Over the past two decades, criminologists have explored the basic content of introductory books in criminology and criminal justice (e.g., Tunnell, 1993; Wagner, 2006; Wozniak, 2001; Wright, 2000; Wright and Schreck, 2000). Predictably, certain topics in the criminology/criminal justice curriculum are emphasized, while others are minimized. This is a crucial point that can have significant ramifications for students, scholars, and the field of criminology. Introductory textbooks are often the first exposure students receive to any given subject matter. As such,
these tools provide a framework for interpreting the field of criminology and criminal justice in both academic and practical/practitioner circles. Although recent studies (Wagner, 2006) provide empirical support for the neglect of subfields within critical criminology in introductory textbooks, such studies have also ignored state crime as an area within critical criminology. Nonetheless, over the past two decades, scholars have produced a steady amount of research on state crime (e.g., Barak, 1991; Friedrichs, 1998; Friedrichs and Friedrichs, 2002; Kuzlarich and Kramer, 1998; Kramer and Michalowski, 2006; Kramer et al., 2005; Mullins and Rothe, 2008; Ross, 2000a, 2000b, 2002; Rothe and Friedrichs, 2006; Rothe and Mullins, 2006). As one of the most devastating and costly types of crime, state crime would seem an appropriate topic to somehow make its way into most, if not all, of the leading introductory textbooks on criminology. One need not perform a rigorous empirical study to notice that few of the introduction to criminology books aimed at the American undergraduate criminology student deal in a systematic fashion with the problem of state crime. Then again, one cannot totally dismiss this kind of inquiry.

Building upon two previous studies conducted by the authors that explored the difficulties of teaching state crime to undergraduate and graduate students (Ross and Rothe, 2007) and the representation of state crime in movies (Rothe and Ross, 2007), it seemed a natural progression to analyze the marginalization of the subject matter within criminology textbooks. This analysis is especially appropriate given that the authors found that the focus on ‘mainstream’ street crime in the criminology and criminal justice academic curriculum acted as an additional barrier to the legitimacy of the topic itself within a typical American university (Ross and Rothe, 2007; Rothe and Ross, 2007). In order to shed more light on what we believe is a glaring omission of textbooks and recent studies critiquing the coverage of critical criminology within these texts (Arrigo, 1999), the authors perform a content analysis of the top-selling criminology textbooks to provide quantitative and qualitative descriptions of such omissions (Krippendorf, 1981). This is followed by a discussion presenting several exploratory questions as to why state crime is either omitted from or marginalized within introductory criminology texts for future research.

Methods

The authors chose the leading introductory to criminology texts as the focus of interest (see list in Appendix). From this list, we selected the top texts dated 2004 or later. In order to determine the most frequently used texts, we reviewed at Amazon.com sales rankings, recognizing that this web site is an imperfect indicator for this kind of data. For a comparison of the results retrieved at Amazon, we looked at comparable sites that sell college textbooks. Based on their ability to rank/order the texts by popularity, we used E-campus and Alibris for confirmation that our findings from Amazon were reflective of classroom sales. We then went one step further and contacted some of our regional sales textbook representative and asked.

1) What is their leading sales criminology textbook? and
2) What text is their largest competitor?

The responses from the representative corresponded with the findings from Amazon, Alibris, and E-campus.

We should note the number of hits retrieved during the general search (in Fall 2007) for criminology textbooks based on popularity: E-campus resulted in 1176 hits; Alibris had 500 hits; and the Amazon search produced 258 hits. The results from these searches included multiple texts by the same author (e.g., Larry Siegel’s several editions, including Theories, Patterns, and Typologies: Juvenile Delinquency: The Core, and Introduction to Criminal Justice). Additionally, not all best-selling intro textbooks in the field of criminology are the same. For example, author Siegel and his publisher produce three different versions of his popular introduction to criminology texts geared to different markets, such as community colleges and universities. Further, some of these textbooks integrate both criminology and criminal justice (i.e. Adler et al., 2006). Amazon, E-campus, and Alibris not only included multiple authors and texts older than 2004, but also books that were not general introductions to criminology (e.g., Criminology at the Crossroads: Feminist Readings in Crime and Justice).

Based on this finding, the authors removed multiple texts from the original search. As such, the margin between the top-ranking text and the seventh leading text often left a gap of 15 to 25 other books under the heading of ‘criminology textbooks.’ The text rankings used for the selection process also corresponded with the regional sales representatives’ impressions concerning their leading texts and competition. By verifying our selection process with two other textbook outlets and the feedback provided by the publishers’ regional representatives, we believe our selection criterion to be representative of the leading criminology textbooks. Moreover, our final rankings and decision to use the seven leading texts concurred with recently published articles that offered content analyses of criminology texts.

The rubric by which the data was coded included five primary questions:

1) Did the text cover crimes of the state?
2) If so, how much coverage was given?
3) How were state crimes introduced? In other words, were they conceptualized as an area within white-collar crime (WCC), political crime, or governmental crime, treated as a stand-alone topic, or some other form?
4) Did the text present a theoretical framework for state crime analysis? and
5) Were the ‘state crimes’ covered by the text reflected in state crime literature (e.g. are they defined as social harms or legalistic and/or are they mere occupational crimes versus organizational state crime)?

We then performed a content analysis, providing quantitative descriptive statistics. This coverage was measured by:
1) the number of words for texts that contained fewer than five pages devoted to state
crime, and
2) print by paragraphs (after having done a comparison of words included in each line
and number of lines per paragraph).

Although similar studies (see Wagner, 2006) have operationalized coverage by centimeters of print, the authors believe that the utility of this kind of metric can be questioned because of the differences in font type among each publisher. Additionally, the researchers coded the specific types and/or any examples of state crime that were included in the texts to identify any patterns or trends of the coverage.

Findings

Not surprisingly, our results coincide with research findings on the marginalization of critical criminology in textbooks and leading journals (Arrigo, 1999; Wagner, 2006; Wright and Schreck, 2000). Within the most current and popular introduction to criminology texts, state crime received minimal attention. Additionally, these books:
1) never included the subject of state crime within the larger umbrella of white-collar
crime or as a separate field of study;
2) did not include a history of the criminological inquiry into crimes of the state;
3) omitted any theoretical framework to address state crime – unlike the significant coverage
given to theories that are supposed to explain traditional street crime; and
4) generally used similar or historic case studies like the Watergate break-in (1972) or the
illegal sale of weapons in the Iran-Contra episode during the Reagan Administration
(1980–88) when mentioning crimes of the state (whether directly as such or integrated as
a form of terrorism or political crime).

Thus, when authors cover this topic, they usually present a series of incidents or examples
where state crime has occurred, failing to provide the contextual, theoretical, and histor-
tical factors associated with this subject.

We begin our discussion of findings by providing a brief synopsis of the coverage and
findings of state crime, beginning with the texts that provided the least amount of cov-
erage and proceeding to the most. From this, we provide an aggregate discussion of the
findings and their relevance to teaching state crime to undergraduate students.

Leading Criminology Texts

Leonard Glick's Criminology (2005) did not address state crime in any form. The topic
of white-collar crime was addressed in a limited manner (2005: 297–316); however, the
vast amount of this coverage focused on occupational crimes including topics such as
embezzlement, employee pilferage, home improvement and real estate frauds, health
care fraud, securities fraud, tax fraud, and computer crime. Exceptions include the brief

mention of environmental crimes committed by corporations (e.g. illegal waste dumping).
Obviously, with no coverage of state crime, Glick does not acknowledge or discuss the
etiological forces or provide any sort of theoretical models or policy implications.

Like Glick, Frank Schmalleger's Criminology Today (2006) ignores all forms of state
crime. Schmalleger also dedicates some coverage (2006: 400–417) to the broader topic
of white-collar crime, including occupational and corporate offenses. Included in the
examples are the more recent cases of Enron, Arthur Anderson, Bristol Meyers, etc. As
with Glick's coverage, however, the chapter is divided into two sections: white-collar
crime and organized crime. This begs the question of whether the coverage of organized
crime is written with the belief that it is a form of white-collar crime, or if the authors
have made the common mistake of confusing organized crime with what most critical
criminologists refer to as organizational crime (which includes corporate crime, state-
corporate crime, and state crime). Additionally, Glick and Schmalleger both give the
same explanations for the etiology of white-collar crime, citing the controversial position
of Hirschi and Gottfredson (for a detailed discussion of this theory and its applicability
for explaining white-collar crime, see Reed and Yeager, 1996).

Similarly, though Adler et al. (2007) devote an entire chapter to white-collar crime
and corporate crime, they fail to discuss any form of state crime. The authors' discussion
of corporate crime does cover some of the current corporate scandals that have achieved
media attention (e.g. Enron). Although Adler, Mueller, and Laufer could have made the
case that, in the area of environmental crime they included, there were opportunities for
state facilitation (e.g. state-corporate crime), the authors fail to make this connection. As
such, the topic of state crime in any form is left unattended.

On the other hand, John Conklin's 9th edition of Criminology dedicated 21 words to
the subject. However, the topic of state crime was buried within the larger subject of ter-
rorism and only addressed state-sponsored terrorism. Additionally, the examples of state
terrorism were limited to countries the US government has declared 'terrorist states' (so-
called rogue states) or, as George W. Bush noted in his 2004 State of the Union Address,
'the axis of evil'. While Conklin does briefly cover the broader umbrella of white-collar
crime, he omits all discussions of state crime within this literature and any of the state
crime theoretical materials.

Likewise, while Larry Siegel's 9th edition of Criminology does address state crime, the
topic is hidden within a discussion of terrorism. However, Siegel did dedicate six times
more the amount of words (a total of 128 words) than Conklin to state-sponsored ter-
rorism. Contextually, the presentation by Siegel was limited to so-called 'repression
regimes', citing Brazil, Columbia, Guatemala, Honduras, Iran, Peru, and Sudan. Like
Conklin, Siegel neglects to include state crime as a topic even within the larger area of
study, white-collar crime. Additionally, Seigel's coverage of white-collar crime is limited to
occupational crimes (i.e. acts committed during the course of one's work for one's self-interest or gain) and corporate crime, negating the links between corporate-state crime and/or
transnational crime (e.g. Kramer and Michalowski, 2006; Kramer et al., 2005).

Sue Titus Reid's Crime and Criminology 11th Edition is the only text that had a chapter
devoted solely to 'business- and government-related crimes' (2005: 310–40). Additionally,
Reid provides a brief, though minimally inclusive, overview of the history of corporate and occupational crimes, including their impact and theoretical explanations. Having said that, the theoretical interpretations are limited to perspectives that offer typologies of offenders and ignore the vast amount of corporate crime theories that address the structure, organization, and individual actors involved. Similar to Barkan and Messerschmidt's texts, Reid devotes much of the corporate discussion to what is more often referred to as 'occupational crime' (i.e., tax evasion, bribery, extortion, and conspiracy). However, she also includes organizational crimes such as product liability, workplace violations, and environmental crimes.

The materials covering government crimes appear to be extensive at first glance (1988: 330–39). However, on closer examination, the types of state crime are again very limited in their discussions and examples. Specifically, Reid reviews obstruction of justice by state officials (e.g., President Bill Clinton and Special Prosecutor Kenneth Starr), the typical cases of Watergate, Iran-Contra, civil rights violations (e.g., Rodney King), and terrorism. This text provides more current examples than do others, including the cases at Guantanamo, terrorist suspect Yaser Esam Hamdi, and the civil rights violations in Iraq (e.g., Shereef Akeel, who was tortured by US soldiers and contractors in Iraq). Regrettably, Reid limits the discussions of state crimes to those committed by the USA and the more minuscule forms of crimes, ignoring genocides (e.g., Darfur, Rwanda, Bosnian Muslims), crimes of aggression (the US invasion and occupation of Iraq), and crimes against humanity (the Congo and Uganda).

Additionally, while Reid provides a simplistic theoretical component to address occupational and corporate offending, there are no theoretical discussions for state crime. And while she offers a few additional explanations, like Glick and Schmalleger, the etiological frame provided is insufficient to address the complexities of organizational crimes. She also neglects to reference any recent work on state crime (including state crime theories) in the section covering such acts. Overall, Reid's coverage – while acknowledging government crime directly in a chapter – fares no better in context than Barkan's coverage (described below).

On the other hand, Piers Beirne and James Messerschmidt's 4th edition of *Criminology* (2006) provides a section on state crime listed under political crimes. At first glance, the coverage appears to be significant, relatively speaking, with 26 pages listed under political crimes by the state. However, upon a more thorough review of the content, its presence is significantly reduced by their conceptualization of crimes by the state. Specifically, Beirne and Messerschmidt dedicate six of those pages to 'state corruption'. While this may not seem problematic, the examples given are in the form of occupational crimes rather than the form of what many state crime scholars generally consider to be crimes (typically under the rubric of organizational crime) (Friedrichs, 2000). For example, political bribery and corrupt campaign practices committed to attain personal gain are the foci of this section.

A total of five pages are used to discuss other forms of crimes of the state (i.e., political repression). Of these cases, many were outdated (COINTELPRO, CIA, and FBI repressions, intelligence-gathering using examples of Martin Luther King and the Committee in Solidarity with the People of EL Salvador), thus ignoring recent state crime incidents and research. Several pages later, Beirne and Messerschmidt again discuss state terrorism after a single page devoted to state-corporate crime (again using two outdated cases: the Space Challenger and the fire in Hamlet). The next subsection (10 pages) is titled 'state terrorism', and provides an array of examples from 1953 to the 21st century (e.g., the US overthrow of the democratically elected leader of Iran, the attempted overthrow of Fidel Castro in Cuba, Operation Phoenix in Vietnam, covert operations in Chile, US support of Osama Bin Laden, general crimes by the CIA, US support for Saddam Hussein and embargos, and the recent illegal invasion of Iraq). These examples are typically considered by scholars who are active in the field to be forms of state crime. Nonetheless, Beirne and Messerschmidt neglect to provide recent state crime research or any theoretical model to address the etiological factors.

As with Beirne and Messerschmidt's texts, Steven Barkan's 3rd edition of *Criminology* (2006) provides moderate coverage, relatively speaking, to crimes of the state with a total of 11 pages. Barkan also includes state crime under the rubric of political crime versus a self-identified chapter or section entitled 'state crime'. He is the only author who acknowledges these crimes by the government are also referred to as 'state-organized crime' or 'state crime'. According to Barkan, the crimes by the government include:

1) political repression and human rights violations;
2) surveillance and infiltration; arrest, prosecution and imprisonment;
3) aiding and abetting corporate crime; and
4) political corruption.

Barkan rightly notes that state crime scholars refer to the latter examples as a form of occupational crime, generally not falling under the same rubric as state crime or crime by the government. It should also be noted that Barkan does make reference to state crimes in other countries as well as those that occur within the USA.

More specifically, Barkan addresses the issue of genocide and references historical accounts of genocide against Native Americans, Rwandan Tutsi, Darfurians, and Bosnians. Although this is a vast improvement to coverage by other textbooks, given that these atrocities resulted in far more deaths than the total official statistics of US interpersonal violence in the past century, it is nonetheless disheartening that such devastation merited less than two pages or six paragraphs, totaling fewer than 1200 words in his entire book. Barkan then moves to the issue of torture, assassination, and related state violence, again devoting four paragraphs and fewer than 1000 words. Additionally, while a photograph on page 408 is of the most publicized iconic images to come out of Abu Ghraib – the symbol of the US position on torture abroad to many Arabs and Muslims throughout the world – there is no mention of the event except as a caption under the photo. Instead, Barkan discusses in brief the repression at the hands of the governments of China, Russia, and El Salvador. Otherwise, the discussion of US government violence is limited to that imposed on civil rights activists in 1950–60, the well-known reference to the CIA Phoenix program that developed out of the Vietnam War, and those committed during the 1987 coal miners' strike. Note that, even with the discussion of the Phoenix program, Barkan fails to connect that with the more recent cases of torture that took place at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo.
In his discussion of unethical experimentation by governments, Barkan cites the Tuskegee research and World War II Nazi practices. For the subject matter of surveillance, Barkan, as did Beirne and Messerschmidt, gives the example of COINTELPRO. He then continues with examples of legal repression that fall under the rubric of human rights violations, which are a form of social harm. These subcategories comprise six of the pages Barkan devotes to the entire topic of state criminality. Additionally, like all other texts, the contextual and historical development of state crime, the standards used to define the illegals, and any theoretical frame to which an analysis of the etiological and epistemological factors can be assessed is missing. Yet only three pages after the discussion of 'political crimes', Barkan devotes 17 pages to illegal drug use, including its history, contemporary use, prevalence of use, the question of a drug crisis, economic deprivation and drug abuse, gender and illegal drug use, the drug-crime connection, the philosophical and scientific argument on drug use and legalization, control policies, and an explanation of illegal drug use. This coverage is double that of the worst crimes known to mankind.

Aggregate Discussion

As the chart below illustrates, of the eight leading criminology textbooks, three do not contain any discussion of state crime. Moreover, two other books briefly mention this subject within the context of state-sponsored terrorism. Of the remaining three texts, one included the topic under government crime, however, a portion of that referred to state crime that referred to as occupational crimes. The other text that mentioned state crimes referred to them as political crimes, thus leaving only one textbook that presented the acts as a state crime. Nonetheless, the examples of the latter were all presented to students under the broader heading of political terrorism. Additionally, none of the texts cover any of the state crime literature that has been produced in the last several years. All of the books fail to provide a discussion of the etiological factors, any theory for understanding the complexities of state crime, or policy implications to control crimes of the state. As such, our finding on the coverage of state crime in the leading criminology textbooks confirms that this subject matter remains a highly marginalized theme.

As we have noted, certain topics in the criminology/criminal justice curriculum are emphasized, while others are minimized. This is a crucial point, given that introductory textbooks are often students' first exposure to the field of criminology. As such, it would seem that a well-rounded exposure to all types, patterns, and costs of crime would merit attention. As with any field of inquiry, many students become interested in a given topic once it is presented to them (e.g. juvenile delinquency, gangs, convict criminology, feminist criminology, and/or occupational crime). Having said this, we recognize that the marginalization of state crime within textbooks may not be correlated with the lack of introduction of the topic by faculty. Nonetheless, the general marginalization of the topic within introductory criminology textbooks could dissuade faculty from introducing the topic within an already time-constrained frame in a typical semester.

Table 1. Comparisons of Leading Textbooks’ Coverage of State Crime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of state crime</th>
<th>Chapter topic of inclusion</th>
<th>Theory presented</th>
<th>Reviews state crime literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glick</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmalleger</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adler, Mueller, and Laufer</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conlin</td>
<td>Yes-21 words</td>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siegel</td>
<td>Yes-128 words</td>
<td>Terrorism</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>Yes-2 pages</td>
<td>Government Crime</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beirne and Messerschmidt</td>
<td>Yes-11 pages</td>
<td>Political Crimes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkan</td>
<td>Yes-11 pages</td>
<td>Political Crimes</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exploratory Discussion for Future Research

While there is empirical support for the claim that overall, topics that fall under critical criminology and in the case at hand (state crime) are marginalized within introductory criminology textbooks, there remains the unanswered question of why the authors do not cover crimes of the state in greater detail. With the current empirical support available showing the existence of this marginalization, it seems the next step is to uncover the reasons for this situation.

Naturally, we have our own set of underlying questions and assumptions that, if answered by future studies, could provide us with some insight. For example, would an empirical study reveal that many of the textbook authors are reluctant to write on this topic due to a lack of understanding of the subfield of crimes of the state? On the surface, state crime is not that complicated to understand. Yet, due to certain complexities, analysts must have an understanding of a state's history, economy, politics, cultures, etc. to better place the state's questionable actions in context. Additionally, there remains a small area of contention within state crime scholars as to the definition of and standards used to define an act by the state as criminal. If the definitional debate continues among these scholars, would it be a realistic assumption that other criminologists, who do not work in this area, may not understand the different definitions of crime (e.g. occupational versus organizational) and/or the laws (e.g. international humanitarian laws)?

It would also be of interest to see how much of the content of the 'typical' textbook on criminology is informally mandated by marketing pressures, and if this could be a factor in the marginalization of state crime. In other words, do publishers' desires for what a textbook should cover be more competitive indirectly affect the authors'
choices in the topics they cover? An alternative question is whether publishers want textbook writers to include discussions on state crime because other textbook writers rarely include this? There is definitely a certain crowd mentality in the publishing industry. No textbook publisher wants to be too ahead of the curve for fear of losing a significant amount of its customer base or investing in a project that may potentially give little financial return. Therefore, experimentation or the inclusion of different material is done very slowly over several editions and typically only when appropriate market research has been done to ensure the sales potential. Further, based on an exploratory test to analyze ‘why’ state crime is marginalized in introductory criminology texts, we engaged in discussions with several editors and textbook authors regarding the decision-making process.

Based on the responses, there may well be merit in the idea that such marginalization is a product of precedent and the perceived potential of the market. As noted by more than one editor, publishers must consider the coverage of topics and the ideological view of the author that is used to present materials, since it could impact the marketability of the text, thus potentially risking a significant financial loss after the investment of reviewers, editing, and production. As an author, one must be conscious of the publishers’ wants in order to avoid being at risk of losing a contract. This could be a significant factor in the ‘hard choices’ authors must make.

There are other assumptions and questions that might provide answers as to why this area of study remains absent from the content of criminology texts. As such, we believe this could be a fruitful research agenda and provide much-needed insight into why the marginalizing coverage of crimes of states continues, even in light of an extensive body of literature, theory, and current examples.

Appendix


Notes

1 State crime has been defined as ‘any action that violates international public law, and/or a states’ own domestic law when these actions are committed by individual actors acting on behalf of, or in the name of the state even when such acts are motivated by their personal economic, political, and ideological interests’ (Rothe and Mullins, 2006: 2–3).

2 The authors selected the most current or contemporary introductory texts given that the growth of literature on state crime has significantly increased in the last five years. Additionally, during the early to mid-1990s, it would be fair to say that state crime as a subfield was still in its infancy. However, as the authors noted, it has since become recognized as a legitimate and significant area of criminological inquiry.

3 Based on this, we saw no value in providing a chart detailing the popularity or number ranking of the texts as several books listed may have been older versions, repeats of the same author, criminal justice-focused, or not relevant to an introduction to criminology class (see above for example).

4 We are also aware that the textbook industry has its own database of current and actual sales, but access to these statistics was not possible, as we did not have an inside in the textbook publishing industry willing to supply them.

5 He does, however, provide three models for explaining occupational crime, including Edwin Sutherland’s differential association, John Bruthwaite’s corporate culture perspective (known more as an organizational perspective), and Gottfredson and Hind’s general theory of crime (suggesting that occupational and corporate offenders are merely following their impulses: lacking self-control).
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Abstract
While it has become commonplace for mainstream media outlets to offer report and commentary on trends in economic globalization, it is rare for these same media outlets to exhibit self-awareness with regards to how the media has developed the forces of globalization. In this article, five academics from disparate disciplines in the humanities and social sciences address this impact, describe the negative consequences that the globalization of media has wrought in terms of social justice, and offer ideas concerning how activist academics might challenge the current direction of media globalization, both in their classrooms and in their activist endeavors.
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Introduction
We are all teachers-activists combining our knowledge, skills, and passions to formulate progressive strategies in response to globalization. We came together to answer the following two questions: what is the connection between the global economy and the media? And how can a bunch of teachers from disparate disciplines – anthropology, communications, economics, philosophy, and sociology – best understand this relationship so as to foster effective pedagogy? In answering these questions, we had to bridge more