

To the Editor:

I read Randy Schwartz's article with great interest ["Unity in Multiplicity: Lessons from the Alhambra," *Thought & Action*, Summer 2001]. The article reminded me that in addition to the many academic benefits cultural diversity can bring into the curriculum, it can also provide many life-enriching benefits outside the curriculum, albeit sometimes in startling ways.

Consider, for example, my first experience in teaching a graduate class with a truly diverse student body. The roster scared me to death: Rekha Anur. Arvind Balasubramaniam. Samip Banker. Gaurav Bhardwaj. Vibhuvadhan Bontala. Shefali Chandila. Pawankumar Deshpande. Svitlana Grankovska. Jian Gu. Swati Gupta. Parameshwar Hedge. Chetan Jain. Shashidhar Kadiri. Henry Kostowski. Vaishali Kulkarni. Guangyi Li. Yanhe Li. Rambabu Manchikalapudi. Padmanabhan Muthuvelraj. Ngoc Nguyen. Yutaka Onizuka. Ashish Patel. Bhuwan Patel. Daniel Shea (did he register for the wrong class?!?). Wenhua Shi. Lan Shu. Ronald So. Hongwu Su. Samrajya Tatineni. Biao Yang. And Stanphenie Yao.

Whew! Now, I knew that a few of these students were just as American as I am, but the diversity in the overwhelming majority really had me worried. Why? You may rightfully ask. Aren't international students usually smart and hard-working? Yes, they are, at least in my experience. Aren't international students usually refreshingly respectful of their professors? Yes, sometimes embarrassingly so. For example, I prefer my students to just call me by my first name, but I

find that the small number of international students who accept this usually feel obliged to address me as "Dr. Prof. Mr. Jesse, sir."

So what's the problem? Well, the problem is that I love to teach, and I believe that the first step in teaching is engaging students' interest and attention on a personal level. I therefore constantly illustrate my lectures with real-life examples from my personal experience.

My students will tell you that I am always talking about my wife and kids. My favorite illustration of multitasking in computer operating systems is the way my boys and I would go through the supermarket when they were in high school, each of us a separate "process" heading in different directions to maximize our shopping efficiency and "joining" at the checkout to resynchronize our tasks. Explain inter-process communication? No problem: that's my wife Bonnie and me doing our shopping alone now that the kids are gone, still going our separate ways, but now with walkie-talkies!

To me, each class is a performance. Over the years some students have loved my classes and some have hated them, but I dare say very few have slept through them. How would these international students, whose life experiences were so different from my own, react to my approach? Would they "get" my jokes? Would they respond to my personal anecdotes? Would my style confuse rather than stimulate them?

I had had my share of interaction with international students before this class, most of it absolutely marvelous, enriching my life as much as it has, I hope, enriched theirs. For example, as a

teacher of programming, I find that students often come to my office for one-on-one help when they are doing their assignments and come up against bugs or difficult algorithms they can't figure out for themselves. Nadeem Chaudry, from Pakistan, had a particularly tricky bug that we worked on together for about half an hour to no avail. At that point I said, "Nadeem, this is a two-cookie problem!"

Of course Nadeem had no idea what I was talking about, but I opened the drawer containing my chocolate chip cookie stash, took one for myself, and offered him one. "Thank you," he said, "but my religion probably doesn't allow me to eat those."

"What religion is that?" I asked.

"Muslim," he answered, but at the same time he looked at the cookie bag more closely. "Wait," he said, "these are kosher. See? They have a U in a circle, which means that they are OK for Jews to eat. Our dietary laws are very similar, so I think it's probably OK for me to have one after all."

"That's fascinating," I said. "I'm Jewish, but I never knew about that similarity in our religions."

Nadeem pushed back hard from the desk at which we were working. "What?!" he gasped. "You're a Jew?!?"

"Yes."

"But then why are you helping me?"

Now it was my turn to be surprised. "Why am I helping you? Because I'm the professor and you're the student."

The poor man was speechless. I can't even remember if we solved his programming problem or not, but I do remember him leaving my

office a short time later, shaking his head as he wrestled with the realization that a Jew had been willing to help him.

A few years later I had another Pakistani student in my class, Omar Hoda. We became friendly because he shot golf in the 70s and offered to give me a few pointers. Omar also house-sat for me a couple of times when I was traveling. He had told me that he was a friend of Nadeem's, but somehow the incident described above never came up in our conversations.

By this time, Nadeem had graduated. Then one day, out of the blue, I got an invitation to his wedding. Didn't know what to wear or how to behave at a Muslim wedding, so I asked Omar for some advice. I also told Omar that while I was of course delighted to be invited to the wedding, I was also amazed that Nadeem would include me in such an important event in his life. "Why?" Omar questioned. "You changed his life."

He then proceeded to tell me the profound effect the little episode in my office with the kosher chocolate chip cookies had had on his friend, changing not only his attitude toward Jews, of course, but also his attitude toward all people different from himself. It seems that by simply helping him tackle a computer problem and treating him with respect, I had unknowingly helped him see beyond the prejudices of his upbringing and inspired him to respect all his fellow men.

I wasn't at all confident that I would have such luck with a class of 31 highly diverse students, and thus I faced my first class with trepidation. But with the very first assignment, I saw that something special was happening: 31 stu-

dents, 31 programs handed in. The second assignment: again 31 programs handed in. As the semester went on some students faltered a bit and turned in assignments late, but as we near the end of the semester we have now had eight assignments due and all students but one have handed all eight in.

About halfway through the semester my wife Bonnie showed up in class on my birthday with a cake big enough for everyone. Not only did the students enjoy the cake, but they filled the board with “Happy Birthday” in all their native languages. (Some wise guys wrote HTML and Java code on the board to display “Happy Birthday” when run, saying we couldn’t ignore those languages, either!)

But the most amazing incident happened one day when I had set up for class a bit early and went up to two Chinese students chatting in Mandarin and asked them what they were talking about. “We were talking about you,” Guangyi Li said with a big smile.

“Oh?” I replied. “And just what were you saying?” I asked, smiling back and hoping for the best.

“That you’re just like a communist!” she exclaimed.

Yeow, that really set me back!

I thought she was kidding. “What?” I asked, trying to maintain my smile. “How so?”

“Because of your ... enthusiasm,” she explained, looking to classmate Hongwu Su for assistance in finding just the right word. “In the old days, the communists were just like you, always full of enthusiasm and excitement for what they were doing.”

Wenhua (Michelle) Shi, another student from the People’s Republic of China added: “Your definition of

a communist is totally different from in my country. I am not a communist, but ‘communist’ is the best and the most beautiful word in my country.

“Its definition is a person who is in the Communist Party, believes that the world consists of material things and was not created by God, serves people without reservation, is hard working and enthusiastic, and is very, very selfless.

“I do not blame you for having a wrong image about communists, because your society is capitalist, and your country’s press always reports news about the bad parts of China.”

So there you have it. “Just like a communist.” Not an insult, but a high compliment. Cultural diversity sure keeps things interesting!

Jesse M. Heines
UMass-Lowell
heines@cs.uml.edu.

To the Editor:

Reading Randy Schwartz’s article, [“Unity in Multiplicity: Lessons from the Alhambra,” Summer 2001] reminded me of a conversation I hadn’t thought about for two decades.

Twenty years ago, when I was in college at the University of Oregon, my friend Dave used to torment my wife and me by forcing us to attend monthly potlocks at his lavish ranch outside of Eugene. (Actually the ranch belonged to Jay, Dave’s rich benefactor.) Most of the potluck attendees were radical UO students on food stamps or aging hippies hustling a free meal.

Usually the feast would begin after someone named Spirulena stood over and blessed each dish of

food; then, as the tofu stir fry was being passed around, conversations would start up.

Well, not really conversations but rather great pseudointellectual pontifications about the inherent evilness of Western culture. To these latter day Bolsheviks, all the insurmountable problems of the Third world—poverty, ignorance, political corruption—were due to the so-called long legacy of exploitative policies of the West. Not once did I ever hear any mention of the billions in foreign aid the U.S. and Europe funneled to the less fortunate nations of the world.

Normally I just gnashed my teeth and listened quietly, but once, after hearing a long winded discourse on European colonialism, I broke my silence and shouted: “Whites weren’t the only ones to practice colonialism. Look at the Moors. They invaded Spain in the 8th Century and camped out there for 800 years!”

“But, but,” a young woman who would later become a writer for National Public Radio said to me indignantly, “the Moors brought culture and learning to Spain!”

I hadn’t thought of that conversation for two decades until I read Schwartz’s piece *Unity in Multiplicity: Lessons from the Alhambra*.

The theme to his piece seemed lifted from one of those long ago left-leaning potluck bull sessions: if another nationality or race conquers a people it’s okay as long as the conquerors bring cultural enrichment and diversity to the vanquished people.

Granted, the Moors did jazz up the 8th Century Iberian peninsula. They built a culturally enriching society. The Moorish art of designing and constructing buildings,

with their lustrous tile decorations and low rounded arches of alternating black and white stone, their delicately worked carvings, their beautifully detailed minarets, was an architectural marvel.

And Moorish Spain was an enlightened seat of learning where advancement in medicine and science took place.

And most important, at least to Schwartz, Moorish Spain was multicultural, bringing together Jews, Mozarabs, Berbers (and their slaves).

But how was it that the multicultural loving Moors ended up in places like Grenada? Well, in 711, 50,000 well-armed Moors swept into Southern Spain, slaughtering and driving the native Visigoths into the mountains of Northern Spain.

There the Visigoths licked their wounds and plotted revenge. Countless wars ensued, and eight centuries later the Moors were driven out of Spain. The native Spaniards behaved no differently than conquered people any place else in the world. They resented, as indigenous peoples tend to do, their culture being displaced by alien invaders—even if the conquerors bring a more advanced culture.

Of course skin color plays an important role in the left’s love of the Moors. Their darker skin makes them easier to romanticize than, say, the British who conquered India in the 19th Century. Unlike the “multicultural” Moors, the British colonialists banned many brutish practices among the conquered natives such as the Indian custom of female infanticide and suttee.

Then, too, Schwartz’s real purpose for writing his piece was to

smear anyone against unchecked immigration. The only people against immigration, in a Schwartzian world of blissful multiplicity, are roving bands of fire-bombing neo-Nazis.

But the subject of immigration is extremely complex. No one could argue that immigrants can and do enrich the countries they have settled in, but there is also a downside to immigration.

Just look at a large, seemingly prosperous country like our own. According to Harvard economist George Borjas, immigration in this country causes “native workers to lose about \$133 billion a year in depressed wages.”

And in some vocations, native-born Americans are lucky even to be employed, having been replaced by immigrants. In California during the ‘80s, the number of African-American hotel maids and housemen fell 30 percent while the number of immigrants with those jobs rose 166 percent. As late as 1989, the seafood industry in North Carolina, Virginia and Maryland was dominated by native-born workers. Today, the industry is dominated by young female immigrants from Mexico. And the poultry industry in the South has long since replaced native-born workers with immigrant laborers.

Moreover, 20 percent of our prison space is filled with the foreign born. Immigrants who arrived in the United States in the 1990s, plus births to all immigrants in the ‘80s, will make up 69 percent of America’s population growth in the next 50 years. This will only encourage more sprawl, water shortages and increased energy needs.

Spain and other Western countries are also experiencing the

same problems fueled by uncontrolled immigration.

Schwartz would have us ignore the downside of immigration and look back to a time when Jews and Arabs lived in enlightened peace (after, of course, most native Spaniards were subdued, driven from their homes and conquered).

We should all admire what the Moors created in southern Spain but not be so bedazzled we forget the real lessons of the Alhambra: multiculturalism—whether it’s conquering armies bearing gifts or waves of uninvited immigrants—works only when the lives of the native people are not being disrupted.

Steve Knight
Lane Community College
Eugene, Oregon

Randy Schwartz replies:

We should hardly be surprised, when a letter is launched with such hyperbole about a friend who “used to torment my wife and me by forcing us to attend monthly potlucks at his lavish ranch,” that the letter’s author would also soar to tall tales about “in 711, 50,000 well-armed Moors swept into Southern Spain, slaughtering and driving the native Visigoths into the mountains of Northern Spain... most native Spaniards were subdued, driven from their homes and conquered.”

Of course, an incursion into a foreign land is no gentle matter, and I would not wish to defend the use of violence in such situations. But the settlement of the Moors in Spain certainly does not rank with the bloody conquests of history, such as the American genocide against native North American

peoples.

Hugh Kennedy reports in *Muslim Spain and Portugal*¹ that the consensus of scholars is that the Muslim force entering Spain in 711 numbered between 7,000 and 12,000, and that it easily defeated Roderick's army of between 24,000 and 30,000 Spaniards.

The Visigoths, who comprised something like 10 percent of the Spanish population, Bernard F. Reilly notes in *The Medieval Spains*², had brutally oppressed the Christian and especially the Jewish inhabitants—the letter writer seems unaware that Jews, like Christians, had lived in Spain for centuries prior to the arrival of the Moors.

No wonder that whole cities quickly surrendered to the Muslim liberators. As one historian summed up, the Visigothic kingdom “collapsed like a house of cards.”³

The letter writer commits a much more serious falsification when he paints a picture of the Moors driving the Spanish people en masse from their homes. In fact, no cities and towns were depopulated. This is why the Arabs and Berbers were, at the outset, a tiny minority living amongst a sea of Spaniards.

They guaranteed religious freedom to peaceable Jews and Christians, including Visigoths living under Muslim rule. Extensive intermarriage, even with the Visigothic nobility, soon made it virtually impossible to distinguish “native” from “foreign” segments of the population. Within a century or two, the great majority of people in Iberia lived under Muslim rule, could speak Arabic, and were the descendants of Christians and Jews who had voluntarily converted to

Islam.

Even then, Christian and Jewish minorities—numbering together about 30 percent—continued to flourish, producing administrators who functioned within the Muslim bureaucracy, as well as financiers, physicians, scholars, court poets, and artists.⁴

It speaks volumes that the letter writer can find nothing bad to say about 19th-Century British rule in India, which was colonial and exploitative. The utter contempt of British rulers for Indian people and their cultures was the exact opposite of the tolerance and respect practiced by the Moors in Spain.

When Lord Kitchener became military commander of India in 1892, he stated: “It is this consciousness of the inherent superiority of the European which has won for us India. However educated and clever a native may be, and however brave he may have proved himself, I believe that no rank we can bestow on him would cause him to be considered an equal of the British officer.”

Rudyard Kipling, in his poem about “The White Man’s Burden,” described the Indians as “fluttered folk and wild—your new-caught, sullen peoples, half devil and half child.” As an Indian diplomat and historian later recalled, “As a result of this doctrine of prestige and race superiority, the Europeans in India, however long they lived there, remained strangers in the country. An unbridgeable chasm existed between them and the people, which was true till the very end of British rule in India.”⁵

My critic claims to have discovered that “Schwartz’s real purpose for writing his piece was to smear

anyone against unchecked immigration.” Actually, my purpose—which the vast majority of readers had no trouble ascertaining—was not to discuss immigration policy but to highlight the social benefits of educational institutions that respect and value the contributions made by peoples and cultures from around the world.

Toward that aim, I had good reason to describe and draw lessons from the recent anti-Muslim pogroms in southern Spain. When bands of thugs arm themselves with clubs, yelling “Out with the Moors!” while firebombing their homes, mosques and cafés, they are not some pressure group for immigration reform. They are mobs bent on exterminating a people and a culture.

If the letter writer wants to grind his ax about “a downside to immigration,” I invite him do so in some other forum where that’s the topic under discussion. My only suggestion is that when he focuses so narrowly on economics, at least he should look beyond the impact of immigration on low-tier wages.

Steven Greenhouse reports in the September 4, 2000 *New York Times* that the same National Academy of Sciences study that claimed that Latin immigration had depressed U.S. wages for non-high-school graduates by 5 percent found also that, nevertheless, immigration had expanded the American economy by \$10 billion.⁶

Endnotes

¹Kennedy, Hugh, *Muslim Spain and Portugal* (New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1996), pp. 10-11.

²Reilly, Bernard F, *The Medieval Spains* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1993), p. 27.

³H. St. L. B. Moss, *The Birth of the Middle Ages*, 395-814 (London: The Folio Society, 1998), p. 166.

⁴S. M. Imamuddin, *Muslim Spain, 711-1492 AD*. (Leiden, Holland: E. J. Brill, 1981), pp. 23-29, 38-45.

⁵K. M. Panikkar, *Asia and Western Dominance* (New York: John Day, 1954), p. 153

⁶Steven Greenhouse, “Foreign Workers at Highest Level in Seven Decades,” *New York Times* 4 September 2000.

To the Editor:

It is an honor to have our book reviewed by so notable a pair as the president of the UUP and its director of research (“Corporatization: Concept or Slogan, a review of *Campus Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*, Summer 2001).

Scheuerman and Kriger praise the book for fulfilling two of its three stated purposes. In their words, the book’s essays “thoroughly describe an endless number of corporate intrusions into what David Noble in his essay calls the sacred place of the academy.” The praise continues, “If you want to know what’s going bad at the academy, this is the book to read.”

They go on to laud the book’s second purpose: to add inspiration to the growing corporate resistance movement in this country. “We felt so good about the many victories campus activists are registering over corporate capitalism we wanted to go out and do something to help.” I hope they found a way to get involved.

However, the reviewers believe *Campus, Inc.* has fallen short of its third goal: providing guidance in the fight against the corporate takeover of higher education:

“The essays are generally a series of anecdotes used to demon-

strate the horrors of corporatization. They reveal the obvious and hide the essential. The authors only vaguely define corporatization and never really analyze the concept and how we might use it as a weapon against corporations” (p.120).

To correct this deficiency, the reviewers offer a definition of corporatization which they believe will clearly draw the battle lines. The Holy Grail for the reviewers is the notion of exchange value vs. use value. Corporations are in business to make a profit. They create products which are exchanged for money—exchange value. The products they create—computers, services, intellectual property—are a means to an end: profit.

But, say Scheuerman and Kriger, universities traditionally have a much different goal. They produce knowledge for its own sake—not a means to an end; rather: “The goal of education is education.” The unfettered pursuit of knowledge is the academy’s use value.

The reviewers conclude that corporatization happens when profit—the corporate exchange value—interferes with the quality of education. This, say the reviewers, is the real meaning of corporatization, and other business practices, while perhaps reprehensible, do not constitute corporatization.

For example, the sale of sweatshop-produced goods in the campus store is a practice we may deplore, but it is not corporatization. To quote Schuerman and Kriger: “It’s a corporate practice we don’t like!” They make the same argument regarding the presence of exclusive soft drink machine contracts on campus. Their argument seems to

be that profits on such clothing and soft drinks do not automatically interfere with the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake.

Here, I think, is where Scheuerman and Kriger go astray. The use/exchange value concept is so narrow that it will not likely satisfy many who are seriously concerned about big business’ intrusion into higher education.

For example, the review does not mention Kevin Kniffin’s (“The Goods at Their Worst,” p. 38) description of Reebok’s attempt at the University of Wisconsin to limit free speech of student-athletes and coaches. (They were asked to sign an agreement never to criticize or make any disparaging comments about Reebok products.) This attempt was ultimately defeated but not without considerable effort and risk on the part of campus activists. Had Reebok succeeded, would “education for the sake of education” have been violated?

It’s not clear from an exchange/use value perspective that it would. Classroom discussions of the great philosophers, for example, would have gone on uninterrupted even if coaches and athletes had signed and followed the non-disparagement agreement. Yet, for many, the Reeboks of the corporate world represent a clear and present danger.

Perhaps the use/exchange value concept would help in defining certain types of corporatization and not others. Unfortunately, the reviewers provide no concrete real-world examples of their concept. Moreover, they fail to discuss any of the specific examples of corporatization provided throughout *Campus, Inc.* (for example, Peck’s chapter, “Keep Your Room Clean: How to

Uncover Corporate and Military Influence on Your Campus”).

In another chapter, “Perils of the Knowledge Industry,” Jeff Lustig presents a three-part definition of corporatization: business intrusion in academia; a shift in governance structure; and, finally, a shift of university function.

The shift in structure is caused by adoption of corporate governing methods, promoting managerial ascendance, a break-up of shared governance, and the routinization and standardization of faculty roles.

The shift in function is toward “productivity” measured in business terms, and evident in the new view of the university as a site of capital accumulation itself, rather than simply as an auxiliary to such accumulation, as in the past.

Lustig also lists the differences between corporate and university goals that the review claims is missing (p. 327-328). Indeed, he introduces the “exchange value/use value” distinction in explaining the current perversion of students’ ideas about the purposes of learning.

Steck and Zweig offer similar distinctions in their chapter, “Take Back the University: Only Unions Can Save Academic Life.” In their introduction, these SUNY faculty pointedly ask, “In the entrepreneurial university, what happens to knowledge that is inconvenient to those with power and money? It cannot thrive.”

And later, “People cannot do creative work looking over their shoulders for signals in the smiles and frowns of the rich and powerful.” While these union activists may not use the terms “use” and “exchange” value, they are obviously describing the object of Scheuer-

man and Kriger’s concerns.

Steck and Zweig conclude by proposing a way in which faculty unions can begin to reclaim university autonomy from encroaching business interests (pp. 303-312). Their model offers hope and a blueprint for a solidarity movement with nonacademic unions and the community at large.

While the reviewers may differ with *Campus, Inc.*’s concept of corporatization, surely they would agree that defining the problem is only half the battle. Defining the solution is equally important.

Clearly, we are all working toward preserving the fundamental values of the university. Ongoing discussions—even disagreements—like the present one take us one step closer to that goal.

Geoff White

To the Editor:

Scheuerman’s and Kriger’s review of *Campus Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower* ignores the real meat of most of the book’s chapters.

Additional definitions of “corporatization,” for example, complemented the one they selected from Richard (not Robert) Daniels. And contributions such as Noble’s recognition of this transformation as an “enclosure of the knowledge commons” are immensely rich in historical connotation and thought-provoking in implication.

Steck and Zweig, to take another example, offer a most lucid and persuasive case for faculty unionism as the means to preserve academic freedom in these times that I’ve seen.

Scheuerman and Kriger stint on describing such contributions in order to offer their own alternative vision to corporatization. This vision is confusing but, nevertheless, deserving of comment, for it accurately reflects the unsettled state of current opinion on the purposes of the American university.

Rejecting the emerging stress on the market or “exchange-value” of higher education, these reviewers insist that “the goal of higher education institutions is education.”

Dewey and others urged more worldly goals, seeing higher education, for example, as a necessary means to democratic politics and citizenship. But Scheuerman and Kriger insist, “The search for truth is an end in itself.” That is education’s “use-value.”

But is it? Are university professors really supposed to be oblivious to the world in which they teach? Do Scheuerman and Kriger mean to reject Howard Zinn’s argument in this volume and press the case for the pursuit of abstract truth?

Why has *this* particular view of a liberal arts education been adopted? It’s a curious one for two union activists.

The classic republican rationale for higher education, rather, was that it was intended to develop people’s knowledge and moral sense and prepare them for citizenship, to help them become knowledgeable about the world in which they lived and capable of informed action in it.

The older view also recognized that different kinds of universities were necessary for different kinds of societies. It would be a shame in rejecting the influence of Microsoft and IBM to leap directly to Plato and Allan Bloom, jettisoning Dewey

and Jefferson among others in the process.

Jeff Lustig
California State University
Sacramento

To the Editor:

As one of the contributors to *Campus Inc.*, I feel compelled to respond to the review that recently appeared in *Thought and Action* (Summer 2001). I do appreciate the constructive feedback from fellow academics, since to date the only other criticism I have received was from a Pentagon operative with the National Security Education Program! Unfortunately, I find some of the reviewers’ remarks superficial and their proposed definition of corporatization inappropriate.

Firstly, there is an explicit qualitative difference between corporate presence (e.g., vending machine), corporate influence (e.g., stadium advertising) and fullblown corporatization (e.g., exclusive marketing contract with attached non-disparagement clause) at a university.

Though it was not the task in my chapter to define corporatization, I did give some rather disturbing and symptomatic examples for UW-Madison: corporate research contracts that frustrate peer review and violate academic freedom in the name of private property rights, officials admonishing researchers to focus on the market potential—not the scientific value—of their taxpayer-subsidized work. I also pointed to the conflict of interest when university officials, deans, and trustee also moonlight as corporate directors, shareholders, and consultants.

Furthermore, corporatization is

not a uniquely academic dilemma—it is occurring in other public sectors as well—the arts, elections, media, parks, etc. As self-described corporate anthropologist, Jane Ann Morris of the Program on Corporations, Law and Democracy (POCLAD) notes, we are living more and more in a “democracy themepark”—a realm of flimsy public facades concealing vast corporate power. This insidious phenomenon is well described in such books as Jerry Mander’s *In the Absence of the Sacred*, Davis Korten’s *When Corporations Rule the World*, Alex Molnar’s *Giving Kids the Business* or Lawrence Soley’s *Leasing the Ivory Tower*.

I agree with the reviewers that corporations have been on campus for a long time—even well before 1900 and Veblen’s 1918 critique which they cite. In fact, some historians of the land grant colleges would argue that they were already captured by agribusiness come the 1870s and were then effectively redeployed as a foil against the Populis Movement.

As legal fictions, corporations are but one type of economic unit, granted a public charter to exist in order to fulfill a social good at the behest of a sovereign state. The first corporations were created by monarchs to facilitate western colonialism—hence, the Dutch East India Company, the British South Africa Company, the Hudson Bay Company, etc. In 1900, there were only 300 corporations in the entire U.S., and they were frequently “executed” by the will of the people whenever they violated public trust and exceeded the privileges granted under their charters. For instance, before the 1880’s it was illegal for corporations to engage in

political lobbying, to own stock in one another, to make charitable donations, or to speculate in real estate.

This radically changed, once corporations usurped the civil liberties reserved for people and began to exercise their newfound powers. The 1886 U.S. Supreme court “Santa Clara” decision opened this Pandora’s box when it extended the 14th Amendment—originally granting human rights to freed slaves—to non-living corporations. This downward spiral of judge-made law continued when the Supreme Court ruled in 1976 that money equaled free speech, allowing corporations free rein over our once-democratic political process. Now we have corporations using “food libel” laws to sue citizen critics, leveraging taxpayer subsidies while price-gouging consumers, abusing privacy laws to avoid public scrutiny and mandated inspection, demanding compensation for property rights and future earning “lost” by regulation, etc.

As my chapter in *Campus Inc.* states, the academic fallout of corporatization reached a critical threshold in 1980/1981 with passage of the Bayh-Dole Act, allowing universities to sell off public research to the highest bidder, and the Recovery Tax Act, allowing corporations to write off donations to education institutions.

Just like the movie “Invasion of the Body Snatchers,” universities have now become thoroughly colonized by the assumptions/preten-sions of corporatization.

To give but a personal example, I had a recent stint as an adjunct professor teaching an introductory environmental studies course with 450 students at a large public

school in the Midwest. When we reached the water pollution unit I referenced and ammonia spill at a nearby chicken processing plant which killed thousands of fish downstream and send several workers to the hospital.

Within days there was a letter before my department chair from a powerful executive, complaining about my use of this particular example, and not-so-subtly reminding him of the generous donations the corporation makes to the university each year.

The academy is “sacred”—but not because it produces something of use value vs. exchange value. In fact, the whole notion of “productivity” is a positivist economic construction that should not have primary weight when it comes to evaluating the quality of education or any other “common good!” Like

other public entities, universities need to be protected against corporatization precisely because they provide a necessary social function—unlike the mercenary manufacture of sweatshop clothing or brand-name junk-food.

Economist Milton Friedman has written quite frankly that “the corporation can not be ethical, its only responsibility is to make a profit.” Until sovereign citizens reassert their control over these legal fictions through diligent charter revocation, corporations can have no democratic legitimacy or moral standing in my mind—whether in the academy or anywhere else.

John E. Peck
University of WI-Madison
Madison, Wisconsin

Welcome to the second edition of NEA's
CD-ROM *The Future of Higher Education*.



Available in
March 2002

We hope this CD-ROM will stimulate your imagination about the potential futures of higher education and pique your curiosity about the environment in which you work. *The Future of Higher Education* is created around themes that we believe will be important to higher education in the coming years and that will help you and your Association focus on where to concentrate efforts and resources.

For a copy of *The Future of Higher Education*, E-mail us at HigherEd@nea.org.

nea
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION



National Education Association

Excellence in the Academy Awards



The 2002 National Education Association Art of Teaching Prize

A \$2,500 award for an essay that illuminates one professor's approach to the complex and intangible dynamic that inspires students with a love of learning or an article that offers practical approaches to improving teaching and learning at the college level.



The 2002 National Education Association Democracy in Higher Education Prize

A \$2,500 award for an article that contributes to the expansion of the welcoming and democratic culture of higher learning and the ideals of tolerance, justice, and the unfettered pursuit of truth traditional to the academy.



The 2002 National Education Association New Unionism in the Academy Prize

A \$2,500 award for an article that describes a higher education local union's collective approach to uniting the academic community in pursuit of quality higher education for all.



The 2002 National Education Association New Scholar Prize

A \$2,500 award for an article by a scholar with less than seven years of full-or part-time employment in higher education. The submission can be made in any of the categories listed above.

The National Education Association is proud to announce a series of awards intended to advance the Association's commitment in higher education. The deadline for submission for the 2002 awards is September 30, 2002. The competition is open to the entire academic community.

The winning entries will be published in *Thought & Action*, the NEA higher education journal. All entries will be considered for publication in *Thought & Action*. Prize winners will also be asked to be presenters at the National Education Association Higher Education Conference, as guests of NEA.

Submissions will be blind reviewed by eight higher education members of the *Thought & Action* Review Panel. For submission guidelines or further information, visit the National Education Association higher education Web site: www.nea.org/he, E-mail clehane@nea.org, or write Con Lehane, Editor, Higher Education Publications, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

nea

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION