

From Art to Alienated Labor: The Degradation of Academic Work

by Jeff Lustig

Discussions of higher education in the U.S. are driven today by the language of finance rather than of pedagogy—more specifically, the language of financial hardship. Terms like “shortfall,” “cutback,” and “retrenchment” set the tone and shape the policies that force austerities and lead to “triage”¹ in American colleges and universities.

These terms have provided the opportunity for a number of university administrators, private foundations, and business roundtables to deliver a new model of higher education under the pretext of simply responding to financial necessities. Were their model to be implemented in all its sweep and detail it would take us beyond austerities to irreversible changes in the life and work of American higher education.

This would be unfortunate, for academic work has always been special work and entrusted with special functions in American society. Though it has gotten more burdensome in recent years, academic work at its best is still marked by qualities of independence, creativity, security, and the sense of fulfillment that comes from helping develop the abilities of the young. Unlike so much work in our society, it has never been routinized. Unlike other workers, faculty have never been stripped of a governing role in their larger enterprise. Unlike many jobs, the rewards of teaching and research have never been reduced to a dollar figure on a paycheck. Academic work has been, on the whole, good work.

Now the men with clipboards and spread sheets arrive to tell us it's over. “[W]hile the business community has endured ... consolidations, downsizings,

Jeff Lustig is professor of government at California State University, Sacramento. He is author of Corporate Liberalism: The Origins of Modern American Political Theory and articles on American and California politics, political thought, and higher education. He has been a statewide officer of the California Faculty Association and president of his local CFA chapter.

reorganizations, and changes in basic management philosophies and organizational cultures,” colleges and universities have lagged behind.² Now that states are cutting their support for higher education, universities have to reinvent themselves too and buckle down to tasks with immediate pay-off, like “reskilling” workers for recycled careers and boosting the local economy. Faculty and students, implicitly, will also have to fall into line.

This at least is the current counsel. The recent Spellings Report on the Future of Higher Education reiterates the argument, and though admitting to “the lack of clear, reliable information about the cost and quality of postsecondary institutions,”

Taken as a whole, what’s distinctive about academic work over the centuries has been the high degree of professional autonomy required for its performance.

barely pauses on its way to the sweeping conclusion that “academic programs and institutions must be transformed to serve the changing educational needs of a knowledge economy.”³ In this article, I will explain the threats to the academy and academic work posed by cutbacks and the new model of the university and suggest ways faculty can resist these threats and avoid winding up as content providers of standardized courseware in a brave new knowledge industry. But first, what do we mean by academic work?

FACULTY WORK

The tasks of higher education vary across disciplines, the skills of the biologist in her lab differing from those of the historian in the classroom, and both from those of the creative writing teacher in her seminar. But taken as a whole, what’s distinctive about academic work over the centuries has been the high degree of professional autonomy required for its performance. Teachers and scholars are prepared for the independent exercise of professional judgment by years of instruction, study, and disciplinary apprenticeship. Once certified, they are deemed competent to decide what is to be taught and how, and what researched and how, subject to neither censorship nor interference from uncertified authorities. That autonomy is the beauty and the burden of academic work, though often misunderstood as well.

This work is distinguished, secondly, by the variety of skills and sheer versatility needed to do it. Under the cloak of a single job title, the faculty member becomes at once a designer of syllabi, architect of learning space, orator, expert, interlocutor, writing instructor, judge of other human beings’ abilities, and alchemist, withal, devoted to turning slumbering lead into mental gold. And that’s just in the classroom.

The mix and weight of these roles varies again across different institutions. But the rewards of doing them combine the pleasures of the humanist scholar with those of the skilled craftsman or artisan. No matter how heavy the course load or ramshackle the equipment, they are the pleasures of doing meaningful work, performing a variety of tasks, freely exercising one's judgment (and thus practicing the liberal arts, "worthy of a free man"), rising to professional standards and doing work from which one continues to learn. It is work that provides what Joseph Conrad's Marlow sought: "the chance to find yourself." Academic work is a calling, and the antithesis of the alienated labor Marx saw separating man from his products, his potential and his communi-

*Academic work is the antithesis of the alienated labor
Marx saw separating man from his products, his
potential, and his community with others.*

ty with others.⁵

Finally, college and university work possesses a peculiarity compared to other jobs. I speak here of their core work, teaching, the activity Seneca first likened to cultivation. Modern universities engage in other activities too: scientific research, technological innovation and cultural preservation. But, "If its object were scientific and philosophical discovery," Cardinal Newman reasoned clearly, "I do not see why a University should have students."⁶ The peculiarity of its essential work, to develop Seneca's metaphor of cultivation, is that while crop failures are often quickly apparent, its fruits and successes only show up over time.

What are those fruits? Careful and informed minds, mainly. And students' discovery, in Paul Goodman's words, of their "own best powers." "The end product of... liberal education," C. Wright Mills added, "is simply the self-educating, self cultivating man or woman." To these essential goals of intellectual clarity, self-discovery, and self-motivation, a democratic society must add the capability of self-government and democratic participation.⁷ And we should include Kant's concern, finally, that a university contain a faculty concerned "with the interests of the sciences, that is, with truth: one in which reason is authorized to speak out publicly." A university should be a redoubt of reason in the larger society.⁸ Again, all of these fruits only show up over time.

Though considerations of space permit only a brief sketch here, it is important to note that academic work also takes place in two spheres usually ignored by the literature on the topic. Goodman provided a clue to the first of these when he observed that, "Colleges are the only important face-to-face self-governing communities still active in our society."⁹ The chambers of self-governance—college and departmental committees, senates, and faculty unions—comprise an essential arena

of faculty work. Participation in them is a natural extension of the professors' responsibilities in the classroom and laboratory, for only faculty know how to do the institution's core tasks of teaching and research. Only they, in their collective capacity, know how to provide for that work's proper conditions and evaluation.

This governance work is at the heart of academic freedom. Whatever protections faculty enjoy against interference from outsiders have been created historically by activity in these forums—the negative “freedom from” has been produced by the positive “freedom to” participate. Faculty members nearly alone in the society thus retain a modicum of what used to be called workers control. An essential part of their work, as Stanley Aronowitz notes, is retaining “as a collectivity ... sovereignty over the educational process” by participating in these governance bodies.¹⁰

A less tangible, less routinized set of tasks is performed in the academy as a public space—a “community of scholars, center of free inquiry” and “democratic public sphere.”¹¹ This space consists in a variety of plazas, fora and meeting halls; and the faculty members' task in it is to maintain dialogue and public debate. Universities and colleges are places where public art and public debate, music, theater, and political controversy are presented to students, faculty, and the local community. They are among the last places left in our society where the young can be exposed to the activities of a public life.

That the university originated as a community of masters and scholars was not accidental but part of its genius as an institution. Community is necessary for the ongoing debates in which students learn the habits of mind necessary for collective inquiry, like respecting evidence, admitting error, and being able to reexamine one's own assumptions. It is necessary for the knowledge that arises from what Habermas terms communicative interaction, as opposed to technical knowledge, which may be learned in other ways. It is a precondition for learning the “skills of



controversy with oneself, which we call thinking; and with others, which we call debate,” in Mills’ keen insight.¹² Community alone provides the equality and shared purpose necessary for persuading people to submit their ideas and reputations to what Arthur Lovejoy, in a memorable phrase, called the “friendly violence ... and correcting action of ... complementary minds.”¹³ For the reputedly conservative Cardinal Newman, the existence of community was more important than even fidelity to an established curriculum.¹⁴

At the center of traditional academic communities, conceptually speaking, and as still revealed by a lingering campus parlance, was the special institution of a

*For the reputedly conservative Cardinal Newman,
the existence of community was more important than
even fidelity to an established curriculum.*

commons. The university was a knowledge commons, a realm entrusted to citizens and scholars by previous generations in which the discoveries of the ages were accessible to all, knowledge was shared, and as with other commonses, the practices of a gift economy rather than a market economy prevailed.¹⁵

It was and is a place whose distinctive character trait was collegiality, key relationship was benefaction, honored figures were those who gave much to others, and core injunction was that “the gift must move.” It was and is a place where a student’s personal “gifts” and vocation could be awakened by gifts from others. When a scientist maps part of the human genome, a sociologist clarifies a new dimension of racism, or a student’s insight resolves a classroom controversy, everyone wins, in contrast to how things work in the zero-sum games of the marketplace. It was their exposure to such a realm that led witnesses at public hearings in California a few years ago to liken the college they once attended to “hallowed ground,” an “oasis,” and a “sanctuary.”¹⁶

Brief though this sketch is, it suffices to make the errors of a few common misconceptions about academic work clear. The favorite charge of the campus reorganizers, for example, is that faculty lack accountability and are responsible to no one. In fact, we see, they are highly accountable—to the standards of their professions developed often over centuries, to their peers, especially during the tenuring process, and to the larger world of scholarship. Theirs is a *professional*, not a complete autonomy, an autonomy within specialized standards and traditions.¹⁷ A second error, often made by faculty themselves, is to regard their autonomy and academic freedom as individual privileges and assume they have no collegial obligations to preserve them. To look at professional autonomy in this way, however, is to set out on a self-defeating journey.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF ACADEMIC WORK

State disinvestment in higher education of the magnitude of recent years has altered the conditions of academic work and deprived it of its expected rewards. Over the last 30 years, states have cut their budgets for postsecondary education by a dramatic national average of 34 percent.¹⁸ Between 2002 and 2004 alone, Massachusetts dropped its appropriations by 23 percent, Colorado by 22 percent, and California by 9.6 percent.¹⁹ California's support fell from 18 percent of general fund expenditures in 1976–77 to only 11.35 percent in 2005–06.²⁰ This trend will probably continue given structural deficits in many states and increased com-

State disinvestment in higher education of the magnitude of recent years has altered the conditions of academic work and deprived it of expected rewards.

petition for the diminishing pool of discretionary monies that remain.

The direct effects of such massive cuts are to increase class sizes, faculty course loads and faculty/student ratios, and as fewer faculty teach more students, to stretch the work week to more than 50 hours.²¹ Faculty who become overworked remain underpaid, however, because of state revenue declines and the university authorities' decisions to divert scarce funds into their own salaries and massive construction projects to be used as lures for local benefactors.

Students suffer too, because faculty's working conditions are students' learning conditions. It's not just that rising levels of deferred maintenance leave them with deteriorating equipment. Overcrowded classrooms and the revolving door of contingent hires also prevent them from developing long-term relations with individual faculty members, and faculty from responding to individual students' needs.

But beyond these direct effects, the fundamental character of the university has been affected by the remedies advancement offices have tried for their fiscal anemia: different funding strategies ultimately producing different kinds of institutions. As the bottom fell out of the federal-grant university,²² presidents of grant-addicted campuses turned in part to the captive market of students and raised tuition and fees, unfazed by the fact that by raising the price of higher education they betrayed a democratic trust by raising barriers to access for the poor and minorities.²³

After the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980, which permitted universities and private researchers to patent and capture royalties from publicly funded research, universities also attempted to patent and license professors' inventions to generate income from royalties and technology transfers.

But in order to attract funding in the large amounts needed, campus presidents and advancement officers have preferred hunting and gathering in the fertile fields of private businesses and national corporations. Their favored device in these

precincts are “partnerships” by which they cede their research facilities, research agendas and sometimes purchasing power of their student bodies to private entities in return for large endowments or equipment, like software systems, from which the corporations will make future profits.²⁴ The agreement between the biotechnology firm Novartis and U.C. Berkeley’s Plant and Microbial Biology department, which put parts of the department’s research agenda under outside control, gave Novartis first rights to patents and placed its representatives on the department’s research committee, was perhaps the most well-known of these. But the most flagrant example of the dangers of the partnerships was provided by the Taborsky affair at the

A graduate researcher with the temerity to defy a large corporation and patent his own invention was arrested, prosecuted, and dispatched to a chain gang!

University of Florida, where a graduate researcher with the temerity to defy a large corporation and patent his own invention was arrested, prosecuted (with the help of the university) and convicted, then dispatched to a chain gang!²⁵

This dependence on private financing is altering our basic ideas of what a university is. From the 19th century civic-republican perspective, the American university was a public institution dedicated to disseminating “the means of intelligence” to citizens and “for the dignity of the commonwealth.”²⁶ It was a public good, paid for by public means and assumed to operate in the public interest. As major funding has begun to be provided by students and private corporations, however, the university comes to be seen as a source of private opportunities, paid for by private entities and serving private interests.²⁷ Rather than the means for conferring a patrimony for our young, the university becomes another agent for billing them for the services they can privately afford.

This enables private interests to breach the levees around the external face of academic freedom and annul university autonomy.²⁸ The threat is felt most keenly by researchers, like Taborsky, who suddenly find their work judged by private corporate priorities. But the chilling effect of outsiders’ interests pervades the classroom too, and the university as a whole when it is found, for example, that many scientists are changing “the design, methodology, or results of [their] studies in response to pressure from a funding source.”²⁹

These are the effects, then, of state funding cuts of the severity of recent years. Momentous as these cuts are, however, the proponents of the new model university would seek even more. The best introduction to their larger designs is perhaps provided by the words of Monsanto CEO Richard J. Mahoney, on a videotape with which California State University (CSU) Chancellor Barry Munitz

greeted his 22 campus presidents at the beginning of the 1997 school year. “I had a nightmare the other night,” Mahoney began. In that phantasm,

I was the Chief Executive Officer of Monsanto and had to run the corporation like a university...[with] many employees... [who had] tenure.... [C]ustomers which we sometimes called students were complaining that they were being ignored. A quick study suggested that ...technology was making obsolete a considerable portion of what we did.... [Like] Monsanto...back in the early '80s there were things we did not for any real reason, but because that's the way they'd always been done....³⁰

The model would transform an institution traditionally noted for its heterogeneity and decentralization into a unified, centrally controlled organization.

That Munitz should have looked to a corporate CEO to spread his gospel is indicative of the shift that has taken place in higher education from thinking about the university as a place where the interests of business corporations simply bulk large—endowing chairs or funding buildings—to thinking about it as a place recast entirely in the image of the corporation.

This helps explain the emergence of business locutions on our campuses, with professors urged to become entrepreneurs, programs dubbed profit centers, students retooled as customers and academic success measured by “value-added” and “productivity.” It also explains Mahoney’s and others’ antagonism to tenure, reliance on technology to supplant faculty work and failure to understand that things are done the way they are in the university not because of dull habit (“complacency” for the Spellings Report), but because of the essential purposes of the institution. In addition to hastening the privatization of mission mentioned above, the new model would transform academic work in four main ways.

First, the model would transform an institution traditionally noted for its heterogeneity and decentralization into a unified, centrally-controlled organization. An enterprise distinguished for centuries by the plurality of its professional schools and intellectual goals and coordinated by faculty through a web of fairly autonomous collegial bodies, would be restructured along lines of a unitary organization designed historically to achieve the single goal of private profit and coordinated from the top by managers. The recent push toward system rationalization mandated by the adoption of financial control methods developed by for-profit entities (which has made “budgeting ... *the* fundamental governing principle of the university as a whole”³¹) hastens this process.

The rationalization along corporate lines seems natural to the administrative wing of the dual authority structure that has emerged on American campuses since

the 1950s, linking a centralized, hierarchically organized bureaucracy overseeing various functions from facilities management to financial aid, to the looser and more egalitarian system of faculty authority over academic policy and curriculum.³²

The thrust toward rationalization explains many current campus conflicts—over whether department chairs are primarily responsible to managers or colleagues, for example, or whether administrators should be permitted under the pretext of merit-pay plans to usurp faculty power over key aspects of promotion and retention. More fundamentally, this rationalization would relocate academic work from a collegial into a bureaucratic context and put faculty on the receiving

Whatever ceremonial homage might be paid to shared governance, this model follows the corporate example in reserving authority to management.

end of directives they had no role in making, subject to impersonal rules, and governed by the manipulative methods of technical reason rather than by the persuasive, substantive rationality developed in communicative interaction with peers.

Second, whatever ceremonial homage might be paid to shared governance, this model follows the corporate example in reserving authority to management. It raises the administrative sector out of the constraints of the dual authority structure in which it has incubated and seeks to confer on it the power to unilaterally make the decisions that shape campus life and character. Administrators at the institutions that most fully embrace the new model seek to confine faculty governance to sandbox activities on a larger playground they control. They have unleashed an arsenal of private business strategies on American campuses that are reshaping those campuses without consulting faculty. The strategies include speed-up, downsizing, outsourcing, privatization, “liquifying” fixed costs (like tenured faculty), and the creation of a two-tier workforce. Temporary instructors whose work lacks the rudimentary protections and benefits faculty have struggled for the last 150 years to obtain now make up half the instructional staff of American colleges and universities.³³ Regarding faculty as something like semi-independent contractors, the new administrators, like the early corporate organizers before them, seek to “to concentrate power in the organization.”³⁴

The extent of the new presidents’ and provosts’ underlying disdain for real faculty co-governance should not be underestimated. Professors err if they think that the college or university president forgot to consult them or failed to hear them clearly. The new administrators’ conscious intent, rather, is to close down the second sphere of academic work, that of self-government, as much as possible. They are waging what Cary Nelson has called a “war against the faculty.”³⁵

Third, for them to win this war, these new administrators must neutralize fac-

ulty power and break the professional status of faculty. The new model would reduce faculty from being primary voices and co-governors of the institution to an advisory role like students and alumni, or simply employees. That's what all the recent talk about the need "to change faculty culture" and to overcome "risk aversion" in order to challenge "complacency," as the Spellings Report puts it, is really about.³⁶

The most committed advocates of campus reinvention go beyond calling for an end to tenure and appeal for an "unbundling" of faculty's multiple roles. They would job out the different roles to outsiders, "eliminating those [roles] that inconvenience administrators, contracting for the others as piecework,"³⁷ and obliterate

The most committed advocates of campus reinvention go beyond calling for an end to tenure and appeal for an 'unbundling' of the faculty's multiple roles.

ing professional autonomy in the process. While the rationale for this is said to be cost-savings, its real purpose is to place instructors under managerial supervision. The pretext is finances, to put it differently, but the real objective is power.

Once this is recognized, a number of seemingly anomalous pieces of the current university puzzle fall into place. The primary reason for swelling the ranks of contingent faculty, for example, has not been to save money but to undermine faculty power by nullifying the internal face of academic freedom. Once 50 percent of the faculty are off the tenure-track and another quarter are awaiting tenure, the protections of tenure, due process, and shared governance have been effectively eliminated for three-quarters of the campus.

The purpose of the current campaign for accountability, similarly, is not to provide for some where there was none before. Faculty, we saw, are subject to many and complex forms of professional accountability. The purpose of the campaign, rather, is to *change the standards* to which academic work is accountable and the objectives for which it is accountable, and to change the people *to whom* faculty are accountable—from peers and journeymen professors to campus bureaucrats and those who simply want the university to produce wage thinkers.

And the assessments movement, for a final example, is worth resisting not only because the most important fruits of a college education are quintessentially of a kind that defies end-of-semester measurement. Nor because students might wind up being taught to the test. It is worth combating because the whole effort seeks by altering methods and criteria of evaluation to transform the work that is being evaluated, and again, to transfer authority from faculty to administration.

With these examples in mind, it becomes clear that the question, "who has the power to define work?" is the basic bone of contention in the current struggles dis-

rupting American campuses. “Whose understanding of the job will govern the workplace?”³⁸—that’s the question that has come to the fore with the advent of the corporate model of governance.

Fourth, the corporate model would destroy what remains of the university as a community and commons and erect a citadel of proprietary knowledge and private calculation in their place. It would become a milieu where discoveries are owned rather than shared, insights are hoarded, and faculty members regard each other as competitors rather than colleagues. That we are well on the way toward such a goal is clear from the fact that where a Benjamin Franklin, for example,

*The corporate campus would become a place where
the value of an insight or discovery is determined by
the price it could fetch in the market.*

refused to patent his stove and lightning rod, and a Jonas Salk his polio vaccine, a computer scientist at U.C. Santa Cruz looking for a way to encrypt messages has acquired a patent on two large prime numbers that “gives him the exclusive right to use the numbers in any way.” Other researchers have patented scientific laws.³⁹

The corporate campus will be a place where the commerce of gifts is supplanted by a commerce of commodities, and the value of an insight or discovery determined by the price they can fetch in the market. The third sphere of faculty work will be eradicated, and what remains of a public space converted into a college theme park occasionally sporting carefully scripted and sanitized events intended for purposes only of public relations and fund-raising.

The marketization of knowledge together with the privatization of campus life charts a process no less fateful for our nation’s future than the famous enclosures of seventeenth century Europe were for its. They mark the enclosure of the knowledge commons. As that enclosure proceeds we can predict that new discoveries will be fenced with patents and copyright, new inventions (like drugs) will be held hostage to desired profit margins, scholarly dialogue will atrophy, students will be closed out of our common intellectual heritage, and the opportunity costs of lost inventions, foreclosed paths of inquiry, and a miseducated citizenry will skyrocket.

The traditional arts of commerce will flourish in such a world, including not only product innovation but also deceptive packaging, product adulteration, and the denial of responsibility when things go wrong. Students will suffer a narrowing of their elders’ responsibilities to them as they become consumers. Faculty will be judged by the funds they raise. And the declaration, “Fiat Lux,” will be replaced on the gates of the academy by the more relevant, “Caveat Emptor.” The new

model in quashing collegiality, autonomy, and authority will have succeeded in converting good work into bad work.

REMEDIES AND RESPONSES

How can faculty resist these assaults on the quality of American higher education and the integrity of their work? First, they need to be aware that the corporate model exists, so they understand the source of campus restructuring plans and what they are up against. Otherwise they run the risk of underestimating the significance of those plans and launching struggles that miss the real issues. It is

Most faculty identify with their discipline or department, perhaps their college, forgetting they are part of a profession and larger national community.

also important to understand the model so they can establish their own independent footing outside of it.

Second, in order to build alliances with other higher education constituencies, faculty need to be clear about who they themselves are. At present, that clarity is lacking due to misconceptions about the nature of their rights and larger purposes. Most faculty identify simply with their discipline or department, perhaps their college. They forget that they are part of a profession and larger national community that has fought for two centuries in America to protect the integrity of intellectual discourse and fulfill responsibilities to provide a genuine liberal education to students and maintain a place “where reason is authorized to speak out publicly.” That forgetfulness may be the real problem with the current American university. Most faculty regard academic freedom less as imposing obligations of sovereignty than as conferring a right to privacy. Such misconceptions in the current era point the sure way to collective defeat. “A profession without power and autonomy,” professor and former NEA union organizer James Sullivan has noted, “is no profession at all.”⁴⁰

Third, what is needed is not simply the intellectual recognition of membership in this larger community but, as Sullivan notes with his point about power, organizational recognition as well. And the most promising means of organization today and chance for creating the power to defend academic work lies with faculty unions, the most recent in a long line of collegial academic inventions.

Faculty senates and faculty unions complement each other. Though some feared that unions would undermine senate governance, studies show that unions have worked to enhance the senate role.⁴¹ This is because senate and union are two faces of the faculty. And an academic union is not just a wages-and-hours organization but a defender of professional standards in all three spheres of faculty

work.⁴² Where senate powers remain advisory and can be ignored with impunity, however, union contracts are legally binding, enforceable at law and they work to uphold the law.⁴³ In an era of reinvention, a faculty without collective bargaining is a weak faculty. (“Without the force of the contract,” Maitland and Rhoades conclude, “the advisory role of faculty in shared governance has limited efficacy in an era of reorganization and restructuring.”⁴⁴) The best way for faculty senates to maintain their power and independence in this era, as faculty at places like Wright State in Ohio have discovered, is to include senate by-laws and original grants of authority in the union contract.

The best way for faculty senates to maintain power and independence is to include senate by-laws and original grants of authority in the union contract.

Unions also provide ways for faculty to provide the real facts about such things as tenure, workload, and contingent faculty to state legislatures and the larger public. And they offer the possibility, finally, for not only defending existing rights but for gaining new objectives—the right to participate in campus budgetary decisions, the right to decide how technology will be used in the classroom and, while we’re at it, a proper accountability program for administrators. Faculty unions are an essential part of modern shared governance.

At the same time faculty struggle against the corporate model, we also need to address the original problem of states’ disinvestment in higher education. This disinvestment is not an inevitable fact of life; nor are spending priorities inevitable once cuts have occurred. Both are political choices.⁴⁵ Faculty need to wage a public campaign to change the politics behind state legislatures’ recent choices and remind the public of the wisdom of its previous commitment to higher education. The only group presently capable of doing this nationally and sufficiently informed about the issues is the faculty itself.

We need a public campaign to warn the nation of the dangers of the corporate university for the republic. I propose that professors, junior faculty, instructors, staff, and students create a national council to unite their various organizations for the purpose of conducting such a campaign. Faculty and their allies need to organize themselves and use public forums, legislative hearings, media interviews, and whatever means are available to persuade the public to reinvest in higher education.

College and university faculty need to do better in defining the terms of debate about higher education than we have done in recent years. The American public needs to hear a voice capable of explaining why academic work is both valuable in itself and necessary for developing students’ gifts, maintaining public space, and sustaining the continuing struggle for a democratic society. 

ENDNOTES

- ¹ See Barry Munitz, "Managing Transformation in an Age of Social Triage," in S.L. Johnson, et al., *Reinventing the University: Managing and Financing Institutions Higher Education*, John Wiley & Sons, 1995. I develop aspects of this article more fully in "The University Revisited: The Alternative to Corporate MisEducation," *Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies*, 27 (1), 17-52. Feb., 2005.
- ² Molly Broad, "Foreword," in D. Oblinger and A. Verville, *What Business Wants from Higher Education*, American Council on Education, Oryx Press, 1998. vi.
- ³ Kelly Field, "Uncertainty Greets Report on Colleges by U.S. Panel," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, September 1, 2006. A38.
- ⁴ Vergerio, after Cicero: "We call those studies *liberal* which are worthy of [i.e., necessary to] a free man." Bruce Kimball, *Orators and Philosophers, A History of the Idea of Liberal Education*, New York: The College Board, 1995. 175.
- ⁵ "Alienated Labor," T. Bottomore, *Karl Marx, Early Writings*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964. 120-34.
- ⁶ John Henry Cardinal Newman, *The Idea of a University*, New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1927. (Orig. 1852). ix. Noel Annan agrees: universities "exist to cultivate the intellect. Everything else is secondary." A. Wooldridge, "A Survey of Higher Education, The Brains Business," *The Economist*, Sept. 10, 2005. 22.
- ⁷ Goodman, *Compulsory Mis-education and the Community of Scholars*, New York: Vintage Books, 1964. 140. C. Wright Mills also stressed that a "prime task of public education...was political: to make the citizen more knowledgeable and thus better able to think and judge of public affairs." *The Power Elite*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1956. 317.
U.C.'s first President, John LeConte instructed California's 1879 Constitutional Convention that investment in a university would "bear its fruit in time, in the form of wise statesmen and legislators, accomplished scholars, original thinkers and investigators, able jurists, public benefactors, and virtuous citizens." John A. Douglass, *The California Idea and American Higher Education*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000. 63.
- ⁸ Kant, *The Conflict of the Faculties*, transl. Mary J. Gregor, New York: Abaris Books, 1979 (orig., 1798). 27-29. Allan Bloom writes that: "The modern university was...an attempt to establish a center for reflection and education independent of the regime and...of public opinion..., devoted to the dispassionate quest for the important and comprehensive truths." *Giants and Dwarfs, Essays, 1960-1990*, New York, Simon and Schuster. 366.
- ⁹ Goodman, 167.
- ¹⁰ Aronowitz, S., *The Knowledge Factory, Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Education*, Boston: Beacon Press, 2000. 65. See also Bloom, 366.
- ¹¹ Goodman, 122. On the university as a public space, see Henry Giroux, "Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere" *Harvard Educational Review*, 72 (4) Winter 2002. 454
- ¹² Mills. 318.
- ¹³ Lovejoy with John Dewey founded the AAUP in 1915. Thomas Haskell, "Justifying the Rights of Academic Freedom in the Era of Power/Knowledge," *The Future of Academic Freedom*, L. Menand, ed., Chicago: University of Chicago, 1996. 66.
- ¹⁴ Newman, 147-48. "Education is not just about transmitting body of facts.... It is about learning to argue and reason, which is best done in a community of scholars," Wooldridge, 4.
- ¹⁵ See Lewis Hyde, *The Gift, Imagination and the Erotic Life of Property*, New York: Vintage Books, 1979. 4, 47. Also, David Bollier, *Silent Theft, the Private Plunder of our Common Wealth*, New York: Routledge, 2003; especially Ch. 9, "Enclosing the Academic Commons."
- ¹⁶ California Faculty Association "Future of the University" hearings, San Jose, March 14, 2000; Los Angeles, May 9, 2000; Sacramento, Nov. 16, 2000.

- ¹⁷ “It is, in short, not the absolute freedom of utterance of the individual scholar, but the absolute freedom of...the academic profession, that is asserted by this declaration of principles.” Ernst Benjamin, “Contractual Protection of Academic Freedom,” April 2006. Ms. in author’s possession. 5.
- ¹⁸ Between 1979 and 1985 state higher education funding as a proportion of operating appropriations (per \$1000 of personal income), fell from \$10.50 to \$9.25, then plummeted again by 2005 to \$6.90. William Zumeta, “The New Finance of Public Higher Education, *NEA 2006 Almanac of Higher Education*, Washington D.C., 2006. 39.
- Recent cuts in federal grants and the shift from need-based grants to loans and tax credits, along with the tuition increases noted below, have saddled graduating seniors now with an average \$19,000 in debt. S. Block, “More College Students Saddled with Big Debt,” *Sacramento Bee*, June 12, 2006. A6. Also Zumeta, 46.
- ¹⁹ Zumeta, 42.
- ²⁰ California Department of Finance, “General Fund Program (Expenditure) Distribution,” Chart C, July, 2005. D. Macaller, Taqi-Eddin, and Schiraldi, “Class Dismissed: Higher Education vs. Corrections During the Wilson Years,” Justice Policy Institute, Washington, D.C. 1998.
- ²¹ J. Lustig, “Treadmill to Oblivion: The Coming Conflict Over Academic Workload, *Thought and Action*. Washington, D.C., NEA, XVIII (1&2), Fall, 2002. 115-128.
- ²² Clark Kerr’s term for the successor to the land-grant university. *The Uses of the University*, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963. 53-55.
- ²³ Tuition and fees in public four-year institutions rose nationally 13% in 2004, and another 10% in 2005. NEA Academe June, 2006, 9. Between 1980 and 2000 the share of higher-education funding assumed by students’ families increased from 35% to 48%. W. Zumeta, “Higher Education in the Nineties: Lessons for the New Millennium,” *NEA 2001 Almanac of Higher Education*, 81. And see Macallair et. al., 5-6.
- ²⁴ Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn, “The Kept University,” *The Atlantic*, March, 2000; and David Noble, *Digital Diploma Mills, The Automation of Higher Education*, Monthly Review Press, 2003.
- ²⁵ Concerning Novartis and U.C., Press and Washburn, 39-42; and G. Blumenstyk, “A Vilified Corporate Partnership Produces Little Change,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 22, 2001. pp. A24-A27.
- University of Florida student/researcher Petr Taborsky continued with previously funded research after expiration of the Florida Progress Corporation grant, and making a major discovery, patented it and took his findings home. The university, whose president, Charles Reed, was also a paid board member of FPC, prosecuted Taborsky on two counts of felony theft—of trade secrets and of his own notebooks. The first months of incarceration were on the chain gang. S. Shulman, “A Researcher’s Conviction,” *MIT Tech Review*, (Feb. 24, 1997): 24; J. Nicklin, “Struggle Over Patent...”, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, (Aug. 4, 1993); L. Jaroff, “Intellectual Chain Gang,” *Time*, (Feb. 10, 1997): 64.
- ²⁶ California’s Horatio Stebbins in the midst of the fight in the 1860s to establish what would become U.C. He added, “The state is bound to furnish the citizens the means to discharg[e] the duties imposed on him...” A representative to California’s 1879 constitutional convention stated that public education “constitutes the very cornerstone of republican institutions.” Douglass, 44, 65, 63.
- ²⁷ “Lawmakers increasingly view higher education as a private good that should be supported more by students and donors, rather than as a public good that deserves state support.” Jeff Selingo, “The Disappearing State of Higher Education,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Feb. 18, 2003. A22.
- ²⁸ Kerr initially denied that there was any downside to the university serving “leadership groups in society.” *Uses*, 8, 19. But by 1995, he emphasized autonomy as a key attribute of a healthy university. *Uses*, 4th ed., Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1995. 182, 192-193.

- ²⁹ R. Monastersky, "Scientific Misbehavior is Rampant, Study of 3000 Researchers Finds," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 17, 2005. A11. Press and Washburn cite a 1996 study of Sheldon Krinsky's which found that of 800 research papers reviewed, a third were done by scientists with a financial interest in the report. 42.
- ³⁰ Videotape in author's possession. The Spellings Report reiterates this script almost verbatim. Field, A39.
- ³¹ Budgeting "sits at the head of the table. Others may sit there too--faculty interests, student interests, staff interests. But finance controls the discussion," even if fiscal officers find it difficult to quantify the intangibles distinctive of college education. Christopher Newfield, "Recapturing Academic Business," 48 *Social Text* 15, Summer, 1997. 44, 48-49.
- ³² Newell, 155, 158 and John Corson, *The Governance of Colleges and Universities*, 1960.
- ³³ Part-timers, who made up 33% of instructional staff in 1987 according to the U.S. Department of Education, counted for 43% by 2003. More importantly, where only 8% of full-time faculty held non-tenure track positions in 1987, fully 21% did so by 2003. J. Gravois, "Growth in Part-Timers Slowed in Last Decade," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Jan. 20, 2006. A19. In California part-timers made up 69% of the U.C. teaching staff and 52% of California State University instructors by 2000. David Kuchta, "The End of Tenure As We Know It," *Faculty Coalition for Public Higher Education*, (FCPHE), San Diego, 4 (4).
- ³⁴ From their perspective "it is the university, not the teachers, that owns the curriculum," Woodridge writes of for-profit managers, and implicitly the new public reorganizers. *The Economist*, 19.
- ³⁵ Cary Nelson, "The War Against the Faculty," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 16, 1999. B4.
- ³⁶ See for example, Laura Noone and Craig Swenson, "Dirty Little Secrets in Higher Education," *Educause*, Nov.-Dec., 2001. 20-31.
- ³⁷ Nelson, B4.
- ³⁸ I am indebted to sociologist David Wellman for this formulation in his study of the long-term conflict between West Coast longshoremen and ship owners. *The Union Makes Us Strong*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995. 209-210.
- ³⁹ "Hot Type" review of Edmund Morgan, Benjamin Franklin (2002), *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Sept. 13, 2002, A18. Seth Shulman, "We Need New Ways to Own and Share Knowledge," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Feb. 19, 1999. A 64.
- ⁴⁰ "Future of the University" hearing, California State University Sacramento, Nov. 16, 2000.
- ⁴¹ Studies cited in C. Maitland and G. Rhoades. "Unions and Faculty Governance," *NEA 2001 Almanac of Higher Education*, Washington D.C., 2001.
- ⁴² A good description of the special character of faculty unions is provide by AAUP's proposal for "member-based unionism," "AAUP Unionism, Principles and Goals," 2005.
- ⁴³ Specifically, Benjamin writes, they work to uphold due process protections and collegial review for promotion and tenure. And law, Benjamin observes, "is the precondition of freedom." 12.
- ⁴⁴ Maitland and Rhoades, 31.
- ⁴⁵ Even after the massive revenue reductions in California triggered by Proposition 13, the state was able to triple the number of its prisons by 1998 and double prison guards' salaries. Macallair et. al., "Class Dismissed." 2. And even after cuts in allocations, the CSU, for example, was able from 1995 to 2002 to increase the number of administrators by 33 percent while the number of students rose by 18 percent, and tenure-track faculty by less than 1 percent. Lustig, 2002. 117.