

# *Neoliberalism, Corporate Culture, and the Promise of Higher Education: The University as a Democratic Public Sphere*

HENRY A. GIROUX

*Pennsylvania State University*

*In this article, Henry Giroux addresses the corrosive effects of corporate culture on the academy and recent attempts by faculty and students to resist the corporatization of higher education. Giroux argues that neoliberalism is the most dangerous ideology of the current historical moment. He shows that civic discourse has given way to the language of commercialization, privatization, and deregulation and that, within the language and images of corporate culture, citizenship is portrayed as an utterly privatized affair that produces self-interested individuals. He maintains that corporate culture functions largely to either ignore or cancel out social injustices in the existing social order by overriding the democratic impulses and practices of civil society through an emphasis on the unbridled workings of market relations. Giroux suggests that these trends mark a hazardous turn in U.S. society, one that threatens our understanding of democracy and affects the ways we address the meaning and purpose of higher education.*

Neoliberalism is the defining political economic paradigm of our time — it refers to the policies and processes whereby a relative handful of private interests are permitted to control as much as possible of social life in order to maximize their personal profit. Associated initially with Reagan and Thatcher, for the past two decades neoliberalism has been the dominant global political economic trend adopted by political parties of the center and much of the traditional left as well as the right. These parties and the policies they enact represent the immediate interests of extremely wealthy investors and less than one thousand large corporations.

— Robert W. McChesney<sup>1</sup>

The task in theory no less than in practice is . . . to reilluminate public space for a civil society in collapse. . . . Societies that pretend that market liberty is the same thing as civic liberty and depend on consumers to do the work of citizens are likely to achieve not unity but a plastic homogeneity — and . . . to give up democracy. . . . We seem fated to enter an era in which in the space where our public voice should be heard will be a raucous babble that leaves the civic souls of nations forever mute.

— Benjamin R. Barber<sup>2</sup>

### The Dystopian Culture of Neoliberalism

As the forces of neoliberalism and corporate culture gain ascendancy in the United States, there is an increasing call for people either to surrender or narrow their capacities for engaged politics in exchange for market-based values, relationships, and identities. Market forces have radically altered the language we use in both representing and evaluating human behavior and action. One consequence is that civic discourse has given way to the language of commercialism, privatization, and deregulation. In addition, individual and social agency are defined largely through market-driven notions of individualism, competition, and consumption. Celebrities such as Martha Stewart, Jane Pratt, George Foreman, and Michael Jordan now market themselves as brand names. The widely read business magazine *Fast Company* devoted an entire issue to the theme “The Brand Called You.”<sup>3</sup> No longer defined as a form of self-development, individuality is reduced to the endless pursuit of mass-mediated interests, pleasures, and commercially produced lifestyles.

One egregious example of self-marketing can be observed in two recent high school graduates’ successful attempt to secure corporate sponsorship to pay for their college tuition and expenses. Just before graduating from high school in June 2001, Chris Barrett and Luke McCabe created a website, *ChrisandLuke.com*, offering themselves up as “walking billboards for companies” willing to both sponsor them and pay for their college tuition, room, and board. Claiming that they “would put corporate logos on their clothes, wear a company’s sunglasses, use their golf clubs, eat their pizza, drink their soda, listen to their music or drive their cars,” these two young men appeared impervious to the implications of defining themselves exclusively through those market values in which buying and selling appears to be the primary marker of one’s relationship to the larger social order.<sup>4</sup> Eventually, First USA, a subsidiary of Bank One Corporation and a leader in issuing Visa credit cards to students, agreed to sponsor Chris and Luke, thus providing them with the dubious distinction of becoming the first fully corporate sponsored university students.

Once the deal was sealed, Chris and Luke were featured in most of the major media, including *USA Today*, the *New York Times*, and *Teen Newsweek*. Hailed in the press as a heartwarming story about individual ingenuity, business acumen, and resourcefulness, there was little criticism of the individual

and social implications of what it meant for these young people to both define their identities as commodities and present themselves simply as objects to be advertised and consumed. And, of course, nothing was said about spiraling tuition costs coupled with evaporating financial aid that increasingly puts higher education out of reach for working-class and middle-class youth. In a media-saturated society, it appears perfectly legitimate to assume that young people can define themselves almost exclusively through the aesthetic pleasures of consumerism and the dictates of commercialism rather than through a notion of publicness based on ethical norms and democratic values.<sup>5</sup> In short, it appears that a story in which students give up their voices to promote a corporate ideology is viewed in the public media less as a threat to democratic norms and civic courage than as an ode to the triumphant wisdom of market ingenuity. Equally disturbing is the assumption on the part of the two students that their identities as corporate logos is neither at odds with their role as university students nor incompatible with the role the university should play as a site of critical thinking, democratic leadership, and public engagement. Undaunted by blurring the line between their role as corporate pitchmen and their role as students, or for that matter about the encroachment of advertising into higher education, Chris and Luke defended their position by claiming, “We want to be role models for other kids to show that you don’t have to wake up every day and be like everybody else.”<sup>6</sup>

After Chris and Luke’s story ran in the *New York Times*, a related incident gained widespread public attention, perhaps inspired by Chris and Luke’s inventive entrepreneurialism. A young couple in Mount Kisco, New York, attempted to auction off on Ebay and Yahoo the naming rights of their soon-to-be-born child to the highest corporate bidder. These are more than oddball stories. As William Powers, a writer for the *Atlantic Monthly*, observes, these public narratives represent “dark fables about what we are becoming as a culture.”<sup>7</sup> One wonders where this type of madness is going to end. But one thing is clear: As society is defined through the culture and values of neoliberalism, the relationship between a critical education, public morality, and civic responsibility as conditions for creating thoughtful and engaged citizens are sacrificed all too willingly to the interest of financial capital and the logic of profit-making.

This sad and tragic narrative suggests that citizens lose their public voice as market liberties replace civic freedoms and society increasingly depends on “consumers to do the work of citizens.”<sup>8</sup> Similarly, as corporate culture extends even deeper into the basic institutions of civil and political society, there is a simultaneous diminishing of noncommodified public spheres — those institutions such as public schools, churches, noncommercial public broadcasting, libraries, trade unions, and various voluntary institutions engaged in dialogue, education, and learning — that address the relationship of the self to public life and social responsibility to the broader demands of citizenship, as well as provide a robust vehicle for public participation and

democratic citizenship. As media theorists Edward Herman and Robert McChesney observe, such noncommodified public spheres have played an invaluable role historically "as places and forums where issues of importance to a political community are discussed and debated, and where information is presented that is essential to citizen participation in community life."<sup>9</sup> Without these critical public spheres, corporate power often goes unchecked and politics becomes dull, cynical, and oppressive.<sup>10</sup> But more importantly, in the absence of such public spheres it becomes more difficult for citizens to challenge the neoliberal myth that citizens are *merely* consumers and that "wholly unregulated markets are the sole means by which we can produce and distribute everything we care about, from durable goods to spiritual values, from capital development to social justice, from profitability to sustainable environments, from private wealth to essential commonweal."<sup>11</sup> As democratic values give way to commercial values, intellectual ambitions are often reduced to an instrument of the entrepreneurial self and social visions are dismissed as hopelessly out of date.<sup>12</sup> Public space is portrayed exclusively as an investment opportunity, and the public good increasingly becomes a metaphor for public disorder. That is, any notion of the public — for example, public schools, public transportation, or public parks — becomes synonymous with disrepair, danger, and risk. Within this discourse, anyone who does not believe that rapacious capitalism is the only road to freedom and the good life is dismissed as a crank. Hence, it is not surprising that Joseph Kahn, writing in the *New York Times*, argues without irony, "These days, it seems, only wild-eyed anarchists and Third World dictators believe capitalism is not the high road to a better life."<sup>13</sup>

Neoliberalism has become the most dangerous ideology of the current historical moment.<sup>14</sup> It assaults all things public, mystifies the basic contradiction between democratic values and market fundamentalism, and weakens any viable notion of political agency by offering no language capable of connecting private considerations to public issues. Similarly, as Jean and John Comaroff, distinguished professors of anthropology at the University of Chicago, point out in "Millennial Capitalism: First Thoughts on a Second Coming," neoliberalism works to "displace political sovereignty with the sovereignty of 'the market,' as if the latter had a mind and morality of its own."<sup>15</sup>

Under the rule of neoliberalism, politics are market driven and the claims of democratic citizenship are subordinated to market values. What becomes troubling under such circumstances is not simply that ideas associated with freedom and agency are defined through the prevailing ideology and principles of the market, but that neoliberalism wraps itself in what appears to be an unassailable appeal to common sense. As Zygmunt Bauman notes, "What . . . makes the neo-liberal world-view sharply different from other ideologies — indeed, a phenomenon of a separate class — is precisely the absence of questioning; its surrender to what is seen as the implacable and irreversible logic of social reality."<sup>16</sup> Also lost is the very viability of politics itself. As the

Comaroffs observe, "There is a strong argument to be made that neoliberal capitalism in its millennial moment portends the death of politics by hiding its own ideological underpinnings in the dictates of economic efficiency."<sup>17</sup>

Defined as the paragon of all social relations by Friedrich von Hayek, Milton Friedman, Robert Nozick, Francis Fukuyama, and other market fundamentalists, neoliberalism attempts to eliminate an engaged critique about its most basic principles and social consequences by embracing the "market as the arbiter of social destiny."<sup>18</sup> In this instance, neoliberalism empties the public treasury, hollows out public services, and limits the vocabulary and imagery available to recognize noncommercialized public space, antidemocratic forms of power, and narrow models of individual agency. It also undermines the translating functions of any viable democracy by undercutting the ability of individuals to engage in the continuous translation between public considerations and the private interests by collapsing the public into the realm of the private. As Bauman observes, "It is no longer true that the 'public' is set on colonizing the 'private.' The opposite is the case: it is the private that colonizes the public space, squeezing out and chasing away everything which cannot be fully, without residue, translated into the vocabulary of private interests and pursuits."<sup>19</sup> Divested of its political possibilities and social underpinnings, freedom finds few opportunities for translating private worries into public concerns or individual discontent into collective struggle.<sup>20</sup>

Within neoliberalism's market-driven discourse, corporate culture becomes both the model for the good life and the paradigmatic sphere for defining individual success and fulfillment. I use the term *corporate culture* to refer to an ensemble of ideological and institutional forces that functions politically and pedagogically both to govern organizational life through senior managerial control and to fashion compliant workers, depoliticized consumers, and passive citizens.<sup>21</sup> Within the language and images of corporate culture, citizenship is portrayed as an utterly privatized affair whose aim is to produce competitive self-interested individuals vying for their own material and ideological gain.<sup>22</sup> Reformulating social issues as strictly private concerns, corporate culture functions largely to either cancel out or devalue social, class-specific, and racial injustices of the existing social order by absorbing the democratic impulses and practices of civil society within narrow economic relations. Corporate culture becomes an all-encompassing horizon for producing market identities, values, and practices. The good life, in this discourse, "is construed in terms of our identities as consumers — we are what we buy."<sup>23</sup> The good life now means living inside the world of corporate brands.

Accountable only to the bottom line of profitability, corporate culture, and its growing influence in U.S. life has signaled a radical shift in both the notion of public culture and what constitutes the meaning of citizenship and the defense of the public good. For example, the rapid resurgence of corporate power in the last twenty years and the attendant reorientation of culture



to the demands of commerce and regulation have substituted the language of personal responsibility and private initiative for the discourses of social responsibility and public service. This can be seen in the enactment of government policies designed to dismantle state protections for the poor, the environment, working people, and people of color.<sup>24</sup> This includes not only President George W. Bush's proposed welfare bill, which imposes harsh working requirements on the poor without the benefits of child-care subsidies, but also the dismantling of race-based programs such as the California Civil Rights Initiative and the landmark affirmative action case, *Hopwood vs. Texas*, both designed to eliminate affirmative action in higher education; the reduction of federal monies for urban development, such as HUD's housing program;<sup>25</sup> the weakening of federal legislation to protect the environment; and a massive increase in state funds for building prisons at the expense of funding for public higher education.<sup>26</sup> According to Terrance Ball, professor of political theory at Arizona State University, corporate culture rests on a dystopian notion of what he calls marketopia and is characterized by a massive violation of equity and justice. He argues:

The main shortcoming of marketopia is its massive and systematic violation of a fundamental sense of fairness. Marketopians who cannot afford health care, education, police protection, and other of life's necessities are denied a fair (or even minimally sufficient) share of social goods. Indeed, they are destitute of every good, excluded from a just share of society's benefits and advantages, pushed to the margins, rendered invisible. They are excluded because they lack the resources to purchase goods and services that ought to be theirs by right.<sup>27</sup>

As a result of the corporate takeover of public life, the maintenance of democratic public spheres from which to organize the energies of a moral vision loses all relevance. State and civil society are limited in their ability to impose or make corporate power accountable. As a result, politics as an expression of democratic struggle is deflated, and it becomes more difficult, if not impossible, to address pressing social and moral issues in systemic and political terms. This suggests a hazardous turn in U.S. society, one that both threatens our understanding of democracy as fundamental to our freedom and the ways in which we address the meaning and purpose of public and higher education.

Unchecked by traditional forms of state power and removed from any sense of place-based allegiance, neoliberal capitalism appears more detached than ever from traditional forms of political power and ethical considerations. Public sector activities such as transportation (in spite of the recent Amtrak bailout, an exception to the rule), health care, and education are no longer safeguarded from incursions by the buying and selling logic of the market, and the consequences are evident everywhere as the language of the corporate commercial paradigm describes doctors and nurses as "selling" medical services, students as customers, admitting college students as "closing a deal," and university presidents as CEOs.<sup>28</sup> But there is more at

stake here than simply the commodification of language. There is, as Pierre Bourdieu has argued, the emergence of a Darwinian world marked by the progressive removal of autonomous spheres of cultural production such as journalism, publishing, and film; the destruction of collective structures capable of counteracting the widespread imposition of commercial values and effects of the pure market; the creation of a global reserve army of the unemployed; and the subordination of nation states to the masters of the economy. Bourdieu is worth quoting at length on the effects of this dystopian world of neoliberalism:

First is the destruction of all the collective institutions capable of counteracting the effects of the infernal machine, primarily those of the state, repository of all of the universal values associated with the idea of the public realm. Second is the imposition everywhere, in the upper spheres of the economy and the state as at the heart of corporations, of that sort of moral Darwinism that, with the cult of the winner, schooled in higher mathematics and bungee jumping, institutes the struggle of all against all and cynicism as the norm of all action and behaviour.<sup>29</sup>

I am not suggesting that neoliberal capitalism is the enemy of democracy or that market investments cannot at times serve the public good, but that in the absence of vibrant, democratic public spheres, corporate power, when left on its own, appears to respect few boundaries based on self-restraint and the public good, and is increasingly unresponsive to those broader human values that are central to a democratic civic culture. I believe that in the current historical moment neoliberal capitalism is not simply too overpowering but that "democracy is too weak."<sup>30</sup> Hence, the increasing influence of money over politics, corporate interests over public concerns, and the growing tyranny of unchecked corporate power and avarice. Increasing evidence of the shameless "greed-is-good" mantra can be found in the corruption and scandals that have rocked giant corporations such as Enron, WorldCom, Xerox, Tyco, Walmart, and Adelphia. The fallout suggests a widening crisis of confidence in the United States' economic leadership in the world and reflects comments such as those by Guido Rossi, a former Italian telecom chairman, who points out that "what is lacking in the U.S. is a culture of shame. No C.E.O. in the U.S. is considered a thief if he does something wrong. It is a kind of moral cancer."<sup>31</sup> Clearly, there is more at stake in this crisis than simply the greed of a few high-profile CEOs. More importantly, there is the historic challenge neoliberalism and market fundamentalism pose to democracy, citizenship, social justice, and civic education.

Such commentary reflects a fundamental shift regarding how we think about the relationship between corporate culture and democracy.<sup>32</sup> In what follows, I argue that one of the most important indications of such a change can be seen in the ways in which educators are currently being asked to rethink the role of higher education. Underlying this analysis is the assumption that the struggle to reclaim higher education must be seen as part of a



broader battle over the defense of public goods and that at the heart of such a struggle is the need to challenge the ever-growing discourse and influence of neoliberalism, corporate power, and corporate politics. I conclude by offering some suggestions as to what educators can do to reassert the primacy of higher education as an essential sphere for expanding and deepening the processes of democracy and civil society. I also offer some ideas for new places and spaces of resistance in which individuals and groups can affirm and act on the values of critical engagement and civic responsibility to deepen and expand the values and practices of a substantive democratic society.

### Incorporating Higher Education

Struggling for democracy is both a political and an educational task. Fundamental to the rise of a vibrant democratic culture is the recognition that education must be treated as a public good — as a crucial site where students gain a public voice and come to grips with their own power as individual and social agents. Public and higher education cannot be viewed merely as sites for commercial investment or for affirming a notion of the private good based exclusively on the fulfillment of individual needs. Reducing higher education to the handmaiden of corporate culture works against the critical social imperative of educating citizens who can sustain and develop inclusive democratic public spheres. A long tradition extending from Thomas Jefferson to John Dewey and C. Wright Mills extols the importance of education as essential for a democratic public life. Sheila Slaughter has argued persuasively that at the close of the nineteenth century “professors made it clear that they did not want to be part of a cutthroat capitalism. . . . Instead, they tried to create a space between capital and labor where [they] could support a common intellectual project directed toward the public good.”<sup>33</sup>

The legacy of public discourse appears to have faded as the U.S. university reinvents itself by giving in to the demands of the marketplace. Venture capitalists now scour colleges and universities in search of big profits made through licensing agreements, the control of intellectual property rights, and promoting and investing in university spin-off companies.<sup>34</sup> In the age of money and profit, academic disciplines gain stature almost exclusively through their exchange value on the market, and students now rush to take courses and receive professional credentials that provide them with the cachet they need to sell themselves to the highest bidder. Michael M. Crow, president of Arizona State University, echoes this shift in the role of higher education by proclaiming, without irony, that professors should be labeled as “academic entrepreneurs.” In light of his view of the role of academic labor, it is not surprising that he views knowledge strictly as a form of financial capital. He states, “We are expanding what it means to be a knowledge enterprise. We use knowledge as a form of venture capital.”<sup>35</sup>

The current debate over the reform of higher education appears indifferent both to the historic function of U.S. universities and to the broader ideological, economic, and political issues that have shaped it. Against the encroaching demands of a market-driven logic, a number of educators have argued forcefully that higher education should be defended as both a public good and an autonomous sphere for the development of a critical and productive democratic citizenry.<sup>36</sup> For many educators, higher education represents a central site for keeping alive the tension between market values and those values representative of civil society that cannot be measured in narrow commercial terms but are crucial to a substantive democracy. Central to defending the university as a public good and site of critical learning is the recognition that education must not be confused with job training, suggesting all the more that educators must resist allowing commercial values to shape the purpose and mission of higher education. Richard Hoftstadter, the renowned American historian, understood the threat that corporate values posed to education and once argued that the best reason for supporting higher education “lies not in the services they perform . . . but in the values they represent.”<sup>37</sup> For Hoftstadter, it was the values of justice, freedom, equality, and the rights of citizens as equal and free human beings that were at the heart of what it meant for higher education to fulfill its role in educating students for the demands of leadership, social citizenship, and democratic public life.

The ascendancy of corporate culture in all facets of life in the United States has tended to uproot the legacy of democratic concerns and rights that has historically defined the stated mission of higher education.<sup>38</sup> Moreover, the growing influence of corporate culture on university life in the United States has served to largely undermine the distinction between higher education and business that educators such as Hoftstadter wanted to preserve. As universities become increasingly strapped for money, corporations are more than willing to provide the needed resources, but the costs are troubling and come with strings attached. Corporations increasingly dictate the very research they sponsor, and in some universities, such as the University of California, Berkeley, business representatives are actually appointed to sit on faculty committees that determine how research funds are to be spent and allocated. Equally disturbing is the emergence of a number of academics that either hold stocks or other financial incentives in the very companies sponsoring their research. As the boundaries between public values and commercial interests become blurred, many academics appear less as disinterested truth seekers than as operatives for business interests.

But there is more at stake than academics selling out to the highest corporate bidder. In some cases, academic research is compromised, and corporations routinely censor research results that are at odds with their commercial interests. For instance, Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn reported that “in a 1996 study published in the *Annals of Internal Medicine* . . . a senior research

scholar at Stanford's Center for Biomedical Ethics, . . . Mildred Cho, found that 98 percent of papers based on industry-sponsored research reflected favorably on the drugs being examined, as compared with 79 percent of papers based on research not funded by the industry."<sup>39</sup> Press and Washburn also provided examples of companies that have censored corporate-sponsored research papers by removing passages that highlighted unfavorable results or negative outcomes.<sup>40</sup>

It gets worse. As large amounts of corporate capital flow into the universities, those areas of study in the university that don't translate into substantial profits get either marginalized, underfunded, or eliminated. Hence, we are witnessing both a downsizing in the humanities and the increasing refusal on the part of universities to fund research in services such as public health that are largely used by people who can't pay for them. Moreover, programs and courses that focus on areas such as critical theory, literature, feminism, ethics, environmentalism, postcolonialism, philosophy, and sociology suggest an intellectual cosmopolitanism or a concern with social issues that will be either eliminated or technicized because their role in the market will be judged as ornamental. Similarly, those working conditions that allow professors and graduate assistants to comment extensively on student work, teach small classes, take on student advising, conduct independent studies, and engage in collaborative research will be further weakened or eliminated, since they do not appear consistent with the imperatives of downsizing, efficiency, and cost accounting.<sup>41</sup>

The new corporate university values profit, control, and efficiency, all hallmark values of the neoliberal corporate ethic. These far outweigh considerations about pedagogy or the role of the faculty in maintaining some control over what they teach. For example, Patricia Brodsky, a professor of foreign language and literature, tells the story of an enterprising dean at the University of Missouri at Kansas City who informed the faculty of the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures that he wanted them to offer a series of beginning language courses in German and Spanish. To save money, he proposed that the courses be taught by computer in the language laboratory rather than be taught in a classroom by a traditional teacher. The word spread quickly among the students that the course was an easy way to get ten hours' credit, and at one point over five hundred students enrolled in first- and second-semester Spanish. There were only two part-time instructors to handle these students, and their role was limited to performing the technical task of assigning grades produced by computer-graded exams. It soon became clear that the computer-driven course was a disaster. As Brodsky points out:

The method employed was totally passive. Students didn't speak at all and rarely wrote. They looked at pictures and listened to voices say words and sentences. Nor were any grammatical concepts presented. Exercises were not interactive, nor did they take advantage of other possibilities offered by computer

technology. The only plus for the student was that they didn't have to show up for class at regularly scheduled times. The problems worsened when students attempted to transfer from these courses into the mainstream curriculum at the third semester level, for they had learned virtually nothing. This caused havoc for instructors in the third semester courses as well as hardship for the students. Their graduation dates sometimes had to be delayed, and they were justifiably angry at having wasted their time and money. It also necessitated our teaching additional remedial courses so that the students could fulfill their requirement.<sup>42</sup>

From the dean's perspective, the course was a great success. He only had to pay the salaries of two part-time faculty while a huge number of students paid full tuition. When the faculty voted to cancel the course because of its obvious problems and failures, the dean responded by claiming the faculty didn't know how to teach and continued the courses by offering them under a different program.<sup>43</sup>

Within the neoliberal era of deregulation and the triumph of the market, many students and their families no longer believe that higher education is about higher learning, but about gaining a better foothold in the job market. Colleges and universities are perceived — and perceive themselves — as training grounds for corporate berths. Jeff Williams, editor of *The Minnesota Review*, goes even further, arguing that universities have become licensed storefronts for brand-name corporations. He writes:

Universities are now being conscripted as a latter kind of franchise, directly as training grounds for the corporate workforce; this is most obvious in the growth of business departments but impacts English, too, in the proliferation of more "practical" degrees in technical writing and the like. In fact, not only has university work been redirected to serve corporate-profit agendas via its grant-suppliant status, but universities have become franchises in their own right, reconfigured according to corporate management, labor, and consumer models and delivering a name brand product.<sup>44</sup>

The "brand naming" of the university is also evident in the increasing number of endowed chairs funded by major corporations and rich corporate donors. For example, Nike CEO Phil Knight has donated \$15 million to the University of Oregon for the creation of a number of endowed chairs across the campus, seven of which have been established, including the Knight Chair for University Librarian and a Knight Chair designated for the dean of the School of Law. The Knight Chair endowment coupled with matching contributions "are expected to eventually support at least 30 new endowed chairs."<sup>45</sup> In addition, the Knight family name will appear on a new law school building named the William W. Knight Law Center, after Phil Knight's father. The Lego company not only endowed a chair at the MIT Media Laboratory, it also funds a \$5 million LEGO Learning Lab. Academic titles not only signal wealthy corporate donors' influence on universities, but have also served as billboards for corporations. Some of the more well known include



the General Mills Chair of Cereal Chemistry and Technology at the University of Minnesota, Stanford University's Yahoo! Chair of Information Management Systems, and the University of Memphis' FedEx Chair of Information-Management Systems.

Corporate giving through the funding of endowed chairs also, in some instances, gives business an opportunity to play a significant role in selecting a faculty member. In this way, they can influence what kind of research actually takes place under the aegis of the endowment. For instance, Kmart approved the appointment of J. Patrick Kelly for its chair at Wayne State University. Kelly worked for years on joint projects with Kmart and, not surprisingly, once he occupied the chair he engaged in research projects that not only benefited Kmart but also saved the company millions of dollars. In response to criticisms of his role as a Kmart researcher, Kelly argues in an article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* that "Kmart's attitude always has been: What did we get from you this year? Some professors would say they don't like that position, but for me, it's kept me involved with a major retailer, and it's been a good thing." Kmart defends their influence over the chair by claiming, "We continue to use Dr. Kelly for consulting as well as training. It's certainly an investment, and one that we do tap into."<sup>46</sup> The tragedy here is not simply that Kelly defines himself less as an independent researcher and critical educator than as a Kmart employee, but he seems to have no clue whatsoever about the implications of this type of encroachment by corporate power and values upon academic freedom, responsible scholarly research, or faculty governance.

In the name of efficiency, educational consultants all over the United States advise their clients to act like corporations selling products and to seek "market niches" to save themselves. The increased traffic between the world of venture capitalism and higher education is captured in a recent issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education*.<sup>47</sup> Goldie Blumstyk, a *Chronicle* reporter, followed business consultant and venture capitalist Jonah Schnel of ITU Ventures for four days as he traveled between Southern California and Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. In the course of his travels, Schnel met with deans and a number of promising professors at the University of California, Los Angeles, and Carnegie-Mellon University in order to explore the possibility of creating spin-off companies capable of producing lucrative profits for both the involved faculty and the university. Within this discourse, the lure of profit is the only cachet that seems to matter. Research projects are discussed not in terms of their contribution to the public good or for their potential intellectual breakthroughs, but for what they produce and the potential profits they may make in the commercial sector.

The consequences of transforming university research into a commercially driven enterprise can be seen most clearly in the profitable bioscience and pharmaceutical industries. As David Trend points out, "The overwhelming majority of research investment [in the pharmaceutical industry] has

gone not to saving the lives of millions of people in the developing world, but to what have been called 'lifestyle drugs' [that treat] such maladies as impotence, obesity, baldness and wrinkles . . . [even though] malaria, tuberculosis, and respiratory infections killed 6.1 million people last year."<sup>48</sup> Research investment for finding new drugs to combat these diseases is miniscule. While pharmaceutical companies will spend more than \$24 billion in research working with universities to develop high-profit drugs such as Viagra, only \$2 billion will be spent on drugs used to combat deadly diseases such as malaria, even though the disease is expected to kill more than forty million Africans alone in the next twenty years.<sup>49</sup> The corrosive effects of the influence of corporate power on higher education can also be seen in the complex connections between universities and corporations that are developing over intellectual property rights, licensing income, and patenting agreements.

Online courses also raise important issues about higher education and intellectual property, such as who owns the rights for course materials developed for online use. Because of the market potential of online lectures and course materials, various universities have attempted to claim ownership of such knowledge. The passing of the 1980 Bayh-Dole Act and the 1984 Public Law 98-620 by the U.S. Congress enabled "universities and professors to own patents on discoveries or inventions made as a result of federally supported research."<sup>50</sup> These laws accorded universities intellectual property rights, with specific rights to own, license, and sell their patents to firms for commercial profits. The results have been far from unproblematic.<sup>51</sup> Julia Porter Liebeskind points to three specific areas of concern that are worth mentioning.

First, the growth of patenting by universities has provided a strong incentive "for researchers to pursue commercial projects," especially in light of the large profits that can be made by faculty.<sup>52</sup> For instance, in 1995 five faculty members in the University of California system and an equal number at Stanford University earned a total of \$69 million in licensing income. And while it is true that the probability of faculty earning large profits is small, the possibility for high-powered financial rewards cannot be discounted in shaping the production of knowledge and research at the university.

Second, patenting agreements can place undue restraints on faculty, especially with respect to keeping their research secret and delaying publication, or even prohibiting "publication of research altogether if it is found to have commercial value."<sup>53</sup> Such secrecy not only undermines faculty collegiality and limits a faculty member's willingness to work collectively with others, it can also damage faculty careers and, most important, prevent valuable research from becoming part of public knowledge.

Finally, the ongoing commercialization of research places undue pressure on faculty to pursue research that can raise revenue and poses a threat to faculty intellectual property rights. For example, at UCLA, an agreement was



signed in 1994 that allowed an outside vendor, OnlineLearning.net, to create and copyright online versions of UCLA courses. The agreement was eventually "amended in 1999 to affirm professors' rights to the basic content of their courses . . . [but] under the amended contract, OnlineLearning retain[ed] their right to market and distribute those courses online, which is the crux of the copyright dispute."<sup>54</sup>

The debate over intellectual property rights calls into question not only the increasing influence of neoliberal and corporate values on the university, but also the vital issue of academic freedom. As universities make more and more claims on owning the content of faculty notes, lectures, books, computer files, and media for classroom use, the first casualty is, as UCLA professor Ed Condren points out, "the legal protection that enables faculty to freely express their views without fear of censorship or appropriation of their ideas."<sup>55</sup> At the same time, by appropriating property rights to courses, even for a fee, universities infringe on the ownership rights of faculty members by taking from them any control over how their courses might be used in the public domain.

Within this corporatized regime, management models of decisionmaking replace faculty governance. Once constrained by the concept of "shared" governance, administrations in the past decade have taken more power and reduced faculty-controlled governance institutions to advisory status. Given the narrow nature of corporate concerns, it is not surprising that when matters of accountability become part of the language of educational reform, they are divorced from broader considerations of social responsibility. As corporate culture and values shape university life, corporate planning replaces social planning, management becomes a substitute for leadership, and the private domain of individual achievement replaces the discourse of public politics and social responsibility. As the power of higher education is reduced in its ability to make corporate power accountable, it becomes more difficult within the logic of the bottom line for faculty, students, and administrators to address pressing social and ethical issues.<sup>56</sup> This suggests a perilous turn in U.S. society, one that threatens both our understanding of democracy as fundamental to our basic rights and freedoms and the ways in which we can rethink and re-appropriate the meaning, purpose, and future of higher education.

### Higher Education, Corporate Leadership, and the Rise of the Academic Manager

As corporate governance becomes a central feature of U.S. higher education, leadership is being transformed to model the highest reaches of corporate culture. In a widely read article, "Its Lowly at the Top: What Became of the Great College Presidents," Jay Mathews argues that it has become increasingly difficult to find models of academic leadership in higher educa-

tion that emulate the great college presidents of the past, many of whom played an esteemed and pronounced role in the drama of intellectual and political life. Pointing to such national luminaries as Charles Eliot, James Conant, Robert M. Hutchins, Theodore Hesburgh, Clark Kerr, and, more recently, Kingman Brewster, Mathews argues that the latter were powerful intellectuals whose ideas and publications provoked national debates, shaped public policy, and contributed to the intellectual culture of both their respective universities and the larger social order. Leadership has taken a different turn under the model of the corporate university. Mathews argues, and rightly so, that today's college presidents are known less for their intellectual leadership than for their role "as fundraisers and ribbon cutters and coat holders, filling a slot rather than changing the world."<sup>57</sup>

Academic administrators today do not have to display intellectual reach and civic courage. Instead, they are expected to bridge the world of academe and business. Sought after by professional headhunters who want candidates that are both safe and "most likely to shine in corporate boardrooms," the new breed of university presidents are characterized less by their ability to take risks, think critically, engage important progressive social issues, and provoke national debates than they are for raising money, producing media-grabbing public relations, and looking good for photo shoots.<sup>58</sup> As reported recently in *USA Today*, "more and more colleges and universities are hiring presidents straight from the business world."<sup>59</sup> To prove the point, *USA Today* provided three high-profile examples: Babson College named a Wall Street veteran as its president, Bowdoin College gave the job to a corporate lawyer and, in the most famous case of all, Harvard University picked former U.S. Treasury Secretary Lawrence Summers as its president. Admittedly, the neoliberal Summers seems to be equally concerned with engaging ideas and asking unsettling questions as with the more mundane task of fundraising.<sup>60</sup> The overt corporatization of university leadership makes clear that what was once part of the hidden curriculum of higher education — the creeping vocationalization and subordination of learning to the dictates of the market — has become an open and defining principle of education at all levels of learning.<sup>61</sup>

In the aftermath of the U.S. recession and the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, many colleges and universities are experiencing financial hard times. These events have exacerbated a downturn in economic conditions brought on by the end of the Cold War and the dwindling of government-financed defense projects, coupled with a sharp reduction of state aid to higher education. As a result, many colleges and universities are all too happy to allow corporate leaders to run their institutions, form business partnerships, establish cushy relationships with business-oriented legislators, and develop curricular programs tailored to the needs of corporate interests.<sup>62</sup> I am not suggesting that corporate funding is any less reprehensible than military funding as much as I am noting how the changing fiscal

nature of universities underscores their growing reliance on corporate models of leadership. One crucial example of this is the increasing willingness on the part of legislators, government representatives, and higher education officials to rely on corporate leaders to establish the terms of the debate in the media regarding the meaning and purpose of higher education. Bill Gates, Jack Welch, Michael Milken, Warren Buffet, and other members of the Fortune 500 "club" continue to be viewed as educational prophets — in spite of the smirched reputation of former CEOs such as Kenneth Lay of Enron, Al Dunlap of Sunbeam, and Dennis Kozlowski of Tyco.<sup>63</sup> Yet, the only qualifications they seem to have is that they have been successful in earning huge profits for themselves and their shareholders, while at the same time laying off thousands of workers in order to cut costs and raise profits. While Gates, Milken, and others couch their concerns about education in the rhetoric of public service, corporate organizations such as the Committee for Economic Development, an organization of about 250 corporations, have been more blunt about their interest in education.<sup>64</sup> Not only has the group argued that social goals and services get in the way of learning basic skills, but also that many employers in the business community feel dissatisfied because "a large majority of their new hires lack adequate writing and problem-solving skills."<sup>65</sup>

Matters of leadership and accountability within neoliberalism and corporate culture in general rarely include broader considerations of ethics, equity, and justice, and it is precisely this element of market fundamentalism that corporate leaders often bring to academic leadership roles. Corporate culture lacks a vision beyond its own pragmatic interests and seldom provides a self-critical inventory about its own ideology and its effects on society. It is difficult to imagine such concerns arising within corporations where questions of consequence begin and end with the bottom line. For instance, it is clear that advocates of neoliberalism, in their drive to create wealth for a limited few, have no incentives for taking care of basic social needs. This is obvious not only in their attempts to render the welfare state obsolete, privatize all public goods, and destroy traditional state-protected safety nets, but also in their disregard of the environment, their misallocation of resources between the private and public sectors, and their relentless pursuit of profits. It is precisely this lack of emphasis on being a public servant and an academic citizen that is lacking in the leadership models that corporate executives often bring with them to their roles as academic administrators. Unfortunately, it often pays off.

Neoliberalism taints any civic-inspired notion of educational leadership because it represents a kind of market fundamentalism based on the untrammled pursuit of self-interest — often wrapped up in the post-September 11 language of patriotism. Consequently, its corporate executives and market professionals may not be the best qualified to assume roles of leadership in higher education. As market-fund mogul George Soros has pointed out, the

distinguishing feature of market fundamentalism is that "morality does not enter into [its] calculations" and does not necessarily serve the common interest, nor is such fundamentalism capable of taking care of collective needs and ensuring social justice.<sup>66</sup> It is highly unlikely that corporations such as Disney, IBM, Microsoft, or General Motors will seriously address the political and social consequences regarding policies they implement that have resulted in downsizing, deindustrialization, and the "trend toward more low-paid, temporary, benefit-free, blue- and white-collar jobs and fewer decent permanent factory and office jobs."<sup>67</sup> Rather, the onus of responsibility is placed on educated citizens to recognize that corporate principles of efficiency, accountability, and profit maximization have not created new jobs but in most cases have eliminated them (over 75 million jobs have been lost since 1973).<sup>68</sup> It is our responsibility to recognize that the world presented to them through allegedly objective reporting is mediated — and manipulated by — a handful of global media industries. My point, of course, is that such absences in public discourse constitute a defining principal of corporate ideology, which refuses to address — and must be made to address — the scarcity of moral vision that inspires such calls for educational reform modeled after corporate reforms implemented in the last decade.

Absent from corporate culture's investment in higher education is any analysis of how power works in shaping knowledge in the interest of public morality, how the teaching of broader social values provides safeguards against turning citizen skills into training skills for the workplace, or how schooling can help students reconcile the seemingly opposing needs of freedom and solidarity in order to forge a new conception of civic courage and democratic public life. Knowledge as capital in the corporate model is privileged as a form of investment in the economy, but appears to have little value when linked to the power of self-definition, social responsibility, or the capacities of individuals to expand the scope of freedom, justice, and the operations of democracy.<sup>69</sup> Knowledge stripped of ethical and political considerations offers limited, if any, insights into how universities should educate students to push against the oppressive boundaries of gender, class, race, and age domination. Nor does such a language provide the pedagogical conditions for students to critically engage knowledge as an ideology deeply implicated in issues and struggles concerning the production of identities, culture, power, and history. Education is a moral and political practice and always presupposes an introduction to and preparation for particular forms of social life, a particular rendering of what community is, and what the future might hold. If higher education is in part about the production of knowledge, values, and identities, then curricula modeled after corporate culture have been enormously successful in preparing students for low-skilled service work in a society that has little to offer in the way of meaningful employment for the vast majority of its graduates. If CEOs are going to provide some insight into how education should be reformed, they will have



to reverse their tendency to collapse the boundaries between corporate culture and civic culture, between a society that defines itself through the interests of corporate power and one that defines itself through more democratic considerations regarding what constitutes substantive citizenship and social responsibility. Moreover, they will have to recognize that the problems with U.S. schools cannot be reduced to matters of accountability or cost-effectiveness. Nor can the solution to such problems be reduced to the spheres of management, economics, and technological quick fixes such as distance education. The problems of higher education must be addressed in the realms of values and politics, while engaging critically the most fundamental beliefs U.S. citizens have regarding the meaning and purpose of education and its relationship to democracy.

### Corporate Culture's Threat to Faculty

As universities increasingly model themselves after corporations, it becomes crucial to understand how the principles of corporate culture intersect with the meaning and purpose of the university, the role of knowledge production for the twenty-first century, and the social practices inscribed within teacher-student relationships. The signs are not encouraging. In many ways, the cost accounting principles of efficiency, calculability, predictability, and control of the corporate order have restructured the meaning and purpose of education. In the never-ending search for new sources of revenue, the intense competition for more students, and the ongoing need to cut costs, many colleges and university presidents are actively pursuing ways to establish closer ties between their respective institutions and the business community. For example, in what has become a typical story, *USA Today* approvingly reports that Brian Barefoot, the new president of Babson College, has thirty years of experience at Paine Webber and Merrill Lynch and will "use his business contacts to get graduates jobs, and he'll make sure the curriculum reflects employer needs."<sup>70</sup> The message here is clear: Knowledge with a high exchange value in the market is what counts, while those fields such as the liberal arts and humanities that cannot be quantified in such terms will either be underfunded or allowed to become largely irrelevant in the hierarchy of academic knowledge.

David L. Kirp suggests that hiring part-time workers is a form of outsourcing, "the academic equivalent of temp agency fill-ins," and as a practice undermines the intellectual culture and the academic energy of higher education.<sup>71</sup> He supports this charge by claiming:

From a purely financial perspective, it's a no-brainer to outsource teaching, because it saves so much money. . . . But the true costs to higher education — even if hard to quantify — are very high. To rely on contract labor in the classroom creates a cadre of interchangeable instructors with no sustained responsibility

for their students, scholars with no attachment to the intellectual life of the institution through which they are passing.<sup>72</sup>

Unfortunately, Kirp seems to suggest that the part-time workers are as deficient as the conditions that create them. It is one thing to be the victim of a system built on greed and scandalous labor practices, and another thing to take the heat for trying to make a living under such conditions — as if all efforts can be measured simply by the nature of the job. The real issue here is that such conditions are exploitative and that the solutions to fixing the problem lie not simply in hiring more full-time faculty, but, as Cary Nelson points out, in reforming "the entire complex of economic, social and political forces operating on higher education."<sup>73</sup>

In other quarters of higher education, the results of the emergence of the corporate university appear even more ominous. One telling example that proved prescient took place in 1998 when James Carlin, a multimillionaire and former successful insurance executive who had been appointed as the chairman of the Massachusetts State Board of Education, gave a speech to the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce.<sup>74</sup> Signaling corporate culture's dislike of organized labor and its obsession with cost cutting, Carlin launched a four-fold attack against the academic professoriate. First, he argued that higher education has to model itself after successful corporations, which means that colleges and universities have to be downsized. Second, he echoed the now familiar call on the part of corporate culture to abolish tenure. Third, he made it clear that democratic governance is not suitable for the corporate model of the university and that faculty have too much power in shaping decisions in the university. Finally, he explicitly condemned those forms of knowledge whose value lies outside of the instrumental sphere of commodification. More specifically, Carlin argued that "at least 50 percent of all non-hard sciences research on American campuses is a lot of foolishness" and should be banned.<sup>75</sup> He further predicted that "there's going to be a revolution in higher education. Whether you like it or not, it's going to be broken apart and put back together differently. It won't be the same. Why should it be? Why should everything change except for higher education?"<sup>76</sup> Carlin's "revolution" was spelled out in his call for increasing the workload of professors to four, three-credit courses a semester, effectively reducing the time educators might have to do research or shape institutional power.

Carlin's anti-intellectualism and animosity toward educators and students alike is simply a more extreme example of the forces at work in the corporate world that would like to take advantage of the profits to be made in higher education, while simultaneously refashioning colleges and universities in the image of the new multiconglomerate landscape. Missing from this corporate model of leadership is the recognition that academic freedom implies that knowledge has a critical function, that unpopular and critical intellectual in-



quiry should be safeguarded and treated as an important social asset, and that faculty in higher education are more than mere functionaries of the corporate order. Such ideals are at odds with the vocational function that corporate culture wants to assign to higher education.

While the call to downsize higher education appears to have caught the public's imagination at the moment, it belies the fact that such "reorganization" has been going on for some time. In fact, more professors are working part-time and at two-year community colleges than at any other time in the country's recent history. A 2001 report by the National Study of Post-secondary Faculty recently pointed out that "in 1998–1999, less than one-third of all faculty members were tenured . . . [and that] in 1992–1993, 40 percent of the faculty was classified as part-time and in 1998–1999, the share had risen to 45 percent."<sup>77</sup> Creating a permanent underclass of part-time professional workers in higher education is not only demoralizing and exploitative for many faculty who had such jobs, but such policies increasingly deskill both partial and full-time faculty by increasing the amount of work they have to do. With less time to prepare, larger class loads, almost no time for research, and excessive grading demands, many adjuncts run the risk of becoming either demoralized, ineffective, or both. Michael Dubson, writing as an adjunct, captures the process in the following comment:

I am an adjunct. . . . I believed caring, working hard, doing a good job mattered and would add up to something concrete. Instead, I find myself on a wheel that turns but goes nowhere. I don't expect this situation to change. . . . I have watched my self-esteem drop, drop, drop from doing work that is, theoretically, enhancing the self-esteem of my students. I have seen the tired eyes, the worn clothes, the ancient eyes of long-term adjuncts. I have looked into their eyes as they have failed to look back into mine. . . . I have known thirty year old men living at home with their parents, forty year old women teaching college and going hungry, uninsured fifty year olds with serious illnesses. I have known adjunct teachers who hand out As and Bs like vitamins and help students cheat on their exams so they'll get good course evaluations. . . . I am a dreamer. I am an idealist. I am a victim. I am a whore. I am a fool. I am an adjunct.<sup>78</sup>

There is more at work here than despair; there are the harsh lessons of financial deprivation, heavy workloads, and powerlessness. As power shifts away from the faculty to the managerial sectors of the university, adjunct faculty increase in number while effectively being removed from the faculty governance process. In short, the hiring of part-time faculty to minimize costs simultaneously maximizes managerial control over faculty and the educational process itself. As their ranks are depleted, full-time faculty live under the constant threat of either being given heavier workloads or simply having their tenure contracts eliminated or drastically redefined through "post-tenure reviews." These structural and ideological factors not only send a chilling effect through higher education faculty, they also undermine the collective power faculty need to challenge the increasing corporate-based,

top-down administrative structures that are becoming commonplace in many colleges and universities.

### Corporate Culture's Threat to Students

Corporate culture's threat to students will also bear the burden of privatization as higher education joins hands with the corporate banking world. Lacking adequate financial aid, students, especially poor students, will increasingly finance the high costs of their education through private corporations such as Citibank, Chase Manhattan, Marine Midland, and other sanctioned lenders. Given the huge debt such students accumulate, it is reasonable to assume, as Jeff Williams points out, that loans "effectively indenture students for ten to twenty years after graduation and intractably reduce their career choices, funneling them into the corporate workforce in order to pay their loans."<sup>79</sup>

Of course, for many young people caught in the margins of poverty, low-paying jobs, and the casualties of the recession, the potential costs of higher education, regardless of its status or availability, will dissuade them from even thinking about the possibilities of going to college. Unfortunately, as state and federal agencies and university systems direct more and more of their resources such as state tax credits and scholarship programs toward middle- and upper-income students, the growing gap in college enrollments between high-income students (95% enrollment rate) and low-income students (75% enrollment rate) with comparable academic abilities will widen even further.<sup>80</sup> In fact, a recent report by a federal advisory committee claimed that nearly 48 percent of qualified students from low-income families will not be attending college in the fall of 2002 because of rising tuition charges and a shortfall in federal and state grants for low- and moderate-income students. The report claims that "nearly 170,000 of the top high-school graduates from low- and moderate-income families are not enrolling in college this year because they cannot afford to do so."<sup>81</sup> Those students who do go on to higher education will often find themselves in courses being taught by an increasing army of part-time and adjunct faculty. Not only do such policies harm faculty, they also cheat students. Too many undergraduates throughout the nation's colleges and universities often find themselves in oversized classes taught by faculty who are overburdened by heavy teaching. Moreover, those professors who are rewarded for bringing in outside money will be more heavily represented in fields such as science and engineering, which attract corporate and government research funding. As Sheila Slaughter observes, "Professors in fields other than science and engineering who attract funds usually do so from foundations which account for a relatively small proportion of overall research funding."<sup>82</sup>

Neoliberalism's obsession with spreading the gospel of the market and the value of corporate culture through privatization and commercialization has

restructured those spaces and places outside of classrooms in which students spend a great deal of time. Corporations are increasingly joining up with universities to privatize a seemingly endless array of services that universities used to handle by themselves. For example, bookstores are now run by corporate conglomerates such as Barnes & Noble, while companies such as Sodexo-Marriott (also a large investor in the U.S. private prison industry) run a large percentage of college dining halls, and McDonald's and Starbucks occupy prominent locations on the student commons. In addition, housing, alumni relations, health care, and a vast array of other campus services are leased out to private interests. One consequence is that spaces once marked as public and noncommodified now have the appearance of shopping malls. David Trend points out that as university services were privatized,

student union buildings and cafeterias took on the appearance — or were conceptualized from the beginning — as shopping malls or food courts, as vendors competed to place university logos on caps, mugs, and credit cards. This is a larger pattern in what has been termed the “Disneyfication” of college life . . . a pervasive impulse toward infotainment . . . where learning is “fun,” the staff “perky,” where consumer considerations dictate the curriculum, where presentation takes precedence over substance, and where students become “consumers.”<sup>83</sup>

The message to students is clear: customer satisfaction is offered as a surrogate for learning, and “to be a citizen is to be a consumer, and nothing more. Freedom means freedom to purchase.”<sup>84</sup>

Everywhere students turn outside of the university classroom, they are confronted with vendors and commercial sponsors who are hawking credit cards, athletic goods, and other commodities that one associates with the local shopping mall. Universities and colleges compound this marriage of commercial and educational values by signing exclusive contracts with Pepsi, Nike, Starbucks, and other companies, further blurring the distinction between student and consumer. Colleges and universities do not simply produce knowledge and values for students, they also play an influential role in shaping their identities. If colleges and universities are going to define themselves as centers of teaching and learning vital to the democratic life of the nation, they are going to have to acknowledge the danger of becoming corporate or simply adjuncts to big business. At the very least, this demands that they exercise the political, civic, and ethical courage needed to refuse the commercial rewards that would reduce them to becoming simply another brand name or corporate logo.

#### Corporate Culture, Pedagogy, and the Politics of Online Education

The turn to downsizing and deskilling faculty is also exacerbated by the attempt by many universities to expand into the profitable market of distance education. Such a market is all the more lucrative since it is being underwrit-

ten by the combined armed services, which in August 2000 pledged almost \$1 billion to “provide taxpayer-subsidized university-based distance education for active-duty personnel and their families.”<sup>85</sup> David Noble has written extensively on the restructuring of higher education under the imperatives of the new digital technologies and the move into distance education. If he is correct, the news is not good.

According to Noble, online learning largely functions through pedagogical models and methods of delivery that not only rely on standardized, pre-packaged curriculum and methodological efficiency, but also reinforce the commercial penchant toward training, deskilling, and deprofessionalization. With the deskilling of the professoriate there will also be a rise in the use of part-time faculty, who will be “perfectly suited to the investor-imagined university of the future.”<sup>86</sup> According to Noble, the growing influence of these ideological and methodological tendencies in higher education will be exacerbated by the powerful influence of the military.<sup>87</sup> As Noble observes, an education subsidized by the military

is likely to entail familiar patterns of command, control, and precisely specified performance, in accordance with the hallmark military procurement principles of uniformity, standardization, modularization, capital intensiveness, system compatibility, interchangeability, measurability, and accountability — in short, *a model of education as a machine*, with standardized products and prescribed process.<sup>88</sup> (emphasis added)

Teachers College president Arthur Levine has predicted that the new information technology may soon make the traditional college and university obsolete. He is hardly alone in believing that online education will either radically alter or replace traditional education. As Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn point out, “In recent years academic institutions and a growing number of Internet companies have been racing to tap into the booming market in virtual learning, which financial analysts like Merrill Lynch estimate will reach \$7 billion by 2003.”<sup>89</sup> The marriage of corporate culture, higher education, and the new high-speed technologies also offers universities big opportunities to cut back on maintenance expenses, eliminate entire buildings such as libraries and classrooms, and trim labor costs. Education scholars William Massy and Robert Zemsky claim that universities must take advantage of the new technologies to cut back on teaching expenditures. As they put it, “With labor accounting for 70 percent or more of current operating cost, there is simply no other way.”<sup>90</sup>

Reporting on the coming restructuring of the university around online and distance education, the *Chronicle of Higher Education* claims that this new type of education will produce a new breed of faculty “who hails not from academia but from the corporate world.” Hired more for their “business savvy than their degree, a focus on the bottom line is normal; tenure isn’t.” This alleged celebration of faculty as social entrepreneurs appears to offer no apologies for turning education into a commercial enterprise and teaching into a



sales pitch for profits. As one enthusiastic distance educator put it for the *Chronicle*, "I love not only the teaching but the selling of it."<sup>91</sup>

Universities and colleges across the country are flocking to the online bandwagon. As Press and Washburn point out, "More than a half of the nation's colleges and universities deliver some courses over the Internet."<sup>92</sup> Mass-marketed degrees and courses are not only being offered by prestigious universities such as Seton Hall, Stanford University, Harvard University, New School University, and the University of Chicago, they are also giving rise to cyber-backed colleges such as the Western Governors University and for-profit, stand-alone virtual institutions such as the University of Phoenix.

This is not to suggest that online distance education is the most important or only way in which computer-based technologies can be used in higher education, or that the new electronic technologies by default produce oppressive modes of pedagogy. Many educators use email, networking, and web resources in very productive ways in their classrooms. The real issue is whether such a technology in its various pedagogical uses undermines human freedom and development. As Herbert Marcuse has argued, when the rationality that drives technology is instrumentalized and "transformed into standardized efficiency . . . liberty is confined to the selection of the most adequate means for reaching a goal which [the individual] did not set."<sup>93</sup> The consequence of the substitution of technology for pedagogy is that instrumental goals replace ethical and political considerations, result in a loss of classroom control by teachers, make greater demands on faculty time, and emphasize standardization and rationalization of course materials. Zygmunt Bauman underscores the threat of this danger by arguing that when technology is coupled with calls for efficiency, modeled on instrumental rationality, it almost always leads to forms of social engineering that authorize actions that become increasingly "reasonable" and dehumanizing at the same time.<sup>94</sup> In other words, when the new computer technologies are tied to narrow forms of instrumental rationality, they serve as "moral sleeping pills" that are made increasingly available by corporate power and the modern bureaucracy of higher education. Of the greatest importance here is how the culture of instrumental rationality shapes intellectual practices in ways that undermine the free exchange of ideas, mediate relations in ways that do not require the physical relations of either students or other faculty, and support a form of hyper-individualism that downplays forms of collegiality and social relations amenable to public service.<sup>95</sup>

The issue here is that such technologies, when not shaped by ethical considerations, collective dialogue, and dialogical approaches, lose whatever possibilities they might have for linking education to critical thinking and learning to democratic social change.<sup>96</sup> In fact, when business values replace the imperatives of critical learning, a class-specific divide begins to appear in which poor and marginalized students will get low-cost, low-skilled knowledge and second-rate degrees from online sources, while those students be-

ing educated for leadership positions in the elite schools will be versed in personal and socially interactive pedagogies in which high-powered knowledge, critical thinking, and problem-solving will be a priority, coupled with a high-status degree. Under such circumstances, traditional modes of class and racial tracking will be reinforced and updated within the proliferation of what David Noble calls "digital diploma mills."<sup>97</sup> Noble underemphasizes, in his otherwise excellent analysis, all indications that the drive toward corporatizing the university will take its biggest toll on those second- and third-tier institutions that are increasingly defined as serving no other function than to train semiskilled and obedient workers for the new postindustrialized order. The role slotted for these institutions is driven less by the imperatives of the new digital technologies than by the need to reproduce a gender and class division of labor that supports the neoliberal global market revolution and its relentless search for bigger profits.

Held up to the profit standard, universities and colleges will increasingly calibrate supply to demand, and the results look ominous with regard to what forms of knowledge, pedagogy, and research will be rewarded and legitimated. As colleges and corporations collaborate over the content of degree programs, particularly with regard to online graduate programs, college curricula run the risk of being narrowly tailored to the needs of specific businesses. For example, Babson College developed a master's degree program in business administration specifically for Intel workers. Similarly, the University of Texas at Austin is developing an online master of science degree in science, technology, and commercialization that caters only to students who work at IBM. Moreover, the program will only orient its knowledge, skills, and research to focus exclusively on IBM projects.<sup>98</sup> Not only do such courses run the risk of becoming company training workshops, they also open up higher education to powerful corporate interests that have little regard for knowledge tied to the cultivation of an informed, critical citizenry capable of actively participating in and governing a democratic society.

As crucial as it is to recognize the dangers inherent in online learning and the instructional use of information technology, it is also important to recognize that there are many thoughtful and intelligent people who harness the use of such technologies in ways that can be pedagogically useful. Moreover, not everyone who uses these technologies can be simply dismissed as living in a middle-class world of techno-euphoria in which computers are viewed as a panacea. Andrew Feenberg, a professor at San Diego State University and former disciple of Herbert Marcuse, rejects the essentialist view that technology reduces everything to functions, efficiency, and raw materials, "while threatening both spiritual and material survival."<sup>99</sup> Feenberg argues that the use of technology in both higher education and other spheres has to be taken up as part of a larger project to extend democracy and that under such conditions it can be used "to open up new possibilities for intervention."<sup>100</sup>



### Higher Education as a Democratic Public Sphere

Higher education should be viewed as a resource vital to the democratic and civic life of the nation against the current onslaught to corporatize higher education. Higher education needs to be safeguarded as a public good against the ongoing attempts to organize and run it like a corporation, because, as Ellen Willis points out, the university "is the only institution of any size that still provides cultural dissidents with a platform."<sup>101</sup> But more importantly, higher education must be embraced as a democratic sphere because it is one of the few public spaces left where students can learn the power of questioning authority, recover the ideals of engaged citizenship, reaffirm the importance of the public good, and expand their capacities to make a difference. Central to such a task for the university is the challenge to resist becoming a consumer-oriented corporation more concerned about accounting than accountability, and whose mission, defined largely through an appeal to excellence, is comprehended almost exclusively in terms of a purely instrumental efficiency.<sup>102</sup>

Higher education can be removed from its narrow instrumental justification by encouraging students to think beyond what it means to simply get a job or be an adroit consumer. Moreover, the crisis of higher education needs to be analyzed in terms of wider configurations of economic, political, and social forces that exacerbate tensions between those who value such institutions as public goods and those advocates of neoliberalism who see market culture as a master design for all human affairs. Educators must challenge all attempts on the part of conservatives and liberals to drain democracy of its substantive ideals by reducing it to the imperatives of hypercapitalism and the glorification of financial markets.

Challenging the encroachment of corporate power is essential if democracy is to remain a defining principle of education and everyday life. Part of such a challenge requires educators, students, and others to create organizations capable of mobilizing civic dialogue, provide an alternative conception of the meaning and purpose of higher education, and develop political organizations that can influence legislation to challenge corporate power's ascendancy over the institutions and mechanisms of civil society. In strategic terms, revitalizing public dialogue suggests that faculty, students, and administrators need to take seriously the importance of defending higher education as an institution of civic culture whose purpose is to educate students for active and critical citizenship.<sup>103</sup> Such a project suggests that educators, students, and others will have to provide the rationale and mobilize efforts toward creating enclaves of resistance, new public spaces to counter official forms of public pedagogy, and institutional spaces that highlight, nourish, and evaluate the tension between civil society and corporate power while simultaneously struggling to prioritize citizen rights over consumer rights.

Situated within a broader context of issues concerned with social responsibility, politics, and the dignity of human life, higher education should be engaged as a site that offers students the opportunity to involve themselves in the deepest problems of society, to acquire the knowledge, skills, and ethical vocabulary necessary for modes of critical dialogue and forms of broadened civic participation. This suggests developing pedagogical conditions for students to come to terms with their own sense of power and public voice as individual and social agents by enabling them to examine and frame critically what they learn in the classroom "within a more political or social or intellectual understanding of what's going on" in the interface between their lives and the world at large.<sup>104</sup> At the very least, students need to learn how to take responsibility for their own ideas, take intellectual risks, develop a sense of respect for others different from themselves, and learn how to think critically in order to function in a wider democratic culture. At issue here is providing students with an education that allows them to recognize the dream and promise of a substantive democracy, particularly the idea that as citizens they are "entitled to public services, decent housing, safety, security, support during hard times, and most importantly, some power over decision making."<sup>105</sup>

But more is needed than defending higher education as a vital sphere in which to develop and nourish the proper balance between democratic values and market fundamentalism, between identities founded on democratic principles and identities steeped in forms of competitive, self-interested individualism that celebrate their own material and ideological advantages. Given the current assault by politicians, conservative foundations, and the media on educators who spoke critically about U.S. foreign policy in light of the tragic events of September 11, it is politically crucial that educators at all levels of involvement in the academy be defended as public intellectuals who provide an indispensable service to the nation.<sup>106</sup> Such an appeal cannot be made in the name of professionalism, but in terms of the civic duty such intellectuals provide. Too many academics have retreated into narrow specialties that serve largely to consolidate authority rather than critique its abuses. Refusing to take positions on controversial issues or to examine the role they might play in lessening human suffering, such academics become models of moral indifference and unfortunate examples of what it means to disconnect learning from public life.

On the other hand, many leftist and liberal academics have retreated into arcane discourses that offer them mostly the safe ground of the professional recluse. Making almost no connections to audiences outside of the academy or to the issues that bear down on their lives, such academics have become largely irrelevant. This is not to suggest that they do not publish or speak at symposiums, but that they often do so to limited audiences and in a language that is often overly abstract, highly aestheticized, rarely takes an overt politi-

cal position, and seems largely indifferent to broader public issues. I am reminded of a story about one rising “left-wing” public relations intellectual, who berated one of his colleagues for raising some political concerns about an author that the newly arrived “left” professor had read. According to our young celebrity, political discourse was not “cool,” thus affirming the separation of scholarship from commitment, while justifying a form of anti-intellectualism that parades under the banner of cleverness that threatens no one but clearly sells on the market. This is more than academic fluff or the mark of an impoverished imagination; it is irrelevance by design.

Engaged intellectuals such as Arundhati Roy, Noam Chomsky, Edward Said, and the late Pierre Bourdieu have offered a different and more committed role for academics. Mocking those intellectuals for whom irony and cleverness appear to be the last refuge of academic scoundrels who disdain any form of commitment, Roy defends the link between scholarship and commitment as precisely “uncool,” as if being fashionable is the most important factor for shaping the identity and work of engaged intellectuals. She writes:

I take sides. I take a position. I have a point of view. What’s worse, I make it clear that I think it’s right and moral to take that position, and what’s even worse, I use everything in my power to flagrantly solicit support for that position. Now, for a writer of the twenty-first century, that’s considered a pretty uncool, unsophisticated thing to do. . . . Isn’t it true, or at least theoretically possible, that there are times in the life of a people or a nation when the political climate demands that we — even the most sophisticated of us — overtly take sides?<sup>107</sup>

Noam Chomsky claims that “the social and intellectual role of the university should be subversive in a healthy society . . . [and that] individuals and society at large benefit to the extent that these liberatory ideals extend throughout the educational system — in fact, far beyond.”<sup>108</sup> Postcolonial and literary critic Edward Said takes a similar position and argues that academics should engage in ongoing forms of permanent critique of all abuses of power and authority — “to enter into sustained and vigorous exchange with the outside world” — as part of a larger project of helping “to create the social conditions for the collective production of realist utopias.”<sup>109</sup>

Following Bourdieu and others, I believe that intellectuals who inhabit our nation’s universities should represent the conscience of this society not only because they shape the conditions under which future generations learn about themselves and their relations to others and the outside world, but also because they engage pedagogical practices that are by their very nature moral and political, rather than simply cost-effective and technical. Such pedagogy bears witness to the ethical and political dilemmas that animate the broader social landscape and are important because they provide spaces that are both comforting and unsettling, spaces that both disturb and enlighten. Pedagogy in this instance not only works to shift how students

think about the issues affecting their lives and the world at large, but potentially energizes them to seize such moments as possibilities for acting on and engaging in the world. The appeal here is not merely ethical; it is also an appeal that addresses the materiality of resources, access, and politics, while viewing power as generative and crucial to any viable notion of individual and social agency.

Organizing against the corporate takeover of higher education also suggests fighting to protect the jobs of full-time faculty, turning adjunct jobs into full-time positions, expanding benefits to part-time workers, and putting power into the hands of faculty and students. Moreover, such struggles must address the exploitative conditions under which many graduate students work, constituting a *de facto* army of service workers who are underpaid, overworked, and shorn of any real power or benefits.<sup>110</sup> Similarly, programs in many universities that offer remedial courses, affirmative action, and other crucial pedagogical resources are under massive assault, often by conservative trustees who want to eliminate from the university any attempt to address the deep inequities in society, while simultaneously denying a decent education to minorities of color and class. For example, the City University of New York, as a result of a decision made by a board of trustees, has decided to end

its commitment to provide remedial courses for academically unprepared students, many of whom are immigrants requiring language training before or concurrent with entering the ordinary academic curriculum. . . . Consequently . . . a growing number of prospective college students are forced on an already overburdened job market.<sup>111</sup>

Educators and students need to join with community people and social movements around a common platform that resists the corporatizing of schools, the roll-back in basic services, and the exploitation of teaching assistants and adjunct faculty. But resistance to neoliberalism and its ongoing onslaught against public goods, services, and civic freedoms cannot be limited either to the sphere of higher education or to outraged faculty. There are several important lessons that faculty can learn from the growing number of broad-based student movements that are protesting neoliberal global policies and the ongoing commercialization of the university and everyday life. As far back as 1998, students from about one hundred colleges across the United States and Canada “held a series of ‘teach-ins’ challenging the increasing involvement of corporations in higher education.”<sup>112</sup> Students from Yale University, Harvard University, Florida State University, and the University of Minnesota, among other schools, organized debates, lectures, films, and speakers to examine the multifaceted ways in which corporations are affecting all aspects of higher education. Within the last few years, the pace of such protests on and off campuses has grown and spawned a number of student protest groups, including the United Students Against Sweatshops



(USAS), with over 180 North American campus groups, the nationwide 180/Movement for Democracy and Education, and a multitude of groups protesting the policies of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the International Monetary Fund.<sup>113</sup>

Students have occupied the offices of university presidents, held hunger strikes, blocked traffic in protests of the brand-name society, conducted mass demonstrations against the WTO in Seattle, and protested the working conditions and use of child labor in the \$2.5 billion dollar collegiate apparel industry. In January 2000, students from the conservative Virginia Commonwealth University joined the rising tide of anticorporate protest by organizing a sleep-in “outside of the vice president’s office for two nights to protest the university’s contract with McDonald’s (the school promised the fast-food behemoth a twenty-year monopoly over the Student Commons).”<sup>114</sup> As diverse as these struggles might appear, one of the common threads is their resistance to the increasing incursion of corporate power over higher education. As Liza Featherstone observes:

Almost all of the current student struggles — whether over tuition increases, apparel licenses, socially responsible investing, McDonald’s in the student union, the rights of university laundry workers, a dining-hall contractor’s investment in private prisons or solidarity with striking students in Mexico — focus on the reality of the university as corporate actor.<sup>115</sup>

Many students reject the model of the university as a business, which increasingly views students as consumers, the classroom as a marketplace, and the public space of the university as an investment opportunity. Students recognize that the corporate model of leadership shaping higher education fosters a narrow sense of responsibility, agency, and public values because it lacks a vocabulary for providing guidance on matters of justice, equality, fairness, equity, and freedom, values that are crucial to the functioning of a vibrant, democratic culture. Students are refusing to be treated as consumers rather than as members of a university community in which they have a voice in helping to shape the conditions under which they learn and how the university is organized and run. The alienation and powerlessness that ignited student resistance in the 1960s appears to be alive and well today on college campuses across the country. Featherstone, once again, captures this rising anticorporate sentiment. She writes:

“Campus democracy” is an increasingly common rallying cry (just as, at major off campus protests, demonstrators chant “this is what democracy looks like”). . . . Like the idealists who wrote the Port Huron Statement, students are being politicized by disappointment.<sup>116</sup>

Student resistance to corporate power has also manifested off campus in struggles for global justice that have taken place in cities such as Seattle, Davos, Porto Alegre, Prague, Melbourne, Quebec, Gothenburg, Genoa, and New York. These anticorporate struggles not only include students, but also

labor unions, community activists, environmental groups, and other social movements. The importance of these struggles is in part that they offer students alliances with nonstudent groups, both within and outside of the United States, and point to the promise of linking a university-based public pedagogy of resistance to broader pedagogical struggles and social movements that can collectively fight to change neoliberal policies. Equally important is that these movements link learning to social change by making visible alternative models of radical democratic relations in a wide variety of sites that extend from the art gallery to alternative media to the university. Such movements offer instances of collective resistance to the glaring material inequities and the growing cynical belief that today’s culture of investment and finance makes it *impossible* to address many of the major social problems facing both the United States and the larger world. These new forms of politics perform an important theoretical service by recognizing the link between civic education, critical pedagogy, and oppositional political agency as pivotal to modes of organizing that challenge the depoliticization of politics and open up the possibilities for promoting autonomy and democratic social transformation.

Students protesting the corporatization of the university and neoliberalism’s assault on public institutions and civil society both understand how dominant pedagogies work within the various formations and sites of capital — particularly corporate capital’s use of the global media and the schools’ — and refuse to rely on dominant sources of information. Such strategies point to an alternative form of politics outside of the party machines, a politics that astutely recognizes both the world of material inequality and the landscape of symbolic inequality.<sup>117</sup> In part, this has resulted in what Imre Szeman calls “a new public space of pedagogy” that employs a variety of old and new media including computers, theater, digital video, magazines, the Internet, and photography as a tool for both learning and organizing.<sup>118</sup> While employing many of the technologies used in online learning and other computer-based educational programs, these technologies operate out of a different political and pedagogical context designed to link learning to social change and challenge the often hierarchical relationships in higher education.

Higher education and the larger culture are too corporatized to become the only sites of learning and struggle. New spaces and places of resistance have to be developed, and this demands new forms of pedagogy and new sites in which to conduct it while not abandoning traditional spheres of learning. The challenge for faculty in higher education is, in part, to find ways to contribute their knowledge and skills to understanding how neoliberal pedagogies create the conditions for devaluing critical learning and undermining viable forms of political agency. Academics, as Imre Szeman puts it, need to figure out how neoliberalism and corporate culture “constitute a problem of and for pedagogy.”<sup>119</sup> Academics need to be attentive to the oppositional pedagogies put into place by various student movements in



order to judge their "significance . . . for the shape and function of the university curricula today."<sup>120</sup>

The challenge here is for faculty to learn as much as possible from student movements about pedagogical approaches and how these movements mediate the fundamental tension between the public values of higher education and the commercial values of corporate culture. If the forces of corporate culture are to be challenged, educators must also enlist the help of diverse communities, foundations, and social movements to ensure that public institutions of higher learning are adequately funded so that they will not have to rely on corporate sponsorship and advertising revenues.

Jacques Derrida has suggested in another context that any viable notion of higher education should be grounded in a vibrant politics, which makes the promise of democracy a matter of concrete urgency. For Derrida, making visible a democracy that is to come, as opposed to that which presents itself in its name, provides a referent for both criticizing everywhere what parades as democracy and critically assessing the conditions and possibilities for democratic transformation. Derrida sees the promise of democracy as the proper articulation of a political ethics and by implication suggests that when higher education is engaged and articulated through the project of democratic social transformation it can function as a vital public sphere for critical learning, ethical deliberation, and civic engagement. Toni Morrison understands something about the fragile nature of the relationship between higher education and democratic public life, and she rightly suggests, given the urgency of the times, the need for all members of academia to rethink the meaning and purpose of higher education. She writes:

If the university does not take seriously and rigorously its role as a guardian of wider civic freedoms, as interrogator of more and more complex ethical problems, as servant and preserver of deeper democratic practices, then some other regime or menage of regimes will do it for us, in spite of us, and without us.<sup>121</sup>

Both Derrida and Morrison recognize that the present crisis represents a historical opportunity to refuse the commonsense assumption that democracy is synonymous with capitalism and critical citizenship is limited to being an unquestioning consumer. Markets need to be questioned not simply through economic considerations but as a matter of ethical and political concerns. The language of neoliberalism and the emerging corporate university radically alters the vocabulary available for appraising the meaning of citizenship, agency, and civic virtue. Within this discourse everything is for sale, and what is not has no value as a public good or practice. It is in the spirit of such a critique and act of resistance that educators need to break with the "new faith in the historical inevitability professed by the theorists of [neo-] liberalism [in order] to invent new forms of collective political work" to confront the march of corporate power.<sup>122</sup> This will not be an easy task, but it is a necessary one if democracy is to be won back from the reign of financial mar-

kets and the Darwinian values of an unbridled capitalism. Academics can contribute to such a struggle by, among other things, defending higher education for the contribution it makes to the quality of public life, fighting for the crucial role it plays pedagogically in asserting the primacy of democratic values over commercial interests, and struggling collectively to preserve its political responsibility to provide students with the capacities they need for civic courage and engaged critical citizenship.

The current regime of neoliberalism and the incursion of corporate power into higher education present difficult problems and demand a profoundly committed sense of collective resistance. Unfortunately, it is not a matter of exaggeration to suggest that collective cynicism has become a powerful fixture of everyday life. But rather than make despair convincing, I think it is all the more crucial to take seriously Meghan Morris' argument that "things are too urgent now to be giving up on our imagination."<sup>123</sup> Or, more specifically, to take up the challenge of Jacques Derrida's recent provocation that "we must do and think the impossible. If only the possible happened, nothing more would happen. If I only did what I can do, I wouldn't do anything."<sup>124</sup>

## Notes

1. Robert W. McChesney, "Introduction," in Noam Chomsky, *Profit over People: Neoliberalism and Global Order* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 1999), p. 7.
2. Benjamin R. Barber, "Blood Brothers, Consumers, or Citizens? Three Models of Identity — Ethnic, Commercial, and Civic," in Carol Gould and Pasquale Pasquino, eds., *Cultural Identity and the Nation State* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001), p. 65.
3. See Tom Peters, "The Brand Called You," *Fast Company* (August/September 1997), 83–94.
4. This quote is taken from the ChrisandLuke.com website. Retrieved July 2002, from <http://www.ChrisandLuke.com/ap.html>
5. For a classic critique of the brand-name society, see Naomi Klein, *No Logo: Taking Aim at the Brand Bullies* (New York: Picador, 1999).
6. Cited in Dawn Kessler, "What Would You Do for a Free Ride to College?" Retrieved July 2, 2002, from <http://www.collegeboundmag.com/side/quickconnect>
7. William Powers, "The Art of Exploitation," *Atlantic Monthly*, Retrieved July 2002, from <http://www.theatlantic/politic/nj/powers2001-08-08.html>
8. These ideas are taken from Barber, "Blood Brothers, Consumers, or Citizens?" p. 65.
9. Edward S. Herman and Robert W. McChesney, *The Global Media: The New Missionaries of Global Capitalism* (Washington, DC: Cassell, 1997), p. 3.
10. I address this issue in Henry A. Giroux, *Public Spaces, Private Lives: Beyond the Culture of Cynicism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001).
11. Barber, "Blood Brothers, Consumers, or Citizens?" p. 59.
12. I take up this issue of cynicism in great detail in Giroux, *Public Spaces, Private Lives*.
13. Joseph Kahn, "Redrawing the Map," *New York Times*, June 25, 2000, p. 5.
14. This is a position shared by a number of influential social and political theorists. For example, see Robert W. McChesney, *Corporate Media and the Threat to Democracy* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 1997); Pierre Bourdieu, *Acts of Resistance against the Tyranny*

- of the Market (New York: New Press, 1998); Chomsky, *Profit over People*; Colin Leys, *Market Driven Politics* (London: Verso, 2001).
15. Jean Comaroff and John L. Comaroff, eds., *Millennial Capitalism and the Culture of Neoliberalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2001), p. 333.
  16. Zygmunt Bauman, *In Search of Politics* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), p. 127.
  17. Comaroff and Comaroff, "Millennial Capitalism," p. 322.
  18. James Rule, "Markets, in Their Place," *Dissent* (Winter 1998), 31.
  19. Zygmunt Bauman, *The Individualized Society* (London: Polity Press, 2001).
  20. Bauman, *The Individualized Society*.
  21. The classic dominant texts on corporate culture are Terrance Deal and Alan Kennedy, *Corporate Culture: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1982) and Thomas Peterson and Robert Waterman, *In Search of Excellence* (New York: Harper and Row, 1982). I also want to point out that corporate culture is a dynamic, ever-changing force. But in spite of its innovations and changes, it rarely if ever challenges the centrality of the profit motive, or fails to prioritize commercial considerations over a set of values that would call the class-based system of capitalism into question. For a brilliant discussion of the changing nature of corporate culture in light of the cultural revolution of the 1960s, see Thomas Frank, *The Conquest of Cool* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).
  22. Gary Becker captures this sentiment in his book, *The Economic Approach to Human Behavior*. He argues, "We not only ought to think and act as self-interested agents, but we are already acting (if not yet thinking) in precisely those ways. We are each of us self-interested calculators of our own advantage, however much we might wish to hide that fact from others and even (or perhaps especially) from ourselves." Cited in Terrance Ball, "Imagining Marketopia," *Dissent* (Summer 2001), 78.
  23. Alan Bryman, *Disney and His Worlds* (New York: Routledge, 1995), p. 154.
  24. Robin D. G. Kelley, *Yo' Mama's Disfunktional: Fighting the Culture Wars in Urban America* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1997).
  25. HUD refers to the Department of Housing and Urban Development created as a cabinet-level agency in 1965. Its stated purpose is to create opportunities for home ownership, provide housing assistance for low-income persons, create affordable housing, enforce the nation's housing laws, promote economic growth in economically disadvantaged neighborhoods, and alleviate homelessness.
  26. For a context from which to judge the effects of such cuts on the poor and on children, see *The State of America's Children: A Report from the Children's Defense Fund* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1998). On the emergence of the prison-industrial complex and how it diverts money from higher education, see Giroux, *Public Spaces, Private Lives*; Christian Parenti, *Lockdown America: Police and Prisons in the Age of Crisis* (London: Verso Press, 1999).
  27. Ball, "Imagining Marketopia," p. 78.
  28. CEO refers to Chief Executive Officer, a term designating the primary head of an organization. This example is taken from Leys, *Market Driven Politics*, pp. 212-213.
  29. Pierre Bourdieu, "The Essence of Neoliberalism," *Le Monde Diplomatique*, December 1998, p. 4. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from <http://www.en.monde-diplomatique.fr/1988/12/08bourdieu>
  30. Benjamin R. Barber, "A Failure of Democracy, Not Capitalism," *New York Times*, July 29, 2002, p. A23.
  31. Cited in Tom Turnipseed, "Crime in the Suites Enabled by Political Corruption Causes a Crisis in the Credibility of US Capitalism," *Common Dreams*, June 29, 2002, p. 1. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from [www.commondreams.org/views02/0629-01.htm](http://www.commondreams.org/views02/0629-01.htm)

32. Critical educators have provided a rich history of how both public and higher education have been shaped by the politics, ideologies, and images of industry. For example, see Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, *Schooling in Capitalist America* (New York: Basic Books, 1976); Michael Apple, *Ideology and Curriculum* (New York: Routledge, 1977); Martin Carnoy and Henry Levin, *Schooling and Work in the Democratic State* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1985); Stanley Aronowitz and Henry A. Giroux, *Education Still under Siege* (Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey, 1993); Stanley Aronowitz and William DiFazio, *The Jobless Future* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994); Cary Nelson, ed., *Will Teach for Food* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); D. W. Livingstone, *The Education-Jobs Gap* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1998).
33. Sheila Slaughter, "Professional Values and the Allure of the Market," *Academe* (September/October 2001), 1.
34. An example of how cozy the relationship between venture capitalism and the university has become can be seen in the story uncritically reported in *Chronicle of Higher Education*. See Goldie Blumenstyk, "Chasing the Rainbow: A Venture Capitalist on the Trail of University-Based Companies," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 15, 2002, pp. A28-A32.
35. Goldie Blumenstyk, "Knowledge Is a Form of Venture Capital for a Top Columbia Administrator," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 8, 2001, p. A29.
36. Some recent examples include: Aronowitz and Giroux, *Education Still under Siege*; Randy Martin, *Chalk Lines* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998); Stanley Aronowitz, *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000); Henry A. Giroux, *Impure Acts: The Practical Politics of Cultural Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2000).
37. Richard Hofstadter, cited in Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn, "The Kept University," *Atlantic Monthly*, March 20, 2000, p. 54. Hofstadter, with C. De Witt Hardy, expands on these views in *The Development and Scope of Higher Education in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952); with Walter P. Metzger, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955); *Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* (New York: Vintage Books, 1963). A more complicated though ultimately distorting critique appears in Stephen Brier and Roy Rosenzweig, "The Keyboard Campus," *Nation*, April 22, 2002, pp. 29-32.
38. See Sheila Slaughter and Larry L. Leslie, *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).
39. Press and Washburn, "The Kept University," p. 42.
40. Press and Washburn, "The Kept University," pp. 39-54.
41. This issue is taken up in Michael Berube, "Why Inefficiency Is Good for Universities," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 27, 1998, pp. B4-B5.
42. Patricia P. Brodsky, "Shrunken Heads: The Humanities under the Corporate Model," p. 5. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from <http://www.louisville.edu/journal/workplace/patbrodsky.html>
43. Brodsky, "Shrunken Heads," p. 6. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from <http://www.louisville.edu/journal/workplace/patbrodsky.html>
44. Jeff Williams, "Brave New University," *College English* 61, No. 6 (1999), 744.
45. Maureen Shine, "Knight, Matching Gifts Endow Record Number of UO Chairs," *University of Oregon News*. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from <http://comm.uoregon.edu/newsreleases/latest/june98/061198.html>. It should be noted that "the Gates Foundation Minority Fellowship Program spends more on advertising than it does on the scholarships themselves." Cited in Jennifer L. Croissant, "Can This Campus Be Bought?" *Academe* (September/October 2001), 3. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from <http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe01SO/so01cro.html>



46. Both quotes are cited in Julianne Basinger, "Increase in Number of Chairs Endowed by Corporations Prompt New Concerns," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 24, 1998, p. A53.
47. Blumenstyk, "Chasing the Rainbow."
48. David Trend, *Welcome to Cyberschool: Education at the Crossroads in the Information Age* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001), p. 59.
49. Trend, *Welcome to Cyberschool*, p. 59.
50. Sheila Slaughter, "Professional Values," p. 3.
51. For an extensive analysis of the issue of intellectual property rights and the control over academic work in the university, see Corynne McSherry, *Who Owns Academic Work? Battling for Control of Intellectual Property* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002).
52. Julia Porter Liebeskind, "Risky Business: Universities and Intellectual Property," *Academe* (September-October, 2001), 2. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from <http://www.aaup.org/publications/Academe/01SO/so01lie.htm>
53. Liebeskind, "Risky Business."
54. Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn, "Digital Diplomas," *Mother Jones*, January/February 2001, p. 8. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from [http://www.motherjones.com/mother\\_jones/JF01/toc.html](http://www.motherjones.com/mother_jones/JF01/toc.html)
55. Press and Washburn, "Digital Diplomas."
56. On this issue, see Bauman, *In Search of Politics*.
57. Jay Mathews, "It's Lowly at the Top: What Became of the Great College Presidents?" *Washington Post*, June 10, 2001, p. B01.
58. Clara M. Lovett, "The Dumbing Down of College Presidents," *Chronicle of Higher Education: The Chronicle Review*, April 5, 2002, p. B20.
59. Jim Hopkins, "Universities Hire More Executives to Lead," *USA Today*, April 22, 2002, p. 1B.
60. Hopkins, "Universities Hire More Executives." See, for instance, the story on Summers by Martin Van Der Werf, "Lawrence Summers and His Tough Questions," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 26, 2002, pp. A29-A32.
61. There are a number of excellent texts that touch on this issue. Some of these include Aronowitz and Giroux, *Education Still under Siege*; Michael Berube and Cary Nelson, eds., *Higher Education under Fire* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996); Slaughter and Leslie, *Academic Capitalism*; Aronowitz, *The Knowledge Factory*; Geoffrey D. White, ed., *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 2000).
62. Stanley Aronowitz, "The New Corporate University," *Dollars and Sense*, March/April, 1998, pp. 32-35.
63. The many books extolling corporate CEOs as a model for leadership in any field is too extensive to cite, but one typical example can be found in Robert Heller, *Roads to Success: Put into Practice the Best Business Ideas of Eight Leading Gurus* (New York: Dorling Kindersley, 2001).
64. For an excellent analysis of Michael Milken's role in various education projects, see Robin Truth Goodman and Kenneth Saltman, *Strange Love: Or How We Learn to Stop Worrying and Love the Market* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2002).
65. Catherine S. Manegold, "Study Says Schools Must Stress Academics," *New York Times*, September 23, 1998, p. A22.
66. George Soros, *On Globalization* (New York: Public Affairs, 2002), p. 164.
67. Stanley Aronowitz and William De Fazio, "The New Knowledge Work," in A. H. Halsey, Hugh Lauder, Phillip Brown, and Amy Stuart Wells, eds., *Education: Culture, Economy, Society* (New York: Oxford, 1997), p. 193.
68. This is amply documented in Jeremy Rifkin, *The End of Work* (New York: G. Putnam Books, 1995); William Wolman and Anne Colamosca, *The Judas Economy: The Triumph of Capital and the Betrayal of Work* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1997); Aronowitz and DiFazio, *The Jobless Future; The New York Times Report: The Downsizing of America* (New York: Times Books, 1996); Stanley Aronowitz and Jonathan Cutler, *Post-Work* (New York: Routledge, 1998).
69. Cornel West, "The New Cultural Politics of Difference," *October* 53 (Summer 1990), 35.
70. Jim Hopkins, "Universities Hire More Executives to Lead," *USA Today*, April 22, 2002, p. 1B.
71. David L. Kirp, "Higher Ed Inc.: Avoiding the Perils of Outsourcing," *Chronicle Review*, March 15, 2002, p. B14.
72. Kirp, "Higher Ed Inc.," p. B14.
73. Cary Nelson, *Manifesto of a Tenured Radical* (New York: New York University Press, 1997), p. 169.
74. I take up Carlin's position in much greater detail in Henry A. Giroux, *Impure Acts* (New York: Routledge, 2000), pp. 51-54.
75. Carlin, cited in William H. Honan, "The Ivory Tower under Siege," *New York Times*, January 4, 1998, p. 4A33.
76. Carlin, cited in Honan, "The Ivory Tower under Siege," p. 4A33.
77. Cited in NEA Higher Education Research Center, *Update* 7, No. 3 (June 2001), 1.
78. Michael Dubson, "Introduction," in *Ghosts in the Classroom: Stories of College Adjunct Faculty — and the Price We All Pay* (Boston: Camel's Back Books, 2001), pp. 9-10.
79. Jeff Williams, "Brave New University," *College English* 61, No. 6 (July 1999), 740.
80. This information is taken from, "Pricing the Poor Out of College," *New York Times*, March 27, 2002, p. A27.
81. Stephen Burd, "Lack of Aid Will Keep 170,000 Qualified, Needy Students Out of College This Year, Report Warns," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (June 27, 2002), p. 1. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from <http://chronicle.com/daily/2002/06/2002062701n.html>. For a robust argument for making college free for all students, see Adolph L. Reed, Jr., "Free College for All," *The Progressive* (April 2002), 12-14.
82. Sheila Slaughter, "Professional Values and the Allure of the Market," *Academe* (September/October 2001), 3-4.
83. David Trend, *Welcome to Cyberschool: Education at the Crossroads in the Information Age* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001), p. 55.
84. Croissant, "Can This Campus Be Bought?"
85. David F. Noble, "The Future of the Digital Diploma Mill," *Academe* 87, No. 5 (September-October 2001), 29. These arguments are spelled out in greater detail in David F. Noble, *Digital Diploma Mills: The Automation of Higher Education* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2002).
86. Noble, "The Future of the Digital Diploma Mill."
87. For an extensive commentary on the Army's distance-education program, see Michael Arnone, "Army's Huge Distance-Education Effort Wins Many Supporters in Its First Year," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 8, 2002, pp. A33-A35. This highly favorable, if not flattering, piece of reporting is accompanied by another commentary on David Noble in which his views are badly simplified and his professional integrity called into question. See Jeffrey R. Young, "Distance-Education Critic's Book Takes Aim at Army's Efforts," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 8, 2002, p. A34.
88. Noble, "The Future of the Digital Diploma Mill," pp. 29-30.
89. Both Levine's statement and the following quote can be found in Press and Washburn, "Digital Diplomas."
90. Massy and Zemsky, cited in Press and Washburn, "Digital Diplomas," p. 8.
91. Noble, "The Future of the Digital Diploma Mill."

92. Press and Washburn, "Digital Diplomas."
93. Herbert Marcuse, "Some Social Implications of Modern Technology," in Douglas Kellner, ed., *Technology, War, and Fascism* (New York: Routledge, 1998), p. 45.
94. Zygmunt Bauman, *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989).
95. John Hinkson brilliantly explores this issue in "Perspectives on the Crisis of the University," in Simon Cooper, John Kinkson, and Geoff Sharp, eds., *Scholars and Entrepreneurs: The University in Crisis* (North Carlton, Australia: Arena, 2002), pp. 233–267.
96. For a critical analysis of the flaws and possibilities of such approaches in higher education, see: Trend, *Welcome to Cyberschool*; Andrew Feenberg, *Questioning Technology* (New York: Routledge, 1999); Hubert L. Dreyfus, *On the Internet* (New York: Routledge, 2001); Mark Poster, *What Is the Matter with the Internet?* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001).
97. Noble, *Digital Diploma Mills*.
98. For more details on the creation of online degrees for corporations, see Dan Carnevale, "Colleges Tailor Online Degrees for Individual Companies," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 28, 2002. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from <http://chronicle.com/cgi2-bin/printable.cgi>
99. Andrew Feenberg, *Questioning Technology* (New York: Routledge, 1999), p. viii.
100. Feenberg, *Questioning Technology*, p. xv.
101. Ellen Willis, *Don't Think, Smile: Notes on a Decade of Denial* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1999), p. 27.
102. Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1996). As Ronald Strickland points out, Readings has almost nothing to say about how the corporate university reproduces the academic and social division of labor between elite and second-tier universities that is so central to changing global economic landscape. See Ronald Strickland, "Gender, Class and the Humanities in the Corporate University," *Genders* 35 (2002), 1–16. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from [http://www.genders.org/g35/g35\\_stricland.htm](http://www.genders.org/g35/g35_stricland.htm)
103. There are a number of books that take up the relationship between schooling and democracy; some of the more important recent critical contributions include Elizabeth A. Kelly, *Education, Democracy, and Public Knowledge* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1995); Wilfred Carr and Anthony Hartnett, *Education and the Struggle for Democracy* (Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1996); Henry A. Giroux, *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Stanley Aronowitz and Henry A. Giroux, *Postmodern Education* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1991); Aronowitz and Giroux, *Education Still under Siege*; and Henry A. Giroux, *Pedagogy and the Politics of Hope* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1997).
104. A conversation between Lani Guinier and Anna Deavere Smith, "Rethinking Power, Rethinking Theater," *Theater* 31, No. 1 (2002), 36.
105. Robin D. G. Kelley, "Neo-Cons of the Black Nation," *Black Renaissance Noire* 1, No. 2 (1997), 146.
106. For an analysis of such events, see David Glenn, "The War on Campus: Will Academic Freedom Survive?" *Nation*, December 3, 2001, pp. 11–14; also see Robin Wilson and Ana Marie Cox, "Terrorist Attacks Put Academic Freedom to the Test," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, October 5, 2001, p. A12.
107. Arundhati Roy, *Power Politics* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press, 2001), pp. 11–12.
108. Noam Chomsky, "Paths Taken, Tasks Ahead," *Profession* (2000), 35.
109. Pierre Bourdieu, "For a Scholarship of Commitment," *Profession* (2000), 42–43.
110. See Nelson, *Will Teach for Food*.
111. Cited in Aronowitz, *The Knowledge Factory*, pp. 63, 109–110.

112. Short Subjects, "Students Hold 'Teach-Ins' to Protest Corporate Influence in Higher Education," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, March 13, 1998, p. A11. Also note Peter Dreier's commentary on student activism emerging in 1998, in "The Myth of Student Apathy," *Nation*, April 13, 1998, pp. 19–22.
113. For a commentary on students against sweatshops, see Liza Featherstone, "Sweatshops, Students, and the Corporate University," *Croonenbergh's Fly* No. 2 (2002), 107–117.
114. Liza Featherstone, "The New Student Movement" *Nation*, May 15, 2000, p. 12.
115. Featherstone, "The New Student Movement," p. 12.
116. Featherstone, "Sweatshops, Students, and the Corporate University," p. 112.
117. I have taken this idea from Nick Couldry, "A Way Out of the (Televised) Endgame?" *Open Democracy*, p. 1. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from [http://www.opendemocracy.net/forum/strands\\_home.asp](http://www.opendemocracy.net/forum/strands_home.asp)
118. Imre Szeman, "Introduction: Learning to Learn from Seattle," in Imre Szeman, ed., Special Double Issue, Learning from Seattle, *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies* 24, No. 1-2 (2002), 5.
119. Szeman, "Introduction," p. 4.
120. Szeman, "Introduction," p. 5.
121. Toni Morrison, "How Can Values Be Taught in This University?" *Michigan Quarterly Review* (2001), 278
122. Pierre Bourdieu, *Acts of Resistance* (New York: New Press, 1999), p. 26.
123. Cited in "Why Does Neo-Liberalism Hate Kids? The War on Youth and the Culture of Politics," *Review of Education/Pedagogy/Cultural Studies* 23, No. 2 (2001), 114.
124. Jacques Derrida, "No One Is Innocent: A Discussion with Jacques about Philosophy in the Face of Terror," *The Information Technology, War and Peace Project*, p. 2. Retrieved July 1, 2002, from [http://www.watsoninstitute.org/infopeace/911/derrida\\_innocence.html](http://www.watsoninstitute.org/infopeace/911/derrida_innocence.html)