The Corporate University in Canada and the U.S.: History, Manifestations, and Oppositional Strategies

Marjorie Stone
Dalhousie University

During a recent half-sabbatical, I held a fellowship at the National Humanities Centre in North Carolina. The NHC—in the Research Triangle Park between University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Duke University in Durham, and North Carolina State University in Raleigh—is a humanities outpost in a beautiful pine forest within a research and development hub that stretches for miles. Across the road from its entrance is the controlled access gateway to one of GlaxoSmithKline's two enormous pharmaceutical research facilities in the Park. Many other R&D enterprises in biotech, high tech, and other industries fill the RTP, mostly hidden by the trees, many invisible at the end of long restricted-access drives. This is the face of knowledge production in the twenty-first century, one might say: concealed in its locations as well as in the dissemination of the research it carries out; accountable to CEOs and shareholders, not to the public; invisibly intermeshed with university applied research facilities, tech transfer offices, and university educational facilities that "socialize" the costs not only of considerable research but also of worker training to "subsidize private profits," as David Shultz notes (np).[1] The NHC was established in

1 In "Franchising the University," Jeffrey J. Williams describes a faculty meeting inaugurating the school year at East Carolina University at which the Dean of

ESC 38.1 (March 2012): 71–88

Marjorie Stone, McCulloch Chair in English, Dalhousie University, has published on a range of Victorian authors and on literary collaboration, gender theory, sex trafficking, multiculturalism, and cultural citizenship. Most recently she was volume co-editor for three of five volumes in *The Works of Elizabeth Barrett Browning* (Pickering and Chatto, 2010). Current projects include a digital archive, a book on Elizabeth Barrett Browning's working manuscripts, and research on nineteenth-century transnationalism, especially networks connecting the anti-slavery, Chartist, and Italian movements.

1978, and it provides a stimulating environment for humanistic research, with highly functional and efficient administrative and library infrastructure supporting the work of its annual group of fellows. Despite massive cuts in government support for the humanities in the U.S., the centre has managed to survive for over thirty years, supported by the active and agile fundraising of its director, advisory board, development office staff, and benefactors. The fundraisers have increasingly turned to private foundations and philanthropists, reflecting the shift in fundraising sources and patterns treated in a *Globe and Mail* series beginning 29 October 2011 with "Save the world inc." (Saunders). The NHC's physical infrastructure is aging, and one can only hope that it will still be providing an infrastructure for humanities scholars thirty years from now.

The current NHC Director, Geoffrey Galt Harpham, is a vigorous advocate for the humanities, evident in his most recent book, *The Humanities and the Dream of America,* and a companion article ("From Eternity to Here") in a 2011 special issue of *Representations* on the corporate university.[2] In these twinned publications, Harpham traces the American history of the humanities within a changing political, cultural, and financial environment much as Daniel Coleman and Smaro Kamboureli track the history of the humanities since the Massey report (1949–51) along with the rise of "research capitalism" in Canada in the introduction to their collection *Retooling the Humanities: The Culture of Research in Canadian Universities* (1–39). The parallels between the studies are striking, despite certain key differences between the Canadian and American trajectories: most notably the American triumphalism of the vision of achieving a "stronger, freer social order" through investing in universities in the 1947 Truman Report, *Higher Education and American Democracy* ("From Eternity" 45), and the more embattled nationalist emphasis on developing an "autonomous culture" in response to the "'American invasion'" in the Massey report (1949–51) (Coleman and Kamboureli 14). The similarities are not surprising, given long-established cross-border business and capital networks now becoming more deeply integrated through the negotiations for a common North American security perimeter. Coleman and Kamboureli point out that the launch, in 1983, of the Canadian Corporate Higher Education Forum (C-CHEF) at Concordia University created an

Arts and Social Sciences encouraged faculty to form "partnerships" with RTC corporations (16).

2 I am grateful to Geoffrey Harpham for providing me with a copy of this essay in manuscript form before it appeared in *Representations.*

entity identified as a "'sister organization of the Business-Higher Education Forum in the USA.'" C-CHEF was established to put "'major Canadian public and private corporations in contact with the presidents, principals, and rectors of Canadian universities'" and to promote "'mutual understanding'" between university and industry: a goal it thought might be better achieved "by working in camera" (21).

Like Harpham, Coleman and Kamboureli emphasize that there was "no 'golden age' when the university purveyed neutral and universally beneficial knowledge" (17). Nevertheless, their parallel studies analyze "critical moments" (Coleman and Kamboureli's terms) in the movement away from emphasis in the Massey and Truman reports on the education of citizens as a national good, as well as the integral role of the humanities in that endeavour. For example, Coleman and Kamboureli note that well before "academic capitalism dominated university discourses," J. A. Correy, President of Queen's University, argued in *Farewell to the Ivory Tower: Universities in Transition* (1970) for conceiving of "the Canadian university as a public utility in the employ of a political-economic system, which it *persisted* in thinking it was still free to criticize" (21). In the U.S., Harpham notes an earlier critical moment in 1963, when University of California President Clark Kerr envisioned the "'multiversity' as a decentered mesh of partnerships, a 'knowledge industry' geared to production, research, technology, and industry" (47). As he points out, however, Kerr would ultimately be "dismayed" about some of the "changes about which he had been so prescient" (47).[3]

In his *Representations* article, Harpham presents a sobering inventory of the "secondary markers" of corporatization that an instrumentalist "research ethos" (46) has produced in American universities, as the "multiversity" Kerr imagined has had more amplified realizations:

> The secondary markers of corporatization are so numerous that enumerating them makes one feel that there is nothing left to enumerate: the proliferation of administrative positions, the huge gulf between faculty and top administrative salaries (not to mention the gap between the highest paid professors and assistant coaches), "performance" bonuses for deans, "incen-

3 As Colleen Lye, Christopher Newfield, and James Vernon observe in "Humanists and the Public University," introducing the *Representations* special issue on the corporate university, Kerr's vision of higher education was also based on principles of democracy. They assert that, "In the postwar period, courtesy of Clark Kerr's fabled Master Plan for Higher Education, California led the world in pioneering a higher education model publicly funded by general taxation that reflected an equality-based model of economic growth" (3).

> tives" for faculty performance, persistent attacks on tenure, the rise of profitable "distance learning," the transformation of academic units into cost centers subject to quality assurance guidelines, conflicts between academic freedom and corporate interests, expansive claims by the university of faculty members' intellectual property rights, the inexorable growth in the number of adjunct faculty, the "outsourcing" of services, … the veneration of "entrepreneurship" in all areas of the university including undergraduate programs, the diminishment or cooptation of faculty governance, decreased administrative and trustee transparency, the humbling of academic disciplines before paradigms of assessment grossly inappropriate to them, decisions to shutter "unproductive" departments (classics, German, philosophy), institutional mission statements couched entirely in management rhetoric, the tendency to treat students as customers who must always be right, the tendency on the part of faculty to compete for students by offering attractive electives (and a counter-tendency to devote most of their attention to the professionally competitive activity of research), the recession-proof growth of athletics…, an eagerness to brand and even to franchise the institution—and, in recent years especially, the thundering appearance of very large for-profit universities whose unembarrassed mission statements address (if they do not always meet) exclusively vocational goals. ("From Eternity to Here" 48)

As many studies have emphasized, the corporatization of universities reflects much broader developments.

Wendy Brown comments in her contribution to the *Representations* special issue that "not far off the horizon are what the 2010 California Republican gubernatorial candidate proposed as 'enterprise zones' encircling public universities where businesses large and small will make direct use of university goods including research, technology, consultants, and cheap labour" (34). Arguably, however, such zones already exist in various locations, as the example of the Research Triangle Park in North Carolina suggests, although geographically and economically the RTP constitutes the centre, not the outer circle, of a multi-university "Enterprise Zone."

As many studies have emphasized, the corporatization of universities reflects much broader developments, intensified by the contemporary global economic crisis in which, in Brown's words, capitalism has begun "cannibalizing itself" (36). In their introduction to the *Representations* special issue, Colleen Lye, Christopher Newfield, and James Vernon observe that "there is no shortage of terms used to describe the nature of the contemporary public university—managerial, corporate, business, marketized,

privatized, postacademic" and that collectively these terms "reference a general process of neoliberal restructuring that is credited with transforming almost all domains of social, cultural, political, and economic life across much of the world" (1). That said, not all of the "secondary markers" of corporatization that Harpham presents in his "bristling list," to use Dionne Brand's terms in *Inventory* (100), are as pronounced in Canada as in the U.S. For example, private, for-profit universities of the kind now advertised on billboards along American interstate highways—their growth documented in Denis Donoghue's *The Last Professor* and by Mary Poovey, among others—are less numerous here, given federal and provincial funding for many universities still categorized as public even when much more than 50 percent of their funding comes from other sources than government. Corporatized college sports, whose role in university branding and fundraising can make coaches more powerful than faculty or even presidents, as the Penn State sexual abuse scandal reminds us, also do not exist on the same scale in Canada.

Thanks in part to the greater strength and wider distribution of Canadian faculty associations and the collective umbrella provided by CAUT, there has also been less erosion of the three pillars—what Cary Nelson terms the "three-legged stool"—of faculty governance, academic freedom, and support for tenure in Canada than the U.S. (31). This point was brought home to me while in the U.S. by a conversation with a tenure-track faculty member—an award-winning teacher whose quantity and quality of publications also met the norm for tenure at her institution—who was nevertheless denied tenure, even though she was one of only ten African American faculty members at a large university in the American south. Annual reviews of pre-tenure faculty in her department took the form of a group of senior faculty members questioning the candidate on his or her research, then writing confidential letters to the chair expressing their views and making claims that the candidate was allowed neither to see nor to refute on the basis of evidence. Such differences remind us that governmental structures and policies combined with strong university faculty associations and labour unions can and do make a difference within a system of universities that are public still in the identity they project if less and less so in their operation and research funding.

At the same time, many of the other markers that Harpham delineates are amply evident in Canadian universities. The ranks of tenured faculty members are contracting, with suspensions or curtailments, as at my own university, of replacement of retiring faculty, at least in the arts and social sciences. While graduate programs in the humanities have grown in recent

years in some parts of Canada, especially Ontario, with an infusion of higher education funding under the first McGuinty government, debates about the ethics of recruiting graduate students into these programs have intensified, as in recent postings by Aimée Morrison and Erin Wunker on the "Hook& Eye" blog. Meanwhile, among the declining numbers in tenure-track positions, "the veneration of 'entrepreneurship' in all areas of the university" that Harpham describes, compounded by the Canadian "research culture" that Kamboureli and Coleman anatomize, has intensified the development of what Wendy Brown terms "neoliberal careerism" (34) among humanities faculty themselves. As Donaghue notes, "the market categories of productivity, efficiency, and competitive achievement, not intelligence or erudition, already drive professional advancement in the academic world, even in the humanities. Today's professors have, in other words, internalized the very standards that have traditionally been used to attack them" (xvi). They do so with all the more alacrity because granting council program and policy changes increasingly reward adoption of such standards, given the market values informing, for example, SSHRC's 2004 mission statement, "From Granting Council to Knowledge Council": a document that reflects, in Len Findlay's words, the "retooling of academic mendicancy to meet the demands" of a "new usury" driven by "business" agendas, within a "narrowly utilitarian" framework (51).

I now see more clearly than I did a few years ago the extent to which the internalization of this entrepreneurial ideology influenced my own work as Dalhousie's first Assistant Dean of Research for the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences from 1999 to 2002, even as I threw myself into defending the value of the humanities and critiquing the commercialization of university research. On the one hand, both within my university and at the millennial symposia in 2000 organized by the federal granting councils on creativity and innovation, I emphasized the historically demonstrated value of curiosity-driven, non-targeted research, in part by referencing the landmark March 2000 *Atlantic* article, "The Kept University," by Eyal Press and Jennifer Washburn. I also protested an initial proposal for an "Atlantic Innovation Fund" to provide matching funds for researchers seeking grants from the Canada Innovation Fund (a pivotal federal engine of the culture of research capitalism) that made no reference to the humanities and social sciences. On the other hand, I encouraged faculty to develop strategic partnerships with both government policy officers and with community organizations and to consider framing their research interests in more targeted ways to fit SSHRC's growing suite of applied research programs. Moreover, I directly worked on developing such partnerships through

my work as a Centre Director from 2004 to 2007 in the Metropolis Project (1997 to 2012), a joint strategic program between SSHRC and federal departments that funded a network of five Canadian centres carrying out research and public policy development on "migration, diversity, and immigrant integration in cities in Canada and around the world" (Stone "SSHRC's Strategic Programs" 135); I also collaborated with policy analysts from the department of Canadian Heritage in trying to enhance the role of the arts and the humanities in the "culture" investigated within the project (Stone, Destrempes, Jeannote, and Foote).

2001 brought another manifestation of the corporatization of universities as debates erupted at Dalhousie and at other North American universities when *Playboy* magazine, facing a declining circulation, sought to establish a network of campus representatives sponsoring university social events. Invited to speak as a resident feminist in a forum on "*Playboy* on Campus" organized by the Dalhousie Arts and Sciences Social Society, I decided to approach the subject parodically, donning a kitten mask and introducing myself as the new *Playboy* Chair in Gender Studies at Dalhousie. I enthusiastically described the new wing of the library endowed by *Playboy*, along with its contents, including an archive of the college girls subgenre of porn, which features college girls—often trying to subsidize the costs of their university education by work for the porn industry—in various erotic poses and states of undress. (My research for the forum included checking out an alcove behind a tattered curtain in the convenience store in my neighbourhood, where I found a plentiful stock of college girl videos.) As more and more buildings—and now classrooms as well—at Dalhousie have been named after corporate funders and corporate giving has become more and more tied to specific research agendas at universities and research institutes across the country, the *Playboy* spoof has seemed less and less parodic.

In fact, university libraries have become one more site for corporatization of special concern for humanities scholars, as senior librarians assume an increasingly managerial, market ethos in an age of digitizatation, and "not-for-profit" institutions and organizations blur or merge with profit-driven enterprises. Ian Brown in a May 2011 *Globe and Mail* article, noted the "deeply digital vision" of McMaster University's head librarian, Jeff Trzeciak, and his advocacy of "shrunken libraries" in which highly trained professional librarians are replaced by "information technologists and (much cheaper) post-doctoral students." Andrew Stauffer, Director of NINES (Networked Infrastructure for Nineteenth-century Electronic Scholarship) at the University of Virginia, and as such no lud-

dite, has called for more rigorous questioning of such sweepingly digital agendas, evident, for example, in a 2009 "Strategy and Research" ITHAKA report, "What to Withdraw: Print Collections Management in the Wake of Digitization," with ITHAKA arguing that university libraries should start de-accessioning print journals in favour of their "digital surrogates" (cited Stauffer 338).[4] ITHAKA is described on its website as "a not-for-profit organization that helps the academic community use digital technologies to preserve the scholarly record and to advance research and teaching in sustainable ways" (www.ithakca.org/mission), but it recently merged with JSTOR and now also offers a "Strategic Consulting" service (Ithaka S+R) to its "clients." As Stauffer and others have noted, books and periodicals bearing important witness to historical patterns of distribution, cultural or political engagement, and specific scenes and acts of reading, are being destroyed—one might say, clear-cut—in increasingly large swathes and replaced with imperfectly executed digital scans, marketed to libraries by the publishing consortia who profit from strictly regulating access to the databases now increasingly available only in very large research universities. The ITHAKA report does not "assume … any extrinsic value to the maintenance of print artifacts but rather takes a critical perspective to analyze why the community might want to keep any print at all," viewing potential faculty resistance to "removal" of "print collections" as a factor inhibiting "decision-making" (cited Stauffer 338).

The managerial ethos of head librarians is a facet of the corporatization of universities reflected more conspicuously in the "proliferation of administrative positions" noted by Harpham in the U.S., a phenomenon equally evident in Canadian universities. At my own, the number of associate vice-presidents has rapidly increased (although one memo from the president argued that many of these reflected changes in title, not new positions), while the 1990s brought a change in procedures for reappointment of senior administrators: from a search after five years to a review, with an intensifying pattern of serial reappointment. The President of Dalhousie has now served three consecutive five-year terms of office and is into his fourth. W.D. Smith presented evidence in a January 2010 *Maclean's* article that the proportion of the budget devoted to administrative costs in Canadian universities has dramatically escalated, while funds devoted to teaching have dropped. Smith's interpretation of the evidence has been disputed (including by my own university president). For example, Alex

4 I am grateful to Andrew Stauffer for sharing a version of this article in manuscript form after he made a presentation based on it at the 2011 Northeastern Victorian Studies Association at the University of Maryland.

Usher, President of Higher Education Strategy Associates (a company that evidently does consultancy work for university administrations) argues that Smith has misinterpreted the data. But even Usher acknowledges that "at the very top ranks of Presidents and Vice-Presidents," Canadian universities have seen "salary growth that is well above average," although, arguably, not so grossly above average as the salaries of chief executive officers in many banks and corporations. Usher does not dispute another, more troubling statistic presented by Smith: that in 1987–88, 15 percent of operating income was derived from tuition fees in "the average top 25 university" in Canada; by 2009, this had grown to 34 percent.

Student debt loads have, if anything, only increased since then.

The escalation in tuition fees accompanying the decline in public funding for public universities in both Canada and the U.S. indicates that students have suffered more from the corporatization of universities than a view of them as customers who are always right suggests. In the U.S., Bob Meister points out, "The price of public higher education has been growing at twice the rate of the economy, twice as fast as health insurance, and three to four times more quickly than consumer prices in general" (128). A March 2012 article by Robert Reich notes that in the last year, "41 states have cut spending on higher education," following earlier "deep cuts in 2009 and 2010." The past year's cuts have resulted in an average 8.3 percent tuition hike in universities in the public system to make up the shortfall (and tuition hikes in some states ranging from 17 to 21 percent). Whereas in the 1970s "tuition at a public university averaged about 4 percent of median family income" in America, it is now "approaching 25 percent," while the New York Federal Reserve Bank "estimates" student debt at "$550 billion" (Reich). In Canada, during Dalhousie's last strike (in 2002), I spoke to young faculty on the picket lines who began their careers with student loan debts of $50,000. Student debt loads have, if anything, only increased since then, to varying degrees depending upon students' socio-economic backgrounds, while prospects for employment have sunk. In both Canada and the U.S., higher education has also become "a substantial banking franchise, a new domain of extraordinary, low-risk" profit for banks (Williams 23) as students pay competitive interest rates and are prevented from declaring bankruptcy.

In contrast, in the 1970s, I benefited from an interest rate held to a level below prime when I graduated in 1972, as well as from an Ontario Student Awards Program that provided a substantial amount of funding in the form of an outright grant if your family income was below a certain level, as mine was. I received $600 as a loan and $1,000 as a grant each year for the four years of my undergraduate years in an Honours English

program. Since tuition fees at the University of Guelph where I was a student were $660 (around $3500 in today's dollars), OSAP support combined with even relatively meagre summer earnings meant I did not need to hold a job during the school year and that I could compete on a level playing field with students from wealthier families. In contrast, today's university classrooms are populated by two nations of students, to echo Benjamin Disraeli in the Victorian period, with a growing group in between. There are those from economically affluent backgrounds; declining numbers from lower socio-economic family backgrounds who may, if they are lucky, benefit from some subsidy but who still often have to work fifteen to forty hours a week just to be in the classroom; and increasing numbers of students with some, although limited support from middle-class parents in increasingly compromised economic circumstances. Then there are the many who are no longer in university or who do not make it there in the first place. I think, for example, of the plumber's son who came to our home with his father and somewhat wistfully described how interesting he found undergraduate study in English literature but who ultimately decided to drop out and enter his father's profession for financial reasons, or the mechanical engineer who had immigrated from Kosovo but who could not afford the two years tuition he needed to pay to establish his Canadian engineering credentials while also supporting a young family.

These economic disparities among past and contemporary students, along with the policies that have greatly exacerbated them, are completely glossed over by *Globe and Mail* conservative pundit Margaret Wente in her March 2012 glib contrast between students today and herself as a member of a "gilded generation" who grew up in "brand-new suburbs and went to brand-new schools." In her own case, she declares, she "graduated from university debt-free" because "university was practically free" in her youth, and then she got the first job for which she applied (in publishing).[5] University was not "practically free" thirty years ago (Wente does not indicate how she paid her tuition, although she does mention later borrowing enough money from her mother to buy into an "up-and-coming" real estate zone in Toronto). If a university education was not free, however,

5 As a columnist who periodically trashes "useless" arts degrees, Wente does not mention that her MA in English from the University of Toronto and a publicly supported educational system may have helped her to get this job. On Wente's credentials and contradictions, as well as tuition fee increases between the 1970s and today in the context of the 2012 Quebec student protests, see Mike Spry. On charges of plagiarism against Wente, her temporary disciplining by the *Globe and Mail*, and her accusatory apology, see Carol Wainio and Rachael Mendleson.

it was more widely accessible: not because of naturalized accidents of economic history resulting in lucky "gilded" and unlucky, ungilded generations but because of government policies with a long-sighted generational reach and a focus on investing in human capabilities.

Information on OSAP in Edward Joseph Monahan's history of the Council of Ontario Universities indicates that I benefited from a relatively brief period in the late 1960s and early 1970s when belief in public investment in higher education was embodied in the Wright Commission and reflected in the statement by the Ontario treasurer in the legislature in 1968 (the year I entered university at age seventeen) that "education is our principal tool for increasing the productive capacity of our economy" (3, 59–60). This public support, in the case of my own family, helped to underwrite the education of five students brought up by parents who worked sixty to eighty hours a week to clear and cultivate a farm and who believed fervently in the value of public education but who were not fortunate enough to gain access to a university education themselves. Nor did they have the financial resources to provide this access for these five children, while also supporting a sixth child with some learning disabilities: indeed, the total net farm income one particularly bad year in my early childhood was $800. Since this particular OSAP investment ultimately help to support the education of two university professors (one of them, my sister, a Trudeau fellow), an orthopaedic surgeon, a geological engineer, and a graduate in agricultural science who applied his expertise in farming, one might argue that, in terms of funding returned to the state in terms of tax revenues alone, this infusion of public money did indeed increase "the productive capacity" of the Canadian economy. In the 1970s, however, Monahan notes that the enlightened vision of higher education as a public good was increasingly displaced by a discourse of education as a "private good," as a more conservative breed of economists argued that the "rate of return" on higher education was "negative" (60).

Still, comparatively speaking, government support for public investment in education was much higher in the 1970s than in the 1990s or in 2011, as it was for other policies designed to enhance social equity. Monahan describes a leaked 1972 Treasury Board memo that led University of Toronto professor Phyllis Grosskurth to resign from a university-government body she was serving on because it approved a $100 increase in tuition and raised the loan ceiling of the OSAP from $600 (the rate I benefited from) to $800 before the grant component kicked in. Thank you Phyllis Grosskurth!, I exclaimed to myself as I read Monahan's report, reflecting on my own experience not as a "fortunate son" of the social elite,

in the words of Creedence Clearwater, but as a fortunate working-class daughter supported by an enlightened higher education policy. In the lead essay in the collection published in her honour, *Not Drowning but Waving: Women, Feminism, and the Liberal Arts,* Patricia Clements, former Dean of Arts of the University of Alberta and a former President of the Canadian Federation of Humanities and Social Sciences, points out that, whereas in 1921, "women accounted for only 16.3 per cent of university enrolment in Canada," by 1967–68, this "had risen to 34.2 per cent," and since 1970, women have driven enrolment growth substantially (5). As Clements's compelling overview of equity in Canadian universities indicates, this growth, in Alberta as in other provinces, grew in large part out of beliefs and policies viewing higher education as integral to the public good.

While Clements documents real gains for women since the 1960s, current conditions have fostered a state of widespread debt peonage for both female and male students, producing increasing disillusionment and a "generalized condition of precarity," in Anana Roy's words (180).[6] This "precarity" has damaging consequences for the democratic expression, participatory citizenship, and creativity essential to the public good in a democracy, as well as to the students and underemployed or unemployed university graduates who endure it. It makes the workers universities produce for a neoliberal economic regime at best risk-averse, at worst controlled by the everyday struggle against economic constraints. "Precarity" and the anxiety about job prospects fueled by it also makes students vulnerable to exploitation by serial internship programs in which they work for free for corporations with none of the protections regarding job security or the right to an harassment-free workplace that regular employees might (or might not) have. At a 2009 conference on "Reworking the University" at the University of Minnesota, Heather Steffen presented a paper pointing out that "about 80 percent of graduating college seniors have worked as interns at some point on their way to a degree. As many as 50 percent of these internships do not pay their workers, and many companies and colleges want students to get (as a so-called bonus) course credit for their internship hours—so students get caught actually paying universities to work for free at a different site." Precarity has also resulted in narrowing choices about fields of study and career paths as students feel increasing pressure to enter programs such as business, as opposed

6 Roy's assertion in this context that "in this struggle, we are all students of color" (179–80), is much more controversial and open to question.

to the arts programs that might be more suited to their talents and abilities.[7] Within arts programs meanwhile, funding cuts have produced the curriculum deficits analyzed by Donna Palmateer Pennee in her *Retooling the Humanities* essay. These in turn produce "preparedness deficits" in students and "narrow the kinds of questions student-citizens might ask, in their diminishing of the capacity to recognize a problem in all its complexity," Pennee points out (70). In Kit Dobson's words in his *Retooling* essay, the application of an economic model to culture can result in a "reduction in the scope of expressible ideas" (7), thereby thwarting the collective creativity fundamental to the vitality and prosperity of a national culture.

As my own limited inventory here suggests, analyzing the manifestations of corporatization in the university has become a "dismal science" of our time. One danger of such approaches is that they can themselves intensify apathy. For Donoghue in *The Last Professors,* the battle against the corporate university and the preservation of the humanities as we know them is already lost. Nevertheless, as Mary Poovey emphasizes in "The Twenty-First Century University and the Market," "if those of us who want an alternative to market values cannot identify 'goods' that we are willing to defend in terms that do not derive from the market, then we will lose not only the relative autonomy the university enjoyed during the first half of the twentieth century" but also the "goods of living culture, which embody and preserve human creativity" (12). Like Poovey, Harpham, Coleman and Kamboureli, and the contributors to the *Representations* special issue, many emphasize that the stakes are far too high to cede loss at this juncture. Granted, there have always been attacks of various kinds on the university, especially the liberal arts, and attempts to undermine its capacity to develop and educate the kinds of critical, aware citizens essential to democracy. Yet, in Henry A. Giroux's words,

> Never has this assault on the democratic polity been more obvious, if not more dangerous, than at the current moment when a battle is being waged under the rubric of neoliberal austerity measures on the autonomy of academic labor, the classroom as a site of critical pedagogy, the rights of students to high quality education, the democratic vitality of the university as a public sphere and the role played by the liberal arts and humanities in fostering an educational culture that

7 Poovey provides statistics on the decline in the U.S. in enrolment in liberal arts disciplines compared to subjects like accounting and computer science (see page 9).

is about the practice of freedom and mutual empowerment. ("Beyond the Swindle" np)

What resistance strategies are most promising in the battle?

What resistance strategies are most promising in the battle Giroux describes? Christopher L. Connery's account of a broadly based faculty movement at the University of California's various campuses opposing corporatized privatization suggests that, while "rational reformism" through "position papers," "hearings, websites, and teach-ins" brought little or no substantive change on its own, student occupations and protests in 2009 *did* capture senior administrative and political attention (95–96). The same might be observed of the more recent student occupations of UC campus sites, especially the group of non-violent seated student protesters at UC Davis subjected to pepper spray on campus, provoking commentaries like Cathy N. Davidson's "Why This is a Gettysburg Address Moment for Higher Education." Many students are already actively resisting corporatization, from the individuals posting cartoon "mockumentaries" on YouTube parodying their reduction to "cash register" target populations for corporate advertising, to Yale University's Employee and Graduate Student Union, which has produced a report on administrative bloat, on the "speed-up" in "time-to-degree" compromising the "quality of research," and on "restoring democracy" in higher education ("Yale, Inc."). Further activism might be fostered through the curriculum by introducing courses like the seminar on the future of U.S. universities taught in 1999 by Poovey (1) or developing pedagogic practices designed to develop the critical and engaged citizenship described by Giroux ("Vocationalizing" 36). In achieving the goal of "restoring democracy," broadly based alliances between student, faculty and staff, and maintenance workers seem especially critical,[8] together with alliances across generations between faculty post or nearing retirement who benefited from public investment in higher education in the 1960s and '70s and students and sessional instructors suffering from the withdrawal of this public support today. One focus for such alliances might be the push for a national system of annual equity audits charting accessibility to publicly funded education in Canadian universities, on the model of the equity audits for gender and diversity within institutions implemented by the federal government contractors program and the smaller scale audits of the Canada Research Chairs program carried

8 For a short-lived period, an alliance across different occupational sectors in the university sprang up at Dalhousie (the "Alliance for a Democratic Dalhousie") in the wake of shared concerns about university governance articulated in the Dalhousie Faculty Association's 1998 strike. Before it dissolved, ADD did manage to obtain approximately fifteen hundred signatures supporting a petition calling for an arms-length inquiry into university finances and governance.

out by Wendy Robbins for the Canadian Federation of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Such large-scale initiatives would require the mobilization of broad public support, but social movements in the past have repeatedly demonstrated that even deeply entrenched practices and economic systems can be altered. The radical abolitionist movement that sprang up in some northern states of America in the 1830s began with a few activists pilloried, persecuted, and even murdered for their views, like the African American activist David Walker or the white abolitionist publisher Elijah Lovejoy. Nevertheless, by employing print media, social and religious organizations of various kinds, networks of traveling lecturers and activists like the formidable orator Frederick Douglass, and mass culture (for example, annual anti-slavery fairs selling a range of anti-slavery material artifacts and goods produced without the use of slavery), the radical abolitionists created a counterculture that led larger and larger numbers of Americans in the northern states to oppose slavery by the 1840s and '50s (see Bennett). This historical example, like the fair trade or related ecology movements of our own time, suggests the benefits of employing mass culture—even consumerist culture, as in anti-corporate university fairs—to reclaim the university as a public institution vital to the public good. It also suggests the importance of outreach to those outside the university, through programs like Halifax's Humanities 101 taught by volunteer lecturers, or analogous programs across the country. Such outreach serves a double purpose. It not only opens up further channels of communication for raising awareness of what is lost when the university is reduced to a corporatized ganglia providing an instrumentalist education as a private good. It also reminds those fortunate enough to have a higher education of the hunger for learning, for the "goods of living culture," in Poovey's words again, that makes enhancing, rather than reducing, access to the university such an ethical imperative in a country that values its democracy.

Acknowledgements

My thanks to Neta Gordon for her advice on revisions in the initial draft of this article presented at the ACCUTE special session on "The Corporate University" chaired by her.

Works Cited

Bennett, Michael. *Democratic Discourses: The Radical Abolition Movement and Antebellum American Literature.* New Brunswick and London: Rutgers UP, 2005.

Brand, Dionne. *Inventory.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 2006.

Brown, Ian. "Don't discard the librarians." *Globe and Mail.* 21 May 2011. F4.

Clements, Patricia. "'My World as in My Time': Living in the History of Equity and Backlash." *Not Drowning but Waving: Women, Feminism, and the Liberal Arts.* Eds. Susan Brown, Jeanne Perreault, Jo-Ann Wallace, and Heather Zwicker. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2011. 3–43.

Coleman, Daniel, and Smaro Kamboureli, "Introduction: Canadian Research Capitalism: A Genealogy of Critical Moments." *Retooling the Humanities: The Culture of Research in Canadian Universities.* Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2011. 1–39.

Connery, Christopher L. "Marches Through the Institutions: University Activism in the Sixties and the Present." *Representations* 116:1 (Fall 2011): 88–101.

Davidson, Cathy N. "Why This is a Gettysburg Address Moment for Higher Education." 19 November 2011. www.cathydavidson.com/2011/11.

Donoghue, Frank. *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities.* New York: Fordham UP, 2008.

Findlay, L. M. "Extraordinary Renditions: Translating the Humanities Now." *Retooling the Humanities: The Culture of Research in Canadian Universities.* Eds. Daniel Coleman and Smaro Kamboureli. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2011. 41–57.

Giroux, Henry A. "Beyond the Swindle of the Corporate University: Higher Education in the Service of Democracy." 27 May 2011. www.globalresearch.ca

———. "Vocationalizing Higher Education: Schooling and the Politics of Corporate Culture." In Henry A. Giroux and Kostas Myrsiades, eds., *Beyond the Corporate University: Culture and Pedagogy in the New Millennium.* Boston: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001. 29–44.

Harpham, Geoffrey. *The Humanities and the Dream of America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.

———. "From Eternity to Here: Shrinkage in American Thinking About Higher Education." The Humanities and the Crisis of the Public University. *Representations* 116:1 (Fall 2011): 42–61.

Lye, Colleen, Christopher Newfield, and James Vernon, "Humanists and the Public University." *Representations* 116:1 (2011): 1–18.

Meister, Bob. "Debt and Taxes: Can the Financial Industry Save Public Universities." *Representations* 116:1 (Fall 2011): 128–55.

Mendleson, Rachael. "Margaret Wente Plagiarism Allegations: Globe and Mail Takes Unspecified 'Disciplinary Action' Against Columnist." The Huffington Post. 25 September 2012. www.huffingtonpost.ca/2012/09/25/margaret-wente-plagiarism_n_1912732.html.

Monahan, Edward Joseph. *Collective Autonomy: A History of the Council of Ontario Universities, 1962–2000*. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier UP, 2004.

Morrison, Aimée. "The degree *is* the job: a modest proposal for the PhD." *Hook & Eye.* 25 November 2011. www.hookandeye.ca.

Nelson, Cary. *No University is an Island: Saving Academic Freedom.* New York: New York UP, 2010.

Poovey, Mary. "The Twenty-First-Century University and the Market: What Price Economic Viability?" *differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 12.1 (Spring 2001): 1–16.

Press, Eyal, and Jennifer Washburn. "The Kept University." *The Atlantic Magazine.* March 2000. www.theatlantic.com/magazine/ar-chive/2000/03/the-kept-university/6629.

Reich, Robert. "Stop Starving Public Universities and Shrinking the Middle Class." *Nation of Change* Op. Ed. 1 March 2012. www.nationofchange.org/stop-starving-public-university-and-shrinking-middle-class-1330615050.

Roy, Anana. "We Are All Students of Color Now." *Representations* 116:1 (Fall 2011): 177–88.

Saunders, Doug. "Save the world inc." *The Globe and Mail.* 29 October 2011. F:1, 4–5.

Shultz, David. "The Corporate University in American Society." *Logos: A Journal of Modern Society and Culture* 4.4 (Fall 2005). www.logosjournal.com/issue_4.4/schultz.htm.

Smith, W. D. "Where all that money is going. Tuition rises, class size grows, and the bureaucracy gets big." 14 January 2010. *Macleans.* www.2.macleans.ca/2010/01/14/where-all-that-money-is-going.

Spry, Mike. "Margaret Wente Hates Herself." Blog posting. 1 May 2012. mikespry.org/2012/05/01/margaret-wente-hates-herself.

Stauffer, Andrew. "The Nineteenth-Century Archive in the Digital Age." *European Romantic Review* 23:3 (June 2012): 335–41.

Steffen, Heather. "Student Internships as Class War." Paper Abstract. "Reworking the University: Visions, Strategies, Demands." 24–26 April 2009. University of Minnesota. www.reworkingtheu.org/program.html.

Stone, Marjorie. "SSHRC's Strategic Programs, the Metropolis Project, and Multiculturalism Research: The Culture of No Culture, Government Partnerships, and Challenges for the Humanities." *Retooling the Humanities.* Eds. Daniel Coleman and Smaro Kamboureli. 133–59.

———, Hélène Destrempes, Sharon Jeannotte, and John Foote. "Immigration and Cultural Citizenship: Responsibilities, Rights, and Indicators." *Immigration, Integration, and Citizenship in 21st Century Canada.* Eds. John Biles, Meyer Burstein, and James Fridere. Kingston: Queen's UP, 2009. 103–35.

[Wainio, Carol.] "Margaret Wente: 'a zero for plagiarism'?" Media Culpa Blog. 18 September 2012. http://mediaculpapost.blogspot.ca/2012/09/margaret-wente-zero-for-plagiarism.html.

Williams, Jeffrey J. "Franchising the University." *Beyond the Corporate University: Culture and Pedagogy in the New Millennium.* Eds. Henry A. Giroux and Kostas Myrsiades. London, Boulder, New York, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001. 15–28.

Wente, Margaret. "We had it all, and still do. It's worth the guilt." *Globe and Mail.* 30 March 2012 . www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/we-had-it-all-and-still-do-its-worth-the-guilt/article2387987.

Wunker, Erin. "After the PhD job and before the next job: an LTA's response to a modest proposal for the PhD." *Hooke & Eye.* 29 November 2011. www.hookandeye.ca.

Yale, Inc. "The Corporate Model in Higher Education." Report of the Yale Graduate Student Union. http://phdoctopus.com/2011/02/10/the-geso-report-on-the-corporate-university.