

Reading List

In trying to gear up for this conference, I have read or encountered a number of pertinent recent books which I here identify. (For the ones which I have read, I include non-neutral annotations):

Stanley Aronowitz, *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2000). A political “radical” and academic conservative, Aronowitz connects labor market issues with education in a useful way, but would seem to be a bit nostalgic regarding City College (in the 30s), his personal experiences as blue-collar who made it, and unions. Perhaps paradoxically, while he rejects Dewey’s “largely ignored concept of education for democracy and democracy in education” as “beyond possibility” given the present situation, he offers us a more democratic, integrated version of the old Chicago core: history, literature, science and philosophy (p. 177). Unfortunately, he seems to lack understanding of the institutional obstacles to his reconstruction. He finds no justification for employing the new technologies (even while he thinks of CD-Roms and e-mail as the core of this).

Michael Bérubé and Cary Nelson (eds.), *Higher Education Under Fire: Politics, Economics and the Crisis of the Humanities* (New York: Routledge, 1995). Fails in its promise to “orchestrate” perspectives on the “the discourses of fiscal policy, politics and the production of knowledge” (p. 5). Most of the contributors are in English Departments and related fields. Despite the title, very little economics (Michael Apple’s quasi-Marxist account is an exception), but as the subtitle also suggests, mainly concerned about “the cultural wars.” Barry Gross’s right-wing polemic may be the most interesting?

Burton R. Clark, *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation* (Pergamon Press. 2001). Sheldon Rothblatt, an informed historian of higher education, writes (on Amazon): “Here is an exploration, at once empirical and conceptual, in language that is sharp and effective, of the way we live now. Clark looks for and finds pathways out of current difficulties that address that old dilemma in the address in the history of universities: how to escape from the vexations of the present without losing sight of the qualities that made universities so very special in the first place.” (Clark has very good essay in Rothblatt and Wittrock, below).

Jonathan R. Cole, Elinor G. Barber and Stephen R. Graubard (eds.), *The Research University in a Time of Discontent* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1993). Mainly a defense: not surprising given that the contributors include five Presidents (two emeriti), one VP (of Rockefeller), two Provosts, the CEO of the Academy of Sciences, the President Emeritus of the Association of American Universities, the editor of *Daedalus* and three well-known neo-conservative social scientists.

Jan Currie and Janice Angela Newson (eds.), *Universities and Globalization : Critical Perspectives* (Thousand Oakes, CA.: Sage, 1998). Excellent for comparative work on higher education, including Currie on Australia and America, Sheila Slaughter on Canadian universities, Donald Fisher and Kjell Rubenson on Norway, Arild Tjeldvoll on

higher education reform in Australia and France, Robert Lingard and Fazal Rizvi on the impact of NAFTA on Mexican universities.

Gerard Delanty, *Challenging Knowledge: The University in the Knowledge Society* (Open University Press, 2001). If I had to pick one book, this would be it. Delanty offers a very well-informed account of the modern University in transition, from its beginnings to today. He seems to have read everyone that is pertinent (including participants at this conference) and has put it together in a convincing way. He argues that the late 60s and 70s were critical, both as regards “organized modernity,” a dramatic shift in the production and legitimation of knowledge and then as regards the self-understanding of the university. But unlike those who hold to grim scenarios (either post-modern or instrumentalist), he offers that the role of the university could be enhanced, and this in the direction which would contribute to more democratic and cosmopolitan forms of citizenship.

James J. Duderstadt, *A University for the 21st Century* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000). Writes as a former President of the University of Michigan. The book is disappointing, partly because of the nearly bulleted style and because some of the ground is familiar. He has, however, a deep appreciation of governance issues (“the history of higher education in America suggests that, in reality, the faculty has had relatively little influence over the evolution of the university” (p. 247), the causes and consequences of “privatization” and the challenge of the new technologies which could promote “the growth of entirely new learning organizations” (p. 304). Could be read in conjunction with Ruchs and Delanty.

Sohail Inayatulla, co-editor of *The University in Transformation: Global Perspectives on the Futures of the University* (Greenwood Press, 1999). Contains a range of essays (some by the participants of this conference) on pertinent topics. Very good comparative materials.

Peter Jarvis, *Universities and Corporate Universities: The Higher Learning Industry in Global Society* (London: Kogan Page, 2001). A professor of Continuing Education, Jarvis argues that globalization forces “a learning market” in which established institutions no longer have a monopoly, that “corporate universities” (not the university as a corporation, but institutions like MacDonald’s Hamburger University which includes a 22-language simultaneous facility and has trained 65,000 managers) are competing in this market. By 1995, there were over 1,000 corporate universities with budgets totaling over \$52 billion (p. 113). Distance education, led by the British Open University, is “one of the easiest ways of marketing education” and developing technologies will extend this. Quoting Kenny-Wallace, “traditional universities are no longer the dominant players in the creation and communication of knowledge, especially in cyberspace. Just-in-case education has moved to just-in-time and just-for-you...Plato.com has arrived”(p. 113). Jarvis concludes that since the traditional university does not know what it is, it is easy for a wholly instrumental discourse to dominate.

Christopher J. Lucas, *Crisis in the Academy: Rethinking Higher Education in America* (New York: St.Martins Press, 1996). A historical acute account which de-mystifies some prevailing beliefs (e.g., about general education, tenure, open admission, the culture of

faculties, governance), and offers some very positive ideas for reform, including, e.g., abandoning the idea of a disciplinary department as an autonomous unit for resource allocations and re-designing administrative configurations which would enable realizing clearly articulated goals, e.g., the development of skills, general education, vocational training, and then assessing the outcomes: an effort at “truth-in-advertising.” Very weak on new technologies and their potential.

Bill Readings, *University in Ruins* (Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press, 1996). Completed just prior to his death in the crash American Eagle flight 4184, Readings book is provocative, but too often obscure and intemperate. The basic argument is that the modern university came to existence as an embodiment of German Idealist thought, mediated by Humboldt and Newman, and had as its goal the transmission of “culture.” But since “the nation-state is no longer the primary instance of the reproduction of global capitals, ‘culture’—as the symbolic and political counterpart of the project of integration pursued by the nation-state—has lost its purchase” (p. 12). He concludes “we should try to replace the empty idea of excellence with the empty name of Thought.” Unlike “excellence,” Thought “does not masquerade as an idea” (p. 160). “Thought demands that we ask what it means, because its status as mere name—radically detached from truth—enforces that question” (p. 160). “Cultural Studies,” for him, is not a possible answer since “culture no longer matters as an *idea* for the institution” (p. 91). For me, at least, his history is dubious, and his analysis, both abstract and overgeneralized, would seem to be distorted by his disciplinary and theoretical perspective.

Sheldon Rothblatt and Bjorn Wittrock (eds.), *The European and American University Since 1800: Historical and Sociological Essays* (Cambridge: CUP Press, 1993). A useful set of historical and comparative overviews. See especially essays by Clark and Wittrock.

Richard S. Ruch, *Higher Ed, Inc.: The Rise of the Non-Profit University* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 2001). An extremely helpful account of the rise of the non-profit, and the consequences for the non-profits. For him, “the question and the challenge is not whether to become more responsive, but how to do so in the face of a tradition of resistance, a history of inertia, and a system of decision making that inhibits quick decisions and rapid response to change” (p. 151).

Sheila Slaughter, Larry L. Leslie, *Academic Capitalism : Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1999). A generally conventional social scientific examination of critical aspects of higher education, including in the argument self-conscious “theory” and a good deal of a quantitative information and survey research materials. They conclude: “We see academic capitalism in general, and science and technology in particular, as bringing about broad change in higher education to the point where the center of the academy has shifted from a liberal arts core to an entrepreneurial periphery” (p. 207). Two “scenarios,” a worst case and a best case (pp. 242-2445) are very persuasive, and neither are encouraging.

Charles J. Sykes, *Profscam: Professors and the Demise of Higher Education* (New York: St, Martins Press, 1990). The Solomons quote one illustrative text: “The story of the

collapse of American higher education is the story of the rise of the professoriate. No understanding of the academic disease is possible without an understanding of the Academic Man, this strange mutation of 20th-century academia who has the pretensions of an ecclesiastic, the artfulness of witch doctor, and the soul of a bureaucrat. Almost single-handedly, the professors have destroyed the university as a center of learning and have desolate higher education” (See Solomon and Solomon, p. 204f.)

Robert and John Solomon, *Up the University: Recreating Higher Education* (Reading, Ma.: Addison Wesley, 1993). A very well known and well regarded professor of philosophy (and former colleague of mine) and his brother, a professor of classics, offer an energetic look at the university from “the inside.” Fun reading. They have one very powerful thesis: Universities exist to teach undergraduates, but indeed, they are currently structured so to make this nearly impossible. The obstacles begin with corporate administration, and extend to distortion regarding “research,” the PhD dissertation, the institutionalization of departments, and the reward system of faculty, including cynical “teaching awards” and the tenure system. The Solomons reject nailing the faculty as “easy targets,” (e.g., as with Sykes’s *Profscam*) and argue for strong faculty governance; but they are not clear whether many, most? faculty are clear themselves about what they should be doing and just cannot, or whether the typical faculty’s warm endorsement of “liberal education” suggests that they are serious victims of ideologies which sustain all those practices which they rightly condemn.

Charles W. Smith, *Market Values in American Higher Education : The Pitfalls and Promises* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000). Finds a number of “false diagnoses and faulty cures, e.g., serious misreading of the fiscal and organizational realities. This resulted in a “paste and mix response to growth in higher education. Offers that we need to decide what we want and determine clearly what we have, then offers a series of “guiding principles” and specific recommendations.

Joel Spring, *Education and the Rise of Global Economy* (Mahwah, N.J.: Erlbaum, 1998). Spring had argued (in *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State*, 1972) that “only elimination of government-operated schools could produce the freedom of thought required for the exercise of democratic power” (p. xi). He now sees this to be naïve “in the face of the uncontrolled power of global corporations.” He now thinks that “the right to an education should include an education in human rights and democratic power.” Some useful data, but the analysis is thin.

Geoffrey D. White (ed.), *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower* (Amherst: Prometheus, 2000). “Leftish” critics, including David Noble, Michael Parenti, Leonard Minsky, Sheila Slaughter, Howard Zinn, Micheal Zweig, Ralph Nader, some too brief, some offering critiques of specific aspects of the problem, some providing small case studies.