



WORK & CULTURE

Lineaments and Contradictions of the Neoliberal University System

Michael Denning

Working Group on
Globalization and Culture,
Yale University

*Breaking Down the Ivory Tower: The
University in the Creation of Another
World*

Work & Culture 2005/2
http://www.yale.edu/laborculture/work_culture/

We have come to Porto Alegre both to reflect on the relationship between university scholars and the global justice movements, and to develop a transnational network of scholars, that "*internationale of intellectuals*" called for by Pierre Bourdieu. "It is time," Jackie Smith and Imre Szeman write in the call for this forum workshop, "for those involved in the university sector to imagine ways in which the knowledges and social and political possibilities that continue to be produced within universities...can be effectively mobilized to participate in the active constitution of alternative globalizations and democratic futures."¹ Smith and Szeman rightly note that the university stands as the key mediating institution in imagining links between scholars and global justice movements. The ivory tower has long since fallen; the university, higher education, tertiary education, the academy -- it has several contemporary names -- is a central part of contemporary mass culture around the world. It is not only being reshaped by the forces of globalization: it is itself a fundamental force of globalization, organizing the cross-border dissemination of research and scholarship, and creating what one scholar has called "a worldwide market for academic talent," with one and half million students studying outside the borders of their own countries.²

Thus, any discussion of the organization of intellectuals, of an "international of intellectuals," -- the guiding thread of this WSF workshop -- requires an understanding of the way the global university system organizes intellectual labor, and the way workers in the higher education industry are reshaping the university. In this short working paper, I will first suggest that the last quarter century has seen a dramatic change in higher education regimes, as the Cold War mass university settlement eroded, and a neoliberal university system -- with new contradictions -- was created in its place; I will then argue that the university must thus be understood as a form of global mass culture, and that this raises a specific set of contradictions which are closer to those of the other culture industries than to an older notion of "the academy"; and I will conclude by arguing that a transnational network of academics must build on the important new forms of intellectual organization that have emerged from the mass culture of the neoliberal university, ranging from a new industrial unionism in higher education to new conceptions of "academic freedom" based not on the privileges of "the academy" but on a reclaiming of a cultural commons.

There is a sense in which the university -- like the novel, the feature film, or the political party -- is an extraordinarily successful cultural form, implanted across the globe through colonization and the destruction of competing models of higher education. "The world's idea of the university as it was shaped in the nineteenth century is...a European one," a new study of the history of the

Michael Denning is the William R. Kenan Jr Professor of American Studies at Yale University and is a member of the Working Group on Globalization and Culture. This working paper was first presented at the World Social Forum, Porto Alegre, Brazil, January 2005.

¹ Jackie Smith and Imre Szeman, "Mobilizing Knowledges: An Intellectual Agenda," Draft Proposal for 2005 World Social Forum, November 6, 2004.

² Philip Altbach, ed., *The Decline of the Guru: The Academic Profession in Developing and Middle-Income Countries* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 7.

university concludes; “all universities outside Europe were formed in accordance with an image of the European university in the minds of their founders, at first or second remove....Centers for advanced scholarly research and instruction regarding religious texts, academies for philosophical discussion and instruction and specialized schools for training in military science, administration, law and theology had been known in antiquity, and in ancient India, parts of the Islamic world and Imperial China. Yet only one of these institutions still survives, the al Azhar University in Cairo.”³

Indeed, it is generally accepted that the modern capitalist university system derives from the nineteenth-century German model, which first took shape in the era of Kant and Hegel (particularly with the founding of the new University of Berlin in 1815). By the end of the nineteenth century, scholars and intellectuals from around the world, particularly the United States and Japan, were making intellectual pilgrimages to the German universities (one thinks of W.E.B. DuBois in Berlin), and were emulating them in developing new “research” universities. In the United States, the German model shaped the new capitalist-backed research universities like the University of Chicago and Johns Hopkins, the secularized and restructured Ivies like Eliot’s Harvard, and the new state universities like the University of Michigan; one sees a parallel development in the late-nineteenth century formation of Japan’s Imperial universities. Together with these research universities one sees the formation of the modern social sciences, the development of many of our contemporary academic professional associations, and the development of modern notions of academic freedom. The other side of these fledgling capitalist research institutions were the early colonial universities, formed to train small elites for the colonial civil service, not unlike the African-American colleges (like Fisk, which Du Bois attended) that emerged in the Reconstruction South after the Civil War.

After World War Two, the center of higher education shifted, in large part because of Hitler’s destruction of the German system: “during the National Socialist regime in Germany, about one-third of all university teachers...lost their chairs; some died in concentration camps; most emigrated.”⁴ Universities in the United States, Britain, and elsewhere took in an entire generation of academic refugees from fascism. Moreover, the mobilization of anti-fascist intellectuals during the war created new forms of alliance between the US state and the university, and led to an extraordinary expansion of universities in the United States after the war.

The age of three worlds (1945-1989) was dominated by a new Cold War higher education regime that was built in both the United States and the USSR around three fundamental principles. First, the university became a major center for state-sponsored research and development, particularly for what US President Eisenhower in 1960 called “the military-industrial complex.” Second, the university became the major center for training high and middle level professional and managerial cadres, and was thus a center for the elaboration of

³ Edward Shils and John Roberts, “The diffusion of European models outside Europe,” in Walter Rüegg, ed., *A History of the University in Europe: Volume III Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 164.

⁴ Matti Klinge, “Teachers,” in Walter Rüegg, ed., *A History of the University in Europe: Volume III Universities in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 130.

Cold War ideologies; as part of this project, both US and Soviet universities recruited students from the “Third World” as part of an attempt to influence and incorporate postcolonial elites. Third, the university became a vehicle of mass public education with dramatic increases in enrollments of working-class students, women students, and students of ethnicized and racialized minorities; in the US and elsewhere, the university became a key institution for remaking racial, ethnic and gender regimes through various forms of what came to be called “affirmative action.”⁵ These Cold War university models had great influence in the newly independent post-colonial nations around the world, and the numbers of universities and university students around the world exploded in the age of three worlds.

The mass university of the age of three worlds was thus both a significant popular institution -- a major advance in the social democratic struggle for relatively accessible and inexpensive higher education for working people (represented in the United States by the education provisions of the “GI Bill” of 1944) -- and a central “ideological state apparatus,” to use the concept Louis Althusser developed in the midst of that era. This compromise -- to fund the ever-growing demand for mass higher education with the R&D resources of the Cold War state -- was highly unstable both fiscally (the “fiscal crisis of the state” in the 1970s marks the turning point in post-war university expansion) and politically, as students began to challenge the conditions of university life (overcrowding, insufficient resources, and restrictions on student freedom) and the subordination of higher education to the research imperatives of the Cold War state. These contradictions generated a world-wide wave of student movements and uprisings in the 1960s and 1970s: from the student sit-ins at southern black colleges that triggered the US civil rights movement to the 1968 uprisings in New York, Paris, Mexico City, Tokyo and the San Francisco Bay Area, not to mention the role of students in the Chinese Cultural Revolution, in the dissident movements in Poland and Czechoslovakia, and in the emergence of a new Arab left in Palestine and Egypt.⁶

The crisis provoked by the student movements led to a dramatic transformation in the university system which had produced the student movements and against which they protested. In the thirty years since the end of the student movements, the mass university of the age of three worlds has been remade. On the one hand, we have seen the collapse and restructuring of the European Communist university systems, as well as an ongoing remaking of the

⁵In the United States, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 set this agenda: its main provisions are summarized at <http://ishi.lib.berkeley.edu/cshe/ndea/ndea.html>: Title II set up student loans, Title VI backed area studies and foreign language study, Title VII brought in new media technologies, and Title X established loyalty oaths.

⁶ Out of these movements came a critique and history of the Cold War education regime, represented by the essays in *The Cold War and the University*; see also Sigmund Diamond’s *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities With the Intelligence Community, 1945-1955*. The quasi-autobiographical accounts of the history of area studies are a key part of this reassessment: the essay by Bruce Cumings in his *Parallax Visions* is paralleled by Harry Harootunian’s chapter “Tracking the Dinosaur: Area Studies in the Age of ‘Globalism’” in his *History’s Disquiet*, and by Benedict Anderson’s fascinating introduction to his *The Spectre of Comparisons*. For a further discussion of the politics of Cold War area studies, see Naomi Paik’s essay in this series of working papers.

Chinese university system along North American lines. On the other hand, we have also seen the waning of the social democratic commitment to mass public higher education, as state aid to students and state support for universities have been reduced; and university education has been largely refigured not as a public good but as a private investment in scarce cultural or human capital. In the United States, this has led to a reduction in the numbers of working-class students in higher education and the effective end of affirmative action policies. A neoliberal university regime has emerged around the world, based on premises substantially different than the Cold War universities.

This neoliberal university system is emerging as a major form of global mass culture and as a major part of the service economy.⁷ It is, increasingly, a global system. "By the mid 1990s," a leading researcher reports, "44 million of the world's 80 million post-secondary students were in developing or middle income countries -- despite the fact that only 6 percent of the population in these countries have attained postsecondary degrees, while 26 percent in high-income nations have similar qualifications."⁸ Moreover, this system often takes the form of an international commodity chain in higher education, with increased cross-border movement not only of research and curriculum, but of students, teachers and researchers, creating a emerging diaspora of migrant intellectual workers.⁹ This flow of students and scholars is "overwhelmingly a South-to-North phenomenon." Of the one and a half million students studying abroad, more than third are in the United States and most of the rest are in Western Europe, Australia and Canada. "A large majority of international students from developing countries study for advanced degrees -- in contrast to patterns from the industrialized nations, where students tend to study for their first degree or spend just a semester or a year abroad."¹⁰ The other striking aspect of the changing geography of higher education is the growth of distance education using radio and television. Though one of the earliest models was Britain's social democratic Open University, founded in the mid-1960s, the five largest distance universities in the world now are "all based in developing countries, and all...have been established since 1978."¹¹

⁷ The analysis of the neo-liberal university regime is being developed, particularly in its US national form. A landmark collection was Randy Martin, ed., *Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University* (Duke, 1998) which includes essays by Sheila Slaughter/Gary Rhoades (who have since published *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State and Higher Education*, Johns Hopkins UP, 2004) and Christopher Newfield (who has since published *Ivy and Industry: Business and the Making of the American University, 1880-1980*, Duke 2003). Four distinct emphases seem to have emerged: a) the analysis of the corporatization of the university; b) the analysis of the casualization of academic labor; c) the new racial dynamics of the post-affirmative action university; and d) the analysis of the relation between universities and the communities in which they are situated.

⁸ Philip Altbach, ed., *The Decline of the Guru: The Academic Profession in Developing and Middle-Income Countries* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 1.

⁹ For a discussion of the conditions and work of migrant intellectual workers, see Christina Moon's essay in this series of working papers.

¹⁰ Philip Altbach, ed., *The Decline of the Guru: The Academic Profession in Developing and Middle-Income Countries* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 7.

¹¹ World Bank Task Force on Higher Education and Society, *Higher Education in Developing Countries: Peril and Promise*, (New York: World Bank, 2000), 31

If global mass culture is constituted by precisely those deterritorialized or extraterritorial cultural spaces that seem mass produced in virtually identical forms across the globe -- built environments like shopping malls, airports, industrial parks, and tourist hotels and digital entertainments like action films, popular songs, and video games -- then the university is surely a quintessential form of global mass culture. Not only is the built environment of the global campus a hybrid of generic realizations of the concrete pastoral with more explicit homages (as Berlins, Sorbonnes, Oxfords and MITs were reconstructed in architecture and curriculum throughout the Americas, Asia, and Africa), but "going to college" is an ever-growing part of global youth culture, inflecting the hopes and desires of both the minority that do attend -- whether as residents or as commuters -- and the vast majority for whom it remains, like the airport or the shopping mall, an imaginary space depicted in popular film (in 1995, enrollment rates in tertiary education stood at 40% in high income countries, 20% in middle income countries, and 5% in low income countries¹²).

Thus the university must be understood in the context of our larger understanding of the dynamics of mass culture. The "industrial revolution" in culture left us with an immense accumulation of cultural commodities, an historically unprecedented audience for cultural products, and the emergence of modern mental labor, a huge labor force of cultural workers. However, mass culture, I would argue, is not a single realm. It has at least four distinct aspects: mass advertising, mass entertainment, mass religion, and mass education. Mass advertising, mass entertainment, and mass education are all relatively new phenomena, going back no further than the middle of the nineteenth century; mass religion is a more complex matter, though the privatization of state churches has led, it appears, not to a process of secularization (the assumption of many early scholars) but to a process of the commodification of religion. Each wing of mass culture has its own peculiarities: mass education, for example, remains unique in that it produces the credentials that help segment the market in labor power. As a result, mass education always appears as more coercive than the other wings of mass culture, which offer a "free" choice -- though usually with a price -- appealing to private tastes, private desires, and private beliefs.

Moreover, each of the wings of mass culture is divided between capitalist culture corporations (the so-called private sector), state culture apparatuses (the so-called public sector), and what we might call the culture foundations (the tax-exempt, dividend-exempt sector which is at once "private" -- officially non-state and therefore sometimes theorized as "civil society" -- and "public" -- officially non-profit and therefore sometimes theorized as a "public sphere"). Curiously, this civil society or public sphere includes not only the "secular" foundations and trusts guaranteed by long-accumulating endowments of capital, but also the "non-secular" churches and church-sponsored schools whose pre-capitalist wealth has had to be reproduced under capitalist relations. That part of mass education which we call the university is a hybrid of these three spheres: an emerging group of straightforwardly capitalist, "for-profit," universities (a small sector in the United States but one which already dominates higher education enrollments in many parts of the world); a huge state culture apparatus educating seventy percent of all postsecondary students in the United States (and

¹² World Bank Task Force, 30.

similar or higher proportions in much of Latin America and Europe) and underwriting much of the budgets of so-called “private universities”; and a large sector of trustee-- or church--controlled institutions.

The neoliberal university system -- what is often called the “corporatization” of the university -- is thus largely a shift in the balance of these forces. In countries like India, Brazil, Indonesia, and South Africa, a substantial majority of all higher education students are in private institutions, and many of these institutions are for-profit universities. As a World Bank task force noted in 2000, there has been a striking increase in the “for-profit” sector around the world and this is expected to continue to grow. Moreover, even those universities officially in the “public” or “non-profit” sector have been privatized, not through direct sale of the institution (not yet anyway!) but through the replacement of government partnerships and contracts with corporate partnerships and contracts. In the wake of the 1980 Bayh-Dole Act, which some have called the most sweeping change in the nature of US universities in history, US universities were granted ownership of patents resulting from publicly-funded research, and thereby made into patent-owning entrepreneurs.¹³ The funding of universities has come to depend less on state support, and more on the management of university investments and the commodification of university research.¹⁴ By the late 1990s, a leading US business magazine was noting that “higher education is changing profoundly, retreating from the ideals of liberal arts and the leading edge research it always has cherished. Instead it is behaving more like the \$250 billion dollar business it has become.” “In 1955,” another business observer wrote, “not a single health care company appeared on the list of the top 50 U.S. corporations as measured by market capitalization. Today, seven of America’s richest companies are in the health care industry. Where the health market was 40 years ago, the education-and-training market is right now.”¹⁵

The affects of this on teaching and research are only beginning to be measured. In some ways, it has simply intensified the long-standing “commodification” of the very activities of teaching and learning, as they were packaged into saleable units of courses and credit hours, grades and degrees. But we have also witnessed the turn to business and accounting courses as the “empirical core curriculum” in the neoliberal university, as well as the privatization and enclosure of the knowledge commons that had begun to be created by the mass public university. The vital infrastructure of scholarly journals and publications which had developed as the public knowledge of the academic community over a century is rapidly becoming the digital property of a handful of giant media corporations posing as “scholarly publishers.”¹⁶

¹³ Leonard Minsky, “Dead Souls: The Aftermath of Bayh-Dole,” in Geoffrey D. White, ed., *Campus, Inc.: Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower* (Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, 200), 95. For further discussion of consequences of the Bayh-Dole act, see Daniel Gilbert’s essay in this series of working papers.

¹⁴ On the changes in university investments, see Amanda Ciafone’s essay in this series of working papers.

¹⁵ *Business Week*, 1997, *University Business*, 1999, both quoted in Richard Ohmann, “Academic Freedom 2000 and After,” *Radical Teacher* #61.

¹⁶ The monopolization of research, scholarship, “theory,” and scholarly journals by the North Atlantic and particularly the US wing of the global academy inflects debates over the

However, the logic of capitalism has always generated the counter-logic of proletarian struggle, a battle over the conditions of life. And the emerging neoliberal university system is not without major contradictions, several of which are highlighted in the World Bank's own report. Though the World Bank task force generally endorses the "differentiation" and privatization of higher education, it none the less acknowledges that a market-driven "flexible" higher education is likely to be fraudulent, with worthless degrees and credentials sold to aspiring households by educational businesses in a quest for short-term profits. Though they are relatively confident that the market will shake out worthless business and accounting schools, they note three areas that are likely to be entirely ignored by a privatized, for-profit university system: education, training and research in the arts and humanities; education, training and research in basic sciences; and access to higher education for "under-represented groups." In other words, it will ignore what actually constituted the heart of the mass public university.

However, the Cold War mass university and its neoliberal successor generated a contradiction that the World Bank report hardly notices: the armies of teachers and researchers who do the work of the industry, producing and reproducing its knowledges -- for mass culture is *not*, as sometimes imagined, a self-generating automatic machine spewing forth already digitized information. The education industry is a major part of world economic activity; "mass education," the world-systems theorist Beverly Silver has argued, "appears as one of the most important 'capital goods industries' of the twenty-first century - in part producing 'knowledge' and, more importantly, producing the workers who have the necessary skills for the new knowledge-intensive form of capital accumulation. Like textile workers in the nineteenth century and automobile workers in the twentieth century, education workers (teachers) are central to processes of capital accumulation in the twenty-first century."¹⁷ The world's teaching force increased from 8 million people in 1950 to 47 million people in 1990, and labor unrest among teachers has grown dramatically since mid-century and has ranged more widely geographically than the labor struggles of textile workers, automobile workers, or transport workers (see figure).¹⁸

In the United States, the union organization of university faculty was a major aspect of the struggles in the mass university in the age of three worlds. In 1960, virtually none of the US academic workforce was unionized; by 2000, 44% of college teachers were unionized, a rate far outstripping that of the total workforce. This was mainly the result of a wave of militancy among teachers in all sectors of education in the 1960s and 1970s; university unionism receded after the famous Yeshiva decision in 1980 halted the spread of public university

dissemination of even fields of critical research: cultural studies, theories of post-modernism, theories of race and ethnicity emerging from US African-American studies and ethnic studies, the use of a subaltern studies paradigm by US Latin Americanists. This general issue was discussed by Carl Pletsch in "The Three Worlds, or the Division of Social Scientific Labor, circa 1950-1975," *Comparative Study of Society and History* 23.4 (1981), and by Walter Mignolo in his "Globalization, Civilization Processes and the Relocation of Languages and Cultures," in the Jameson and Miyoshi collection, *The Cultures of Globalization*.

¹⁷ Beverly Silver, *Forces of Labor: Workers' Movements and Globalization since 1870* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 114).

¹⁸ Silver, 115-6.

unionism into the private sector. In response to the growing bargaining power of university teachers, the neoliberal university dramatically shifted the teaching responsibilities onto part-time contract teachers -- adjunct or graduate assistants - - who were for the most part outside the unions and collective bargaining agreements of university faculty. The casualization of higher education teaching and research and a proliferation of part-time contract teachers has led to a new wave of labor activism among these contract teachers.¹⁹

But unionization is not enough; as Andrew Ross has suggested in a powerful recent essay, unionization in the culture industries should be a spur to rethinking our own ideologies of cultural work, particularly the discounting of cultural or creative labor, the self-flexibilization that makes artistic and academics the model for post-fordist knowledge workers in general.

Nor is it enough to think of the university simply as a culture industry, for it keeps the attention too much on the “academic” aspects of the university. After all, of the 2.6 million workers in the US university industry, only 43% are what UNESCO calls “higher-education teaching personnel,” the elaborately divided and hierarchized workforce of tenured and probationary, part-time and full-time, adjunct and graduate faculty.²⁰ The university is also a service industry, a central part of the characteristic landscape of post-fordism: the university-hospital city. The largest employers in Greater New Haven are the university with 9,000 employees and Yale-New Haven Hospital with 6,000. The other major hospital is number five, and number six is a maker of medical supplies; so four of the six largest employers are part of this complex. And this is not only true of small cities like New Haven. Randy Martin notes that Columbia is the third-largest private employer in New York City, and NYU is the sixth largest.

Several key issues are raised by these university/hospital urban complexes.²¹ First, the university is inextricably linked to the fiscal crises of these cities -- often exacerbated by the tax-exempt status of many universities, to battles over welfare and a living wage, and to the apartheid landscapes of these cities. Second, these disciplinary institutions depend upon a divided labor force that is remarkably parallel, combining professionals with PhDs and MDs, a permanent intermediate workforce of younger interns and TAs, large clerical staffs, and substantial dining, cleaning and maintenance staffs. It is not an accident that the Yale workers were first organized by a union of hotel and restaurant workers, because a residential campus is largely a hotel and restaurant complex. It is telling that Yale is tied as the third largest employer in Connecticut with the Foxwoods casino, which is also the target of an UNITE HERE organizing drive.

Third, the forms of flexible management, the increasing use of casual, part-time and subcontracted labor and the creation of a two-tier job system cut across the academic and non-academic staff. Indeed, the growth of teachers unions in the key decades between 1960 and 1980, and their revival over the last

¹⁹ For more on the conditions of casualized contract teachers, see the essays by Dan Gilbert, Nazima Kadir, and Christina Moon in this series of working papers.

²⁰ nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/digest99/d99f228.html See also UNESCO’s “Recommendation concerning the Status of Higher-Education Teaching Personnel,” (1997) which can be found at www.ei-ie.org/ressourc/english/eedhiedrec.html

²¹ For a further discussion of the university-hospital city, see the essay by Sumanth Gopinath in this series of working papers.

five years, is only one part of the larger historic organization of public sector, service sector and white collar employees. Just as FDR's NRA in 1933 signalled the onset of the industrial unionism of the CIO, so JFK's executive order of 1962 kicked off what became the hidden mass movement of the 1960s.

Thus one can see an important move from the academic craft unionism that dominated early faculty unionism to a vision of industrial unionism in the university, as in the alliance between the Yale unions of clerical and technical, dining and maintenance, and graduate teachers unions (long called the Federation of University Employees, it renamed itself the Federation of Hospital and University Employees, as UNITE HERE joined together with the SEIU organizing drive at Yale-New Haven hospital).

How then does such an understanding of the emerging neoliberal university affect our imagination of transnational network scholars, an "international of intellectuals? We inherit several models of intellectual activism, among which are: 1) the classic liberal model of the "public" or "citizen" intellectual, a model that generally elides the institutional mediation of the university, imaging that scholars could speak directly to the public, the citizenry, civil society; 2) the social movement or party intellectual, a model which similarly tends to elide the university as space, but articulates scholars directly with the institutions of the movement or party, through party schools, publications or movement think-tanks and NGOs; 3) the professional association, a legacy of the German research university, built around the solidarity and group ethos of the discipline or intellectual field, and on a notion of academic freedom and autonomy protected by the rights of tenure or civil service status (in the US, represented by the original AAUP), but with some distance from the struggles for social justice outside the academy; and 4) the craft union model of collective bargaining in the university industry, represented in the United States by such important teachers' unions as the American Federation of Teachers, the National Educational Association and the transformed AAUP.

All of these remain important ways of conceiving the politics of intellectual workers; but none, I would suggest, adequately respond to our contemporary situation. On the one hand, I have suggested that a wider industrial unionism in the university creates more powerful alliances in the specific cities where universities form a leading industry; but in the US we still have few model of a university industrial unionism that links universities in different places (a partial exception is the system-wide bargaining in certain state universities like the University of California), let alone across national boundaries. On the other hand, there are still few models of a new form of transnational academic activism -- perhaps NGOs like the Scholars at Risk network, the 1990s World University Service reports on academic freedom around the globe, some of the groups initiated by Pierre Bourdieu in the 1990s -- that would cross the disciplinary, geographical and occupational hierarchies of the neoliberal university not only to "participate in the active constitution of alternative globalizations and democratic futures" but to challenge the privatization of the public university, the commodification of academic knowledge, and to forge an academic commons, a World Academic Forum.

For mass education is not simply a capitalist sub-contracting of the costs of training labor, a disciplining of docile and qualified bodies; it is also the product of a historic battle for cultural justice. The struggle for mass education is a

continuation of the constant battle over working time, a battle which reaches from the informal arts of resistance around coffee breaks and lunch hours to the organized labor struggles for the eight-hour day, the weekend, and the vacation, to the social democratic struggles over the working lifetime: the rights to childhood education, unemployment coverage, parental leave, and retirement. The democratization and extension of higher learning for adults --sabbaticals for all working people -- remains a vital part of "another world."