TRACES

A MULTILINGUAL SERIES OF CULTURAL THEORY AND TRANSLATION

Universities in Translation:
The Mental Labor of Globalization

Edited by
Brett de Bary

香港大學出版社
Hong Kong University Press

Hong Kong University Press
14/F, Hing Wai Centre
7 Tin Wan Praya Road
Aberdeen
Hong Kong

© Traces, Inc. 2009

ISBN 978-962-209-991-3 (Hardback)
ISBN 978-962-209-992-0 (Paperback)

The name *Traces*: *A multilingual journal of cultural theory and translation* has been changed to *Traces: A multilingual series of cultural theory and translation*.

Permission requests, reprints, and photocopies. All rights reserved; no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the publisher (Traces) or a license permitting restricted copying issued by copyright agencies. Please contact the Traces office for enquiries.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Secure On-line Ordering
http://www.hkupress.org

Printed and bound by Condor Production Co. Ltd. in Hong Kong, China

Contents

Statement of Purpose v

List of Editors vi

Contributors ix

Introduction 1
Brett de Bary

By Way of a Preface, Whither Intellectuals?
(Seoul, Moscow)

A Presentiment of the Death of Intellectuals in Korean Society 25
Goh Byeong-Gwon
— translated from Korean by Lee Seok-Won

Humanities Across the Borders: A View from the Periphery 51
Helen Petrovsky

Part 1: University Reform and Its Ironies: Globalization as Rhetoric
(Giessen, Tokyo, Mérida, Paris, Shanghai)

Academic Capitalism: Toward a Global Free Trade Zone in University Services? 61
Helmut Dubiel
— translated from German by Eric Savoth

The Oxymoron of Higher Education: Neoliberal Restructuring and the Incorporation of Japanese National Universities 73
Iwasaki Minoru
— translated from Japanese by Gavin Walker

The Accountologist: An Emerging Form of Anthropological Life in Mexican Universities 89
Steffan Igor Ayora Diaz

Of Forms and Re-forms in French Higher Education: The École normale supérieure 105
Laurent Dubreuil

From Elitism to Populism: The "Industrial" Model and Chinese Higher Education 119
Lei QiLi
— translated from Chinese by Ma Hongnan

Part 2: ***University Reform and Bildung: Subjective Technologies, Language, and Colonial Legacies***
(Singapore, Beijing, Taipei, Hong Kong, Tokyo, Seoul)

Once Again, Reinventing Culture: Singapore and "Globalized" Education 135
C. J. W.-L. Wee

Redefining "Liberal Education" in the Chinese University 153
Cao Li

Articulation, Not Translation: Knowledge-Production in an Age of Globalization 165
Ding-tzann Lii

On English as a Chinese Language: Implementing Globalization 177
Meaghan Morris

The "Age" of the University in Asia 197
Ukai Satoshi

Contents

Neoliberal University Reform and the International Exchange of Intellectuals 207
Kang Nae-hui
— translated from Korean by Kang Nae-hui and Lee Seok-Won

Part 3: Thought and Resistance
(New York, Boulder, Cambridge, Ithaca, Aberdeen)

The University Without Wall: Jewish Studies, Holocaust Studies, Israel Studies 229
Gil Anidjar

How Many Ward Churchills: Organizing Against Racism, Empire, and the Neoconservative Assault on the University 253
Daniel Won-gu Kim

Academic Freedom and Political Change: American Lessons 263
Andrew Jewett

The Discourse of the University: Modern and Postmodern 279
Eric Cheyfitz

Faculty Governance in the "University of Excellence": Comments 295
Risa Lieberwitz

The Conditions of Theory 299
Alberto Moreiras

Part 4: The University and the Emancipatory Project: Limits and Possibilities
(Paris, Ithaca, Providence, Mérida, Seoul)

Cognitive Capitalism and Education: New Frontiers 317
Yann Moulier Boutang
— translated from French by Philippe Bonin

Cognitive Capitalism and Its Discontents 331
Dominick LaCapra

Comment on Yann Moulier Boutang's "Cognitive Capitalism and Education: New Frontiers" 337
Naoki Sakai

Imagined Networks: Digital Media, Race, and the University 341
Wendy Hui Kyong Chun

Very Much a Midnight Child: Software and the Translation of Times at the University 355
Gabriela Vargas-Cetina

How an "Intellectual Commune" Organizes Movement: A Brief Report on the Experiment "Research Space Suyu+Nomo" 371
Ko Mi-Sook
— translated from Korean by Lee Seok-Won

Traces Editors Recommend ..... The Edu-Factory Machine: Transnational Politics and Translational Institutions 385
www.edu-factory.org

Submission Guidelines 387

Traces Publishers 389

Contributors

Gil ANIDJAR teaches in the Department of Middle East and Asian Languages and Cultures and the Department of Religion at Columbia University.His most recent book is *Semites: Race, Religion, Literature* (Stanford University Press, 2008).

Steffan Igor AYORA DIAZ is a Professor of Anthropology at the Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán where he is currently coordinator of the Academic Team (Cuerpo Académico) Studies of Cultural Practices and Representations. His work, informed by postcolonial and post-structural theory, has been concerned with identity, globalization, and power issues. He has conducted research on shepherds' work and representations in Sardinia, Italy; on indigenous healing and state power in Chiapas, Mexico; and currently is completing a book manuscript based on fieldwork in Yucatán: *Foodscapes*, *Foodfields and Identities in Yucatán*.

Brett de BARY is a Professor of Asian Studies and Comparative Literature at Cornell University. She directed Cornell's Society for the Humanities from 2003 to 2008 and its Visual Studies Program from 2000 to 2003. She has published criticism and translation in the areas of Japanese fiction, film, and literary theory, and, most recently, on the women writers Morisaki Kazue and Tawada Yôko. *Deconstructing Nationality*, which she co-edited with Naoki Sakai and Iyotani Toshio, was published by the Cornell East Asia Series in 2005.

Philippe BONIN is a graduate student in French Studies at Cornell University. He is writing his dissertation on the transitional aspects of the epistolary novels (including Voltaire's *Lettres Persanes*) in the 18th century, suggesting how this

hybrid format developed new ideas that broke with ancestral traditions and opened onto the Revolution.

CAO Li is now a Professor of English and Deputy Director of the Liberal Education program at Tsinghua University. She is the author of *Gayatri Spivak* (1999), *Critical Studies of Prize Winners of Fiction of the American National Book Award* (co-ed., 2002), *The Eternal Utopia: Introduction to the Great Works of World Literature* (ed., 2004), *The Idea of the University and the Humanistic Spirit* (co-ed., 2006). Her current interests include historical narrative and postcolonial writing, the Cambridge critics, and liberal education.

Eric CHEYFITZ is the Ernest I. White Professor of American Studies and Humane Letters and Director of the American Indian Program at Cornell University. He has published in the fields of American Studies, American Indian Studies, and on issues that involve the corporate university and academic freedom. From 2005–2007 he served on the Cornell Faculty Senate's special Committee on Governance; and for the last two years has been involved as an expert witness in the academic freedom case of Ward Churchill.

Wendy Hui Kyong CHUN is an Associate Professor of Modern Culture and Media at Brown University. She has studied both Systems Design Engineering and English Literature, which she combines and mutates in her current work on digital media. She is the author of *Control and Freedom: Power and Paranoia in the Age of Fiber Optics (*MIT, 2006), and co-editor (with Thomas Keenan) of *New Media, Old Media: A History and Theory Reader* (Routledge, 2005). She has been a fellow at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study at Harvard and a Wriston Fellow at Brown. She is currently working on a monograph entitled *Programmed Visions: Software, DNA, Race* (forthcoming MIT, 2010).

Helmut DUBIEL is a Professor of Sociology at the Justus-Liebig-Universität in Giessen, Germany. His areas of research are critical theory, political sociology, and contemporary European History. From 1989 to 1997 he was the Director of the Institute für Sozialforschung in Frankfurt. From 2000 to 2003 he held the Max Weber Chair at the Center for European Studies at New York University. Among his many publications are: *Theory and Politics* (1986), *Niemand ist frei*

von der Geschichte (1999), *La Teoria critica della societa* (2000), and *Deep Within the Brain* (2009). The present article is taken out of the manuscript *Critique of Excellence*, a book on the critique of higher education in Europe. It will appear at the end of 2010.

Laurent DUBREUIL is a Professor of Romance Studies & Comparative Literature and the Director of the French Studies Program at Cornell University. He received his education in France, and especially at the Ecole normale supérieure. As a student elected to the Scientific Board of the Ecole, and a trade-unionist, the author opposed what was then the preparation for the ongoing "reform."

GOH Byeong-Gwon is currently the Chair of Research Machine "Suyu+Nomo," a research commune in Seoul for scholars who are mostly in the fields of humanities and social science and who are not affiliated with formal educational institutions. Goh conducts all his research, seminars, lectures, and writing there. His published works include *Nietzsche*, *A Thousand Eyes and A Thousand Ways* (2001), *Nietzsche's Dangerous Book, Thus Spake Zarathustra* (2003), *Money, Its Magical Quartet* (2005), and the *Commune-ist Manifesto* (2007) written in collective effort with colleagues at "Suyu+Nomo."

IWASAKI Minoru teaches philosophy and social thought at Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, with an emphasis on modern German and Japanese philosophy. Among his many articles and books, he has most recently co-edited *Sengô Japan Stadeizu* (Postwar Japan Studies), published by Kinokuniya Books in 2008. Iwasaki was active in organizing public protest against the University Incorporation Law passed by the Japanese Diet in 2003, during which time he co-edited, with Ôzawa Hiroaki, the book *Gekishin! Kokuritsu daigaku* (Severe Shock! National Universities; Tokyo: Miraisha, 1999).

Andrew JEWETT is an Assistant Professor in the Department of History and Social Studies at Harvard University. His research centers on the interplay of academic disciplines (especially the social sciences) with political thought and political culture in the United States. He is currently working on a pair of book manuscripts, entitled *"To Make America Scientific: Science, Democracy, and the University Before the Cold War,"* and *"Against the Technostructure: Critics of Scientism Since the New Deal."*

KANG Nae-hui teaches in the Department of English at Chung-ang University in Seoul. Publisher of the cultural studies journal *Munhwa/Gwahak* since 1992, he is also Co-Chair of *Munhwa Yondae* (Cultural Action). His book *Shinjayujuui sidae hanguk munhwa wa komunjuui* (Korean Culture in the Neoliberal Age and Communism) was published by Munhwa Gwahaksa in 2008.

Daniel Won-gu KIM is an Assistant Professor of English at the University of Colorado at Boulder and a member of the Labor/Community Strategy Center in Los Angeles.

KO Mi-Sook is a scholar of classical Korean literature. She launched the Research Machine "Suyu+Nomo" experiment in 1997 in a small study room where literary scholars met for seminars. Dedicated to the pursuit of knowledge outside the institutional strictures of the university or government think tanks, "Suyu" is entirely self-sufficient and maintains itself on the basis of tuition received for seminars and contributions from members. Today the Research Space offers classes and seminars in critical theory, language (Chinese, Japanese, and English), in classical literature, and in translation, and yoga. It is one of the liveliest sites of intellectual exchange in Seoul and has frequent international visitors. Ko Mi-Sook's award-winning book on the iconoclastic eighteenth-century scholar Yeonam was published in English as *A Philosopher's Journey into Rehe* in 2005.

Dominick LaCAPRA is a Professor of History and Comparative Literature and the Bryce and Edith M. Bowmar Professor of Humanistic Studies at Cornell University. He is the author of thirteen books, the most recent of which are *History and Reading: Tocqueville, Foucault, French Studies* (2000); *Writing History, Writing Trauma* (2001); *History in Transit: Experience, Identity, Critical Theory* (2004); and *History and Its Limits: Human, Animal, Violence* (2009).

LEE Seok-Won is a Ph.D. candidate in Japanese History at Cornell University. He is writing a dissertation on the intellectual history of Japanese empire in interwar Japan, with a focus on the social scientific discourse of East Asian empire.

LEI QiLi is an Associate Professor and Vice-Dean of the Communication School, East China Normal University. Some of his publications include: *The Illusion of Media: An*

Analysis of Everyday Life and Culture in Contemporary China (《傳媒的幻象——當代生活與媒體文化分析》，Shanghai: Shanghai Shudian Press, 2008); *Reconstruction by Representation: Film, Video and the Spiritual life of Contemporary Chinese* (《在呈現中建構——傳媒文化與當代中國人精神生活研究》，Shanghai:Wenhua Press, 2007). He is also the acting chief-editor of Refeng Xueshu(《熱風學術》, an academic journal, Guiling: Guangxi Normal University Press). His academic interests are media cultural studies, modernity of printing, and the publishing activities in the Late Qing and Early Republican China.

Risa L. LIEBERWITZ is a Professor of Labor and Employment Law in the Cornell University School of Industrial and Labor Relations. Before moving to Cornell, she was an attorney for the National Labor Relations Board. Professor Lieberwitz has published extensively on the "corporatization" of the university and its implications for academic freedom. She has also played an active role in faculty governance in the Cornell University Faculty Senate.

Ding-tzann LII is a Professor of Sociology at National Tsing-hua University, Taiwan. He teaches political sociology and cultural sociology, and is currently doing research on democratic culture.

MA Hongnan is the Program Manager for the East Asia Program at Cornell University.

Alberto MOREIRAS is Sixth Century Professor of Modern Thought and Hispanic Studies at the University of Aberdeen. He has taught at the University of Wisconsin and at Duke University, and is currently also a Regular Visiting Professor in Romance Languages at the University at Buffalo. He has published *Interpretacion y diferencia, Tercer espacio: Duelo y literatura en America Latina, The Exhaustion of Difference: The Politics of Latin American Cultural Studies*, and *Linea de sombra: El no sujeto de lo politico*.

Meaghan MORRIS is Chair Professor of Cultural Studies at Lingnan University, Hong Kong, and a Professor in the Department of Gender and Cultural Studies, University of Sydney, Australia. Her books include *Identity Anecdotes: Translation and Media Culture* (2006); *Hong Kong Connections: Transnational Imagination*

in Action Cinema (co-ed. with Siu-leung Li and Stephen Chan Ching-kiu, 2005); *New Keywords: A Revised Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (co-ed. with Tony Bennett and Lawrence Grossberg, 2005); *"Race" Panic and the Memory of Migration* (co-ed. with Brett de Bary, 2001); and *Too Soon, Too Late: History in Popular Culture* (1998).

Yann MOULIER BOUTANG, Professor of Economic Sciences at the University of Compiégne, also teaches at the Ecole Supérieure d'Art et Design de Saint-Etienne, France. He is at once economist, researcher, essayist, and political militant. One of the first figures in France to introduce the works of the Italian Operaismo movement (i.e., of Mario Tronti and Antonio Negri), he is currently Senior Editor of *Multitudes* (Paris: Exils). In addition to numerous collaborative works on political economy, migration, and international law, he is known for *De l'esclavage au salariat: Economie historique du salariat bridé* (From Slavery to Wage Labor: An Economic History of the Wage-earner), Paris: PUF, 1998. *Le Capitalisme Cognitif: La nouvelle grande transformation* (Cognitive Capitalism: The New Great Transformation) was published by Editions Amsterdam in 2007. *Multitudes* can be accessed on the web at: http://multitudes.samizdat.net/.

Helen PETROVSKY is a member of the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Her major fields of interest are contemporary philosophy, visual studies, and North American culture. She is a translator of works by Gertrude Stein, Jacques Derrida, and Jean-Luc Nancy. Among her books are *The Unapparent: Essays on the Philosophy of Photography* (Ad Marginem Press, Moscow, 2002), *Anti-photography* (Tri Kvadrata Press, Moscow, 2003), and *Theory of the Image: Lectures* (forthcoming). Since 2002 she has been Editor-in-Chief of the biannual theoretical journal *Sinij Divan*.

Naoki SAKAI is a Professor in Comparative Literature and Asian Studies at Cornell University. He has published in the fields of comparative literature, intellectual history, translation studies, the studies of racism and nationalism. His publications include: *Translation and Subjectivity* (in English, Japanese, and Korean); *Voices of the Past* (in English and Japanese; Korean forthcoming). He has led the project of *Traces*, a multilingual series in four languages — Korean, Chinese, English, and Japanese (German will be added this year) and served as its founding senior editor (1996–2004).

Eric SAVOTH is a graduate student in the Department of German at the University of California, Berkeley. His current research interests are in the intersections between literature and philosophy, especially in the writings of Nietzsche and Proust.

UKAI Satoshi is a Professor in the Graduate School of Language and Society at Hitotsubashi University. He is known for his many translations and critical writings on the work of Jean Genet and Jacques Derrida, and more broadly for his studies of philosophy, deconstruction, and post-coloniality. Among his books are *Oginai no Arukeologii* (Archaeology of Reparation; Kawade Shobo, 1997), *Teikō e no Shôtai* (Invitation to Resistance; Misuzu, 1997), and *Shuken no Kanata de* (Beyond Sovereignty; Iwanami Shoten, 2008).

Gabriela VARGAS-CETINA is a Professor of Anthropology at the Universidad Autónoma de Yucatán in Mérida, Mexico. Her academic work has centered on organizations (especially co-operatives), and on expressive culture (mainly music and dance) in Mexico, Canada, and Italy. As Chair of the undergraduate program in anthropology at the Autonomous University of Yucatán (2002–2006), she coordinated the modification of the curriculum so as to diversify students' choice of electives while emphasizing both theory and field methods. She is currently writing on urban music in Yucatán, on structural inequality in academia, and on the future of higher education.

Gavin WALKER is working on a dissertation called *The Labor of Difference: Primitive Accumulation and Historical Life* in Asian Studies at Cornell University, and is currently translating a volume of the selected writings of Uno K¯oz¯o.

C. J. W.-L. WEE is an Associate Professor of English at the National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, and was previously a fellow in the Regional Social and Cultural Studies program at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore. He has held visiting fellowships at the Centre for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi, India; the Humanities Research Centre, Australian National University; and the Society for the Humanities, Cornell University, and is the author of *Culture, Empire, and the Question of Being Modern* (2003) and *The Asian Modern: Culture, Capitalist Development, Singapore*

(2007), and the editor of *Local Cultures and the "New Asia": The State, Culture, and Capitalism in Southeast Asia* (2002). His present research interest is in the formation of and the relationship between contemporary visual art, theatre, film, literature, and urban culture in the larger East Asia region and in Singapore.

Introduction

Brett de Bary

This volume contains a series of short essays on the contemporary university contributed by scholars who work at diverse sites in Asia, Europe, and North America. Most authors are based at public and private universities in their respective national settings; some work at research institutes or collectives located outside the university. The authors are not specialists in educational policy but were asked, as non-specialists, to contribute short, reflective essays on the state of the university as it appeared to them in settings in which they work. Rather than being a series of research reports, this *Traces* volume has been envisioned as a symposium — an assemblage of commentaries by teachers and researchers working in many different locations. In accordance with *Traces* practice, essays in the volume were submitted not only in English, but also in Chinese, Japanese, Korean, French, and German (and later translated) — this English-language edition does not constitute an "English original."

Contributions to the volume were solicited out of an awareness that the university, an institution whose emergence has been synchronous with that of modernity and the nation-state, is undergoing intense pressures. The situation has been variously described as one of scalar transformation, of renewal and reform, of crisis, and of precarity. Globalization of economic and cultural life, irreversible in the waning years of the twentieth century, has seemingly thrown the university, whose provenance has been so powerfully national, into disequilibrium. That

scholars of critical theory in the humanities have responded over the past two decades with a growing number of studies analyzing university-based knowledge practices should not be surprising. Far from seeing North American studies by Marc Bousquet, Frank Donoghue, or their forerunner Bill Readings, for example, as unnecessarily apocalyptic or defeatist in their thinking, this volume seeks to extend the practice of critical reflection on the conditions of knowledge production they engage.[1] At a time when the future of the university has so obviously become a global discourse, however, we must go beyond the narrowly national focus of these studies.

That reference to the "global" has become both indispensable to the rhetoric of today's higher education reform and an accurate description of its broad-ranging deployment is one starting point for the reflections in this volume. Viewed in a global context, the fate of the university appears caught up in contemporary contradictions surrounding sovereignty, as has been proposed by Ned Rossiter.[2] Its borders have become increasingly porous, as it faces pressures from global market economies and increasingly internationalized student bodies. At the same time, governance of the university still remains circumscribed by the national, through continuing dependence to varying degrees on state funding and involvement with regimes of intellectual property rights enforced by nation-states. Nevertheless, however pervasive the structural contradiction between national sovereignty and global neoliberalism in the university appears, the manifestations of this contradiction are uneven. This accounts for the fact that the rhetoric of higher education reform, as we will see in this volume, demonstrates what Rossiter calls "distinctive *homogeneity* as a policy discourse," and yet appears "*translated"* in various ways once we look beyond the level of policy reproduction to the local.[3]

Policy Discourse: Globalizing Knowledge and the Mental Labor of Globalization

The "distinctive homogeneity" of the policy discourse of higher education reform is readily evident in the essays contributed here, written by scholars from China, France, Germany, Hong Kong, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Russia, Scotland, Singapore, Taiwan, and the United States. So far little attention has been given

to continuities linking, for example, higher education policies in Singapore and France. Yet such continuities are hardly unexpected: they are consonant with features of neoliberal capitalism whose description has preoccupied theorists for several decades now. Thus growing global conformity in the legal, economic, and curricular imperatives addressed to institutions of higher education bears out the inevitable "time-space compression" entailed in the neoliberal tenet that "the social good will be maximized by maximizing the reach and frequency of market transactions," according to David Harvey's oft-cited formulation.[4] As bases (although by no means the only ones) for the development and broad dissemination of the information technologies on which this reach and frequency relies, universities have become critical to such processes of "time-space" compression. That advocates of neoliberal policies now "occupy positions of considerable influence in education (the universities and many 'think tanks')," then, is not merely a reflection of neoliberalism's accession to the status of "the common sense way many of us interpret, live in, and understand the world."[5] It is also an indication of neoliberalism's strategic interest in the university.

Several broad themes may be taken to illustrate the global "homogeneity" of policy discourse evident in this volume. First, these essays attest to an on-going process of scalar transformation of higher education. This refers in some national contexts (China, for example) to an explosive expansion in the actual numbers of institutions of higher education and their college-age applicants. In nations like Korea and Japan, where youthful populations are declining, universities have nevertheless been asked to expand the demographic that they serve through development of "life-long" education programs. Since scalar transformations are linked to efficiencies of scale, moreover, these policies have also prominently included amalgamations among institutions of higher education. Universities and colleges in neighboring locales have been directed to merge their administrations and campuses; international partnerships and joint-degree programs between spatially remote institutions are multiplying rapidly. Within the European Union (and among other nations participating in the Bologna Process), the attempt to co-ordinate higher education policy across 46 different nations is unprecedented in scale.

This scalar transformation of the university as physical plant and administrative unit has been matched by the global nature of the movement to reorganize universities around business principles. It is true that global expansion in the

numbers of institutions of higher education meant an absolute rise in government spending on higher education in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.[6] At the same time, universities both old and new have increasingly taken on the characteristics of commercial bodies. The contradictory effects of Rossiter's "combinatory force of national sovereignty and neoliberal ideology" are most visible in nations with well-established public universities. In some cases, new policies and even more coercive measures — such as changes in national law — have reduced outright government fiscal responsibility toward individual public universities while mandating commercialization. In the name of giving national universities greater "autonomy" and freedom from government interference, Japan's University Incorporation Bill (passed into law by the Diet in 2003) imposed on national universities new requirements for financial self-sufficiency, as well as new managerial and accounting regimes. These universities continue to receive a part of their funding from the state (although this is scheduled to be decreased incrementally), but their legal status has been transformed, quite literally, into that of firms. Insofar as the mandated "autonomy" and self-sufficiency requires them to generate a greater portion of their income through increased tuition payment, management of these national universities now more resembles that of Japan's private university sector. In a different, but related move, the Korean government in 2005 issued a "Basic Plan for Developing National Universities" that explicitly encouraged national universities to adopt more entrepreneurial and business-like behavior. New legal frameworks for university—industry collaborations (which could extend to university—industry—state collaborations), including profit sharing, facilitated such behavior. In Singapore, which long had no private higher education sector, private initiatives have recently been encouraged to complement, and even compete with, prestigious national universities. Government programs to encourage private provision of higher education have been similarly marked in Africa, Latin America, and other parts of Asia.[7]

Rise in numbers of tuition-paying students in higher education has been a global trend, and over time has led to the perception that universities are no longer oriented to the production of "citizen-subjects" but to consumers, to whom they offer "services." Rossiter, mindful of scalar transformation, qualifies this new subject as most distinctively a "transnational consumer client."[8] In its role as purveyor of services, the university must adhere to administrative principles expressed through a proliferation of terms translated from the worlds of business

and industry: "efficiency," "transparency," "quality assurance," "accreditation," "stakeholder," and the like. Experts on educational policy (who may also be consultants on this same policy) often depict the adoption, or imposition, of new managerial and accounting regimes as a logical outcome of this increase in tuition-paying students. Describing the passage of the 1988 Education Reform Act under Margaret Thatcher's New Public Management Reforms — an emblematic case of neoliberal re-structuring of higher education — Roger King writes positively of overcoming the informal elitism that had preserved British national universities like Cambridge and Oxford as "secret academic gardens."

> Greater accountability to the government on behalf of students, taxpayers, and other users of university services was inevitable in the climate of the 1980's and 1990's when there was a turn . . . to more transparent and numerical forms of public evaluation and democratic accountability.[9]

King's emphasis on the emergence of a "mass" clientele for higher education in the UK in the 1980s is echoed in Philip Altbach's construction of the relation of "supply" and "demand" to the "massification" of East Asian higher education in roughly the same period: "as a middle class developed . . . and as literacy levels and secondary schooling became more widespread, demand grew for access to higher education."[10]

One would of course not dispute the possibilities for empowerment and creativity offered to individual subjects by the global expansion of higher education described as "massified" and "democratic" in this literature. Yet from a broader perspective, the adoption of New Management Reforms in higher education by governments around the world must also be seen as continuous with the epochal reorganization of social and economic life inaugurated by the emergence of neoliberalism in 1979–80.[11] The theme of globalization was by this time a staple of policy-formation in business and industry of both "advanced" and "developing" societies. Not only did educational policy makers routinely portray themselves as responding to "challenges" of globalization and "demands" of industry. It was also the case that the ubiquitous presence in educational policy discourse of managerial categories like "human resources" represented an on-going and intensifying folding of educational policy into national strategies for business and labor productivity.

Both King and Altbach allude repeatedly to the way higher education reform of the 1980s was reformulated around concerns for national competitiveness and the re-stratification of global labor markets. "We live in an age of increasing competitiveness for nation states," King asserts, "and universities are seen as key elements and facilitators of our now predominantly knowledge-based societies."[12] Altbach offers this rather straightforward generalization about education and re-stratification of labor in 1980s Asia:

> As countries such as Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and others developed, their economies became more sophisticated and wages rose, and they were no longer competitive with lower-wage economies. They realized that they had to develop more sophisticated industries and a service sector to remain competitive. In short, they were forced to move toward becoming "knowledge-based economies" — and higher education was seen as a key factor in national economic survival.[13]

Linked with the development of human resources, recent higher education policy bears out capitalism's tendency to continuously re-differentiate labor markets. Intensification of so-called knowledge-based productivity, however, has also had the effect of subverting the spatial basis for this very differentiation.

Massification and commercialization, from this perspective, suggest that we can understand the "distinctive homogeneity" of globalization discourse in late twentieth-century higher education less as "ideology" — in the sense of some kind of discursive reflection of material conditions — than as inherent in the very collapse of the distinction between the economic and the cultural in new informatic modes of capitalism. As a form of biopolitics concerned with the control of entire populations, higher education has been necessarily implicated in the passage, within the capitalist mode of production, whereby the territorially bounded "role of industrial factory labor has been reduced and priority given instead to communicative, cooperative, and affective labor."[14]

The ongoing integration of industrial and cultural sectors under new managerialist regimes that has occurred in tandem with this profound reorganization of social labor has rendered the divisions between the "mental" and "manual" increasingly untenable. As Maurizio Lazzarato observed in 1996, the "management mandate" constituted a transformed mode of regulation across a workforce that more and more deeply included intellectuals and their activities in its definition of *production*.[15] The "integration of scientific labor into

industrial and tertiary labor has become one of the principal sources of creativity," Lazzarato noted; with this decline of "the earlier rigid division between mental and manual labor . . . capitalism seeks to involve even the worker's personality and subjectivity within the production of value."[16] Seen in this light, the practices of self-sufficiency, accountability, autonomy, entrepreneurialism, and flexibility being urged on the contemporary university are merely consonant with the broader mode of neoliberal governmentality that has corresponded to this transformation of dominant productive processes. The globalization of mental labor, we could say, has been concomitant with a "mental labor of globalization" referred to in this volume's title.

While based on different approaches and developing different problematics, both the concept of "audit cultures" proposed by Marilyn Strathern and her colleagues, and Marc Bousquet's recently proposed notion of the American "system of academic labor" maintain that the new regime of self-management must be analyzed as a disciplinary technology equally applicable to labor *within* and *without* the academy. "Audit culture" referred to the way educational reforms launched under British new managerialism had translated techniques of auditing used in the business sector to public sector institutions like universities.[17] This reorganization of the university around principles of formalized accountability, was part, according to Cris Shore and Susan Wright, of a "wholesale shift," the emergence of a "new rationality of government, or what, following Foucault (1991) we might call 'neo-liberal governmentality'."[18] Shore and Wright see "formalized accountability" as a political technology that seeks to bring persons, organizations, and objects into alignment across societies. In audit cultures, they argue, the organizing principles of economic life (principles of the free market) are extended to the conduct of individuals with the aim of making them "self-actualizing agents": ". . . external subjection and internal subjection are combined so that individuals conduct themselves in terms of the norms of thought through which they are governed."[19] Indeed, some contributors to this volume show precisely how the ideals of accountability and self-management prescribed to the university as an institution register in the individual conduct of university employees.

As in the description of audit cultures, Bousquet's multi-faceted study similarly insists that, since "mental labor is in fact labor," "observations paralleling skilled academic work with other forms of skilled work largely ring true."[20] Bousquet is primarily concerned to argue, following Italian autonomists, that however abstract

in form, value in information or knowledge-based economies is nevertheless premised on the exploitation of living labor. His concept of the "system of academic labor" situates the US university, with its dependence on a swelling force of contingent faculty, squarely within the informal sector of the economy where labor is expected to appear and disappear on command. For Bousquet, academic labor and other forms of labor in the informatic mode are not ways of "laboring with less effort," but of "laboring in a way that is effortless for management." Such labor must present itself as "independent," "self-motivated," even "joyful."[21]

Since Bousquet's work foregrounds the implications for the university of the growing adjunct workforce in a way the essays in this volume do not, we should clarify here that we would not disavow that an over-arching regime of self-management differentially, and more brutally, effects higher education's part-time faculty. (The growing salience of self-managed exploitation in certain economies, by the same token, should in no way obscure the continuing global existence of exploitation under more physically coercive conditions.) Questions about the stunning inability, if not failure, of tenured university faculty to resist the imposition of reforms — or even develop a language of critique — are raised by several of our contributors. It may be, as Bousquet suggests, that, in addition to managing themselves, tenured faculty have been co-opted into a certain role as surrogates of university administrations in their roles as managers of graduate student employees (teaching and research assistants).[22]

But it is also true that, standing on the attenuating border between the cultural and the economic, the university exemplifies the challenges posed by the new terrain of political struggle where distinction between the material and the subjective (and mental and bodily subjectification) is crumbling together with that between "bricks-and-mortar" and the virtual. In this latest phase of capitalist production, boundaries are continuously dissolved, but also displaced. Thus in his writings on immaterial labor Lazzarato astutely observes that self-management does not do away with antagonism in the productive process. Participative management, "far from eliminating the hierarchy between . . . autonomy and command, actually re-poses the antagonism at a higher level," within the very personality of the individual worker.[23] Like Bousquet, he notes the authoritarian nature of the requirement that the self-managed worker be expressive. His observation that greater engagement of the worker's subjectivity in the production of value "threatens to be even more totalitarian than the earlier

rigid division between mental and manual labor," while possibly shocking, seems quite plausible within the terms of this analysis.[24] It may be for this reason that a repetitive, one-dimensional narrative about "corporatization of the university," which attempts to base its ethical force simply on an assumed opposition between (as one book title has put it) "knowledge and money" has so far not proven politically efficacious.[25]

Universities in Translation

As has been suggested above, the global expansion of institutions of higher education in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century has been linked to re-stratification of labor. Capital's continuous search for lower-wage economies into which to export industrial factory labor forced many nations to seek a competitive edge by redefining themselves as "knowledge-based" economies after the 1980s. Yet revolutionary advances in communicative and information technologies, during this same period, have made it equally possible to outsource new forms of immaterial labor. Thus the common perception of today's world as one characterized by homogeneity and differentiation, deterritorialization and reterritorialization. Global division of labor co-exists with the relaxation of a more rigid division between mental and manual labor, leading to heterogeneities in the situation of universities at different sites.

This is why, while the existence of a world-wide tendency to commercialize higher education must be acknowledged, this volume does not present a narrative of university incorporation as a simple monody. To do so would run a serious risk: that of mistaking the scalar aspect of today's higher education reform for a process of totalizing subsumption of difference.[26] Not only does capitalism continue to rely on disparities generated along an international division of labor, but neoliberal governmentality everywhere makes use of these in its disciplinary technologies, which totalize and differentiate in the same stroke. For example, the growing ubiquity of the evaluative grid, be it the world university academic rankings, the assessment exercise, or the performance chart, in higher education (and the paranoia such grids induce), brings institutions and individuals together only to set them against each other. Our essays trace out differences, stratifications, ***and*** hierarchizations in a process that is global in scope.

Traces' commitment to translation has therefore been indispensable to this study on a number of levels. First, as a practice, translation (certainly a form of the immaterial labor described above) has allowed us to approach the question of globalization and higher education, not merely as a relatively new problematic within humanities scholarship, but, more importantly, as a new kind of scholarly *practice* and a new conversation. Only through translation have we been able here to juxtapose perspectives rarely brought together, in an in-between space that refuses both the monolingual restrictions of national publishing industries and the exclusions and asymmetries of the global English-language academic publishing system. Moreover, translation theory, broadly considered, addresses the kinds of processes, whether voluntary or coercive, of local interpretation and adaptation of policy discourse that Rossiter refers to. Our essays offer nuanced analyses of such local processes. Also relevant to our volume is the notion of translation as a subjective technology or aspect of *bildung*, and thus as a disciplinary arrangement for producing national subjects (differentially and hierarchically coded in the global context), whose administration has been entrusted to the modern university since its inception.[27] Finally, our use of translation in this volume reflects an attempt to be more mindful of how multiple histories differently inflect the restructuring of higher education being carried out in so many contexts today. Of course, this volume makes no claim to offering an exhaustive representation of such differences. Yet a number of essays here allude, however glancingly, to the traces of heterogeneous histories on the terrains of current higher education reforms. These deserve more in-depth attention, and include, among others, the legacies of the events of 1968 in Europe; of the recent *minjung* (democracy) movement, whereby an alliance of intellectuals and workers overthrew Korea's military dictatorship in 1988; of the tradition of experiments with socialist educational policy at what is today the Autonomous University of the Yucatán; of the turbulent history of the Chinese university in relation to revolutionary movements and the state, and so on. Although our short essays offer only glimpses of such histories, they call out for much richer elaboration.

****

Our symposium opens with prefatory, paired reflections from Seoul and Moscow, broaching the broad question of the future of the "intellectual." Writing from Seoul, Goh Byeong-Gwon presents us with the paradox of the "death of intellectuals

in knowledge-based societies." Helen Petrovsky in Moscow describes today's humanities scholar in terms of dialectic of the ordinary and the uncanny, visibility and invisibility. While composed at different sites and in quite different styles, both essays ask if the stature and role of the individual intellectual has not been rendered obsolete by "media" (information technologies or technologies of mass communication) — and both register ambivalence about this development. Goh, although lamenting the seeming disappearance since the early 1990s of the publicly engaged intellectual in Korea, nevertheless describes this process as merely a "tragi-comedy," since Web-based mass intelligence (a version of Marx's "general intelligence") has proven its new and potent, if anonymous, political efficacy. Similarly, Petrovsky, while critical of intellectuals seeking superficial visibility as media figures, asks if the media "does not tell us more about the global world than does any single descriptive language." If we look beyond the ordinary, immediately visible images of television, Petrovsky suggests, we will note the uncanny existence of invisible ties that bind TV spectators together as global communities. How can we take account of the immaterial bases of these new political subjectivities? While encouraging us to be optimistic and resourceful, Goh's and Petrovsky's essays also attest to a diminution of university-based intellectuals' claim to a monopoly on knowledge. By suggesting that, on the contrary, the production of a "subject of knowledge" has now become extensively imbricated in processes of economic and technological production in society at large, they set the stage for our considerations of the contemporary university.

Scholars Helmut Dubiel, Iwasaki Minoru, Steffan Igor Ayora Diaz, Laurent Dubreuil, and Lei QiLi have contributed essays comprising Part One: **University Reform and Its Ironies: Globalization as Rhetoric.** They write of universities in Giessen, Tokyo, Merida, Paris, and Shanghai, respectively. All find the dialectic of homogeneity and difference in current higher education reform a topic rich in ironies. Perhaps because all describe public universities that have distinguished reputations within their national contexts, these essays expose most acutely the tensions surrounding national sovereignty and neoliberal ideology in the contemporary university. Suspecting that its goal is simply to produce a "free trade zone in university services," Helmut Dubiel irreverently compares the Bologna Accord's mobilization of universities in no less than 46 nations to other possibly ill-conceived "big" products of the transnational EU imagination: the design of the Airbus 380 or the failed European constitution. Laurent Dubreuil,

depicting reforms at the École normale supérieure, traces the circular process whereby politicians at home justify their reorganization of the French national university by invoking, under the rubric of "globalization," the same European Union policies they themselves have formulated at the international level. Iwasaki Minoru acerbically details the one-two punch of university financialization in Japan, which is requiring national universities to generate the larger part of their own operating expenses while reducing their government funding according to a draconian schedule. Japanese university faculty, performing exhausting yearly assessment exercises for a Ministry of Education to which they no longer formally belong, find that "autonomy" has actually intensified their regulation by the government.

Indeed, essays in Part One offer detailed local accounts of the toll taken by new managerialism in the university. Description of its effects cuts across the many similar concerns taken up in all five essays, whether they have to do with intensifying pressure in non-US universities to publish research in English; universities' accelerating and seemingly crass recruitment of international students to increase revenue from tuition; mandated faculty participation in self-abasing schemes to accumulate "points" and rewards for their work; languishing faculty governing bodies; or the substitution of mere mechanical accumulation of facts for *bildung* in higher education — an apprehension articulated in Lei QiLi's eloquent re-reading of Durkheim's *Evolution of Educational Thought* for a twenty-first-century China, and in his theme of the "industrialization of higher education."

In all of these essays, the rhetoric of globalization in higher education is considered in its relentless uniformity as well as its often absurdly redundant aspects: in policy discourse "globalization" is tautologically proposed as the *cause* and motivation for university restructuring but also as its ultimate *goal*. Following Readings, our authors well perceive that "globalization," like the "university of excellence," functions rather in the manner of the *point de capiton* in the Zizekian "ideological quilt": it is the unifying object whose identity exists only in the fact that it is "always referred to by the same signifier."[28] Its role is always structural and performative. Such repetitiousness and predictability, however, do not detract from the differentiating force of this policy as an aspect of neoliberal governmentality. Rather, they strengthen it. Calls for institutional standardization, our authors suggest, are neither premised on, nor do they necessarily aim for, global equality. The discourse of global higher education reform thus appears

as more coercive in some settings than in others. The status of the American university as a "global university," for example, is often taken as a cause for self-congratulation by its members. Yet elsewhere the command to "become global" functions as a threat, as a typical disciplinary discourse that sustains and reproduces mimetic desire for an unattainable object. "Time lag," that staple of colonialism, seems not to have lost its purchase in the world of today's education policy, with its exhortations "not to be left behind," or to "catch up" with a model, which is often implicitly, or explicitly, the American university. Steffan Igor Ayora Diaz' witty reflections on "the accountologist" in the Mexican university trenchantly analyzes how colonial dynamics persist in Mexican efforts to shape higher education in response to pressures exerted by supranational agencies.[29] He situates the contemporary Mexican university within a global order in which cultural colonialism is a conspicuously persistent presence. Complex processes of translating educational policy from the supranational through the national, regional, and state levels, Ayora Diaz maintains, produces no less than a form of the mimicry Bhabha describes in colonial subjects: it makes public universities "seem as desired, but not quite." Moreover, such commands surprisingly appeal to a national subject once predicted to be obsolete in the era of global education. Once again we observe the contradictions surrounding the university's sovereignty. In the neo-liberal rhetoric of reform, nationalism is mobilized for the very purpose of superseding the nationally based university.

The theme of mimetic identification, so basic to the educational process of *bildung*, forms a bridge to Part Two, **University Reform and *Bildung*: Subjective Technologies, Language**, **and Colonial Legacies,** containing essays by C. J. W.-L. Wee (Singapore), Cao Li (Beijing), Lii Ding-tzann (Taipei), Meaghan Morris (Hong Kong), Ukai Satoshi (Tokyo), and Kang Nae-hui (Seoul). Grouped around the problematic of *bildung*, essays in this section take up many questions broadly related to the university's role in subject formation, including its inculcation of subjective technologies like language learning or protocols of writing. Awareness of the conflicted legacy of the modern university in Asia — institution of cultural colonialism *par excellence*, yet with a commitment to reason and speculative thought — frames this section.

C. J. W.-L. Wee, writing of the Singaporean university, opens the section with thoughts on the resonant topic of "*re*-invention." Neoliberalism's proclamation of the end of history, his essay demonstrates, did not signal the end of capital's

need for invention, nor of the university's role in *bildung*, the fabrication, in this case, of inventive national subjects. As immaterial labor more and more defines a crucial boundary for re-stratified labor markets, universities in some settings have been charged with responsibility for creating subjects not only "flexible," but also, emphatically, "creative." While earlier essays have shown that a result of university restructuring may be the drastic weakening of the humanities (in Japan, for example), essays by Wee and Cao Li point to cases where higher education policy has, by contrast, prominently emphasized "cultural" aspects of education. That one result is as consistent with the logic of neoliberal policy as another may simply exemplify the "perversity" (Rossiter's term) of its intense drive to develop and exploit creative labor.[30] Both Wee and Cao show how such local programs were generated, and rhetorically presented as demanded by, inexorable forces of global capitalism. Singapore, located in an area hard hit by the 1997 currency crisis, was, according to Wee, forced to come to terms with the need to ambitiously transform an earlier mode of participation in the global capitalist order (one that had permitted a certain regionally based economic and cultural autonomy in the 1980s). Twenty-first-century capitalism would demand nothing less than the *subjective and psychic* incorporation of the Singaporean citizen. Similarly, Cao Li introduces China's current policy of "cultural quality education" against the backdrop of the nation's shift away from centralized economic planning (which had assigned college graduates their jobs), and the rise in the economy of the 1990s of Chinese—foreign joint-ventures which demanded flexibility, rather than specialization (emphasized under earlier, Soviet-style educational policies), of their employees. Both essays explore — and exploit the potential for irony of — the disparity between government interventionism and the "creativity" it seeks to promote. But that such subjectivities are being designed to have the capacity for "self-management" is also without doubt.

Essays by Ding-tzann Lii and Meaghan Morris turn to matters of language. Their probing observations of the linguistic demands placed on contemporary Asian scholars on the multiple levels of research, publication, writing, and teaching expose the tip of the iceberg of language politics in the global university. Both open by posing a troublesome question: has globalization detached scholars from their local contexts? They record (as many of our other essays delineate), the sweeping implementation of new protocols attendant upon university reform in Asia — the familiar "principles of formalized accountability" which

monitor institutional and individual productivity. Lii proposes that this has led to a powerfully overdetermined situation for Asian academics. Global rankings of universities, for example, intersect with rankings of individual faculty in citation indexes, which in turn feed back into the global ranking of institutions. Yet precisely in their capacity as global measuring instruments, the relied-upon citation indexes are English-language publications that use English-language materials (articles published in the so-called "international" journals) as their basis for measurement. Lii is critical of ways in which consolidation of a global Anglophone academic publishing system has reinforced the hegemony of theoretical paradigms dominant in Anglophone scholarship (and impoverished possibilities for critical theory). In this vein, Morris seizes on the implications of university globalization for the increasingly internationalized field of Cultural Studies. Contemporary academic writing in Cultural Studies may disavow the heteroglossic conditions that characterize its own local contexts of production, Morris observes. Her subtle tracing of the diegetic (filmic) and extra-diegetic (classroom) linguistic negotiations involved in her discussion of a Johnnie To Kei-fung film with students in a tri-glossic Hong Kong university puts to rest the idea that Cultural Studies can (or ever should be) described as an "Anglophone event."

Morris' discussion of linguistic complexity in Hong Kong, where post-colonial English has managed to maintain the official status of "English as a Chinese language," opens the way for Ukai Satoshi's reflections on other institutional and intellectual legacies of colonialism in the Asian university. We are grateful to Ukai for allowing us to translate an essay originally published in Korean and French in the Korean journal *Daedong Chulak*, directly addressing Korean colleagues. Kang Nae-hui, in framing the greater part of his essay on university restructuring as a dialogue with Ukai's earlier essay, helps us realize *Traces'* goal of participating in international intellectual exchange not originally mediated through English. The two essays explore the risks and promises of intra-Asian exchanges of students and scholars recently promoted by universities under the rubric of globalization. While largely driven by economic and administrative rationales, such exchanges might offer productive political possibilities, Ukai suggests, if Japanese universities first broke their long silence about their complicity with Japanese imperialism and war crimes. Kang's essay concludes Part Two by thoughtfully returning us to questions of labor that opened this Introduction. It is high time academics came to

terms with their status as workers under neoliberalism, he reminds us. Even such matters as "academic freedom" could be best dealt with in terms of frameworks that pertained to the status of the worker within and without the university.

Commentaries on the US university are grouped together in Part Three, **Thought and Resistance**, which follows Kang Nae-hui in taking up the question of "freedom" in higher education. The aspect of twenty-first-century globalization on the American university that most deserves attention, this volume suggests, is the impact of the Bush administration's global War on Terror. If Helmut Dubiel and Iwasaki Minoru have questioned the seeming inability of faculty to contest the sweeping reorganization of their work environments under university reform, essays in Part Three address the even more stunning silence of American academics confronting intensified censorship of academic discourse as the war advanced. It may be that justification of the preemptive war on Iraq, which sought no moral legitimation in prior frameworks of international law, posed such unprecedented ideological challenges that mobilization of American universities was inevitable. The enormity of the task of wholesale "reorganization of an international order by which the invasion itself would appear just" (in Brett Neilson's terms) has no doubt placed acute pressures on US universities, paving the way for the recurrence of tactics of intimidation reminiscent of McCarthyism.[31] The presence within universities of a technological infrastructure amenable to deployment by the government's new regimes of surveillance — technologies in many cases developed and refined within universities themselves — has also been a factor, underscoring once again the ambiguous breakdown of the university's sovereignty.

These matters are addressed with urgency and eloquence in articles in this section by Gil Anidjar (New York), Daniel Kim (Boulder), Eric Cheyfitz and Risa Lieberwitz (Ithaca), Andrew Jewett (Cambridge), and with concluding remarks by Alberto Moreiras (writing from Durham, but now in Aberdeen). Essays by Anidjar and Kim are themselves attempts to break the disheartening silence that has surrounded some of the most fraught sites of struggle over academic speech in the twenty-first-century American academy. Through a complex series of allusions to "walls," Anidjar remarks on the violence of disciplinary boundaries that so often, in the modern university, reinforce arbitrary constructions of ethnicity, with devastating "real world" consequences. His essay attempts to dismantle the problematic distinction between Jewish Studies and Arab (or Islamic) Studies

institutionalized in American departments of Middle Eastern Studies by tracing the common roots of both. Daniel Kim details the chilling process whereby the University of Colorado in 2007 revoked the tenure of Ward Churchill, Professor of Ethnic Studies, whose war criticisms had been the subject of a media firestorm, and the struggles of scholars who protested this. The existence of such recent and grave assaults on intellectual discourse within the university are, we sense, not well known outside the US.

Andrew Jewett and Eric Cheyfitz, however, caution us about constructing a notion of "academic freedom" that is merely an ideality. Cheyfitz proposes that resistance, or truly critical thought, has always been difficult to practice within the American university, which from its foundation has been a corporate institution, grounded in individual property rights and committed to the reproduction of a largely bourgeois class. For Cheyfitz, even Readings' suggestion of a "community of dissensus" within the university is such an ideality, since Readings' "de-referentialized university" is presented as an abstraction that does not take into account the existence of alternative practices of education in its immediate environment. Critical thought, moreover, cannot always be equated with the institutional discourse of "academic freedom," Andrew Jewett reminds us. He sketches out a Cold War dialectic whereby university science departments became more and more integrated into US government-determined research agendas, in return for funding that provided them with departmental autonomy and "freedom." The pattern has been repeated with the corporate sponsors of today. Following Jewett's essay, we have included comments by scholar of industrial and labor relations, Risa Lieberwitz, who helps us see links between the concerns of Cheyfitz and Kim, and Iwasaki Minoru's earlier comments on the decline of faculty governance in the contemporary university. Lieberwitz stresses that rights to free expression must be seen as essentially collective and thus can only be protected by the renewal of solidaristic bodies that have been fragmented by neoliberal governmentality. Her insistence that in the present era such solidarity can be sustained only if faculty redefine themselves as part of a broader political constituency of workers or "employees" (extending to staff, adjunct faculty, and graduate students) echoes Kang Nae-hui's call to academics to recognize themselves as workers.

We conclude this section with Alberto Moreiras' crucial efforts to rejoin the theme of "academic freedom" to that of critical thought, and to reflect on

the fate of critical theory in the contemporary university. His essay cautions us not to under-estimate how demanding the task of combining a commitment to "unconditional thought" with commitment to a responsible politics will be. Yet by suggesting that the radical efforts at transformative thought begun in 1968 are still unfinished, and that arduous work of creating new conceptual categories remains to be achieved, he offers a hopeful, if ambitious and sobering, agenda for future theoretical work in the university.

Part Four, **The University and the Emancipatory Project: Limits and Possibilities,** contains contributions from Yann Moulier Boutang (Paris) and his respondents Dominick LaCapra and Naoki Sakai (Ithaca), Wendy Hui Kyong Chun (Providence), Gabriela Vargas-Cetina (Merida), and Ko Mi-Sook (Seoul). Coming at the conclusion of our volume, the section recapitulates and re-frames themes taken up by earlier essays, while raising further questions about the university's future. In dialogue with work by Lazzarato and others about the growing significance of immaterial labor, Boutang proposes we are witnessing a shift from industrial to what he calls a form of "cognitive" capitalism, based on the accumulation of revenue gained from knowledge and innovation. Boutang is at pains to clarify (and he joins Marc Bousquet and others in this respect) that cognitive capitalism does not represent a commodification of knowledge *per se* (which is why he rejects commonplace formulations like "knowledge-based society"). Rather, it is innovation and invention — that is, the living subject's investment of time — that extract economic value from knowledge. Boutang's related claim that private capitalism "externalizes" many of the costs of this living cognitive work by passing them on to society at large ("be it the government or private household"), resonates with observations about the exploitation (and self-exploitation) of the new "intellectual proletarian" by Lazzarato and Bousquet, although Boutang does not elaborate on this.

Boutang's analysis reinforces many others in this volume that delineate the deepening integration of education and subject formation into capital. Yet he adds an important, and more optimistic, inflection to these stories by insisting that under cognitive capital, "the educational process *need not* be dominated by an . . . irresistible process of commodification." In its drive to make profit by transforming innovation into a globally distributable information good, Boutang points out, cognitive capital must rely on computer technology which enables infinite reproduction of information virtually for free, thus reducing the value of

its product. It is precisely this inherent weakness that has provided the ground for an emerging, and global, struggle over intellectual property rights. Boutang asks that we join this struggle by working to ensure democratization of access to new information technologies, as well as to universities themselves, in this way advancing the emancipatory promise of education. Boutang's essay is followed by thoughtful invited responses from Dominick LaCapra and Naoki Sakai. LaCapra questions Boutang's claims for the historical and global significance of the emergence of "cognitive capitalism," which has left intact the commodity system, many older forms of productive labor, and still vastly unequal distribution of goods, including those that offer access to cognitive capitalism. Naoki Sakai directs Boutang's own concern for "externalities" to the American university, whose global and even deterritorialized incarnation still presides over salient divisions of intellectual labor.

Wendy Hui Kyong Chun's essay on "Imagined Networks" continues to negotiate the terrain of technology and education, astutely complicating many familiar assumptions about the very terms of her argument on "digital media, race, and the university." Characteristically attuned to the politics of representation and the image, Chun shows that stereotypes about "technology" often intertwine with those about race, making much of the familiar rhetoric linking the two suspect. She expresses skepticism, for example, about the discourse of the "digital divide" and social programs that assume, in turn, that technology will automatically empower students. Like Petrovsky, however, Chun also points to the significance of new, if ephemeral, communities ("imagined networks") that digital technologies sustain. That today's universities around the world support many such networks is one positive aspect of their "global" dimension.

Our volume closes with two essays that go the farthest towards imagining and/or practicing an alternative higher education. Both incorporate this section's concerns with education and property. Also engaging with Boutang's and Chun's problematic of the digital, Gabriela Vargas-Cetina analyzes the struggles over ownership that have riven the development of software, itself initially based in the university. Her playful conclusion outlines the framework for a utopic "Open Streams University" that might answer Yann Moulier Boutang's demand for mass democratization of higher education. Finally, and perhaps most refreshingly, we offer words from Ko Mi-Sook, founder of the dynamic research space and intellectual commune "Suyu+Nomo" in Seoul. Trained as a scholar in classical

Korean literature, Ko is one instance of an intellectual who concluded there was no choice but to exit the contemporary university, and to refuse its institutionalized practice of knowledge based on a regime of property rights. Her description of Suyu's loosely organized, nomadic, transnational practice of intellectual "commune-ism" (as distinct from "communism") offers us a glimpse of the struggles, joys, and unabashed idiosyncrasies of such an alternative educational practice.

****

At the end of these introductory remarks, some words of appreciation are in order. First, my thanks to all who contributed essays for publication in this volume. All were generous in their responses to my invitation to write on a topic that, however familiar and close to hand, represented in most cases a departure from their areas of scholarly specialization. Their work has enabled this volume to be linguistically and geographically diverse, but also to juxtapose perspectives that did not assume a theoretical or political consensus in advance. While in this introduction I have worked to emphasize (I hope not excessively) the shared concerns and overlapping themes in these broad-ranging papers, my appreciation for the variety of their intellectual and political orientations has also been keen. I am sure this variety will be appreciated by readers. Thanks also to contributors for their patience (given the time-sensitive nature of some of their topics) with the inevitably lengthy process of translating many contributions into English. To our translators, let it be known that discussing those subtle and intractable problems of translation with you was an intellectual high point of the process of editing!

Essays in this volume grew out of presentations at two events originally convened at Cornell University in 2005. The first at a workshop on "Globalizing Knowledge Work" held at Cornell in March, 2005. Phil Lewis, then Director of the French Studies Program at Cornell, offered keen advice on conceptualizing this project. We were pleased to have Sun Ge, of the Comparative Literature Group of the China Academy of Social Sciences, and Yukiko Hanawa, of New York University, address us at the event. I am most grateful to Cornell's then Provost Biddy Martin, and to many other Cornell colleagues who assisted as panel chairs and discussants on this celebratory occasion: Bruno Bosteels, Dominic Boyer, Susan Buck-Morss, Stuart Davis, Sandra Greene, Salah Hassan, Victor Koschmann, Natalie Melas, Timothy Murray, Tracy McNulty, Shirley Samuels, and Shelley

Wong. Guest speakers Manthia Diawara, Dilip Gaonkar, Fuyuki Kurasawa, and Catharine Stimpson also addressed us at the event. I received helpful suggestions from Jon Solomon, while he was working on analysis of the university with the edu-factory project, whose announcement appears at the end of this volume. Finally, for support and encouragement that was warmly appreciated at various stages of my work I would also like to thank Mary Ahl, Mark Anderson, Karen Brazell, Ding Naifei, the indefatigable Dianne Ferriss, Tom Lamarre, John Kim, Andreas Langenohl, Christine Marran, Catherine and William Sleight, and our editors at Hong Kong University Press, Dennis Cheung, Colin Day, and Michael Duckworth.

Notes

1. See Marc Bousquet, *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-wage Nation* (New York and London: NYU Press, 2008); Frank Donoghue, *The Last Professors: The Corporate University and the Fate of the Humanities* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2008); Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), among many others. One English-language study that avoids such national preoccupations is Jan Currie, Bev Thiele, and Patricia Harris, *Gendered Universities in Globalized Economies: Power, Careers, and Sacrifices* (Lanham, MD, and Oxford: Lexington Books, 2002). I have also benefited from reading the work of specialists in educational policy, who, for their part, have done extensive comparative work. A comparative study of educational policy in Asian universities is Philip G. Altbach's and Toru Umakoshi's *Asian Universities: Historical Perspectives and Contemporary Challenges* (Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004). F. King Alexander and Kern Alexander, eds., *The University: International Expectations* (Québec: McGill-Queens University Press, 2004) considers educational reform at various Anglophone universities. Roger King, ed. *The University in the Global Age* (Houndsmill, Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK, and New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2004) offers thoughtful perspectives on late twentieth-century developments in the relations between markets, states, and higher education.
2. For observations on the university as caught between "the combinatory force of national sovereignty and neoliberal ideology," see Ned Rossiter, *Organized Networks, Media Theory, Creative Labor, New Institutions* (Rotterdam: NAi Publishers), 17–8.
3. Rossiter, 27 (emphases added). While Rossiter uses "homogeneity" and "translation" to refer to the policy discourse of the "creative industries," I here adapt the descriptive terms and apply them to the discourse on university reform, which he takes as one subset of the "creative industries."
4. David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neo-Liberalism* (New York: Oxford University Press), 3. The notion of "time-space compression" was first introduced in Harvey's *The Condition of Postmodernity* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).

[5] Harvey, ibid.
[6] King, xiv.
[7] King, 22–3.
[8] Rossiter, *Organized Networks*, 28.
[9] Roger King, "The Contemporary University," in *The University in the Global Age*, 16.
[10] Philip G. Altbach, 20.
[11] Situating the emergence of neoliberalism as a global event from the start, Harvey points to the temporal proximity of Deng Xiaoping's liberalization of the Chinese economy in 1978, Paul Volcker's appointment to head the US Federal Reserve in 1979, and the elections of Margaret Thatcher as UK Prime Minister and Ronald Reagan as US President in 1979 and 1980, respectively. For Harvey, these years mark a "revolutionary turning point in the world's social and economic history." Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 1.
[12] King, xiv.
[13] Altbach, 20.
[14] Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Empire* (Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press, 2000), xiii.
[15] Maurizio Lazzarato, "Immaterial Labor," in *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, ed. Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 133.
[16] Lazzarato, "Immaterial Labor," 135–6.
[17] Marilyn Strathern, "Improving Ratings: Audit in the British University System," *European Review* 5 (3): 305–21.
[18] Cris Shore and Susan Wright, "Coercive Accountability: The Rise of Audit Culture in Higher Education," in *Audit Cultures: Anthropological Studies in accountability, ethics, and the academy*, ed. Marilyn Strathern (London and New York: Routledge, 2000), 61.
[19] Ibid., 61–2.
[20] Bousquet, *How the University Works: Higher Education and the Low-Wage Nation*, 59. Bousquet is here expressing qualified agreement with the arguments put forth in David Noble's *Digital Diploma Mills: The Automation of Higher Education* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2002).
[21] Bousquet, *How the University Works*, 62–3.
[22] Ibid., 20.
[23] Lazzarato, "Immaterial Labor," 134.
[24] Ibid., 135.
[25] This is not to dispute the value of the analysis in Roger L. Geiger, *Knowledge and Money: Research Universities and the Paradox of the Marketplace* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004).
[26] See the thoughtful discussion of this point by Massimo de Angelis, "Measure, excess and translation: some notes on "cognitive capitalism," http://www.edu-factory.org (5 July 2007).

[27] The notion of an "economy of translation" constituted by multiple disciplinary arrangements, established under but outliving colonialism, has been explored in the preceding volume of the *Traces* series. See Naoki Sakai and Jon Solomon, eds. *Translation, Biopolitics, Colonial Difference* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2006).

[28] Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (London and New York: Verso, 1989), 98–9.

[29] In the Mexican case, educational reform has been folded into broader structural adjustment policies formulated by the World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

[30] Ned Rossiter, "Organised Networks, New Institutions and the Legacy of Form," Paper delivered at the conference *Culture in Context: Pragmatics, Industries, Technologies, Geopolitics*, Institute of Ethnology, Academia Sinica. September 16–17, 2006.

[31] Brett Neilson, "The Market and the Police," in Sakai and Solomon, *Translation, Biopolitics, Colonial Difference*, 159.