

About Academia

(the transcriptions: an internal document)

a project by Muntadas

Introduction

The interviews that are included in this book were conducted between March 2009 and October 2010, mostly in Cambridge, MA—either at Harvard or at the MIT campus—and are an integral part of the project *About Academia*.

The contents of this volume are not meant to be taken as an independent publication, but rather as a complimentary tool in order to provide a larger context to the viewer. Within this volume, the incomplete and fragmented nature of the edited text on the screen finds its necessary complement: video projection and this booklet form a unit within the gallery space.

Although abridged, every effort has been made in transcription of the conversations to maintain their original quality and thereby to preserve their dialogic essence. I thank each of the interviewees for their time and interest.

Muntadas

Cambridge, MA, Feb 2011

Contents

| | |
|----------------------|-----|
| Carol Becker | 11 |
| Noam Chomsky | 21 |
| John Coatsworth | 29 |
| Fernando Coronil | 43 |
| Thomas B. F. Cummins | 57 |
| Diane E. Davis | 67 |
| Brad Epps | 81 |
| Flora González | 97 |
| David Guss | 103 |
| David Harvey | 115 |
| Ute Meta Bauer | 127 |
| Saul Slapikoff | 133 |
| Doris Sommer | 141 |
| Mark Wigley | 149 |
| Howard Zinn | 161 |
| Biographies | 171 |

Carol Becker

Muntadas: How do you see academia and the university and what are the similarities and differences between them?

Carol Becker: To me the university is an institution. I think of academia, rather, as a concept that represents all the people who think and work in intellectual ways within an institutional structure, as opposed to intellectuals who work outside an organizational structure. Academia represents that organization and the university is almost the physical embodiment of the intellectual work that's done. The university is really nothing other than the composite of the programs, the departments, the schools, the students, the faculty, and the staff, all structured within an organizational plan of buildings that come together, representing those disciplines manifested in concrete—in buildings. The university is the physicality of it and academia is the idea of it. That's how I would make the distinction.

M: Could you comment on university values, on cultural and collective values?

CB: There's a difference in being here at Columbia and at a stand-alone art school. Art schools really have little power, except within a very small world, called the "art world." Even within that world, art schools are at the bottom of the hierarchy of museums, galleries, and so forth. Now back at a university, I'm trying to understand the way a place like Columbia works. It's very different. I always went to big state universities, which I never saw as powerful. But I do see Columbia as powerful. I see it as having an enormous amount of power in relationship to its immediate location and also globally, because it has something like 285,000 alumni all over the world. So the thinking and the pedagogy that take place here, the way in which people are taught to think is very significant. People learn how to debate ideas at Columbia, where there is a constant back and forth. It's a very urban school. It's very gritty. It's confrontational. People here like to have real discussions—it's New York. I see the effect of that way of educating people when I travel for Columbia. I was just recently in Athens where I met European alumni; I've been in Paris for Columbia; I've been in Amman, where I've met alumni from the Middle East. When I see the way that people think outside of the university, I realize the amazing influence of the time that people spent in an institution like this during those very early developmental years when they were just beginning to learn how to think through ideas. The concepts and con-

structs, the people they encountered then, have had a great impact. This is true of all students who go to all colleges and all universities. But I'm looking at it again now that I'm back in the university structure and thinking to myself, this is really pretty fascinating; the memory of the place that people have of Columbia—the physical location, the intellectual location of Columbia—people remember their time here. It's very powerful in the way that it helps them construct their own mental apparatus.

M: How do you perceive the fact that culture could be produced both inside and outside the university?

CB: When I was at the Art Institute for many years, one of my goals was to take a school with a great tradition of making things and to help that institution also become an intellectual place. That was one of my goals, and I think one of my legacies. I helped make the school a place for making things but also a place for thinking about production, the place of objects in the world and all those other ideas that it didn't traditionally embrace. We brought in many wonderful new faculty and we made that balance.

I came to Columbia very much aware of the fact that although there was a very unique school of the arts with writing, film, visual arts and theater, and some fantastic people teaching, the school didn't have power within the university structure, in that it was almost unknown to people within the university. One of my goals has been to infiltrate an Ivy League institution with a school of art production. Could the art school actually have a place within the university where very powerful disciplines are housed in the medical school, the business school, the law school and the journalism school? These are very heavy-duty schools with historically enormous reputations. Could we also be a part of this?

Our idea was to see if a School of the Arts could have power within that structure; to see if the production of art and culture could resonate in this university so that it doesn't just think of itself as a place that studies art, art history, literary criticism, film studies, but can also be a place for production; to see whether the school can be powerful enough to make people think about, engage with and be proud of the production of art.

M: The university—as an organization of higher learning—has evolved from institution to corporation. Could you comment on that?

CB: It's hard for me to see the university as a corporation. Certainly it's a brand. Each university is a unique brand that people come to and buy into and become the product of. What I see is an enormous pressure to bring money into the in-

stitution. Columbia is unique in that it's always been a radical, progressive place; a confrontational place. As a university it's a little bit different and I'm more comfortable in its orientation because of that. I can't quite see it as a corporation because the product is so ephemeral. The product is the transformation of consciousness, always of the next generation of people coming through. I may be very idealistic, but I'm really in my heart and soul an educator and I believe that these are amazing places where that kind of pedagogy can take place. Talking about the specific schools of Columbia, I might be able to discuss more intelligently the relationship between those schools and the corporate structure. Historically, business schools have had a very different relationship to universities, but also to the cities and to the country, and have developed theories that are directly implemented. The University of Chicago has put out theories of economics that were adopted and then used to shape entire societies—our own included. Coming from this point of view, my perspective, standing in the School of the Arts, it's hard to see our relationship to the corporation in that way.

M: The university is based on a certain network of donors and trustees who provide institutional support for sentimental reasons, but also for political reasons. I would like your comments on how that network can be a source of conflict of interest.

CB: It's definitely a network. When I travel with Columbia alumni, showing them contemporary art as I just did in Greece, I see where the connections are, and I see the enormous access that Columbia has to very powerful people all over the world because those people came and went to school here. That's true of Harvard. It's true of Yale. It's true of Princeton, Stanford. These alumni go back to their countries and they become the leaders of business, thinking, and government. I find it amazing, having spent so many years in an art school where the network didn't lead up to heads of state. People didn't go to the school of the Art Institute and then become the head of a government in their own country. The trustees here all went to Columbia, so it feeds back into itself that way. Predominantly, the donors are people who have gone to Columbia. It's a circular system where people attend, receive something that is valuable to them, and continue to give back, to connect to the next generation of people as they meet them. Those people then come into the world at another level because they've had those experiences.

M: I have a question about the international network affecting the different countries politically. If one thinks of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, one sees that a lot of Latin American leaders went there and later

became presidents. Do you believe the same thing happens here, at Columbia?

CB: The people that I met in Greece were the next generation of young Greek leaders, the heads of big hospitals, people in finance, in business, who had gone to Columbia. I see the influence of what they learned in what they're bringing into those situations. As I move in those circles of alumni I begin to see that. I saw the same thing in the Middle East. In Amman, where people came from Saudi Arabia, Dubai, and Abu Dhabi, many had gone to Columbia. I see the enormous reach of these institutions. If you take all the major institutions in the United States and think about the number of generations who were educated here, and the amount of influence they've had globally, it would be enormous.

M: Universities have changed since the 1960s. What is their connection now with military programs and war technology?

CB: I don't know the direct research that would be implicated, but I do know that on the other side there is an enormous amount of research in biology and chemistry on issues that directly affect people's lives, and in the Earth Institute on global warming and sustainability. There are probably many things going on that I don't know about that would have direct implications. Certainly all technology has implications for war strategy, but on the other hand there's all this other research that's going on that's not about war, but is about cancer and sustainable development. All of these things are going on simultaneously. How they are then used and taken into society is another issue. MIT has always been the center of those kinds of issues. Columbia was also a place that was politically volatile in the 1960s, and part of the reason why Columbia is an institution with a very difficult past is because in the 1960s people got scared of Columbia. They got scared of the fact that there were riots, that there was always this type of protest going on. Columbia's also always had a very complicated relationship to this physical community and to Harlem. The university is constantly rethinking its own actions because that history in many ways was very damaging to Columbia.

M: Do you have any comments on the tendency of faculty members to reserve their criticism for situations outside of their own university?

CB: Well it's also about action. It's complicated for several reasons. One of the reasons why street protest often comes from students is that once you're employed in an institution, you're in a complicated relationship. The university is supplying you with the things you need to survive. If you have criticism with

policy, you have to find ways to address that criticism at the people that could actually effect change, but you have to do it in ways that are not on the street. If I had a very profound grievance with something that was going on here that I knew about, I would probably go right to the president or the trustees with it. I probably wouldn't be demonstrating in front of Alma Mater: in my role as Dean that would be a very compromising thing to do. It's not that one becomes immune to the contradictions of an institution, but one has to separate strategy and principle. If you really want to change something it depends on which role you have in the institution. If you're a student, you might take one route. If you're faculty, you might take a different route. If you're a dean, you might take another route. It doesn't mean that you wouldn't necessarily try to have your voice heard; you just have to be strategic about how to have your voice heard.

Also, the higher up you are in an institution, the more you understand how things actually do work and where you go to make changes happen. Being a dean has actually been a very great learning process. As difficult as it is for me as a writer and as a creative person, it's also been incredibly pedagogical. I've had to grow up a lot and I've had to learn a lot about how structure and power work; how to actually change institutions, the strategic way to actually make things different, how to get the resources in the right places. It's not always the way that it looks from the outside. Sometimes you have to really know the inside and you have to know how a place works. Many people don't want to have to take on that role because they want to be in an oppositional relation to the institution, but that oppositional relationship doesn't always change it. My question is, how do you actually take these enormous institutions with enormous resources, enormous power, and enormous strength and figure out a way to actually transform them for ethical and moral good? Sometimes you have to give away a lot of your life to do it. It's not overt, and yet when you leave your role ten, fifteen, twenty years later, your part of the institution is transformed. It's a complicated question. I would always break everything up into principle and strategy, because I don't want to waste my time in opposition unless it's actually going to change something.

M: We had a very politically engaged university in the 1960s. Is this type of political engagement coming back to the university?

CB: When you come to a place like this you see that all of that conceptual work that was done around race, class, ethnicity and the subaltern, all those things that were discussed then, have now been transformed into ideas, and have moved from protests about equality and gender into reified forms—centers, programs, books, and knowledge. All those ideas that were generated then are now academ-

ic curricula, which wasn't the case twenty-five years ago. What happens when all of that is absorbed as discourse? Now everyone can talk the talk. And also, there really has been a change of consciousness about ideas. I also see that a lot of people, in their attempt to succeed in the profession, have made what were very complicated social critiques into their professional work and thus into esoteric bodies of knowledge and books that don't necessarily affect society directly any more. In that way the university has become a repository for new ideas but not necessarily for active change. I don't see another generation of young professors coming along with that same idea—that the only reason to be here is to change society. I see, too often, that the reason to be here is to succeed within this universe, in the same way that so many young people want to be successful in the art world, rather than in the larger world. They want to put radical ideas into the art world because the art world will like those ideas, and reward them, but not because those ideas will transform the political landscape. That's not the goal. That success has a very narrow focus. I think that is a part of what's happened in the university.

M: When you consider classroom spaces, it is clear that we have two kinds. Classrooms at Harvard or Columbia look like monastic spaces, while classrooms at MIT and other young universities have transparent buildings made of glass and new architecture. How do you think these different spaces affect the dissemination of knowledge?

CB: For an art school, the ideal would be a big, open, flexible space that we could constantly reconfigure as we chose, depending on what we were thinking about at any given five-year interval. We don't have that. In my dreams sometimes, we start an art school with a group of people that has no facility at all. The facility takes up so much time, so many resources, so much energy, and then we're trapped within it. Even if we're going to build a new, small venue building on 125th Street, the minute it's built the idea that is being formed now will already be somewhat dated. It will take seven years from now, and the thinking started two years ago, so perhaps ten years will have passed by the time we actually see what we envision now. We'll already be somewhere else in our thinking, but we'll still have to live in that building. I think we're all very constricted by the physical world. That's why we have to imagine the most flexible spaces we can now. I think it would also be really fun to have an art school without any building or facility. We'd just arrange to meet somewhere, talk, and then people would go off and produce the work.

M: The idea of a setting for academic teaching in an open space like a garden, where the teaching can be more flexible.

CB: That's the idealized notion. But universities also spend such a huge amount of resources to maintain buildings, and are really unable to do so. These places are old, and are falling apart. Whole pieces of ceiling fall on faculty heads. In many ways, I think we are trapped within the physical structures.

M: But universities are expanding their real estate; Columbia into Harlem, Harvard into Allston, and NYU's expansion. This is important because a university's power is represented in its real estate.

CB: There's a whole study to be done on Columbia's move to Manhattanville, because it's been so complex. Columbia, I think, has truly tried to make up for some of its very difficult past in relation to its adjacent communities. Whether people perceive it that way or not is another question. What will happen once those buildings are there? Will these accommodations do what everyone hopes they will do? Will they succeed? I don't know the answers. I just know that the problem with universities structured around space as they are, is that they either grow or they die. They can't sustain themselves in the same footprint forever. It would have to be a very different concept. The problem is that bodies of knowledge keep changing. One of the buildings that will be on 125th Street is called Mind, Brain, Behavior. As thinking evolves, these disciplines now need to be together. You need to figure out how to keep evolving the architecture alongside the thinking. As I said from the very beginning, the university really is the physical embodiment of the evolution of ideas. Now, more and more, people want to cross the silos that other generations constructed. They can't do that in these old buildings, so they need to imagine new environments—hopefully more flexible ones—that can be transformed as ideas evolve.

Furthermore, these institutions can't sustain themselves economically without growing, and this problem is almost unavoidable. You see small liberal arts colleges, for example, really struggling because they want to keep the same footprint of students but they can't do that and move into the twenty-first century and still have enough resources unless they charge people more money. So they're on this treadmill of having to grow. Meantime, it's very difficult to maintain the buildings of the past while you're building the buildings of the future. So you have this inequity: an old campus that needs a lot of resources that isn't going to get them; a new campus that has to be built so that the university can be seen as moving forward, in order to compete with all the competitors that are moving forward.

The universities, the church, and the city are the big landowners in New York. You have Columbia at one end and NYU at the other, and you have the church and the city somewhere in the middle. I see this as an inevitability that no one

can figure out how to contain. The problem of changing what the place is, the thinking and the research, is big. How do you become a global university in the twenty-first century? What does that even mean? You talk about “global citizens.” What does that mean? And how does that reverberate in an institution that has been here for centuries?

M: Their expansion affects the neighborhood, and it’s happening right now.

CB: It’s happening and no one can stop it. It’s not necessarily a bad thing, but how it’s done is hugely important. If you go to 125th Street right now, there’s not much there. There was a big fight about the space but that’s mostly settled. The first stage is not moving people out of their homes. But the question is, how will it affect the neighborhood? Hopefully it will be positive; everyone is trying to make it that way. We’re only going to know when we see it in action.

M: What’s your perception of the differences between private and public universities?

CB: I’ve only attended public universities, but I’ve worked mainly in private universities for long periods of time. The school of the Art Institute of Chicago is a private school. The museum exists partly on Park District land, the museum of the Art Institute—but these are basically private institutions. Columbia is a private institution. I’ve always very much believed in public institutions because that was my education. That was all my family could ever afford. I’m watching what’s happening as New York is about to lay off an enormous amount of teachers and the University of California is being completely decimated. That was where I got my PhD, at the University of California. It’s tragic. Whereas these were incredible models of egalitarian educational possibility, what happens now, when all of these students in California, who were counting on being able to go to these public institutions, will not be able to do so? My own education as a young person growing up in Brooklyn, in New York, was always in fantastic public schools. I received a great education. It’s all gone. Now, if you want a great education for your children in New York, you have to send them to private schools, which my parents, for example, could never have afforded.

The dynamics of this have changed so much in the last forty years from what they once were. The systems at the University of New York and the University of California are extraordinary. The University of Michigan is still a great school. I don’t know what will happen, however. This global recession is affecting everybody. I’ve just come from Greece, so I’m aware of what’s happening there, but it’s not just Greece, Spain, Italy, and Ireland, it’s happening in this country too.

When will the budget of New York State completely falter so it can no longer function? I don't even know if these alternative models are still going to exist into the future. If the public universities are decimated then the faculties will bail and want to come into the private universities because they won't trust the public ones. At one time, working for the University of California was the best job you could have in the country. The faculty didn't teach much. They had lots of research money. They had, and still have, fantastic libraries and fantastic research opportunities. These were amazing places. Students could go to school for very little, so there really was economic diversity. If all that shifts, what does it mean? It's huge. I don't know the answer.

M: Thank you very much. Would you like to add anything else, any concern or comment on something that I haven't asked you?

CB: You didn't ask: "How do you move in subversive ways when you are in a position of power?" I think about this because of the roles that I've assumed. It seems my karmic destiny to end up in these roles, even though I never set out to be a dean or to work in such ways. All I was going to be was a professor and write my own books. But it is clear to me that if you work in an educational institution and you want to see things happen, then you eventually have to take on leadership roles or else you can't move things. The higher up you are in the structure, the more capacity you have to change institutions. The trick is to learn how to do that effectively, and that's a completely different conversation. But if I were going to ask one more question, based on all your concerns, I would ask all the people you're interviewing how they survive within these institutions. How do we make change happen? Why are we even here and what do we hope to achieve?

Noam Chomsky

Muntadas: Historically, what does academia represent, and what does the university represent?

Noam Chomsky: Universities are one specific form in which an academic system can be established, so the modern university system is basically coming from Wilhelm von Humboldt and expanding in different ways in an academic setting. One could call the church an academic setting, in some of its capacities. University is a specific kind. You can have an academic setting with no students, for example, like the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton. We don't call it a university; a university has students, student-teacher relationships, mechanisms for certification, and so on, which the Institute for Advanced Studies doesn't have.

M: The values that the university accumulates for the people associated with it—whether spiritual, cultural, economic, or related to the act of knowledge—represent a kind of power. Could you comment on this?

NC: In principle, the university should realize these values as much as possible, independent of external structures of power and their value systems. It may be that the external value system seeks power or domination, expansion, justification for its actions, and so on, and in principle the university will try to be independent. There are cases, such as MIT, where there's a surprising internal quasi-contradiction through much of its recent history. It became very explicit during the Vietnam War. This university happened to be one of the main academic centers of anti-war resistance, yet was largely funded by the Pentagon. It looks like a conflict of some kind, but in fact it worked out. The function of supporting resistance was part of the genuine and valid function of the university, although I'm sure the Pentagon didn't see it that way.

M: Do you see a big difference between private universities and public universities?

NC: It's a hard distinction to make. Again, take MIT. Theoretically, it's a private university, even though it was established by the government as a Land Grant college, but in practice it's funded externally. A lot of it is public funding. Until recently, it was mostly state funding. It's private in that it has its own trustees and

internal management system, but it relies on what's called soft money, external funding, mostly state funding, and some corporate funding. So private and public boundaries are somewhat blurred depending on the perspective from which you look at it.

But the University of California in Berkeley is a state university that also has private money, public funding, and corporate funding. On the one hand, there is the formal administrative structure, and on the other hand, the support that actually keeps it going day to day.

M: The university is defined as an organized institution of higher learning, but lately it's evolved into more of a corporation. Can you comment on this evolution and its relationship with economics and the structures of what a corporation means?

NC: It constantly leads to various kinds of tensions. There are tensions between the internal function of the university and its principle as an independent institution of inquiry and those challenges. There's the fact that it isn't on Mars, it's in a particular society with a particular structure of power and concentration of wealth. Its survival depends on it creating tensions. Internally, there are tensions as well. In principle, the university ought to be run by participants: faculty, students, and staff. In practice, there's a structure of authority: deans, presidents, the trustees, and so on.

M: Donors, trustees, and institutional supporters are linked to the university sentimentally, but also politically. What are some of the implications here for creating a network of economic support?

NC: It's nebulous. You're going on a journey through an intricate terrain full of bumps and ambushes and you've got to find your way through it. There are cases when many would regard this as improper interference in the workings of the university from outside forces. I know of cases, here and elsewhere, where administrative officers have simply foisted on faculty appointments, administrative structures, or emergent departments, or have eliminated departments, without soliciting faculty input. There's also a complex question of the extent to which the university should be faculty-run, and the role of those who are sometimes called stakeholders: students, staff, and others. What's their role in running the university?

And there have been constant efforts to try to deal with it, such as student and faculty committees, efforts which never really got very far from the beginning. And yet there are some other things which are regarded as just faculty matters,

such as who gets a degree and who doesn't. It's improper to have students participate in that because then they would be privy to confidential information that they shouldn't have.

M: Alumni become fellows or friends of the institutional college, like an Alma Mater. How does this system operate in terms of decision-making?

NC: Take the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. It brings people in from the Third World, for education, training, participation, and so on. Does it bring political leaders, and military officers, and peasant organizers? We know the answer to that. It doesn't bring in peasant organizers who are trying to start a revolutionary movement. There's a filter that has to do with the general structure of power. Alumni pressures show up in many ways, and many universities privilege children of alumni for admission, and you can understand why. The university is trying to establish a base of funding and tries to maintain loyal alumni who will fund it. This is because universities are essentially parasitic institutions. You can't get around that. They don't internally generate their own economic support. They rely on the outside for economic support and that forces compromise, often unpleasant compromise. In places that are well run, such as MIT, they tend not to bend to external pressures. The case I mentioned is a dramatic one. A laboratory that is one hundred percent military funded is one of the main centers of resistance to the war. I mean real resistance, not just protest, but engaging in what the government considers illegal activities.

M: Are we talking about the Lincoln Laboratory?

NC: No, not Lincoln. Lincoln's an off-campus military laboratory; this is just the academic laboratory, the Research Laboratory of Electronics. It's part of the University but it happened to be at the time one hundred percent funded by the military. Most of MIT was funded by the military. That's a little misleading and people don't understand what it means. One part of the function of the military in the United States is, of course, the military, but another part of its function is helping to create the economy of the future, so the Pentagon has used this function as a device for compelling the public to pay the costs and take risks of economic developments with the profit, with the outcome, going to the private sector. Take computers, which happened to be developed substantially in that laboratory. They were developed on public funding, mostly through the Pentagon. But of course, when something comes out that is marketable, it's handed over to the corporations. That's just how the economy functions, not just in the United States but in advanced industrial countries generally. The Pentagon

played that role as long as the cutting-edge of the economy was electronics-based. Now the National Institute of Health plays much same role because the cutting edge of the economy is becoming biology-based. There are various roles that the public institutions play outside the university. It's not transparent; most of the public don't know that when their taxes go to the military they are actually helping develop the private economy of the future.

M: It was a common joke in the 1970s that if David Rockefeller became president of the United States it would be a demotion. His namesake, The Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard University, can be seen to have indelible and ineffable connections between academic pursuits and the global impact of social and economic institutions. Do you have any comments on this? Are there implications of status quo with regard to Latin America? I feel like there's a certain interest in academics worldwide that depend on economic interests. Latin America is now becoming an interesting economic investment; there are many people who are interested in supporting Latin America in terms of education.

NC: Latin America has historically been regarded as Washington's backyard. This goes back almost two hundred years to the Monroe Doctrine. Latin America's supposed to be our turf and that's why there have been such massive interventions in Latin America. It has happened elsewhere too, but not on the scale that it's happened in Latin America, and that's why there's such a kind of fervor, almost hysteria sometimes, if some part of Latin America moves towards independence. Cuba's a striking example. It's just considered outrageous that Cuba isn't doing what we tell it to do. It wouldn't matter as much if Kenya weren't doing what we tell it to do because it's not our traditional area of control. In fact, during the Nixon administration, planners were concerned about Chile. Some high official said, "If we can't control Latin America, how do we expect to control the rest of the world?" This at least we have to control. It's becoming more and more difficult as for the first time in five hundred years Latin America is moving towards a degree of independence and integration and diversification of its external relations, with South Africa and China and others.

There's a modification of policies in the United States, at the governmental level but also from foundations, on how to try to accommodate these very important developments in Latin America. For example, just a few days ago some documents were released under the Freedom of Information Act, which finally begin to answer what has been a hidden question. In the case of Bolivia there's an extremely impressive popular democratic movement which displaced the traditional elites, mostly white, wealthy elites, and they didn't like it, they wanted to

somehow retain their power and separate themselves from the democratic developments of the indigenous majorities.

M: Maybe these elites have been studying around here.

NC: These documents that were just released indicate what has long been suspected, that the USAID programs are going to the opposition and the quasi-secessionists, to all the elite movements, in a more or less traditional effort to subvert the government. I wouldn't be surprised if you also find that in people who've been at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

M: Part of the interest of this project is to try to bring some self-criticism to people who have been teaching and have been a part of the university for many years. I know that you like to separate your teaching from your political involvement, which is extracurricular and outside of the institution.

NC: It's even inside the institution, but I do it on my own time. I've always tried to make an extremely sharp separation, so for about twenty-five years I was teaching undergraduate courses in social and political issues, social change, international affairs, and so on, but I always did it on my own time. The university assisted. They let me get a room and allowed the students to get credit for it. For me, it was on my own time. However, I keep my own political work away from my formal academic work. I wouldn't bring this in except for a casual mention.

M: Seen from the European perspective other colleagues and I have, it can sometimes appear as an ethical paradox with political involvement worldwide.

NC: It could be. There's a sort of ambiguity about that. I mean, suppose that you're a political scientist, or you're teaching international affairs, or you're an anthropologist. Everything you're doing is within a political and social framework, and overwhelmingly it's in the framework of state power and dominant culture. That's not considered politicized. However, anything opposed to it *would* be considered politicized. The Political Science department here in the 1960s was literally engaged in counterinsurgency in Vietnam. They had a villa in Saigon where students went to study the society, but that's studying it in an occupied country, and linked to the aggression. That wasn't considered politicized. Now, imagine someone had started a subsection of the department which was working on developing technology to resist, but it was meant for the Vietnamese to resist foreign occupation and was working on investigating the US government so as to provide information to the resistance on how to resist more effectively.

Well, first of all, they'd all have gone to jail, but if they hadn't, that would've been considered politicized. What's called bringing politics into the classroom typically means bringing dissent into the classroom. Conformity is not considered politics; it's just the norm.

M: Do you think we should be more critical of our own institutions? I am thinking of people with a following, someone like Howard Zinn at Boston University, some critical voice at Harvard, or yourself here at MIT, who can assume that role. I think that if this happened with an associate professor or an assistant or a student, it would not be heard.

NC: But institutions vary.

M: What about you?

NC: I happened to be treated very well. When I was in and out of jail, facing a long jail sentence, involved in resistance and so on, it never affected the way I was treated inside MIT. But let's take Howard Zinn at Boston University. They had an extremely autocratic president who pulled every trick in the book to expel him from the university, and then, finally, forced him out by telling the Political Science department they wouldn't be able to function until they got rid of him. These are the two extremes of how universities can work. The way MIT worked was basically quite good. The way Boston University worked was outrageous. Boston University is a private institution.

M: You say that in the 1960s students' activism was very important in reformulating a part of the university. Do you see the situation very differently now?

NC: It is different. For one thing, the university is totally different. The activism of the 1960s did change universities and society, so if you walk down the halls of MIT today it's half women, a third minorities, the dress and relations are informal. If you walked down the same halls when I got here, in 1955 or even in the early 1960s, it would've been white males, formally dressed and respectful relations. The whole character is different. It has changed, even in terms of the way the work was treated, so up to the 1950s and 1960s there was very little attention to the question of the social impact of scientific and technological development. Those became significant issues under the pressure of the student movement, and in fact, there's a famous day, March 4, 1969, when sessions were closed, classes were suspended, and the institute was thrown open to discussion. There were discussions and debates on what we were up to, the social implications of what

we were doing, and if we should have been doing something else. This has set a tone which, to a significant extent, has been followed ever since. As a result, the universities are different, the kind of student activism is quite different, so we tend to think. The common talk is that the entire decade of the 1960s was a time of activism, but the real student activism in places like this took place for about a year or two at the end of the 1960s, when there was a peak of intense activism: before that, there was not much, and afterwards, it kind of faded. It didn't just disappear; it went off in other directions. There's a far greater diversity of activism today than there was in the 1960s. If you counted participants it's probably not very different.

M: I'd like to ask you to summarize some of these questions. Do you see any conflicts between the network of administrative power and the university?

NC: There have been cases in which the administration, here and elsewhere, imposed a faculty member on the department. There are other, fortunately rare, cases in which faculty works through appointments, and presents to the administration, this person promoted to tenure and the administration refuses, sometimes under trustee pressure or community pressure. Luckily, these cases are not numerous, but they do exist, right in the present. Not here, as far as I know, but in other places, and these are things that the universities are constantly struggling against. There was a big case at the University of Colorado, just very recently, where there was pressure to fire a tenured professor. They made up all kinds of excuses, but the real reason was because of critical comments he made after 9/11. It's a state university so the legislature was involved, as well as the alumni and communities, and it finally led to a court case.

M: I have a question about space. I remember when I met you in the 1970s it was in "the barracks" [Building 20].

NC: That was the best building we ever had. It was a nice informal building.

M: When we talk about the university, space and architecture are important. Do you have any comments about architecture and the university?

NC: It's very personal but I like that style. I even like the so-called Infinite Corridor, the monastic look of it. But that particular space, which was designed as a temporary building during the Second World War, was a very comfortable building to work in, if you didn't mind the windows falling out and the squirrels in the wall. It was very free and open, there was a lot of interchange, and no security

whatsoever. You could walk into it twenty-four hours a day and into your office to talk to people, you didn't have to have pass keys. It was astonishing because there was a lot of high-tech equipment in there, there was work that was indistinguishable from classified work, but it was an open, free environment. The building itself was conducive to informal relations and interchanges, interdisciplinary relations. This was partly because it was so simple and unpretentious, partly because it was its own, and I suspect students might've liked it better.

M: Maybe they think they are outside the university. When they are in the cafeteria they feel like they are in a coffee shop. How do you feel about it? How is the transition of the space, of the use of the space?

NC: My personal preference would be an office just like a box, a place where you can have bookcases, a blackboard, and talk to students. I have to say, this office is a lot better for things like interviews because it's spacious.

M: It's bigger than the one you had before.

NC: It's bigger.

M: Thank you very much. Thank you for your time, you've been very kind.

John Coatsworth

Muntadas: What is the relationship between academia and the university? What do those two words represent to you?

John Coatsworth: In the common parlance of American academics, academia and the university are identical. Academia is the place you go when you want to do research and teaching. That means the university. In the broader sense, one can think of academia as a world that includes all those individuals who try to contribute to understanding about society, who carry out scientific or humanistic research, some of whom teach in American or other universities, although many others don't. Many have broader audiences in mind, or other occupations. But a very large number of those whose main activity is writing and research find employment in universities. So, although it includes many people who are not academics in the formal sense, most of them find teaching and research in universities the best way to fulfill their objectives.

M: Cultural values relate to the university as an act of disseminating knowledge. Then we have the fact that the university can accumulate power, through the role played by teachers, the administration, and the directors of programs. Do you have any comments on this?

JC: Universities are, of course, institutions of the societies in which they are created. They are part of those societies. They contribute to them, or they criticize them. They support them, or they undermine them. Much depends on circumstances and issues. In terms of values, the university is the only institution that society supports in which scientific investigation is of value in itself, in the human and the social sciences as well as the hard sciences. The only major institution where these values are part of the everyday culture and operation is the university. One can imagine think tanks, consulting companies, banks, other kinds of powerful institutions that produce what one would call proprietary knowledge—knowledge that's produced for a particular purpose and is owned by the institution that produces it. Universities are the only place where individual scholars, some of them with considerable support, such as scientific laboratories, produce research according to an agenda that the scholar himself, or herself, defines in terms of some scientific objective, and where the results of the research are normally published for all to see and criticize.

What makes universities unique is the general respect that one finds for this kind of enterprise, and the protections that are built in, though not always effectively, for those scholars who pursue lines of research or reach conclusions that are unpopular or startling to those outside the institution.

M: Could you identify some of the differences between private and public universities, both historically and as you see them now?

JC: One can imagine various ways of categorizing institutions of higher education in the world, but speaking just about the United States one only finds three, or perhaps four. The majority of the four thousand or so colleges and universities in the United States are private, often church-affiliated, and are directed towards providing instruction but do not reward research activity much. Most American students who go to colleges for four-year degrees, for the Bachelors degree, go to institutions of this kind.

Then there are a large number of institutions that are publicly created, beginning with the great Land Grant Universities that were a product of the westward expansion of the United States. Each of the states was granted land by the federal government, free of charge, to create an institution of higher education, and they all did. Many of the state universities in the United States are great centers of learning, wonderfully supported by their public constituents and by their legislatures, and the best of them are where you find a very high proportion of the research in the social and human sciences as well as the natural sciences. They often operate without any expectation that there will be any profit in returns to the society or to those in power who created the institution, although many of the Land Grant institutions produced agricultural extension services for farmers. That's part of what made them so popular and created a base of support among the public for their activities.

And then, finally, there are a much smaller number of private universities, and some private four-year colleges, which are supported largely by tuition revenues, but in some of the more prominent cases, by great endowments that their alumni and others have contributed and that allow them to operate with some degree of independence from the ebb and flow of economic circumstances.

M: Can you compare the past, present, and future of universities?

JC: Like any institution in modern society, or any society, universities were created two centuries or more ago in the United States, and even earlier in other parts of the world, for purposes that are quite different to those they serve today. If you look at American universities in the 1820s or 1830s, many felt that their

main responsibility, especially the private ones, which were the majority, was to train Protestant clerics. Just as many of the European universities were founded, in part at least, to train priests.

By the end of the century, this model in which moral philosophy, theology, and natural history were all in a single faculty had been replaced by universities based on the German model, in which knowledge is compartmentalized into departments, each one with boundaries which mark the differences between the science or the preoccupation of its faculty and those of other departments. The concepts of a doctorate and a dissertation had been introduced.

Mid-century, the universities are evolving in the United States, they are becoming more democratic, largely because of the impact of World War II and the Depression which preceded it. It took another twenty years or so, into the 1960s, before many universities abandoned their restrictions on the admission of people who were ethnically or racially diverse. When I graduated from college, exactly ten percent of the graduating class at my university was Jewish, although, had the admission policy been to admit people based on their qualifications and their possible success at university, the proportion would have been much higher. Many universities would not accept African-American applicants and had great difficulty accepting other minorities. There were a large number of men's colleges, but a much smaller number of women's colleges. Most of them are now co-ed.

The university that confronted the cultural changes of the Depression and World War II was a university that was much more elitist, much more ethnically and religiously provincial, and much less reflective of the larger society of which it was a part. Many of these aspects of universities in the United States, both private and public, were transformed by the turmoil of the 1960s. There was a cultural transformation in which the notion of universities as *in loco parentis*, as supervising every aspect of the personal as well as academic lives of their students, gave way to the notion that students should be allowed much more freedom in all kinds of ways. The curriculum should reflect students' interest in having a choice, and the students themselves should not be restricted by criteria that are irrelevant to their capacity to do well in the university as students.

The transformation on the research side was also quite remarkable during the post-World War II period. But in the 1960s and 1970s in particular, American universities did something quite remarkable; after many years of talking about how international the universities were, in the United States at least, they actually started to engage the world and to help Americans understand the world in which America was now playing a much greater role. Finally, the universities began to take seriously what they had been saying for years and begin to make appointments and to produce PhDs which knew something about the language and culture of other countries, a much larger number than ever before. That gave

way to a trend to begin to think critically about American culture and the place of the United States in the world, and even to reflect a little on the peculiarities of Western culture and civilization, as opposed to those of other parts of the world. But perhaps the most dramatic thing that changed was almost imperceptible but is now quite dominant. To give an example from my own field, if you asked an American academic or an intelligent observer not employed by the university, in the nineteenth century, or even in most of the first half of the twentieth century, “Why are some countries of the world poor, and others rich?”, the explanations would have had to do with the immutable characteristics of the people who lived in other countries. Either they had the wrong culture, or the wrong race, or the wrong climate. And it’s too bad, there’s nothing they can do about it, they’re just not as capable as the people who lived in Northern Europe, where the Industrial Revolution took place.

Now, what we’ve seen is the transformation of that view. We now understand the less developed world as a part of the world that just got started a little later, for reasons that are perfectly understandable, but that it is full of people who are just as capable as the people in the North Atlantic. They can develop their economies and they can even achieve very high rates of economic growth, high levels of productivity, and in some cases, they can do it with far less negative consequences for the welfare of their own populations. For example, in East Asia for the last half-century, what has been most notable has been not only the rapid rates of economic growth, but that many of the countries have become more equal in terms of the distribution not just of income and wealth, but also of social services.

The provincialism of the American academy, in the way that it viewed the rest of the world, was shattered in the 1960s and 1970s. Partly that was the influence of the war in Vietnam and the protests against it, and partly it was the influence of looking at a globe transforming itself in ways that the older, much less scientific theories would not have predicted.

M: Could you comment on the evolution of institutions into corporations?

JC: Most universities are not-for-profit institutions. They depend on the tuition revenue that is generated by their students and by the contributions of their alumni, whether in the form of endowments or current-use gifts that help to support the institution. If you look at the basic structure of the institution, it hasn’t changed a great deal. Perhaps most important in the post-World War II era has been the increasing role of government in supporting both research and other kinds of costs that universities confront; fellowships, loans to students, and so on. But there has also been a considerable transformation in the way universities were run during this period. It is reflected in the large number of people who are

part of that vast number of bureaucrats that run the central administrations of most institutions, because the functions that they have to perform now are much more diverse and generate much more paperwork. For example, the federal government regulates universities in ways that require us to fill out forms when we hire people. We have to report on the ethnicity of our student body. We have to report on student loans. We have to report on crime statistics in neighborhoods around universities. We have all kinds of Affirmative Action requirements in terms of hiring people. The universities are much more regulated than they used to be on the government side.

On the private side, many universities depend, to some degree, on how well their endowment is invested. Most universities, and even small colleges that have some endowment income, depend on financial managers to make sure that their income is as safe and as predictable as possible, but at the highest possible rate of return. In that sense, universities have become much more like corporations now than they used to be. They have to manage funds, they have to report to the government, they are not as free to behave in the ways that they had in the past. They are powerful institutions, but they are powerful not because they are institutionally coherent and they can assert influence in one direction or another collectively as institutions, but because they have become tremendously successful both in scientific and in economic terms. Much of the research that results in technological breakthroughs later on is done at universities; many of these are public universities, but many are private as well. Many of the intellectual trends that become important in the public, or that influence legislation, are generated, initially, by research that is done by independent scholars at the universities themselves.

There has been a transformation of universities. They are much more professionally run and they have more civil service employees that do all the paperwork. They have to worry about financial management in ways that they might not have had to do in the past when they were not so wealthy. In a sense, they are now different kinds of institutions, but their power in society has become much more connected to the quality of the research that they carry out, and the contributions that they make to public discussion, or to scientific breakthroughs, unlike the time when public opinion was less important in the world of politics and scientific breakthroughs were not so common and not so important.

M: You mentioned the economic structure of the universities. The influence of donors, trustees, and institutional support can have an implication for universities, sentimentally as well as politically. Sometimes this implication can produce conflicts of interests.

JC: In what sense?

M: Alumni and friends, donors, people related to the Alma Mater and part of this international network, affect political countries, both economically and in the formation of political leaders.

JC: There are several aspects to this. The first is the question of whether the dependence of many of the best universities, where the best research is done, on financial support from alumni, from wealthy and powerful individuals, and to a much lesser extent from corporations or even from the government, has a distorting effect on the social science, the humanistic research, or even the basic scientific research they do. That's an area in which universities have been extraordinarily sensitive to their environment. For example, before I can sign an agreement for a corporation to make a contribution to the School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia, the agreement itself must go to our office of legal counsel, and any implication in the agreement that I sign, suggesting that decisions on academic matters, on the content of programs, on who we hire, on which students we admit, on who is invited to conferences and meetings, on who becomes fellows and affiliated with the institution; any implication of control by the corporation providing the funds, or the donor providing the funds, that might have slipped past my notice into that gift agreement, simply won't be approved.

To put it another way, with many corporations providing research funding for medical or pharmacological research, the research itself is regulated by universities in ways that sometimes the researchers themselves find quite intrusive in order to remove the possibility, or even the appearance, of a conflict of interest between the scientific objectives of the researcher and the business objectives of the contributor.

If they put themselves up for sale their reputations suffer, and the research quality of their faculty deteriorates, so they have introduced very strong guidelines to prevent the routine conflicts of interests from occurring that would make the university a servant of a particular corporation, company, organization, or even the government. That's not always been the case. Universities are better at this now than they've ever been, partly because of scandals that occur when university researchers establish relationships with particular companies, or when universities themselves do, and their entire academic and scientific purpose gets distorted. That's one set of very explicit rules that many universities now have. There's a second sense, in which universities, particularly the top universities, the American Ivy League, or some of the better state universities, become the educational institutions which many of the top leaders of our country have graduated from. In some cases, such as Columbia and Harvard, many of the top leaders of

other countries are alumni. There's an issue of causality. It used to be the case that many of the top leaders, certainly the corporate leaders, of most Western countries, and certainly the United States, were educated in a relatively small number of institutions. Columbia was one of them, Harvard was another, as was Princeton. That's because their fathers and grandfathers had gone there and because they were part of a somewhat circulating but nonetheless elite group of individuals whose children always went to the same schools, and attended the same parties, and went to the same universities, and so on. Although there has been considerable turnover in the American elite over the years, during the period between the end of the nineteenth century and the 1950s, these institutions were the places where the US elite tended to send their students. As the attraction of the United States spread around the world, elites in other countries did the same. They sent their children to elite American schools, mostly to graduate schools. Since the 1960s, if not slightly before, many of these same universities which were almost exclusively for the children of the elites, and perhaps a very small percentage of very bright individuals from other social groups, have transformed themselves into institutions in which a very high percentage of their incoming students are not from the upper ranks of income earners, either from the United States or abroad. They do this through financial aid programs. It's done for students from abroad through various fellowships programs from their home governments or the US government. A high proportion of those people who are in leadership positions in the private sector, both here and abroad, who have gone to these universities, are now more likely to be the result of the qualifications they presented and their success in those institutions than of their social origins and the networks that they started out with. Many leaders in the world and in the United States come from relatively modest backgrounds. They were admitted to these universities, and they became chums with other people who were going to become leaders, and networks were created of alumni. It linked them to past elites, but it made the circulation or turnover in elite membership, both US and foreign, greater than it had been in the past. So, if you ask the question, "Are the top American universities contributing to the formation of elites in various parts of the world, and therefore connected to the highest levels of power, both economic and political?" the answer is yes, absolutely. If you ask the question, "Have they democratized the way elites are selected and networks formed?" I think the answer is also yes. But there's no question that the very top universities in the United States, and of course in Western Europe and elsewhere, are places where elites are formed. Members of future elites establish contacts, and their loyalty to their institutions sometimes reflects how rapidly they've risen from relatively modest circumstances

as a result of their education in these institutions.

M: The David Rockefeller Center has its focus on Latin America as a region, and on the global impact of social and economic institutions on politics. Would you like to comment on how the incentive was formed, its history, how you perceive it now? What were the intentions, and what were the results?

JC: I didn't take part in the conversations between the Harvard president at the time, Neil Rudenstine, and David Rockefeller. David Rockefeller was a Harvard graduate, class of 1936 I believe, and had been supporting various Harvard initiatives, at the request of Harvard presidents, for years. And Neil Rudenstine, because of his experience at the Mellon Foundation, had a particular interest in Latin America. He'd also traveled there, and he knew that David Rockefeller's family, and David himself, had spent a good deal of time in Latin America, had created something called the America Society in New York, and had business dealings throughout Latin America, as had his brother, Nelson. There's a long history of family association, both with Latin America and with Harvard. Neil, as I understand it, had several conversations with David about the possibility of helping Harvard to create a Latin America Center. Harvard was famous for its international centers in Russian, East European and East Asian Studies, but it had a very small Latin American institute, and very little institutional support for research and teaching on Latin America.

I first learned of these conversations when David Rockefeller agreed to make what turned out to be an eleven million dollar gift to the university to endow a new center for Latin American studies. Eleven million dollars produces an income to do a lot more than Harvard's small Latin American Studies committee had been doing up until that point. Subsequent fundraising from people who David helped to recruit to the center's advisory committee, and from others interested in Latin America and Harvard, raised the endowment of the center by several times beyond David's initial gift, and he ended up giving another ten million dollars to the center that had already been named for him. Then the question is, "What do you do with all this money?" when it became a Latin American Center with the largest budget of any of its kind at an American university in the United States, something in the range of five to seven million dollars a year.

What the center did was to help various departments of the university appoint faculty who were experts on Latin America; to provide travel grants for both undergraduate and graduate students who wished to go to Latin America, to pursue classes or especially to carry out research; to bring to the University a series of leading intellectuals from Latin America chosen by peer review and an application process, chosen by Harvard faculty, for the outstanding character of their work, to come for a year or a semester at a time; to partner with various

departments and professional schools around the university on projects that either contributed to Latin American development in various ways, or that were focused on some scientific, social scientific, or humanistic issue that the faculty themselves defined. I think that's most of what the center did, and as far as I know, continues to do very well. Latin America is now a more important part of Harvard's map than ever. There's much more activity, much more study abroad, it's much easier for faculty to engage in research on Latin America than it was before. I think that was the whole purpose of the center.

M: Part of the interest of this project is to bring some self-criticism to people involved in teaching or directing a university. People can be very political outside, and less so inside, in terms of criticism or self-criticism. Could you comment on having a certain kind of awareness and criticism of the place where you work?

JC: My impression is that universities are among the places in the world where most criticism is heard more often. An ordinary faculty member at an American university can't be fired for criticizing his dean, or his president, or the direction of the university or how it's spending its money, or anything else he or she has a mind to criticize. The authority structure is much different from government and the private sector where everyone is expected, more or less, to hew the company line literally, and criticism is either not welcomed, or is very contained and focused on specific issues.

My experience is that American professors are among the most critical of their own institution and its employees than professors in any comparable institution in the world. They tend to be both self-critical and they tend to be much more critical of the society that they live in. It's not always the case, but it is probably not accidental that most of the social movements that have originated in criticism and resulted in significant cultural and social change in the developed world have originated, at least in part, in universities' faculties and students.

What I sense is that universities are where you're most likely to find criticism, both internal and external. Both criticism of how the university is not living up to its ideals and should be doing better, and criticism of the society on the grounds that this policy or that practice doesn't make sense, though I don't want to give the impression that we already live in the best of all possible worlds.

M: Could you compare European and American universities? The formation of their structures is very different.

JC: I can tell you something from my own experience. I was an assistant professor at the University of Chicago in the early 1970s. My wife organized a union,

first of librarians, then of all the clerical employees at the university. When a new university president was inaugurated, and a leaflet was passed out at the door to denounce the anti-union activities of the president about to be inaugurated, because he had taken a very dim view of what my wife was doing, the only member of the faculty that had signed this was me. I think it was a Trotskyist pamphlet. A number of my colleagues said, "You know, you don't have tenure yet. You need to be a little more discreet." I was promoted without difficulty. No one mentioned that incident, or any others, in which I was playing a decidedly less than accommodating role before the authorities at the institution. I think that's generally the case. It's not always the case. It's probably the case in a minority of American universities, even though academic freedom is something we say we value. But for the best universities and for those who treat scientific work and academic work with respect, it is almost always the case.

I don't know of a single case in a very long career in which political activities, social criticism, or other external criteria have been used to determine the outcome of a tenure case. I know cases in which there have been very tough decisions that administrators have had to make. In most cases, as you know, the decision of whether to give tenure to somebody goes through a department where there is peer review, and then it reaches the president of the university.

There have been cases where immense external pressure has been exerted on a university to make a decision one way or the other, particularly if a professor has opinions that are controversial. But in the universities where I've served, Chicago, Harvard, and Columbia, I don't know of a single case in which the outcome was based on criteria other than the quality of the academic research, to the best that the university authorities could determine.

M: Can you establish a class analogy between individuals in society in general and at Ivy League universities?

JC: Social class?

M: Social class. How individuals belong to a certain class, and certain Ivy League universities, Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, belong to another. Do you see that in terms of a starting point? I think it makes a difference as a starting point in life.

JC: So the question is, whether these great universities, with their private endowments and generous donors from among alumni, who often occupy very powerful positions in government and the private sector, whether these universities do

enough to criticize society?

M: Whether they are keeping things for themselves, and whether they should be more generous.

JC: Are these institutions that support the status quo? Are they an obstacle for social, and cultural, and economic, and political change?

M: One can establish an analogy with individuals; people will become a part of a certain economic class and will see and be more connected with a certain group. It seems as if certain groups will be like clubs. We talked earlier about a network, but this is much more detailed. I'm trying to create a comparison between the world outside and inside the university, the relationship with social and economic classes.

JC: There are two issues here. One is the question, "What governs university activities? What is it that professors do? Who defines those tasks? What topics do they carry out research on, how is that research disseminated, what kinds of things do they teach in the classroom, and therefore, what, in the end, are the consequences for society?" The other question has to do with how that institution contributes to the stability, or instability, of the society of which it is a part. "Does it support or undermine other institutions? Does it compete with other institutions? Is it a force for social change? In both cases, is there a class dimension? And if there is, what is it?"

American universities are too small, even from an economic point of view. Not enough Americans go to university. The figure hasn't changed in almost half a century. European universities, which used to be highly elitist and admitted only a small percentage of college-age students, have now surpassed us in the number of college-age students that are actually enrolled. And that stagnation in enrollment in American universities has had two effects: it's bad for the economy, and it's bad for society. It's bad for the economy because productivity increases would have been possible had universities expanded more, and admitted more students, and educated more of them better. Those people would have been more productive. It's bad for society also in the sense that the fact that we have not expanded means that social mobility has probably declined, at least by some indicators. The United States is already the most unequal country in terms of income distribution, of all the advanced countries. So that's part of it.

The second thing that has to be said is that if you take the social background of researchers and of university students, you see they are enormously more diverse than they were thirty, forty, or fifty years ago, but they are not a reflection of society. Certainly not in the great elite institutions that we just mentioned, the Ivy

League and the most prestigious of the state universities. They are institutions in which the advantages you get at birth, from the socioeconomic class into which you are born and the ethnic group of which you are a member, are not being overcome as well as society needs them to be overcome. Universities are much more diverse than they used to be, in terms of social class and ethnicity, but they are not yet—certainly not the elite universities—a reflection of the potential talent pool that exists. Although even the elite universities are much more diverse than they used to be, and contribute so much more to social mobility than they once did half a century or a century ago, there's no comparison, they're not anywhere near what they need to be in order to serve the larger interests of society better than they do.

Regarding the relationship of universities to institutions, economic, political and the like, there were moments in American history when universities were really the flash-point for criticism and social change, particularly in the 1960s and the 1970s. That's much less true now, at least in a highly visible way that one would recognize if there were large numbers of people marching in the streets. But if you look at the way students are educated, the topics that faculty do research on, the kinds of careers that students often choose, those areas of university life contain enormous challenges to the way in which society is organized and the way in which social class is defined in American society, the way opportunities are skewed, both within the United States, and between the United States and other countries. It's not just that our students are quite idealistic, as you would expect them to be, and their professors equally so, though perhaps they are more skeptical because of their age. It's because of the kinds of careers that people choose and the ways that they define the goals that they want to pursue in their lives. But I would say that there's no way of altering the fact that universities serve a social function. The question is whether that function is co-terminus with some set of objectives that one might imagine an economic and political leader assigning to it. That's a sociological question with lots of implications, but I don't think universities actually work that way.

M: How important is the space that we live and teach in? How you think architectural typologies affect the university, the life of the university, and the teaching that goes on there?

JC: You're asking the dean of a school that's in a fourteen-story building that one of our students recently referred to as a Neo-Stalinist monstrosity. So I'm very sensitive to the issue of the relationship between academic enterprise and architecture. In general, Columbia, and many other universities, was built with walls around it. Even today, to get to the Columbia campus you go through a gate and

all the entrances to the buildings face inwards, the space inside the wall. If you try to get into a Columbia building from an ordinary street, you'll see it's very difficult, you won't find an entrance. It's the sense of a closed community that leaves the rest of the world aside and excludes it deliberately.

M: A kind of gated community?

JC: A gated community, exactly. That was the concept of universities from the early part of this century. This was considered a model of how universities should look. Fortunately, now Columbia has the opportunity to do something different because it has acquired eighteen acres of Manhattan real estate, just north of the current campus, and it has been planning what to do with this huge new space. It's not huge in comparison to some other parts of the world, but in a large urban area it's quite a project to have this large of a space with which to think about constructing a new campus. The first phase of construction will include a new building for the School of International and Public Affairs. The architect is Renzo Piano, who wanted to create something that was exactly the opposite of what the initial campus was like. He wanted to create something open, with public spaces, that invites the community to come in, that has public access on the ground floors that face commercial streets, and that serves as a gateway to a public park along the river, so that people would not feel that this was a university separated from the community. Indeed, the architecture itself will be quite transparent. As you may know from seeing the New York Times building, his only other building in New York, he has a different concept of how buildings should interact with the space around them and their communities. For me it's been a very exciting time to think about the connection between space and what universities are doing. We don't take young men, separate them from the temptations of the world, and place them in a cloistered community with professors who study moral philosophy, like monasteries. We don't even think of the new university as a modified form of the former model. We think of the university as open to the broader world, and its architecture should reflect that.

M: What about the implication that this is related to the university's role as a corporation? The university becomes involved in real estate and expansion, and all that is part of a system of real estate, expansion, and gentrification. How do universities confront that?

JC: That's an enormously complicated question. The answer depends on which university you're talking about and what kind of an area it's expanding into. In the case of Columbia we're expanding into an area in which in the entire

eighteen acres held only about 160 families. Most of the area was occupied by warehouses, automobile factories that closed down in the 1950s and 1960s that produced models that no longer exist in the American vocabulary such as Studebaker and Nash, you may remember them from decades ago. The opportunity to acquire the real estate without displacing large numbers of people was there. The university then went to consult the broader Harlem community about what the transformation would mean and how the university could develop a relationship with the surrounding community that would be much more constructive than has been the case of “town-gown” relations between Columbia and the community in the past. A large community benefits agreement has been reached with the representatives of all the community organizations in the area. The university is paying for the development of a public high school that will be open to students in the area but linked to our engineering school. In the Institute for Mind, Brain, and Behavior there will be a diagnostic clinic open to the community. On the first floors, many buildings will have commercial establishments—cafes, restaurants, bookstores, and theaters that will have events that will be open to the community. There are specific community benefits for various organizations. The University has tried to be a good citizen in that respect. But when a run-down area is transformed into a shimmering new campus, no matter the intention or how inviting the architectural style, it certainly has an effect on the surrounding community which could be described as gentrification. The only way you can deal with that is by trying to minimize the negative effects of the process and to make sure that those people who wish to stay in that community are able to do so, and to benefit from the changes that are about to take place. This area comprises a substantial amount of middle-and low-income public housing, and there is no question that it will continue to be there and that Columbia will be as good a neighbor as it can be.

M: This is different from what has happened with NYU.

JC: NYU has a much more difficult problem to face because they are more constrained and have to go building by building. Unless they go to an island offshore, they don't have an opportunity to coherently design a single space for their campus.

M: Columbia's situation is more like Harvard with Allston.

JC: Yes, but Harvard's is a much bigger space.

M: Are there any other questions that I haven't asked but that you would like to discuss?

Fernando Coronil

Muntadas: Historically, how has academia been represented and what is the relationship between academia and the university? Do you see similarities and differences?

Fernando Coronil: Well, I think there are historical links between the university and academia in the West. At this point in time, in the public sphere and in most people's minds there is a strong identification between the university and academia. They are seen as similar if not identical. But while today the university is a highly institutionalized center of learning typically located in a central space in a city, historically academia was located in an informal space at its margins. In the West, academia originated in learning practices developed by Plato outside of Athens. Plato believed that the pursuit of knowledge would be developed through open dialogue between people. Since then, "academia" has named multiple practices of learning and research. Over time there has been a close connection between academia and the university. Often, academies—as various sites of learning—were the origin of universities; for instance, in the United States it was Benjamin Franklin who founded an academy that later became the University of Pennsylvania; there is a very close connection and mutual interaction between the two.

I have to say that I'm not an expert on this topic. I work in a university but I haven't done research on the historical formation of either the academy or the university. Still, I see academia as larger than universities, for it involves more varied practices of learning. For me, while the university refers to an institution, to a formalized setting where knowledge and teaching take place, academia preserves some kind of openness that evokes the informal situation of its origins with Plato. Academia is more encompassing than the university as an institution, yet the university, as a central core of academia, makes academia connote rigorous practices of learning similar to those that define scholarly work in universities. Academia includes universities, but also other sites of knowledge formation, such as academic societies of arts and sciences or institutions like Brazilian Candido Mendes' Académie de la Latinité. Universities are more narrowly institutional.

M: We see then that the university accumulates some spiritual, cultural, and intellectual values, all based on the act of knowledge, but that it also creates a status quo and accumulates power. Do you have any comments on that?

FC: That's a critical issue. You've raised the question of the relationship between knowledge and power. You ask about universities, and of course there are many kinds of universities and locations of universities. Universities in the South, in the Third World, are different from universities in the First World, in metropolitan centers. Power plays a different role in elite universities and in average universities. The question of power affects all these universities differently. In some places, like in the United States, many universities, particularly the most important ones, are directly connected with very powerful non-state agents, such as corporations. In some cases they were even founded by private individuals. The University of Chicago, where I studied, was founded by the Rockefellers. The major universities in the South, as in Venezuela, where I come from, are state universities, as is also the case in Mexico and Argentina where we have some of the finest universities in Latin America. Also in Europe major universities are promoted by the state and they have a different kind of relationship to power. In general, one of the greatest problems that universities of every kind confront everywhere (public and private, in the South and in the North) is the tension between their universal claims and their regional location—the tension between the university as a place which claims to produce universal knowledge and to pursue some kind of universality, and the fact that any university is always rooted in the context of relationships informed by a local culture and saturated by particular interests, histories, and power relations. So on the one hand you have an ideology of universality; on the other hand, you have the practice of a particular nexus of power and culture, so that any university is always engaged in some kind of tension. This tension manifests itself in all kinds of ways—the ways that intellectual agendas are defined, topics are constructed, disciplines are divided, in the ways that canons are established. If you are a person from the South coming to a university in the North, it is likely that you will become more aware of the tension between formations of knowledge that are perceived as canonical, as universal, but which are developed in the center and reflect that perspective. The bottom line in all of this is that the formation of Europe and of the West as the center of the world has implied, through processes of colonization and expansion of capital and culture, not only some kind of political dominion, but also a form of cultural hegemony. It is the West that defines the canon of scientific knowledge, and also of knowledge in the humanities and the arts, so that everything else has to be filtered through and translated into the terms of the canons established by the West. If you come from the South or from the margins of the West's dominant culture, it is likely that you may immediately feel that tension in all kinds of ways, for you're working in a terrain that is saturated by the relationships of power that reflect existing hierarchies, and you have to fight within that terrain in order to make things work for you, unless you just conform to what is given.

M: You already mentioned the difference between private and public universities. Would you like to add anything else?

FC: When one thinks about universities and tries to characterize them, it is important to establish whether we are talking about universities in the South, in the North, in Europe, in Asia, in Africa. In Venezuela, public universities have a commitment to public welfare that is much more explicit than that of private universities. My own experience as a student in the United States was in private universities. I trained at Stanford and at the University of Chicago, two major private universities. The University of Chicago, funded by the Rockefellers, is widely recognized as a very serious institution, one of the most intensely rigorous and intellectual of US universities. When I was at Stanford and Chicago it was interesting for me to observe the links but also the relative autonomy of universities from their financial sponsors. At the same time, my professional career in the US has been at public universities: I taught during twenty years at the University of Michigan where I'm an emeritus professor, and now I teach at the Graduate Center, City University of New York. For me, one of the striking features of US universities is their tremendous importance as centers of training, critical thinking, socialization, and knowledge production. Universities have achieved a centrality that is remarkable, such that, in fact, the distinction between the top private and public universities is not very strong. If you are in Berkeley, Harvard, MIT, Wisconsin, Cornell, Stanford, Michigan, you feel the same kind of excellence and critical thinking. At the same time, if you look carefully I think there are some differences between private and public universities. My own preference in the US is to work at public universities. My sense, based on my limited experience, is that one breathes a different climate in public and private universities. There's a different kind of commitment, even in terms of the students that are accepted; I also sense more openness to diverse intellectual agendas, a more democratic ethos.

M: Do you have any comment on the transition of the university from an institution to a corporation?

FC: Universities have always been tied to centers of power, to political, religious, or ideological interests. There is always a tension between the reality of these ties, and the conceit that universities are detached from society and are independent centers of learning. Yet this tension is what makes them attractive as centers of critical thinking and also allows for the pursuit of certain kinds of intellectual interests and scientific work. Universities became even more dynamic centers of knowledge production when they changed from the medieval model, in which

transmission of knowledge was the dominant activity, to the post-Humboldtian model, in which research and creativity were promoted. I don't think there is a sharp divide between a stage that was free from corporate pressures. The medieval university was a corporate institution. I think what has happened is that there is a growing commoditization of social life. The power of capital and of mega-corporations has expanded. In the last two decades of the twentieth century, during the period of neoliberal globalization, we have witnessed the expansion of the power of the market and of its influence over society and over universities, particularly in the United States. Because the US is a global power, its universities have significant influence over universities in other countries. This period has been identified with the corporatization of the university; yet this change involves an intensification of a previous process, not a rupture. I think the university is more and more subjected to the logic of the market in all kinds of ways. I've seen this process at work in my own universities, such as in the pressure to have degrees in shorter times, PhDs conferred in seven years instead of ten years, and various modes of using cost-benefit analysis to regulate university life. The market also affects what is regarded as valuable and important in the university, from university salaries to topics of study, and influences the ranking of certain schools over others. When you have financial cuts, it is the humanities that suffer—of course the business school is not going to suffer, engineering is not going to suffer, economics is not going to suffer, so the university is clearly responding to societal pressures. There are forces against this process of corporatization, but at this point they are still weak. Despite all of this, the university remains one of the central institutions where the life of the mind, of the spirit, is valued and nurtured, a place where critical thinking is encouraged. In the university, independent thinking remains active and resistant to forces that are much more narrowly utilitarian and pragmatic.

M: I think the institutional and corporate aspects of the university are based on a specific structure—donors, trustees, and public support are an important part of the institution. This creates sentimental links with students, but also political, social, and even economic links. I think it creates a network of affiliations.

FC: What you're saying is true. The weight of these affiliations depends on the particular university. In private universities you can see private influence much more clearly. In elite private universities, like Harvard, Yale, Princeton, these connections are quite evident and manifest themselves in all kinds of ways—from how students get accepted, despite all the claims to the contrary, to who gets hired as faculty or chosen as president or to the board of trustees. These connections create conditions for the reproduction of the institution and of the

social groups attached to them; the reproduction of these relations continues afterwards, beyond the university, through the market, through jobs and connections to other spheres of power, politics, business, and the arts. This happens less in public universities, in which the pressure of the donors and the importance of the boards that run the university take on a different significance because the interests at stake are also different.

M: I think we need to address the friends and donors part of this Alma Mater. They have international work that affected Latin America. Many Latin American presidents studied at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

FC: Like Salinas, the ex-president of Mexico, Calderón after him, and many others. You are absolutely right. Yet despite their differences, private and public universities sometimes play similar political roles. At the height of the celebration of the neoliberal market, the University of Michigan conferred an honorary degree on Carlos Salinas, before he fell out of grace, and it did so clearly responding to outside interests, without consulting its Latin American faculty. In general, however, I think public universities have a more marginal connection to the power elite and major corporate interests. I think this relative independence makes them more open and democratic; in some cases, it also makes them more intellectually alive and stimulating; in my view, the University Michigan is more intellectually alive than Harvard—debates and discussions are more intense and rigorous. Michigan is not tied to big corporate interests, even from companies located in the state of Michigan. Michigan is a public university that doesn't have wealthy donors like the Rockefellers. Although it is a public university, only approximately one quarter of its income comes from the state of Michigan; the rest comes from its huge and devoted alumni. A mass of people are connected to Michigan for sentimental reasons; the football team and other sports play a large role in cementing this kind of sentimental attachment—I, for one, continue to root for Michigan's football team despite its poor performance in the last years. My sense is that other major public universities in the United States are like Michigan in this respect—somewhat more open and democratic than the elite private universities.

M: Like Mexico with UNAM.

FC: Exactly. But then you have universities like Harvard and Yale that are connected to the US elite, to the Kennedys, to the Bushes. These are the universities where the Latin American elites prefer to go; they seek to get a degree that

legitimizes them as members of the international elite. Of course the Rockefeller Center at Harvard is a peculiar institution. It is a center that has promoted the connection between US and Latin American elites as well as between Harvard and Latin American studies; it is connected to the Rockefellers and yet it was directed during its first decade by John Coatsworth, a brilliant and very progressive scholar who managed to make it into very open and interesting institution. The Rockefellers are visionary not only because they're a family of very smart people, and are very astute economically and politically, but also because they were involved in the oil business, a business that was the most dynamic, transnational, global business in the world. They learned to think globally when people were thinking nationally and locally. I think they had the vision of the globe, of the world, far earlier and far ahead of many of their contemporaries who were much more provincial in their outlook. I think the Rockefellers were always at the cutting edge. It's no accident that the Rockefellers founded the University of Chicago as a center of learning that was very open. I was told that members of the US American Communist Party would send their kids to the University of Chicago to learn Marxism because it was taught in the University of Chicago like nowhere else, because it was placed in the context of the great books and the great Western intellectual tradition. Let me share an interesting anecdote. It has been reported that Nelson Rockefeller in the 1930s was very interested in Venezuela because a major source of income for Standard Oil was Creole Corp, a subsidiary of Standard Oil in Venezuela. Concerned about political changes in Venezuela, Rockefeller asked his Creole executives to read *Das Kapital* because he was aware that there was turbulence among Venezuelan oil workers and middle sectors and Creole had to be prepared for changes in Venezuela. Nelson established close connections with the emerging political elite, including Rómulo Betancourt. He also created in Venezuela something called the Venezuelan Basic Economy Corporation (VBEC) that preceded the International Basic Economy Corporation (IBEC), which was a visionary corporation. Nelson realized that extractive industries would be targets of attacks by nationalists. He said that US corporations in Latin America had to become good corporate citizens, so he began creating corporations that were not just extractive but were involved in industry, services, and commerce. And he did this before the policy of import substituting industrialization (ISI) had become the mantra of development ideology in Latin America.

M: We see that in some ways, certain programs in Latin America oppose certain agendas, those of Chávez, Morales or Lula, for example. Are there any political and economic implications to this?

FC: It's very complicated. Since we were talking about the Rockefellers, let's consider Venezuela. If you look at Venezuelan politics intimately you begin to see the complexity of politics in the area. The Rockefellers established a close alliance with progressive social democratic parties and their leaders, including Rómulo Betancourt, who was the founder of Accion Democratica in Venezuela (AD) in the 1940s and president of Venezuela in 1945. Despite their profound differences, Rómulo Betancourt and Nelson Rockefeller shared at that point similar visions of development and modernization and compatible views concerning the role of capital in the development of Venezuela. This alliance has continued for many years. On the one hand, AD presented a public rhetoric of nationalism and anti-imperialism. On the other hand, in practice AD established an alliance with oil companies, even if the government sought to regulate them, diminish their profits, and increase state income. With Chávez, something similar is happening. On the one hand, like Betancourt before him, Chávez claims to object to American Imperialism, and I'm sure he does to some extent. But if you look carefully at his oil policy—including conflicts with EXXON, which is the contemporary form of Standard Oil—there's also an alliance with corporate interests. You can see this alliance through the creation of joint companies which benefit both the oil companies and the state, but not necessarily the nation. The nation might benefit more if the state avoided forming joint ventures and established other forms of connection with foreign capital, such as rigorous service contracts. It's a complicated picture. There's a bit of a double discourse here. But the core problem is that these leftist governments in Latin America you asked me about (Evo's Bolivia, Lula's Brazil, Correa's Ecuador) want to create more democratic and just societies—excellent and necessary aims—and yet they are constrained by global structures of capitalist production that force them to continue to maximize state income by developing their nations' comparative advantages—exploiting natural resources according to the capitalist logic of profit maximization.

M: The university in the 1960s was a politicized situation. How do you perceive the interest of students? It seems like it's less politicized now than it was.

FC: It's a sign of the changing times. The period after World War II was a period of tremendous political turbulence. It was preceded by the dramatic fight against fascism, which placed on the global agenda the issue of freedom and democracy, and created the foundation for the decolonization of European colonies in Africa and Asia. This was the period of the Algerian War, and the war in Vietnam. It was also a period of economic growth globally from 1945 to the 1960s. Periods of political change and economic growth are periods marked by openness and possibilities. I think what happened in France in 1968, the student revolt in Mexico

also in 1968, and the hippies and counter-culture in the US, were an expression of flowering possibilities which involved a critique of the established order. It created the possibility of people imagining alternative futures. Then came a period of economic contraction and political disillusionment. It was also a period of Thatcherism in England and Reaganism in the US, a period of economic and cultural contraction. It was also a period that evinced the limits of really existing socialism (or more accurately, of really inexistent socialism), of the failure of authoritarian regimes that claimed to represent socialism. These circumstances created a contraction of possibilities. People focused more on making it within existing structures rather than on changing them. Politics took a different form. I can see this process in the generation of my daughters. When they went to high school and to college, student politics focused on specific issues, and even on personal relations. The dream was less to change society as a whole and more to try to change specific areas of society and your own life. I think in many ways this change had some positive aspects.

M: Maybe socially observing is less fashionable, less hyped? A demonstration was a social event in the 1960s, it was how people met. It was a life occasion. I think it's a paradox between the previous question and the fact that in the 1960s universities were implicated in politics from the perspective of the military. MIT is a clear example. You have laboratories, the documents proving they were involved with bombs, military research and the implications with corporations, and I think there are other universities probably also involved, although perhaps less is known about them. It was a more conscious role of the alumni and the students, but also the institution was really implicated in research work for military objectives.

FC: It was a big war, the war in Vietnam, with huge visibility and human costs. At that time many US universities were also implicated in counter-insurgency in Latin America. In a politicized public context, it makes sense that universities became major sites of social critique and opposition to the war and to imperialism.

M: How is it that we are critical outside but not inside the university?

FC: I think we are critical outside and inside, but in different ways. For instance, I was at Stanford in that period and I remember demonstrating and being part of the anti-war movement. At that time people denounced the complicity of Stanford with the war in Vietnam. When Vice-President Humphrey gave a talk at Stanford we were involved in strong protests. Scholars and students sought to

analyze the links between universities and the war. Their critique was both internal and external. Chomsky and others researched and made evident what Eisenhower had called the military-industrial complex. Some talked of the military-industrial-university complex. The North American Congress on Latin America (NACLA) was founded by Fred Goff, a friend from Stanford. NACLA's task was to analyze the links between corporations, universities, the military, states, and US policy in Latin America. NACLA has flourished and continues to publish its journal, now located in New York. You raise an important and puzzling question. At that time it was relatively easy to make a critique from within the universities that was internal and external—that criticized the military and major corporations and also the university. Now we have a situation in which there is a similar complicity between universities and the war machine. Yet the wars in Iraq or Afghanistan do not have the same kind of public visibility or influence as the war in Vietnam. The public's relation to the war has changed. It's a sign of a changing climate that somehow the space for critique and public protest has, at least in this country, shrunk a bit. Even problems that affect everyone, like climate change, do not seem to elicit the kind of collective concern that they should.

M: In your circumstances, in your university, do you see any self-criticism by the people involved in teaching? Do you think they're more political outside than inside, or have times changed and people just do what they can?

FC: It's interesting that we have talked about the shift from active protest against public policies in the 1960s and late 1970s, to the decline of that form of critique. One of the things that has happened in academia now, in the universities, is that political work has focused more on intellectual critique within academia itself, on less evident or visible forms of complicity with powerful institutions. You can mark this change with the so-called linguistic turn, with the shift from political economy to discourse analysis, from the confident grand narratives of political economy to the more partial and uncertain focus of cultural studies, from structuralism to post-structuralism, from modernism to post-modernism. This has been a period where critical academics have focused on the relationship between power and knowledge through different disciplinary or knowledge formations—feminism, post-colonial studies, queer studies and cultural studies. Even traditional disciplines have been criticized from within, engaging such issues as the provincial character of the Western canon, intellectual agendas, Eurocentrism, sexism and the like. This has been a period that has seen a serious critique of Western epistemes, of Western notions of universality, and shown an unusual openness to different forms of knowledge, different forms of art. In different fields you find that young people are political in a different sense. It is as if

the basic feminist dictum that the person is political had been morphed into the common notion that knowledge is political. On one hand you have corporate pressures to make the university more openly into an agent of the reproduction of a capitalistic society. On the other hand, however, the university has become a space of self-critique, of critical thinking, a source of critiques of capitalist society and culture. In a way this critique has not been as visibly intense as before, when it focused on public policies, but now we criticize the very function of the university, the very forms of knowledge of the university. This is a very positive achievement.

M: Could you summarize the conflicts between the network of administrative power and the university as regards the situations of both students and teachers?

FC: University life is saturated by power relations at every level; these forms of power influence decisions in every field, from decisions about tenure to decisions about which students are accepted and debates over the very notion of minority and affirmative action; from decisions about curriculum and intellectual agendas to the distribution of funds to different schools. All of these decisions are influenced by and saturated by power. The paradox is that the university occupies that special space within society where independent learning and critical thinking are produced, but it's a prison that is defined and constrained by power relations. This tension between independence and dependence does not just manifest itself in the policies of the administration, or in the work of the faculty and students, but inside the very formation of knowledge that takes place in the disciplines, its agendas, and intellectual pursuits. Disciplines claim to pursue science or knowledge, but they seldom ask science or knowledge, "for what? for whom? on what basis?" Certain projects are being developed and not others. What questions are being asked? What research agendas are being promoted? Within my field, the social sciences, what are the theoretical schemes that guide our work? At every level, established structures of power are coercive. You enter a field and you work within certain kinds of theories and follow certain kinds of positions and actions that seem natural. Those theories are mostly developed in the West for the West in terms of its own intellectual projects, its own universality. You work within this framework and if you stop and think, perhaps you can decide "I'm going to produce this or that within this field," but on the other hand, you can decide, "I'm going to fight this or that." You know that if you're going to fight you're going to have problems getting a degree because your professor might think that your project is not following the canon or whatever. Once you publish it or you get the degree you might then decide to do something that might not fit in the discipline and you might not get tenure. At every level you

engage in self-censorship. You have to be fighting to be critical because knowledge formations are coercive, they are seductive, they are powerful. The same goes for art, where even innovations occur and are accepted in a field of power (Botticelli, Michelangelo, Picasso) yet there are other painters and forms of art that are not canonized; just think of magnificent African sculptures whose authors remain invisible. Who decides what high art is? A similar process occurs with theory. Western political and economic dominance means that Western knowledge dominates. But Western knowledge pretends a universality that it does not have. Part of the task of critical intellectuals at the university is to constantly challenge those forms of knowledge that are sanctioned not just by the administration but by their colleagues, by the air they breathe. They're always in some kind of tension. Luckily the university is the kind of space that offers that possibility of critical thought, and encourages it, even if it punishes you if you go too far. If you are too critical you are excluded.

M: How is the university related to space?

FC: It's almost an aesthetic relationship that is political too. Many universities in the US are isolated campuses, gated communities. Some of the most prestigious universities are like that. Think about Harvard, where you enter a majestic space; or Princeton, Yale, or Duke. Some universities are separated in this manner while other universities are more integrated into the communities, like Michigan, or NYU or The New School. These spaces evoke a different relationship between the university and the city. NYU is a wealthy private university yet it is not a gated university. CUNY's Graduate Center is just part of the city. You enter the center and you are in a very special place, but you come out and you are in the street, you see the life of the city and you form a part of it and people come in and out; it's a kind of open university. Every university occupies a sacred space, whether it's public or private, open or closed to the community—a space separated from the rest of society by different sorts of boundaries. Something special happens when you enter a university. The university is surrounded by an aura of sanctity. This aura reflects itself architecturally, whether the architecture tries to be luxurious, like Columbia's, or is rather simple, like that of The New School.

M: But that new architecture is more transparent and glass-oriented. Is that something that could be related?

FC: I'm not familiar with universities that are too glass-oriented. Most universities are not. They tend to be more monastic, old-fashioned things. But maybe I don't know the ones you have in mind.

M: It becomes a kind of extension of the campus creating security.

FC: You have to have those types of concerns. But in terms of architecture, it's funny. Most buildings are not too glassy and transparent, at least not the ones I'm familiar with.

M: The universities' evolution from institution to corporation causes them to physically extend more. Columbia to the north, NYU, Harvard. Do you have any thoughts on this?

FC: Columbia was always in the real estate business. I wouldn't draw a sharp distinction between the corporate university and the pre-corporate university. All universities are connected with the states' capital and politics and with corporate interests, it's only that now, over time, that this process has intensified and become more evident. The fact is that Columbia always had huge land interests in New York, and so has NYU and so has Chicago. Chicago was established by displacing an Afro-American community that was there, with its bars, its music and restaurants, and it continues to expand and to displace it. This is not new; it's an intensification of a process. We're seeing that this process happens in many US universities.

M: Is there anything you would like to add?

FC: You said you were thinking about universities mainly in the US. But I'm also concerned about the relation between US universities and those of the rest of the world. I know that major universities are being developed in India and China, but one of the things that concerns me is the growing gap between universities globally. I think that major metropolitan universities should try to seek the global democratization of knowledge. Being a global university should not just mean to be ever more powerful, but to be engaged in the globalization of knowledge production. Universities in this country have a responsibility to avoid the concentration of knowledge production within themselves. Because they are global and important like Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Berkeley and Michigan, they tend, by their own power, to attract scholars like yourself at MIT or myself at CUNY. Like monetary capital, cultural capital tends to reproduce itself. It is not only a question of brain drain, it's also a question of influence and knowledge that becomes produced and canonized in these places. I don't know exactly how, but I feel that one of the tasks of major metropolitan universities is to de-center themselves. They should establish connections with universities, intellectuals and students in the South in order to reduce the growing gap between wealthy nations and

their centers of power and nations in the South. In many places in Latin America where this gap has expanded, the quality of education has decreased. Research and basic science have decreased. Excellent scholars from Latin American end up going to France or to the US or to England in order to find better working conditions. The top US universities should not just be global centers of knowledge production, but of the global democratization of knowledge production.

Thomas B. F. Cummins

Muntadas: What is the distinction between academia and the university?

Thomas Cummins: Well, I think the major distinction between the university and academia is that you don't have to be in a university to be part of academia. You can have independent historians, independent scientists who have a relationship with academic interests. What I mean by that is they are not necessarily interested in or have a financial or utilitarian direction in the very banal sense of academic interests but are actually engaged in abstract questions of knowledge, whereas the university allows a space for that to occur, where there aren't outside pressures. The difference is that you have students, both undergraduates and graduates, who either want to go on as academics, inside or outside the university, or they want to go into a different aspect of it, such as curatorship. That's not to say that they're not academics, but if they want to go into commercial curatorial work it's slightly different.

M: Could you talk about cultural, economic, or knowledge-related values and the status-quo power accumulated by universities?

TC: Yes, power accrues to individuals who are attached to institutions if the institution is itself powerful, and Harvard is certainly a powerful institution. It has a great convening power; that is, it's universally known in the world as a place of learning and also as a place of political and cultural engagement. When you're attached to institutions such as that, you participate in that power, and it depends on how you want to use it. Do you want to advance knowledge, do you want to advance your own career? These aren't usually different but depend on how you see what you want to do. I came to Harvard from the University of Chicago. One of the reasons was that I was asked by colleagues in Latin America to go to Harvard to stay there because there'd never been a full-time professor in Latin American arts and there was a chance at Harvard, in connection with the David Rockefeller Center, to actually begin to build something that hadn't existed before.

M: Universities define themselves as institutions of higher learning, but lately they have defined themselves more as corporations too that exist, like many other institutions, in a mixed economy, both public and private. How do you see that?

TC: That's a very complex question and involves two major elements. One is an increasing instrumentalism by the students, in terms of their careers. They are oriented towards acquiring techniques, skills, and knowledge that can be deployed to the maximum in the economic sphere. Here at Harvard and at most universities you have very pre-professionalized students interested primarily in economics. I think the largest major here is economics, with about 780 students, whereas you have forty students studying classics. That is a significant change in universities, in that you are going directly into these pre-professionalized majors, which means that you don't have much relationship to the professors. They don't teach the students, they don't see them, they don't have many office hours, classes are taped, you don't even have to attend many of these classes until you get to the smaller, more specialized classes. So, is the university commercialized? Harvard has been for the most time, as the majority are. They have a brand name and they certainly protect the name Harvard as does Coca-Cola, as does Walt Disney, as does any kind of institution that has proprietary rights over what it represents within a kind of commercial world. The third part is the interest connected to business, culture, and cultural economy. All of those have intersections at various levels, whether it is through donations, interests that want to be promoted in different ways, or through personal relations with people who want to advance similar interests. It's a very complicated question, but it couldn't be otherwise in a capitalist society. How else is a university going to run?

M: In relation to that, donors, trustees, and institutional supporters are linked to the university affectively, sentimentally, but also politically. What are some of the implications here? How do you see this structure of trustees and donors that become a network to create links between them and certain subjects?

TC: Again, that is a very complicated question, in the sense that it's probably the most loaded question of any university that intends to be independent and free of influences. Faculty are in many ways kept apart from that, in that you don't have to negotiate with donors unless you want to, or you're asked to. It's not normally that direct a relationship between faculty and donor, as it can be as corrosive as it can be beneficial. Having said that, the interests of donors, the interests of politicians are always reflected in the university, but I've seen great courage at times by administrations who say, "Look, we're not going to do that, no matter what you ask us to do." It comes at a financial cost, it comes at a political cost, these things have to be weighed, measured in a *longue durée*, what it means to continue to have a university that can be as independent and as free a space for the advancement of knowledge as possible. It doesn't mean that it's pure. There is no such thing as purity.

M: To summarize this question, do you see any conflicts between the network of administrative power and the university?

TC: There can be, I've seen it, but there's also been a corrective to that as well. This is where the outside world simply sees the position of tenure as a privileged position, which is that senior faculty have great security, and they can do whatever they want to do. But it really is a position in which you can take a principle stand against the administration or some other entity. In fact, it becomes necessary to have that confrontation, so there is a balance of power between administration, faculty, and students, that I think is unlike any other institution, because of the ability to say freely, often, behind closed doors or in public, how you regard the situation between outside interests and those that are of interest to the university and that are not being necessarily well taken care of by the administration. That happens very seldom, but when it does happen it is an indication of the health of what a university stands for, and it is incumbent to have the relative safety of being able to say, without having recourse by the administration, what is right and what is wrong. It doesn't mean the faculty is right, it doesn't mean that the administration is right, but it does mean that there is a set of powers and balances that can be called upon, so, in my reckoning, that's very good.

M: When alumni become fellows or friends of the institutional college, as an Alma Mater, how does this system operate in terms of decision-making? You see a student get a degree and become part of a privileged group of affiliates. How do you see this relation to the exercise of a group pressure of future political, economic ventures?

TC: I think that institutions of higher learning do create an elite; that is, they are enfranchised by both the knowledge that they are accumulating the skills, and also meeting other individuals who will go off into the world to become part of that elite. I don't think that that's unusual in any social or cultural group. The question is, "What are the values that come along with the formation of that group? Are they values that are intended to solidify a corporate elite or intellectual elite in a way that maintains their hold on that, and can it be passed on through generations by admitting certain groups or not?" When it comes to admissions in the United States, and Harvard itself has changed dramatically in this way, it's not how admittance to programs are made, it's not about legacies, as they were once called, but it's need-blind admissions, and it has to do with the quality of the students themselves. That said, what are the values that you instill in them? One of those values is the ever important and continuing sense of critical questioning about what it is to be a citizen in a democracy. What

does democracy actually mean in terms of participation, not only for self, but for the Latin American community? I'm not sure that we've done as good a job in the last twenty years as we might have. We're seeing the collapse of values, or we're seeing the result of values that are not necessarily being enacted, that the individual has taken over completely the ideal of what it is to be a citizen, and self-wealth has come at the expense of a greater good. I think that's in the process of being corrected.

M: As to the relationship between the United States and Latin America—or between the United States and Eastern Europe, Asia, or other countries—part of this possible influence is brought about by the students who extend the colonization of corporate relations. For instance, if a student from Venezuela becomes part of the Alma Mater support group, does it affect the construction of the country if he becomes its president? This could be linked to relationships with the university itself and the extended role of the person in connection with politics and economics.

TC: My answer to that would really simply be anecdotal in the sense that this isn't a world that I work in, or know, in a concrete, analytical way. What I know is that alumni in Peru, Chile, or Argentina, who have a strong identification with Harvard, who often studied there and feel very proud to have taken part in that, come from all different political spectrums, which I think is really quite interesting. One of the things I was really impressed with was the growing interest in creating philanthropic institutions in Latin America in a way that had not been done traditionally. What I mean by that is public philanthropy as opposed to individual foundations, trying to replicate some of the institutions that really reinforce democratic institutions. That said, as the world becomes smaller, and universities and institutions like Harvard and other large, global institutions create a set of relations with people from all around the world that meet here—at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, which is a place where a lot of that goes on, or the Fletcher School of diplomacy at Tufts University. All of those have a way of creating networks intentionally, so that when people need to sit down and discuss problems and issues, they actually can do that.

I know that when I was the interim director for the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, we actually brought people together from Chile, Bolivia, and Peru to discuss, in a neutral place, issues of border disputes and problems, not to resolve them but actually to create relations so that when issues flare up there is a way of communicating with people who have something to do with that, be it the press, be it military, be it the political sector, be it the cultural sector. We had people from museums; the idea is that you have established at

least the possibility of dialogue between the individuals, as opposed to individuals who only represent their self-interests, or represent the interests of their own country, but don't know anybody's counterpart other than by name. I think it's a good thing.

M: What interests me about your answer is the political spectrum of most of the students at the cost of the university. Those who can afford a place like Harvard or MIT or Yale are people who come from a high class or the oligarchy in their own countries. Most of them are politically on the right side of the spectrum. It implies a kind of future participation in politics in their own country. They also participate in a group, and in the network of a group.

TC: It's important to point out that now it's not necessarily the ability to pay tuition to come to Harvard or to Yale, but it's rather the preparation that comes with having a certain social and economic status. If the family income is below \$160,000 or \$140,000, I can't remember the exact number, it's a sliding scale of what you pay, so it's not burdensome. If you were to come from a family that is making \$150,000 you basically don't pay any tuition as an undergraduate. If you've been admitted as a graduate student in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University, you are given a stipend and your tuition is paid so there is no financial burden. It really comes prior to that, which is having access to knowing English, being able to have excellent education so that you have the possibility of scoring well on standardized tests, as well as to be able to demonstrate that you can write, do analytical reasoning, etc. All of that comes from the preparation you have to be accepted. This is where the work on education at a level where students can be prepared in Latin America, as well as the United States, is critical to having a broader spectrum of not only political, but really economic differences. The question then is whether the political tendency of those who have access to these means to have education is --by and large, in Latin America, not the United States--right-wing. Because in the United States, left and right, has a very different kind of spectrum than elsewhere in the world. They are not, I'm assuming, as left-wing as some of the governments that now are in power.

M: The Ivy League represents a particular standard level of *connaissance*, awareness, knowledge, status quo. Do you believe in these implications? How do you see them in relation to public universities?

TC: I've taught at both public universities and at private universities. It's an interesting question and it has to do with the history of higher education in the United States. As you move from the East Coast towards land-grant universities,

and then to colleges in the Midwest and the West, you have an ever-increasing number of very, very good, if not excellent, public universities. I went to UCLA, which is an extraordinary place, with resources and faculty, and very difficult to get into. The university system in California is without par, the University of Michigan is truly a great public university. It's when states decided that their institutions would be supported publicly. It's only been in the last half of the twentieth century that you can see that state institutions and states such as New York and Massachusetts really began to recognize the importance of having state institutions of considerable resources and offering them to a wider group of students. That said, the Ivy League stands as a set of institutions that most students in high school who want to go on to do work at the highest level, aspire to. They set a standard, along with Berkeley, Stanford, Chicago, Michigan, and Illinois, but it does have a completely different feel to it. I don't think we have football coaches that are paid more than the president in any of these institutions. I don't think we have basketball coaches that are paid more. In other words, the large, public institutions have a representation to the public that has nothing to do with academics. As far as I'm concerned, and know, the alumni may be happy about the Harvard-Yale football game, and maybe the students are, but nobody really cares, that's not what is at essence. At the University of Chicago, for instance, one of the great uses of their football stadium was to drop football completely and for Enrico Fermi eventually to conduct his experiments in it. Subsequently it was torn down and the library was built in its place. This really made the University of Chicago the "Monsters of the Midway." I think that that's the really large difference, that except for Stanford perhaps, the great institutions of higher education put their emphasis where it should be.

M: This is interesting, because this is very peculiar to American universities.

TC: It's out of hand, and once the genie is out of the bottle it can't be put back in as now there is an expectation that you can be entertained by a university, that's what they do. They're in the entertainment business, for NBC, CBS, the sports channels.

M: It was a common joke in the 1970s that if David Rockefeller were to become president of the United States it would be a demotion for him, in the sense that his namesake, The David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard University, is emblematic of indelible and ineffable connections between academic pursuits and the global impact of social and economic institutions. How do you see the role of the center in terms of its relationship with Latin America? I think culturally, David Rockefeller was one of the people who bought a lot of the Mexican work now exhibited at MoMA.

TC: His brother did as well. It's very interesting in one's own personal history, having to grow up in the 1960s and 1970s and thinking about where you stand in relation to those in power and those who have a say about things. Coming to Harvard, working with John Coatsworth, director of the David Rockefeller Center, who along with David and Neil Rudenstine made it happen, you realize that someone like David Rockefeller is one of the old-time Republicans who have an understanding of what it means to have a mixture of culture, politics, and economics, in a way that is intended in the end to advance both social and cultural conditions. It's an interesting phenomenon that has made me think and rethink how I understood those relationships before, when I was outside them. I'm not sure I want to expand more on that, and not because I'm hiding something, but I haven't fully digested exactly what that is, as you work through a whole set of relations, trying to accomplish certain aims that you feel are justifiable, honorable, and should go forward.

M: How do you see the evolution, especially in relationship with our context, of interest in Latin American art history versus other areas, such as European art history for example? Over the last few years we have seen that interest increasing; by way of example, MoMA opened a department of Latin American art.

TC: I think it's a complex question, certainly; there have to be people who have the resources to advocate for such positions at MoMA or here. As somebody working with Latin America, I see this as being of importance and growth, partly because people understand that demographics in the United States are changing. There's a much greater amount of immigration from Latin America to the United States so there is an understanding that this is a community that needs to be addressed in terms of its own cultural heritage. It's not just a European heritage, it's a heritage that's mediated in part by Europe and in part by cultures in Latin America. As the United States changes dramatically, this is why this is being pushed forward on many fronts, and that's different from Africa and Asia, to a degree. Nonetheless, there is strong support for Asian Studies, and Cultural Studies, and increasingly contemporary African art, and we have somebody who teaches that and is working on that as well. We've taken our students to Africa, to Darfur, to the contemporary fair, so we try to keep this as balanced as possible, but outside of Harvard the increased exposure to Latin America in general is very complex. Some people have the resources, collected this material, and want it to be part of the history of modern and contemporary art.

M: Like Austin, Texas.

TC: Like Austin, Texas, like MoMA, etc.; but there is a receptivity to it, at a political and cultural level, that is much broader than that.

M: In a way, art as a concept belongs to production, to artists, but also to critical aspects, universities, art historians, criticism, curatorial staff. Then the system recedes more and more, and disappears. We're talking about the same thing, but the perspective is very, very different. One thing is the practice, another thing is the theory, and another is the economy. How do you see that these three parts are interrelated, especially if we see them increasing over the last twenty or thirty years?

TC: We saw a decrease last year. The contemporary market is falling apart and Sotheby's and other institutions are having a very difficult time. Nonetheless, you're right. The first publication I ever had appeared in France, called *The Role of the Marxist Art Historian in a Capitalist Society*, and it tried to discuss the kind of issues confronted by somebody doing a critical, historical study in a field that Clement Greenberg said was attached to the umbilical cord of gold. There is no other field in the humanities that is quite as directly a part of something of extreme universal equivalent, value, at an economic level.

At the same time, it also represents the antithesis of that, the aesthetic values of the disinterested, if you take a Kantian kind of view, then there is a certain kind of understanding of the work as something that is expressive of values that are not economic. But at the same time, you understand that for the artist, for the world of the arts to continue, now completely embedded in the market system, is the idea of patronage. The old systems of advancing art in a culture have given way to a free market system, and that includes both ancient and contemporary. All of this now is negotiated through the market. The only mediating institution or ideology is national patrimony, what belongs to a nation that is inalienable, and is therefore above and beyond the market system. This is very interesting, because you're going back to nineteenth-century nationalism and the definitions of identity through cultural patrimony and objects in particular, in relation to a global economy that sees almost everything as a commodity of one form or another and so you have two really very competing interests; a national patrimony and free market system. Contemporary art, by and large, operates solely on the free market system, and that's why it's probably been hit the most; also, because of overproduction. But, at a certain point, if you step back you see that there is an overriding concern about objects staying in institutions and places where they are, whether it's paintings that are long-standing and the university begins to sell them; and then you have reactions, whether it's the Rose Gallery here at Brandeis, or it's the sale of the painting in the Philadelphia Historical Museum. Be that as

it may, there comes a point when these works have more than mere economic value, even though they go into the market. Then comes cultural patrimony, which says no matter how much you can pay for this, it is not available for the market. Then, of course, what you have is theft.

M: What about the production from the university?

TC: My field is not contemporary art, but I think it would be just impressionistic, anecdotal, in the sense that the relationship between contemporary art, its production, the university, and the market is really one that's extremely fraught for a variety of reasons. Bringing pieces into a collection, for example, already begins to legitimize certain kinds of works. That's inevitable, there's nothing you can do about that. It's the same thing as deciding to focus your analytical attention on a contemporary artist, who does have sometimes quite remarkable...

M: Implications...

TC: Yes. That's the nature of the beast. One thing that I think has been somewhat overblown in the last ten years, that I've seen, and this is again anecdotal, is a kind of entrepreneurial curatorship in the contemporary field, where you have impresarios almost as mediators between shows, collections, galleries, and writings, in a way that I think has always existed but is now exacerbated. And I don't think it's been as critical as it might be.

M: I think this was a characteristic of the 1980s.

TC: And 1990s.

M: A kind of hybrid between critic, curator and impresario, under the idea of independent curator. I think the idea is good, but Harald Szeemann in a way invented that. In other hands it could perhaps become another multiple complex.

TC: It's a very difficult position to navigate, to maintain a critical distance and to maintain a level of analysis that does not fall into pat ideas that might have currency within the university on one level and then become re-circulated as fast or interpretative models that sound good but actually are undressed.

M: The logical model would be that people from the same generation, from the theory and the practice, could be more acquainted in terms of understanding certain of the subject matters, or the tools, to try to bring light to an audience, to orient it, although not in terms of values of the market.

TC: I would agree with that. I think the contemporary field is the most difficult to operate in.

M: Is there anything you would like to add? Maybe something that I didn't ask or that you feel you need to address?

TC: You gave me the space to amplify. I think being in any position of power, any position of decision-making, really has to be seen with some modicum of self-reflection regarding what it implies. Sometimes you have phenomenological experiences of being in meetings where you are looking at the meeting from outside, as if saying, this would be a meeting that I might very well be critical of and yet I'm participating in for the reasons I defend. That's it, the lights are on.

M: That's a good ending, we have light.

Diane E. Davis

Muntadas: How do you see the relationship between academia and the university? Do you see differences? Do you see similarities?

Diane Davis: I'm not a linguist and I'm far from prepared to offer a clear definition of what academia is and how it might be distinguished from the university, but the first way I'd respond to that question is by thinking about the latter as an institution. Institutions have structures of hierarchy, authority, power, financing, and other objectives and constraints that define and limit their operations. Although academic institutions are a particular subtype of institution, academia as a concept is distinctive, referring more to a knowledge network or circle of ideas and people connected to each other and to the pursuit of the life of the mind. Such networks and intellectual commitments do not have to be bounded by formal institutions, but they often flourish within academic institutions.

M: If we talk about the values (spiritual, cultural, economic) that are related to knowledge and its distribution, the university accumulates a status quo power for those connected to it. Would you like to comment on that?

DD: As somebody who studies countries outside the United States, I would say that it depends on where those universities are located, how they are funded, their institutional histories, and the larger societal and political context in which they are embedded. In general, many institutions accumulate power and universities are a particular subset of institutions that accumulate certain forms of power. In some countries universities have historically held more influence, visibility, and reputational standing than in others, although the types of power they wield may be different for a variety of reasons. In the United States, some of what gives universities their concentrated power and authority in today's world is the way they often work with the private sector in the development of the economy and in the service of market innovations. In Latin America, where I have lived and studied, universities are more autonomous and have fewer connections to the private sector, with their reputations historically linked to the world of politics and art and to their capacities to produce public intellectuals. In Mexico, a country I know quite well, the main public universities are known for their autonomy and have historically defined themselves as the sites for debate and criticism of both the state and the market. But as times change even this is in transition, with liber-

alization and economic crisis limiting government support for public education and with private universities growing in numbers, market influence, and overall reputation. In short, it all depends on context, history, and even the larger economy. These make the functions and reputations of universities different, leading to different forms of knowledge production and different types of power, which may change over time. This is already clear within the United States, where different universities have different reputations, sometimes based on their regional location or history, and where a few select universities have become known for their cultural or intellectual influence as well as their capacity to influence the worlds of politics and economic policy.

M: Do you think there is a difference between public and private universities?

DD: Generally speaking, public and private universities have different relationships to the worlds of power, but that does not mean that their functions are entirely different or that they automatically produce different forms of knowledge. Although I am now teaching at a private university, MIT, I received my PhD from the University of California, so it is on that basis that I feel I can say something about public universities. In terms of power, in California the public university has influence in certain decision-making circles, but until recently it was very limited and circumscribed to California and the types of people involved in politics and public policy in California. It has not historically garnered the kind of national global standing that Harvard or MIT has, but it holds influence in its own circumscribed region. It is true that the Clinton and Obama administrations have tapped some key economists and public policy personnel from the UC system in recent years for national positions, so this distinction may be on the decline. What is unclear is whether these trends are eating into the stated mission of state-level public universities, which is to serve the general citizenry and not merely the elite and to give opportunities for students to produce knowledge for the public good. Historically, such mandates have not necessarily governed private universities, although the irony is that in today's world sometimes private universities are able to achieve these aims more easily than public universities. This may not only occur during times of fiscal crisis when the public university has limited funds for meeting its mandates, but also when public opinion establishes conservative constraints on what universities can do or teach. In California, there are sometimes limits to what public oversight bodies of the university might approve in terms of curriculum or operating budgets because of the need to be accountable to the general public. Paradoxically, you might not find the same kind of constraint in the operation of a private university, if it is fiscally autonomous and not dependent on a state budget that is approved

by publically-elected officials, although there might be other forms of constraint owing to the hierarchical structures of authority, alumni, funding, etc. Every case is specific, but there are some general patterns that lead us to believe that in the best of all worlds, a public university would be in a strong and unencumbered position to promote knowledge production for the public good, with the latter very broadly defined.

M: Universities are defined as organized institutions of higher learning, but lately they're seen more as corporations because of their relationship with economics. There's a certain link between knowledge and economics. Could you comment on that?

DD: I do think that the pressures on universities to function like corporations are growing. In the twenty-odd years that I've been teaching, I have started to see this pressure more and more, and it does have an impact on decisions: who gets hired, who gets to stay, where the universities invest their money, etc. This is because, like corporations, universities want investors—or donors—to stay committed so they can guarantee a steady revenue source. In contemplating this question, I am thinking a lot about the university that I know best, which is MIT. I don't know Harvard as well, but it is in the same category: a leading private university with world-class research that has a mission and a mandate and needs a constant flow of funds to achieve its aims. Maybe the educational mission and mandate actually serve a larger public good, particularly now with need-blind admissions; but because these leading universities are complex institutions with many educational programs and needs, and they need to compete in terms of salaries to attract the best faculty, they are often governed by corporate logics of efficiency in administration and the need to generate and focus resources for maintaining institutional visibility and reputation. I don't want to speak for Harvard because I don't know it well enough, but like all private universities, my university has to worry about generating income, and because it's a science and engineering school, the financial resources required to run labs and fund research are enormous. Those of us who are in the "softer" side of MIT, such as the School of Architecture and Planning, tend to see the down side of the corporate model more because we tend to be on the farthest end of the trough and our research does not generate the kind of grants, donor interest, or market payoff that innovation in science and technology often does. I do think that this happens in all universities, i.e. the establishment of a pecking order of funding priorities, and I wish there were ways to avoid the pressure. The institute leaders will tell you that they need to balance the budget and make decisions about what is best for the university as a whole, which is true; but it is hard to shake the sense

that a corporate logic creeps in everywhere. I would like to ensure that this logic doesn't get in the way of supporting knowledge production even in non-revenue generating fields.

M: The institutional corporation of the university has this structure of donors, trustees, and institutional supporters, all linked effectively through the university; sometimes sentimentally, sometimes politically. Could you describe some of the implications of this?

DD: Sometimes alumni or donors have a historical relationship to a university and for this reason will be very generous with their funds, but often they want to target the activities that they are already interested in, so there may be unanticipated consequences in terms of which research or knowledge is supported and which isn't. If left unchecked, this tendency could institutionalize support for ideas or domains of research that accommodate conventional wisdom, or that appealed to prior generations rather than spearheading support for new research. You need money to innovate for the future, but you also need academics and university administrators who know their subjects well and can inspire alumni and donors to get excited about experimental methodologies, new ideas, and unconventional innovations. Not all alumni have retrograde ideas, but many are confident in their own priorities and they give money to things that are already important to them. Often alumni are governed by ideas that trace to their generational experience, or that remind them of the university they used to know. But if a university wants to constantly reinvigorate itself, and transcend old boundaries or move into new research areas, it needs strong advocates who will support that, and that's the biggest constraint of alumni-based funding. At MIT we've had alumni support for innovative things, of course, so that doesn't mean that all support from alumni is backward-looking.

M: To summarize this question, do you see any conflicts between the network of administrative power and the university?

DD: A good university and a good university administration are constantly aware of such conflicts, including between university goals and donor preferences, but are able to live in that world, and will actively try to create some space for maneuver, despite these tensions. Most upper-level university officials and major universities are pretty savvy at being able to manage such conflicts; if not, they're usually out.

M: Alumni become fellows or friends of the institutional college, as an Alma Mater.

How does this system operate in terms of decision-making? You see a student get a degree, become part of a privileged group of affiliates—a network—how do you see that in relation to the exercise of a group pressure on future political and economic ventures? I'm thinking of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, where a lot of people are learning their politics. They have something to say, with an opinion and also with action.

DD: And when they talk, they often have the power of the university name behind them, even if they are speaking on their own behalf. Let me return again to the cases of Harvard or MIT: these are world-class universities, and people who come here from across the US or around the world have doors open for them when they go back home. They may use this access for personal gain or to insert themselves in positions of power, thus reproducing existent power structures. On the other hand, an alumni network or alumni from an institution like Harvard or MIT could in theory use the power of the university name to do something very unconventional or even revolutionary. They don't always have to reproduce the standard structures of power. It's important to remember that the potential is there, and whether it is used has a lot to do with the education you give to the students when they come to the university. Professors can help determine whether students will return home and use their knowledge to reproduce or challenge structures of power; it may depend on whether and how you make them aware of those things when they're here. Of course, in some universities the students who enroll are from families of power in the first place, so it's hard to know whether there is any independent impact of the university. One of the things that I like about MIT so much is that we do have a very open admissions process, selecting students less on family legacy and more actively on merit or an unusual academic profile. A surprising proportion of the incoming freshman class every year at MIT are the first kids in their family to go to college, which is amazing. So we're not only talking about families of power who are sending their kids to a prestigious university. If you can get those kids to be involved in projects with those that come from families of more privilege, they are all exposed to the same sets of learning processes, and thus there is some potential to shake up conventional power structures. I know I'm straddling a fine line here. I think there is a danger that prestigious universities will reinforce existent patterns of power and influence, but there is also the opposite possibility, at least for students who are willing to use the prestigious name to challenge the status quo or do something really different.

M: It was a common saying in the 1970s that if David Rockefeller became president of the United States it would be a demotion. This is emblematic of indelible

and ineffable connections between academic pursuits and the global impact of social and economic institutions. Do you have any comments about the status quo of donors, or committees that wanted to be part of this group, the “happy few?”

DD: The power and influence of donors like David Rockefeller can be a big draw, because it helps create a larger network of wealthy or influential people who maybe didn't go to a particular university but want to be connected to it because folks like Rockefeller identify it as an important institution worthy of support. I'm just a plebeian professor and I don't run in these circles of the big donors, so it is hard to know for sure. But to me the big issue I think I alluded to earlier is autonomy; how many programs within a university that are funded by wealthy donors have the autonomy to follow academic freedom and to support their students and faculty projects in the ways they see fit? I think that a good donor base is important for achieving these aims, as long as the donors don't want to get too involved in micro-managing research aims. In some sense, the scenario that you're painting could be the ideal scenario. If donors are giving money to a university program or institute so they can hang out with the David Rockefellers of the world, and then they leave the money here at the university in order to get that access, that's a positive thing. If they want to get involved in censoring the projects or programs where their money goes, I think that's problematic. That is why we need to recognize academic freedom and the importance of struggles over them.

I was a fellow at the Rockefeller Center at Harvard, twice, so I know a little bit about how it operates. I'm very grateful for the time I had there. I met some really exciting, interesting people, some in circles of power and some, like me, professors doing research. One of the things that I like about the Rockefeller Center, or certain types of institutes that are funded by external donors with global reputations, whether they're foreign or domestic, is that the name was so big that the center didn't need an agenda, it didn't have to be the David Rockefeller Center for Biological Innovation, or the David Rockefeller Center for Stem-Cell Research. It became the David Rockefeller Center for Latin America and it was to me a big umbrella that allowed more autonomy amongst the people who ran the program. The faculty it hosted and the intellectual world that was built showed a great degree of pluralism. I don't think we see that kind of agenda-free donating much anymore. A lot of people give money for a certain idea or a narrowly defined program or project, and there's less room for interdisciplinary experimentation and pluralism. The Rockefellers were one of the first great philanthropic families, and they supported universities long before the drive to over-specialization became a trend. The world is a different place now. Maybe philanthropists aren't as willing

to turn over to the university the complete control over what to do with donor money. Now it seems that there may be more strings attached to funds, even quasi-legitimate strings having to do with overall research focus. For example, if we think about Bill Gates, he's funding certain well-defined projects, so the capacity of the donors to put their imprint on what they will support and what they won't support is something different now. In the light of these historical changes, I highly value the Rockefeller Center and see it as more of a model for philanthropy than some of the other ways of funding universities that dominate in the present.

M: A lot of departments at MIT are involved with heavy research in physics and electronics. How do you see that particular interconnection of departments with certain interests of different kinds, be they military or Department of Defense? I would like to have your take on that.

DD: I came to MIT a little over eight years ago, and before that I spent fourteen years teaching at The New School for Social Research in New York. If we had a continuum of universities, MIT would be at one end, and The New School would be at the other, particularly in terms of defense funding. In fact, somebody said to me when I took my new job, "Oh you're going from the heights of social science to the heights of rocket science." I mention this because it addresses this question about funding. I taught at Harvard, too, and received my Ph.D. from a public university, UCLA, and all four of these places are very different institutions with different relationships to the principal funders of heavy research in sciences and technology innovation. For historical reasons, MIT tends to be much more tied to government money—a lot of it is Defense and State Department money—as well as other national institutes, like NIH. From my limited view, it seems more tied to these resources than most of the other universities I am familiar with, because the university was built primarily around science and technology, and these fields were identified as important for national defense and the national economy. That adds a different dimension to the university. I am pretty far removed from the defense-oriented types of research projects because I'm in the School of Architecture and Planning. Yet I have never felt any major negative impact on my work or on my own scholarship. Maybe this is because my research subjects are unrelated to national defense or the economy, science and technology, but whatever the reason, my work is quite marginal to those who control these larger funds of money.

One negative impact I do recognize, however, especially as somebody who is a social scientist, is that we have an overhead rate at MIT that is calibrated to reflect the fact that a large proportion of the research at MIT is being funded by govern-

ment agencies. We have a sixty-five percent overhead rate, which is applied to all grants, no matter who funds them. If you work in the fields of social science or art, to get a foundation to pay more than half of what they're spending on something besides direct research is almost impossible. This is a crudely practical response, but that is really where I feel the difference, because I rely mostly on donor foundations for my research. As somebody who studies Latin America—you come from Spain?—what is surprising to many people here is that private donors are so important to the university, and that there is not more federal money, because in most countries of the world it is the federal government that gives the money, not private donors. So MIT is a funny institute that way, because it does have a large degree of federal funding, but it is often directed towards certain types of projects, and this makes overhead rates so high that many private donors themselves are alienated, although private donors themselves are absolutely necessary for the university mission too. It's a complicated if not paradoxical situation with both pros and cons.

But back to why I mentioned The New School—we had no money from the federal government because we didn't sponsor science or technology research. We didn't have much research that would support market or business development either, and for historical reasons the faculty themselves weren't very pro-business, a situation that set both opportunities and constraints in terms of external funding. I felt like we were constantly struggling for money there, but at the same time, we were forced to be very creative about the ideas, and when we received external funds for research we were able to undertake projects that were what we really wanted to do, and not just what private donors or the funding agencies were looking for at a particular time. Now, after all these years, and nearing a new stage of my career, I wouldn't say one model is necessarily better than the other. I would say that they serve different purposes for the production of knowledge and for individual faculty at different times in their life. At an earlier stage, when I was at first an assistant professor, it was a challenge to be looking for external money from foundations, but it forced me to be very entrepreneurial in a scholarly sense, to think about new ideas and to engage new audiences in ways that I wouldn't have had. If I had been in a place where I knew I was going to get money for my lab and I knew if I defined a project I would definitely get money, I might not have been so creative. Now, I have my reputation established, and I don't mind searching for support from standard funding organizations, because I know how to frame my research in a way that pleases us both. But that does not mean I am always successful. Thus one wants to have faculty and students and administrators recognize those competing tensions between the originality of an idea and its potential for funding, and to help faculty with both aims so that universities remain vibrant places for new knowledge. How one manages this mix will be different at every university.

M: I'd like to bring in the question of self-criticism. Some people in universities are actually public figures, opinionated, and sometimes we are not critical enough of the institutions in which we work. Would you like to consider that?

DD: It's a really interesting question. It's a huge question. I know plenty of people at MIT who share the progressive values that you see expressed by public intellectuals outside the university, but not all will use them to criticize the university, and I would include myself there. In addition to concerns about alienating administrators, I wonder how much of that has to do with the ways in which we live in "modernity," that is, we actively differentiate the spheres of the world we live in so that we tend to separate our work world from our political world, or from our home world. Maybe it's a problem of modernity, or maybe even of the American context, and not so much of universities, or MIT and the faculty there. Perhaps people think there is a place for their politics and it is not necessarily integrated into their research. There's a differentiation of domains, that's what I mean by modernization.

M: For example, at the beginning of Media Lab it was very clear. Media Lab students would come with their grant from Korea; they didn't know what they were working on and they were very happy to be here. They were working on a chain process that they didn't know the final product of, and it would be maybe partly sponsored by the Department of Defense or a corporation. This fragmentation keeps everybody in their own territory, but this is a strange moment of globalization. It seems that thinkers are thinking globally, but that within the work structures they should know all the different parts of their own projects.

DD: The supply chain. That's interesting because then you could ask the question, "How much of that is a product of how universities are structured institutionally, with that explaining why knowledge is fragmented?" In this case, we see that the Media Lab is in our school, the School of Architecture and Planning, not in the School of Engineering or Science or even Humanities and Social Science. What happens then is that this set-up institutionally reinforces a fragmentation: those working on these projects are isolated from others in science and technology, but also from the social science departments and their logic. These different approaches are really not well integrated in our school. So part of the problem is lack of integration, and universities can do a better job of creating institutional structures that allow for more knowledge production along the lines that you're suggesting. But then there's also education itself, the content of education. Such knowledge is what universities are supposed to be doing; teaching people how to make these connections, global and otherwise, even if the institution itself doesn't

make it easy. That's our fault, whether at the university or in modern society. We are not teaching people to put the pieces of the puzzle together.

M: As an architect, I'd like to ask you about space, and working with the space. I think the university earns some of its heritage from a monastery typology, such as with its long corridors. Each one has its own typology, something between monasteries and prisons. Do you have any comments on that? Think about the physicality of the university, why MIT has their columns, why Harvard wants to be Oxford, why there is this idea of relationship to associate the typology of architecture with a certain kind of definition of representation.

DD: In the interest of full disclosure, I'm not trained as an architect, and I would call myself an urbanist, so anything that I say I'm sure a bona fide architect is going to jump all over. But I do study space, and the use of space in the built environment, although more on the urban scale and not necessarily in terms of buildings. I do pay attention to them, however. When I went to The New School I had been teaching at Harvard. I was interviewed at The New School for Social Research and I remember coming back from my interview with some trepidation. All the great intellectuals had been there—Eric Hobsbawm, Hannah Arendt, Agnes Heller, Richard Bernstein, Charles Tilly—intellectually it was an incredible place. Yet I remember coming back from my visit and telling my husband about the building where I gave my talk and met the faculty, “It doesn't look like a university.” The New School was housed in an old department store on Fourteenth Street, in the Village in New York, and I had been using ivy-covered, red-bricked, and quadrangled Harvard as my frame of reference. Later I came to appreciate the fact that the physical space The New School inhabited was so nondescript that it encouraged a full engagement with the life of the mind. That is, our intellectual life spilled over and into the space instead of vice versa, so I really appreciated that. At a certain point, you don't think of the environment as being important at all, because you connect up intellectually through the personal relationships and scholarly debates. There are some nice buildings there, of course, including a Bauhaus building that The New School owns, but this was not where the graduate faculty was located. When I moved to MIT, the buildings were strikingly different. This was at the time when Bill Mitchell, the past dean, was building Frank Gehry's Stata Center and he was really trying to upgrade MIT with architecture. I heard the tail-end of debate on campus between the scientists and engineers who said things like, “We don't need beautiful buildings, all we need is another Quonset hut,” because this was a type of architecture that embodied the mentality of engineering in the 1940s. The view was that MIT is a place for innovation and problem-solving, not the aesthetics and class power of

iconic architecture. They weren't using that language, of course, but sometimes these beautiful buildings are not about knowledge; they're about what you were suggesting earlier, about power.

What is interesting about MIT is the tension about the buildings themselves. Even in our school, the School of Architecture and Planning, a lot of money is spent. We have new spaces that many of the architects love, but I was always suggesting to our chair or dean that I'd rather spend that money on graduate student support than on a new building or new spaces. If you're in a place where there are different tensions about the built form or aesthetics, that can actually spill over into new tensions about knowledge, and power, and privilege, so I think MIT has a lot of loose ends about the built structures.

M: Bill Mitchell was conceiving the campus like a city, where they wanted to have different names of architects. It's a tradition with Saarinen and I. M. Pei; you could see that the specific architecture could add some elements. I think he was very happy in the barracks because when you are in them you feel that you are out of the university.

DD: Exactly, when you are in the Stata Center on its internal "street," you feel that you're outside, but at the same time, connected to the university, so to me that connection of the inside and the outside world is very powerful. That's what I mean about MIT. It's a composite in a variety of ways. It's not totally glorified as isolated from everyday life, and it is not necessarily seen as hegemonic in terms of architecture, power, or privilege. Harvard is slightly more iconic in this way, perhaps because they've had more money and a longer history of establishing visual coherence in these regards. Integration of styles is an important idea in architecture, but the possibility of allowing for a little disorder is a good thing. An avoidance of too much comprehensive matching and programmatic structuring can create a very vibrant, intellectual environment. In many ways, MIT is like that; maybe not consciously, but because there's no consensus about what type of physical setting is best, and that ironically might help produce a more lively environment.

M: Nowadays universities are evolving into corporations and are involved in city planning and gentrification: Harvard with Allston, Columbia with Harlem. What is your opinion on that? What are the economic and gentrification implications of the university's action on making city and building territory?

DD: MIT is involved in East Cambridge, and we have our own plans and projects, although not as huge as the Allston project, perhaps because we don't have that

kind of money. Usually major research universities have such plans. MIT seems to be directly connected to the start-up world, so there are a kind of ethics and politics of urban development related to office-space in the areas surrounding the university. That's one thing that I don't want to comment on too much, because I don't know so much about the start-up world. Because of my expertise as an urbanist I like to talk about other dimensions of it, not so much the content of the research that sustains start-ups, but the fact that the university is involved in transforming the surrounding neighborhood. I think that it goes two ways. Renovating troubled neighborhoods can be a good thing, but not if they displace people without remedy. MIT is helping generate investment in a formerly industrial area, not necessarily a residential area, so the tensions are not that great. The story is different for Harvard in Allston, and historically it is different from most other town-gown conflicts. The University of Chicago had this struggle all the time, with the Black Panthers around them. If the university is seen as a corporation and corporations need money to generate revenues, and if the university is also planning for growth in the future, they will need space. The question is how to manage this without displacing local people and generating antagonism. You can understand the logic of universities and appreciate their forward-looking aims, but you also have to understand the logic of how these goals can affect the world or destroy the physical domain that surrounds you. I think a more plebeian or knee-jerk response to this would be that universities shouldn't physically expand because there are people with cultures and histories in those neighborhoods. I understand that critique completely and a lot of my colleagues in urban planning work on keeping gentrification to a minimum, so I'm all behind that. But there are other ways to see this. I work on the question of urbanization at different scales, linking it up to globalization, and one of the things that I'm constantly telling my students to think about is the scale of action and what they're trying to accomplish. Sometimes keeping your nose only to the small scale and the community around you may be penny wise but pound foolish. In other words, you could protect an area, but what is a longer-term vision of the project that will bring growth or opportunities, not only to the people who live around there, but for all of Cambridge or Boston or New England? The global world makes us think about scale in a different way than we used to in the past, and I relish more discussion about these questions, about universities in their neighborhoods and communities, because our view of this is kind of pre-modern—we've looked at it the same way for about fifty years. That is not to say that I think that MIT or Harvard should bulldoze local neighborhoods and evict their residents, but there has to be more knowledge and more debate on the table about the pros and cons of expanding, and what process makes it most just and equitable, not just in the present, but in the long term. Those are really difficult

questions to deal with, and I think, because they're difficult, the best way to deal with them is through the most open process, have the most people involved in the most pluralistic discussion.

M: If historically the church was important in the development of cities, do you think universities are now determining the extent of transformations? How should we view the relationship of power between the master plan of a city, the city's own interests and the implications of an institution or corporation having to change that master plan? I think this is happening everywhere. The master plan of São Paulo could be changing very quickly, for economic and political reasons. What is your take or your experience of that?

DD: It's true. I remember when Harvard made the announcement about buying some land in Allston. I remember being shocked reading about it in *The Boston Globe*. I was not involved in any of the politics, and I'm not taking a position, but as an urbanist I remember being stunned that the Boston Redevelopment Authority sold Harvard this large plot of land at a relatively modest price. This made it easy for Harvard to expand, and one wonders whether something happened there. It could have been a really good plan, I don't know, but the ease of the purchase raises questions about the institutions involved, in addition to planners for universities, and who was available for representing the visions of the community and the neighborhood. I do agree with you that just thinking about these questions should convince us that communities and cities where there are universities need to be more vigilant about expansion, because it may be true that universities are the new religious institutions in terms of visibility and economic power, particularly with respect to its associations with urban land. Some of this owes to ideas that are generated within the university itself. For example, here at Harvard we have Michael Porter arguing for innovation strategies built on clustered activities that link universities and businesses in physical space. The Cambridge-MIT alliance seems to be built in part on Cambridge University's desire to do what MIT has done: i.e. embrace cluster theory and the potentials for economic growth that come from linking universities to business start-ups. Then there is Richard Florida, and his ideas about the ways that economically successful cities are creative cities with arts and education, among other things, with the university clearly playing a role in sustaining such a profile.

So everybody is writing about the important role the universities play in growing the economy and the culture of a city. Everybody wants that—everybody wants more culture, and everybody wants more economic growth, but then you have to raise the question about the trade-off. In order to counterbalance the possibility that someone would just come in and argue for a massive change, or that city

managers might just say, “Well I read Richard Florida, I read Michael Porter, I know that this will be good for the community so let’s accept it,” there needs to be more involvement from below. What can be done—and this is something that I think is really great that MIT is doing, and Harvard is doing it more too—is to foster a more equitable, or two-way, engagement with the community. To get back to your very first question about the difference between academia and the university: if we think about academia as a world of networks, built around ideas and knowledge production, and if universities could play that role with surrounding communities themselves, and create new activities that open the world of ideas and knowledge to people who live in the neighborhood, residents may be more likely to get engaged in the long-term planning for the area. MIT has started doing this by strongly supporting the Cambridge Science Fair, and now we’ve opened a theater down on Massachusetts Avenue in Central Square with experimental programming. I think those are all positive things. That doesn’t mean that the interests of some small, third-generation Portuguese family that lives in East Cambridge getting pushed out by real estate are going to be taken care of with these two particular activities, but I think it widens our understanding of the meaning of place and the relationship between the university and the community.

M: Thank you very much.

Brad Epps

Muntadas: Would you make any distinction between academia and the university?

Brad Epps: I think it's a largely semantic question. I think the terms are used by most students and professors interchangeably. I am fond of reminding my students that "university" means "turning towards the One," "uni-versus," and as a result the increasing specialization or hyperspecialization that imposes a rather atomistic model is quite notorious here at Harvard. It has created some problems for a more interdisciplinary, interactive understanding of the university without turning to the One. Beyond that, I am really skeptical of the "academy" in terms of great institutions, which are more present in Europe than in the United States; in Spain, the Real Academia de la Lengua, and so on. They tend to be arbiters of the word or the truth. I have great problems with those organizations, but in common, everyday practice there's very little substantive differentiation.

M: If we talk about values—spiritual, cultural, economic—related to knowledge, we see that the university accumulates a status quo power. Would you like to comment on that?

BE: I've been at Harvard University now for eighteen years; there is no question that it has a great reputation. Its reputation is intimately linked up in power and money. It's not by accident that it's the world's wealthiest institution. As a result, as I've said in one of the articles I've published, the private, Western university space is that which is arguably least capable of doing a thorough questioning of these very questions that you raise, regarding the imbrication of politics, economics, and free thought or research in any number of other subjects.

M: Universities define themselves as organized institutions of higher learning, but lately the university has come to be seen more as a corporation. Could you comment on that?

BE: There is no question that that is happening. I can only speak as a humanist, someone who works on literature, cinema, the visual arts—the humanities understood broadly, philosophy, critical theory, and things like that. Humanities are particularly embattled in universities throughout the world. With respect to the university that I know best, the one for which I've been working for so

many years, I have indeed seen an increasing corporate model, a concern about the numbers of students in classes, a way in which success is understood in those terms rather than anything else, so that the courses that attract two hundred, three hundred, four hundred students are rather perfunctorily presented as the most successful.

The fact is that in virtually all of those cases, true instruction, face-to-face work, goes on between graduate students and adjunct faculty, not the professor celebrity. Along with the importation or the implantation of a corporate model there is also the importation/implantation of a model of celebrity, or academic stardom, which is not by any means always linked to involvement in the public sphere. Noam Chomsky would be a figure of that sort. I'm referring to more discreet "academic stars" who end up holding a lot of disciplines hostage, so that new thinkers and new thoughts from less wealthy parts of the world often fall off the screen.

One of the things that I work on are Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies, and I've noticed that even among Latin Americans and Spaniards the theoretical texts that are deployed are almost exclusively those that are produced within the United States, Great Britain, and to some extent France and Germany, even though there are some quite extraordinary thinkers from Mexico, Cuba, Argentina, etc. The corporate model, in the case of Harvard University, which has had some less than transparent practices in its acquisition of land for expansion in Allston and Brighton, has also been quite controversial; its employment practices, particularly around a living wage, have reinforced the notion of a corporate university. In fact, at Harvard, there is what is called the Harvard Corporation, and one of the stipulations in the bylaws is the proper use of the trademark, "Harvard." What one can say about it, how one can use it, remains a question, so I think there is a shady space there regarding the limits of what one can say about the university, how one can deploy the name of the university, and how someone who is employed by that university can present him or herself to others.

M: This has also happened in other institutions, such as the Museum of Modern Art, that are very proud to be the filters controlling their own image. Donors, trustees, and institutional supporters are linked to the university effectively, sentimentally, but also politically. What are the implications here? Perhaps we could define it firstly, as a creating network, and secondly, as a more economic interest.

BE: Of late I've taught in Sweden, Germany, France, several places in Spain and Chile, and soon Holland and the Czech Republic. My colleagues find it rather

bizarre that I will use my sabbaticals to teach in other universities in other countries but I actually see this as part of an ongoing process. I'm fifty, so I'm not that terribly old; I've long been concerned about a type of provincial attitude regarding the understanding of the university, even among scholars who move around the world. Most of them have had very little time in the classroom in other countries. One of the things that I've learned is the degree to which the alumni matter in the United States, *vis-à-vis* pretty much any other country, and the power of alumni associations. I call it a fetishistic attachment to the university, and nostalgia is part of that. Fetishistic and nostalgic attachment to a university, shot through with sentiment and feeling, but indeed the sentiment and feeling can be very wisely activated on the part of fundraisers to raise money. I think it bears nuancing; I've been working for many years along with my feminist colleagues here at Harvard to create some space for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Studies. This has by no means been easy. After creating networks between graduate and undergraduate students and staff and people, even in the administration, lower-ranking administrators as well as colleagues of all ranks, someone approached me and said, "Brad, you've done a good job, bringing all these people together, but you're forgetting a very important contingent, and that is the alumni." Indeed, in this case, there's a Harvard Gay and Lesbian Caucus. It's quite powerful and active, and they've been instrumental in working to raise money for an endowed visiting professorship. In order to do that, we had long negotiations with members of the Office for Alumni Affairs and Development. It's one thing to raise money for the university, and it's another thing to raise money for certain targeted projects which clearly create more questions among administrators who would prefer that the money simply arrive at the university and they could then use it in any way they deemed fit.

There's a visible effect and it has to do with the presence of names on buildings; it has to do with a certain status to be gained by someone giving money, with the expectation that their name will be enshrined in the university on a building, such as the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies. There are many, many other examples like that.

M: There are all these different levels.

BE: Years ago one of the deans kindly suggested that in the light of my rather strong student evaluations I open myself up to less minoritarian issues. So the premise was that the problem that I was facing was that I was focusing on minoritarian issues—women's issues, issues of race, of sexuality—and that it was just "too bad" that I wasn't able to bring my pedagogical expertise to bear on a larger group of students. My first response is that perhaps I've had good

evaluations because I've been working on these minoritarian themes with a relatively small group of students—that is a luxury, and I'm aware of that. But my experience at this university, which has a reputation that at times is quite oppressive and counterproductive to intellectual thought, has really been from marginal programs. I'm currently the chair of the committee on Degrees of Studies of Women, Gender, and Sexuality, a program that was reformed from Women's Studies, to acknowledge changes in the field. It's a complex, interdisciplinary field. We don't have departmental status, so all of the faculty who are in that program have joint appointments. That means that we have to attend twice the number of meetings and fill out twice the number of forms than many colleagues who are members of full-fledged departments. There's no question that there is a hierarchy of departments, with departments such as Economics, and to some degree History and perhaps Psychology, receiving the lion's share of appointments and boasting the largest numbers of students. At Harvard there are about seven hundred students who concentrate in Economics.

I remember Larry Summers, in one of the three debates that he and I had. I was the director of the Public Service Leadership Conference, and in one of those debates President Summers speculated on the advisability of maintaining small programs, in Sanskrit or minoritarian languages, and so on and so forth, so that the problem there was clear: the number of students. And I responded by saying, "The problem could also be those departments that have very large numbers." We need to reflect on why so many students enter this university and within a year and half (until recently, within the first year) are required to declare a concentration, and an overwhelming number choose Economics. Is that for intellectual reasons? I don't think so. I think it's for reasons of careerism and a path of least resistance from Harvard University to Wall Street and other areas of personal enrichment, and, indeed, I do find that troubling. I think that there are profound divisions within the departments, within and between the programs.

M: How do you see the trustee and donor structures that become networks in order to create links between them and certain subjects, and to benefit themselves?

BE: To benefit themselves? I know precious little about the trustees. I've been at Harvard for eighteen years, and it's somewhat of a feudal guild system; it's very much couched, there's a lot of secrecy at this university. A lot of decisions are made from the top down, and I speak as a tenured faculty member, as a full professor. But the true impact, the role of the trustees, is something that I don't understand, I haven't been privy to that. There are materials available for public consumption; one can learn a certain amount about it, but I've had no direct contact with these people. I have had contact with alumni as donors. In this

much more restricted field, I really have not had any contact with what I would call the movers and shakers of Harvard, who tend to be interested in disciplines that are, on the whole, not the humanities.

M: In connection with that, as old alumni become fellows and friends of the institutional college, as an Alma Mater, how does this system operate in terms of decision-making? You see a student get a degree and become part of a privileged group; how do you see the ties with the exercise of group pressure, of future political and economic ventures?

BE: There's no doubt that there are networks here, that there are power networks at Harvard. Even a cursory glance at the power brokers in the economic sector, the political sector—by which I also mean the governmental sector—the legal sector, the medical sector will show many, many people affiliated with Harvard. Barack Obama is the latest example. I believe he studied at Harvard Law. There's an entire culture, I would almost call it a cultural myth, regarding certain elite universities. Back to the earlier question about the academy and the university, I would actually talk about universities and note any number of distinctions, public/private being the most obvious, but also the size of the university, its location, whether it's urban or non-urban, what region it's in—whether it's in New England, the South, or the West. All of these things matter. There are programs, for example, in Texas and in California that are much, much more attentive to Native American or indigenous culture than at Harvard. There's no question that there are powerful social networks that are generated by universities, and by Harvard University in particular. It's a self-replicating power structure, and even with some of our more progressive politicians, it's interesting to note how many of them have had some sort of affiliation with Harvard or Yale or Stanford, some of the Ivy League or select elite schools in the United States.

M: As regards the relationship between the United States and Latin America, could we speak of extended colonization or corporate relations? For instance, a student from Latin America becomes part of an Alma Mater support group. Does this affect the class structure of his own country, and if the answer is yes, how?

BE: We would have to ask about the class provenance of the student. It may not be surprising that many of the international students who have historically come to Harvard have been from the landed and most powerful classes. Many of them have been part of oligarchic families in their countries of origin, so that the class structure there has not been as questioned, let alone as disrupted, as one might believe. The international student is not equivalent to the immigrant who

is coming in search of work. There are clearly students who manage to come with fellowships or scholarships who are not part of those upper classes, and the university has made some strides in the last few years for open admissions, or admissions in which the financial status of the parents or the students is really not the question. But this continues to be the case at the Rockefeller Center, for example. The number of leading political and financial figures who come in and out of the university is undeniable and these people are not always exactly trailing clouds of glory. Many of them have complex and perhaps suspicious dealings in their countries, and in this country, just as many people at Harvard do as well.

M: It was a common joke in the 1970s that if David Rockefeller were to become president of the United States it would be a demotion, in the sense that his name-sake, the Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard University, is emblematic of indelible and ineffable connections between academic pursuits and the global impact of social and economic institutions. Do you have comments on the David Rockefeller Center, on the implications of the status quo, and on implications with regard to Latin America?

BE: Those contradictions are quite apparent for anyone who knows anything, or even very little about what's called economic history in an international framework. This also occurs in the realm of art. One could think of the Frick Collections in New York, one of the most glorious private collections of art in the country, perhaps in the world, and the provenance of that art is an entirely different story. It'll take you back to a history of class conflict, of economic injustice, and I think those trails could be taken back to Brown University, with the man who gave his name to that university, and any number of other institutions. The question then becomes, "How feasible is a progressive critique of these histories, while working within the institutions that still carry their names?" I think there's a sort of embarrassment for many people, and yet this embarrassment in most cases doesn't create an obstacle. There is a tendency to certain self-congratulatory rhetoric that would push to the side this sort of genealogical or historical revision of the ways in which various entities, various institutions, come about.

I'm very aware of the contradictions of my own work in such a place, not merely the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies, but much more powerfully, Harvard University. I haven't resolved these contradictions or questions, and they're ongoing for me.

M: As a participant from inside the university, how do you see your role in terms of self-censorship? How critical are we of our own institution? Could you give me your thoughts on this?

BE: There's no question that there's extraordinary self-censorship. There's a sort

of narcissistic attachment to elite universities, by which I mean the way by which the meritocracy perpetuates itself. Again, Larry Summers, in one of his very throwaway comments, said, “Well everyone who is at Harvard, certainly everyone who is a senior faculty, deserves to be here, there’s been this rigorous vetting process.” There’s no doubt there’s a rigorous and very attentive vetting process, but the notion that that means that all of us who are here are, perforce, the best in our fields is absolutely absurd. There’s a very inflated rhetoric in many of the Ivy league universities and other select universities—Stanford, Chicago, Duke, perhaps Johns Hopkins—and it’s something I have long noted and struggled with. People who can be absolutely brilliant can be extraordinarily penetrating when it comes to deconstructing or deciphering the contradictions in any number of areas other than the place of their own work, their places of institutional enunciation.

In some respect being a gay man, and being gay during the mid 1980s, when it really wasn’t that easy, and grappling with the very extensive notion that all of us were going to die of complications from AIDS anyway, before long, gave me a different take on this, and I suppose I was less fearful about raising certain questions because I had a greater fear, a more existential or ontological fear about my own mortality. That crisis, for many people, subsided just like the crisis of tenure. It is commonly said to junior faculty that they should mind their Ps and Qs, they should maintain a relatively discreet position, not become overly involved or overly invested in any number of social or political actions, anything that smacks of activism, even public service. Many of these junior faculty learn that lesson all too well and end up perpetuating it into the future.

Harvard’s motto is *veritas*, which is a very high-sounding Latinate way of grappling with the more vernacular, colloquial truth, and a lot of times, the vernacular, colloquial truth that implicates us is really not at the center of reflection here.

M: The pursuit of knowledge cannot be disentangled from the political agenda; economic resources sustain the social project that engendered them. Do you have any comments on that?

BE: You’re right to say that it’s not merely about the right and the left. I would desire to situate myself on the left, on the side of progressive thought, on the side that is secularist, that deeply questions nationalism, that looks with a critical eye, looks at questions of economic justice, the redistribution of wealth, and along with the distribution and the redistribution of wealth, the distribution and redistribution of knowledge. I’m very painfully aware of the contradictions of undertaking that work within the institutional framework in which I find myself. What I’m saying right now can then be troped in a heroic manner, which also I

find quite offensive. It galls me that some of us who are working on subjects that are of less visible economic benefit can then present ourselves in a heroic guise. I find that really troubling as well. I don't see anything heroic in the work that progressive academics are doing within the academy; I see it as necessary work.

M: There are two questions that come from reading your paper. You explored the concepts of Hispanist, Latin Americanist, and Hispanic Studies. How do you see that these groups are positioned, or how could they be defined?

BE: The piece to which you're referring I wrote while working as a visiting professor in Lyon, France, at the Université Lumière II, and I was very desirous to work with a group of French graduate students who were studying Spain and Latin America, as I had done in Germany or Holland or Sweden or other countries. My stay was interrupted by student protests regarding the proposal by Villepin for the contract of first employment that would have allowed employers to dismiss anyone under the age of twenty-six without any justification. This was an open door for all sorts of racist, xenophobic, homophobic, and classist expressions to riot. The students responded by closing down the university at which I was teaching, and indeed, most of the universities throughout France.

As I was having a conversation with the Dean of Harvard regarding what courses I would be doing, as I would become director of Women, Gender, and Sexuality, I saw students clashing with the police right outside my window. This brought home to me the stakes of education, the precariousness of the global economy, Bourdieu's notion that the overwhelming majority of human beings live in a state of perpetual precariousness. This is not the state of full professors, tenured faculty, and I do think that this creates a problem. It doesn't mean that what a tenured faculty member does or says about these issues matters not, but it does render their position difficult, if not suspect, and calls for more sustained self-reflection, self-interrogation, and questioning of the degree of self-censorship or a certain decorum in the name of truth.

M: Do you see an evolution of interest in Latin American Studies versus European Studies, and if so, is that interest also for economic reasons?

BE: I realize I didn't answer the question about Hispanism, Latin Americanism, and Hispanic studies, but I can link it to the one you've just asked. These disciplinary formations or configurations have an international dimension. Often as not, the complexity of that international dimension is lost, and it's lost by way of very embedded practices. I remember when years ago I was offered a job at Utrecht in the Netherlands, and a colleague here at Harvard, who shall

remain nameless, was simply astonished. She said, "You'll be out of the loop!" I said, "What loop is that?" There are different loops in different places. As an American, having been born and raised in the Appalachians in North Carolina with a family of very limited means, I was actually quite interested in living in the Netherlands, and of having my loop becoming more European—that is to say, less American, less what would be expected of me. So there's no doubt in my mind that International Hispanism or International Latin Americanism or International Hispanic Studies is more an ideal than a reality, because the presence and power of the US academic system, along with that for the British system, to a considerable degree, is such that even the greatest Latin American intellectuals tend to fall off the screen. I'm ceaselessly astonished at the degree of ignorance among my Spanish colleagues living in Spain of any and all things Latin American. I've been working with a number of colleagues on Film Studies, Literary Studies, and Women's Studies, to try to mix things up a bit. There are ways in which the elite academic power systems that are at the center of these conversations have presented an image of the international even as they've suppressed it. They've rendered it less truly and completely international.

Having said that, I think the David Rockefeller Center really works very hard to attend to Latin America in all its complexity and not merely to Argentina or Mexico, or a couple of the other countries that are more populous or more powerful in their gross national product. Brazil would be another example. There are efforts to do this, and there's a recognition of problems here. Another one of the difficulties has to do with ways in which students are recruited, specifically graduate students, in Europe or Latin America. Many of my students were holding down a job as they were studying. They did not have full fellowships or scholarships; they had and have very few employment opportunities. The Modern Language Association in my field is a clearing house for most people who study Spanish Literature, French Literature, American or British Literature, and there are all sorts of complaints about the problems in the job market, the ups and downs in the numbers of the jobs available.

The situation in other areas is starkly different, and it raises some serious questions about the lengths to which we go to recruit students. Increasingly, over the past eight or ten years, when speaking to prospective graduate students who may be interested in coming to Harvard, they would tell me about the money that Princeton was giving them, or the money that NYU was giving them, or the money that Stanford is giving them, and it vitiates the entire conversation. It pushes it in a different order. I did not go into the study of Spanish and Latin American literature to make money. I understand that people need to have money and live, but I'm concerned that programs in a relatively small discipline such as Hispanism have been unable to work together in order to stave off this economic

competition among the programs. There are many ways to do that. It could be by inter-university collaborations, so that it doesn't become so momentous for one student to go one place or another. I don't have any quick answer to this, but I do think that it's time for professionals in any given discipline to come together and really take a long, hard look at the practices by which we recruit students and the way in which we hold out monetary rewards to them.

M: It's like the influence of soccer and football.

BE: Absolutely. This is part of the celebrity culture, the academic star system, in which one will play with a possibility of employment elsewhere in order to increase his or her salary. That is certainly happening. What was happening at the level of the graduate students is part of a much larger picture. There is no question that here faculty, and indeed people who are not faculty, administrators (I'm thinking particularly of money marketers) are making million dollar salaries at an institution that is supposedly non-profit and enjoys tax-exempt status. I have serious questions about individuals who profit very nicely while working at these tax-exempt, supposedly non-profit institutions. There was a lot of controversy about the salaries being paid to money marketers, people who are raising money for Harvard. Now all of this has shifted and you get Larry Summers. It's not just David Rockefeller who would've seen the presidency as a demotion. Larry Summers, I'm certain, saw the presidency of Harvard as a demotion as his true interests were in the political sphere. He now criticizes the use on the part of some of these banks and businesses of monies to pay huge bonuses; formerly, he wasn't critical. The response was, "Don't be naïve. We need these people who make these huge amounts of money for the universities so you can put on your little symposia on art, or literature, or indigenous culture, or lesbian/gay whatever." That's still pretty much with us, I'm afraid.

M: To return to Hispanism and Hispanic Studies, have you seen in your career a shift of interest from European to Latin American Studies?

BE: Maybe Europe is exhausted, but maybe the Monroe Doctrine has been re-invigorated. I do wonder about these hemispheric initiatives or programs in the Americas that would look less to Spain and Europe. Africa, is, by the way, perfunctorily discounted, which is another story. It is called Transatlantic Studies; the line is diagonal from Latin America to Spain or Europe and back, and some will add the north-south line from the United States to Latin America and back up, but there's another line, the transatlantic between Africa and Latin America. The traffic of slaves is the most notorious of those relations.

Whether or not in a language class, somebody is taught Spanish (a Castilian, an Argentine, a Mexican, a Cuban, etc.) I think that there's been a general recognition of the value of this diversity. That wasn't the case when I was a student. I remember a Puerto Rican friend of mine being chastised by the faculty about his Spanish, and mine, which is non-native, was presented to him instead as a model. There are some perverse plays there, but that particular problem is not as acute as it once was. The other question about the possible exhaustion of European thought or European models is a more pressing question; it tends to play itself out, in ongoing and often highly personalized, even nasty, debates regarding critical theory and field work, or more grounded work that may be of a more social, political or anthropological nature. I've actually thought and written about this, that the critical theory contingent will over and again adduce European philosophical models. Bourdieu, Badiou, the moment of the *maîtres à penser* has passed. Most of them are dead: Derrida, Foucault, Lacan, Barthes. In the 1970s and 1980s they actually broke open, in some respects broke apart, a much more stultifying, philological model. Then they became institutionalized quite quickly in their own right, and one person after another would talk about the groundlessness of thought, and the status of the subaltern subject, in which any reference to historical, sociological, anthropological, economic, or political data had to fall prey to *nuestro americanismo*, a certain fetish of presence and so forth.

This is still playing itself out, and the claim on the part of many Latin American and some Spanish intellectuals, writers, artists, professors, and students, is that it's not that there is no philosophy in Latin America, it's just that it is produced in a different way, that the literary is not as inimical to philosophical or political or social thought as it has become in an Anglo-American and, perhaps, European framework.

M: You mentioned Africa and I think that is an important consideration because most of the different programs are totally dismissed. That in a way reaffirms that if it's not an economic investment or economic relations it is out of the loop.

BE: I'm collaborating with a colleague at Bates College and another at Hofstra University, I have two Galician colleagues ... this is the kind of inter-institutional cooperation that I think is possible. In other words, each one of us managed to come up with a little bit of money, but together we were able to finance the trips of four Equatorial Guinean writers; at Hofstra, my colleague Benita Sampedro has organized a really quite extraordinary three-day symposium on Equatorial Guinea. They want to bring attention to a country in Africa, the smallest country in continental Africa, but the one country in which Spanish enjoys co-official

status.

I'm sick of hearing even very well-educated Hispanists say that Spain lost its last colonial possession in 1898. That's absolutely untrue. Indeed one could argue that Spain still has enclaves in Morocco; this is a very controversial subject. To bring attention to this is something that I think is possible and important to do. I don't want to kid myself, however, that the organization of a symposium of a series of visits is in and of itself going to be the solution, but I do think it's a step in reflecting on this. Equatorial Guinea, interestingly enough, is of interest to the United States State Department and other entities because of petroleum, but the situation of the country is quite dire. We need to think more truly internationally, more globally, and not only just repeat certain catch-phrases—"the exhaustion of global difference" or "it's an accomplished fact of globalization." Bourdieu says that globalization is Americanization. I think he has a very good point. What I would argue, though, is that it lets Europe off the hook. Spain is the second-largest investor in Latin America, and any number of sectors and people have spoken of a neocolonial endeavor. Prat de la Riba, one of the founders of a certain brand of Catalan nationalism, called for Catalans to educate themselves *a la americana*, and he didn't mean Latin American, he meant North American. He talked about a type of nationalism whose highest modality is imperialism—not imperialism of military might but an imperialism of culture, cultural imperialism, so Europe is most definitely still implicated in imperialistic endeavors.

There are ways, and I wonder and worry a lot about this, that my own endeavors are going to be perceived as part of an imperialistic project. When I taught in the south of Chile, in Valdivia, I was petrified with the way in which I was going to be perceived by the students. As I suspected, there was a great deal of suspicion and skepticism, and I think that's healthy. I think that a professor who confronts suspicion and skepticism is compelled to respond to it and that is not something that we confront in our daily practice at universities in our own countries. That experience of working through those perceptions, those stereotypes, those generalizations, and those assumptions, was incredibly enriching for all of us involved. I had a student at the end who said, "Well, you've changed my view not only of literature but of the United States as a much better place." And I said, "Listen, I'm very happy that I've made you appreciate literature a little bit more, but maintain your skepticism about the United States."

M: Art these days is very much involved in a certain kind of construction of fear. It's an industry, actually. I found a quote from MacArthur in connection with the Korean War, and he was already saying this. After the Cold War it was already present in the relationship between Khrushchev and Nixon, and since September 11 it's been increasing. How do you see this?

BE: There's no doubt in my mind that the George W. Bush administration was

based almost entirely on the politics of fear. You could add avarice, you could add cynicism, you could add a smarmy patriotism; the patriotism is just rather shocking. It is me-my-mine, rather than we. This facile, knee-jerk demonization of socialism, of the redistribution of wealth, is really quite astonishing. The general climate of fear, which is manifested most concretely but at the same time most diffusely in the figure of the terrorist, actually dovetails rather nicely with other more discreet and decorous fears: the much older fears that civic involvement, social action, let alone activism are inimical to intellectual inquiry in its purest form, that the ivory tower must be defended at all cost, that—God forbid—the gate should be broken down.

During the Living Wage Campaign at Harvard University in 2002, a very high-ranking member of the administration called me, concerned about the students who were occupying the president's office, and asked me a non sequitur. "Where is my office?" so I said, "It's in Boylston Hall." "What floor?" he said. I said, "The third, why?" "Well, I suppose the flames won't reach there." I said, "What do you mean?" "Well 'these people' are hooked up with these anti-globalization people that have created havoc throughout the world, and they could tear down the gates of Harvard." And I simply responded, "Well, then leave the gates open, don't close them, and they're not going to be pushed down." This was one of the highest-ranking officials at Harvard, responding to me about a cause of social, economic justice, nothing less than the living wage.

I had students calling me a communist and telling me to leave the country. I brought out my Marx and others to show how inimical the notion of a living wage is to communist and Marxist thought: it basically allows the worker to have enough to live on and to perpetuate the system. There is indeed an extraordinary amount of fear here, but it's a fear that precedes the contemporary problems of global terrorism, or the so-called clash of cultures, and it's really very much bound up in a meritocracy, in a sense of a select few. I really do think that it can take us back to one of the founding moments, and founding rationales, of this and of many universities.

M: A question I asked a biologist I interviewed was, "How much research in biology could be affected by a right-wing or left-wing position?" Do you see a similar situation in the humanities?

BE: In the humanities it's much more difficult to appeal to some objectivity, usually cast as scientific objectivity beyond the vagaries of politics. When you're dealing with literature and art, even the notion of art for art's sake is not devoid of political and economic ramifications. I don't think it's surprising that a lot of the so-called culture wars have been played out in the humanities, although,

clearly, the social sciences and the so-called hard sciences have been implicated, particularly if you think about in vitro fertilization and stem cell research, and so on. Is there a gay gene? There are any number of other polemical, or problematic areas of study, but I think in the humanities, in the beleaguered status of the humanities in general, the easiest reason to say that they're embattled is their use, understanding "use" in the sense of employment, of how one can get a job and make a living with philosophy or with art, or with the analysis of a literary text from the fourteenth century, or something like that. Those problems are being played out throughout the university. There are a lot of people who are clearly doing extraordinary work, and clearly doing courageous work, and have pushed ahead regardless of the opinions of politicians, political pundits, and the arbiters of common morality.

M: Is there anything else you would like to add?

BE: I think this line of questions is extremely important; I wish it were more frequent, I wish it were almost a part of a daily plebiscite or a self-critique, and a critique of the institution and institutionality, in general. There's a way in which even the recognition of contradiction can become naturalized, and it can become, in some respects, other than contradictory. It just allows for the system to perpetuate itself. I wondered to what degree, frankly, intellectual work might not be buttressed or might be complicated productively by work that is not purely intellectual, by work that may be, admittedly, more "hands on." Certain social scientists, particularly anthropologists and sociologists, as well as many scientists, have very different modus operandi than humanists; many of the scientists work in groups so that, day to day, they're collaborating with people. Many of them are actually working with materiality. However—and I think this is a challenge for humanists and humanism—humanists have tended to work in an increasingly individualistic manner, in which the prize is the longer CV. I think that we in the humanities need to find ways to have collective projects, to recognize collective projects in this vetting process for tenure, the golden apple of most academics in the United States and many elsewhere, which tends to dismiss or to underestimate the importance of collaborative work, and indeed, of an essay, so it becomes a single-authored book. There's something that bears intellectual reflection about these models and also the intellectual endeavor, which is not buttressed or complicated by something more material that has to be interrogated more rigorously. The difficulty is wrenching people out of the learned practices and the sense that the only way to really have a place in the academy is a much more individualistic, neo-liberal path, or productivity and hyper-productivity, which often means that a university professor's "work" is anything but teaching and advising students.

Just two days ago, a student said to me, “I know you’re on sabbatical. I’d really like to talk to you, but I don’t want to take you away from your work.” I said, “Well, this is what you need to know. Working with you is my work, advising you is my work.” Clearly he had previously learned a lesson, I think a very unfortunate lesson, that academic work takes place outside the classroom, beyond collaborative ventures, and really with an eye to increasing an individual CV. I think there has to be a lot of soul searching among academics; again, from my perspective, among humanists and Hispanists in particular.

Flora González

Muntadas: In your opinion, what is the distinction between academia and university?

Flora González: Academia is the bureaucratic institution, the economy of the institution, the interest of the institution, where the university is. It is the space that allows students, scholars, and all kinds of knowledge to circulate. Mainly, it allows different opportunities to go beyond academic boundaries.

M: Let's talk about the spiritual, cultural, and economic values related to the act of knowledge and the status quo of power that universities accumulate, for those involved in it.

FG: I've been fortunate enough to rise through academe in a privileged way. I went to institutions that allowed me to choose my jobs. I had to fit within the norms of academic requirements through the tenure process. During that tenure process, I wouldn't say I censored myself but I limited my research boundaries so that I would be tenured in the academe, whereas after having received tenure I began to feel I had a freedom to choose my subjects more widely. I'm of Cuban descent and I'm very interested in studies of Cuban culture and the Caribbean. Before getting tenure in the field of literature in the United States there was an unspoken pact that if you wrote about Cuban culture, you wrote about Cuban culture in the diaspora, not in the island, because of political reasons. So I chose to write about South American authors before getting tenure, and then, after I received tenure, I began to retrain myself as a Caribbeanist and as a Cuban studies person. Since then I have translated Cuban poets, I have written a book about Cuban women producing culture in Cuba, and I continue to do that. That's how my trajectory has been determined by academic limitations.

M: University is defined as an organized institution, but lately it's also been seen as a corporation, because of the relations between knowledge and economics. Could you comment on that?

FG: For individuals to find a place in the university there has to be a way of following all the mandates of the university in economic terms; in other words, not everyone gets to work at the university. In the last ten years or so there's been

great limitation of scholars who, for all kinds of reasons (sometimes political reasons based on their place of origin, sometimes based on where they got their degrees and so on) might not be able to find a place in the higher echelons of the university. The university really picks and chooses its members very carefully, based on whether they have occupied the right places within the institutional hierarchy, and the steps to get to that place. Very often, people who begin at privileged institutions end up getting jobs at privileged institutions. Those who don't go up that university-privilege ladder don't make it into the spaces of the university. Then that economy limits the individual. Also in a more global sense, universities have an agenda, based on their economics and the people who support the university, and the faculty are often seen as the rebels who have to go against the institutional support that they get from the outside.

M: Donors, trustees, and institutional supporters are linked to the university affectively, sentimentally, but also socially and politically. What are their implications when it comes to creating a network and obtaining economic support?

FG: I can give you an example as to the power of a board of trustees at an institution, like Emerson College, where I work. About three years ago, we had a search for an endowed chair in Art History. One of the people who sat on that search was the donor, who was also a trustee of the institution. There were many people, faculty and administrators, who participated in the search, but the donor, having instituted the endowed chair, had a great deal to say as to who was hired for the position. That's a very direct way in which the board of trustees and the donors might have power over academics and over who gets hired at an institution. For a while at Yale University, where I received my degree, all the graduate students who taught at the institution were trying to unionize. There was a big battle between them and the private institution that chose not to allow the unionizing of its members because they were considered as being trained at the institution. The union, which is one way in which faculty and other individual members working at the university can have some power within the institution, is very often diluted or canceled by the power of the board of trustees and the institution itself.

M: Do you see any conflicts between the network of administrative power and the university?

FG: Yes I do. The university, at least as it has been defined in the twentieth century, is a place where multiple points of view can be shared, and very often the people who hold the economy of the institution are able to macro-manage and limit the freedom that people are seeking. In the recent past we have seen

institutions who have had difficulty bringing in controversial speakers and controversial figures, such as world politicians. For many years, Nobel Prize winner García Márquez could not be invited to institutions in the United States because of his relationship with the Cuban government. There is still a managing of what ideas get disseminated at the university.

M: Former alumni become fellows and friends of the institution of knowledge, as an Alma Mater. How does this system operate in terms of invisible decision-making forces? If you see students here get a degree, and they are part of a privileged or affiliated group, how do you see that in connection with the exercise of certain group pressures for future political, or maybe economic ventures?

FG: Well, generally the alumni who return and support an institution are people who have gone to occupy places in the most conservative institutions of government, in economics, and in all kinds of organizations, either in the field of the arts, medicine, or journalism, because to have power within the university they must have accumulated a great deal of wealth. It doesn't always work that way, but wealth sometimes comes with a much more conservative agenda, in terms of what they're willing to accept within university institutions.

M: In relation with Latin America, affiliation groups made for students and participants of big universities have become a power structure of decision-making. Students from Venezuela, Brazil or Puerto Rico maintain relationships with the university in recognition of the Alma Mater and a support system. Then it becomes a kind of class structure in their own countries and is affiliated with this network. Could this become a relationship of extended colonization or an extended corporate and political connection between the United States and South America?

FG: Absolutely. I taught for a couple of years at the University of Chicago, where it's very well known that the School of Economics has strong ties with economic institutions in South America, particularly Chile, with the Chicago Boys. There is a very close relationship between South Americans from the oligarchy who come to study in major institutions in the United States and the power and the prestige that they garner by being connected to such North American institutions. In the case of Chile, the connection with the School of Economics at the University of Chicago was highly instrumental in creating and supporting a dictatorship that lasted many years in Chile.

M: A popular joke in the 1970s ran that if David Rockefeller became the president of the United States it would be a demotion. This is emblematic of indelible and often ineffable connections between academic pursuits and the global impact of social and economic institutions. Do you have any comments about the figure of David Rockefeller and the implication of a status quo, especially with South America?

FG: Teaching in the Boston area at Emerson College, I've been connected with Harvard University through the Rockefeller Center and the W.E.B. DuBois Institute for African Diaspora Studies. My sense for the David Rockefeller Center is, at least for those of us who are connected with the center in the United States, that we tend to receive the benefits of the wealth of the Rockefeller family.

M: Do you see this as problematic in any way?

FG: I really don't have enough information to be able to comment on that specifically, but within an institutional university environment there is a sense that a very conservative economic endowment allows for all kinds of so-called liberal research, study, connections, and so on. There are all kinds of very heavily subsidized, very conservative institutions that are used by academics in either liberal or progressive ways to do their research going back and forth. However, I am very conscious of how that wealth also contributes to oppressive means in South America. It's a very contradictory ideology.

M: I would like to return to the question about Cuba. How do you see the academic, political and cultural influence of the relations between the United States and Cuba through the university? Politically, there's an embargo. How is the university acting in that situation?

FG: Universities as institutions don't engage in any kind of influence that they may have. Large institutions in the United States would have a great deal of influence with the government, in terms of establishing at least a flow of knowledge between Cuba and the United States. Generally, the university waits for other larger organizations or faculty-organized institutions to lead on such questions. The Latin American Studies Association, for example, is one of the few organizations that is not connected to the university specifically but which has lobbied very heavily against the economic embargo and has done a great deal to help specific scholars throughout the world who are being persecuted for the kind of work they are doing. Institutions themselves do not engage in this at all, and it's only under a great deal of pressure from other organizations that institutions may

begin to engage in a dialog that deals with actual policy change. I'm talking about policy change because universities allow forums to take place about the subject, but they don't in themselves engage in any policy change, and given the kind of power that they have, they definitely could.

M: The pursuit of knowledge cannot be disentangled from the political agenda and the economic resources that sustain it, or the social project it engendered. Do you have any last comments on that?

FG: Particularly in the United States, where we have a government that through the NEA and the NEH purports to allow creative minds and scholars to go beyond ideological boundaries set by the institution, we have definitely seen how they have been under attack. Artists and scholars are always pushing at those boundaries, but ultimately it's the scholars or the creative minds or the creative workers who have to bend under the pressure of the economic and institutional powers.

M: Is there anything else you wish to add?

FG: In my academic career of almost thirty years I can look back and say that I have very often had to self-censor my own research and scholarship in order to get through the hoops of the university, of academe, so that I could eventually be a lot more outspoken. It's taken me at least twenty-five years to feel as if I can do the research that I want to do, and that I can speak openly regarding the place of education in this country. When I was beginning my career I certainly felt that I couldn't do that.

M: Thank you very much.

David Guss

Muntadas: Do you see any similarities and differences between the university and academia?

David Guss: When I think of academia, I think of the structure of the university; in other words, the way that the administration works, the way that departments work, the way disciplines operate. When I think of the university, I think of the overall physical structure of place. I do think of them as being different; the university as a place, and academia as the infrastructure, the intellectual, the bureaucracy, disciplines.

M: In the framework of the university, we talk about values: spiritual, cultural, and political. How are they connected with knowledge? How do values interweave with power within the university?

DG: That's a good question in terms of knowledge, because when you think about academia as I described it, you see the way that the administration of a university, the deans and different disciplines, create knowledge. This is not necessarily the way students within a university receive knowledge. A whole structure exists outside of the classroom which is probably much more important in terms of what's actually imparted, in terms of knowledge and behavior, and especially values and ethics, in the creation of a whole individual. That's very much a part of the structure of the American university, as based on the British university. There's a real difference between the way American universities are formed and founded as opposed to continental universities, which Latin American universities are much closer to.

M: The structure of the university is moving from that of an institution to that of a corporation, and this has a lot to do with economic structure. Would you like to comment on that?

DG: Many people certainly depend on universities for their livelihood, so its ability to function successfully depends on its ability to obtain enough income, enough support, and enough of an endowment to be able to do that. If you think about it in the performative way, there's a kind of behind-the-scenes activity in terms of what makes everything actually work. The ideal that people promoted

about the university is that it's about knowledge and values, and that somehow we are in an ivory tower, separated from the real economic world. That's the conceit of the university but the fact is that we know that that's not the case and we know from what's happened over the past year and a half that we're very connected to the global markets, so the universities, particularly private universities that are very dependent on their operating budget and their endowments, are really struggling right now. We're looking much more behind the curtain than we did before, because usually people don't think about that when they're at a university.

M: Donors and trustees are linked to the university, creating a kind of network. How do you perceive this network system? It's not only connected to economics but also to the use of power.

DG: It's about the trustees and how you become a trustee, so there are many trustees that are very unsavory characters. Hans Haacke exposed the same type of behind-the-curtain, behind-the-scenes activity that we're talking about, particularly at the Whitney Museum. Who are the money people behind museums, not only in New York, where he's done most of his work but also in terms of government, such as the piece about Rudolph Giuliani and his relationship to the Brooklyn Museum? There are people at universities who are asking for more transparency in terms of endowments. One thing has simply to do with who the trustees are. We don't usually discuss that much at the university in terms of the trustees, because we really are very dependent upon them. It's a very interconnected, difficult network.

M: Do you think it sometimes creates a conflict of interests?

DG: It sometimes creates a conflict of values, but in terms of conflicts of interests, there are questions about that, especially the questions that have been raised over the last year in relationship to Madoff and the various people related to him and to various universities. I'm not necessarily saying that there's a conflict of interests, but I'm aware of who the trustees are and they are not necessarily so because they've accomplished fantastic things in the world of academia—they've published books, made fantastic studies and contributions to particular disciplines—they're trustees because they're very successful in the corporate world, because they're very powerful people, and they're powerful economically and their power in economics translates to power economically. So, is there a conflict of interests there? Very likely.

M: I think the affiliation groups are set up by students and alumni and have become part of the power structure and decision-making at the university. How do you take advantage of that? When people support the university, how is it linked to their gaining control in their own countries? Here we are gradually moving outside of the United States. When someone comes to study at Harvard they are part of an affiliated group; in a way, especially in Latin America or Europe, it has a kind of increasing value not only in knowledge but also as regards becoming part of the network. Do you have any comments on that?

DG: When you go to a university you're going into a particular structure of status, depending on where you go, and that's also going to align you with your future network of people who, according to the university, may become your future economic or artistic network, depending on what you're actually studying. Your placement is dependent upon that, and your future opportunities may be dependent on that as well. Universities can be very helpful in that regard. I think every university has a career services department, and career services can be very helpful to people, but I think the immediate network that people usually have once they graduate from the university is their fellow students.

M: I have some questions about the public university and the private university. The Ivy League represents a certain kind of status quo; then we have public universities. What's your take in terms of both, or the broader spectrum of the university?

DG: In the United States when you talk about public and private universities you're talking about states. Massachusetts has a particularly tragic situation which most people aren't aware of, and when you see the backstage activity it's something like what Dean MacCannell talks about. Massachusetts, because of its private universities, is thought of as being the Athens or Mecca in the way it's talked about, this great center of learning. It is a center of many private universities, well endowed with students coming from all over the world to study. The reality of the situation is that it's almost allowed the state to let the public university system fall apart. At one point we were in the top ten in terms of the fifty states in the way in which the public universities are funded; now we're in the last five in terms of per capita, of what kind of funding we give to public universities. Now we are spending in Massachusetts less per student at public universities than we spent ten years ago, which is extraordinary. It's hard to compute that. Go to a community college and see the types of facilities that are offered to our students who can't afford to go to elite universities, who can't afford to pay 50,000 dollars a year. To me it's certainly an issue of class, but I consider it a tragedy.

It's very unfortunate. I'm not saying that these schools are bad, they're just underfunded, and they're not given the resources that they really deserve. This makes it very difficult for teachers to teach in those situations, it makes it very difficult for students to get the kind of education that they should be getting. Again, I'm not criticizing public universities; I'm just criticizing a state that stopped making the resources to the public universities available. The gap is clearly growing, and the gap is going to grow more as states are now really hard-pressed in their budget. We have an enormous budget deficit in this state; most states do. Translated to other states, places like California in particular, where they have the largest population in the country in terms of the state. They were going to expand seven colleges into full universities but they couldn't because of finances. They created one new state university, I think it's Fresno, and have gone to the other state universities and have told them that they don't have a choice, that they have to expand by many thousands of students in each of these universities. This expands the number of students in classrooms, which expands the teaching load for each professor, and that's a very difficult situation. Your question is a good question, and it's a question that people aren't focusing on enough. The real gap is between private and public universities.

M: Traditionally, Latin American donors want to be close to a Rockefeller position. Historically, universities have had strong departments in European studies, although now they are switching to Latin American studies. Why do you think this is happening? This might be a move that is related to economics. Also, the status quo associated with David Rockefeller; there might be donors who want to be there in order to be close to him.

DG: I teach at Tufts University, so the question about David Rockefeller is one that is difficult for me to speculate about. One can look at this in terms of language. The total number of students taking every single language other than Spanish is less than the number of students who are taking Spanish at universities today. That's very dramatic. That means that all these other language programs are competing with Spanish. It's not surprising in terms of our own country. I wouldn't call it the Latinization of the United States, but we have enormous amounts of immigrant populations in the United States so being bilingual and learning Spanish is something that is very useful.

When I went to high school, Spanish wasn't even offered. You could take Latin, French, or German. That's a dramatic change that we're talking about. There's an enormous availability of people learning Spanish and wanting to learn Spanish, doing their junior year abroad—not simply in Spain, but in Latin America. An enormous group of students go to Latin America for their year abroad, and

particularly to perfect their Spanish. That makes sense, and I think that this snowballs into a greater interest in that area, which is healthy. We live in a bilingual continent and people are acknowledging that by their choice of what they're studying. I see it more in that way rather than an economic opportunism.

M: You mentioned that you are interested in the place and in the architecture of universities. Could you comment on this?

DG: My interest in place and place-making and thinking about how people really create place-attachment is part of my work as an anthropologist. Thinking about place-attachment is almost a biological necessity for actually being psychologically healthy, and people create place-attachment in many different ways. The university is a very unique example of radical place-attachment. I've been working on a project that I call the Architecture of Utopia. I think of the university as a kind of utopic space and part of this utopic space is this kind of radical place-making.

Why do I call it radical place-making? People come to a university in a very transitional state, and the transitional state—anthropologists might call it a liminal state—is a movement from one nuclear family to another. Very few people today are going to go back to live with their parents after college. I know that there are new statistics out that say that people can't afford to go out and get their own apartments, but the reality is that when you move out of high school you come to the university which is a world totally composed of strangers, unlike the continental and Latin American university where mostly people live at home when they go to school. You come to a world completely composed of strangers who all of a sudden are going to become your colleagues, your classmates, your new family, part of this new Alma Mater, "nourishing mother," which is why we call it the Alma Mater in the American university. And how does that occur? That occurs through the type of architectural place that you create this new attachment to. It creates an ideal bounded community, which we think of as utopia, which means "no place." We commonly call the university an ivory tower, which is not part of the real world. Those are all common platitudes about the university, but underneath these platitudes is a reality that is utopic: it's "no place." It's a world of social communitarianism, which again is the heart of utopia. Everybody is the same age, there is no money, everybody has swipe cards that parents put money on. Actually, there aren't even cards. Universities, in terms of having this green space, which heralds back to our eighteenth- and nineteenth-century sense of place, is very different. Then of course the students all live together in a reality that is more than anything devoted to sociality. This kind of sociality is a transference of allegiances in terms of a long-lasting attachment to place, which Harvard

does really well. Harvard has mastered it, and they've mastered it architecturally with their river houses, they've mastered it in terms of creating this long-term allegiance which then translates into future economic allegiance, where you are going to give your money later on. Again, this whole process is what I call the architecture of utopia. Perhaps when we think of the Georgian architecture of Harvard, the neoclassical architecture of the University of Virginia, or the type of neo-gothic architecture, which really spells learning, of Yale and other places, the architecture promotes this idea of intellectualism, of learning. It's a lot more than that, in terms of the process of allegiance, this process of transferral, that is really taking place in this new environment.

The architecture of utopia and thinking about these utopic spaces in these ways is very interesting to me because they are very diverse. We might say that Harvard is the gold standard in the reality of the university, as the university as place and place-making, but women's colleges have a very different sense of place in the way that they were created as environments for women to come and learn together. When you look at Wellesley College or Smith College, there's a very different reality there. You can also think of the really new utopic spaces and what a lot of people, like Paul Vanderbilt Turner and others who write about the architecture of universities, have looked at is that universities are the new economic engines of urban space. Now, what does that mean? It means that the largest landowner in Philadelphia now is the University of Pennsylvania. The future of Philadelphia is what UPenn decides to do. Harvard is trying to do that in Boston, in the same way.

M: And Columbia in Harlem.

DG: What Columbia is doing in Harlem and Manhattanville is going to be the largest project ever of its kind. It's a 7.1 billion dollar project that they're actually doing in Manhattanville, in New York City.

M: Somehow, we believe that museums and stadiums are part of the gentrification process of cities, and we leave universities out of the analysis because that's more complex.

DG: That's changed, that's totally changed. One of the great examples of that is Boston. The midtown area of Boston, the area that is now being called the Theater District and that used to be called the Combat Zone, lower Washington Street and the whole area where Tremont and Boylston cross, was once an area where the best shops existed and where the best theaters existed. It's gone through a very long period of decay, and part of that transitional decay was what we called

the Combat Zone. This is where you had porn theaters, which a lot of the great theaters had to be reduced to, and a lot of adult bookstores.

M: Like Times Square.

DG: Like Times Square. The difference between the two is that, in terms of what we might think of as cultural tourism—which they’ve succeeded with, but eliminated diversity in the process—is that midtown Boston has been transformed entirely by two universities, Emerson and Suffolk. If you look at what Emerson has done in particular, they have bought up the entire block of Boylston along the Boston Common and the Garden and unified it. They rescued two of the best theaters in the city, The Colonial and the Majestic, which is an enormous gift to the city. Now they’re moving up Tremont Street, which they’re unifying, and they’re joining with Suffolk, which is putting their new dorm on West Street. But Suffolk is doing it in a different way, and going back to your questions before about conflict of interests, Suffolk is the main university that has been accused of a conflict of interest between the trustees and the university and a lot of that has been discussed in *The Boston Globe* in the past year. It’s fairly clear; there has been a real conflict of interest.

Nevertheless, the point is: who are the new city planners? The new economic engine in a city like Boston, in a city like Philadelphia, even in a city like New York, is the university. They’re producing new sorts of labor for the environment and for the economy. Perhaps that’s what they’re producing. Nevertheless they are absolutely fundamental to the future of the American city and that’s a different type of architectural utopia because of its permeability. What I mean by that is that up until now, when we think of the university, we think of it as being very bounded by gates, such as the type of gates at Harvard, the nine gates that let you go into the place. You think of all these types of gates that keep people out; you can’t get in without a swipe card.

M: Universities as gated communities.

DG: They’re gated communities, and the more their rhetoric is about openness and about their involvement in the community, the more gated they become and the more difficult it becomes to get in. When I came to Harvard for the first time, anybody could walk into Widener and look at the beautiful dioramas, and go up and see Harry Widener’s beautiful library in the library. Now nobody can get in unless you have a Harvard card. They are gated communities. The new discussion, which is something that Renzo Piano has been articulating in discussion with Columbia and what Manhattanville is going to be like in New York,

is that that's not going to be the case anymore. The university of the twenty-first century is going to be totally permeable. If you look at the structure of Manhattanville, the first level on the street is all shops which are all privately owned, and the second level is the university. Underground are all the mechanicals; you're not even going to see them. Underground, in Manhattanville, all the mechanicals are totally hidden, the community is on the first level, and on the next levels going up are the university spaces. It's a completely new design in terms of what the new urban university is going to be like, the transformation of the future of the American city.

M: I have a question about the sociological point of view in terms of what you say about place and people. The traditional support structure is family. When the family starts to disintegrate some people look to the church, and religion in Eastern Europe is very important. In Spain it was important, but is less so now. I think a third support structure is the university. It's a kind of transition between family, church, and university.

DG: Absolutely. Thomas Jefferson knew that. Thomas Jefferson is extremely important in the American university because his model for the University of Virginia, which he probably borrowed from Union College, has become the dominant model. It took a long time: he designed the University of Virginia in about 1825. At first most universities didn't adopt the quad model, with the main building at the end. It was one that many people resisted and Olmstead reviled, because Olmstead became very important in the design of universities, but the design eventually took over. What's the significance of that design? Jefferson said that he wanted to create an academic village, and the importance of the academic college was, to think of the design as a body, that at the head of the quad was not a church, not a cathedral, it was the library, it was secularism. He was very aware of that in terms of his own belief system. He wanted to substitute this allegiance to family and church with a new set of humanist, rational values. He really implanted this idea that the university as the academic village would be the new space. He wanted the family of the new academic village to be one in which the new head of the household was the professor and his wife, so the new structure was of colonnades, and inside were students who lived and learned with the professors and their families. The professor's family lived above, the students lived down below and learned, and they all lived together. Behind, they had gardens. It was a completely new family that was replacing the old one and replacing the old values.

What happened was that the wives of the professors said, "We can't take it," having all these students in the house all the time. They had to start a structure of dorms

and have the students move out. But the idea that the university was going to replace those older values is exactly what you're saying.

M: In relation to your research on the architecture of universities, they need a container, they need to build a structure for teaching and for using. Could you give your opinion on how the use of architecture is important in parallel with the development of the university?

DG: Absolutely. There are two things in your question. One is in terms of thinking of the new model of the urban university that we're talking about—it could be Manhattanville, it could be Emerson—the thing is, is it still going to be a campus? Is it still going to be the university as we know it? Or is it actually going to end up being more like the continental university, one where it is totally permeated by the city and indistinguishable? That's one architectural question, and it's an architectural question that lots of people are asking, as the universities transform today in terms of the city.

The other question is in terms of what you think of as a sort of veneration of the older style of architecture. Does the architecture of a university continuously reproduce itself to be a university? Some universities have done that in very boring ways. If you go to Washington University in St Louis, it's a theme park of the neo-Gothic done very poorly. A lot of the students really like it. I've interviewed students at Washington University about their feelings on it, and if you go to Washington University now you'll see that they're creating a lot of new buildings all made to look like old buildings. At Washington University (I'm using them as an example, there are many other universities that are forced to not step outside of that mold) no new building can be different from any of the older buildings, which are based on this neo-Gothic collegiate architecture. There are other universities that are campuses, such as MIT, which have used radical new architecture to reaffirm their mission. Not to undermine them as a campus, but if you think of the why, MIT, structurally, is a fairly new university. It moved over from Boston to its new site fairly recently, around 1916, and created a very dominant neoclassical style. It is a slightly ludicrous style, and they did that to say, "We are a university," and it says it; it's advertising. You see those columns, you see the big dome, and it says, "We are a place of learning."

In the fifties, MIT said it wanted to make a statement. It wanted to say "we are the vanguard of knowledge, of invention, of experimentation; we are a university that's committed to discovering new technologies." They did that through architecture, and they went out and they hired Saarinen, who was one of the most radical architects of the university structure. They created not only the chapel but also the big campus center, which is a new university center, which is a magnificent

center, and many of the alumni were hysterical. They said, “We’re not going to give any money, this is a terrible thing that you’ve done, you’ve destroyed the whole character of the university. Our university is built in a neoclassical style.” The president said, “I haven’t destroyed the University, I’ve reaffirmed the university. This architecture says we are cutting edge, and if we are going to be cutting edge we should be cutting edge not only with what goes on in the classrooms but the classrooms themselves.” That’s precisely what MIT did over the last few years with the Gehry building and with the “Sponge Dorm.” It was completely calculated; they said, “We need to make a new statement. If we’re going to make a new statement of our commitment to experimentation and to being at the cutting edge of new technology we’ll have to do it through our own architecture.” Universities who don’t make that statement will be making other statements, such as Washington University.

M: If we look at certain kinds of needs, such as stadiums, monasteries, and auditoriums, they have a specific type of architecture because of obvious needs, such as capacity. Is the architecture of the university, with its long corridors and classrooms, designed to serve a certain kind of situation, such as a monastery or a prison? Have you analyzed it psychologically in terms of what it represents for knowledge?

DG: Absolutely. Vassar College was one of the first women’s universities, built about 1867 or 1870. The first women’s colleges could be compared to panopticons, because all of the women were in one giant building in order to be watched; the idea that people wrote about in that time was that women all together in this situation would probably go crazy, that women weren’t cut out for this type of academic life of the mind. These enormous structures like Vassar College, with enormous main halls, were kind of based on a sanatorium. This relationship to space and what goes on in that space is one that you see reproduced in many different places, such as Oxford and Cambridge, where there were the first models for the residential college. The residential college was a very radical experiment that Oxford began at the time. The model was for people coming together and learning and living in the same place; not living with your family and coming to take classes like at the University of Paris or Bologna, but actually living in the same place with your professors. The model was the monastery.

That became very problematic later on, particularly when it was transferred to the United States, where people wanted to really make a strong distinction between the church and state and the learning environment, so the residential colleges built were ones which were clearly not monastic. The model of Harvard and Yale were very important in relation to that, because the model which is really

important to think back to, the original vision of Harvard and Yale, was one of no gates, was right on the common, and was a part of the city and the community. Only later did it turn inward, and they both were redesigned and created the Yard. All the backdoors become the front doors and they turned their backs on the city. The idea first was to say, “We’re not going to be apart.” That’s essential in terms of how learning occurs. It’s very different and it’s very diverse, so the Infinite Corridor and the long corridor that you refer to is partially because you come from MIT. The idea of the Infinite Corridor is really an MIT idea, to create these funnels where people are interacting and there is that kind of effervescence and cooperation, people working together, which is very much part of the model of an engineering college and isn’t necessarily going to be the model of other colleges.

M: The last question I have is about a sense of self-criticism about the relationship of knowledge, the use of power, accumulation of power, and how some people are critical outside but not critical inside. Do you have anything to say about that? I say self-criticism, but I will extend it to the community. Do you think self-criticism is missing in the academic world?

DG: Certainly Tufts University has gone through that type of self-criticism. Whether it’s been successful or not is still to be determined, but the result of that was to create a large new initiative in relationship to learning in the community. Active citizenship became something that was part of the new mission of the university. We got a couple of very large grants, one of the largest being from the Omidyar family of eBay, who really directed the way their grant of a hundred million dollars would be used. They wanted it to be used either through micro-lending if it became part of the endowment or through initiatives of community-based learning and active citizenship—students not restricting their learning to the classroom, but actually applying it in collaboration and cooperation with various parts of the Boston/Somerville/Medford community.

For anthropologists such as myself it’s been a boon, it’s allowed me to really work at home, and to do very exciting projects where knowledge is actually shared with the community. I’ve done that in different ways. A lot of my colleagues in the Anthropology department at Tufts would ask the same question, and it is a question of self-criticism. How can I apply my knowledge where I learn rather than thinking of it like simply a kind of abstract critique of American policy abroad, but make a difference in the communities where we actually live and exist? The university helps to support that, so it’s very healthy.

How does that translate into the whole structure of academia and the community where I teach? That’s still a work in progress, and partly that is because a lot of

the people who I'm speaking of and who are involved in that already have tenure. If you would've started that work when you were an assistant professor and your work was at that experimental level, it might spell doom for your career. It's certainly a conversation that's been ongoing at Tufts. I think that conversation would certainly translate into the sort of self-criticism that you're talking about in terms of how we, as academics and intellectuals, can be much more involved in changing the social fabric of the communities that we actually live in, rather than just criticizing the foreign policy of our country abroad.

M: Thank you.

David Harvey

Muntadas: How do you perceive the relationship historically of academia as a tool of knowledge?

David Harvey: I agree with Marx that ideas can be a material force in historical change. Academia is one of those places where new ideas can be developed, where new possibilities can be explored and elaborated. It's not the only place. In fact, there are lots of places in mind. My critique of the university right now is that on a technical, scientific side it is indeed a source of research and development, but in the social sciences it's becoming apologetic for the existing scheme of things. The innovative ideas about social order and so on are more likely to come from outside than from inside. Historically, academia is supposed to be critical and open, but the disciplines and the organization of the universities with the financial constraints and the hierarchies that now exist inside universities are making it a less fertile environment for innovative ideas these days. I think that's a shame.

M: Inside the university you see cultural and intellectual values as acts of knowledge. They establish a status quo and a certain kind of relational power.

DH: One of the functions of the university which we often forget is to preserve knowledge or what's already been constructed. For instance, they're striking right now and we're in the midst of an economic crisis. Many people have gone through university training, in fields like economics, and they're not even familiar with the thinking of someone like Keynes or Marx. Preservation of knowledge is one of the things we should be concerned about because very frequently that knowledge can be a constraint upon the arbitrary use of power inside of academia. One of the difficulties right now is that there is a rather arbitrary conglomeration of power within the disciplines that dictates what is or is not acceptable in terms of what you can write and how you can think. Very often there is a loss of historical memory in all of that. I've just been reading about how people are rediscovering what happened in the 1920s. They say things like, "Well if we had only studied that carefully, then we wouldn't have got into the current mess the way we have." Again, the way in which power is exercised within academia has increasingly been a function of the way power is mobilized outside of academia, and power outside of academia is effectively money power. In the same way that money power has corrupted democracy, I think money power has been corrupting universities and corrupting academia in general.

M: It is a transformation from university to corporation.

DH: You can pretty much date when universities, including public universities, started to become more and more dependent on private income. We distinguish in this country between private and public universities, but in fact many public universities like Berkeley or Michigan are heavily dependent on private sources of money. Michigan receives only fifteen percent of its budget from the state. There's the distinction there. I remember it very well personally. My department at Johns Hopkins is a private institution, but it actually works with a lot of public monies. We were told in my department that we were in trouble some way or another with the dean, so we showed what a good group we were academically in terms of our productivity, in terms of our student training and where our students went after graduation. The dean came in and looked at our report and pushed it to one side and said "I'm only interested in one thing." And he held out a dollar bill and he said "this color green and you don't make enough of it." It was in the 1980s when that really began.

M: You don't think it was around during Reagan's time?

DH: Yes. At first it came in subtly and then it came more violently, and then after a while it became what many faculty members accepted as being the norm. Their job was to go out and find money, so therefore they had to chase money in order to preserve their position. From the 1980s onward we've had this big transformation in the way in which universities are working, which means that there are less and less possibilities for independent research. At Johns Hopkins University in the 1980s there was a discussion in the faculty of a report which said "Curiosity-driven research has driven the university up until now, but now we have a bigger mission which is to put our research at the service of government and business." And I got up and I said "What about the service of the people? What about all those people who can't pay?" And everybody looked at me shocked as if I was saying something incredibly radical. Actually, the best tradition of universities in this country has been that they have served a public function and have not been captive to certain audiences, but again we can date that transition and transformation pretty much from the end of the 1970s to the beginning of the 1980s. It became standard practice thereafter.

M: It's a different paradigm, how we compete with Europe for example. Do you see that difference?

DH: One of the competitive strengths of the US in the global economy is the

fact that there are research universities which have accomplished a tremendous amount, particularly in the sciences and organizational forms. Research universities in the US have topped global university structures. European universities are now struggling to catch up. What you see happening in European universities is governments starting to structure incentives, starting to use things to try to push universities to become much more like American universities. I taught at Oxford for six years in the Thatcher period. Thatcher was very emphatic about needing to change the culture of the universities from their traditional function to a new function, to create research understandings that are going to promote capitalist development—business, government and all the rest of it. This is something that European universities are lagging behind in terms of international competition. In some ways I think that's a pity. But it's not to say that European universities were full of people who were actively engaging with public function. There was a lot of flabbiness. In a lot of European structures, people got in their positions and they didn't do very much. They were not held accountable. There were difficulties with the old model. But as I remember, as was certainly the case in the British system that I was educated in, in the 1960s and early 1970s people in the universities considered it part of their obligation to undertake public functions on behalf of the public interest. That was a very important tradition. It's essentially been broken by this neoliberalization, the corporatization that Thatcher introduced. The European Union accords, the Bologna Accords, have imposed that model across the European Union; it is closer to the British model, which is grounded very much in the US model.

M: The university is based on the structure of donors, trustees, and institutional support. I think it's our sentimental relationship, which is also political, that creates a network and affiliations. Do the people with money affect the structure and decision making?

DH: Yes. For instance, the model that was introduced into Johns Hopkins when Michael Bloomberg—current Mayor of New York—was chair of the board of trustees. He's an alumnus of Johns Hopkins. They started to think of the university as a series of cost centers and profit making centers. Then that broke down and departments became cost centers and then individuals became cost centers. I went from being a valued member of the university community because I was producing a lot of writings and was very productive to being one that was not valued at all because I didn't bring in any money. That was the transition we've been talking about. There's a tension here; capitalism in itself is not necessarily that innovative. It's opposed to the university in that it has to allow a certain amount of freedom and liberty of inquiry. In other words if it tries to mandate

from the top down, it won't work, so you have to create an environment in which increasingly entrepreneurial innovation becomes crucial. But that means there's a certain freedom in liberty of action inside the university. I say to my colleagues, "You don't have to play their game and exactly follow their rules, university is still a space in which you can start to create networks which are your own networks. You can start to pursue your own forms of knowledge. And if you want to, those forms of knowledge can be highly critical of the existing structures, highly subversive of neoliberal orthodoxy." That depends on the individuals who are inside of the university. In other words, there are lots of opportunities within the university to create what you might call counter hegemonic forms of knowledge. Part of the criticism I would have of us, collectively within the university, is that we've not taken enough advantage of the fact that we have to be given that liberty. Otherwise universities would not really be functional in relation to what capitalism really needs, which is innovative new ideas.

M: This association of donors, trustees, alumni, and their relationship with the Alma Mater and the university is an interesting aspect to consider. So is their relationship with Third World countries, where in Latin America and even parts of Europe people are going back and being part of a political scene. We see a lot of this relationship with the Alma Mater and power in Latin America, and of a group affiliation or network.

DH: It was conscious policy on the part of the state department and the US government during the Cold War to try and bring in as many people as possible from other countries, particularly from Latin America, into the US university system so that they would become networked into the US. It's very interesting when you look at the people who are treasury secretaries in different countries around the world and ask how many of them were trained in the US—not only trained in the US but trained in select institutions in the US. You would find them very close to a network, to a knowledge system. This has been going on since the 1960s. One of the oddities right now is the way in which anti-terrorism is working and the difficulties in getting visas and all that. The US is actually undercutting that right now. You find many people who are saying, "I don't want to go, I can't go there right now. It's too difficult, it's too expensive," so they go to Australia, Britain, or Europe. The training network is becoming a little more dispersed right now, but at this point many people in senior government positions in many countries in the world are US-trained, and consciously so from both sides. Singapore, for example, sent wave after wave to study electrical engineering and things like that to the major research universities in the US and they took all of that knowledge back. You'll find people in those fields in Taiwan and

South Korea. They also used that as a way to try and catch up with the US in terms of transferring knowledge from the US to those kinds of environments and then using that not only in the social sciences but in the technical sciences. This has been a very big part of what globalization has been about from the 1950s onward.

M: The university in the 1960s was active politically. Things are changing. I don't see these types of political organizations. Do you?

DH: Don't romanticize the 1960s too much. For instance, in my own discipline, you couldn't talk about Marx. I would go to geography meetings and you would never hear the word imperialism mentioned. When some of us said we've got to talk about US imperialism we couldn't get published.

M: I agree but I'm talking about the opposition.

DH: The opposition took a long time to come into being. It began in the early 1960s, but if you talk to people who were initially involved in the 1960s there were very few. Then the opposition built until you get up to 1968, 1969 and 1970. Universities in the 1950s and 1960s were sitting in the wake of McCarthyism, which was extremely repressive and had done a lot of violence to academic freedom. It took a long while to reconstruct. The situation now is slightly analogous to what it was in the early 1960s. There are signs of small groups of students beginning to mobilize around a different agenda. They're not being heard very clearly. There are still a few of us around that keep the radical flag flying with our teaching and our research and our publishing. There is a younger generation that is beginning to feel that something is chronically wrong and that something has to change. It is certainly not a mass movement at this point. As difficulties mount what you start to see is reactions inside the universities. For instance, the students in the California system have been showing a lot of activist behavior lately. Many students are against the cuts. We see the same things going on in Athens, we see the European universities beginning to mobilize a little bit. There are signs of student unrest, but at this point it hasn't gone very far. In situations of this kind, my historical observation is that it's a bit like the stock market crash of 1929, which produced massive social movements three or four years later. We've just been through a massive crash and we're only one year past it. If things don't get better very fast then I think you're going to start seeing this mounting unrest because first off, there aren't the jobs and secondly, to the degree that there are jobs, they are pretty meaningless jobs. I think we might see something in the next three or four years. I don't know, but I certainly see signs of it beginning to

bubble a little bit at the grassroots level.

M: Universities, with the help of corporations, helped with programs in the 1960s; they were involved with the war, especially at MIT. You mentioned McCarthyism, but I think that it's a responsibility of the universities.

DH: My experience is at Johns Hopkins University which has the largest per capita defense department budget of all American universities. This was all kept hidden—they set up a separate campus where all this could go on. Back then the war was on, and so was the draft, which made a big difference to student attitudes toward the war. The anti-militarism was a part of the draft. We don't have a draft anymore and I think that is one of the most significant differences between the 1960s and now in terms of student attitudes. There's a war in Afghanistan and Iraq and action is going on elsewhere but the attitude of the students is "I don't have to be a part of it. Somebody else will do it." There's a sort of racism and an attitude of "New immigrants can do it and I don't have to do it. As long as it doesn't affect me I'm not going to rise up and revolt against it." That's one of the big differences. You're not going to see the same sort of antagonism to military contract research that you started to see in the 1960s. I think policy makers understood that. One of the issues that arose for policy makers after the 1960s was how to prevent something of this sort happening from inside a university. I think they've taken measures to try to diffuse that issue, which have been fairly successful.

M: A part of the interest of this project is to bring some self-criticism to people who have been involved in the university as teachers. Sometimes the political implications are different inside the university than they are outside of it.

DH: It's always difficult. You're always caught in a contradiction. If you want to preserve your academic status, if you want to preserve your power inside of the institution, then you have to be very careful what you do. There's always a certain level of self-censorship that goes on. "Can I push this or not?" This covers all sorts of areas; for instance, how you write. Do you write in a way that is popular and then have your academics call you to say, "You're not a serious academic anymore?" Or do you write in a way that's acceptable to the academic canon? It is difficult and I've always been treading this line, but here I think one of the things that has been very good for me has been having critical students. I've lost count of the number of times one of my students have called me a bourgeois cop-out, and told me that I don't push things. I've lost count of the number of times that people outside of the university have said "I can't understand why

you're not more supportive of what we're doing." I have to be prepared to say sometimes that they're right. I could have done far more and still maintained my power inside the university, but I didn't push it as far as I could have. You don't know where the boundary is. Sometimes you fear to take those extra steps because you'll get into real difficulties, whether it's against the administration, with your colleagues, and discipline in general, when people will start to say that they're not going to talk to you anymore. It's a difficult world. I was personally very fortunate because for many years I was protected from people higher up who considered I was important. If I had not been protected by people further up I would have been thrown out of the university. There were attempts, apparently, to throw me out of one of my past universities. But they didn't go very far because some people higher up said, "You can't do that." But in order for them to say that, I had to produce a standard of work that they could say was academically very good. That's one of the things I say to my students when they come in, I say "Look, as a graduate student you can be as active as you want and I hope you will be active, but when the chips are down and mess is going on I want to be able to take what you've written and what you have studied and show it to people and say 'Look, this student is an excellent student.' I need that. I can't protect you if you don't have that body of work in hand." What I try to do is train the graduate students to ride that contradiction, but to always recognize it because many people I knew who made a radical turn in the 1970s got thrown out of the university. They got thrown out in part because they didn't have the body of work there which would have protected them. I always made sure I had the body of work there. Situations arise where it doesn't matter whether you've got the body of work there or not, you'll still get thrown out. I was protected against that which I've mentioned. But getting that body of work there means that you write in a way that is not accessible to the mass public. I have fortunately reached the age and status where that doesn't matter anymore. They can throw me out if they want, I don't care. I can do what I want.

M: This is pretty much about protecting yourself from the critical outside by producing outstanding work. But what about censorship by the institution itself? Are there politics inside the university? You used the word self-censorship. Is that something that is current?

DH: People will say things to you in private conversations that they would never dare put in print. I see a lot of that. There's also censorship inside. For instance, when I started writing in a more radical mode I found it very difficult to publish. Books would not get reviewed, things of that sort. There's censorship and then there's self-censorship. I think they go together. One of the areas of censorship

is not so much inside the university and the university departments, but it's in the professional associations, the sociological associations, or the anthropology associations. It's through the professional associations and what gets considered to be good research within that discipline. There's a lot of censorship going on and you see that in all the fields that I'm familiar with. You see it in economics, you see it in political science. In political science everyone had to go and start doing rational choice theory. You couldn't go out and do traditional political science; you were marginalized if you did that. Censorship is also a fad in terms of what you should and shouldn't be doing. There's self-censorship where there's the fear that you're going to be too exposed to criticism. You can get too exposed to the point where people will even push you out of the university. It's happened to many of my colleagues in the 1970s. They got pushed out of the universities because they were radical, because they were saying things that people didn't want to hear, and to some degree also because they didn't have the publication record that they needed in order to protect themselves. Again, I say to incoming graduate students, "to be a radical in a university means you have to produce twice as much as everybody else and it has to be of a very superior quality. Then you have a much better chance of surviving." Whereas nonentities, who are not producing very much, can pass through provided they're not saying anything that is radical or critical.

M: Do you see conflicts between the network of administrative power and the university?

DH: Yes. But again, there has been a transition. There was much more faculty power back in the 1960s and 1970s and it's increasingly being displaced by administrative power. That is partly due to the fact that faculty don't use the full power of instruments that they have, but also because administration has become far more prominent in university government for a variety of reasons.

M: Howard Zinn was very bold in his revolt against the Boston University president. He was one to fight very strongly.

DH: Yes, and that has lead increasingly to arbitrary power. You used Boston University as a good example of a lot of arbitrary power being used by the president, particularly from Silber in those years. It was a notable case but it wasn't an isolated case. There were many other cases of a similar sort, but they were not so prominent and they were not quite so obvious.

M: All these things we talk about happen in university classrooms and corridors—

the physical space of the university. How can architecture affect teaching and the communication between people as the university moved from monastic architecture to transparent glass architecture? This has happened more in Asia than here, although it's starting to be a change in universities here. I would like to get you thinking about the exercise of teaching and its relation to university spaces.

DH: Obviously the traditional view of the university was of an ivory tower behind gates, such as Oxford and Harvard. It's an isolated place where somehow we're protected from all of the dynamics that are going on outside the walls. I have to say that I'm not entirely opposed to that aspect of the university. Having a place where people can be and reflect and think through carefully; a lot of very important knowledge has come out of that, historically. I don't entirely dismiss the notion that universities should be a little bit like that. But what's happened more recently has been the integration of the university with powerful institutions, particularly government and corporations. What you'll find is these big complexes which are produced by the corporations, pharmaceutical companies that will build a whole set of laboratories. NASA will build a whole complex. Universities have become increasingly corporate and government-oriented. Architecturally, they have gone along with that. It's the bureaucratic glass tower as you've mentioned. The seminar rooms are less seminar rooms than board rooms of a corporation. There's an architectural shift that's taken place. One thing that has tended not to happen has been creating a university that is open to the public. That is something that strikes me as a great pity. Having said that, architectural form doesn't necessarily entirely dictate behavior. There is a big question, and I'm going to come back to how we as a faculty and you as a student actually use and appropriate the space. We can start to battle internally, to say "This space should be liberated so that we can have freewheeling seminars" so that students who want to get together and organize their own educational program can do so. It's hard to do that in one of these corporate board rooms, but it can be done. You can even use the stairwells in some way. But then you have a battle with the security apparatus and you have battles with administration to be able to do that. The internal organization of the universities seems to me something which can be opened up. This is something we try to do at CUNY, to open it as much as we can to the public. We do a lot of public programming so that people can come off the street and come to seminars and to presentations. We do that on a pretty regular basis, but CUNY is still a rather special place. It's a university that considers its public mission important. You find most universities now are trying to have a public program in which they invite people in from outside. I would like to be pushed a lot further. I don't think a university can cut its ties from government, nor do I think a university should cut its ties to government. I don't

think it should cut its ties to corporations. But it should also have an opening to people and popular forces and particularly to the social movements. That is something we are also trying to cultivate at CUNY. At the same time, it should have its ivory tower aspects. A university to me does all of those things and keeps all those things in dramatic tension. That's what makes it a much more interesting and vibrant and vital place.

M: The extension of that is the architecture outside of the building, and real estate. Columbia is extending north. NYU has really gentrified a lot of the lower side of Manhattan. Harvard has already crossed the river to go to Allston.

DH: Yale dominates New Haven. John Hopkins is taking over all of east Baltimore.

M: Due to your research on the right to the city, I think your take on that would be interesting. You've been thinking a lot on the relationship of the city and the economy.

DH: Universities need more space. If they grow, they're going to look for it. The problem is in finding a new space which does not displace people, and in particular does not displace low-income people. The big problem of university expansion is that very frequently they expand into those areas which are lowest cost in terms of land and property values, which turn out to be the areas where low-income populations live. What I object to is the expansion of universities at the expense of lower income populations. Can you imagine Hunter College in Manhattan using eminent domain to expropriate a big chunk of Park Avenue? No. There's no way that would happen given the power relationships that exist in the city. My objection is not to the fact that universities expand, but the manner in which they expand at the expense of low-income populations. This is the heart of the difficulty. CUNY is expanding, but to some degree it has expanded into a few areas where it hasn't displaced low income populations. It has moved into areas that are empty in some way already for other reasons. This is the difficulty.

M: Do you think that in the transition of university from institution to corporation, the plans of the university have included real estate?

DH: Yes. Johns Hopkins had a special part, a for-profit corporation which was real estate development. It was making money on its real estate development and profiting from it. When we objected to some of the things that the real estate department was doing, the university said we couldn't interfere because

they were a separate corporation. There's some problems with that. The other thing that is significant is that very often universities are competitive now in making acceptable environments for the student body. There's a lot of competition between the universities to make them pretty and to make them look like a nice suburban campus in the middle of a teeming city, because a lot of the students come from the suburbs and feel uncomfortable when they get thrown into the city. The university wants to establish control over its surroundings. One of the most scandalous things that's been happening in NYC is the transformation of Washington Square Park, which is all about the power of NYU to try to get rid of the types of populations that typically circulate around the park, to turn it into a different kind of space that is more carefully monitored. Johns Hopkins moving into Baltimore was a scandal because the census tract in which it's located had the lowest life expectancy of any census tract in the US. Here's this incredible institution and the university wanted to get rid of it. What did it do? It announced plans for expansion, for knocking down the housing, for getting rid of the people. In other words, universities don't necessarily just expand. It's what kind of philosophy lies behind the expansion. Why do they want to expand? They want to gentrify, they want to get rid of troublesome populations. In Johns Hopkins' case, during the 1960s and the middle of the 1970s, having a low income population on your doorstep was profitable because Medicaid was quite lucrative. When caps started to be put on how much you could charge Medicaid patients, servicing that low income population became a drain on the budget. There came a point in the 1980s where we all had to help the hospital because it was running a deficit. One of the answers to the deficit was to get rid of the low-income population. There are all kinds of strategies in which the university is operating like a corporation which has an agenda that is an internal conflict to the university. This was interesting because many of the people down in the medical school felt that they wanted to service this low-income population and we believed that we should set up some kind of way of doing that. The university was playing this game of gentrification, getting rid of the lower-income population. There's a tension in there.

M: The word gentrification has emotion in terms of the etymology of the word. I think it comes from the 1950s. In other countries the word for gentrification does not exist; they start using the English "gentrification."

DH: Its origin back in the 1960s was about the movement back into the cities of people that could revitalize neighborhoods, but as they revitalized neighborhoods the housing values went up and the lower-income populations were driven out. During the 1970s and 1980s it was a critical time so when you

used a word like gentrification it had a critical connotation, although now it's positive. A lot of governments are in favor of gentrification. Municipalities favor gentrification and they don't get upset when you use the term. They say "Yes, that's what we want. That's how this city can increase its tax base, by attracting upper-income people back and increasing property values." This is a very positive thing. It is similar to the way that cities start to use eminent domain to get rid of low-income populations and to set up high-rise condominiums. In the social literature that I'm familiar with gentrification is now being spoken about in a positive way. This is urban revitalization through gentrification, and urban revitalization is good, right?

M: Does it lose the sense of speculation?

DH: No, it doesn't lose the sense of speculation, but speculation is seen as good.

Ute Meta Bauer

Muntadas: What is the distinction for you between academia and the university?

Ute Meta Bauer: A university is the hosting institution and the apparatus, while academia is a certain way of thinking, a methodology, and also a reflection of knowledge as such and a particular understanding of the world.

M: Talking about the values—spiritual, cultural, and economic—all related to the act of knowledge, that the university accumulates for those in a position of power, would you have anything to say?

UMB: There are turning points in our society, usually related to politics, and these are the moments when the division between academia and university becomes obvious. This is when you stand up for academic values versus the apparatus that host you, which usually is related to the power that constitutes and finances this machinery. There was an interesting publication by Zone Books about academia after September 11 reflecting what it means to have tenure as an academic after September 11 in the United States. This text has its focus on the importance of tenure as a protective shield to guarantee academic freedom. The essay recapitulated various historical moments when tenure was crucial for academics and explained tenure as a status conferring lifetime academic employment. The text recapitulates that an academic gives a promise to academia. It is not about serving the institution, the university; it is about serving the community, the citizens, the people. For me, as a newly tenured professor in the US that was interesting to read.

M: Do you see any difference between the United States and Europe in this matter?

UMB: If you look back to Europe in 1968 you will find a similar division between the state-run institutions versus their academic populations. If you recall, the University of Paris VIII (University of Vincennes in Saint-Denis) in France was the direct result of May 1968. Then you could also see the members of the Frankfurt School who, to some extent, were divided on both sides of the Atlantic over a discussion of what academia should represent versus what is happening

on the streets in terms of politics: the distinction between the university and its population became impossible to miss.

M: A university is defined as an organized institution of higher learning, but lately it's more a corporation, as it appears to operate on the creation of knowledge for its own sake and for the prerogative of economic interest.

UMB: I would go even further. I'm also critical of an academic hegemony versus other types of knowledge production that are dismissed or put into question by academics. But in respect to academia versus the corporate approach, I have to say there's more and more pressure to define what students should learn at universities in terms of potential future professions. Today, fundamental research is more difficult to fund than applied research. The profession of "philosopher" does not exist. Even if you studied art in the past you did not necessarily imagine becoming a "professional" artist. Today, the pressure to study in a field that promises a job perspective is high, especially in the United States. In the United States tuition costs are enormous and this has an impact on which fields people choose to study. Cost efficiency and the goal to bring revenue are also reflected in research. Research has become as corporate as the university itself.

M: Donors, trustees, and institutional supporters are linked to the university effectively, sentimentally, but also politically. What are the implications here?

UMB: Here in the United States, through the alumni programs, there is a strong link between alumni who established themselves in a wide variety of professions and the universities, especially the one where they carried out their undergraduate studies. Alumni are the link between the industries, corporations and their Alma Mater. This is a sustainable chain of support that is not only based on capitalist interests, it also marks the respect towards the university that has "equipped" you for life "out there," that provides you with the skills and intellectual tools to reach a certain position in your professional life. It mirrors the American spirit. Then there is the sector of gifts and donations, and the administrative leadership of universities today has to be capable to create revenue. The university as a knowledge market is closely tied to economic markets. This is indeed problematic because it creates obstacles to research in fields that are not creating revenue or results in the "wrong" type of news in the media. Research is endangered by short-term evaluation while in academia we should be receiving support to engage in research that might not create immediate results.

M: To summarize this question, do you see any conflicts between the network of administrative power and the university?

UMB: The administration of knowledge has its impact on the production of knowledge. There needs to be a balance between governing and freedom of thought. History has proven that societies have every so often overcome their governments, their administrations, when their conditions became Kafkaesque. It is a problem whenever administration becomes its own self-supporting force and protects itself in order to survive. At times the governed body needs to overcome its own executive structure. My take on that is that the administration, like a government, is put in place to support the structures they oversee. They are supposed to represent and not regulate the people. And if necessary they need to be reminded of the fact that this creates a healthy tension.

M: When alumni become fellows or friends of the institutional college, as an Alma Mater, how does this system operate in terms of decision-making? You see a student get a degree and become part of a privileged group of affiliates. How do you see this relation to the exercise of group pressure on future political, economic ventures?

UMB: I see alumni also as a lobby for future students, for their interests and also often alumni financially support their faculty, their program, and their university. And of course this provides an efficient network that had been called the “old boys network.” This is less the case in Europe than in the United States. Here it matters what university you attended and part of it is exactly to enter such alumni networks.

M: In regard to the relationship between the United States and Latin America, is there a connection with students that extends the colonization of corporate relations? For instance, if a student from abroad becomes part of the Alma Mater support group, does this affect the class structure of his own country, and if so, how?

UMB: Of course these are extended networks and of course they create distinction. If you attended a top university abroad of course this is registered “at home.” The Latin GSD, for example, is such an alumni group at Harvard, that brings in speakers from Latin America who might not necessarily be on the radar otherwise. I am sure that counts for many active alumni groups and it reflects geopolitics. And a certain percentage of students from the so-called peripheries who can only afford to study in the United States, if they are on a stipend, or belong to a certain class. And this class might have an agenda in their country. Take Chile and the effect that Milton Friedman had through the Chicago Boys,

alumni of Friedman at the Chicago School of Economics. One cannot be naïve about the fact that the privilege of a good education might lead to re-inscribing a colonial constellation that we could describe as post-colonial condition. However, an alumni network of students from all over the world forces us to widen our horizon, it bears the potential for a critical understanding of globalization, and supports student and faculty to become engaged in various fields and areas around the globe.

M: The Ivy League represents a particular standard level of awareness, knowledge, and status quo. How do you view the Ivy League and its impact on public universities?

UMB: Education is a very important tool for emancipating people and the high quality of an education at a top US university is a fact. But it is crucial to increase financial support for public education starting at pre-school level, test-cross subsidizing models based on tuition that reflects the financial ability of parents. We have to support access to good education for everyone, some of my colleagues go even further—they say schools should be able to offer what one can call education without hesitation. Public schools cannot compete for top faculty, as they can't offer the infrastructure, top students and top salaries. And let's not forget the brain drain from other countries to US Ivy Leagues and other high-ranked universities that offer not only competitive conditions but also the needed nurturing climate and therefore access to funded research.

M: A common joke in the 1970s was that if David Rockefeller became president of the United States, it would be a demotion. The sentence is emblematic of indelible and ineffable connections between academic pursuits and global social and economic institutions. Do you have comments on David Rockefeller and implications of the status quo, especially as regards Latin America?

UMB: In terms of Rockefeller and the Rockefeller family and their relation to Latin America I have to back out, as I do not know enough to give a comment.

M: From your perspective from inside the university, how do you see our role as faculty in terms of self-censorship? How critical are we of our own institutions?

UMB: To have tenure is very important because it allows academics to criticize the structure they are in. Our “home” university is the structure we know best and therefore we can give constructive critical feedback. It's crucial to start reflecting upon our own surroundings rather than just to point a finger elsewhere.

If we're not able to bite the hand that feeds us, we are at the wrong place intellectually and ethically.

M: The pursuit of knowledge cannot be untangled from the political agenda. Economic resources that sustain the social project are engendered.

UMB: Universities in the US are highly dependent on funding, specifically when it comes to research. Take green energy. This field would not necessarily have received such wide attention in the US twenty years ago. But there is a change in consumer culture, people care about being “green,” and this puts pressure on the market. Therefore politicians and corporations alike have to deal with this and today there are funds to engage in green energy, to seriously address global warming, to search for ways to reduce energy consumption. This is a big step as to cut back and “think smaller” goes against the American philosophy of growth, expansion, and consumption. But to become “green” also promises new markets. If there is revenue, there are funds. If there are funds, there will be research. It is as simple as that. And social change does not promise revenue.

M: So, we can criticize the status quo. But do we also need to provide alternate solutions?

UMB: What is crucial to me, as an educator, is to support students to become emancipated and critical individuals. Educate them in a way that forces them to think for themselves. I don't support complainers, I support those who really engage to change things and get involved themselves. Of course we should be also taking part in this and join forces to address what needs to be addressed.

M: Is there anything you'd like to add that I haven't asked you about?

UMB: I look towards models that had engaged in different approaches, supported transdisciplinary efforts to allow students and faculty alike to understand the larger picture. The New School of Social Research is an interesting example. In Germany, where I come from, the Bauhaus engaged in a different pedagogy in the arts, developing a wider notion of art and design as part of forming a new society. I am interested in alternative schooling models, and also adult education. The Birmingham School of Cultural Studies arose out of an adult education model. It is critical to invest in other models that support an understanding of the complex challenges we face today. But we should not give up universities as the places of free thinking, and where new generations of intellectuals will be nurtured with the spirit of critical thought.

Saul Slapikoff

M: Do you see any distinction between academia and the university?

SS: Academia, in the way I think you're using it, is really the collectivity of the professoriate, the people who teach and the people who do research. The university is the institution, the trustees. The trustees were the institutional power. Unless you have another set of definitions, that's the one I can use, the one that I'm comfortable with.

M: If we talk about values—cultural and economic—they are related to the act of knowledge. The university accumulates status quo power for those involved in it. Would you have anything to say about this?

SS: I lived through a very interesting time in the American university. I started teaching in 1966 and there was a lot going on at that time in terms of student power and growing anti-war demonstrations, at Tufts University, where I'd just started teaching in my first job. The faculty very quickly developed a movement for faculty power. When I arrived almost all power resided in the hands of the administration. Tenure decisions were made by the dean of faculty, who would appoint an ad hoc committee on each tenure case that pretty well predetermined the outcome, because he would select people who were likely to be sympathetic, or unsympathetic as the case might be. The faculty ended up in a major fight for revision of the bylaws of the arts and sciences that gave considerable power to the faculty. That committee, the Committee on Tenure and Promotion, became an elected committee. Appointments to other committees were made by an elected committee on committees, so that the dean could no longer pack committees and the structure according to his whim. There was a major change in faculty power that reflected what was going on. We had a faculty of perhaps three hundred, and in those days, if you went to a faculty meeting, before these changes occurred there would only be a handful of people there. What was the point of going? There was no power in the hands of the faculty at all, it was a question of listening to what administrators had to say. We transformed that to maybe two hundred people coming to faculty meetings at the peak of interest in this. People used to run for office, they would take positions, so there was a lot of change during that moment. It has since tapered off. The intense interest on the part of faculty has faded. With the faculty who don't care that much anymore,

the administration has found ways to regain a significant amount of institutional control. Even though the structures that we won in the 1960s remain, they don't have the life that they used to have.

M: The university is defined as an organized institution, but lately it's seen more as a corporation, because it appears to operate thanks to the creation of knowledge for its own sake and it has an economic prerogative. Could you comment on that?

SS: A new dean of faculty visited the Biology Department, of which I was a member, and he made the department furious because we were committed to biology in the broadest sense—we were not a molecular biology department, no single sub-discipline was dominant, but he tried to make distinctions about what was going to result in patents and what wasn't. Questions of knowledge didn't matter to him; the question of patentability of discovery mattered to him. The department rose with one voice and really objected to his concept of what we ought to be or become, but it was clear that their interests were business interests and that there had to be that practical application that had a potential for producing some profit for the university through ownership of patents. They created a structure in the university that oversaw the possibility of patenting discovery.

M: Donors, trustees, and institutional supporters are linked to the university affectively, sentimentally, but also politically. What are some of the implications here?

SS: Let me give you a couple of cases. There's the case of Norman Finkelstein, who is a son of survivors of a concentration camp and who's run against the grain of conventional wisdom on the Holocaust, or what he calls the Holocaust industry. He's not a Holocaust denier but he sees the institutional power in the Jewish community as something that's exploiting the Holocaust, rather than dealing with it historically.

He was recently denied tenure at DePaul University, not because he hadn't done scholarship and published, which he had, but what he had published had outraged people like Alan Dershowitz and others in the organized Jewish community, the pro-Israel community, and brought great pressure on DePaul so that he was turned down in his bid for tenure, in spite of the fact that he had been a productive scholar. They just didn't like the content of his scholarship.

There's another similar case. There was a woman in the Anthropology Department at Columbia University, whose name I can't remember, who came up for tenure. Her sin is that she is Palestinian-American. The organized pro-Zionist community

opposed her bid for tenure, and there was a major battle at Columbia over that. People in the field all deeply respected the work that this woman had done. She was clearly a good anthropologist, and it took a major battle for her to get tenure at Columbia. Sides withdrew, with published positions arguing one way or another over what should have been a routine case for somebody who had done her work and done it well. The content of what she was doing, of who she was—not even of what she was doing, because she wasn't that controversial in her research—but the fact of her being Palestinian-American was enough to bring down the organized Zionist-Jewish community. Many Jews supported her, it's not a question of Jew versus non-Jew. It was a battle within the American Jewish community.

M: This is basically for political reasons. Do you see any relationships with economics in terms of organizations' thinking for profit?

SS: If you look at the pay structure within a place like Tufts University, which is not among the Ivy Leagues but is an aspirer for high-value research, has strong faculty and has those commitments, it's clear that major support and major salary goes into the sciences and engineering. There's a pay scale that's true of scientists and engineers, there's another one for social scientists, then there are those for the humanities, and lastly, the arts. People are rewarded for doing the same kinds of work, except that research in the arts and social sciences is different, they don't get rewarded. Why support the sciences and engineering? Because there's a potential profit center there. They're in competition in the outer society with higher paying jobs, because you can move from the university to industry. That's the excuse that's made, but why the university doesn't value the scholarship and teaching and service of faculty who teach in the social sciences, humanities, and arts is a major issue to those of us who think about fairness, at least.

M: To summarize this question, do you see any conflicts between the network of administrative power and the university?

SS: I identify them as a unit: the institutional power and the university as a corporate body are one, to my mind. They may wear different masks on different occasions, but that's what it is.

M: Alumni become fellows or friends of the institutional college, as an Alma Mater. How does this system operate in terms of decision-making? You see a student get a degree and become part of a privileged group of affiliates; how do you see that in relation to the exercise of group pressure in future political, economic ventures?

SS: You have to make a distinction between institutions. In institutions that aim directly at societal elites, what you just posed as a question becomes a reality. For many institutions that are not elite institutions in that sense, alumni probably have more power over questions like sports—who should be the football coach or the athletic director. Their passions are raised by that. They don't particularly interest me but they do interest other people and they play a large role given that the money made by football helps support other parts of the athletic program, and the power of alumni there is enormous. In the same way, it's enormous at Harvard.

M: Let's look at the Ivy League emphasis, this relationship between more power and the university in the case of the privileged.

SS: It's an extended community. The institution is there to train the future power elites and to replicate itself in that sense. It's not interested in changing the nature of society, it's interested in sustaining it and replicating it. Then the people who rise up organizationally, women and alumni groups, will reflect those values, they will become the successors in business and finance. Many of the people who as undergraduates were involved in political opposition make other choices and don't end up there, so what you get reflects the reproduction of the university.

M: In international terms, especially in the relationship between the United States and Latin America, would you say there is a situation of extended colonization or corporate relation? If a student from abroad becomes part of the Alma Mater support group, and perhaps becomes a politician, how is this connected with the university?

SS: I don't have detailed information about it. In general, thinking about the way they train foreign Latin Americans and Middle Easterners at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, you see that while they're here they're exposed to an American value system. From the CIA point of view, they become what the CIA would call assets, because of their training and associations here they might well become people who are particularly sympathetic to a US approach in their home countries when they get back.

And yet, when I've met people in the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, they tend to be a much more varied bunch than that would suggest. There's a stereotype that they're all going to become US assets; many of them have a much more oppositional view about power in their own countries.

M: A common joke in the 1970s was that for David Rockefeller to become

president of the United States would be a demotion. The sentence establishes emblematic, indelible and ineffable connections between academic pursuits and global impact of social and economic institutions. Do you have comments on that and on its implications of the status quo, especially as regards Latin America?

SS: Like most jokes, if they're really funny then there's some truth to them. It's said they grab you around their central truth, that makes it funny because it casts our real set of relationships in bold relief. The Rockefellers, David Rockefeller in particular, were major actors in control in the Western hemisphere, Latin America in particular, and the little reflections of it. You can go to a Rockefeller-built resort if you like, in the Virgin Islands, but far more compelling is the control over agriculture and extractive and manufacturing industries in Latin America. I'm not an expert in this, I only know now what I read on the Internet.

M: Do you see an evolution of interest in Latin American Studies versus European studies? I think this interest in Latin American Studies has increased. Would this be related to economic interests?

SS: Well, part of it is that US interests and power in the Western hemisphere are beginning to diminish. There's a lot more independence from leftist governments in Latin America, although that doesn't mean that Latin America can exist by itself. There's a vacuum created that Europe and China are only too happy to fill, economically and politically. We're at a moment of transition, and how it all will end, I don't know. It's clear that Latin America is no longer politically controlled by the US in the way that it was, and that has created space for others to develop relationships.

M: Maybe other continents?

SS: Other continents and other countries, and there's competition between them. There was no competition before that; now it's possible and it's happening.

M: As a participant from inside the university, how do you view our role in terms of self-censorship? How critical are we of our institutions? Could you give me your thoughts on this?

SS: In my thirty-three years teaching at Tufts it was clear: there were a handful of us who, over the years, were willing to be critical. Most faculty didn't want to go there, because questions of retaliation were possible. Whether they were real, I don't know. I was married to a woman who brought a sex discrimination case

against Tufts that she ultimately didn't win, but she won a contract claim. My raises were almost put on hold during that time. I had to fight to get to the point where I was going to get raises again, and those kinds of retaliations were always a possibility for untenured faculty. Careers are at risk if they become too critical. I was fortunate—I became a faculty member during the 1960s. I had a different value set, I was an active leftist, I was anti-war, and tenure was not the main thing on my mind. I had my teaching, my research, and my politics, and those were the things that drove me, but they didn't drive most of my colleagues. Only perhaps half a dozen or so of us who were so driven.

M: The pursuit of knowledge cannot be disentangled from the political agenda; economic resources that sustain the social project are engendered. Do you have any comments on that?

SS: Well, as scientists we know very well that we may pursue questions based on the intrinsic interest of trying to understand particular facts of nature. How they get used is something else again, something that an institutional structure has major control over. The university recognizes that, so that its move to patent potentially valuable ideas—not leaving them just in the world of ideas, but taking them and moving them into the world of business—is great, and increasing. I don't think there's a research university in the United States that doesn't have an office that is constantly looking for things to patent, and trying to raise consciousness in faculty to report patentable ideas, because they're trying to market this stuff and make what they can out of it.

M: How do you see political ideas as affecting a career in terms of research, or a career jeopardized by a certain kind of ideas?

SS: Some questions in biology have pay-offs. If you put in two grant applications, the one that has a research project with a potential pay-off down the line in terms of product, such as a direct application to human health, rather than fundamental knowledge about it, will be more likely to be funded. There is at least some marginal benefit to the applicant who has something equally qualified. If somebody is pursuing what we could call a fundamental question without immediate pay-off, they're likely to fund the person who has pay-off. That's part of the culture now. When research is done on the human genome, it's research that is of potential interest. Evolution was touted from the beginning as a solution to human illness. What happened was that the genome was patented. Craig Venter develops his own process and it becomes patentable. This is fundamental knowledge that we don't collectively own. Individuals now own that.

M: Do you know when that started?

SS: This tendency goes back a long time, it was resisted in an anti-institutional period in the 1960s but very shortly after that it became much more emergent. A good example is Coumadin: people take it as an anti-coagulant but it was discovered as a rat poison, Warfarin, at the University of Wisconsin. They've made a lot of money from the licensing of this rat poison that in the right dose turns out to be an anti-coagulant. The patenting of that long predates my entering academe, so there'd been a tendency of finding things like things that are patentable like that and patenting them. It's become a dominant mode in institutional behavior.

M: My knowledge is that the pressures on economic revenue in research are becoming more and more evident under the Reagan administration when they began asking the university to be productive. Is that something that is perceived?

SS: With Reagan you had a spokesperson for that. It was really out there, that administration coming in with a clear, Republican ideological agenda. He was a clear articulator of it. Whether or not it originated with Reagan, I'm not so sure; I'm not so sure it wasn't around with Carter or before, but the dominance of that attitude may well date from the 1980s.

M: Do you have anything to add, anything I didn't ask you about or that you think could be complimentary to this complex relationship between economics, politics, the industry of knowledge, and power?

SS: A lot of us tend to romanticize the university of the past. We look at the university of today so clearly enmeshed with power and with economic interest, with a business mentality about what its faculty ought to be doing or the pay-offs that ought to be there from faculty research, but my guess is that that romantic picture just doesn't really apply, that we romanticize a less virulent pressure in interest because after all, the university, before the end of World War II, was there for the elites. I'm the first generation of my family to go to college. The whole number of PhDs obtained by people from working-class backgrounds is really a major post-World War II phenomenon. The university before that was an institution for elites. You had to have some other kind of support or be willing to live really marginally to be able to do that as a working-class person. Some people did, but it didn't become anything like it did after World War II. The GI Bill helped that enormously, the Russians with Sputnik helped that enormously. Suddenly it became something we had to do a Cold War way: build the university, build the sciences, build engineering.

Doris Sommer

Muntadas: Do you see a distinction between academia and the university?

Doris Sommer: Being someone who's interested in words, I can say that academia is a word that was used by the Greeks to describe an institution of higher learning, and university is a medieval word that has survived into modern times. For me at that level, there is not a major distinction. Both had the presumption to understand universal issues, an ambition that's clear in the modern word, university.

M: Let's talk about values—spiritual, cultural, and political values—how are they associated with knowledge? How do you connect that knowledge, through the university, interweaving them with economics and power?

DS: This question doesn't get asked very often at the university. But Cultural Agents do ask it and try to come up with a range of responses, practical responses, not only academic answers. Values are important because they drive activities, not only because they clarify knowledge. At Cultural Agents we believe that knowledge is achieved through what Marxists would call praxis. One reflects on existing conditions, designs an intervention for a positive outcome, and then reflects on the effects of the intervention and the change in conditions. That's not necessarily an approach to learning that is consistent with contemporary humanism, but it had been a long tradition. Cultural Agents tries to link into that civic tradition of humanism which is rooted in Classic and Renaissance learning. Ethical behavior has a direct link to aesthetics from the eighteenth century on and these develop in the early days of modern universities, from Berlin's first university in 1810, as training in civics. One learned about foreign countries and one's own government, one learned languages in order to understand a home culture in the context of others. This is the tradition of the humanities that we've somehow lost touch with. Cultural Agents gets back in touch with it, not only by mounting major conferences but also developing workshops. If we've located exemplars of civic engagement through art and aesthetic reflection, people who make significant contributions to the world through creative practices, then those creative practices deserve to be multiplied at the university. Our major inaugural event was in December of 2003 when Brazilian Augusto Boal, the developer of Theatre of the Oppressed, came to do ten days of workshops with

us and with community members in the Boston-Cambridge area. We continue to develop our capacities and the capacities of students, faculty, and friends in the Boston area through hands-on work. Recently, we hosted Boal-type workshops at the A.R.T. for acting students and dramaturges, and also for race-relations counselors at Harvard College.

M: If we see the university as a traditional institution, we now also need to see the institution as corporation. Could you comment on that?

DS: I would share many of the disappointments and criticisms that are voiced by colleagues throughout the university, when we see ourselves treated as just another business, rather than a haven to develop a sense of freedom from business as usual. That freedom allows us to develop, as I said, ethical values. Very soon, the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures at Harvard will meet to consider how to respond to the elimination of four humanities departments at SUBY Albany in October 2010. And now we have new worries about the fate of the NEH and the NEA in Congress.

However, what distinguishes Cultural Agents from some responses to a crisis in the humanities is a sense of responsibility to offer practical answers to skepticism about our field. Some business-like demands may be unreasonable and debilitating, but not all of them are. When a corporate-style administrator asks humanists what they contribute to society, or how we can justify major expenditures in humanities programs when it's hard to calculate what benefits they bring, humanists typically feel offended. "Humanists don't have to be useful; we're dedicated to the arts." This allergy to utility is what keeps the humanities rooted in a certain moment of aesthetic thinking. It's the moment in which freedom is achieved through purposeless, disinterested, appreciation of beauty. This is an important experience that we learned to theorize from Kant. However, what the humanities have lost touch with is Kant's general program of achieving political freedom and constructing non-coercive accords. The program begins with the aesthetic experience and then continues to develop a sense of political commonality from the shared sense of beauty, a "common sense." It's not based on any stable truth or goodness, but on a subjective experience that can become inter-subjective. Sometimes this means "courting agreement," as Kant says, and this is the beginning of political deliberation. It is based on an experience outside of existing interests and concepts, an experience accompanied by freedom from those concerns. The link he located between freedom and responsibility, artistic innovation and social innovation, can be recovered if we frame humanistic study as a civic project of teachers who are Cultural Agents.

M: A little more pragmatically, to return to a kind of day-to-day situation, donors, trustees, institutional supporters are linked to the university affectively, romantically, but also socially and politically. What are the implications of this?

DS: I will answer your practical question with a practical answer based on personal, although limited, experience. On several occasions, I have researched with the Development Office how to engage existing and future donors to Harvard in this project of civic development through the arts. I've been told that in fact, many donors are intensely interested in the arts and would welcome the chance to link the arts and humanities to a renewed commitment to civic education. However, the priorities of the university don't include this one, so donors are encouraged to choose among other no doubt worthy projects. One very interesting front for collaborations and acquiring greater flexibility in the university might be to engage development offices in new opportunities for broadening their networks and for deepening the commitment of donors by responding to their own passions for arts linked to civics.

M: Could you comment on the economic implications? If they donated money, did they want anything in return?

DS: That would be a fair bargain, and there are now very effective ways to measure, through social indicators, what kind of work the university is capable of doing. For example, I recently got a note from a colleague who worked at Brown University for several years on a parallel project to the one that we developed in arts literacy called the Paper Picker Press. Kurt Wootton's Arts Literacy also makes art the vehicle for critical thinking and high level literacy. Kurt worked for four years at a local high school in Providence, Rhode Island, with a base at Brown, training teachers, developing collaborations, cajoling people to consider the arts as a necessary part of any standard curriculum in the range of academic subjects. He recently got the results, after a four-year pilot and two years into the implementation after that pilot. On the state standardized tests, students showed that their reading proficiency increased threefold. This was not the result of a program targeted to improve grades—many high schools have those programs, and they don't deliver the profound gains of arts literacy. There are good social indicators that could prove to donors that their money was being very productive in creating the base of a democratic society.

M: Do you see any conflict between the university and the network of power that it implies?

DS: My own participation at the university, and in projects that I think the university can support with more commitment, make me complicit. My role here is to take opportunities to develop a sense of civic excitement and commitment among students I am privileged to teach.

M: Could you talk from an insider/outsider perspective? You see that the university, academia in general, has an implication of creating a certain kind of system of power.

DS: The thing that comes to mind is the Harvard brand. Anyone who studies at Harvard, anyone who has taken even a week-long certificate-granting seminar at Harvard, somehow wields power in home countries and even in this one. Sometimes the power is disproportional to what they've learned. The networks are important. I'll give you an example: The Harvard Alumni Association convenes presidents of Harvard clubs from all over the world. Harvard clubs are opportunities for graduates of Harvard to continue to remain in touch and to maintain their social networks, both in their own countries and when they come here from abroad. Last year, the clubs convened and the main event for the Latin American Club was a workshop with Cultural Agents in La Cartonera, in the Paper Picker Press, because the director of the Latin American circuit at the Harvard Alumni Association is a very intelligent, creative and socially-committed woman named Sara Aske. She knows that this creative literacy project could help to build strong societies in the graduates' homes. What she did was dedicate the entire morning to organizing very correct, wealthy graduates of Harvard in what looked like child's play, and what they soon realized was an exercise in high order thinking. Networks can be incredibly powerful. I hope we don't forget the potential that we have through networks, and I would like to imagine that these networks, even through Harvard, can be activated to really build the basis of strong citizens, which means creative citizens.

M: You are speaking about alternatives and your position is clearly alternative. I'd also like to hear about what you think is mainstream in these Harvard clubs.

DS: It would be presumptuous of me to say more than I know, and my own practice in the networks is alternative, but the fact that the networks make those alternatives possible gives me more impetus to resignify what a network means. Resignification is a convenient term we use in the arts in general, and when I say that Kant was developing a clever way to use common sense, I'm saying he's the master of resignification. Why not resignify what networks mean without getting stuck in legitimate critiques that have already been suggested in the standard, not

alternative use? In other words, Cultural Agents recognize the need for analysis and for critique. The problem that concerns us is that academic and even artistic projects often remain at the level of critique and don't risk that extra move towards intervention. Intervention is risky. We would rather understand networks as an opportunity for intervention.

M: Affiliation groups are made by all students and in a way by alumni. The university has become a power structure of decision-making. An example of this is a student from Venezuela, Brazil or Puerto Rico who maintains a relationship with the university as a recognition of the Alma Mater, and as a support system. How do they take advantage of that?

DS: Again, these are waters that others swim better than I, but I do want to say at least that you can think alternatively about what those power structures look like. I think about the example of Puerto Rico, where there are many distinguished graduates of Harvard. They are successful lawyers and businessmen and politicians. But there is barely a network of Harvard alumni in Puerto Rico—there is no club. Therefore, there are intellectual, academic opportunities—I'm not sure about economic and political opportunities—that aren't exploited because the network hasn't been built yet. I have great hopes, and even some optimism, that The David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies will be able to ignite enough interest and pride in one's Harvard background to raise funds so that we can continue to host a Winter Institute in Puerto Rico that joins Harvard faculty, Puerto Rican faculty, and graduate students in equal numbers from both sides of the puddle, as they say in Puerto Rico. It's a seminar that's been held very successfully for five years. Our funding is about to run out, and I think it brings great advantages, distinction, and networking for Puerto Rican students and faculty that Harvard alumni should help to grow.

Again, from me you have the alternative voice, but I think that networks should not be dismantled but be resignified. It's the same mechanism in gangs, if you will. There's no really effective way to dismantle a gang, because these "families" are sources of support and recognition. The only successful intervention that I've seen in gangs is to resignify them as arts collectives, as businesses, as other categories in civil society. I would like to explore how privileged networks might be resignified for a developing world. Some societies reach a level of insecurity that affects all sectors, which raises incentives for this resignification.

M: In connection with the university, they created what has been called the Ivy League, that represents knowledge, a kind of standard level of *connaissance*, but also status quo. How do you see the Ivy League in a broader spectrum?

DS: I'm very glad you ask that because now I have the opportunity to say that I am a graduate of only public schools: public grade schools, high schools, university, and graduate schools. I'm a graduate of Rutgers University, a fine but not first-rate university at all levels, and as many people in academia, I am an autodidact to some important measure, because we keep reading, sometimes in reading circles when the texts are challenging. One disappointment that I have with Harvard is the difficulty in establishing reading circles. People are either too busy or reluctant to admit they find some books hard, unlike other places I've worked. There are some very distinguished public universities that most serious academics recognize on an equal footing with the Ivy League; Berkeley, the University of Wisconsin at Madison, Michigan; it's not impossible even for very elite academics to recognize that parity. Being a graduate of a public university, I have enormous faith in the possibility of acquiring a good public school education, and the main project that Cultural Agents is involved in now is a project to increase the efficacy of literacy programs through the Cartonera/ Paper Picker Press in the area of Boston. I know that Mayor Menino several years ago convened a meeting among top administrators of the great universities in this area to discuss the challenge that he thought we all should share; children in many public schools in the Boston area don't learn to read and write. The dropout rate is alarming, especially for minority students. When people tell me that in Mexico the dropout rate is in the 38 to 39 percentile for high school, I ask them to sit down before I tell them about the New York area and also Boston. The graduation rate—not dropout rate—for minority students there is about 38 to 39 percent. There is still a collaboration that was established then, between the city of Boston and major universities, to collectively fund enrichment programs in the schools that are most underserved.

The responsibility and opportunity for Ivy League institutions and also for excellent public universities is to do the kind of research and the kinds of arts intervention that will increase the likelihood that kids in public schools get a good education. In fact, Public Humanities programs are developing quickly. The most recent one I learned of is at Yale, through their American Studies program.

M: How do you see self-censorship of intellectuals inside universities, in relation to politics and economics? Do you have any comments about the position of intellectuals in their own institutions and about the self-censorship process that we are involved in?

DS: That's an enormous ethical issue, because successful people tend to be strategic. University professors are notably cautious about their own positions. During the debates around Larry Summer's presidency here, many people were very critical

of the presidency and yet very few were openly critical. I have a colleague who wondered why people were so self-censored, distinguished people with years of tenure and many academic medals.

M: A common joke in the 1970s ran that if David Rockefeller became president of the United States it would be a demotion. The sentence is emblematic of indelible and often ineffable connections between academic pursuits and the global impact of social and economic institutions.

DS: I have great respect for the way that the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard University has developed with the Rockefeller donation. The founding tone of academic and also social commitments established the center's mission as autonomous from donors' contributions. When the first donation was announced, and when the first group of the advisory committee of potential donors was convened, it was very clear that the donors wanted to eliminate the possibility of Latino studies and immigration studies. That was at the beginning, in 1992 or '93. It was decided, though, that if immigration issues were important to the faculty, if they related to Latin America in obviously indirect but important ways, then they should not be excluded from the agenda. We had many debates on that issue, and they were always resolved with integrity and a dedication to the best scholarly criteria. We're living through a very difficult economic moment. I have no idea what kinds of conversations to anticipate. I can only tell you a good historical memory which keeps me very much dedicated to the center.

M: Traditionally, universities have very strong European Studies departments. In American universities these departments seem to be switching slightly to Latin American Studies. Is that because of geographical and cultural, or also economic interests? What are the implications in discovering a country that could be a potential client?

DS: We have commented at times that the United States didn't seem to have much interest in Latin American affairs. We were all delighted that it was very high on Obama's agenda, so we don't take for granted that interest is shifting, in any dramatic way, from European Studies to Latin American Studies. The departments do grow, but not to the same degree or at the same rate as appointments in American government or American history. Asian Studies may be growing at a faster rate than Latin American Studies. There are good donations.

M: There is a connection with economics.

DS: Certainly. There is also a healthy mood at the university, probably directly related to economics, which is a sincere commitment, for the first time in hundreds of years, to international study. One thing that David Rockefeller did about two years ago was donate seventy-five million dollars to the project of encouraging every undergraduate at Harvard College to have a significant undergraduate international experience. It can't be tourism, it can't be short. Through that donation, Harvard can afford to send students to a place other than the United States and require them to stay at least eight weeks and report on that stay in intelligent ways. Globalization has all sorts of effects, positive and negative, but that project has been an eye-opener and a mind-opener for the university, and again it's thanks to David Rockefeller's donation.

Mark Wigley

Muntadas: What is your take on academia and the university? Do you see difference or similarities? How is your approach in terms of the concepts of the two entities?

Mark Wigley: University I understand more easily than academia. University is an old mechanism for thinking. Based on the relationship between teachers and students, a university is a corporation, a body of people that has nothing to do with architecture. In fact a university at its core is nomadic. It's wherever the teacher is. At the beginning the teacher receives a foundation, such as a building, and the only reason we have architecture was that it was good prestige for a city to have a good teacher, so they would give them a space, a building. Architecture began as a bribe to keep a university in one place. Then the architecture gets more and more solid and so we start to think of a university as a place, as a site of buildings. You have this fundamentally nomadic institution. Since it's a place for thinking, it is nomadic not just in the sense that it can be anywhere in the world, but can actually be not in the world at all. University is kind of like a part of the place in the world and leaves the rest of the world behind; you go to the world of ideas. Then architecture starts to arrive, trying to restrain the university to belong to a place and could tell a story that says "At the beginning there are only fixed ideas that the university is discussing." In fact, they are not discussing the ideas, they're discussing how to discuss the ideas, so there are certain theories of the angels and so on. A good student is one that knows how well to argue the standard positions. There's no new knowledge. The university is not a place to generate knowledge, but a place to protect knowledge. You protect the knowledge but you don't need that protection yourself. What happens after a while is you have more and more architecture, more and more physical protection, and not by accident. You actually have more and more freedom, and more and more invention of knowledge. You could even say the more we can invent new ideas and explore, the more we move towards a research university, the more solid architecture we have. It's an inverse relationship between the strength of the architecture, the immobility of the architecture, and the mobility of the ideas; teachers no longer moving, but ideas now moving. In the beginning there were teachers moving but the ideas were actually always the same.

This is the long answer to your question. Academia is the most conservative element of this system. Even more rigid than the architecture is the academia,

the faculty. Faculty is the most extremely solid, immobile part of the university. We've gone from a situation where the most mobile thing is the teacher to a situation where the most fixed thing is the teacher. In a way, the purpose of academia is to stop the university from moving. Faculty is very good at that. They are really professional. We give tenure to the people we think can really hold the university in its place the strongest.

M: Aside from the cultural and intellectual values also provided by these acts of knowledge, the university accumulates a certain kind of status quo and also a certain amount of power. What are your comments on that?

MW: The central trick of the university is to say "In order to think we should step outside the normal space and time." You leave the world behind in order to be above the world or before the world or after the world to think and reflect. It's a space of reflection. You can reflect on the world but not from inside the world. This idea is a trick because the university says "We are not in the world, we are not instrumental in the world." We leave the instrumental behind but this then becomes a source of huge instrumental power, like the philosopher who says to the king "You should do what I tell you because I'm not political. I just give you the truth." The university says to the world "Because we're outside of the world, we can tell you what to do." Universities become very instrumental and so there is a power that comes directly from this gesture. The physical space of the university is the most obvious sign of this kind of paradox. You could not be more in the world than these huge accumulations of masonry; so much ivy hanging there, so much money stored there. But still, the power of this comes from saying "We don't care about power, we care only about the truth."

M: I think universities function as institutions, but gradually have evolved into corporations. I think the function of people's roles have evolved from the institutional to the corporate world. How do you see this evolution?

MW: I'm not sure. I have, in a way, two answers in mind immediately; the second one is more interesting. What if it was the other way around? A university, by definition, is always a corporation. What if Harvard, Yale, Princeton, to give the most obvious cases, operate more like big business earlier? What if the big nineteenth-century companies that become the big corporations in the twentieth century are imitating the structures of universities? Already in the nineteenth century universities are holding a lot of land and a lot of resources and already these endowments are in process. We look at it and say "Wow, universities sacrificed their traditional role and it becomes increasingly hard to tell the difference

between a university and a big business.” But it probably goes in both directions. The business becomes more and more like a university and a university becomes more and more like a business. For example, even most corporations see themselves as educational institutions. Even their advertising is just a communication of the inner truth of the product. If only one knew that this toothpaste was so internally beautiful then you would all use it. Then you go inside the actual structure of the corporation and they have a process of education or training. It’s absolutely a corporation with very large amounts of capital and very large amounts of workers. Legally subject to almost the same rules except one enormous and puzzling threshold; the university is a not-for-profit corporation, in theory and in law. A corporation is a for-profit.

Far from not paying the same taxes, where is the difference? In the US, at this moment, politicians are very skeptical about the universities’ non-profit status because they correctly observe the instrumental function of the university, and the fundraising and the capital and the magnifying properties of the university. The university itself has been paying so much attention to the flow of money inside itself that it’s almost embarrassing to say “not-for-profit.” We should at least hesitate and say “Maybe this distinction is not so clear.” We know perfectly that the large corporations pay no taxes, that when they apply all of the rules, all of the loopholes that are given to them by virtue of cultural advantage of a corporation, they end up paying no tax. In a strange way there is not such a clear line between a not-for-profit and a for-profit corporation—and I don’t have any expertise in this, but I think nobody in the university will fully pretend to be outside the business economy, and nobody in business will pretend to be outside the economy of knowledge—if we can say that. There is, between the two, a huge area of mutual collaboration. This area of mutual collaboration may even be honorable. Instinctively we are bound to say “No”, that this is a zone of collusion and false representation and simulation, that the world of profit is using relationships with universities as a disguise for their carnivorous appetites, and that the university uses the space as a disguise for its profit seeking sensibility. We can watch a young student of biology as she makes a huge breakthrough in the organization of the genes, and then is able to work in a laboratory sponsored by a corporation and take that research further, and is then able to start a new company with the money coming from a big drug company, but the university is receiving a lot of intellectual property rights. What do we say? What are the ethics of this? It’s not so easy. Let’s say that this drug saves many lives. What do we say?

M: How do you perceive private and public universities? Are they similar or is there still some distinction in the organization of the two?

MW: It's a great question. It was the formation of the public universities, the state universities, that allowed architecture to get into the university, specifically at MIT. The formation of MIT as the first land grant college allowed architecture to enter university because you had a university aiming to a more broad, egalitarian base. Not by accident architecture, in that moment, was able to say "Ha, well you know, it's true that we're a combination of science—instrumental logic—and so we can arrive in a technical university, and we are philosophical and artistic so we also belong in the classical understanding of a university." The classical university had always said "Absolutely no architecture." We arrived that way. Have the private universities become more like the technical universities? Yes. Have they re-engineered along protocols of diversity arguments to address the same population? Yes. But is the difference still great? Yes. The difference is still huge because the real difference is symbolic. There are likely scholars doing work in the state universities that have all of the philosophical rigor and elitism that one would associate with a classical university, but it will not be packaged in the same way. I don't have the expertise here, but my tendency is to think that structurally there's no discernible difference, but symbolically it's the same. If I get a scholarship to go to an Ivy League institution, do I bring my culture to the institution or do I learn the culture of the institution? The answer is usually I learn the culture of the institution. I am teaching in an elite university. It's Columbia University with a much stronger political base, much more international, much more cosmopolitan, much more New York. But to learn the cosmopolitan language of New York is not quite the same as speaking with the voice of the disadvantaged. It's close though. The university where I teach is a test case of the line between an elite fortress and a more broad-based and therefore risky exchange. All of the symptoms of Columbia, and why I like it more than I can say, are exactly that the university stages the tests every day. You watch ideas and people go backwards and forwards across a perceived line between elite authority, global elite authority and challenges to that authority, at every level.

M: This university is organized.

MW: I have a couple of thoughts. One is, there is no corner of the university that escapes this question. You cannot hide in a department of Philosophy or Religion or Plasma Physics or Art History or Eighteenth-century Aesthetics. You cannot hide from this moment of exchange between the world, the money of the world and this world of ideas. Let's say the line between the inside and the outside of the university is not a wall. Again, it's about architecture being a disguise. The lines between the inside and outside of the university exist inside each teacher, and each classroom, and each essay, and each negotiation. But the obvious case is

a donor who names a department or a chair. The motivations for the donor are many. There can be guilt at the end of a long, successful life if nothing was given back, so it can be a last-minute decision. It can also come early as a love or even jealousy of the university. What if a lot of money comes into the university because of its seeming detachment from the economy—something very beautiful, something precious, something like innocence, such that you could have something like this by supporting it? The great honor of teaching at a university is to be with young minds. If I'm a donor I can be with young minds, in a certain way. Maybe I could never be a teacher, or maybe I can be very successful in the world of business, and not be a great teacher, but in donating I can enable teaching. In each case, you can see the most generous thoughts in the donor, and you can read the exact symptom for the most disingenuous and selfish thoughts after all—it is my name I will now place on that teacher. It is as if I have an employee who speaks beautiful thoughts but now I'm speaking beautiful thoughts through him. Also, the person will speak for me when I'm dead; he will speak forever. You can see it absolutely as the ultimate form of narcissism. You can also see it as the empowering of the students that listen to voice. My general feeling is that it makes almost no sense to make a decision about this—the university is in the world. The university is highly capitalized economy. There is no clear line between the economy of ideas and the economy of resources. It means that a donor makes the possibility of a new research possible. This is an extremely beautiful thing. You can read it another way, but I'm not sure what a person who reads all of the donations negatively does. For example, can they buy anything in a store, can they read a book? What options are left? An easy target is a business that you don't have a lot of respect for so you feel like they don't belong in the space of the university. Perhaps you are right—the university is also protecting certain ideas. All of us must hesitate at that border, and I think that hesitation and that border are the most interesting parts of a university.

M: Years ago, this was a romantic view. Are there less politicized people now?

MW: I suppose in a general sense I don't think that any one moment or any one person is more political than the other. The question is, what is the politic? Clearly the sense of a common politics, in the 1960s, was the sense of a shared set of enemies and a shared set of goals. I don't see that that is so evident today. I think there's a multiplication of change. There's also quite a different sense of strategy. Around questions of globalization, ecology, human rights, I think you see some of the political actions that are familiar from the 1960s and even the questions are familiar. Now you have a student that is much more multitasking, dealing with much more diverse forms of information. There's much more, so

he's seeing the political stage in much more in a space of communication than, for example, the space of a campus. For most students, a successful Internet attack, such as occupying a president's website, would be a much more powerful political statement than occupying a president's office. Or to put it another way, occupying the president's office would only be political inasmuch as it fit into this context. I have also a kind of nostalgia that says perhaps this is wrong, perhaps you have a more anesthetized generation that somehow has been trained to see themselves as politically effective agents in the electronic space. In other words, they see themselves as being highly functioning democratic agents, agents of democratic force. Whereas, in fact, the space that they occupy and demonstrate in is a relatively controlled and relatively unchanging space.

Architecture is a field with a slow fuse. There is the sense that you only become operational ten to twenty years after graduating. There are a lot of students that are aiming their political will to a future event. It is so hard to tell if this new generation is just going to accept work from any client in any space.

M: But there were many faculty members within American universities who criticized the Vietnam War.

MW: The faculty are the solid structure of a university. If you take a person and each idea of a person linked to the next person it forms a chain that is an almost immovable structure. To become part of that structure, to get tenure, you essentially offer that you will take a place in that structure and you will link with the colleagues on each side of you. The choice of tenure is the choice of collegiality, but collegiality also means a kind of domesticity, protection of the house. To defend the house well, in a changing world, you need some mutations. You need some variation. It seems to me that universities survive as an institution almost in a Darwinian sense, by repeating almost everything like in a biological species. Almost everything is repeated. But, every now and then there is a small variation and that variation carries in it the potential to allow the whole organism to evolve. When choosing someone to give tenure to there should be a little mutation. Really forceful, powerful critiques directed from the faculty to the structure of their own universities are firstly extremely rare, but secondly are perhaps impossible because if you take your position at the university by linking arm to arm with all the other colleagues and all the other ideas, your very ability to have an idea depends on this university structure.

M: And the political implications outside the university?

MW: It's a very strong paradox, but firstly, it's normal. The number one role of

teachers is to protect their house, although they will tell you the opposite. It's a completely traditional, uber-conservative role. In fact, you could be in the most experimental—your whole field could even have the word experimental in it, you could be in experimental plasma physics—but your core structural operation would be to protect the house. Chomsky is such a beautiful example because his scholarly work was on deep structure, was on things that don't change within; language, for example. The fluidity and unpredictability of languages conceals from us a little bit the way in which language doesn't change. This is a very pointed question for me because I am in a school which is defined as the most experimental school in its field in the world. Its job is to change assumptions. How do you create a structure within a university; a laboratory, a whole school as a laboratory? Whose purpose it is to change the assumptions of those who teach about architecture in the university? How do I create a structure which will, itself, not be challenged, because universities don't challenge their own structures but generate work that ultimately changes the direction and assumptions of the field? To put this question very clearly, how do you give tenure to somebody in architecture whose role is to subvert the way people think? In a certain sense, every time we go to the university to say "Please, this person should be given tenure" we have to explain that this architect or philosopher has the ability to change the way we think about architecture radically to such an extent that they cause nervousness in the field, and this is why we should keep them.

Interestingly, in an architecture school, the university is very respectful of this argument precisely because architecture is seen to be not only a science, but an art. In a strange way we are able to go backwards and forwards across the line between subversion and conservation in this way. If you get into the other parts of the university it becomes more of a challenge. Surely the sign of somebody having very strongly criticized the university is that their survival within the university is really threatened. They're just surviving. Very few faculty put themselves in that position. Many are faculty who wear the flag of the 1960s. Faculty that see themselves as highly political, faculty that speak discourse of class, who speak of conservatism of the university itself, are often the very first people to make sure their sabbatical is carefully organized and their retirement plans are carefully structured and they're very sure that tenure was a good thing. In other words, in their personal life they could not be more servants of the university. I think the new generation of students is absolutely distrustful of radicals with room service, which is how they see the generation that was so strong in the 1960s. They see this generation as having the language of the revolution, but the personal life of gentrified classes. As you know, we who have tenure in the university have four months every year to reflect. Do we really use these four months to seriously engage and challenge the assumptions of our field, or are we living a very protected life? The level of hypocrisy is impressive.

M: I want to go back to talking about architecture, university, and space. Most of the things we've been talking about are happening in spaces; classrooms, libraries, corridors, and the form of the university monasteries. What will happen when these building become glass and transparent? What are your thoughts about the relationship of the university space and the use of the space in relationship to architecture? How people are moving, the topology, the use of the university space and the conditions and implications of that space?

MW: I have quite a deterministic attitude about that. Each of the spaces of the university is a precise machine for sustaining a certain type of discourse. Classroom, lighting system, a set of tables, a projector, a software package like PowerPoint. To what extent is PowerPoint defining the space of university teaching more than the walls of the university? All of these things support a certain way of thinking. Every small change in the physical space of the university produces and is designed to produce a certain kind of intellectual change, so my answer would be yes, a glass university would generate an entirely different discourse than one with solid walls. It's clear that more of the key teaching in a university happens outside of the classroom—in the hallways, cafeterias, the bench, the smoking areas. In fact, more universities are starting to understand this and are starting to think of the spaces in between the classrooms as the most important spaces. The university in a way is trying to turn those spaces into teaching spaces. Does that mean that those spaces will no longer work? Maybe.

M: Gain access to WIFI and to where everybody can work with computers.

MW: Whenever I place a beautiful bench in our school, within five minutes it's occupied almost twenty-four hours a day. If I were to put a camera on that bench, and monitor all the transactions there, I would probably conclude that it's more interesting and more important for the future of the field than anything that happens in the classroom. Or to put it another way, the classroom is setting the basic conditions, or creating the possibility for the conversation that happens at the bench. Bad lecture in the classroom creates the possibility for two students to argue about why it was bad, and in arguing why it was bad, come up with their own position. I have a strong sympathy for the people that argue that the primary purpose of the university is teaching and teaching even at a more or less formulaic level that is giving the students a capacity to think in new ways. The real product of the university is not the idea that goes from the teacher to the student, but the idea that the student has after they leave the university. In this sense, the main responsibility for us is ideas the students haven't had. The question is, "Which architectural spaces best serve the brain ten years after graduation?" The strong

feeling now would be the spaces in between.

If that's the case, if you have an all-glass university, one of the effects of that is that you have no space in between because it's all the same space. There might be some useful nostalgia for the monastic environment for exactly this moment that you leave it. Remember that's the first trick of the university: you enter the space of knowledge, you leave behind the politics, the time, the economy, the rhythm, the people, the context, the food of everyday life, to think and then return. When you're thinking, you are in an economy with people—after all, the word symposium is the word for a feast. You are eating a lot and are with people a lot. There's a lot of sex in a university, for example, but it's different and then you return. The question is how to upgrade the architecture like upgrading the software, or the curriculum, in such a way that it generates more potential. In this sense, one of the big questions we're facing is increasing the classroom as a Skype classroom with students from different locations from around the world. This is something theorized since the 1960s and experimented with since the 1960s. Now it's not an experiment, it's the normal thing.

M: Do you think a particular space is changing; for example the classrooms, the auditoriums? Is there any kind of movement in thinking for classrooms and auditoriums to change?

MW: Yes, there is a movement that started in business schools for so called “breakout rooms,” small spaces that can have six or seven people in them. In the business environment this meant that after a big lecture teams of students would go to a small room and work on a project together. This starts to move now through the university. It creates the possibility for new kinds of interaction, new kinds of collaborative thinking. These rooms are often equipped with Skype. I could have a small breakout room in one university connected to a small breakout room in another university. Small breakout room in a business school can be connected to a breakout room in a social science school which can be connected to an art school. This is one big direction.

But the second one is that the architecture student has had an increasing influence on space. More universities are saying we need an open space that can be continually changing according to the nature of research, essentially a collaborative space which is occupied twenty-four hours a day, equipped with electronics and so on, and is an open-ended laboratory space in which people work collaboratively in ever shifting ranges of teams. Now if you go to science, they say, “This is how science is done now.” You work in a laboratory, but there are other scientists with you and they are all sharing the same space and then you eat together. We are moving towards a combination of open studios—which are like lofts—

generally with good light because they are also social spaces, sometimes quite big rooms, but also small rooms.

If you look at the history of universities, generally every school offers a spectrum. There are the large hierarchical lecture theaters with every student assigned to a seat, saying nothing, not even asking questions, just receiving wisdom from a single figure. Tiered down, moving closer and closer such that the room is one where the teacher can see every person and they interact, closer and closer to seminar rooms around a table through to the breakout room. Most universities provide the full spectrum and keep the students bouncing up and down from there. In an architecture school you generally begin your day in a big lecture theater, then you go to a seminar room, then you go to a studio room, and you end your day back in the lecture theater.

M: The position of the teacher changes. It was a blackboard, now it's a projector and a screen that the teacher is behind. It's more of a cinematographic situation than the rhetorical.

MW: Yes. More and more the student takes the position of the teacher. This seems to highlight something that's always been true, but not focused on—we all know that the teacher is a performance artist. It's just clear. As with any other performance, the medium is not quite the message so the performance can be great, but the content not great, but the pedagogical effect is perfect, and vice-versa. Being a student is also a performance. In the tradition of the big lecture hall with the one-way traffic of information we don't pay attention to the fact that even listening is a performance. There's a certain aesthetic to listening. This has now developed and the student has a series of very stylized performances. The spaces have been adjusted to this. The only real innovation has been the arrival of these big loft spaces in almost every school. In physics, for example, they now use the studio system to think through a problem. You can argue that when people put a problem online and have the problem solved by a community of a hundred thousand scientists, they're using something like the studio system, a multidimensional system. Big empty spaces, non-hierarchical spaces, are coming in. Very small pods, breakout rooms, are coming up. The middle of the usual spectrum is sitting there. The usual spectrum is like an old slide projector, it's still a powerful mechanism.

M: What are the implications of universities' expanding need for space? Are there issues of gentrification and issues of benefits in real estate?

MW: In as much as the universities are corporations, like any other corporation

they're in competition with each other, so they assemble resources to compete. It has nothing to do with gentrification. It has to do with the competition between the universities. This competition is not a negative thing. It is generating the conditions for new forms of knowledge. Universities keep expanding and they will keep expanding. This becomes an embarrassing fact for both the city and the university—embarrassing for the city because the university seems to be carnivorous, seems to be eating the city, and embarrassing for the university because it's always treasuring its dream of being outside the economy. As your space keeps growing exponentially, the truth of the fact that you and the city are, and have always been, sleeping with each other becomes painfully obvious. This expansion occurs within the more vulnerable pockets of cities, the available pockets of cities, like any other kind of expansion. Then there is a showdown between the disadvantaged who occupy the pockets and the advantaged of the university. Again, this is a complete embarrassment for all sides. If the university could expand without occupying such spaces it would. But it can't and it never will. One could perhaps tell a history of the expansion of universities that is a history like the expansion of cities themselves. Then gentrification comes in as an ecological consequence of growth. These are arguments that you will find in New York and Boston and everywhere. They will never end. Universities will continue to grow. Universities are bigger than cities because each part of the world has associated with it a part of the university. The university is a thinking machine, so a liberal arts university and a research university are thinking about everything. Every part of the world has a piece of the university assigned to it, but also every part of the previous world; the history and the future. Universities are machines for thinking about the world and beyond the world and before the world. Like computers, the capacity for that thinking machine will grow exponentially. We might even imagine that universities will grow even more quickly. This takes us to the real question that is, in order to be a brain able to think about the world today, you cannot imagine a university only being in one city. I think what will happen soon is that the university will explode to a global scale. The question will not be, "What does it mean for Columbia to go uptown or Harvard to go across the river?" It will be, "What does it mean for Harvard to be in India?" Then the question will be, "Does Harvard occupy India in the way that it's occupying the disadvantaged suburb of its own city?" If the answer is "Yes," this will be a hugely negative thing.

M: In terms of franchise? Similar to what happened with museums?

MW: Yes. I think that the franchising of universities has nothing to do with expanding intellectual firepower, but has to do with expanding the market for

a set of ideas. The standard strategy taken by universities is a Starbucks model, where you sell existing intellectual content. It's really about moving intellectual content in the global scale but also increasing the financial import channels.

M: Historically, the US wanted elites from Third World countries to come here, but at the moment these universities can go to them.

MW: I see it in terms of a structural evolution. Most of the big universities, not just American, are going for the franchise model, which I think is entirely boring and has nothing to do with the expansion of intellectual firepower. For that reason, it will run out of steam because in the end what makes universities competitive is their capacity to think. Maybe I'm naïve about this, but I think a university that has more power to think will have more power in the world and will ultimately be more competitive. In that sense, I'm proud that Columbia has rejected the franchise model. But if you reject the franchise model then and you imagine a global university, you imagine a university able to think globally, to occupy the world in the way that cities have to this point. You are talking about a much more fragile, much more vulnerable architecture. Any kind of colonial ambition that underlines the franchise model will be defeated by such mechanisms. If you genuinely expose yourself to the kind of breathtaking creativity the unique situation in the Indian subcontinent represents, if you really say "There are extraordinary new forms of intelligence being produced there." Being dedicated to intelligence you want to be there in a non-colonial way, which means to open your own structures to possibly the most profound transformation possible. Very few universities are willing to make that move. New York universities are more inclined to do that because you have to be crazy to be in New York in the first place. By definition you have opened your life to radical risk. Universities in New York will lead the way a little bit in how a university can be outside its own skin, and put itself completely at risk and maybe just to finish. I'm not sure it's safe to assume that universities will be important institutions in the future. They are very powerful, but very old and slow-moving mechanisms.

Howard Zinn

Muntadas: What are the differences and similarities between the university and academia?

Howard Zinn: I suppose that academia is a broader term than university, and academia may take in an intellectual world, which is wider than the world of the university; but frankly, I've never made a distinction between the two. Do you distinguish between the two?

M: Some people differentiate in terms of a structural situation; academia is more the software part, and university is the machine.

HZ: I see. They think of the university as the institution, the organization, and academia more as the function. One the structure, one the function.

M: If we talk about values—spiritual, cultural, and political—that are all connected to knowledge, how do they interweave with power through the university?

HZ: Values in the university are presumably upheld by the university's faculty, who are trying to impart these values to their students. Power is something that is wielded by the administration of the university. The administrators of the university are generally not the people most concerned with spiritual or moral issues, although they may claim that they are, because the university is supposed to be imbued with these values and is supposed to pass them on; but the power in the university is generally not dedicated to these values. The power is dedicated to perpetuating the structure and finances of the university and to perpetuating the university as an institution, and this does not require particular attention to spiritual or moral values. There's a conflict between these two elements.

M: If in the past we saw the university as a traditional institution, lately it is behaving more and more as a corporation. Do you have any comments on that?

HZ: The university is very much like a business institution, and it is a corporation. Technically it is incorporated by the state. It has the attributes of a corporation in that a corporation is generally not concerned with human values, but rather is concerned with profit and control and perpetuating itself. The administration of a

university behaves like a corporation and is concerned with the budget, with how much money goes in and how much money goes out, and it will decide which schools in the university to close and which to keep open on the basis of their profitability. This is very comparable to what corporations do when they close down, or when they open up different activities depending on their profitability. In that sense, in their motives, the university is a corporation, and it's structured like a corporation; it has a board of directors like a corporation does, and a board of trustees. The members of the board of trustees are not the faculty or the students or people who work in the university but are, in fact, mostly business people, so there is an actual organic connection between the corporate world and the university because the members of the board of trustees are important figures in the corporate world. In several different ways, the university becomes a corporation that is not too different from the corporations of the business world.

M: Donors and trustees are linked to the university by networks and economics. How do you perceive the network system and its economic implications? If they donate money, will they want something back? What are the implications of network creation among the donors and the board of directors in relation with money?

HZ: People who donate money to the university or support the building of a structure on the university that's named after them or their grandfather will not obtain some immediate, visible remuneration from what they do. But they have a long-term aim in the perpetuation of society as it exists, the maintenance of the status quo, which of course benefits their class, an elite group in society that has money and sits on the board of directors of corporations and the board of trustees of universities. What they gain from this association with the university is not immediate profit. There may be some prestige involved; the businessman who's on the board of trustees of a corporation because it suggests to the world that he is not simply a profit-making businessman but that he has higher aspirations; he cares about education, he cares about values. It creates a prestige for this corporate person who is on the board of trustees. Beyond that, it acts to perpetuate society as it exists, and that's the aim of the university in modern society; to prepare and train people to take their proper places in the existing society. It doesn't train people to change the existing society, and certainly not to overthrow the existing society. It trains people to fit into the niches that exist in society and to form the material that keeps that society going in the way it has been going. That is a long-term reward that members of the board of trustees get.

M: To summarize this question, do you see any conflicts of interests between the network of administrative power and the university?

HZ: The conflicts of interests come between the officials of the university—the president, the vice-president, the deans, and the board of trustees—and the people who really, by right, should be considered as making up the heart of the university. Those are the teachers, the students, the technical workers, the secretaries, and the workers at the university. There's a conflict about what their function is, there's a conflict about the money that the university has and how the university spends that money. It's a conflict that is very often concealed, whereas it is not concealed in the hard world of the corporation. That same conflict between the employer and the worker is not concealed in General Motors or Exxon, but in the university it is concealed because of the special nature of the university in which everybody is supposedly working towards a common goal. They're not working towards a common goal, because the interests of the people in the administration are really different to the interests of the faculty and the students and all the people who work in the university.

M: Alumni become fellows and friends of the institution of knowledge, as an Alma Mater. How does this system operate in terms of decision-making? A student gets a degree and becomes part of a privileged group of affiliates; how do you see this in relation to the exercise of group pressures on future political, economic ventures? A student from South America could come to the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, for example, and become affiliated with the Harvard network. What would this represent for the future politics of the country?

HZ: It's very clear, and we see it especially in recent history, that the credentials of having a degree from Harvard or Yale or Princeton are very important in gaining access to top posts in the government, right up to the presidency. You see that the presidents and their advisors have gone to Yale or Harvard, and in the economic sphere corporations are proud to have high administrative posts filled by people who are from Ivy League schools. They do create an elite who become the decision-makers of the country.

M: What is your take on private universities and public universities?

HZ: Public universities have a different student body, generally, than private universities. You don't find graduates of public universities being appointed to cabinet posts by the president of the United States. There's a very distinct difference in status between people who have graduated from public universities and people who have graduated from private universities. Whereas the control in private universities is exercised by the board of trustees, public universities would

appear to have more flexibility and more leeway and more freedom than private universities; however, that freedom is limited by the fact that private universities owe their financial status to the state legislatures, and the state legislatures are, of course, political bodies. The result is that the politicians in the state legislatures scrutinize what the public universities are doing, in the same way that members of the board of trustees in private universities try to keep an eye on what's going on in the university. The result is that there's not a great difference in the degree of academic freedom in private or public institutions.

M: You've been part of Boston University for a long time. I know that Boston University has a certain interest in struggles and discussions, especially in the period with Silber, and that you were a very active part of that. Could you give us your opinion on that struggle?

HZ: Boston University, under the presidency of John Silber, was an extreme example of what is generally true of universities, and by that I mean that the greatest power is exercised by the people who contribute the least to the education of the students in the university. The trustees and the president and the vice-president have the most power and the least connection with learning. At Boston University, this distinction was carried to the extreme by a president who maintained a kind of tyrannical power for himself, who did not give the faculty any rights. Normally, while the faculty is ultimately subject to the power of the president and trustees, there's a certain degree of leeway and freedom that faculty have in a university. That degree of freedom did not exist at Boston University. In most universities, despite the political conservatism of the administration and trustees, the departments will be given a certain amount of freedom in choosing their faculty, in appointing faculty, in giving tenure to faculty, and the administration will only rarely interfere. However, in the case of Boston University, the administration always interfered. The administration kept a very close eye on which professors were appointed and which professors got tenure, unlike most universities, where there's a certain degree of freedom given to the departments and the faculty in choosing and giving tenure to their own. At Boston University the president had absolutely no hesitation about overlooking every tenure appointment and overriding any tenure decision made at the departmental level. We had situations at Boston University where a professor was approved for tenure by the faculty committee in the department or the university, and then was denied tenure by University President John Silber. We have a number of such cases. There was a very sharp conflict between the faculty and students. At Boston University there were the faculty and students on one side, and the administration on the other side, culminating in the late 1970s. This resulted in strikes, which is a rare

phenomenon in universities; faculty and secretaries, technical workers, buildings and grounds workers, and librarians all went out on strike against the university. Boston University was not a departure from the usual hierarchical control that exists at universities, but an extreme example of that control.

M: As a participant from inside the university, how do you see your role in terms of self-criticism? Sometimes it's easier to talk about what happened in Iraq and what happened in other parts of the world, and not so easy to be critical of what's happened locally, on your own turf.

HZ: This is a common situation and is caused by fear. It doesn't require a lot of courage to criticize something that is far away. It requires more courage to be critical of the immediate situation that you are in, because in your situation, the criticism could result in punishment. The result is a very great reluctance to criticize what is happening in institutions. You'll find faculty members who feel free to criticize what is happening outside the university very boldly and openly, but when it comes to the university itself they become silent, because to speak out would jeopardize their position, their salary, their tenure, their hope for promotion, their hope for a sabbatical. There's a great pressure there for silence and conformity.

M: I perceive this situation in places like MIT, where there is a relationship with the Department of Defense or the military. I think there should be more voices in relation with that, or in universities where the departments of political science have part of the strategies of international politics.

HZ: I remember that during the Vietnam War there were faculty and students who criticized MIT's connection with the government, criticized the research that was going on at MIT that was connected to the war, but I think this was a minority of the faculty. Most of the faculty were very reluctant to speak out on this.

M: Do you remember who in the faculty were more active?

HZ: Noam Chomsky said that Salvador E. Luria in the Biology Department and Louis Kampf in the English Department were very active. There was O'Neill in the Department of Linguistics. There was a small number of faculty who spoke out about MIT's role, about the Draper Laboratory, etc.

M: That was in the 1960s. It seems that things are changing a lot. You mentioned

the word fear before, and I think that the word fear is emotional. Everybody knows what we mean, but the theme is being used politically for certain kinds of manipulation.

HZ: Fear has many political uses. Fear results in this stifling of opposition, results in silence, and it's very useful to administrations to create an atmosphere of fear. At Boston University, the president created an atmosphere of fear. All you have to do in order to create it is to act in just one or two cases that serve as an example for everybody else. As in the nation at large, all that is necessary is for a few people to be singled out, a few cases created that will demonstrate to everybody else that they had better not step out of line or this will happen to them. In the 1950s, the House on American Activities Committee only put a few people in prison. But by putting a few people in prison, they intimidated hundreds of thousands of people who became fearful of speaking out in any way.

M: In your years of practice did you perceive any alternative to the structure that already exists in universities?

HZ: I can imagine a more democratic structure; I don't know if I see it anywhere. There are some colleges and universities that are somewhat more democratic than others, where the principals have students on the board of trustees, or places like Hampshire College in Western Massachusetts that will give the student a much larger voice in the administration of the college, but those are rare exceptions. I can imagine a democratic university where the administrators will be simply administrators, where their jobs as administrators will be to implement decisions made by faculty and students; in other words, where faculty, students, and the workers of the university will make important decision about the policies of the university, and then it will be up to the president and the vice-president to carry out these policies. I can imagine such a democratic structure but I don't see it anywhere.

M: Do you know if anybody has been researching or exploring this?

HZ: Henri Giroux. He writes a lot on education and the education system. You might say he does so out of personal motives, because he was denied tenure by President John Silber at Boston University and had to leave. But he has written a lot about education, about the corporatization of universities, and about the lack of democracy and academic freedom in universities. He's given a lot of thought and written a number of books on that. I'm not sure where he teaches now; I think it's somewhere in Canada. It would be worth exploring it with him.

M: How do you feel about the neo-political situation here now, with Obama? How is the expectation and the optimism, or criticism, after waiting for change?

HZ: Waiting for Godot. We're still waiting. There was a euphoria that surrounded the election of Obama, an exultation, and I shared in that wonderful feeling of getting the Bush administration out of power and of getting a new administration, almost any new administration, into power. Especially an African-American; this is historic, it means many white Americans voted for Obama. Thirty years ago they wouldn't have voted for Obama, so in a certain sense there is a feeling of relief, a feeling of a historic change. On the other hand, Obama, once in office, showed himself to be a traditional Democratic Party president. He follows the tradition of the Democratic Party, which is to make mild reforms on the domestic front on issues of education and health, to move a little farther and a little more progressively than Republicans, just enough to maintain your constituency. On foreign policy, the Democratic Party behaves very much like the Republican Party. Traditionally, the Democrats and the Republicans have both been expansionist, violent, aggressive, imperialistic. This is still true. Obama shows all the signs of being a militarist. He sends more troops to Afghanistan, which is absolute idiocy, an absolutely ridiculous policy. Afghanistan has been destroyed and mutilated by imperial power after imperial power claiming that they will do something good for the country, and the United States is continuing the same. They're continuing to bomb and kill people in Afghanistan. Obama, almost immediately after he came into office, sent predator missiles over Pakistan. As a result, innocent people died. Bombing, by its nature, is indiscriminate, whatever they may claim. "Oh, we're going after terrorists." Obama has the same attitude that Bush had, that somehow terrorists are the problem. The terrorists are not the problem; they are the symptoms of the problem. The problem is American policy in the world. Other countries in the world don't worry about terrorism, because they don't bother anybody. The United States bothers everybody in the world, and as a result, we produce terrorists. Obama maintains a military budget just as large, perhaps even a bit larger, than Bush's military budget. His latest appointment in Pakistan and Afghanistan, General McChrystal, is a psychopath. The man is a torturer. He has no compunction about the killing of civilians in the hope that somewhere, among the civilians, there is a suspected terrorist. Obama does not show the signs of any important change in American policy, except on the domestic front.

M: From the perspective of understanding the Latin America situation, I think the fact that he recognized former mistakes and tried to have a dialogue means that he's already trying to destroy this idea of the American enemy, at least in words. I think it's a good approach.

HZ: That probably is the most positive thing in Obama's foreign policy, what he's done in Latin America so far. It's been mostly words, rather than actions. If you look at his actions, he's eased the restrictions on travel to Cuba. The fundamental problem with Cuba is the embargo, which is absurd, and Obama seems reluctant to do anything about that. Obama is smooth, he is articulate, he makes promises, he makes gestures, he will talk with Chávez, he is willing to talk with Iran. But all of this is really very small, compared to what needs to be done. We're in a very critical situation in the world, and in the United States, where bold steps need to be taken to reverse policies. So far Obama hasn't shown any signs of taking those steps.

M: The war in Afghanistan seems like a kind of crusade, like the Catholic crusade, against the Taliban. It's a religious situation.

HZ: It's a political and military battle which takes on a religious character because of the fundamentalism of the Taliban, but it's fundamentalism versus fundamentalism. We have fundamentalists all over the world now—we have the Muslim fundamentalists, we have the Israeli fundamentalists, we have the American Christian fundamentalists. Religion is always a very convenient way to conceal political and economic motives. After all, the fundamentalism of the Taliban did not stand in our way when we were utilizing the Taliban. When we wanted to get the Soviets out of Afghanistan and establish American power in Afghanistan, we used the Taliban. Now they're the enemy. The more we see them as the enemy, the more they become our enemy. We create enemies by what we do. I don't hold out much hope for Obama right now unless there is a widespread expression in the United States, among those people who supported him (after all, he drew very inspiring and very energetic support from large numbers, especially from young people) and I think one would require these same people who supported him to begin to criticize him and demand that he not surrender, which is what he is doing, surrendering to the right-wing Republicans. He acts as if he feels he must please them in some way. I worry about who he will appoint to the Supreme Court. I worry that he will look for a candidate that the Republicans will accept instead of a candidate he will fight for no matter what the Republicans do. I have a friend who lives here in Cambridge and is a specialist on childhood education. She says that Obama's choice of Secretary of Education is terrible. First, he believes in standardized tests, which was the Bush administration policy. Teachers are opposed to standardized tests. Educators who know anything about education are opposed to them, but the Secretary of Education instituted standardized tests when he was in charge of education in Chicago. This is a very mechanical way of approaching education. All of this sounds very negative, because it is.

Biographies

Carol Becker

Carol Becker is Professor of the Arts at Columbia University and Dean of Columbia University School of the Arts. Before this she served as Dean of Faculty and Senior Vice-President for Academic Affairs at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago. She is the author of numerous articles and several books including: *The Invisible Drama: Women and the Anxiety of Change*; *Zones of Contention: Essays on Art, Institutions, Gender, and Anxiety*; *Surpassing the Spectacle: Global Transformations and the Changing Politics of Art*; *The Subversive Imagination: Artists, Society, and Social Responsibility*; and most recently *Thinking in Place: Art, Action, and Cultural Production*.

Noam Chomsky

Noam Chomsky is Institute Professor in the Department of Linguistics and Philosophy at MIT. He received his PhD in linguistics in 1955 from the University of Pennsylvania. During the years 1951 to 1955, Chomsky was a Junior Fellow of the Harvard University Society of Fellows. Chomsky has lectured at many universities in the United States and abroad, and is the recipient of numerous honorary degrees and awards. He has written and lectured widely on linguistics, philosophy, intellectual history, contemporary issues, international affairs and US foreign policy. The major theoretical viewpoints of his doctoral dissertation appeared in the monograph *Syntactic Structure* in 1957. This formed part of a more extensive work, *The Logical Structure of Linguistic Theory*, circulated in mimeograph in 1955 and published in 1975. Among his recent books are *New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind*; *On Nature and Language*; and *Hopes and Prospects*.

John Coatsworth

John Coatsworth received his BA in History from Wesleyan University, and his MA and PhD in Economic History from the University of Wisconsin, Madison. He has served as Dean of the Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs since 2008; before this he served as Interim Dean (2007–2008) and as visiting professor (2006–2007). He has held the position of Monroe Gutman Professor of Latin American Affairs at Harvard University (1992–2007) and was founding director of Harvard's David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies. Prior to his work at Harvard, Coatsworth was a member of the faculty at the University of Chicago from 1969–1992. He is a Member of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Board of Directors of the Tinker Foundation, and numerous professional associations and is President of the Latin American Studies Association and former President of the American Historical Association. Coatsworth has been a Guggenheim and Fulbright fellow and has received numerous research and institutional grants from public agencies and private foundations. He has also acted as consultant for program design or review to numerous US universities and private foundations. His publications include eight books and many scholarly articles, and his most recent book is *Living Standards in Latin American History: Height, Welfare and Development, 1750–2000*, edited with Ricardo Salvatore and Amílcar Challu.

Fernando Coronil

Fernando Coronil is a Venezuelan anthropologist who works in the United States and has taught in various Latin American universities. He has written extensively on Latin America as well as on social theory, including critiques of Western assumptions about knowledge and history. He is well known for *The Magical State: Nature, Money, and Modernity in Venezuela*; his work on political violence; his critique of "Occidentalism" as well as his contributions to postcolonial perspectives; theories of the state, globalization, and imperialism. He is currently Presidential Professor, Department of Anthropology, Graduate Center, City University of New York and Professor Emeritus in the Department of Anthropology and the Department of History, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. He was trained at the Liceo Andrés Bello in Venezuela, received his BA at Stanford University, and his MA and PhD at the University of Chicago.

Thomas Cummins

Thomas Cummins received his PhD from UCLA in 1988. He taught for eleven years at the University of Chicago and was the Director of the Center of Latin American Studies from 1998-2001. He was also the acting Director of the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard University in 2003-2004 and has lived and taught in Argentina, Colombia, Ecuador and Peru. He is the author of the books *Toasts with the Inca* and *Brindis con el Inca: La abstracción andina y las imágenes coloniales de los quecos*, as well as of numerous articles and is the co-editor (with Elizabeth Boone) of *Native Traditions in the Postconquest World* and (with Emily Umberger) of *Native Artists and Patrons in Colonial Latin America*. Cummins is currently the Dumbarton Oaks Professor of the History of Pre-Columbian and Colonial Art and Chairman of the Department of the History of Art and Architecture at Harvard University.

Diane E. Davis

Diane E. Davis is Professor of Political Sociology and former head of the International Development Group in the Department of Urban Studies and Planning at MIT. She is currently a member of the Provost's International Oversight Committee and MIT's Global Council. She served as acting director of the Program on Human Rights and Justice at MIT from 2003-2004, and as Associate Dean of the School of Architecture and Planning from 2005-2007. She has received awards from the MacArthur Foundation, the Carnegie Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Heinz Foundation. Davis is a Member of the European Research Council and a founding member of an international working group on Urban Resilience in Situations of Chronic Violence. She also directed the DUSP-MIT initiative called Just Jerusalem: Visions for a Place of Peace and its culminating project, the Just Jerusalem Competition (envisioningpeace.org). Recent publications include *Cities and Sovereignty: Identity Conflicts in the Urban Realm*, co-edited with Nora Libertun de Duren; *Discipline and Development: Middle Classes and Prosperity in East Asia and Latin America*; and *Irregular Armed Forces and Their Role in Policies and State Formation*, co-edited with Anthony Pereira.

Brad Epps

Brad Epps is Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures and Professor and former Chair of the Committee on Degrees in Studies of Women, Gender, and Sexuality at Harvard University. He has published over a hundred pieces on modern literature, film, art, theory, and immigration from Spain, Latin America, Catalonia, the United States, and France and is the author of *Significant Violence: Oppression and Resistance in the Narratives of Juan Goytisolo*; and co-author of *Spain Beyond Spain: Modernity, Literary History, and National Identity*; *Passing Lines: Immigration and Sexuality*; *All About Almodóvar: A Passion for Cinema*; a special issue of *Catalan Review* on Barcelona, and a special issue of the journal *GLQ* on lesbian theorist Monique Wittig. He has taught as visiting professor or scholar in Spain, Germany, France, Chile, Cuba, the Netherlands, and Sweden. He is currently co-editing a volume of essays on Ibero-American cinema and is preparing two books of his own: *The Ethics of Promiscuity* and *Barcelona and Cinema*.

Flora González

Flora González is Professor of Writing, Literature and Publishing at Emerson College in Boston. Her publications include *José Donoso's House of Fiction* and *Guarding Cultural Memory: Afro-Cuban Women in Literature and the Arts*. With Rosamond Rosenmeier, she edited and translated *In the Vortex of the Cyclone: Selected Poems by Excilia Saldaña*. She has taught Latin American, Caribbean and Latino literatures and cultures since receiving her PhD from Yale University. In the late 1990s she was a resident fellow at the Du Bois Institute at Harvard. Professor González has finished a memoir about her experience as a Cuban-American tentatively titled *My Mother's Sewing Lessons*.

David M. Guss

David M. Guss is a poet, translator, editor, folklorist, and anthropologist who has lived and worked in various parts of Latin America. He is the author of a study of the Yekuana Indians of Venezuela entitled *To Weave and Sing: Art, Symbol, and Narrative in the South American Rain Forest*, has edited *The Selected Poetry of Vicente Huidobro* and published a book of poems entitled *Walky-Talky*. His other books include *The Language of the Birds: Tales, Texts, and Poems of Interspecies Communication* and a translation of Carlos Oquendo de Amat's *Five Meters of Poems*. In 2003, Guss curated an exhibition entitled *Lost Theatres of Somerville*, and his essay about this exhibition was awarded the Theatre Historical Society of America's 2005 Jeffrey Weiss Prize for the best article on a subject related to theatre history. His most recent book is *The Festive State: Race, Ethnicity, and Nationalism as Cultural Performance*.

David Harvey

David Harvey, a leading theorist in the field of urban studies, earned his PhD from Cambridge University and was formerly professor of geography at Johns Hopkins, a Miliband Fellow at the London School of Economics, and Halford Mackinder Professor of Geography at Oxford. His published titles include *The New Imperialism*; *Paris, Capital of Modernity*; *Social Justice and the City*; *Limits to Capital*; *The Urbanization of Capital*; *The Condition of Postmodernity*; *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference*; and *Spaces of Hope*; and *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. His numerous awards include

the Outstanding Contributor Award of the Association of American Geographers and the 2002 Centenary Medal of the Royal Scottish Geographical Society for his “outstanding contribution to the field of geographical enquiry and to anthropology.” He holds honorary degrees from the universities of Buenos Aires, Roskilde in Denmark, Uppsala in Sweden, and Ohio State University.

Ute Meta Bauer

Ute Meta Bauer is an Associate Professor and founding director of the Program in Art, Culture and Technology at MIT, where she previously served as director of the Visual Arts Program from 2005-2009. From 1996 to 2006 she held an appointment at the Academy of Fine Arts Vienna as a Professor of Theory and Practice of Contemporary Art. Educated as an artist for more than two decades, Bauer has worked as a curator of exhibitions and presentations on contemporary art, film, video and sound, with a focus on trans-disciplinary formats. She was a co-curator of Documenta11 (2001-2002) in the team of Okwui Enwezor, was the artistic director of the 3rd Berlin Biennale for Contemporary Art (2004) and in 2005 curated the *Mobile_Transborder Archive* for inSite05, Tijuana/San Diego. Bauer was the founding director of the Office For Contemporary Art Norway (OCA) as well as the founding editor of the magazines *META* and *Verkstedt*.

Saul Slapikoff

Saul Slapikoff is an Associate Professor Emeritus at Tufts University, a political activist, a biochemist tenured in the Biology Department, and was for six years the chair of the American Studies Program at Tufts. He was active in the draft resistance movement and New University Conference, an organization of radical faculty and graduate students in the 1960s and 1970s, and has been an active member of the editorial collective of *Radical Teacher* magazine for over twenty-five years. Since Israel’s invasion of Lebanon in 1982, he has been involved with various organizations working for peace with justice in the Middle East. His book *Consider and Hear Me: Voices from Palestine and Israel* was published by Temple University Press in 1993. Having retired from Tufts University at the end of 1998, he is currently trying his hand at being a playwright.

Doris Sommer

Doris Sommer is Ira Jewell Williams, Jr., Professor of Romance Languages and Literatures, Professor of African and African American Studies, and Director of the Cultural Agents Initiative at Harvard University. She is author of *Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America*; *Proceed with Caution When Engaging Minority Literature*; *Bilingual Aesthetics: A New Sentimental Education*; *One Master for Another: Populism as Patriarchal Rhetoric in Dominican Novels*; and is the editor of numerous publications. Professor Sommer has a BA from New Jersey’s Douglass College for Women, MA from Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and her PhD from Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

Mark Wigley

Mark Wigley is Dean of Columbia University's Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation. He is the author of *The Architecture of Deconstruction: Derrida's Haunt*, *White Walls*; *Designer Dresses: The Fashioning of Modern Architecture*; and *Constant's New Babylon: The Hyper-Architecture of Desire*; as well as the editor, with Catherine de Zegher, of *The Activist Drawing: Retracing Situationist Architectures from Constant's New Babylon to Beyond*. He has curated exhibitions at MoMA in New York, Witte de With in Rotterdam, The Drawing Center in New York, and CCA in Montreal.

Howard Zinn

Howard Zinn was raised in a working-class family in Brooklyn and flew bombing missions for the United States in World War II, an experience he pointed to as shaping his opposition to war. In 1956, he became a professor at Spelman College in Atlanta, a school for black women. It was here that Zinn collaborated with historian Staughton Lynd and mentored a young student named Alice Walker. During this time he also became involved in the Civil Rights movement where he participated as an adviser to the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) and later chronicled in his book *SNCC: The New Abolitionists*. He was fired from Spelman in 1963 for insubordination related to his protest work, and moved to Boston University where he became a leading critic of the Vietnam War. He is perhaps best known for *A People's History of the United States*, which presents American history through the eyes of those he feels are outside of the political and economic establishment. He passed away in January, 2010.

This project was conceived for and produced by the Art Forum program at the David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard University.

I am grateful to José Falconi for the invitation to consider and address the contradictions in which academic knowledge is produced. I'm also grateful to Joaquín Terrones, Paula Kupfer and Marcela Ramos for their support in this process. At the Carpenter Center, Melissa Davenport and Ed Lloyd were instrumental in producing the first version of the show at Harvard.

I would like to thank Andrea Nacach for her design, Marshall Reese for his contribution to the editing process, Olivia Muñoz-Rojas for her help in reviewing and discussing the history of academia as an institution, and Joan Olivar and Josephine Watson for reading and reviewing the final manuscript.

Last but not least, I would like to thank Irina Rozovsky, who not only taped all the footage used in this project, but whose continuous dialog and help these past two years lent a much needed sense of continuity.

In its first version, the project will be presented at Harvard and will then travel to Arizona State University.

Muntadas
Cambridge MA, February 2011

