

**SCHOOL OF POLITICS & INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
RESEARCH SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
COLLEGE OF ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES
THE AUSTRALIAN NATIONAL UNIVERSITY**

**An Embarrassment of Histories:
Reflections of the Study and Teaching of the Subject of Terrorism**

Paper presented at the Panel FD 33:
*The World Out(side) of Control:
Politics Beyond Global Governance*
52nd Annual Convention of the International Studies Association,
18 March 2011, Montreal, Québec.

Michael McKinley
michael.mckinley@anu.edu.au

An Embarrassment of Histories: Reflections on the Study and Teaching the Subject of Terrorism

ABSTRACT

This paper proceeds from a proposition that the explanation for terrorism is not to be confused with a justification for it; that the “why” question is integral to any understanding of terrorism even if the terrorism that proceeds from the reasons deduced are no grounds for it. What the paper then argues is that all abbreviated forms of Terrorism Studies – those that ignore, or treat perfunctorily, the history and various contexts of campaigns of terrorism – should be resisted: at the very least, they support an approach once labelled as the “politics of the last atrocity;” at worst, they affirm common state approaches to countering terrorism which will probably ensure its perpetuation. Accordingly, it is proposed that terrorism, and terrorists, be examined: historically - in a sweep that significantly precedes the events of, and since 9/11, so as to rid the concept of its pop violence connotations; critically - so as to challenge various mythologies as to its “root causes” and successes attributed to military responses; and self-critically - by which is meant giving full credence to the evidence that exists which implicates many of the current targets of terrorism in campaigns (or support for campaigns) of terrorism.

Prefatory Remarks

This paper addresses the very general in order to consider the specific. What I have to say about the problems of trying to teach the subject of terrorism in the current university environment in the United States apply *mutatis mutandis* across the whole spectrum of universities that exist under the dominant ideological arrangements of neo-liberalism. Thus, other universities in other countries appear in this analysis by implication, or as bodies revealed through the refraction which it affords. In Australia, to venture another inductive leap, the emerging national malaise is probably worse than in the United States because, as has been so often the case, the tendency is to embrace discrete practices from different national settings as though they were a whole cloth without understanding that, in reality, they are variants which require reconciliation where they are not mutually exclusive. Anthropomorphically, the result is akin to a person with a wilfully self-compromised immune system engaging in exceptionally high risk behaviour in relation to not one, but several highly pathogenic viruses. The study of terrorism, in this context, cannot but be badly served. In societies that have lived in relative domestic peace, it is immediately interpreted apocalyptically - as the barbarism which follows civilisation - and is besides both sudden and fundamentally uncontrollable in such profound ways that it threaten all social rules. And yet the violence in which the same societies that feel threatened by terrorism are embedded remains unrecognised to such an extent that it is too easy for academics, analysts, commentators and students alike to succumb to the temptation to practice and speak of nothing but what is known in Northern Ireland as "the politics of the last atrocity." They begin, reflexively, in the manner of Joseph Conrad's reaction to the anarchist bomb attack on the Royal Observatory in Greenwich Park, London, in 1894, and recorded in *The Secret Agent*:

[A] blood-stained inanity of so fatuous a kind that it is impossible to fathom its origin by any reasonable or even unreasonable process of thought. For perverse unreason has its own logical processes. But that outrage could not be laid hold of mentally in any sort of way, so that one

remained faced by the fact of a man blown to pieces for nothing even most remotely resembling an idea, anarchist, or other.

In time, however, and usually the transit is short, “civilized society” asserts its contrary nature as its leaders lend themselves to the cult-worship of counter-terrorism savants, themselves steeped in the cultivated innocence of what they should be most knowledgeable, and responds violently and blindly while all the time proclaiming the virtue of its cause - the *bellum justum*. But this is an amalgam of little more than farce and savagery, revenge, and indiscriminate repression as, again, Conrad recounts such an attack by a French man-of-war in *Heart of Darkness*:

In the empty immensity of earth, sky, and water, there she was, incomprehensible, firing into a continent. Pop, would go one of the six-inch guns; a small flame would dart and vanish, a little white smoke would disappear, a tiny projectile would give a feeble screech--and nothing happened. Nothing could happen. There was a touch of insanity in the proceeding, a sense of lugubrious drollery in the sight; and it was not dissipated by somebody on board assuring me earnestly there was a camp of natives - he called them enemies! - hidden out of sight somewhere.

Such reflexes are all the more to be expected within intellectual traditions that proliferate what the Yale University scholar, Cleanth Brooks, called the three “Bastard Muses” - Propaganda, Sentimentality, and Pornography - in conjunction with a fourth, identified by the poet Czeslaw Milosz, as “historical amnesia.” While the first three attack democracy, and by extension a democratic education, through, respectively, pleading unscrupulously for a “special cause at the expense of the whole truth, unwarranted emotional responses in excess of the occasion, and a focus on one powerful human drive at the expense of the total personality, the last does so by facilitating the refusal to remember.¹ History is jettisoned as an unnecessary burden on functioning in the present, while historical understanding becomes an even

1 As cited in “Bill Moyers: Facts Still Matter” http://www.truth_out.org/print/67571 accessed 14 February 2011.

greater redundancy. Overall, the narratives and questions which attend to the political dimensions of the inquiry into who we are, and how we got here are robbed of two essentials to understanding, namely ambiguity and paradox. In their place academics have little choice but to teach, and students have few options but to learn and subscribe to the only available, sacramental knowledge (state anointed, church approved, corporately convivial, economically beneficial) administered by the duly appointed clerisy. All information passes through epistemological and political filters; indeed, to teach faithfully according to neo-liberal precepts, within the neo-liberal university, requires the same disposition towards “revealed truth” that is evident in seminaries and theological colleges. And the metaphor is not misplaced: so many of the modern universities are in the baroque and rococo traditions of the counter-reformation, being designed to impress, even intimidate, by displays that are direct, simple, obvious, dramatic and expressed self-confidently. And the target is basically the same now as it was in between the 16th and 18th Centuries – the illiterate, the passive, and the obedient under which rubric can be assumed the uneducated and the ignorant who mistake the ornate, florid and playful manifestations of the modern academy for a real university.

Three consequences follow. The first is that any attempt to engage in authentic academic and intellectual activity must, as a priority, detoxify its environment. Second, any such attempt will take place within a polity populated by communicant members of an intellectually closed order, or worse, slaves. And third, should academics decide to teach, supervise, research and write outside the confines of the establishment, they will do without the canonical certificates of *nihil obstat* and *imprimatur* which the authorisers of knowledge and truth extend to their trusted teachers. Moreover, and worse again, they must necessarily assume the status of an agnostic, apostate, or heretic (depending on the relative emphasis they place on their beliefs and practices). An appeal to “the facts,” no matter how scientifically verifiable, will not salvage the situation: a University of Michigan study has found that when misinformed (as opposed to uninformed) people, particularly partisans were exposed to corrected facts in news stories, they rarely changed their minds; indeed, they deploy a defence mechanism known as “backfire” to

avoid the cognitive dissonance which would result from the change – which is experienced as threatening – and often become even more strongly set in their beliefs.² This has obvious consequences for both democracy in general and the understanding of terrorism in particular.

And now to repeat, there is nothing in this preface, or the following pages, that should be taken as an endorsement of terrorism. An ornithologist, after all, is not a bird. As well, it is readily conceded that it might well be the case that an intellectually sophisticated and rigorously thought through understanding of terrorism would, under, certain far from improbably circumstances, lead to the conclusion, that force must be used to defeat its immediate threat. But I would also venture that, in the course of reaching this conclusion, critical scholars and students would come to the understanding that terrorist violence is a tactic common to (for example) most, if not all state-making including his, or her own, and that, to use Hedley Bull's terminology, an "undiscriminating scepticism" applied to all claims in relation to terrorism, terrorists (their reasons and rationality), and their victims would create a field of choice hitherto not discerned and perhaps not even possible. That said, such an outcome is not guaranteed and there are many examples of well educated people behaving savagely, especially when induced by good intentions. On the other hand the present is not sustainable and the study of terrorism in the universities continues, where it is attempted, with little light where it is not in total darkness. The remainder of this paper details the inexorable trend towards the latter, and concludes, between pages 90-96, with a series of specific impediments and questions designed to sheet home the almost futile nature of the project to understand the dimensions of the form of political violence which has transfixed the Western political imagination over most of the last decade. Although it is not essential, a reading of the companion paper to this one, "The Question of War in Global Governance:

² Ibid (for a brief reference), and then to Joe Keohane, "How facts backfire," dallasnews.com, *The Dallas Morning News*, 8 August 2010. For the original research see Brendan Nyhan and James Reifler, "When Corrections Fail: The Persistence of Political Misperceptions," <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~bnyhan/nyhan-reifler.pdf> accessed 3 March 2011.

America's Authority in Transition?" (a presentation to Panel FD 33 at this Convention) would explain the wider context of this paper.

The Collapse of Higher Learning

A Coronal Inquiry

The modern research university is, like Dracula's Transylvania, very much troubled by the un-dead. From time to time, but quite frequently nevertheless, the professional associations whose memberships are drawn from faculty within the disciplines of these universities feel the need to arrange whole conventions, or major themes in a convention programme devoted to considering the many aspects of alleged theory-policy, theory-technology divides and the attendant separation of "pure" scholars from applied practitioners. This is both a macabre and bizarre undertaking if pursued seriously on the grounds that, if the divide referred to ever existed, it belongs to another time outside of recent memory: how credibly can it be suggested that at any time in the last 80 years there was a viable difference between a pure, contemplative clerisy engaged in inquiry in the name of knowledge for its own sake, and theory-building, and a secular priesthood of technologists and policy-oriented scholars? Such alleged distinctions, moreover, are dangerous because they are not only insensitive to the power of ideas, but take no account of the mobilising force of writing seemingly far removed from policy relevance: poetry, for example. Yet, and without artistic and personal conceit, the most perceptive poets are acutely aware of their responsibility when the objects of their imagination are shared with an audience of critical mass which then translates them into its own political and strategic objectives and then undertakes the campaigns, frequently insurrectionary or revolutionary, that will see them achieved. We find, then, that the Irish poet, William Butler Yeats, towards the end of his life, committed himself to a self-examination and self-questioning of the casualties of his creative impulse in a way that any self-reflecting and self-critical scholar in the humanities and social sciences should be able to identify with:

Now that I am old and ill,
Turns into a question till
I lie awake night after night
And never get the answers right.
Did that play of mine send out
Certain men the English shot?
Did words of mine put too great strain
On that woman's reeling brain?
Could my spoken words have checked
That whereby a house lay wrecked?³

The point to this inclusion is not a recommendation that all scholars consider themselves poets but the suggestion that, if the link between poetry-as-inspiration and action was clear enough for Yeats to ask the question as to what he might be responsible for, then the very notion of a theory-practice dichotomy is preposterous. Besides, did not (for example) John Maynard Keynes not only embody the fusion of the two but pungently banish the fable of their separation to the realm of nonsense in the Concluding Notes of his *General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*?

The ideas of economists and political philosophers, both when they are right and when they are wrong, are more powerful than is commonly understood. Indeed the world is ruled by little else. Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influence, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist. Madmen in authority, who hear voices in the air, are distilling their frenzy from some academic scribbler of a few years back.

To say the least, the distinction alluded to is dead; indeed, theory and practice were never, and could never be independent of each other and, as for the self-directed scholars who are popularly held to inhabit the contemporary university, they belong now to the wind. Like the herds of buffalo that once roamed the Great Plains, all that remain are those kept in existence for purposes of convenient mythology and ceremonial occasions. In short, the call to consider the what might be the appropriate relationship between the

³ William Butler Yeats, *The Man and the Echo*.

creation of knowledge and its application invites us to disinter the idealised scholar, pronounce him or her dead, and conduct an autopsy - only in order to bury the decomposing body again.

To this extent, it makes no sense to construct concepts, caveats and conditions of possible working relationships between alleged disparate communities which do not exist; instead, the task more appropriately defined is to conduct what in many parts of the world is known as a Coronal Inquiry, the common purposes of which are:

- To establish where, when and how the death occurred.
- To identify persons (if any) to be charged with certain offences.
- Identify the deceased person if the identity is not known.

To a greater or lesser extent, these tasks will be woven through this chapter but they attend upon the context, assumptions and arguments that the chapter is primarily concerned with. The immediate focus is thus subordinated to the general proposition that that the United States has entered into a Tridentine period of its history. This is to say that, as with the Renaissance Catholic Church in general, and the Church ruled over by the Renaissance Papacy in particular, the United States is now beset not only with decline in, but also the corruption, inversion, and subversion of its “orders” – one of the foremost of these being the elite institution charged with “higher learning,” the research university.

At the heart of this crisis there is a conflict: one cannot say it “rages” because, in the language of contemporary strategic analysis it falls under the heading, “asymmetric conflict:” on the one hand a well-resourced, technologically advanced, powerful and arrogant force which is opposed, on the other, by an irregulars armed with ideas, a few stalling tactics, and the sense that, though they are certain to lose, the example of their resistance might, for some others, somewhere, be an inspiration to act likewise and perhaps with greater success when the times are more convivial. The main difference between this conflict between radically unequal adversaries, and the war in

Afghanistan, is that, within the University, it is the insurgents that are identifiably the losers and are being slaughtered in direct proportion to their lack of power. The conflict itself is, for all of that, very Tridentine, being fought between those who take the University seriously and those who take education seriously or, at greater length, between those whose cause is a successful career in the corporatised, neo-liberal university as it aggrandises itself while simultaneously impoverishing those who are placed in its solemn care, and those – the minority whose contours are steadily receding – who have accepted the commitment to provide a critically educated citizenry on the understanding that, while it might not guarantee democracy and a good society, its absence will almost certainly guarantee that one does not exist.

The latter, at their perceptive best, will concede that, yes, as per Tolstoy, a happy liaison with the policy community might be possible under certain idealised circumstances in which the demands placed on the scholar are tempered by his or her need to remain true to scholarly integrity, but that, regrettably, the existence and extension of such arrangements across time and place so as to constitute a common *modus vivendi* are unlikely in the extreme, and thus Augustine of Hippo's caution is more salient when he counselled complete abstinence over the search for perfect moderation. Had he lived some time after the Catholic Reformation (also known as the Counter-Reformation) he could have offered, as proof of his exhortation in this context, the experience of the Society of Jesus, the Jesuits.

They attracted dedicated, highly intelligent and eloquent men for the purposes of conducting missions to the “poor and lowly and pagans,” but over time their strengths were recognised by the Vatican as being ideally configured to the Counter-Reformation in general, and combating heresy in particular, and from there, to advising rulers on what was becoming known as “reasons of state” (*ratio status*). Their co-option was consummated by the early 17th Century. Notwithstanding the purity of their founding intentions, they then possessed a well-defined political doctrine and were associated with the teaching of doctrines such as “tyrannicide, the papal power to depose rulers; the legitimacy of ‘Machiavellian’ policies; the justifiability of persecuting and breaking faith with heretics.” Whether or not they were as guilty as charged, they were vilified accordingly, and the very term “Jesuit” became synonymous

with “duplicity, double-dealing and the doctrine that promises made to heretics are not binding.”⁴

The minority are thus aware of the temptation inherent in all requests from power: flatteringly, they are pitched to the scholar as people possessing (in Yeats’ phrase), a “gift to set a statesman right,” and this could even be true, but an historically informed prudence warns us that there are other, related truths and principles to consider and be governed by.⁵ Among these scholars might consider the injunction attributed to Hippocrates, *primum non nocere* (first, do no harm), rather than what seems to be the current guiding reflex of, opportunistic *primum succurrere* (first, hasten to help). The costs and consequences of the latter throughout just the Cold War have been extensively documented, but in summary, so many of them are encompassed in the sobering insight that Neil Postman offered over twenty years ago:

I try to remind myself that during the last two decades men with Ph.D.s in the humanities and social sciences, many of them working for the Pentagon, have been responsible for killing more people in any given week than the Mafia has managed since its inception.⁶

4

See Harro Höpfl, *Jesuit Political Thought: The Society of Jesus and the State, c. 1540-1630* (Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2004), esp. pp. 1-111.

5 From William Butler Yeats, *On Being Asked For a War Poem*.

6 Neil Postman, “The Educationist as Painkiller,”

<http://www.neilpostman.org/articles/Postman-TheEducationistAsPainkiller.pdf> accessed 27 January 2010, originally published in *English Education* (1988), 7-17. It was also published in *Conscientious Objections* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1988), 82-96. To name just three works worth consulting see: Noam Chomsky, et al., *The Cold war & The University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years* (New York: The New Press, 1997); Jonathan Feldman, *Universities in the Business of Repression: The Academic-Military-Industrial Complex in Central America* (Boston: South End Press, 1989), and John Trumbour, *How Harvard Rules: Reason in the Service of Empire* (Boston: South End Press, 1989), hereafter cited as Trumbour, *How Harvard Rules*.

Scholars should also consider the manifest truism that being knowledgeable in a certain area, possessing a sophisticated and nuanced understanding of it, and producing right (logical, correct, accurate) analyses of it, is no guarantee of a scholar's acceptability; indeed, all three can constitute an absolute impediment to being treated seriously if they run counter to reigning political and policy preferences. The accounts of this form of epistemic exclusion as they relate to America's war in Vietnam provide a salutary lesson here, as does the whole corpus of thematically similar works on the willed ignorance which has attended the failures understand the threat posed by *Al Qaeda* pre-9/11, and the legal and strategic conundrums which confronted, and still confront, the US in Iraq and Afghanistan. Crucially, what account upon account testify to is not that there was a shortage of expertise which could only be remedied by further co-opting the University but, rather, that the requirement was for ostensibly independent affirmation of decisions and policies reached outside of the realm of rigorous strategic inquiry and analysis.⁷

To serve the state and the statesman is, therefore, a fraught enterprise, ethically, politically and intellectually for any scholar who takes seriously the professional and personal integrity invested in the person of a university scholar. If she or he is to remain true to the way of thinking in which they are embedded, they are alienated from it the moment they agree to advise the Prince, and with possible consequences to which they are unaccustomed, and yet responsible for:

We are closed in, and the key is turned
On our uncertainty; somewhere
A man is killed, or a house burned,
Yet no clear fact to be discerned:
Come build in the empty house of the stare.⁸

⁷ James C. Thomson provides a very salient essay on Vietnam in this context in his, "How Could Vietnam Happen: An Autopsy," in Douglas M. Fox (ed), *The Politics of U.S. Foreign Policy Making* (Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear, 1971), pp. 299-309. More recently, the following works are relevant: Anonymous, *Imperial Hubris: Why the West is Losing the War on Terror* (Washington, D.C: Brassey's, 2004); Richard A. Clarke, *Against All Enemies: Inside America's War on Terror* (New York: Free Press, 2004), and Philippe Sands, *Torture Team: Deception, Cruelty and the Compromise of Law* (London: Allen Lane, 2008).

We come, then, there is the dubious proposition that a serious scholar should serve a statesman. Yeats (unsurprisingly) had a view on him, too, and he described such a being in the following terms:

A Statesman is an easy man,
He tells his lies by rote;
A journalist takes up his lies and takes you by the throat . . .⁹

It is a sign only of the corruption in the political order that, in the period since the events of 9/11, both of these descriptions have become so routinised that they are not thought of being comment-worthy beyond a ritualistic denunciation by the IR mainstream. So internalised has this situation become in the subsequent “state of emergency” and the “wild zone of power” that it has generated, that notions once thought to belong to the realm of tongue-in-cheek, throw-away lines by curmudgeons and standup comedians have the status of common sense – truths requiring no reflection upon their implications.

¹⁰ In this context we might recall Texan Guinan’s definition of a political leader as someone “who will lay down your life for his country,” and Henry Wotton’s descriptions - of a diplomat as “a man of virtue [honest] sent abroad to lie for his country,” and a journalist as “a man without virtue who lies at home for himself” - all three of which resonate with the historical record of (say) the post-World War II period. Thus, a scholar’s assignation with the state is a mutually beneficial transaction in which the former is heralded as an

8 William Butler Yeats, *Meditations in Time of Civil War*, Part VI, “The Stare’s Nest By My Window,” Verse 2.

9 William Butler Yeats, *The Old Stone Cross*.

10 For the context of these phrases see, Susan Buck-Morss, *Thinking Past Terror: Islamism and Critical Theory on the Left* (New York/London: Verso, 2003), p. 29, as cited in Henry A. Giroux and Susan Searls Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education: Race, Youth, and the Crisis of Democracy in the Post-Civil Rights Era* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), p. 250 (hereafter cited as Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*).

“effective” specialist from the sheltered realm of the academy who is prepared to operate in the “real world” with all the rigor and integrity popularly associated with such a status, at the same time, she or he elevates to the level of acceptable and overall unproblematic behaviour what in any other circumstance in contemporary life would be held to be a lack of integrity.

Needless to say, these mutual benefits apply only if the scholar acts foolishly and/or stupidly in the first place, by playing Faust to the state’s Mephistopheles and seeking mastery, money, and fame by selling his or her intellectual integrity. Naturally, the degree to which such a scholar’s abandonment of the ideals of the University is foolish or stupid will depend upon the character of their complicity in the nefarious affairs of the state which they have been appointed to advise on, but there should be no mistaking the fact that, for an IR specialist complicity in nefarious affairs within the purview of U.S. foreign and security policy is virtually inescapable. Sadly and tragically, the scholar is not absolved by remaining in the U.S. University’s current reigning variant – the neo-liberal research university – because it is so aligned with the forces and power of the U.S. itself that it cannot be considered a site of teaching, learning and research independent of the state.

What this chapter argues, therefore, is that what we have to hand is most accurately described as the “undead University” – a schizophrenic, vitiated place, almost devoid of spirit, in which there are but residual bastions, or outposts of the albeit far-from-perfect traditional University – with the result that exhortations to take the generic theory – practice divide seriously are at best demands made by those who have not visited the planet earth (and certainly not the United States) in recent memory, or worse, deliberate attempts to camouflage and distract from attention what in corporate life would be a stealthy, but nevertheless hostile, takeover. To this end, there are three foci (though several more could be included) constituted by, first, an account of the ideal character of the object of analysis, including the subversion of the ideal, or what the object has become; the corruption of faculty which follows inevitably from their habitat’s decline in health; and the parallel but equally determined withholding of education from those with a right to expect it. These foci are the university, the scholar, and the student.

I

THE UNIVERSITY

Subversion, Decline, and the Privileging of Annihilation

It is a popular belief in modern democratic societies that the Universities are unique as sites of teaching, inquiry, research, and writing which, above all, are marked by their independence from the various forces which influence so much of the life outside of the academy. The academy, in these terms, approximates to an ideal which, though it never existed, continues to be honoured in the terms put forward by Wilhelm von Humboldt, as:

. . . nothing other than the spiritual life of those human beings who are moved by external leisure or internal pressures toward learning and research.¹¹

But this is more than an ideal proclaiming the need for the satisfaction of a personal yearning; indeed, its wider, extremely serious ramifications are apparent in the comment it attracted from Noam Chomsky:

The extent to which existing institutional forms permit these human needs to be satisfied provides one measure of the level of civilisation a society has achieved.¹²

Historically, moreover, to the extent that the University approached von Humboldt's ideal in more than a vestigial resemblance it "reduced the entropy of time and fought against it;" fought against it, furthermore, as a stable institution, able, because of its historical consciousness, "to preserve at least a pocket of memory, " and maintain, as Régis Debray recalls it, "a tribal reservation for the ethics of truth."¹³ Within it, which is to say within the

11As cited in Milan Rai, *Chomsky's Politics* (London: Verso, 1995), p. 125 (hereafter cited as Rai, *Chomsky's Politics*).

12As cited, *ibid.*

13Régis Debray, *Teachers, Writers, Celebrities: The Intellectuals of Modern France*, trans. David Macey (London: NLB, 1981), p. 49 (hereafter cited as Debray, *Teachers, Writers, Celebrities*).

membership of the academy, education and abnegation were “virtually synonymous,” a deceased identity which Debray laments with just a hint of contempt for its successors:

Integrity, obscurity, selflessness; the words raise a smile, but the archaism of the vocabulary derives from the downgrading of the practices of the schools, not vice versa.¹⁴

The University, then, was of a dominant site of secular critique practised by people “capable of living what [they] taught until it killed [them].”¹⁵ In their commitment to this principle, to what Paul Bové sees as the imperative to “take aim at the unequal, imperial, antidemocratic present,” academics demonstrated a truth: “Critics should never be good company.”¹⁶ And both Debray and Bové, just to name two, share what Giroux, Gould, and Dewey are intent on making even more explicit as the purpose of university education – the need to provide the bases of that “educated and active citizenry [which] is indispensable for a free and inclusive democratic society” within the belief that critical citizens are made, not born.¹⁷ In turn, this democratic education must take the form of being “an education for democracy . . . it must argue for its means as well as its ends.”¹⁸ Ultimately, this is to be encapsulated within the

14ibid.

15ibid.

16Paul Bové, *In the Wake of Theory* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1992), p. 66 (hereafter cited as Bové, *In the Wake of Theory*).

17 Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*, pp. 4 and 257.

18 Eric Gould, *The University in a Corporate Culture* (New haven: Yale University Press, 2003), p. 225, as cited in Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*, p. 284.

principles which all education should take place, “intellectual freedom and ethical responsibility.”¹⁹

The problem is that both the ideal and the popular belief, insofar as they are held to be apply to the recent past and present, are wrong. In the United States this is generally the case because of the operant environment being determined by American Exceptionalism, American Religion, and Capitalism as a pantheon of beliefs beyond radical criticism. As Amherst College President, Alexander Meiklejohn, warned from an earlier period in which the University was under threat (in 1916):

Insofar as a society is dominated by the attitudes of competitive business enterprise, freedom in its proper American meaning cannot be known, and hence, cannot be taught. That is the basic reason why the schools and colleges, which are presumably commissioned to study and promote the ways of freedom, are so weak, so confused, and so ineffectual.²⁰

Moreover, within a society which Barry Alan Shain reminds us tolerated “only a narrow range of behaviour,”²¹ at its inception, and which, subsequently, acquiesced in the transformation of its foundational myths and religions by corporate capitalism, resulting in criticism being rendered either acceptable or unacceptable by capitalist-corporate criteria, it is particularly wrong. In the McCarthy period, loyalty to the United States, and to the university, therefore, was defined to include a faculty member’s an acceptance of the existing

19 Dewey, as cited in Bruce Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University: Professionalism, Purity, and Alienation* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1990), p. 199 (hereafter cited as Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*).

20 As cited in, Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*, p. 255.

21 Barry Alan Shain, *The Myth of American Individualism; The Protestant Origins of American Political Thought* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), p. 320.

politico-economic order and a willingness, induced on pain of dismissal, to sign a “loyalty oath.”²²

Furthermore, the popular belief about universities is inevitably wrong where the universities in question are defined, as most are wont to define themselves, as “research universities,” and where the disciplines covered include the natural sciences most in demand by military-industrial interests, or the social sciences with pretences to prediction and control, sought after by those policy communities of the state which seek power in, and over, human affairs, both at home and abroad. This is no less the case when the universities in question derive their status from the extent to which they are consultants to government or industry. In plain terms, if independent inquiry in the “relevant” areas of the mainstream American research universities, and under the conditions outlined, is predicated upon the independence of the individual university, then, on an everyday basis, those universities have been, and remain hopelessly compromised.

Historical Subversion

Even a cursory acquaintance with the history of the university system should be sufficient to dispel doubts to the contrary. Since the 1880s, businessmen have dominated the boards of trustees of most American universities which, of course, might be thought to explain the corporatisation of the modern university.²³ A more accurate assessment, however, is that this stewardship is better seen as a reflection of the deeper capture of the universities themselves, and on a day-to-day basis. Such a view is assisted by the role which the universities are accorded by the wider society within which they are situated, which, for the most part, is as a service sector devoted to the production of graduates - teachers and technocrats - who will develop, justify,

²²Michael Parenti, *Against Empire* (San Francisco: City Lights, 1995), p. 180 (hereafter cited as Parenti, *Against Empire*).

²³ibid, p. 177-178; and Lawrence C. Soley, *Leasing the Ivory Tower: The Corporate Takeover of Academia* (Boston: South End, 1995), pp. 19-21 (hereafter cited as Soley, *Leasing the Ivory Tower*).

and maintain the exclusivity of capitalism as a political-economic system. And that includes the system's imperatives which, *via* policies, institutions, and regimes of one type or another result in capitalism's global domination. So steeped is this view that, with no little sense of irony, Michael Ryan observes that two otherwise opposed groups in society, radical teachers and business technocrats, hold identical views as to the operational purposes of universities in the United States though their reasons for doing so differ widely.²⁴

As regards the former, the proposition appears to be warranted beyond America, and no matter whether the teacher is on the (broadly perceived) left or the right. Thus Michel Foucault identified two functions of the University: "to put students out of circulation," and to "integrate" them into the values of a society.²⁵ For the conservative ideologue, Allan Bloom, the issue of what is at stake for American society in the course of a student's "four years of freedom" is even more baldly asserted: "They are civilisation's only chance to get him."²⁶ "Possession" of the student, and therefore, the student's environment, is the objective, but not for its own sake:

Radicals argue that the university services capitalism by providing it with trained manpower, technology, and new knowledge. Business technocrats essentially agree, but whereas the radicals deplore this situation, business people recognise its importance, and they do all they can to foster it.²⁷

24Michael Ryan, *Marxism and Deconstruction: A Critical Articulation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1982), p. 132 (hereafter cited as Ryan, *Marxism and Deconstruction*).

25As cited in Bové, *In the Wake of Theory*, p. 95.

26Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy And Impoverished The Souls Of Today's Students* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1987), p. 336.

27Ryan, *Marxism and Deconstruction*. p. 132.

The purpose, more finely put, is the maintenance and reproduction of the already-existing power relations conducive to business, within what Frederick Bohm, Director of the Exxon Education Foundation, describes as the University's "cohesion of purpose" which, notably, "*leaves out any moral perspective.*"²⁸ Thus, it is on the basis of this, and similar pronouncements, and an extended understanding of the tensions between left and right, radical and conservative, which they give rise to that Michael Ryan concludes:

The university is a historical product; it reflects and reproduces social stratification by rationing knowledge according to class; it trains "leaders," thus preserving external structures of political authority; it embodies conservative business ideology in its institutional structure by segmenting and instrumentalising knowledge; it promotes a monopoly of scarce scientific knowledge and technology by business; it trains social agents in the norms and mores of the dominant culture; and so on.²⁹

But this situation has less to do with fiats handed down by boards of trustees who, basically, lack the capabilities of to effect their wishes within the faculty, and is more a function of the university becoming increasingly dependent for its survival upon infusions of government and corporate funding for specific, confidential / classified projects in order to survive as a "research university." Previously, it was the case that the universities were regarded as an intellectual prosthesis provided by the state on the grounds that some research tasks were so considerable in scope, and so beyond the resources of even the largest enterprises, that the "socialisation of intellectual production" was agreeable even to business.³⁰ They were funded accordingly, especially in the context of the Cold war, and especially where a relation to "national

28As cited, *ibid*, p. 134.

29*ibid*, p. 136.

30R. C. Lewontin, "The Cold War and the Transformation of the Academy," in Noam Chomsky et al, *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Postwar Years* (New York: New Press, 1997), p. 3, (hereafter cited as Chomsky et al, *The Cold War and the University*).

security” could be, or was, asserted. But, with the contraction of the state as a source of infrastructure development, and the growth in non-university research institutions (“think tanks”) the patronage of research universities underwent a profound change: the emergent phenomenon is the inability of such universities to attract adequate funding for research which might not have an immediate, and, above all, profitable application, whereas funding is available for those universities prepared to act as, effectively, the research divisions of corporations and the residual government programmes. In most cases this arrangement conceals the fact that, because the university adopts the position of a mendicant in its eagerness to be “relevant” to contemporary demands - namely, it has so internalised the identity of receiving alms that it no longer expects to receive what it *needs* - the full costs of the research are simply not covered. The result is that corporations and government agencies obtain an undeclared subsidy from whatever source is principally responsible for university funding overall - frequently government education budgets - a practice neo-liberal economic theory, virtually all corporations, and most Western governments disavow as an inducement to dependence upon the “nanny state” when it is described as “welfare” or “social security.”³¹

Funding foundations are thought to ameliorate this condition, but it is difficult to see why. Foundations are to the super-rich what legitimate businesses are to organised crime: they serve two entirely necessary rehabilitations for what is, ultimately, greed. In the first instance of reputations built on the amassing of fortunes derived from the exploitation of resources and labour as a result of, or under conditions not dissimilar to, conquest, giving some of it away to respectable members of the middle-classes for their otherwise unfunded research; in the second, of the *status quo* by maintaining an intellectual climate which will not seriously challenge the dominant discourse. And because monetary wealth has received the benediction of American Religion, the excess of it which is offered as alms comes to the clerisy of university professionals not only in measured quantities, but on the understanding that the projects they undertake be conducted with impeccable

³¹Soley, *Leasing the Ivory Tower*, pp. 32-35.

professional discretion.³² Funding agencies or foundations, therefore, effect a conservatism in the approach to knowledge which they underwrite in addition to entrenching the conservatism of professions in general. Conversely, they cannot be correlated with the knowledge that insight and experience provide because the historical locales for both are in the margins between disciplines, in the heaths beyond settled accounts of the world.

So long as the regime of selective and institutionalised penury operates, four subordinate, but interrelated, factors or tendencies, all in any case pronounced in modern capitalist society at large, vitiate all attempts to achieve greater intellectual independence. The first of these is the reduction of the University's activities - its courses, research output, and publications - to commodities, or products, in a "generalised market" which services "a society of mall-strolling consumers with short attention spans."³³ Since, so the logic goes, money is the most decisive determinant of institutional existence, the University can satisfy the prerequisite of its survival by teaching whatever is in demand, especially in the light of contested claims concerning the nature of "excellence" within, and between, disciplines. In the absence of any agreement as to what counts as "good" in each field, the "market" masks all dissension with an appeal to the student who, in Bill Readings' economic reformulation of the traditional relationship, "is situated entirely as a *consumer*, rather than as someone who wants to think."³⁴ The *dignity* of a particular course of study is simply erased by its *marketability*.³⁵ What is procured, then, is not an education, and what is saved is hardly a university which accords with

32Bruce Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, p. 249.

33The above phrases are from David Damrosch, *We Scholars: Changing the Culture of the University* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1995), and Bill Readings, *The University in Ruins* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1996), respectively, as cited in James Miller, "The Academy Writes Back: Why We Can't Close the Book on Allan Bloom," *Lingua Franca*, March 1997, pp. 64-65.

34Readings, as cited, *ibid*, p. 65.

35*ibid*.

the popular, idealised concept espoused by von Humboldt; rather, to borrow from Lewis Lapham, the whole process is one of denigration in which the University is conceived as “a resort hotel deserving of respect in the exact degree to which it satisfies the whims of its patrons and meets the public expectation of convenience and style at a bargain price.”³⁶

The second factor, well developed by Régis Debray, concerns the identity of university scholar-intellectuals in a generalised market. In particular, the scholar-intellectual understands that to exist is to be heard, and that he exists “only in so far as he (sic) is recognised by others as worthy to exist.”³⁷ Thus, in a society marked by the “organic decadence” of capitalist reductionism, university academics are faced with what they construct as a choice between a life of abnegation, or the seeking out of acknowledgment and reward wherever it is forthcoming. The pursuit of the latter, then:

. . . is both symptom and factor, cause and effect. In immediate terms it is equivalent to a transfer of power. The ideological field of power is magnetic: as one force of attraction weakens, the other grows stronger. But the iron filings still form a pattern; and as the intellectuals must cluster round something, they will go wherever the organicity, and therefore the potential for organisation and promotion, is greatest: the more ambitious into the media and private capital, the more scrupulous into the state administration.³⁸

It is nevertheless a free choice of identity enhancement since neither the government nor the private sector of the economy force academics into their respective service, and many are those who refuse despite being offered considerable inducements to enlist. But for those making the choice an ostensible escape is effected from the anomaly of universities - namely,

³⁶Lewis Lapham, *Hotel America: Scenes in the Lobby of the Fin-de-Siecle* (London: Verso, 1995), p. 5.

³⁷Debray, as cited in Bové, *In the Wake of Theory*, pp. 115-117.

³⁸As cited, *ibid*, p. 111.

according to Harvard's R. C. Lewontin, a situation in which "academic staff have the education, social status, and special intellectual craft knowledge, of self-employed professionals such as doctors and lawyers, while at the same time are salaried employees who are required to work for periods under conditions set by their employing institution."³⁹ And clearly, it is an attractive option for some, as David Newsom recounts the American scene in the mid-1990s:

Five national security advisers since the administration of John Kennedy were professors before assuming their White House appointment: McGeorge Bundy, Walter Rostow, Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Anthony Lake. Three of the last five US representatives to the United Nations -- Donald McHenry, Jeane Kirkpatrick, and Madeleine Albright [subsequently Secretary of State] -- have all come from Georgetown University. Faculty members from numerous other institutions, and particularly the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, have been called upon for advice on foreign policy issues from arms control to economic development.

*This class of academics stays close to politicians and welcomes occasional immersion in governmental action (emphasis added).*⁴⁰

A virtually logical extension to the presence of business interests on the formal controlling bodies of universities, the increasing domination of the University by corporate capital, constitutes the third factor and tendency. In America during the Cold War it became somewhat more entrenched as a form of academic dogma to counter the threat of "world Communism," and eventually found expression in a document entitled *The Rights and Responsibilities of Universities and Their Faculties*, published under the auspices of the American Association of Universities, which proclaimed that a university was "an association of individual scholars . . . united in loyalty to the

³⁹R. C. Lewontin, "The Cold War and the Transformation of the Academy," in Chomsky et al, *The Cold War and the University*, p. 28.

⁴⁰David D. Newsom, "Foreign Policy and Academia," *Foreign Policy*, No. 101 (Winter 1995-96): 53.

ideal of learning, to the moral code, to the country, and to its form of government.” It also included the statement “free enterprise is as essential to intellectual as to economic progress.”⁴¹ Years later, though, the corporate disposition remained unapologetic in its attitude to free inquiry: William Simon advocated that the withholding of business funds from universities which did not promote its interests, while *Business Week* felt compelled to alert its readership to the proposition that the existence of Marxists on American campuses could presage an intellectual climate hostile to private enterprise.⁴²

Their fear was as absurd as it was unjustified, and both because the myopia of business was unable to discern what the more sensitive lens of critical theory saw foregrounded - Debray’s “organicity” of the intellectuals:

For the intellectual order, power does not lie where shallow people think it lies: with those whom everyone calls powerful . . . It lies with those who control career prospects, increased print runs and greater social visibility . . . This amphibiology to the word power lies between the many impostures that disguise flunkies (in the true professional sense of the word) as insurgents.⁴³

In a general sense, confirmation is provided from a most unlikely source, the universities themselves. Carnegie Mellon University report that, no later than 1994, in excess of 1,000 university-industry cooperative research centres had been set up some 200 campuses. Between them they spent USD4.3 billion on research and related activities, involved 12,000 faculty members in the project as well as 17 per cent of the America’s PhD students in the sciences and engineering.⁴⁴ Also confirmed was Debray’s “transfer of power” as

41As cited in David Montgomery, “Introduction,” in Chomsky et al, *The Cold War and the University*, p. xxii.

42Ryan, *Marxism and Deconstruction*, p. 133.

43As cited in Bové, *In the Wake of Theory*, p. 114.

44Wesley Cohen, Richard Florida, and W. Richard Goe, *University-Industry Research Centres in the United States* (Carnegie Mellon University, July 1994), as cited in Ron Nixon, “Truth to the Highest Bidder: Science for Sale,” *Covert Action Quarterly*, No. 52 (Spring 1995): 49.

evidenced by the chronic and substantial declining share of the federal government's contribution to research and development (to 55 per cent in 1993), and the corresponding rise to dominance in some areas - health research, for example - of corporate funding.⁴⁵ Thus, in a study by Juliet Merrifield, there was no doubt that a transformation has been achieved:

The image of the scientist whose research is shaped by a pure thirst for knowledge is misleading at best. Because of the structure within which they must work, scientists may be "persuaded" to do some kinds of research and not others. *Money is the primary mechanism of control, but we must not overlook the system of internal controls on scientists*, which are also effective in influencing them to serve the needs of the powerful rather than the powerless. In order to engage in scientific research today, scientists need not only access to funds, but also *access to facilities and equipment, access to the media of scientific communications, and the rewards of recognition* (emphasis added).⁴⁶

The implications of this transformation create, in turn, the final factor, the reorientation of the university to, in Ryan's terms, an "economy." In effect this is but the final consummation of the university's relations with the "generalised economy" of the wider society, a conclusion which overturns any notion of the two being defined by their allegiance to unbiased scholarship, and the biased politics of the world, respectively. It is, equally, the satisfaction of two complementary desires, the union of a technologically-created corporate sphere (reliant on university-produced knowledge), and university knowledge which is created by corporate finance.⁴⁷ As participatory witnesses to this

⁴⁵ibid.

⁴⁶Juliet Merrifield, *Putting Scientists in Their Place: Participatory Research in Environmental and Occupational Health* (New Market, Tennessee: Highlander Research and Educational Centre, January 1989), p. 7, as cited, ibid.

⁴⁷Ryan, *Marxism and Deconstruction*, p. 148.

transaction, students inescapably become part of what Foucault saw as the “rituals of inclusion inside a system of capitalist norms.”⁴⁸

The ‘Moral’ Collapse

For many, this represents the “the moral collapse of the university,” the “decline of the university,” or the “university in ruins.” Whatever the perspective of critique, a sense of loss accompanies the understanding of the University-as-corporation. In the context of this analysis, the nature of the loss is most acutely undergone as a general reorganisation of the academy according to the rubric of capitalism, while, in the particular, it is experienced as the “destruction of the humanities as critique.”⁴⁹ Within the former, critique is pauperised to the extent that, unless it is valued because it is pleasurable, it is, quite simply, unmarketable to the populations of modern economies impatient with the written word (always provided they can read and understand it), and dependent more than ever on media ruled by sensationalism, personality at the expense of symbol, image at the expense of concept, and obsessed with distribution to the detriment of production.⁵⁰

By even these injuriously brief accounts, so subordinated to the dominant interests of society is the university that any self-conscious and self-critical assessment of it would have to conclude that it is, in the main, just another instrument of the dominant political-economy. Removing the term “just,” however, allows for a necessary expansion and refinement because the subordination extends to the University being more than an educational institution with a corporate ethic, as developed in above: as is documented in

⁴⁸As cited in Bové, *In the Wake of Theory*, p. 95.

⁴⁹ibid, p. 110.

⁵⁰ibid, pp. 109, 111, and 118.

the works of Jonathan Feldman, Michael Parenti, and Lawrence Soley, it has become so integrated into corporate life that its investment portfolios and consultancies make it complicit in Third World repression; its emphasis on the consultative function alone has corroded its commitment to education; and even the commonplace crimes it now commits are indistinguishable from the worst in corporate history -- fraud, deception, and corporate corruption.⁵¹

In sum, loyalty oaths served only as a general instrument for academic discipline, but did not preclude the imposition of more traditional forms of censure, such as dismissal, denial of tenure, or the cutting-off of research funds, where critique, or the threat of critique from the "left" arose in relation to capitalism, U.S. imperialism, wars, and other social ills consequential to all three.⁵² With the passage of time, the corporatisation of the university, in all its fuller expressions, provided a more urgent inducement for these measures to be exercised, ultimately to the point where an inversion was obvious. Thus the sociologist, Sigmund Diamond, could be denied a position at Harvard on the grounds of his public, civil-libertarian resistance to McCarthyism, but the same university was untroubled by the fact that its scientists invented one of the most horrendous of "conventional" modern battlefield weapons, Napalm.⁵³

If at this point is introduced the eminently reasonable proposition expressed by Ryan - that reason "is inseparable from the institutions in which it is preserved and passed on, and in the practice of which it has its being,"⁵⁴ - then the idealised notion of universities as sites of independent inquiry is seen to founder on its confrontation with their everyday practice. Not only is the

⁵¹See: Jonathan Feldman, *Universities in the Business of Repression: The Academic-Military-Industrial Complex in America* (Boston: South End, 1989), hereafter cited as Feldman, *Universities in the Business of Repression*; Parenti, *Against Empire*, and Soley, *Leasing the Ivory Tower*.

⁵²Parenti, *Against Empire*, pp. 175-196.

⁵³ibid, pp. 175 and 179.

⁵⁴Ryan, *Marxism and Deconstruction*, p. 132.

university-as-institution a preposterous site of knowledge because of its institutional involvement in the antitheses of education, but its faculty is not credible to the extent that they embody the corporatist ethic of the institution. As Wilshire phrases it, the “ultimate educating force is who I am.”⁵⁵ His argument, which is identical to Debray’s in this regard, is that the teacher carries both a special authority and a special responsibility to exemplify personally, “the nature, value, and meaning of truth.”⁵⁶ It follows, therefore, that teachers who identify with the pathologies of the university pointed to here - what Wilshire perceptively regards as its “moral collapse” - are at the same time exemplifying themselves and, more importantly, their discourse, to their students, and their society more broadly.

Privileging The American Way of War and Strategies of Annihilation

There is no limiting case for the co-option of the University. Projects involving indiscriminate, massive, and wanton death and destruction have been, and continue to be embraced within the professionalised ambit of academic expertise, so much so that, in the interests of honesty, Chomsky advocated that universities establish in their very centres, appropriately named “Departments of Death,” “Death Technology,” and “Theory of Oppression.”⁵⁷ In effect, his proposal was an alert to the fact, attested to in the disciplinary histories of the natural, and social sciences, that war, and especially the Cold

⁵⁵Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*.

⁵⁶ibid.

⁵⁷As cited in C.P. Otero (ed.), *Language and Politics* (Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1988), p. 248, in Rai, *Chomsky’s Politics*, p. 129.

War, has been an undisguised benefactor of the academy.⁵⁸ Indeed, for those in it who were prepared to accept the latter's strictures in order to enjoy its opportunities, the retrospective glance can be unwelcome and uncomfortable:

Although it is a severe blow to their sense of moral righteousness and self-esteem, academics must face the fact that the Via Dolorosa along which many of their colleagues and friends were dragged to their crucifixions was also the high road to professional prosperity for the great majority.⁵⁹

What is being suggested here is an overture, a first indication. But what this chapter is concerned to demonstrate is just how unremarkable, in the American university context, have been a succession of excursions into a phenomenon which should be alien to the very concept of the academy: annihilation.

In 1959, at the Commander Hotel in Cambridge, Mass., Harvard President Nathan Pusey made the following observation about his institution:

The sort of activities that goes on in the classrooms and laboratories of Cambridge is contributing vastly to the immense national efforts we are making and shall have to make to live up to our nation's acquired responsibilities in the world and to compete effectively in this life-and-death struggle in which it seems that we are to be engaged for a long time with our alien rival, the USSR..... Harvard is no stranger to such struggles Our university has done its part -- and more -- in every conflict in our nation's history.⁶⁰

⁵⁸The benefits to the discipline of economics have already been the subject of exposition in this regard, but for a brief survey of other areas of inquiry see Margaret C Jacob (ed.), *The Politics of Western Science 1640-1990* (New Jersey: Humanities Press, 1992), esp. the editor's chapter "science and Politics in the Late Twentieth Century, " and Stuart W. Leslie's "Science and Politics in Cold War America."

⁵⁹R.C. Lewontin, "The Cold War and the Transformation of the Academy," in Chomsky et al, *The Cold War and the University*, p. 2.

⁶⁰As cited in Trumbour, *How Harvard Rules*, p. 51.

Although everything that Pusey had to say *about* Harvard was, and remains true, it is the invocation of “every conflict in our nation’s history” that deserves particular examination because of the evident pride Pusey expresses in relation to them. His evident concern is to laud Harvard’s substantial contributions without reference to the causes which they have served, an inexcusable default in a post-Nuremberg world sensitised to the dictum that patriotism and duly authorised commands are held to be subordinate to humanitarian ethics. In other words a prudential caution attaches to serving the state in general, and, given the history of the United States, serving the US in particular. And the reason is clear on two counts: first, there broad critical scholarly agreement that the United States is a “country made by war,” that “[p]olitics and folklore sustained the centrality of war for Americans long after the Revolution,” that war is an ever-present metaphor in other struggles in America, and that the armed forces “spurred economic development.”⁶¹ Second, and more significantly in the current context, what Russell F. Weigley has called the “American way of war” was defined very early in the nation’s existence, against the native Americans, by none other than George Washington, in his instructions to Major General John Sullivan on how to proceed against the Iroquois in 1779: he was to “lay waste to the all the settlements around . . . that the country may not be merely *overrun* but *destroyed*..” Further, he was ordered to:

. . . not by any means, listen to any overture of peace before the total ruin of their settlements is effected . . . Our future security will be in their inability to injure us . . . and in the terror with which the severity of the chastisement they receive will inspire them.

Understanding perfectly the tenor of his commander, Sullivan expressed his accord with the statement that “the Indians shall see that there is malice

⁶¹See, for example, Geoffrey Perret, *A Country Made by War: From the Revolution to Vietnam - The Story of America’s Rise to Power* (New York: Random House, 1989), and Michael S. Sherry, *In the Shadow of War: The United States Since the 1930s* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), esp. pp. 1-3 (hereafter cited as Sherry, *In the Shadow of War*).

enough in our hearts to destroy everything that contributes to their support.”⁶² Alien was the dictum of Polybius, that it is not the object of war to destroy one’s enemies but to cause them to mend their ways.

When subsequently extermination again became emblematic of the Union against the Confederacy in the Civil War, and each successive war thereafter, historians began to understand that the “American way of war” was a particular, though not unique, egregiously brutal and unlimited type of war informed by a “strategy of annihilation.”⁶³ Struggling to understand it, some, like Charles Royster, found their voices in eloquent and insightful accounts which resonated with American Exceptionalism:

[Americans took] flight into unreason: into visions of purgation and redemption, into anticipation and intuition and spiritual apotheosis, into bloodshed that was not only intentional pursuit of interests of state but was sacramental, erotic, mystical, and strangely gratifying.⁶⁴

Nathan Pusey’s pride in the services Harvard had rendered to the United States over the years, no less than his embrace of the national mission of 1959, required either an amnesiac condition which covered one hundred and eighty years, or a sense that the criminal excesses of the national strategy was irrelevant in the interests of his institution remaining a courtier to Washington. Either way, if Harvard is taken as the exemplary model for American universities, the prognosis for education as for critical resistance to the state in the coming years, was bleak, and was eventually proven to be so.

With a fitting focus on the exemplar, however, if we briefly examine one of the great dichotomies in global strategy of the second half of the 20th

⁶²Citations from Richard Drinnon, *Facing West: The Metaphysics of Indian Hating and Empire Building* (New York: Schocken Books, 1990), pp. 329-332.

⁶³Russell F. Weigley, *The American Way of War: A History of United States Military Strategy and Policy* (New York: Macmillan, 1973).

⁶⁴Charles Royster, *The Destructive War: William Tecumseh Sherman, Stonewall Jackson, and the Americans* (New York: 1991), p. 241, as cited in Sherry, *In the Shadow of War*, p. 2.

Century, we find that the University in general and Harvard in particular exerted an extraordinary and, pathological influence on the way the world was known. This is because the understanding of the (Soviet) East within the East-West relationship owed much to the fact that Western Sovietology was a para-disciplinary discourse dominated, in the first instance, by the importation of anti-Russian bias acquired as a result of study in western Europe, and then, research centres in the United States which, returning the compliment, appointed European and Russian émigrés who imparted the same hostility while resident in the US. The earlier acquisition had its origins in America's need to understand the Soviet Union in the pre-World War II period, and consequently, decisions taken by Robert F. Kelley, a Harvard graduate and former instructor, who was head of the State Department's Eastern European Division from 1924-1938. In this period he ensured that his Soviet specialists were trained in either Paris or Berlin as were, for example, Charles Bohlen (later ambassador to the USSR), and George Kennan, respectively. Both deserve the title "fathers of containment,"⁶⁵ Kennan moreso, but not just because of the famous "X" telegram; his early writings and memoirs are marked by the adoption of the nineteenth century dichotomy between Teutons and Slavs wherein German culture was viewed most favourably, whereas Russian civilisation was seen as unchanging and barbaric.⁶⁶

The later effect was noticeable when Harvard, with its Russian Research Centre, was charged with training American Sovietologists after 1945 and the course offerings were seen to follow in the intellectual tradition of Kennan. Thus, the peoples of the USSR were either described in terms such as "heathen" or "primitive", or genealogically linked with Genghis Khan (which amounted to the same thing)⁶⁷. Not only was a permanent Soviet threat thesis perpetuated, but also a contempt and/or hate for the country which was the

⁶⁵Trumpbour, *How Harvard Rules*, p. 63 and 79-80.

⁶⁶ibid., pp. 79-80.

⁶⁷ibid., p. 81.

object of study. Furthermore it was a disposition which could be sustained without great difficulty by the practices of recruiting émigré intellectuals who shared the animus -- such as Zbigniew Brzezinski, Henry Kissinger, Talcott Parsons, Richard Pipes, Thomas Schelling, and Adam Ulam - and so were in a position of recognised authority within the foreign policy discourse to pass it on to successive generations of students, or graduates who rose to prominence within the policy-making bureaucracy -- such as John J. McCloy, Robert McNamara, Donald Regan and Caspar Weinberger - where they did not actually accept such positions themselves.

Yet it is important to understand that émigré, mainly eastern European intellectuals were only the more visible and constant reminders of the discourse of Soviet-hating at Harvard and in the US. more generally. Others, whose details are understandably less well publicised, were relied upon to establish an understanding more intimate, more extensive, and more immediate than mere scholarly inquiry could impart. Hence, one of the major enterprises of Soviet studies was the “utilisation” of Russians who were exiles or refugees for reasons having to do with World War II (so-called Displaced Persons), and other Russians who had been encouraged to defect from the elite of the “Soviet World”. These were to be interviewed for information thought to be indispensable to, *inter alia*, US Air Force intelligence, in return for possible academic employment in the America. Of this development, Diamond concludes “the intelligence aspect of the work of the Russian Research Centre and the research aspect of its work cannot be distinguished.”⁶⁸

What could be distinguished, however, were those who were identifiably neither eastern European, nor Russian, and whose presence confounded the declared tenets of every American university. These were academics and members of research institutes thought to possess valuable scientific knowledge and expertise on the Soviet Union, but whose records would otherwise disqualify them from entering the United States. They were Nazis and Nazi collaborators, and they came in their hundreds - 642 between May

⁶⁸Sigmund Diamond, *Compromised Campus: The Collaboration of Universities with the Intelligence Community, 1945-1955* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 103-110 (hereafter cited as Diamond, *Compromised Campus*).

1945 and December 1952 - and, most likely, thousands, under the aegis of Project Paperclip, a program that had its origins in 1944, long before the advent of the Cold War. They came to the United States, moreover, with the full knowledge and approval of their host institutions, which included the universities, "think tanks," and industrial corporations of highest renown. They included, for example, Nicholas Poppe, a famous language expert, and former employee of the Wannsee Institute, an SS research facility which had been the site of the announcement of the "final solution to the Jewish question." Nevertheless, Harvard initially agreed to offer him a faculty position on condition that the US. Government certify, in writing, that Poppe's presence was in the national interest; despite this being forthcoming, he was eventually denied a position there only to take one at the University of Washington.⁶⁹

But of particular significance for this paper is the fact that Project Paperclip was directed by George Kennan and closely supervised by personnel within the State Department's Office of Research Intelligence, in particular, Evron M. Kirkpatrick. Kirkpatrick typifies the interpenetration of academic and state space and, thus, the homogenising of their discourse(s). He later became Executive Director of the American Political Science Association (APSA), and in the company of his wife, Jeanne Kirkpatrick, a Georgetown University political science professor, former ambassador to the United Nations in the Reagan Administration, and a member of the editorial board of the journal of the American Peace Society, *World Affairs*,. Intellectually, he was a defender of conventional political "science" and, although it does not necessarily follow, primitive and closed. From his position in the APSA he not so much attacked, as condemned critical theory on the grounds that it assails "the very foundations of the scholarly ethic: reason, objectivity, and freedom," going so far, ironically, as to associate it with a politically inspired attack on objectivity and reason by forces hardly worth differentiating from Communism, Fascism, and, ironically, Nazism!⁷⁰

⁶⁹ibid., pp. 105-108; and Trumbour, *How Harvard Rules*, pp. 80-82.

⁷⁰Diamond, *Compromised Campus*, pp. 103-106, and David Ricci, *The Tragedy of Political Science: Politics, Scholarship, and Democracy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984) (hereafter cited as Ricci, *The Tragedy of Political Science*), pp. 135, 140, 166, and 283-284.

This particular example, of hysterical anti-intellectualism and ethical disengagement by the academic community is, however, but an acute case of a chronic condition. In the thirty-plus year span of Kirkpatrick's career of influence upon American knowing, other, convergent developments and influences, of a no less reprehensible complexion, give the lie to any suggestion that Kirkpatrick and Project Paperclip were temporary or situational aberrations. Examples of the type cited to this point, and immediately following, and the documentation provided to accompany Sigmund Diamond's analysis of the University in the early Cold War dispel any myth that it was a place for the most part removed from the inanities of McCarthyism. To the contrary, they and he show why it was that many prominent administrators, faculty, and students were so caught up with the popular suspicions of the time that they actively and secretly sought close ties with the intelligence agencies⁷¹. In the process the University became a willing accessory to, and accomplice of the FBI and the CIA.

Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, Samuel P. Huntington, director of Harvard's Centre for International Affairs, joined his opinions with those earlier expressed by Stanford's Thomas Bailey to the effect that the foreign policy elite were even right to deceive the citizenry about the true nature of American interventions and other military actions essentially on the grounds that (i) deception was an inescapable attribute of the process of government; (ii) some people no longer accepted their inferiority to the governing classes; (iii) democracy is possessed of a "distemper" or "excess" which facilitates "previously passive or unorganised groups in the population blacks, Indians, Chicanos, white ethnic groups, students, and women [to embark] on concerted efforts to establish their claims to opportunities, positions, rewards, and privileges, which they had not considered themselves entitled to before," and (iv) effective democracy "usually requires some measure of apathy and non-involvement on the part of some individuals and groups."⁷² Although at the time this disposition was not directly connected to the influence of Leo Straus's

⁷¹Diamond, *Compromised Campus*, pp. 24-49, and 243-286.

teachings, historically it provides an interesting foretaste of there more explicit emergence when his acolytes were appointed to senior positions in the Administrations of President George W. Bush in the years 2001-2008.⁷³

At other times - in the 1960s - Huntington designed the forced urbanisation of the South Vietnamese peasantry as a legitimate instrument of US strategy and in so doing was the architect of the reduction of the rural population of the country by some 30 per cent, the consequential transformation of Vietnam from a food exporter to a food importer, and the parallel legitimisation of a rural bombing campaign over five times more intense than the US campaigns against Germany and Japan in World War II combined.⁷⁴ In the same decade he also advocated that political scientists become social engineers rather than theoreticians, and, somewhat consistently, that US foreign policy concern itself less with the development of democratic government among its allies and other states with which it had influence, and more with supporting those who were, no matter their undemocratic character, effective.⁷⁵ None of this was an impediment to his appointment to President Carter's National Security Council or, subsequently, his continued tenure and standing at Harvard.

Henry Kissinger, too, was welcome in this milieu, no objection being raised to his presence, let alone academic status, despite the fact that his record of foreign policy stewardship is, literally, strewn with support for

72Samuel P. Huntington in Michael J. Crozier, S.P. Huntington, and J. Watanuki, *The Crisis of Democracy* (New York: New York University Press, 1975), pp. 61-62, 75, 92, 102, and 113-114, as cited in John Trumbour, *How Harvard Rules*, p. 74.

73 From many offerings dealing with Strauss's influence in this period, the following is suggested as most useful: Anne Norton, *Leo Strauss and the Politics of the American Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004).

74Trumbour, *How Harvard Rules*, pp. 78-79, and Marilyn B. Young, *The Vietnam Wars 1945-1990* (New York: HarperCollins, 1991) p. 177.

75Trumbour, *How Harvard Rules*, p. 107-108.

assassination, murder, and *coup d'état* (Chile, 1973), betrayal in the name of power politics (Kurdistan/northern Iraq, 1975), invasion and subsequent genocide (East Timor, 1975), just to name three representative examples, the last two of which produced a combined death toll of at least 150,000 , and 600,000 refugees.⁷⁶

In the light of these examples, and the International Studies Association -South Region's decision to invite former Director of Central Intelligence, William Colby, to give the keynote address at its annual meeting in 1993,⁷⁷ it seems reasonable to infer that such persons and their exploits exert an almost pornographic attraction upon the mainstream discourse; it provides a voyeuristic association with those who have, or had power over the life and death of nations and their peoples, an occasion of encouragement for their would-be imitators, and stimulation for the more passive. Certainly, it was implicit in the invitation to Colby that his direction of the *Phoenix* program - a computer-directed campaign within the war in Vietnam, made notorious by its "assassination, torture, and systematic savagery," which resulted in the deaths of between 20,000 and 60,000 Viet Cong and suspected communist sympathisers - was absolved, declared irrelevant, or even retrospectively endorsed.⁷⁸ As well, it confirms, under the guise of a scholarly enterprise, the close historical affinity between the mainstream discourse of international relations and successive theories, practices, and practitioners which countenance genocide.⁷⁹ And, should it be doubted, the ongoing status

⁷⁶For an account of Kissinger's responsibility in these events, and others, see Walter Isaacson, *Kissinger* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992). For a damning, thoroughly researched and evidence-based indictment of Kissinger as a war criminal, see Christopher Hitchens, *The Trial of Henry Kissinger* (London: Verso, 2001).

⁷⁷*International Studies Newsletter*, Vol. 21, No. 1, January 1994, pp. 1 and 3.

⁷⁸For a well-documented account of this program see Douglas Valentine, *The Phoenix Program* (New York: Avon, 1992).

⁷⁹The term "genocide" is used advisedly": Frank Snepp, Chief Strategy Analyst for the CIA in Saigon, described his ultimate position in *Phoenix* as a "collaborator in the worst of the terrorist programs, in the most atrocious excesses of the US government." Barton

enjoyed by people such as Colby, Kissinger, and Huntington in the University, confirms the organic nature of the relationship between the state, university faculty, and significantly, students.

What needs to be emphasised at this juncture is the fact that, though attempts have been made to place restrictions on the more invasive activities of the state on US campuses, those concerning the intelligence agencies have evidently failed for the most part. Indeed, on the basis of the above examples, and Loch Johnson's analysis, we should infer that the will to resist the both the constrictions of American knowing, and the premature closure of alternatives simply never existed for long enough, or strongly enough to keep at bay the dominant discourse. As a consequence, the CIA attempts to open, and maintain some form of contact with, approximately 25 per cent of the approximately 4,000 colleges and universities in the United States, has mail and telephone links with about 18 per cent, and actually visits some 10 per cent, especially those offering advanced programs in language, science, and foreign policy. The last-mentioned category covers a multitude of activities under which the CIA's four directorates (Operations, Intelligence Administration, and Science and Technology) and the Office of Public Affairs engage in data and information collection (which also covers the use of academics in covert operations), recruitment of foreign agents (including covert recruitment of American and foreign faculty and students by the CIA) and general staff, research consulting, research contracting, career instruction, protection of campus recruiters and public relations.⁸⁰ And it's hardly a cottage industry according to Sharon Foster, a CIA spokeswoman, who in 1988 bragged that the Agency then secretly employed enough university professors "to staff a large university;" subsequent to 2001, experts estimate that numbers

Osborne, another who helped direct *Phoenix* operations, was more specific: he termed it a "bad genocide program." See Michael Maclear, *Vietnam: The Ten Thousand Day War* (London: Thames/Methuen, 1981), pp. 354-357.

⁸⁰Loch K. Johnson, *America's Secret Power: The CIA in a Democratic Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), hereafter cited as Johnson, *America's Secret Power* pp. 166-175.

involved would only have increased.⁸¹ They will have increased, moreover, beyond the routinised, day-to-day levels of academics who conduct classified government-directed research in the physical, biological, medical, human behavioural sciences.

The National Security Education Act of 1991, from which was established the National Security Education Program (NSEP), is but a more recent indicator of the institutionalisation of these practices in the social sciences, humanities, and area studies. In formal terms it is piece of legislation that was written and sponsored by the chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, David Boren, in response to a post-Cold War world held to consist of regional, non-communist threats. According to a former CIA senior estimates officer, David MacMichael, “gives the directors of the national security system a solid foothold on university campuses and a significant amount of control over their programs of international affairs, language and area studies, and of the students enrolled in them.”⁸² The money provided under the Act will, *inter alia*, fund scholarships for student to study abroad and for programs in “critical areas”. The students, then, will be subject to a type of double jeopardy: as the Act makes clear, they will be on Defence Department money, studying the society, language and culture of a country the government of the United States thinks might pose a “security problem”, and in that country; at the same time they will also have their program of study determined by another government agency, the Defence Intelligence College, which will monitor their progress which, inevitably, leads to graduation and the time when the Secretary of Defence is empowered to order them into service in an intelligence organisation, under threat of financial penalty. The conditions of this arrangement would, therefore,

81 David H. Price, “Exposing the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program,” Counterpunch, 12-13 March 2005, www.counterpunch.org/prie03122005.html, accessed 31 May 2010 (hereafter cited as Price, “Exposing the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program,”).

82David MacMichael, “Spooks on Campus”, *The Nation*, June 8, 1992, p. 780.

appear to deserve MacMichael's conclusion: "Universities, under this scheme, merely contract to provide training for the nation's intelligence services."⁸³

Tolerances of anti-intellectual practices and apocalyptic concepts such as those discussed come to reign as regressive consequences for four reasons integral to a capitalised, corporatised regime of knowledge production:

[F]irst, the segmentation and division of the world into disciplines and the social world into sectors or professions (politics, economics, health, and so on); second, the essentialist distinction of norms and deviations, endogenous factors (profit maximisation) from exogenous factors (ethical and environmental questions); third, the separation of subject and object, knower and known, academic and social world, which downplays the role of intellectual technology in constructing the world; and fourth, the privileging of models of a ratio, an equilibrium, balance, or harmonious order in society (which necessarily ensues from the above practices).

⁸⁴

In other words they reign because they are the logical conclusions to forms of knowing which include prejudicial abstraction, abusive simplification, and an obsessive concern for the detail which leads intimate knowledge which is unleavened by empathy or humility in the face of the complexity which the Other turns to us. As well, they reign now because of an unchallenged discursive privilege, just as they did during the Cold War. Then, privilege (and protection) permeated the intelligence project. Not only were graduates of the universities mentioned earlier recruited disproportionately to such organisations as the OSS and the CIA, and thus both received rewards for their orthodoxy, but steps were taken to ensure that as little disruption as possible, intellectually speaking, came their respective ways.⁸⁵ Beneficiaries have

⁸³ibid.

⁸⁴Ryan, *Marxism and Deconstruction*, p. 152.

⁸⁵For an account of recruitment habits see, Robin W. Winks, *Cloak and Gown: Scholars in the Secret War, 1939-1961* (New York: Quill/William Morrow, 1987).

included numerous Harvard professors such as: Richard Betts and Samuel P. Huntington, who published an article in *International Security* in 1986, based on research funded by the CIA which that agency would not allow to be acknowledged; Nadav Safran, director of the Centre for Middle Eastern Studies, whose book on Saudi Arabia was funded in the amount of \$107,430;⁸⁶ and Ernest May and Richard Neustadt, whose \$1.2 million study of intelligence was openly sponsored by the CIA and praised by the university's President, Derek Bok.⁸⁷ But large sums have also gone elsewhere - for example \$25 million, in 1955-1962, to the MSUG (Michigan State University Group) Project which, under the aegis of the Department of State (which finessed the involvement of the Central Intelligence Agency) and the pretext of training South Vietnamese police officials and supporting the development of democracy, maintained a dictatorship in accordance with US strategy.⁸⁸ And this, not coincidentally, overlapped with the U.S. Army's interest in the potential to militarise social science research for the purposes of controlling violent revolutionary movements, primarily in Latin America, inimical to U.S. strategic objectives. Known as *Project Camelot*, the work itself was essentially of a counter-insurgency nature, but contracted to the Special Operations Research Office (SORO) at American University and ran in 1964-1965 until the opprobrium it attracted for subverting social science research for the purposes of strengthening established but oppressive governments led to its cancellation.⁸⁹

⁸⁶Johnson, *America's Secret Power*, p. 159.

⁸⁷Trumpbour, *How Harvard Rules*, p. 72.

⁸⁸Johnson, *America's Secret Power*, pp. 157 and 300 n. 4.

⁸⁹See: [Irving Louis Horowitz](#) (ed), *The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot: Studies in the Relationship Between Social Science and Practical Politics* (Cambridge MA: M.I.T. Press, 1967); [A. L. Madian](#), [A. N. Oppenheim](#), "Knowledge for What? The Camelot Legacy: The Dangers of Sponsored Research in the Social Sciences", *British Journal of Sociology*, 20 (No. 3, September 1969): 326-336; Mark Solovey, "[Project Camelot and the 1960s Epistemological Revolution: Rethinking the Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus.](#)" *Social Studies of Science* 31 (2): 171-206; George E. Lowe, [The Camelot Affair](#), Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Tome 22, No 5, May 1966.

The urge to co-opt the University, and, just as importantly, the willingness of the University to be co-opted, nevertheless, remains as persistent as a chronic, senile itch: in a 2005 volume of *Military Review*, Montgomery McFate surveyed its most recent presentations:

Over the past 2 years, senior leaders have been calling for something unusual and unexpected - cultural knowledge of the adversary. In August 2004, retired Major General [Robert H. Scales, Jr.](#), wrote an article for the [Naval War College's](#) Proceedings magazine that opposed the commonly held view within the [U.S. military](#) that success in war is best achieved by overwhelming technological advantage. Scales argues that the type of conflict we are now witnessing in [Iraq](#) requires "an exceptional ability to understand people, their culture, and their motivation." In October 2004, [Arthur Cebrowski](#), Director of the [Office of Force Transformation](#), concluded that "knowledge of one's enemy and his culture and society may be more important than knowledge of his order of battle." In November 2004, the Office of Naval Research and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency ([DARPA](#)) sponsored the [Adversary Cultural Knowledge and National Security Conference](#), the first major DOD conference on the social sciences since 1962. Cultural knowledge has suddenly become such an imperative primarily because traditional methods of warfighting have proven inadequate in Iraq and [Afghanistan](#). US technology, training, and doctrine designed to counter the [Soviet](#) threat are not designed for low-intensity [counterinsurgency](#) operations where civilians often mingle freely with combatants in complex urban terrain.⁹⁰

Relief, if not remedy subsequently was sought in the form of at least seven new programmes which, at their core, were an explicit quest to securitise higher education in general, and to the weaponize culture by mobilising the expertise of anthropologists, sociologists, and social psychologists. Historians of education will recognise these as post-Sputnik redux in the post-9/11 era - as the startled, myopic reactions to a strategic surprise.

⁹⁰Montgomery McFate, "[Anthropology and Counterinsurgency: The Strange Story of their Curious Relationship](#)," *Military Review* (March-April 2005), The U.S. Army Professional Writing Collection, http://www.army.mil/professionalwriting/volumes/volume3/august_2005/7_05_2.html accessed 17 May 2010.

The first was the establishment of a pilot programme which expanded the already existing relationships between the universities and U.S. Intelligence under Section 318 of the 2004 Intelligence Authorization Act. Known as the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program (PRISP) – it was named after the Chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence – it is a decentralised, covert scholarship programme designed to “train intelligence operatives and analysts in American university classrooms for careers in the CIA and other agencies.” PRISP is generally interested in recruiting graduate students in Islamic Studies, scientists with expertise in bio-terrorism, counter-terrorism, chemistry, physics, science and engineering. It also seeks those with “advanced area expertise in China, Middle East, Korea, Central Asia, [and] the Caucasus,” but students with previous linguistic experience in “Chinese, Arabic, Persian, Urdu, Pashtun, Dari, Korean, or a Central Asian or Caucasian language such as Georgian, Turkmen, Tajik, or Uzbek” are given preference. The less than 150 students per year who are authorised to receive funding in the test phase of this programme, are required to “participate in closed meetings with other PRISP scholars and individuals from their administering intelligence agency” and are paid stipends up to USD25,000 per year. On the basis of historical of fifteen years of evidence gleaned from Freedom of Information Act research covering the actions of students during the Cold War, especially the period of McCarthyism, David Price, an anthropologist and long-standing critic of the incursion of intelligence agencies on to university campuses, concludes that it is a “certainty that these PRISP students are also secretly compiling dossiers on their professors and fellow students.”⁹¹

The second, modelled after PRISP, but authorized under the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act 2004 was a new scholarship programme, to be overseen by the Director of National Intelligence (DNI), known as the Intelligence Community Scholars Program (ICSP). The Act, in the description by David H. Price, allows for the DNI to determine which fields and subjects of study will be funded and authorises various unnamed, but sponsoring intelligence agencies “to enter into contractual arrangements with individual”

⁹¹ Price, “Exposing the Pat Roberts Intelligence Scholars Program.”

students who will provide a return-of-service amounting to two years of intelligence agency work for every year of funded education, most likely in the social sciences and area studies. Although the funding levels are unspecified in the Act, Price notes that it is “reasonable to assume” that they are comparable with the \$USD40,000 per year / \$USD160,000 over four years that students funded under the NSEP are entitled to. Both PRISP and ICSP, however, “secretly place students employed by intelligence agencies in university classrooms . . . both “recruit intelligence employees at the front end of the process” the difference being that the latter adds increased penalties for those not wanting to fulfil their return-of-service.⁹²

Within a year of PRISP and ICSP, came the National Security Higher Education Advisory Board (NSHEAB), the third initiative and one seemingly more concerned with domestic intelligence although the boundary between it and its predecessors are renowned for being porous. It was announced in September 2005 by the Director of Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Robert S. Mueller, and comprises the presidents and chancellors of several prominent U.S. universities for the to “provide a forum for open, direct dialogue between the FBI, other government agencies, and higher education to address areas that could potentially be exploited by other countries.” Graham Spanier, President of Pennsylvania State University, was chair of the first Board, whose other members were:

William Brody, President, Johns Hopkins University
Albert Carnesale, Chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles
Jared Cohon, President, Carnegie Mellon University
Marye Ann Fox, Chancellor, University of California, San Diego
Robert Gates, President, Texas A&M University
Gregory Geoffroy, President, Iowa State University
Amy Gutmann, President, University of Pennsylvania
David C. Hardesty Jr., President, West Virginia University
Susan Hockfield, President, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Martin Jischke, President, Purdue University

⁹² David H. Price, “Carry On Spying (or Pay Us Back at the Rate of 2,400 Per Cent,” *counterpunch*, 21-22 May 2005, pp. 2-3, <http://www.counterpunch.org/price05212005.html> (hereafter cited as Price, “Carry On Spying (or Pay Us Back at the Rate of 2,400 Per Cent”), accessed 31 May 2005.

Bernard Machen, President, University of Florida
James Moeser, Chancellor, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
C .D. Mote, President, University of Maryland, College Park
John Wiley, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin, Madison
Mark Emmert, President, University of Washington

Notwithstanding the pious tones of Director Mueller to the effect that the FBI wished to be sensitive to the “special culture of colleges and universities,” the direct inference to be taken from other statements was that the participant institutions were being enthusiastically co-opted in terms identical with MacMichael’s conclusion above, or, as Mueller put it, speaking on behalf of the NSHEAB through an FBI press release:

We also want to foster exchanges between academia and the FBI *in order to develop curricula which will aid in attracting the best and brightest students to careers in law enforcement and the intelligence communities* (emphasis added).⁹³

Echoing Mueller, Spanier acknowledged:

We are mindful of that higher education can play an increasingly prominent role in national priorities through our research, advanced degree programs, and educational outreach.⁹⁴

In 2009, the rationale for co-option was, if anything, more explicit and, on the occasion of the February Board meeting of that year, Deputy Director, John S. Pistole, that, since U.S. universities conduct billions of dollars worth of research and development on their campuses, they could play a key role in the national security effort of the U.S.⁹⁵ This required that the universities enter into a

93 Federal Bureau of Investigation, Press Release, 15 September 2005, “FBI Appoints National Security Higher Education Advisory Board,”
<http://www.fbi.gov/pressrel/pressrel05/highed091505.htm>, accessed 31 May 2010.

94 Ibid.

95 Federal Bureau of Investigation, Press Release, 4 February 2009, “National Security Higher Education Advisory Board Holds February Meeting,”

collective agreement to forget that, under COINTELPRO (**C**ounter **I**ntelligence **P**rogram), which ran from 1956-1971, the FBI operated a series of [covert](#), and often illegal projects aimed at investigating and disrupting [dissident political organizations](#) within the [United States](#) under virtually the very same guise as is now current in the Global War on Terror and – namely, "protecting [national security](#), preventing violence, and maintaining the existing social and political order."⁹⁶

Co-option by way of a significant and aggressive intelligence agency presence on twenty-two U.S. campuses comprises the fourth initiative, officially described as a “systematic long-term program at universities and colleges to recruit and hire eligible talent for [intelligence community] agencies and components” and “increase the [intelligence recruiting] pipeline of students.”⁹⁷ Its origins are located in 2004 with a \$USD250,000 grant to Trinity Washington University, but thereafter it grew into an extensive programme with the appellation Intelligence Community Centers of Academic Excellence (IC-CAE, and pronounced “Icky”) which, by early 2010, included openly-established centres on twenty-two campuses hosting fifteen U.S. intelligence agencies including the CIA, FBI, National Security Agency, Defence Intelligence Agency, and Homeland Security.⁹⁸ Even then, this does not adequately describe the

<http://www.fbi.gov/pressrel/pressrel09/nsheab020409.htm>, accessed 31 May 2010.

96 See SUPPLEMENTARY DETAILED STAFF REPORTS ON INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES AND THE RIGHTS OF AMERICANS, BOOK III, FINAL REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO STUDY GOVERNMENTAL OPERATIONS WITH RESPECT TO INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES SENATE, APRIL 23 (under authority of the order of April 14), 1976, COINTELPRO: THE FBI'S COVERT ACTION PROGRAMS AGAINST AMERICAN CITIZENS, <http://www.icdc.com/~paulwolf/cointelpro/churchfinalreportIIIa.htm>, accessed 01 June 2010.

97 David Price, “The CIA is Welcoming Itself Back onto American University Campuses,” *Democracy Now!*, 9 February 2009, http://www.democracynow.org/2010/2/9/david_price_on_how_the_cia, accessed 25 February 2010.

98 Ibid, and David. H. Price, “How the CIA is Welcoming Itself Back onto American University Campuses,” *counterpunch*, 9-11 April 2010 (hereafter cited as Price, “How the CIA is Welcoming Itself Back onto American University Campuses,”

extent of the reach of the IC-CAEs; for that, Norfolk State University (NSU) provides an interesting and indicative example. In April 2010 its dedicated web site, <http://nsu.edu/iccae>, proudly announced that, in 2006, NSU it received \$USD2.3 million from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence with the IC-CAE goal of preparing students “for leadership positions in government service with a specific emphasis on developing those critical skills to begin a career in the intelligence community.” The web page in question somewhat confusingly immediately invokes the neo-liberal moment because the first page is headed “Center for Academic Excellence: Preparing Leaders for America’s Global Market, and “Preparing Leaders for America’s Global Market” is the footer on pages thereafter, because nowhere else does it refer to economics or trade.

The real focus is the embedding of any NSU major in a Middle Eastern context. Accordingly, one link on the above site is to a press release which details the October 2009 National Advisory Board meeting of IC-CAE at which two IC scholars (in Compute Science and Optical Engineering, respectively) who were also studying Arabic, presented accounts of their internships in Egypt. The same release reported that a guest speaker from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration provided “very helpful information on interviewing etiquette to a group of students eager to work with intelligence agencies,” while the Director of the NSU Center was said to be “working tirelessly to get students to apply for study abroad opportunities and internships.” The page becomes even more notable when it also announces that under the aegis of the IC-CAE, NSU is offering a free two-week non-residential biotech summer program for *high school students* during which they will have the opportunity to pilot an on-line course in Arabic. Thus a second link is to another press release detailing the Center’s sponsoring of a summer high school programme for more than 30 students from Metropolitan High Schools to be held at the University of the District of Columbia in July 2009. It states that “The Arabic teacher comes from the Middle East Institute here in Washington, D.C. [and that] the students have been exposed to calligraphy with an Omani chanting from the Koran,” and

<http://www.counterpunch.org/price04092010.html>, accessed 31 May 2010.

that they have visited the Embassy of the United Arab Emirates, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Cryptological Museum, and the Spy Museum. Reference is also made to the closing ceremony at which the keynote speaker was Ms Michele Platt, Vice-President of CACI – a major private military corporation which had supplied interrogators to Iraq, some of whom were identified by the Department of the Army as “individually culpable” in the Abu Ghraib atrocities. She is reported as having given “a very inspirational talk about the importance of learning strategic languages as well as being good citizens so that they would be eligible to qualify for a security clearance.” Confirmation of the closeness of the relationships in IC-CAE is dispelled by the dominating images on the site – the NSU logo and the crest of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (DNI).⁹⁹

The need for the intelligence community to move beyond its inadequate security intelligence and “place bets on high-risk, high-payoff research” that would give the U.S. “an overwhelming intelligence advantage over future adversaries” was the rationale for the fifth initiative – the Intelligence Advance Research Projects Activity (IARPA), founded in 2008, modelled on the Defense Advanced Projects Agency (DARPA), and under the authority of the Director of National Intelligence. As with the IC-CAEs, it uses existing educational programmes within the universities as training courses for intelligence personnel.¹⁰⁰ At the same time IARPA goes considerably beyond these: the *Reynard* project, for example, is somewhat typical of the type of work under way:

99 See: <http://nsu.edu/iccae> (accessed 31 May 2010) and the right hand column with links to the following listed press releases” “The Intelligence Community Center for Academic Excellence (IC-CAE) at Norfolk State University recently held the National Advisory Board Meeting on October 22, 2009,” and “The Norfolk State University Intelligence Community Center for Academic Excellence (NSU IC-CAE) is sponsoring a summer high school Arabic program for 30 high school students from more than 10 Metropolitan High Schools at the District of Columbia this summer from July 8-31, 2009.” For CACI, see P.W. Singer, *Outsourcing War* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 2005).

100 Price, “How the CIA is Welcoming Itself Back onto American University Campuses.”

[It] has signed contracts with five research teams, mostly from major universities, to develop systems to observe "avatars" — animated computer images — that take part in popular "virtual world" games such as Second Life and World of Warcraft.

Such games have more than half a billion players around the globe, according to Reynard program manager Rita Bush. Players include many young Muslim men.

The idea is to study how these avatars — like those in the hit movie "Avatar" — behave and communicate with one another for insights into how real-life people in hostile cultures think and act.

IARPA officials think that analyzing avatars' behavior in a "virtual world" can produce useful insights into the nationalities, genders, approximate ages, occupations, education levels, even the ideologies of their creators in the "real world." Players also use avatars to communicate with one another.

"One of the goals of this program will be to understand how terror groups might use such virtual worlds to communicate," said V.S. Subrahmanian, the director of the Institute for Advanced Computer Studies at the University of Maryland, who isn't connected with IARPA.¹⁰¹

By early 2010, IAPA had contracted around seventy-five university research laboratories and another 50 technology companies, and the prospect was for more to join them in the quest, as articulated by DNI, Dennis Blair, to "generate revolutionary capabilities that will surprise our adversaries and help us avoid being surprised."¹⁰²

The sixth, established in 2007, with an initial budget of \$USD40 million, was the Human Terrain System (HTS), in which specialists were to "elicit information from villagers [in Iraq and Afghanistan] for Pentagon databases and provide cultural orientation to U.S. military leaders." Specifically, in the words

101 Robert S. Boyd, "Feds thinking outside the box to plug intelligence gaps," McClatchy Newspapers, 29 March 2010, <http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2010/03/29/91280/feds-thinking-outside-the-box.html>, accessed 01 June, 2010.

102 Ibid.

of David Kilcullen, counterinsurgency adviser to U.S. Army General David Petraeus (then in Iraq), they were to be involved in “armed social work.”¹⁰³ And his description was accurate: the embedded social scientist within each of the twenty-six, five-person Human Terrain Teams is required to wear a military uniform and receive training in the weapons that they would be carrying. To say the least, neither the appearance, nor the company, nor the objective are remotely in accord with the research ethics demanded of social scientists in general and anthropologists in particular, as anthropologist Hugh Gusterson explains:

What distinguishes anthropology from espionage (apart from anthropologists’ impenetrable jargon) is that we seek the consent of our subjects, and we follow an injunction to do no harm to those we study. According to the anthropological code of ethics, our obligations to those we study trump all others – to colleagues, funders, and nation. .

... Embedded anthropologists are on shaky ethical terrain because they cannot realistically get free consent from their interlocutors while dressed in camouflage and travelling with U.S. soldiers in Humvees. Similarly, they cannot control the use of information they collect for the military, and thus cannot ensure it isn’t used to harm communities they study. For instance, during the Vietnam War, under Project Phoenix, anthropological knowledge was used to target villagers for assassination.¹⁰⁴

The seventh, announced in April of 2008, and funded at \$USD50 million over five years, was Project Minerva, an initiative with a strong preference for

103 Hugh Gusterson, “The U.S. Military’s quest to weaponize culture,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 20 June 2008, <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/columnists/hugh-gusterson/the-us-militarys-quest-to-weaponize-culture>, p. 1 (hereafter cited as Gusterson, “The U.S. Military’s quest to weaponize culture,”) accessed 18 May 2010. See also Dahr Jamail, “When Scholars Join the Slaughter,” *truthout* Report, 26 January 2010, <http://www.truthout.org/when-scholars-join-slaughter56379> accessed 18 May 2010.

104 Gusterson, “The U.S. Military’s quest to weaponize culture,” p. 2.

anthropologists, but generally “designed to mobilize social scientists for open research related to the war on terror.” This brief was, however, interpreted widely because, under its aegis, those involved would, in addition to “researching the relationship between Islam, violence, and terror, and proposing new experimental fields which . . . might be as useful in the war on terror as game theory proved to be during the Cold War,” also help collate “open-source documents pertaining to Chinese military policy.”¹⁰⁵ This ambit, and the dubious claims made as to the contribution of game theory to one side, Project Minerva is not the obvious ethical minefield that the HTS presents, but it is subversive of sound research funding, and sound intellectual practice nevertheless. In the first instance, 80 percent of Minerva’s budget is administered by the U.S. Department of Defense, an agency with little history and expertise in peer-reviewing and funding social science research, most especially in anthropology. The other 20 percent is administered jointly by a civilian agency, the National Science Foundation, and the Pentagon, which provides members for the relevant review committees, in a relationship which not only does nothing to assuage the concern already mentioned, but corrupts the integrity of the NSF review process. The immediate casualty of such an arrangement is that the applicant pool is reduced: many highly knowledgeable anthropologists jealous of their reputations as autonomous scholars will eschew military funding on principle and / or because of the taint that is acquired when it is known that a researcher is funded by the military. Those whose understanding of U.S. foreign policy and strategy is that they are part of the problem will in all likelihood eliminate themselves, or be eliminated summarily as well. And yet, at the same time, there will be those social scientists who have an eye for the main chance and who are prepared to cater to the Pentagon’s needs in the hope of sharing in the research largesse which it is distributing, and from there this could become a dependent relationship. As Gusterson summarises the process, “knowledge is subtly militarised.”¹⁰⁶ And

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid, and Hugh Gusterson, “Project Minerva revisited,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 5 August 2008, <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/columnists/hugh-gusterson/project-minerva-revisited>, pp. 1-3, accessed 18 May 2010.

then, of course, without shame, it is disingenuously presented as the product of exemplary university research conducted dispassionately and objectively by independent scholars.

Shame, apparently is unbecoming. Their predecessors – as witness Harvard’s contributors by way of one example and set the tone for self-effacement in this regard – advised the Central Intelligence Agency and trained many of its analysts. A measure of this, and quite separate from the seven designated programmes just considered is that, in the post-9/11 era, the University’s general cultivation of closer relations with the U.S. intelligence agencies has been both a preoccupation and what Price terms a “programmatically loyalty marker,” with campus consortia forming for these precise purposes without any promise of intelligence agency funding – a leading example being the National Academic Consortium for Homeland Security (NACHoS) which, again according to Price, aligns “research and teaching at member institutions with the requirements of . . . [the] war on terror.” As of 2005, 251 universities had joined the consortium and “firmly declared their vague commitment to studying national security issues, antiterrorism, developing Homeland Security technologies, and to ‘educate and train the people required by governmental and non-governmental organisations, to effectively accomplish international and homeland security roles and responsibilities.’ ”¹⁰⁷

Yet, with regard to what is perhaps the defining event of the last sixty-five years, the inability of US intelligence to in any way anticipate the end of the Cold War, and the break-up of the Soviet Union and the Eastern Bloc – in effect to competently discharge in a timely fashion its *raison d’être* and to avoid being held publicly accountable for either defaults – is to comprehend the extent of extraordinary privilege extended to the failure of the military-Intelligence-University nexus. At its simplest, it is the unembarrassed indulgence of egregious incomprehension caused by all parties infecting the other with but variant strains of an inadequate, unaware and dogmatic understanding of the Soviet Union rather than the University bringing to it an

107 Price, “Carry On Spying (or Pay Us Back at the Rate of 2,400 Per Cent.”

approach which recognised the radical changes which had been effected since the time of Lenin. But it is not just a singular privilege; it also mandates limboic exile for the critical scholar-intellectual. The failure requires little illustration other than to note the constructions, *ad seriatim*, of an unchanging and unchangeable Soviet Union and Warsaw Treaty Organisation; of hostile intent, replete with bomber gaps, missile gaps and windows of vulnerability; of implacable Soviet opposition to the West since the beginning of the Cold War; and a Soviet Union which thought it could fight and win a nuclear war which dissolved without system war notwithstanding the weight of worst-case scenario writing and mainstream international relations theory which held that they could not, and therefore would not.¹⁰⁸

The Neo-Liberal Intensification: Dénouement

In the late 1980s, as neo-liberalism and government were finding their convivial relationship to be profitable and popular, *Social Epistemology* published a prescient essay by Harry Redner which, on the basis of existing vectors and structures of learning and research, foretold of the situation in higher education today.

But the trend towards the 'bureaucratic system' is irresistible . . . the universities, as well as the technical academies, business colleges . . . and other middle schools [become] dominated . . . by the need for the kind of "education" that produces a system of special examinations and the trained expertness that is increasingly indispensable for modern bureaucracy . . . It is even now possible to see the ultimate upshot of this development: state, civil society, the economy, and the multiversity will fuse institutionally as each exercises an interlocking control over the others. . . . The state-multiversity-industrial

108 See, for example, Patrick Cockburn, *Getting Russia Wrong: The End of Kremlinology* (London: Verso, 1989), and Friedrich Kratochvil, "The Embarrassment of Changes: Neo-Realism as the Science of Realpolitik without Politics," *Review of International Studies*, 19 (1, Jan., 1993): 63-80.

complex will be the one organising, knowledge-producing and goods-and-services-delivering entity.¹⁰⁹

Redner, notably, is silent on the democratic content of this future world but implicitly he is suggesting that, where the institutionalisation of knowledge is a fact of life, the control of social, economic and political choice would already achieved the status of a given. He was correct. In November 2008, the National Intelligence Council of the United States produced another of its excursions into futurology, *Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World*, and it would be fair to say that it accepts and assumes at the level of existence what the above apprehended at the level of foreboding. Even a skim-read of the Acknowledgements (which appears four pages in) will attest to the fact that the document itself is unselfconsciously a product of the “state-multiversity-industrial complex.” Indeed, in the quest to identify the medium-term future, the assumption is that one need consult only the most conservative of sources with impeccable credentials from within that complex.¹¹⁰

The Atlantic Council of the United States

The Stimson Center

Dr. William Ralston, Dr. Nick Evans , SRI Consulting Business Intelligence

Dr. Alexander Van de Putte of PFC Energy International

Professor Jean-Pierre Lehmann, Evian Group at IMD, Lausanne

Peter Schwartz and Doug Randall, Monitor Group’s Global Business Network

Professor Barry Hughes, the University of Denver

Dr. Jacqueline Newmyer and Dr. Stephen Rosen, Long Term Strategy Group

Dr. Geoff Dabelko, the Wilson Center

Dr. Greg Treverton of RAND

Sebastian Mallaby, the Council on Foreign Relations

Carlos Pascual, Brookings

Dr. Michael Auslin, AEI

Professor Christopher Layne, Texas A&M University

¹⁰⁹Harry Redner, “The Institutionalisation of Science: A Critical Synthesis,” [*Social Epistemology*](#), 1 (January, 1987): 37-59, as cited in Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, p. 223.

¹¹⁰National Intelligence Council, *Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World* (Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, November 2008), “Acknowledgments” (precedes p. 1).

Professor Sumit Ganguly, Indiana University
Dr. Robin Niblett and Jonathan Paris, Chatham House, London
Professor John Ikenberry, Princeton's Woodrow Wilson School
Professor Lanxin Xiang, CICIR in Beijing
Dr. Bates Gill, SIPRI in Stockholm
Julianne Paunescu, State Department, Bureau of Intelligence and Research (INR)
Marilyn Maines, NSA
Toffler Associates

Accordingly, in the 'transformed world' of the report, education is important, but only for instrumental purposes relating to global power:

Higher Education Shaping the Global Landscape in 2025

As global business grows increasingly borderless and labor markets more seamless, education has become a key determinant of countries' economic performance and potential. Adequate primary education is essential, but the quality and accessibility of secondary and higher education will be even more important for determining whether societies successfully graduate up the value-added production ladder. . . .

The US may be uniquely able to adapt its higher education and research system to rising global demand and position itself as a world education hub for the growing number of students that will enter the education market out to 2025. Although further opening of US classrooms and laboratories could mean greater competition for US students, the US economy would likely benefit because companies tend to base their operations near available human capital. Continued export of US educational models with the building of US campuses in the Middle East and Central Asia could boost the attractiveness and global prestige of US universities.¹¹¹

Read with any sensitivity to the words and processes of "education," what is envisaged has nothing whatsoever to do with a democratic education and an education for democracy; all that matters is marketability and market

¹¹¹ Ibid, p. 17.

share as measured by some sort of world ranking – “the attractiveness and global prestige of US universities.” How this order of merit is established constitutes one of the more vexed questions in contemporary university culture, but, if indications are a guide, it relies upon undergoing two fundamental transformations. The first of these is a process in which the University is presented as anything but a University – “a cross between summer camp and lotus land.”¹¹² Paradoxically, its self-representation is actually a rare excursion into truth; at the same time, but it is a truth which cannot be broadcast indiscriminately if it is to represent itself to the “state-multiversity-industrial complex” as a neo-liberal actor worthy of partnership. To do so would question its seriousness, and so, a subterfuge is required: the University speaks in different languages according to the audience. To intending students, who are increasingly taught by casual, temporary faculty, the message is agreeable and familiar and unchallenging, and accurately conveyed by David Trend:

. . . student union buildings and cafeterias took on the appearance – or were conceptualised from the beginning – as shopping malls or food courts, as vendors competed to place university logos on caps, mugs, and credit cards. This is a larger pattern in what has been termed the “Disneyfication” of college life. . . a pervasive impulse toward infotainment . . . where learning is “fun,” the staff “perky,” where consumer considerations dictate the curriculum, where presentation takes precedence over substance, and where students become “consumers.”¹¹³

112 Mark Edmundson, “On the Uses of a Liberal Education: I. As Lite Education,” *Harper’s Magazine*, September 1997, p. 47 (hereafter cited as Edmundson, “On the Uses of a Liberal Education: I. As Lite Education,”). This is an excellent essay which has only grown in salience and insights since its publication; it is, furthermore, complementary to the works cited throughout this paper by Wilshire, and Giroux and Giroux.

113 David Trend, *Welcome to Cyberschool: Education at the Crossroads in the Information Age* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield, 2001), p. 55 (hereafter cited as Trend, *Welcome to Cyberschool*), as cited in Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*, p. 275.

To its own – the neo-liberally accommodated – the appeal to student gratification gives way to the second transformation, to what is essentially a market in *curricula vitae* – whereby one's education, professional history, and other qualifications thought to be relevant (consultancies, government advisory positions, endowed fellowships, etc.) are put out to tender by the highest bidder. In this process teaching is not only downgraded – because a principal reason for offering oneself in the first instance is to secure more research opportunities, and thus, to find a refuge from teaching in one form or another – but the hiring university acquires status which it has not earned except through the possession of money. Moreover, it is a practice little different to that made notorious by the Dominican Friar of the late 15th and early 16th Centuries, Johann Tetzel, who sold indulgences to the faithful. Instead of springing souls from Purgatory, however, the neo-liberal variant offers relief from a position in a low status academy and the remission of the punishment due for committing the sin of academic obscurity. In the end, the university in question, like a brothel employing classical piano players, proclaims exemplary rehabilitation.

Left unanswered are questions which must be asked concerning the state of the mental and moral health of the University. It cannot, and could not afford, for example, justify its multiple personalities to an informed audience, in public, because (i) undergraduates would take offence to know how their very existence is a threat to their teachers' professional advancement; (ii) parents of undergraduates would object to subsidizing their children's extension of juvenility into their early 20s; (iii) funding agencies would question the need for such excessive indoctrination in a social discourse already established, and (iv) Boards of Regents would balk at being governing bodies of institutions with reduced social and community caché. Aware of this, it lives the life of a consensual neurotic – assuming the guise of a traditional community of scholars, a 21st Century corporation, a multiversity, and a training institute for the bureaucracies and management systems of late capitalism, depending on the immediate constituency which must be satisfied.

In the light of legal decisions handed down recently from the highest authority that corporations have the status of people with First Amendment rights under the U.S. Constitution, the temptation might be to see the

University anthropomorphically: as schizophrenic. More accurately, perhaps, its pathology should be defined as Dissociative Identity Disorder (DID) because the many and consistent signs and symptoms it reveals are major indications of the presence of DID: lapses in memory (dissociation), particularly of significant life events; blackouts in time, resulting in finding oneself in places but not recalling how one traveled there; being frequently accused of lying when they do not believe they are lying (for example, being told of things they did but do not recall); finding items in one's possession but not recalling how those things were acquired; encountering people with whom one is unfamiliar but who seem to know them as someone else; being called names that are completely unlike their own name or nickname; not recognizing themselves in the mirror; feeling unreal (derealization), and feeling like more than one person.

114

And why would this not be the case? If, for example, Harvard is chosen as a site of investigation, how is it possible to be assured that teaching, research, supervision, administration and public outreach will be conducted with integrity when 1,600 (of 8,900) faculty have reported to the Dean that that “they or a family member had a financial interest in a business related to their teaching, research or clinical care?” The same question is prompted when it is known that 149 of these were with Pfizer, and 130 with Merck, and one professor’s disclosure revealed forty-seven company affiliations.¹¹⁵ The question becomes obdurate when the Harvard Medical School student handbook’s explicit attempt to silence students who might find these lucrative arrangements questionable and want to give voice to their unease. A new revision now reads, “All interactions between students and media should be coordinated with the Office of the Dean of Students and the Office of Public

114 Roxanne Dryden-Edwards, MD: Medical Author, and Melissa Conrad-Stöppler, MD: Medical Editor, “Dissociative Identity Disorder,” MedicineNet.com, http://www.medicinenet.com/dissociative_identity_disorder/page2.htm, accessed 01 February 2010, pp. 1-3.

115 Eric Alterman, “Harvard, Heal Thyself (Why Journalism Matters),” *The Nation*, 28 September 2009, p. 9. The article acknowledges the work of *The New York Times* investigative journalist, Duff Wilson relating to the Harvard Medical School and its affiliated teaching hospitals and institutes.

Affairs. This applies to situations in which the students are contacted by the media as well as instances in which students may be seeking publicity about a student-related project or program.”¹¹⁶ And while this *contretemps* proceeded, it was announced that Harvard, iconic American university, bastion of learning, had indulged its inner gambler: in the fiscal year ending 30 June 2009, it managed to lose \$USD1.8 billion in cash, and a further \$USD9.2 billion in other investments from an endowment approaching \$USD40 billion prior to the onset of the Global Financial Crisis, the cash loss being the result of placing funds directly needed for everyday running expenses in “stocks, hedge funds, and other risky assets.” The consequences of this preference for the casino over the court of reason was that, between December 2008 and October 2009, Harvard laid off 275 staff, offered voluntary retirement to others, and imposed salary and hiring freezes.¹¹⁷

The urge to dismiss these episodes as vignettes – brief, impressionistic instances of aberrant behaviour – is quite easily resisted in the knowledge that those who have been close to the scenes of their commission and, furthermore, understand them as increasingly permanent features of the research university landscape have long been disconcerted by what they portend. Just as those cited to this point have given voice to their misgivings, so too has Derek Bok, who, in a career which encompassed being Dean of the Harvard Law school (1968–1971), University [President](#) (1971–1991), and currently the Faculty Chair at the [Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations](#) at Harvard, with teaching appointments also at the [Harvard Graduate School of Education](#) and the [Harvard Kennedy School](#). In 2003 he warned of the possible consequences of the cheapening and trivialization of higher education:

116 Ibid.

117 See: Beth Healy, “Harvard admits to \$1.8b gaffe in cash holdings,” *The Boston Globe*, 17 October 2009, http://www.boston.com/business/articles/2009/10/17harvard_loses_18b_in_cash_place_d_in_high_risk_investments?mode+PF accessed 20 October 2009, and Andrew Delbanco, “The Universities in Trouble,” *The New York Review of Books*, 14 May 2009, p. 36 (hereafter cited as Delbanco, “The Universities in Trouble”).

One can imagine a university in the future tenuring professors because they bring in large amounts of patent royalties and industrial funding; paying high salaries to recruit “celebrity” scholars who can attract favorable media coverage; admitting less than fully qualified students in return for handsome parent gifts; soliciting corporate advertising to underwrite popular executive programs; promoting Internet courses of inferior quality while canceling worthy conventional offerings because they cannot cover their costs; encouraging professors to spend more time on delivering routine services to attract corporate clients, while providing a variety of symposia and “academic” conferences planned by marketing experts in their development offices to lure potential donors to the campus.¹¹⁸

The terms outlined have come to pass and Bok’s passage now seems to be only an accurate, if tragic, description. At the same time, it is a remarkable example of dissociation: indeed, is it not curious, even in 2003, that Bok – who, 15 years earlier, had applauded both Ernest May and Richard Neustadt’s \$USD1.2 million CIA-sponsored study of intelligence, the Kennedy School’s appointment of CIA Africa expert, William Kline to its faculty, and who would have been acutely unaware of Harvard’s other activities (previously mentioned in this chapter) – did not describe his vision as a contemporary observation?¹¹⁹ By 2010, Bok’s vision was merely *passé*, having been overtaken by obscene attempts by university presidents to ingratiate their institutions with sources of finance. In April of that year, Syracuse University (SU) President, Nancy Cantor, invited the CEO of JP Morgan Chase, Jamie Dimon, to deliver the commencement speech at the graduation ceremony on the grounds that he was “playing a key role, front and center in addressing one of, if not the major global challenge(s) of our day.” Cantor’s position was arguably true given the contemporaneity of the Global Financial Crisis, and the view that Dimon was

118 Derek Bok, *Universities in the Marketplace: The Commercialization of Higher Education* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003), p. 75, as cited in Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*, p. 259.

119 Trumpbour, *How Harvard Rules*, p. 72.

one of those significantly responsible for it, but that was not the reason she invited him. To be precise in this matter, JP Morgan Chase had a close collaboration with SU and had pledged it \$USD30 million; the partnership had yielded a new technology center and a new minor called “Global Enterprise Technology” which raised questions about whether the overall liaison was essentially about indoctrinating and training future employees for the bank and rehabilitating its “bankster” image. These concerns were exacerbated when it was revealed that the same SU President, had also chosen singer-songwriter, Billy Joel, to give a commencement address after he had donated \$USD320,000 to SU’s Setnor School, and commissioned a statue of a legendary SU footballer who had died of leukemia in the 1920s but whose sneakers were adorned with the Nike logo despite the fact that Nike was not founded until 1964. Then again, this should not surprise: SU’s sports complex was, until recent times, known as the Carrier Dome in honour of the Carrier Corporation’s involvement with the University.¹²⁰

II

THE SCHOLAR

A Fitting Case of Well-Adjusted Betrayal and Species Suicide

These times, it is argued, require not that scholars rediscover the need to “speak truth to power” according to the Quaker injunction; rather that they understand the need to insult it as an essential disposition prior to discoursing on scholarly responsibility. The problem is that the social category of scholars and the university-as-institution – are poorly equipped to behave in this way; both have for so long accommodated their attackers that they have been, most precisely, willing parties to their own demise. Here and now, in the vernacular, they lack the balls for initial resistance and the stomach for a protracted fight. If truth be told, they probably lack the even the imagination to identify their

120 Ira Glunts, “The Shill on the Hill,” *truthout* / *Op-Ed*, 26 April 2010, <http://www.truthout.org/ira-glunts-the-shill-on-the-hill58888?print>, accessed 27 April 2010.

demise and the reasons for it. For all of that, the times require that they - who almost unanimously revere Socrates - take him seriously: he was honest, a courageous soldier, he taught that the unexamined life was not worth living, and was true to his word - choosing death over a life without philosophical inquiry. And yet scholars need to understand, take profoundly to heart, that his death was ordered by a democratic process. It was one of the earliest warnings that the democratic system of government which is held to be the best, also frequently requires blood sacrifice; it can be, moreover, two-faced when encountering discomfiting, freely expressed, intellectually compelling, and democracy-enhancing ideas and practices which threaten the regnant majority. The need, therefore, is to rediscover the visceral nature of politics, within and without the academy, and in these projects, recall the words of Henry Brooks Adams, who wrote in *The Education of Henry Adams*: "Politics, as a practise, whatever its professions, has always been the systematic organization of hatreds."¹²¹

Why the need? Quite simple, really: the old verities and virtues will not, and are not serving scholars and scholarship now. Indeed, as noted above, they are probably significant causes of the situation the modern Western University and its scholars find themselves in today; more, continuing adherence to them constitutes an act of self-harm. The indiscriminate civility (not least practised as obsequiousness) extended by the academy towards those it should despise must be one of the first areas of conscientious self-examination. In this approach scholars might recall and honour the late Howard Zinn, who just days before his death in January 2010, wrote to Henry Giroux, (himself and Susan Searls Giroux being very much sources of insight and inspiration to this writer in recent years) in the following terms:

Henry, we are in a situation where mild rebuke, even critiques we consider 'radical' are not sufficient. (Frederick Douglass' speech on the Fourth of July in 1852,

121 Henry Brooks Adams (1838- 1918) was the great grandson of John Adams, grandson of John Quincy Adams, and son of US Secretary of State, Charles Adams; he was also a Pulitzer Prize-winning historian (1919). The quote above comes from Chapter 1 (1907). Source: Information Clearing House daily bulletin, 16 December 2006, p. 1.

thunderously angry, comes close to what is needed). Raising the temperature of our language, our indignation, is what you are doing and what is needed. I recall that Sartre, close to death, was asked: What do you regret? He answered: *'I wasn't radical enough'* (emphasis added).¹²²

Misplaced Civility, Cowardice and Corruption

A 'radical enough' approach minimally requires acknowledging the obligation academic scholars have on all sides, to themselves, and to their students. This is not, it is emphasised, to construct an unattainable ideal, but to remember the purpose of the University and those who comprise it. Indeed, the lineaments of obligation are simple: *"academics will have to assume their responsibility as citizen-scholars by taking critical positions, relating their work to larger social issues, and offering students knowledge, debate, and dialogue about pressing social problems."* And since academics are entrusted with educating students – the national treasury of a nation – academics *"will also need to provide the condition for students to have hope and to believe that civic life not only matters, but they can make a difference in shaping it so as to expand its democratic possibilities for all groups."*¹²³ The predicate condition here is that, for those who would presume to educate others, they must first educate themselves about themselves.¹²⁴ This is a difficult and demanding task at the best of times and a fraught enterprise in the present given the ecology of the University. Nevertheless, it is an inescapable conclusion that it is logical and essential.

122 As cited in Henry A. Giroux, "Howard Zinn: A Public Intellectual Who Mattered," *Truthout / Op-Ed*, 28 January 2010, <http://www.truthout.org/howard-zinn-a-public-intellectual-who-mattered56463?print>, accessed 29 January 2010.

123 Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*, pp. 8-9.

124 Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, pp. 139-140.

Concerned, self-conscious and self-critical academics might, then, begin with an act of insurrection and reconsider *la trahison des clercs* (the betrayal of the learned) which is everywhere around them, and their deference to the administrative authorities which now govern Western, neo-liberal universities overall, and the research universities of the United States specifically. While it is true that such authority has both juridical and financial power over the daily activities of faculty, and the decisions of this reality are profoundly real, it is also true that there is no need to bend the knee when in its presence because such an acknowledgement of inferiority is intellectually indefensible if only a few questions are asked. To begin, why does an academic, who has studied, researched, taught, supervised, written and published for years in order to come to a point of competence and expertise in a discipline, then decide on a university-administrative career for which, in general, she or he has no specific qualifications other than wanting the change which the appointment will bring? Ultimately, the answer must be some combination of administrative power and the significantly superior remuneration which accompanies the ladder of posts; either that, or they were closet managers all along, waiting only for the opportunity to disclose themselves. Admittedly, it might also have something to do with being made aware of one's inadequacies as a scholar (which is hardly a harbinger of success in any new project), or a loss of enthusiasm for the operational world of teaching, supervising, research, writing and publication. No matter the reason, such a figure is no longer a colleague because colleagues do not forsake one another, especially in an era in which the quality of academic life is being undermined by the neo-liberal managerialism which administrators must embrace if they are to prosper.

Colleagues do not surveill colleagues by requiring them to devote swathes of their time to providing meaningless administrative detail in a series of continuous "mission statements," "strategic plans," and statistical exercises as though the documents so produced, and the compilations so collected, had any meaning which could be subsequently recognised in the introduction of improved teaching and research practices. In fact, the contrary is true: they are used as the rationale for the harassment of faculty by way of setting "improved productivity targets" in research and external funding and the concomitant reduction in the resources devoted to face-to-face, human contact

teaching. And because this traditional form of teaching is time-consuming and demanding of energy, and its consequences are not immediately obvious or necessarily measurable, it is bureaucratically held to be inefficient, an activity inferior to successfully attracting external funding, consulting, publication in approved establishment journals, and managerial administration. In other words, living the Socratic life is incomparable with life in the corporate university which, as explained by Richard Ohmann:

. . . acts like a profit-making business rather than a public or philanthropic trust. Thus we hear of universities applying productivity and performance measures to teaching (Illinois); of plans to put departments in competition with one another (Florida); of cutting faculty costs not only by replacing full-timers with part-timers and temps and by subcontracting for everything from food services to the total management of physical plant, but also by substituting various schemes of computerized instruction; and so on.¹²⁵

Sadly, since most academics have long lost the art of barbed expression, we find one of the better descriptions of this supervising category uttered by a Cardinal in the third volume of Morris West's Vatican trilogy, *Lazarus*:

Bureaucrats are the accursed of God . . . They record everything and understand nothing. They invent a spurious mathematics by which every human factor is reduced to zero.¹²⁶

By their cast of mind, by their decisions and by the actions they take against practising academics, these are what Wilshire calls "thugs in tweeds" - misologists - possessed and defined by their hatred of reasoning, argument,

125 Richard Ohmann, "Citizenship and Literacy Work: Thoughts Without a Conclusion," *Workplace* (25 November 2002), as cited in Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*, p. 257.

126 Morris West, *Lazarus* (Melbourne: William Heinemann, 1990), p. 108.

logic and enlightenment. Though, paradoxically, the bureaucracy provides the principal or, in some cases, the only connection between the increasingly differentiated components of the modern university, its character has the role of an independent variable inimical to the life of the mind.¹²⁷ To the extent the defection of former colleagues is absolved scholars merely extend their cowardice, and the problem is that cowardice in the University is a besetting condition which was incubated from within: no armed government agents or mass movement within the University brought about the neo-liberal revolution – it was executed, as with McCarthyism before it, by a combination of a singular lack of courage by a critical mass of academics in its early stages, and entrepreneurial opportunists, both of whom understood perfectly what was to hand.

Cowardice, unfortunately, is found in numerous other guises, one of which is the taught, habitual exaggeration by way of *misleading* under-, and over-statement in academic writings. The latter first: uncharged war criminals like Henry Kissinger and Samuel Huntington are hailed as exemplary advisers-to-the-prince but all too seldom (and never in the academic mainstream) are they described as what they are. They are popularly exalted as role models – a fine a case of overstatement as we might find. The more common form, of expression is, however, the former: from the earliest days those with an academic bent are instructed to underplay their findings; it comes with the advice that all indignation be transformed into the hallowed attitude known as “more in sorrow than anger.” To be in breach of this charge is to be, emotional, or worse, “polemical.” To the extent that scholars conform, they deny that they are truly human: they express their “sorrow” about, *inter alia*, genocide, slavery, tyranny, despotism, racism, sexism, *apartheid*, fascism, female genital mutilation, but anger is beyond them – and being bloody angry is . . . well . . . human, but simply un-academic. Similarly, to advocate responsible and accountable democracy is surely not just a preference but, when reflected upon, a visceral and thoughtful demand born of the fibres of human consciousness, of who human beings are and what they might be capable of.

¹²⁷ Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, pp. xviii and 80-83.

For all of that, this question should be asked: would *International Studies Quarterly* or the *American Political Science Review* publish a well-researched, logically-argued, *angry* analysis? Maybe they would, but the evidence since the late 1980s is that they have not.

By extension, scholars are cowed by publishers as well. It follows because a cowed profession should generally not be expected to produce journals which admit the emotions when otherwise rigorously treating their subject matter. That is why scholarship must be buttressed (and in some cases, replaced) by the best of the journalists and correspondents – Lewis Lapham, Robert Fisk, John Pilger, Paul McGeogh, and Alan Ramsey, for example; maverick academic writers such as Ward Churchill, and Noam Chomsky; and the type of pure outlaw writer no longer with us, as personified by Hunter S. Thompson in journalism and Howard Zinn in the University. That they are so necessary is in reality an indictment of academics absent from their place of duty – a collective Missing In Action.

Appeasement of grand, or high academic corruption will suffice for the further outline of the portrait. In the neo-liberal university the question is not so much “where do scholars confront it?” but “how can serious scholars possibly avoid it?” Indeed, it is almost ubiquitous, and that is why, in the first instance, scholars should have perversely welcomed the opprobrium suffered by John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt when their essay, “The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy,” was published in *The London Review of Books* in March 2006. It was not because scholars should have borne either of them any ill will, but rather, because of two straightforward reasons. In the first instance, the wider scholarly community should have been glad because it highlighted what some less well-known academics had been experiencing since the beginning of their careers. Second, their essay, and its consequences for them, precipitated an acute crisis of disclosure: regardless of the accuracy of their claims, they had breached the rule that the subject itself was off-limits for polite scholars, unless of course it was an exercise proving the null hypothesis (a preposterous project if ever there was one, but one which flourished in the aftermath). They had risen above the endemic intimidation which takes the form that any serious, non-Israeli criticism of Israel’s policies and strategies is proof positive of anti-Semitism – a serious charge – slur though it is. In the

process they had transgressed, produced a discursive bastard from the illicit union of political dogma and scholarship.

In fact, the very outrage expressed by Mearsheimer and Walt's detractors was the surest indication that it had failed and was in dire need of reinforcement. Had discussion of the "Israel Lobby" been traditionally accorded the same significance and sensitivity by mainstream International Relations in the U.S. as (say) the relationship between public opinion and U. S. foreign policy, their essay would have been treated according to whether it was a contribution to knowledge. Either that, or it would not have been written in the first place because there would have been no need to burden an already congested district in foreign policy studies with another offering. And the reinforcements have probably arrived: given the reaction to "The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy," which, it should be emphasised, was written by two prominent IR scholars from leading institutions (the University of Chicago, Harvard), and given that Mearsheimer is on record as saying he and Walt's "chances of ever being appointed to a high-level administrative position at a university or policy making position in Washington would be greatly damaged," who among younger scholars will attempt such insolence in the future and run the risk that senior colleagues will denounce them for destroying their professional reputations on the back of anti-Semitism and for writing, "piss-poor, mono-causal social science."¹²⁸

Recent experience might very well teach them that though "the truth will set you free" (John: 31-32), it will first, move others to anger and retribution; then, as Gloria Steinem put it, piss them off. Ultimately, it will keep chances of promotion to a minimum. What they have learned, and will espouse in the interests of success, is the new academic doctrine of the trinity which, it has to be said, lacks the mystical challenge of the original - namely that: professionalism is the mode within which the laurels are awarded to approved research productivity; teaching is a declared value only, not to be operationalised on the grounds of career inefficiency; the polluting Other within the University - those not professional (as defined) and still practising

128 Philip Weiss, "Ferment Over 'The Israel Lobby,'" *The Nation*, 15 May 2006, pp. 16-20.

inefficient teaching – are a reproach to the new regime and must be banished. And the character of the productivity being served should be borne in mind: it is to join the project of publishing for its own sake rather than because there is something “out there, in the world” which necessarily needs attention. Expressed another way, the very fact that an article is published in an academic journal should in no way imply that the journal is more than an outlet for special interests, vanity and the career interest of its editors and contributing authors, or that it has something important to say about a pressing question of the human condition, let alone that it will be read. As argued earlier in this chapter, based on Debray’s study, *Teachers, Writers, Celebrities*, this is because the nature of academic research, writing and publishing is such that there are many more considerations attending final publication and presentation than the mere merit of the analysis. And then there is question of engagement with it even when it is accessible – with studies concluding that, on average, an academic journal article is read by only one person. And why not, considering the publication landscape? As Gerald W. Bracey of the Virginia Department of Education wrote in his “The World in Bits and Pieces,” a 1985 essay containing figures which, from all accounts, have increased significantly:¹²⁹

After all, there are now more than 40,000 professional journals of science alone, and researchers in search of truth (and fame and tenure) are pumping articles into them at the rate of one every 30 seconds, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.¹³⁰

129 Attempting to discover just how many scholarly journals are available for academics to publish in is a difficult task, as Carol Tenopir, has demonstrated. She nevertheless cites Ulrich’s web site (<http://ulrichsweb.com>) as possessing an authoritative and comprehensive listing of active serials in publication and states that, on the basis of this research, in 2003, there were 180,200 active serials (<http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA374956.html>), accessed 03 June 2010.

130 Gerald W. Bracey, “The World in Bits and Pieces,” *Newsweek*, 28 October 1985, as cited in Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, p. 75.

The constant preoccupation and concern with academic publishing, in this context, demonstrates a two conditions, the first of which was present before the neo-liberal era, but has been exacerbated by it. By privileging the atomisation of knowledge which is in lockstep with the professionalisation of the University and its disciplines, knowledge is increasingly presented as “bits” which make sense only if there is a subsequent, put preferably parallel process of integration which of course, professionalisation outlaws in the interests of proprietorial knowledge. As this practice proliferates, so too does the alienation of the “bits” from the whole, effectively, in Bracey’s view, contracting both the past and the future, and prescribing “what Eastern philosophers call the Eternal Glorious Present.”¹³¹ The second, though it arises from a state of generalised anxiety brought on by the pressures of the neo-liberal university, might more accurately and specifically be located somewhere between an Obsessive Compulsive Disorder (OCD) and professional priapism. In terms of the former, the behaviour is consistent with the clinically-defined compulsive behaviours typically symptomatic of OCD:

Repetitive behaviours or mental acts that the person feels driven to perform in response to an obsession, or according to rules that must be applied rigidly.

The behaviours or mental acts are aimed at preventing or reducing distress or preventing some dreaded event or situation; however, these behaviours or mental acts either are not connected in a realistic way with what they are designed to neutralise or prevent or are clearly excessive.

In addition to these criteria, at some point during the course of the disorder, the sufferer must realise that his or her obsessions or compulsions are unreasonable or excessive.

Moreover, the obsessions or compulsions must be time-consuming (taking up more than one hour per day), cause distress, or cause impairment in social, occupational, or school functioning.¹³²

131 Ibid.

132 See “Obsessive compulsive disorder treatment at the Huddersfield and Manchester Hypnotherapy Clinic,”
http://www.jamesfroggatt.co.uk/obsessive_compulsive_disorder_treatment/obsessive_c

Alternatively, in the knowledge that the readiness to publish is not necessarily related to the possession of anything new, or different to argue or expound upon, the otherwise obvious permanent disposition to do so, which itself is a consequence of being expected to do so, is not dissimilar to priapism - being apparently healthy, in the 20-50 years age group, but afflicted with a prolonged painful erection entirely unrelated to sexual thoughts and more a consequence of being treated as, and being expected to function as a machine in perpetual motion.¹³³ In both instances, OCD and priapism, the conditions are curable, but only within the prior understanding that they are pathologies which will worsen unless the required treatment is applied pre-, and post-tenure, currently a forlorn prospect.

Expressed unambiguously this regime of professionalism mandates legitimate violence in the University, but in explaining this counter-intuitive reality, it helps to understand the ways in which violence is linked to those things held to be sacred, and in this, the analysis is indebted to the path-breaking work of French anthropological philosopher, René Girard. It arises from the fact that, once a profession is defined, it establishes both identity and pollution, the former being threatened by the latter, and is thus subject to not only anxiety but the consequential need to act against the object which threatens the identity. Obviously, although it is the very construction of the identity which causes the need for violence, that cannot be admitted because it would also justify the sense of guilt which accompanies it - so the search is on for an object upon which guilt and punishment can be visited, and then expelled from the community in an act of expiation and purity renewal.¹³⁴ The

[ompulsive disorder treatment.shtml](#), accessed 03 June 2010.

133 See "Priapism," <http://emedicine.medscape.com/article/777603-overview>, accessed 03 June 2010, and The Cleveland Clinic, "Priapism," http://my.clevelandclinic.org/disorders/priapism/hic_priapism.aspx, accessed 03 June 2010.

134 Rene Girard, *Violence and the Sacred* (London and New York: Continuum, 2005), esp. Chapter 1, "Sacrifice," pp. 1-40 (hereafter cited as Girard, *Violence and the Sacred*).

practice itself, though found historically in Syria, Ancient Greece, the Indian city states and among the Vikings, is widely associated with the Old Testament (*Leviticus 16*) and the ceremonies accompanying the Day of Atonement, in the form of the *scapegoat*. In the modern era, it most commonly presents at a defence mechanism by those suffering from a variety of personality disorders (antisocial, borderline, paranoid) and psychopathy.¹³⁵

Academics of the traditional, pre-neo-liberal mode, and students, are ideal scapegoats: they are sufficiently like their contemporary counterparts to be recognizable, yet transgressors provoking fear amongst the latter by virtue of being “grossly imperfect, unauthorized [and] polluting.” To consort and fraternize with them is to court threat, professional disease and death; the rule for neo-liberals, therefore, is to find them guilty of crimes against the prevailing piety – crimes which the neo-liberals have constructed themselves out of their own vulnerabilities and uncertainties – and to sacrifice them, exclude them on pain of expulsion from the corporate identity themselves. In the name of “the rational management” of the University a monstrous irrationality is committed: the sacrifice of the selected victims is no more than the self-deception of those in dire need of deceiving themselves that they have maintained scientific and technological purity when all they have done is defer to a particularly egregious and totalising version of the sacred-as-institution, sacred being a category which neither science nor rational management can acknowledge.¹³⁶ The Reformation reasserts itself in this case as the schism between those who take the University seriously, and those who take education seriously.

Professionalism in the absence of reform is nevertheless safe and provides security. Safe because, when professionalism is defines in terms of

135 See: American Psychiatric Association, *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 4th Edition – Text Revision - *DSMIV-TR* (Arlington, V.A.: American Psychiatric Publishing, 2000) and Michel Hersen, Samuel M. Turner, and Deborah C. Beidel, *Adult Psychopathology and Diagnosis*, 5th Edition (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2007).

136 Girard, *Violence and the Sacred*, pp. 1-40, and the references and uses of this work in Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, pp. 171-174.

demonstrated deep knowledge on a particular subject it rapidly becomes both isolated and arcane. Its benefits are, for all of that, substantial: specialists set the rules for dialogue, challengers are excluded and challenge is minimised, non-specialists are intimidated from even approaching the specialisation, publications are assured, ego is satisfied, status acknowledged and the security of living in an area of inquiry unventilated by the flux and confusion of everyday life provides the practitioner with a successful if not distinguished career and perhaps springboard into management. Practised as near to perfection as possible, all taint of political persuasion is effaced by either the esoteric nature of research and publication, or the fact that neither can be related to a greater whole which might in some way “test” the findings. Ultimately, and for the most part, it is an intentionally conservative approach which ensures the maintenance of the *status quo* and is rewarded accordingly. It is also the indicator of the now chronic crisis in American university education, the genesis of which goes back at least to the late 1980s. Surveying reports from the Carnegie Foundation, the National Commission on Excellence in Education, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Association of American Colleges, Calvin Schrag writes that they “all decry the lack of curricular coherence, the threat of excessive vocationalism, hyper-specialization of vocabularies, faculty self-indulgence, political self-interest, and fanatical departmental allegiances” which have eroded liberal learning.¹³⁷

In the this same period, the very subject areas which contribute significantly to educating the self, and an education for democracy, decline was everywhere evident:

Between 1966 and 1988, a period in which the number of bachelor’s degrees awarded increased by 88 per cent, the number of bachelor’s degrees awarded in the humanities declined by 33 per cent. Foreign language majors dropped by 29 per cent; English majors by 33 per cent; philosophy majors by 35 per cent, and history majors by 43 per cent. . . . A 1986 survey funded by the NEH . . . showed more than

¹³⁷ Calvin Schrag, “involvement, Integrity, and Legacy in American Liberal Education,” paper presented to the International Association of Philosophy and Literature, Seattle, 3 May 1986, as cited in Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, p. 95.

two-thirds of the nation's seventeen year olds . . . could not identify the Reformation or the *Magna Carta*. Vast majorities demonstrated unfamiliarity with writers such as Dante, Chaucer, Dostoevsky, Austen, Whitman, Hawthorne and Melville As . . . a teacher at the University of Illinois at Chicago, observed . . . 'Students . . . do not register to read books of whose existence they do not know.' . . . It is possible to graduate now . . . from almost 80 per cent of the nation's four-year colleges and universities without taking a course in Western civilization . . . In 1988-89, it is possible to earn a bachelor's degree from: 37 per cent of the nation's colleges and university without taking any course in history; 45 per cent without taking any course in American or English literature; 62 per cent without taking a course in philosophy; 77 per cent without studying a foreign language.¹³⁸

Cynically, and yet appropriately, it might be noted that this decline in degrees in the humanities was partly, perhaps significantly, a self-inflicted wound. The best colleges, after all, were deliberately ridiculing them, and the commitment to study in general. Quite apart from SU's honouring of Billy Joel (already mentioned), Mark Edmundson, in 1997, indicated the cheapening of both as though having a celebrity send graduates out into the world was other than the triumph of the vacuous over the necessarily serious:

This past spring, Kermit the Frog won himself a degree at Southampton College on Long Island; Bruce Willis and Yogi Berra took credentials away at Montclair State; Arnold Schwarzenegger scored at the University of Wisconsin-Superior. At Wellesley, Oprah Winfrey gave the commencement address. (*Wellesley* – one of the most rigorous academic colleges of the nation). At the University of Vermont, Whoopi Goldberg laid down the word.¹³⁹

138 Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, "Humanities in America: A Report to the President, the Congress, and the American People," September 1988, as cited in Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, pp. 51-52.

139 Edmundson, "On the Uses of a Liberal Education: I. As Lite Education," p. 46.

For those who might be inclined to suppose that the sciences had somehow benefited in a redistribution of academic effort, the evidence was just as disappointing because their relative power, too, had declined:

In 1971 roughly 425,000 graduated in the arts and sciences category and the same number in the professional. In 1984-85, the latter had swollen to 650,000, the former dropped to 350,000.¹⁴⁰

If, anything, the U.S. military, were ahead of the curve in this regard. Under the banner of “efficiency” members of Congress with business and law qualifications, and “managerial-minded” Secretaries of Defense, most of who were ignorant in strategy, operational craft and tactics, urged upon willing military subordinates their own conceit that they “were capable of managing all things regardless of their content.” In time, such demilitarised officers came to regard “their greatest personal accomplishment . . . a graduate degree in business administration, management or economics;” by 1985, there were “ten such degrees for each history graduate in the officer corps; one hundred for each graduate in military history.”¹⁴¹

And this was only at the elite level; it was worse further down the educational chain. Concomitantly, one third of the U.S. adult population was functionally illiterate, and another one third was functionally a-literate, conditions which deny the transmission and understanding of complex ideas which require an ability to read at an advanced level.¹⁴² Their ignorance of the

140 U.S. Department of Education, *Digest of Educational Statistics*, 1987, p. 105, as cited in Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, p. 52.

141 Edward N. Luttwak, *The Pentagon and the Art of War* (New York: Institute for Contemporary Studies / Simon and Schuster, 1985), pp. 138-139.

142 On illiteracy, see Jonathan Kozol, *Illiterate America*, (New York: Plume, 1985); and on a-literacy, defined as “the ability without the inclination to read.” See the Librarian of Congress’s estimate in Neil Postman, *Conscientious Objections: Stirring Up Trouble About Language, Technology, and Education* (New York: Knopf, 1988), pp. 64 and 111.

world in general and even of the United States suggests a population incapable of being describes as an informed citizenry. While a large volume of survey-based literature exists on this subject, in the current context it might suffice to cite just a few representative examples. First, there was the National Geographic Society's 1988 survey of 18 to 24-year-olds – which, by definition included, but was not exclusively constituted college or university students, and graduates: out of nine countries assessed, the US was allocated the equal sixth position (with UK) above Italy and Mexico, but below Sweden, West Germany, Japan, Canada, and France. Among the findings relating to the US were: 75 per cent did not know where the Persian Gulf was; 45 per cent could not identify Nicaragua on a map; 25 per cent could not identify the Pacific Ocean or the Soviet Union; less than half could identify Japan on a map; 50 per cent could not identify South Africa on a map (and 45 per cent did not know that apartheid was the official government policy there; and 14 per cent could not identify their own country on a map.) NB: the number tested in all countries was 10,820, and the maps in question were unmarked.¹⁴³

In the 2002 survey, the US scored second to last (above Mexico), with only 17 per cent being able to find Afghanistan, while the whereabouts of the US itself defeated 11 per cent, the Pacific Ocean 29 per cent, Japan 58 per cent, France 65 per cent, and the UK 69 per cent. Worse, less than 15 per cent could locate Iraq or Israel, and 33 per cent thought that the population of the US was between one and two billion. Four years later still (2006), the US was still only ranked above Mexico and, despite Hurricane Katrina's devastation to the southeastern US in 2005, nearly half could not locate Mississippi, and one-third could not locate Louisiana on a map of the US; the same number could not identify the compass direction 'northwest.' Tested on places beyond the borders of the US, the percentage able to locate Afghanistan had fallen to 10 per cent and 47 per cent could not locate India, and 74 per cent wrongly thought that English was the most commonly spoken native language in the world (when it's Mandarin Chinese). On a map of the Middle East, 63 per cent

143 Kelley Griffin, "American know-how: 1-in-7 lost in space," *The Australian*, 29 July 1988, p. 7.

were unable to locate Iraq and 70 per cent found the location of Iran and Israel too difficult.¹⁴⁴

[In other surveys around this time, fully one third of American citizens assented to the belief that the U.S. Government was in regular contact with aliens.¹⁴⁵ Subsequently the geographical extent of ignorance was increased: while a Newsweek poll in 2007 – that is, nearly six years after the attacks of 9/11 – 41 per cent (5 points more than in September 2004) believed that Saddam Hussein was directly responsible for planning, financing and carrying them out; at home, the lack of knowledge only intensified with 89 per cent of Americans unable to name the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court (John Roberts).¹⁴⁶ In February 2010, the tradition continued with a CNN/Opinion Research Corporation survey finding that 71 per cent of Americans believed that Iran had nuclear weapons.¹⁴⁷ And then there is the confusing data which revealed that, while just 59 per cent of Americans support the proposition that “homosexuals” should be allowed to serve in the U.S. military, 70 per cent would allow that “gay men and lesbians” be allowed to serve¹⁴⁸].

144 See: “Survey Reveals Geographic Illiteracy,” *National Geographic News*, 20 November 2002, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2002/11/1120_021120_GeoRoperSurvey.html and “Young Americans Geographically Illiterate Survey Suggests,” *National Geographic News*, 2 May 2006, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2006/05/0502_060502_geography.html both accessed 21 May 2010.

145 Paul Ormerod, *The Death of Economics* (London: Faber & Faber, 1994), p. 108.

146 Josh Catone, “Number of Americans who believe Saddam-9/11 tie rises to 41 percent,” *therawstory*, 24 June 2007, <http://rawestory.com/printstory.php?story=6591>, accessed 26 June 2007.

147 Political Ticker, “70% of Americans Believe Iran has Nuclear Weapons: Poll,” 21 February 2010, Information Clearing House, <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article24819.htm>, accessed 25 February 2010.

148 “Harper’s Index,” based on a CBS New Poll, *Harper’s Magazine*, May 2010, pp. 15 and 69.

This is a hostile environment for university teachers in general and for neophyte and rising career scholars in particular. Though they might in some rare and fortuitous circumstances escape grand strategic academic corruption, they will not escape endemic lower strategic corruption. This is to say that they will find themselves embedded in the decomposition of the university as the silent adjective (neo-liberal) steadily subordinates the noun it is applied to (the academy) as though nothing was changing. For a start, while the majority of longer-serving academics have reluctantly adjusted their regimes to, if not fought against this transformation, most new academics have accepted as wallpaper the ideology of the commercial imperative; for them, the transformation of the albeit imperfect traditional, collegial university into a place with students and books operating according to the demands of a moderately large airline simply never happened because it was a pre-existing condition to their appointment. In any case the faculty have all had to find ways of surviving the demands of neo-liberalism, and they have done this largely by accommodating to neo-liberalism in a manner which hopefully will soon attract the interests of both evolutionary biologists and psychologists specialising in terrorism studies: according to the former, they became just as neo-liberal as the administrators and managers; within the latter they constitute a peculiar study of the Stockholm Syndrome – in which the victims subjected to high risk violence end up identifying with, and even defending their captors after they have been released despite the irrationality of both dispositions. Either way, the accommodation is complete once the commercial imperative is accepted as unchallengeable because, then, faculty are service providers and students are clients, a consensus which quietly or implicitly concedes that the customer is always right. The Neo-liberalised University thus removes the institutionalised doubt that is the *leitmotif* of the Enlightenment tradition by, on the one hand, presenting itself as the implacable and irreversible social reality, and, on the other, purchasing the surrender of its antagonists and refashioning them as its exponents.¹⁴⁹

149 See the reference to Zygmunt Bauman, *In Search of Politics* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1999), p. 127, in Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*, 1987, p. 251.

Once acculturated, university faculty acquiesce in their repeated incursions of surveillance in their academic lives. Not only will their publications and ability to attract external funds to their university be enumerated on a regular basis, they will be evaluated by their students in surveys which reveal little about the educational benefit the latter might have received. If it is accepted that education is “basically a moral relationship between persons devoted to the truth,” that university teaching is for the most part an attempt to educate those that, in academic terms, are “young, lowly, uncertified [and] uniformed,” and this involves lengthy dialogue (but especially listening) as students try to make sense of themselves and the world, then it follows that “the most important work in the university is unrecorded and unrecordable.”¹⁵⁰ By extension, minimal reliance should be placed upon those “come-all-ye” surveys of opinion, conducted at the end of courses, which allow all enrolled students to express their views without them being moderated for class attendance (and other) compliance records, diligence in reading the set materials, submission of work on time, medical and psychological state, and grade achieved. Additionally, if for example some students attend the occasion solely for the instrumental purposes of completing the evaluation forms and gleaning knowledge of the content of the final examination, then the case for scepticism is further made. In both cases, and regardless of whether students of good, or indifferent academic standing complete the surveys, the time frame is problematic to the extent that they simply do not allow sufficient time and experience for reflection on the course as part of an education for life as distinct from the necessary component for a degree.

In this light, contemporary evaluations by peers and graduates later in life, as well as students, would be a stronger indication of performance. To those who claim that such a delayed form of evaluation would be intolerable, the response should be that patience is required, that education does not immediately disclose its benefits and disbenefits, that education can, in some cases, take decades to manifest itself, and that the value of some research can

150 Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, pp. 229 and 273-274.

take considerably longer. Just as Nobel Prizes are not bestowed immediately on publication of an ostensible breakthrough nor should a contribution to an educational transaction be judged on the views of those who are yet to know what is important to know, their immediate certainties in this matter notwithstanding. This is not to deny the need for evaluations so much as to emphasise the need to rid them of an impatient scientism and to conduct them so that mean something to those directly involved - the teachers and their students - which is to say, teachers and what they once were.

III STUDENTS

“A race of highly trained barbarians”

For teaching academics university students are an incubus of despondency beyond worry and the occasional nightmare: individually and collectively, they are a source of despair, frustration, anger, but also of wonder and delight. In fairness, the darker moods in general predate the neo-liberal transformation of the University and were the product of engaging youth with the traditional demands of independent, higher study, research, deeper reflection and analytical writing at a time in their lives when there were distractions aplenty, and when academics were subject to the traditional demands to “publish or perish.” But that situation was accommodated to, barely tolerable though it was. All its parts have now either changed unrecognisably, or intensified, also unrecognisably, from the perspective of (say) 1980, and not surprisingly because the culture of the University has, logically, aligned with the dominant culture of society. Students reflect this more than their teachers because a diminishing, but still sizeable number among the latter can remember the previous academic regime and attempt to live under it heretically, albeit in a modified form. The former, and, it should be noted, early career academics, on the other hand, have no referent and are hostage to the current fashion of standing in awe of nothing:

What they will not generally do, though, is indict the current system. They won't talk about how the exigencies of capitalism lead to a reserved army of the unemployed and nearly inevitable misery. That would be getting too loud, too brash. For the prevailing view is the cool consumer perspective where passion and strong admiration are forbidden.¹⁵¹

And coupled to this is the normalisation of catastrophe and disaster, both of which they experience vicariously, almost pornographically, and so can adopt an unwholesome equanimity as vast parts of the world suffer apocalyptically, as though they are not at all implicated to the slightest degree in what is unfolding before their eyes. Paradoxically, as Edmundson accurately describes them, they are also decent, discerning, and "potent believers in equality" and fairness, but this is of no consequence: they are career-inefficient, distractions, and now more than ever defined within the neo-liberal academy as "impediments to the productive process and should be excreted."¹⁵² The University, however, is careful not to express this imperative to audiences that would find it offensive as an operational policy. It chooses instead to betray them by co-opting them in a charade of education which, in point of fact, is nothing but a cynical exercise in instruction.

They are welcomed to the University, not as students who need to acknowledge their own ignorance, the need to be taught, and the need to learn with humility, but as autonomous agents – clients – in an act of subscription payment and subsequent membership within the social-economic caste, and the power and wealth it bestows, which deposited them there in the first place. Education (from the Latin *educere* – to lead out, or to draw out) is reduced to the last of their concerns, if it registers at all, and they receive instead as many years of instruction (from the Latin *instruere* – to build in information and techniques) as is thought necessary to raise them up to a minimum level of professional literacy. Since education is not the objective, basic questioning is

¹⁵¹ Edmundson, "On the Uses of a Liberal Education: I. As Lite Education," p. 42.

¹⁵² Ibid, and Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, p. 152.

foregone in favour of answers to questions that need not be asked anew. This assumes, of course, that they know what they need to know in their future lives. Conveniently forgotten is that even economic theory of a neo-liberal character requires the customer to be defined as an individual who can make an informed choice and knows what she wants, whereas undergraduate students can hardly know what it is that they need to know, or how it should be taught to them.¹⁵³ The betrayal is consummated with an act of immaculate deception whereby, when the requisite professional training in the academy is certified as complete, the whole process referred to as an “education” despite the absence of any close engagement with the precursors of one.

Few, if any students in the course of their studies fully realise the extent to which their education is but a bought commodity apart from being made aware periodically that it is seriously expensive. They do not fully comprehend the impoverished offerings in their degree structure which result from the emphasis placed on securing numbers (“bums on seats”) because funding flows in direct proportion to enrolments. Nor will they appreciate for some time that anything deters enrolment is discouraged – thus critical comment, difficult material and assignments, and, of course, low grades, especially failures. All of these are made unacceptable to an even greater extent as foundations fund favoured courses and the export of education assumes a significant and integral function of the university because the fees so raised are effectively not only subsidising the costs of the university but absolving the relevant governments from funding them adequately out of state and national treasuries.

Consider just a few indications, the first of which is what Peter Sacks calls, the “massive disinvestment” in university education:

The University of Virginia now receives a mere 8 per cent of its funding from the state of Virginia, down from nearly 30 per cent a quarter-century ago. At the University of Wisconsin, in a state with a long progressive tradition, only about 19 per cent comes from public funds – also down from around 30 per cent just a decade ago. To make up for the

¹⁵³ Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, pp. 22 and 234.

decline in public money, tuition rates have been climbing even faster than at private institutions . . .¹⁵⁴

The logical and empirically verifiable consequence of this is obvious. A federal advisory committee, in a 2002 report entitled, *Empty Promises*, estimated that at least 400,000 students across the U.S. came from families with incomes under \$USD50,000, but who otherwise met college admission standards, were unable to enrol because of financial barriers. Of these, 160,000 did not attend even two-year colleges because of the same barriers. On the other hand, for those intent on entering a top-tier, private school, and who are affluent enough to pay full fees, the cost is \$USD50,000 per year and even this covers less than two-thirds of the real total costs, the other one-third being subsidised from other sources. Taken together, the evidence is entirely unsupportive of an America proclaiming equal opportunity and the potential to rise above poverty and prejudice with education and academic diligence. Net effect: “the United States [now] stands tenth, behind Canada, Japan, South Korea, New Zealand, Belgium, Ireland, Norway, Denmark and France in the percentage of its young people (ages 25-34) who have earned a post-secondary degree.”¹⁵⁵ And all of this in a nation that, in less than a half-century has sent successive manned missions to the moon, designed, built and deployed billion dollar weapons systems, fought trillion dollar wars, added more than 10 trillion to the national wealth, “cloned monkeys, reconfigured the weather, multiplied (by factors too large to calculate) the reach and value of the internet . . . and upward of a trillion dollars a year on liquor, pornography, and drugs.” As Lapham concludes, “this situation is neither an accident or a mistake;” to the contrary, as presently constituted it serves “the interests of a society content to define

154 Peter Sacks, *Tearing Down the Gates: Confronting the Class Divide in American Education*, (Berkeley, C.A.: University of California Press, 2009), as cited in Delbanco, “The Universities in Trouble,” p. 36.

155 Delbanco, “The Universities in Trouble,” p. 38.

education as a means of indoctrination and a way of teaching people to know their place.”¹⁵⁶

In time, the logical and empirically verifiable consequences of the overall situation might become as obvious as they are absurd and tragic. By any interpretation, it is a permissive environment in which fraud flourishes. Compelled to compete commercially rather than academically for students, the race to the academic bottom ensues coincidentally with the rise of the corporate stylists. How else to explain universities which advertise their courses as essentially therapeutic - “being designed to help you discover your pathway to career achievement and personal fulfilment” (NYU’s *Spring Bulletin*, 2006).

Plagiarism and grade inflation - both in epidemic form - accompany this transformation, both encouraged by easy access to the World Wide Web. (Doubt the former and ask why it is that *turnitin.org*, and other similar programmes have become indispensable to universities attempting to maintain their reputation for academic honesty and integrity). The latter increased according to the iron laws of course enrolments and the additional need for academics not to run foul of the students’ assessment surveys - or, in some cases, such sites as *ratemyteachers.co.uk* - in the interests of promotion, or just a quiet life in which a modicum of research and writing time might be garnered. Sometimes, often in point of fact, this situation explicitly extends into the surreal: the only other places comparable - where the clients are not to be improved but disturbed, and the service providers will do anything for a peaceful period of duty - that come to mind are geriatric wards and serviced villas for those suffering from dementia and Alzheimer’s disease.

Acute is the risk here: the Y-generation which constitutes the bulk of the undergraduate population exacerbates the situation because, in general terms it is confident (excessively so), assertive, entitled (according to itself), and yet miserable. Edmundson reported early on that it was a generation “a touch depressed” and lacking in “the confidence to acknowledge what would be their

¹⁵⁶ Lewis Lapham, “School Bells,” *Harper’s Magazine*, August 2000, pp. 7-9.

most precious asset for learning: their ignorance.”¹⁵⁷ It demands not only to be infantilised, but also to be maintained in this stage of arrested development. According to a serious study by one of their own, Jean M. Twenge, they: “speak the language of self as their native tongue,” “blame other people for [their] problems and sink into anxiety and despair,” and “have been consistently taught to put their own needs first and to focus on feeling good about themselves.” She adds, their attitudes reflect “childhoods of constant praise,” and yet “there is some very convincing evidence that depression and anxiety are markedly more prevalent” in it.¹⁵⁸ On this last point, support which confirms earlier studies with the same focus is readily to hand. Research findings published in mid-2006 in the *Archives of General Psychiatry* point to a 500% increase in the use of potent antipsychotic drugs to treat children and adolescents for problems like aggression and mood swings over the period 1993 – 2002.¹⁵⁹ These are a paradox: considerate and easy to please if you, first, please them, but difficult people to teach if you deconstruct their comfortable ideological certainties, and take them out of their intellectual comfort zones, and extremely difficult people to treat as responsible adults – so the university doesn’t.

157 Edmundson, “On the Uses of a Liberal Education: I. As Lite Education,” pp. 43 and 47.

158 Jean M. Twenge, *Generation Me* (New York: Free Press, 2006), pp. 1-9.

159 Benedict Carey, “Use of Antipsychotics by the Young Rose Fivefold,” *The New York Times*, 6 June 2006, Truthout http://www.truthout.org/issues_06/0706HA.shtml accessed 8 June 2006.

Note: By way of comparison, in Australia, the increase in scripts being written for antidepressants between 1990 and 2000 was 352%; by 2004, in a population of 20 million the estimate was that the usage by 1-2 million (or between 5% and 10% of the population) of psychoanaleptic drugs (“happy-making brain chemicals”) of whom 25% were under the age of 20 years old can only be seen as the response to an epidemic. See: Gail Bell, “The Worried Well: The Depression Epidemic and the Medicalisation of Our Sorrows,” *Quarterly Essay*, Issue 18 (2005), pp. 1-74. In some reported cases in Australia, it goes as far as bullying academics by way of standover tactics, emotional blackmail, and constant streams of intentionally intimidating email. See: Hannah Edwards and Chantal Rumble, “We pay, you pay: bullying students turn on academics,” *The Age* (Melbourne), 12 November 2006.

In effect, the University has capitulated to this newly asserted “right to be happy” and abdicated its duty of care to the students and its obligations and responsibilities to the communities which, in good faith, and no little expense fund it in the expectation that it will provide an education to those who study within it. Accordingly, the growing weight assigned by university management to student-survey exercises (which tend to measure happiness and fulfilment as opposed to educational outcomes, and are invulnerable to challenges by teachers)¹⁶⁰ intensifies the pressure to award high grades for mediocre work and has become an ever present reality as has the lineaments of the graduate - who now more than ever personifies Clifford Geertz’s haunting vision of the future in which general education had disappeared: “a race of highly trained barbarians.”¹⁶¹

Then again, even the training is of questionable value because it must accord with a fondly remembered “educational experience” (which will also be surveyed immediately after graduation) and the “right to be happy.” By virtue of these overriding concerns, the residual teaching of the humanities and social sciences to students has learned to cater to them by foregoing a range of approaches that could be described as “uncomfortable” or “difficult.” Given that intensive undergraduate teaching is time-, but particularly energy-intensive, this is achieved without difficulty and according to the Second Law of Thermodynamics - described by Hill and Thornley, as “perhaps the most pessimistic and amoral formulation in all human thought”- by reducing the labour spent, and the labour required, in the process guaranteeing the entropy of the system as a whole.¹⁶² Over time, and within a constant state of affairs,

160 Thus the *Journal of Happiness Studies* is a common outlet for studies based on such approaches.

161 Clifford Geertz, *Local Knowledge* (New York: Basic Books, 1985), p. 160, as cited in Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, p. 79.

162 Gregory Hill and Kerry Thornley, *Principia Discordia* (Forgotten Books, 2008).

the process is irreversible. To ensure that it works to greatest efficiency all that is required is a coherent strategy of withholding.

Nowhere is withholding more obvious than in the capitulation of the University to students' complaints about texts that are not easy to understand by insisting that all course readings possess a self-evident clarity. At the core of this is demand are two assumptions, the first is that identified by David Trend - the "Disneyfication" of college life with its "pervasive impulse toward infotainment" - is normal and acceptable when it is offered as a substitute for learning.¹⁶³ The second assumption is that the student-reader is characteristically passive and should not have to work to understand what is on the page, as though serious texts are not to be differentiated from the advertising copy and dumbed-down accounts of almost everything which the non-print, electronic media offer. Beyond this, is the clear suggestion that no effort should be required in understanding anything, and no burden of responsibility rests upon the reader for critical analysis of the text and reflection upon it. In sum, all communications are to conform to the ideal of a "frictionless discourse purged of complexity" out of which will arise "spontaneous truth" as the product of a process from which thoughtfulness has been eradicated.¹⁶⁴ This is the current trend, stupid, and wrong. Under the heavy constraints of academic disciplines, it inculcates, in the diagnosis of Michael J. Shapiro, graduates with a "trained incapacity" to practise nothing but an "anaemic, empiricist philosophy" which treats with nothing but "mere appearances." His argument, and one developed by other critical scholars (which could be deployed currently), is that critically oriented is hard to grasp because "things *should* be hard to grasp." Echoing Gilles Deleuze, he continues with the proposition that when they are easy to grasp "we are not thinking yet." In that default the boundaries of pop clarity will ensure that

¹⁶³ Trend, *Welcome to Cyberschool*, p. 55, as cited in Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*, p. 275.

¹⁶⁴ Henry A. Giroux, "On Pop Clarity: Public Intellectuals and the Crisis of Language," *truthout* / Op-Ed, 24 March 2010, <http://www.truthout.org/on-pop-clarity-public-intellectuals-and-crisis-language57950> accessed 25 March 2010.

additional voices, and perspectives continue to be silenced and marginalised and the new concepts and processes which might enhance learning never happen because the source of their exclusion is never disrupted.¹⁶⁵

Interactions between teachers and students are now inoculated against error of any type which allow the student to take offence. This, perforce, includes being so unable to defend a confidently asserted proposition that the proposer is rightly embarrassed. The *modus vivendi* in the “teaching environment” (no longer a classroom) is for tutorials and seminars to be conducted in the tongue of “weightless” commentary which neither takes a position nor contributes to anything remotely resembling a discussion between people interested in a subject, let alone an argument about its configurations and meanings. This regime is not so much conservative – which it is because it will change nothing – as the formal avoidance of serious intellectual effort in an establishment ostensibly devoted to precisely that activity on the grounds of self-asserted, privileged, retiring disposition. Edmundson reflects on this fragility as follows:

The Socratic method – the animated, sometimes impolite give-and-take between student and teacher – seems too jagged for current sensitivities. Students frequently come to my office to tell me how intimidated they feel in class; the thought of being embarrassed in front of the group fills them with dread.¹⁶⁶

To the extent that they are indulged in this fragility, the University betrays them a step further by never really challenging their status as a protected species and graduating them into an abrasive, highly competitive neo-liberal world which cares nought for their vanity, or the fact they were deceived into thinking it could ever be acceptable outside the University. To

165 P. Schouten, ‘Theory Talk #36: Michael J. Shapiro on Pictures, Paintings, Power and the Political Philosophy of International Relations’, *Theory Talks*, <http://www.theory-talks.org/2010/02/theory-talk-36.html> (01-02-2010).

166 Edmundson, “On the Uses of a Liberal Education: I. As Lite Education,” pp. 43-45.

the extent they accept this situation as normal, even desirable, only a deep foreboding emerges. Students who have normalised catastrophe – and an education foregone is a catastrophe – are politically numb, desensitised, accustomed to the art of surrender. If they neither know nor care about questions of accountability and responsibility, they are a long way from home, democratically speaking, and closer to the destination that is fascism. And the fact they have not even begun to understand they are politically and socially dormant, biologically alive but in a torpor, is testament to just how dangerous the present is. Doubt it, and ask why there is no anger, not even a glimmering of a mass movement among the current generation against the neo-liberal university as a weapons of mass instruction and why it is incomparable with that of 1968, which at least, not to idealise it, had a concept of education and the courage and vocabulary of the street and gutter to articulate it. The following brief extract is cited only to suggest just how much has been lost in engagement and conviction (and definitely does not imply and endorsement of the injunctions to violence and destruction):

. . . Students, you are all impotent cunts (that much we already know) and you will stay so until you have:

- beaten up your teachers
- bugged all your priests
- set fire to the faculty . . .

[The Vandals' Committee of Public Safety, Anon., Bordeaux, 1968]¹⁶⁷

Conclusions: Pleasing, Purity and Academic Life in a Reliquary

To the extent that the contemporary university scholar/teacher is complicit in this catalogue of academic felonies, she or he is in a remarkably similar position to those who, though in Holy Orders, lived scandalous lives and contributed to the need for the radical reformation which fractured the

¹⁶⁷ Michael Rosen and David Widgery (eds), *The Chatto Book of Dissent* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1994), pp. 107-108.

established Church after the Council of Trent. Like the corrupt inhabitants of the monasteries and convents, they know that, in a career sense, the abnegation of the self which is imposed - in this case by traditional teaching and writing with integrity - is very likely a promotional blind alley. For them, the knowledge and understanding that much of their work will not be recognised, or will be recognised only years later, or is unrecognisable is overpowering. In the words of the poet-philosopher Ralph Waldo Emerson, they yield to the temptation of “display and immediate fame,” to pressures which ensure that, whatever their rationale for adopting neo-liberalism as their new creed, they are indifferent to the values they profess to serve, and, not to put too fine a point on it, enthusiastically embrace the trade in indulgences.¹⁶⁸ *Placebo* (“I shall please”) is the new motto: an audience, any audience, rather than intellectual influence is pursued and satisfied by means of what is essentially an academic and intellectual sham, it is accompanied by eclecticism rather than coherence, and affability rather than truth. In the end, the result is chimerical: the university is occupied by schools of academics that aren’t academics; in truth they are consultants and technical instructors that just sound like academics on the odd selectively chosen, ceremonial occasion.¹⁶⁹

Living under *Placebo* does not, because it cannot allay, all the fears previously held, or, more to the point, it creates another syndrome. As with neo-liberalism generally, neo-liberalism in the University is totalitarian in character and the embrace of it for a true scholar is nothing short of a willing and consensual betrayal. It might have entered the academic-institutional bloodstream at the level of executive management, as did McCarthyism in an earlier age, but this does not explain its comprehensive infestation of the University. For faculty, that “success “ was their own, as it also was previously, and as Stuart Hall argues in the following terms:

168 As cited in Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, p. 126.

169 The foregoing comparisons are adapted from Regis Debray, *Teachers, Writers, Celebrities: The Intellectuals of Modern France*, trans. David Macey (London: NLB, 1981), pp. 62, 73, 160, 164, & 175 (hereafter cited as Debray, *Teachers, Writers, Celebrities*).

The state didn't send out the secret police to transform higher education into an entrepreneurial sector; we have done that all by ourselves by taking on the ethic of managerialism as the everyday practice of institutional life.

170

It follows that collaborating academics are governed by, and will govern others when the opportunity arises, by the principles of neo-liberalism, and these are not only vindictive, but vindictive in all directions and in the nature of the Old Testament, the Torah/Pentateuch, and the Counter-Reformation. It is a world in which all alternatives are by definition *anathema*, a world of cognitive exclusion, obsessed with the dichotomy of purity/impurity. Mary Douglas explains:

The underlying principle of cleanness in animals is that they shall conform fully to their class. Those species are unclean which are imperfect members of their class, or whose class itself confounds the general scheme of the world. . . . *Leviticus* takes up this scheme and allots to each element its proper kind of animal life. In the firmament two legged fowls fly with wings. In the water, scaly fish swim with fins . . . Any class of creatures which is not equipped for the right kind of locomotion in its element is contrary to holiness. Contact with them disqualifies a person from approaching the temple. Thus anything in the water which has not fins and scales is unclean. . . . The only sure test for cleanness in a fish is its scales and its propulsion by means of fins.¹⁷¹

This is not a world in which outsiders or revisionists can be tolerated and only strict compliance is acceptable because all else is a threat. It follows that it is a world which serially produces, first, the need for, and then the physical reality,

170 Les Terry, "Travelling 'The Hard Road to Renewal': A Continuing with Stuart Hall," *Arena Journal* 8 (1997): 47, as cited in Giroux and Giroux, *Take Back Higher Education*, p. 45.

171 Mary Douglas, *Purity and danger: An Analysis of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Praeger, 1966), pp. 55-56, as cited in Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, p. 163.

of scapegoats upon whom can be heaped the cause of failures and whom, ultimately, can be violently banished and destroyed.¹⁷²

To avoid the temptation to be other than the “right kind”, and thus to be contaminated under the gaze of a regime of obsessive purity requires that any common grounds for communication be denied, or seen as public relations pretexts when they are mentioned. The need never to err creates reduces realms of risk-averse activity to the same extent it proscribes interesting, discretionary but risky action. The resultant rampant segmentation gives rise to the professionalised “multiversity,” the natural consequence of which is the demise of any principles of intellectual unification. It is, nevertheless, unified bureaucratically and hierarchically, and both in a totalitarian way, which is exactly why the neo-liberal University is so attractive to bureaucrats and totalitarians and others of an anti-intellectual bent. Liberal Arts, Humanities and critical Social Science programmes are not necessarily expunged from curricula; rather, where they exist, they are treated as objects of condescension – which ensures their humiliation as core, or “priority” areas of research and teaching – while at the same time they serve to legitimate the claim that a particular university is faithful to the tradition it has broken with but has not the courage to admit with candour.

Scholarly commitment to the traditional University in the context just outlined is, according to your disposition, redundant, an imperative or a futile gesture, or all three. Not to be committed and to take action in accordance with the commitment is to cede the University and its better traditions to a form of late academic barbarism. Yet action will doubtless fail. Because the University is neo-liberalised in accordance with Western society’s neo-liberalisation, the chances of the former, acting on its own, effecting a reversion to the *status quo ante* are not worthy of serious consideration. It is not as though the present and immediate likely foreseeable future of the University is in the balance – it isn’t. The current landscape is without so-called “tipping points” because fulcra went long ago, when the universities all too readily accommodated to neo-liberalism. The contemporary status quo will not

¹⁷² See Wilshire, *The Moral Collapse of the University*, pp. 170-171 in this context – where the author incorporates René Girard’s *Violence and the Sacred* (London: continuum, 2007).

be disturbed, therefore, from within, but from without, and even then it will need to proceed from a change in thinking which itself proceeds from the demonstrable, catastrophic failure of neo-liberalism. And judging from the less-than-radical responses by Western governments to the Global Financial Crisis, the threshold of tolerance for neo-liberal disaster is at painfully high political levels.

As this regime of indulgence continues over time, the neo-liberal University and neo-liberal academics will become routinised; the traditional liberal-educational counterparts of both will belong to the receding past. The pitiful process now at hand is reminiscent of the project which saw the return of the Irish Wolfhound – once a massive and magnificent regal beast, bred for hunting, guard duty and battle (in which they were known to attack soldiers on horseback and charioteers), and much prized by their owners. Over time, political and economic conditions reduced them, in the first instance, to the level of ornament, and then almost to extinction. That they exist today is the result of nostalgia and a sentimental cross-breeding programme which has produced a giant, shaggy, gentle and congenial animal which behaves nicely with small children; to some it just a toy dog with one of the shortest live-spans in the canine world.

For all of this, relief from, and within the neo-liberal University remains a possibility for scholars but only under conditions not yet met; indeed, at least two possibilities can be identified from the corpus of revolutionary theory and strategy. The first can be derived from Mao but it requires the existence of a popular demand in society which can through several steps be translated into action. The second, adapted from Guevara, and organisationally more likely, is the creation of a network of totally dedicated, rebellious academics with revolutionary objectives within the vestiges of the traditional University. Both require the expressed or latent disenchantment with neo-liberalism to make the transition from intellectual appeal to political action; absent that, and any form of revolution cannot be contemplated. This is not to deny that academic resistance and insurgency in the interim is without purpose – it is not – but until more propitious circumstances appear, its significance will be the legacy it leaves rather than the immediate effect it has on the prevailing regime.

The University was never perfect or ideal. It is, perhaps, best described in the Latin phrase, *ecclesia semper reformanda* – a community always in need of reform. But “community” is the operant term: should it disappear, or be reduced to the status of an accessory or embellishment, then there is no point to discussing whatever it was in the present tense. As with the Church at the time of the Reformation, it is though the institution, and not the membership has gone elsewhere – *in partibus infidelium*. What remains are the accidents (material qualities) of the traditional University, but not its essence. For scholars, this is a loss of habitat which provokes the question, “to what, and how they give their loyalty to the Enlightenment project no longer in favour where they are?” Might it not be better to reach an accommodation with neo-liberalism and gracefully accede to requests to open up channels of cooperation with “practitioners”? Some, perhaps many, would argue that such discretion is advisable and prudential and would no doubt be profitable, and there is already abundant evidence that it is the chosen path for many academic specialists.

On the basis of the argument in the foregoing pages there is little that can be suggested which is at once alternative, viable, likely to be successful and possessed of integrity. The question then become whether this absolves the obligation to resist. Again, on the basis of the preceding argument, resistance is possible albeit within constraints. The very fact that the University tolerates vestiges of its better previous self provides for the possibility of keeping it alive in microcosm. For now at least. Admittedly it is a meagerly supported mission, but, it must be emphasised, one that is permitted and possible. In no way does it sanction defection to neo-liberalism and that is the burden of this chapter: if U.S. scholars currently live in the worst of times for the intellect in their careers, there is no logic in the claim that exacerbating the situation is ethically or intellectually justifiable. Conceded is the fact that the present and future outlined in these pages constitute a bleak prospect in which no apparent constituency for reform is apparent, and yes, it is sad and tragic, yet to present it any other way would be delusional.

IV

STUDYING TERRORISM IN THE DARK

Reverting to the specific study and teaching of the subject of terrorism, it remains only to throw a few analytical grenades at the edifice of the university-as-institution. If, the account to this point is valid, and we also assume that this study must, at the very least, involve understandings of an historical, political, sociological, economic, religious and psychological character, or run the risk of being only a caricature, then the attempt itself is difficult to justify because it is seriously compromised. “Understandings,” here, is the operative term: merely ticking the box labeled *psychological*, for example, is insufficient and inadequate because depth of understanding must accompany the breadth of explanation. Nevertheless, in the university-as-institution outlined, how credible is it that an academic could teach an undergraduate course in which the following are included, juxtaposed, and critically understood?

That Muslim terrorists comprise only part of the terrorist spectrum.

Timothy McVeigh was convicted of detonating a truck bomb in front of the Oklahoma City federal building in 1995, which resulted in 168 deaths. He was Catholic.

In 1994 Baruch Goldstein, a Jewish-American Israeli settler in the West Bank city of Hebron opened fire on Muslim worshippers, killing 29 and wounding 150. He died at the scene, and his grave later became a pilgrimage site for extremists in Israel.

Murderers of abortion doctors in the US frequently carry out their crimes in the name of evangelical Christianity.

In 2010, in a protest against federal government policies, Joseph Stack flew a plane into an Austin building housing IRS offices. He came from a Christian background and ranted against all religion.¹⁷³

173 These four examples are from Reese Erlich, “4 Common Myths about the War on Terrorism,” Information Clearing House, <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article26874.htm> accessed 3 March 2011.

That the Obama Administration claims to have unreviewable authority to kill American citizens outside combat zones in the Global War on Terror if they are deemed a threat.

In November 2010, the Obama Administration argued before a federal court that it had, and should have, sweeping powers to target and to kill U.S. citizens anywhere in the world, and that no court had any role in reviewing that power, or the legal standards that apply.¹⁷⁴

That some of the most revered figures in US political life are, on the basis of abundant and available evidence, war criminals and / or guilty of atrocities which include aiding and abetting terrorism, and torture.

In the interests of brevity, three names will suffice with regard to aiding and abetting. Ronald Reagan, who defended the “dirty war” waged by the military junta in Argentina in the 1970s and 1980s, armed the Guatemalan military in their internal genocidal and terroristic military campaigns against the Mayans, and declared the military dictator who unleashed death squads upon them, General (Efraim Rios Montt), to be “a man of great personal integrity.”¹⁷⁵

Henry Kissinger, for (very briefly) his “involvement in the war in Indochina, mass murder in Bangladesh, planned assassinations in Santiago, Nicosia, and Washington DC, and genocide in East Timor.”¹⁷⁶

Richard Holbrooke, who began his career in the infamous assassination programme which then became genocidal known officially as Phoenix, graduated through executive

174 ACLU, “Obama Administration Claims Unchecked Authority To Kill Americans Outside Combat Zones,” Information Clearing House, 8 November 2010, <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article26777.htm> accessed 9 November 2011.

175 Robert Parry, “Ronald Reagan, Enabler of Atrocities,” consortiumnews.com, 6 February 2011.

176 For an exceptionally well constructed account of Kissinger’s criminality, see Christopher Hitchens, *The Trial of Henry Kissinger* (London: Verso, 2001).

control of US support for the Islamic *mujahedeen* in Afghanistan, and a coalition of exiled Cambodians which included a mass murderer, to a central role in organizing the military and institutional framework responsible for the mass slaughter of Yugoslav people, and the creation of a statelet – Kosovo – synonymous with heroin trafficking, white slavery and the international trade in human organs, and currently run by a man, Hashim Thaci, he and Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, hand-picked who has been named in the Marty Report to the Council of Europe as being the overseer of its organized crime.¹⁷⁷

President George W Bush's 2010 memoirs are sufficient in relation to torture: he admits that authorized that detainees be waterboarded – in other words tortured – which is a crime under US and international law. At approximately the same time this memoir was published, and by way of just one indicative example, it was announced by the US Department of Justice that no would be held accountable for the destruction of 92 interrogation videotapes which showed high-value detainees being subjected to various torture techniques by CIA interrogators.¹⁷⁸

That remote killing of Innocent people in the Global War on Terror is obscene, even if the President jokes about it.

The record of 700 civilians killed in Pakistan by CIA *Predator* and *Reaper* drones in 2009 alone, and approximately 2,000 in the five years to 2010, should not be a matter for public humour yet, at the White House Correspondents' Association dinner in May 2010, when President Obama observed the teen pop band, The Jonas Brothers, in the audience he said, "Sasha and Misha are huge fans, but boys, don't get any

177 Robert Scheer, "Speaking Ill of "the Best and the Brightest," Information Clearing House 22 December 2010, <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article27115.htm> accessed 23 December 2010; Andrej Grubacic, "Richard Holbrooke, the Butcher of the Balkans," *ZSpace*, 18 December 2010, and Alexander Cockburn, "Could a Serbian Heart Have saved Dick Holbrooke?" *The Nation*, 31 January 2011, p. 9.

178 Jason Leopold, "Special Prosecutor Declines to File Criminal Charges Over Destruction of CIA Torture Tapes," *truthout Report*, 9 November 2010.

ideas. Two words for you: predator drones. You will never see it coming.”¹⁷⁹

That suicide is a life-ending tactic on both sides of the Global War on Terror, and has perhaps, a longer tradition and more substantial tradition in the United States.

While suicide terrorism is popularly associated with terrorist acts committed by Muslims, the origins of suicide terrorism reside in another culture – Sri Lanka’s Tamil Tigers – it is even less well-known that suicide after combat is one of the besetting pathologies observable among US veterans: whereas, by 1990, more Vietnam War era veterans had committed suicide (approaching 60,000) than had been killed in it, the current trend accords with the precedent, a rate of 18 suicides per day among the current veteran population.¹⁸⁰

That terrorism in a cause favoured buy the United States will be indulged.

The most obvious case in point is hard-line anti-Castro personality and former CIA agent, Luis Posada Carriles, identified by US intelligence and Immigration and Customs Enforcement as a terrorist, specifically, as the mastermind of the 1976 midair destruction of a Cuban airliner carrying 73 people and a series of hotel bombings in Havana, all of which he boasted about: when arrested in 2005 and finally charged, it was only on counts of making “false statements” and the fraudulent use of documents to enter the United States. The US has refused to extradite him to the Venezuela – which

179 Mehdi Hasan, “US drone attacks are no laughing matter, Mr Obama,” guardian.co.uk, 28 December 2010, and ANI, “US Killed 2,043 People, Mostly Civilians, in Pakistan,” Information Clearing House, 3 January 2010
<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article27174.htm> accessed 25 January 2011.

180 Walter H. Capps, *The Unfinished War: Vietnam and the American Conscience*, Rev. Ed. (Boston: Beacon Press, 1990), p. 1, and “Quick Facts: Plight of US Veterans,” <http://www.press.ir/usdetail/1166369.html> accessed 22 February 2011 in conjunction with numerous accounts at ABClocal.go.com.

had a legitimate claim to him in relation to the bombing of the airliner.¹⁸¹

That the terrorist violence directed against the United States and the allies who encourage and support US strategy needs to include (but not exclusively) the centrality of violence, much of it terrorist and (what I would term) *para-terrorist*, in American life.

The self-appointed assassin who killed six people and wounded 14 others including Representative Gabrielle Giffords, who was shot in the head, in Tucson on 8 January this year committed a criminal act which is poorly understood as an aberration rather than another episode in a long tradition. After the murders of Lincoln, Garfield, McKinley, the Kennedy brothers, and Martin Luther King, and the attacks on George Wallace, Ronald Reagan, posterity is surely generous to the point of criminal indulgence to see them as historically atypical. Domestically, do not the Wounded Knee and Waco sit comfortably alongside Samar - that had to be made "a howling wilderness" - and Ben Tre - that had to be destroyed in order to save it"? Are these and many others to be seen outside, or independently of the United States accounting for 45 per cent of global gun deaths, or, in 2006, nearly 31,000 fatalities? And for what reason if they are? Is the US not a "Free Fire Zone" on tis evidence? And any answer at all must grapple with the bizarre: within days of the Tucson shooting sales of handguns in Arizona jumped 60 percent to 263 on 10 January compared with 164 the corresponding Monday a year ago, the second-biggest increase of any state in the country, according to Federal Bureau of Investigation data. Handgun sales rose 65 percent to 395 in Ohio; 16 percent to 672 in California; 38 percent to 348 in Illinois; and 33 percent to 206 in New York, the FBI data show. Sales increased nationally about 5 percent, to 7,906 guns. Federally tracked gun sales, which are drawn from sales in gun stores that require a federal background check, also jumped following the 2007 massacre at Virginia Tech, in which 32 people were killed.

181 Peter Kornbluh, "A Former CIA Asset Goes on Trial," *The Nation*, 24 January 2011, p. 24.

According to Jason Linkins of *The Huffington Post*, on hearing of the atrocity, the owner of two Arizona gun shops, told his manager to get ready for a stampede of new customers. The manager was right: instead of hurting sales, the massacre had the \$499 semi-automatic pistols - popular with police, sport shooters and gangsters - flying out the doors of his Glockmeister stores in Mesa and Phoenix. The manager noted: "We're at double our volume over what we usually do." All that remained was the need for a contextual reminder and it was provided by Linkins, who reported: "Of course, this is nothing new, nor is it a localized oddity."¹⁸²

¹⁸² Jason Linkins, "Glock Pistol Sales Up After Arizona Shootings," *The Huffington Post*, 11 January 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/01/11/arizonans-flock-up-the-bl_n_807517.html?view=print accessed 4 March 2011.

