

**People or Markets: Some Thoughts on Culture and Corporations in the University of the Twenty-First Century**



Tom Moylan

*Social Text*, No. 44 (Autumn - Winter, 1995), 45-59.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0164-2472%28199523%2F24%290%3A44%3C45%3APOMSTO%3E2.0.CO%3B2-A>

*Social Text* is currently published by Duke University Press.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/duke.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

SOME THOUGHTS ON CULTURE AND CORPORATIONS IN  
THE UNIVERSITY OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

Sitting in the dentist's office last spring, I glanced at the March issue of *Time* magazine. On the cover was an illustration of a hominid face identified as "*Homo erectus*" and the words, "How Man Began: Fossil Bones from the Dawn of Humanity Are Rewriting the Story of Evolution." My reading of the cover story revealed, however, that it was not bones that were responsible for this revisionist history but the ideology of the marketplace. For in his description of the evidence that produced a shift from an "out of Africa" theory to a more global "multiregional hypothesis," the author explains that humanity arrived by way of *competition* for survival in several territories. As he puts it:

Modern *Homo sapiens* was clearly not the inevitable design for an intelligent being. The species seems to have been just one of several rival product lines—the only one successful today in the evolutionary marketplace.<sup>1</sup>

Free competition, it seems, has not only produced wealth but indeed humanity itself. Interestingly, the power of the supposedly open-ended, unfettered market—which is now championed as the only viable utopia at the "end of history"—is here supported by the familiar illustration of a series of hominids advancing in a straight line toward the taller, better product of the new human. The free market rules at the end of history, but only after arriving by way of history.

Later that spring, I saw in my faculty newsletter that the common sense of the market was also being enlisted to reshape the university. In an article entitled "The University and the Market for Higher Education," the chair of the economics department opens his call for restructuring third-level education with a characterization of the university as "one type of producer in the entire market for higher education." For him, traditional campuses are "bureaucratically organized factories" that deliver "relatively standardized and comparatively simple products" which can no longer compete in an education market based on the flexible production of "custom products." In its place, he suggests moving on to the alternative design of a "professional corporation or partnership."<sup>2</sup>

Along with restructuring, he adds a plea for privatization, which he supports with the claim that public funding is a zero-sum pool in which “social security, medical care, and federal mandates” are favored over education. As a result, he suggests ending the “contractual relationship” with faculty and moving to a market-based, “fee-for-service agreement.”<sup>3</sup> This argument, of course, rests on an assumption that the long-standing commitment to public, third-level education has now been superseded and that the only solution for universities, as with other state institutions, is to submit to market forces—an assumption that regulates the activity of academia according to monetary value, that pits one sector of public service against another, and that overlooks the potentially available monies that have been steadily removed from the reach of taxation in the redistribution of wealth that resulted from the political interventions of the 1980s.

Later, in July, while a resident at the Banff Centre for the Arts, I encountered an extended example of how market ideology has informed efforts to reconfigure social structures and relations along the lines of a corporate rather than a more broadly social logic: this ideology works in such a way that institutions of art and education are not only appropriated for corporate use but are changed as well by the forces doing the appropriation.

Founded in the 1930s, at the foot of Sleeping Buffalo Mountain in the Bow Valley of the Canadian Rockies, the Banff Centre is a highly regarded facility that has served a mix of Canadian and international artists for over sixty years.<sup>4</sup> The institution became an early player in the link-up of arts and commerce when its Centres for Management and Conferences opened in the 1950s to serve the business community and to generate additional funds (a goal that began to be met by the Centre for Conferences in the 1980s). Yet, until the 1990s, arts programming remained the focus of the Centre (the “jewel in Alberta’s crown,” as former provincial premier, Peter Loughheed, put it).

In 1978, on the wave of the Alberta oil boom, the Banff Centre severed its ties with the University of Calgary and became the independent Banff Centre for Continuing Education (with the Centres for the Arts, Management, and Conferences as its three administrative units). Affiliation and funding shifted from the Calgary campus to the Alberta Government’s Ministry for Continuing Education, and the Centre “became, to all intents and purposes, a fifth university in Alberta.”<sup>5</sup> In the late 1980s, under the pressures of capital restructuring and the ebbing of Canada’s extensive commitment to the social contract, the administrative and programmatic balance began to change. As corporate influence increased during the Mulroney government, and as restructuring efforts began to enlist cultural practices in systemic economic changes, the Centre’s central administration began to shift its priorities to the management

division and to draw on the arts program as a secondary resource for the management training programs.<sup>6</sup> The process of restructuring was intensified in the 1990s after the Conservative Party came to power in the province and began to implement right-wing populist policies (influenced by Reform Party members within the Conservative ranks). Even though Alberta is still richer than many provinces due to its lingering oil revenues, the government has been moving to cut the provincial budget by 40 percent over a three year period, in those cases where it is not simply selling off sectors to private industry. According to one *Globe and Mail* report, the province is “eliminating more than 30,000 people from the welfare rolls by tightening the eligibility requirements, lowering the levels of benefits, offering one-way tickets out of the province, and forcing single mothers with children older than three months to return to work.”<sup>7</sup>

Harsh as these cuts are, and responsible as they are for the present round of specific budget reductions at the Banff Centre, the strategy of restructuring and privatization is endemic throughout Canada (as it is in the U.S. and elsewhere) and cannot be explained solely by Alberta’s extremist version. It is part of an increasingly global strategy that marshals the ideology of the free market to win support for structural realignments on the basis of claims that personal wealth will increase, when indeed not only does individual income not rise but existing public services, and with them the substance and quality of life, actually declines. As François Dumaine, the assistant director of the Canadian Anti-Poverty Organization, puts it, economic restructuring may be raising corporate profits to an all time high, but it is not improving income distribution—either by creating jobs or by increasing social programs. Over the past thirty years, the corporate share of federal revenues has fallen from 21 percent to its present 7 percent. With 1.4 million unemployed and 2.1 million working part time, jobs are becoming even scarcer, and the gap between high- and low-wage earners and older and younger workers is widening. In this harsh context, “social programs are no longer seen as a means of redistributing wealth in Canada, but viewed as just a large number on the expense side of the balance sheet.”<sup>8</sup>

Given this pervasive agenda of reducing and eliminating publicly funded programs at all levels of daily life, it was clear to the artists and writers in the 1994 summer arts residency that the Banff Centre’s progressive policies, programs, and personnel were endangered. Experienced administrators (including program directors in art studio, ceramics, and photography) were facing their last days of work (some after twenty-five years of service), and those who survived were facing the speed-up of increased workloads and looking ahead to collaborating with short-term consultants hired for specific programs rather than for long-term service. Artists, who had worked under fair and reciprocal one-page contracts

that mentioned negotiations of rights and revenues only if and when such opportunities arose, now encountered imposing ten-page contracts that accorded immediate and full control over the distribution of their work to the Banff Centre and to any of the corporate funding sources involved in their projects. In addition, the innovative thematic residency programs that had supported groups of about twenty artists and writers for ten week periods, three times a year, were being cut to one per year.<sup>9</sup>

Further indications of the impact of restructuring on the arts programming at Banff became available on 11 August 1994, when the new director of the Media and Visual Arts Program, Sara Diamond, met with the summer arts residents to talk about the changes taking place at the Centre. As Diamond explained it, facing the provincial budget cut of 40 percent meant that the Centre for the Arts was being forced to reassess its entire operation. This crisis set the scene for the merger of the Visual and Media Arts Programs, and it meant that the 40 percent gap in funding had to be made up by programs that generated revenue through rental of space and/or services or by corporate donations or sponsorship of specific projects. Although Diamond stressed that she herself would seek a balance between high-tech media projects (including video, film, and virtual reality production, which garner external sponsored research funding more easily) and visual arts projects (which often require more internal support), it seemed that, despite hopes for the contrary, the merger of the two programs threatened the slippage of the visual arts into second place behind the demands and opportunities of the cost-effective media projects (which are more attractive to corporate interests). It also meant that rental and revenue claims on space and human resources could potentially displace claims by the visual arts or by any projects, including high-tech ones or the more theoretical thematic residencies, that would not produce an immediate exchange value.<sup>10</sup>

This shift in priorities and structures is captured in the freshly painted slogan on the side of the Centre's forest green service vehicles ("For the Arts, For Management, For Conferences"), and a further marker can be found in the new job titles as the word "art" was dropped from all categories but that of the senior "artistic director/executive producer," thus recasting the assistant arts directors as "directors of professional practice" (see *A Place for Artists*). In the most recent program schedule of the Centre for Management, this new order of things is praised as a "synergy of management, the arts and innovation." According to this document, the three areas of activity offered by the Centre for Management are (1) the "Open Market Programs" (including general management and leadership training, resource and environmental management training, health sector management training, and administrative development programs), (2) the "Custom-Designed Programs" (offering training and development seminars geared to specific organizations, and provided in collaboration with

the Centre by a private consultancy group), and (3) the “Festival of Mountain Films” (a profit-generating enterprise which also contributes to the use of mountain-climbing training as a “leadership product” in the Open Market leadership seminars). As an example of the new direction, an offering in the schedule is entitled “Creativity in Management: Sustained Innovation” and stems from a partnership between the Centre for Management and the Centre for the Arts which “focuses on the implementation and sustainability of innovation in the workplace.”<sup>11</sup> The emergent strategy was echoed by Doug Macnamara, the new general manager of the management division, when he described the three resources that the Centre offers for “world class” management training as its proximity to outdoors activities, its facilities in visual technology, and its arts programs.

This offer of innovative training to potential business sector residents at the Centre was ironically repeated for the arts staff when a management consultant was brought in during the summer to help them cope after they began to express their anxiety over the impending restructuring. The consultant described her task as that of “trying to make people happy at their jobs,” which for the central administration of the Centre seemed to mean suppressing the crisis, not addressing or countering it. As reported by members of the staff, the process involved reinforcing the seamless language web spun by the prevailing market ideology so that any critique based in an alternative set of values and expectations could simply not be uttered, or if uttered not heard.<sup>12</sup> One tactic in particular involved the refashioning of the *cultural* practice of “collegiality” (that valuable glue which helps people work together in a common context of support and debate) into an *economic* practice that placed a premium on weathering the storm of change and on getting along by way of getting the job done. In fact, the entire consultancy process offered a good example of the “soft” disciplinary logic involved in the present corporate appropriation of the cultural sphere.

As the summer went on, I also learned from the Canadian artists in the residency that not only were the facilities of the Banff Centre being redirected toward corporate service, but that the federal policy of support of artists (begun in 1944 and administered by the Canada Council for the Arts since 1957) was being gradually phased out as part of the global shift toward the imposition of a logic of privatization and competition. As a result, the dynamic Canadian network of federally supported artists and artist-run centers was facing extinction, and in their place the forces of the market would soon be naming “art” and privileging some artists while relegating most others to redundancy (especially those who worked in specific ethnic or tribal communities, identity groups, or in oppositional political movements).<sup>13</sup>

My account of the Banff Centre, of course, is meant to be exemplary of a larger tendency that is affecting art and education institutions in

Capitalism's  
concern with  
culture is not  
new. Time-motion  
studies, the social  
work tactics of  
Fordism, and  
the force of  
advertising are all  
instances of the  
employment of  
culture for the  
mechanisms of  
accumulation.

many locales. Another example brought to my attention during the summer was the recent shift to corporate domination of the visual production programs at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Over the past several years, the MIT Media Lab has been going through what appears, from the viewpoint of those in the Lab programs, to be a “hostile takeover” of an arts program by corporate interests (including U.S. and Japanese firms). As the funding and, therefore, the policies and practices of the Media Lab fell under this transnational corporate influence, programs that were deemed not essential to the new direction of high-tech, digitalized visual production—in this case the film and photo programs—were cast aside (along with their personnel). Dissenting programs, which refused to come under the new corporate discipline—most notably the Center for Advanced Visual Studies—slowly died as their remaining funding sources dwindled.<sup>14</sup>

---

2

Back in Virginia at the end of the summer, I continued to think about these changes in institutions of art and education, this time in the context of the U.S., for these are conditions I have heard about from colleagues working in higher education across the country. Beyond the horror stories of each specific situation, what concerned me was the overall impact of this now pervasive imbrication of economics and culture on the entire social fabric.

In the *Australian Cultural Studies Reader*, John Frow and Meaghan Morris recount Rupert Murdoch’s advice on a recent economic crisis: “Oh, you know: change the culture,” Murdoch asserted. In what Frow and Morris describe as the “formula of neoliberal rhetoric,” it is now taken for granted that “economic problems need ‘cultural’ solutions”—in which “culture” (that “complex of social customs, values and expectations” which affects our ways of living) becomes the means for “challenging the conduct of other people’s everyday working lives.”<sup>15</sup>

Of course, capitalism’s concern with culture is not new. Time-motion studies, the social work tactics of Fordism, the force of advertising, the development of the culture industry, and the expansion of consumer markets (from early department stores to the production of suburbs and their lifestyles, to the commercial reconfigurations of the body, and even to the commodification of political correctness by the Body Shop or Ben and Jerry’s) are all instances of the employment of culture for the mechanisms of accumulation. However, as Avery Gordon has pointed out, in the 1980s corporations took a qualitative leap forward in their latest “discovery” of culture.<sup>16</sup>

The ground for this leap was being prepared well before the electoral power-shifts of the early 1980s. To be sure, the long march of the New Right into governments around the world marked a crucial moment in the recent instrumentalization and privatization of culture; for, as Larry Grossberg argues in the context of the U.S., it was the New Right's understanding and appropriation of the counterculture that endowed the Right with the cultural force it needed to win.<sup>17</sup> However, as Radhika Desai has demonstrated, the relationship between free market ideology, cultural practices, and the economic order had been persistently explored long before the Reagan-Thatcher victories by think tanks such as Britain's Institute of Economic Affairs and the Centre for Policy Studies or by Virginia's Public Choice School. Indeed, each of these, and others like them, can trace their own roots back to the Mont Pelerin Society, which was founded in 1947 by Austrian economist Friedrich Hayek—an institution that, according to Desai, provided “an international congress of neoliberal intellectuals to battle what [Hayek] saw as the tide of collectivism sweeping the world.”<sup>18</sup> The body of theoretical analysis generated by these intellectual centers valorizes the market as the historically triumphant ideology and technology. Yet, unlike other versions of market-based economics, these projects have carefully developed a more sophisticated and effective approach by paying acute attention to cultural dynamics and to the theories that address those dynamics, from hermeneutics to cultural studies. In what I would call “corporate cultural studies,” the influence of the “interpretive turn” is quite evident. In the pages of the *Harvard Business Review*; in the restructuring projects at places like the Banff Centre, MIT's Media Lab, and many universities; and in the outreach courses and consultancies offered by programs such as the Banff Centre for Management, culture is consistently reutilized as an economic force. As Frow and Morris put it, this employment of culture provides ways of “changing the minutiae of behaviour (‘work practices’) at the workplace, and thus the texture and organization of home and family life; it means inducing workers to invest more actively in the corporate ethos; it can mean improving race and gender relations in the interests of achieving an ‘international outlook’; it means sharpening class consciousness by making competitiveness, ‘inequality of outcomes’ and, therefore, poverty, more acceptable” (viii).

Therefore, when the political interventions of the 1980s began to take hold, the organizational and theoretical bases for a revived, and global, corporate culture were in place and ready to help fill the vacuum created by the policy interventions of the new conservative governments; for, as the apparatus and policies of the postwar liberal state were eliminated through a combination of fiscal crises and ideological redefinitions of what was economically and politically “realistic” or “appropriate,” public insti-

tutions (including the arts and education) became ripe for elimination, restructuring, or privatization, in all cases rendered more vulnerable to direct corporate influence in the face of shrinking state support. So too, as Gordon has argued (citing Jon Cruz), corporations themselves had to confront their own “social deregulation”<sup>19</sup>: for, downsized and dispersed in the leaner transnational context, they too required an ethos and culture that suited organizations hoping to move into the twenty-first century unchallenged by competing systems.

Certainly, by the early 1990s, the range of alternatives had been significantly reduced. With the breakup of “actually existing” socialist states, the pressure to at least consider values and behavior not based in a market model was all but eliminated. For, deformed and brutal as those alternatives might have been, their existence at least challenged local and national liberal politics to retain a commitment to some effort at an equitable and democratic distribution of wealth, power, and quality of life. However, in the so-called post-communist era, that pressure is gone, and neoliberal and neoconservative narratives now play out with little reference to any form of collective responsibility for dimensions of human needs and desires or ecological vitality not charted on the map of profitability.<sup>20</sup> Despite recent theoretical caveats against essentialism, teleology, and privileged agents, the one “truth” that has survived in the era of global capitalism is the ideology and logic of the market. Yet, to ensure that that “truth” continues to infuse the construction of the new order, cultural formations and practices as the leading producers of that new commonsense need to function effectively—in businesses, in universities, and indeed throughout the entire “corporate-driven society.”<sup>21</sup> By severing the cultural sphere from the state, and reducing it to the level of commodification in everyday life, what the corporate order has done is to reinscribe culture directly within the economy.

Within companies themselves, the insights of corporate cultural studies now play a significant role in interventions which address the motivation and communication challenges encountered in organizational restructuring. Through the procedures of what I would term “cultural taylorism,” required changes in firms can be achieved in ways that are not rigidly and hierarchically imposed but rather implemented in an efficient manner framed in the rhetoric of the market and contextualized in an ambience of shared vision, teamwork, and multicultural sensitivity. Thus, at the Banff Centre and elsewhere, consultants can manage alterations in the workplace culture that meet the needs of those in charge, but not those of the employees or the larger population. The result is a disciplinary process in which everyday practices (including those long used by workers to get along with each other and to survive the job) are studied, abstracted, and repackaged as “soft” techniques (such as personal development, diversity

management, or quality work groups) designed to displace the skills of criticism and to produce appropriate, agreeable behavior based on the ideological construction of a common direction and interpersonal cooperation that carries the assumption that the interests of each employee are homologous with the interests of the firm.<sup>22</sup> However, while the goal of all these efforts is the production of a new corporate subject and system, it appears that much more interactive participation in this process is invited at executive and managerial levels, while more passive reception is still expected from rank and file workers. That is, while leadership training for CEOs involves stimulating case study seminars and “experiential learning” of leadership techniques in role-playing sessions or in mountain-climbing expeditions, the reorientation of wage workers—to accept new work times and rates, to handle new team work methods, to assume new cultural complexities, or to embrace antiunion values—is often presented in one-dimensional forms (such as posted communiqués or inspirational videos) that diminish the possibilities of such messages being deflected or sabotaged by their receivers. To cite but one instance of the latter: every three months in 1990 and 1991, the Canadian McDonnell-Douglas Corporation sent out a five-minute video tape to 17,000 employee households as a motivational effort to create a competitive “team spirit” among its assembly workers. Such a project seems to be little more than an updated exercise of the Fordist technique of sending social workers into employee homes to stimulate consumerist behavior, achieved now by the contemporary vehicle of video which delivers instead the virtual CEO of the company to each home.<sup>23</sup>

In the university, a complementary cultural logic is experienced each day—often without question, much less resistance.<sup>24</sup> Certainly academia plays a leading role in generating the cultural theory enlisted in restructuring, and here it would be useful for those of us who are involved in cultural studies programs to have a clearer understanding of the role of these newly funded programs in this relationship. At another level, however, we also need to have a keener sense of the ways that the organizational tactics themselves are being turned back on the university in a parallel restructuring project that impacts campuses. This internal restructuring, of course, is conducted with the help of governmental pressures (by way of budget reductions and legislation favoring privatization) and corporate involvement (through the impact of market ideologies, disciplinary methods, and the shift to private funding). Indeed, as reports from around the country indicate (and as seen in the collective anxiety of the large number of jobless members of the literary and language professions at the 1994 Modern Language Association meeting), the contemporary university system, in the U.S. at least, seems to be on its way to being radically altered in ways that threaten to reduce public access to advanced educa-

tion. That is, the university system is shifting toward becoming a training ground for a diminished number of technical workers (especially served by two-year colleges) and an even smaller number of managerial workers (in a severely downsized university system, one that might well move to cost-efficient three year degrees, subcontracted faculty workers, and other programmatic mechanisms of the era of flexible production). In this new educational context that promises to be firmly in place by the next century, corporate appropriation often begins with the assumption that university research, courses, and workshops should be immediately, and probably solely, usable for the new economic order. Indeed, the rise of cultural studies programs in the last several years has come at a fruitful moment for this project of theory transfer, for they can provide a dynamic body of work that can be rendered useful for the current connection of the economic and the cultural. To the extent that such programs proceed with an understanding of this dynamic, and work against and alongside it as well as with its funding initiatives, this could be an important critical relationship. However, to the extent that cultural studies becomes a name for corporate cultural studies (and draws off support that could otherwise be available for African American, ecological, gay/lesbian/bisexual, labor, Latino, Native American, women's studies or other engaged programs), the research and teaching a lot of people are doing could well end up serving ends completely opposed to their projects.

More direct appropriation of artistic and scholarly work proceeds as well through the legal avenues of copyrighting or patenting the "intellectual property" generated in the university, a pattern most evident in the genetics industry, but now seen in the virtual reality arts world.<sup>25</sup> Yet another form takes place by way of the expectation that programs funded by corporate sources must be made instantly available to corporate visitors. In an essay in progress, entitled "Demo-Aesthetics," Lorne Falk explores this procedure by which artistic production in high-tech areas such as virtual reality is being displaced by distracting demonstrations of the results of such work to boards of visitors, CEOs, and others from the home offices who show up for a quick bite of information to take back to headquarters.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, as Canadian artist and critic Oliver Kellhammer has observed, the process of privatizing intellectual property has generally been made much easier because of the increasing capacity for digitalization to provide clean, uncomplicated information. Now that linguistic and visual information can be broken into isolatable and therefore more readily exploitable units—as already done with the mapping of the genetic system—knowledge is more readily quantifiable and manipulatable in pieces which can be separated, packaged, and sold, and used as discrete items.<sup>27</sup>

Along with these dynamics, the influence of direct corporate contributions in light of declining public resources adds yet another layer to the makeover of the university according to the image and needs of the corporation. Increasingly, programs and projects are expected to raise outside funding and to be cost-effective to the point where they must pay their way or die. In such a climate, corporate funds are often welcomed as a panacea for shrunken budgets. All too often, however, the path of least resistance among overworked academics leads to the generation of programs that meet private economic interests; and, as a related development, the ability and willingness to build projects critical of the corporate order, or even projects not directly related to it, steadily weakens.

The domination of corporate sensibilities in the university has therefore threatened long-standing institutional practices (job-related or not) such as full-time employment at a livable wage, faculty governance, tenure, nonsupported and open research, and open admissions to all citizens ready for third-level studies. As a result, the guarantee of postsecondary education is in danger of being eliminated. In this atmosphere, new quantitative demands—such as productivity pressures based on increased class size and course loads, extended contract periods, the demand that all research be externally sponsored, and even the use of e-mail to conference with students with no increase in credit hours—become forms of speed-up furthered by the ideological vehicle of qualitative demands for sacrifice in the face of budget cuts and for a united front against external forces that seek to destroy the university—even as the allied internal versions of those forces are already reshaping the everyday lives of students, staff, and faculty. As in corporate settings, flexibility and innovation become keywords for effective service of the new order, and little else. As seen at Banff, even “collegiality” (that particular virtue in universities with their traditions of academic freedom and faculty governance) becomes recast as the quite uncollegial disciplinary expectation of a conflict-free cooperation with the new agenda.

---

### 3

By way of a conclusion, I share these observations on the impact of market ideology—not to encourage people to take refuge in some radicalized enclave staving off corporate demons, nor in some nostalgic effort to reverse the clear-cutting of the groves of academe that has led to the flexible facilities of the university of the twenty-first century—but rather to engage critically on this new ground. In this light, I suggest that those of us (in all our diversity) who are involved in working for a just and demo-

---

The domination  
of corporate  
sensibilities in the  
university has  
threatened  
long-standing  
institutional  
practices.  
As a result,  
the guarantee of  
postsecondary  
education is in  
danger of being  
eliminated.

---

cratic world need to become more familiar with the present ideological and structural matrix; to learn what is going on and what is at stake in the corporate reconfiguration of our own organizations, of state bodies, of schools and other institutions, and of the entire realm of the social; and to begin to develop alternatives that are not reducible to the monoculture of the market utopia that arrogantly offers itself as the only way to understand reality.

Indeed, the changes described in this essay are not usefully regarded as simply “good” or “bad” but rather as part of the parameters of a new conjuncture in which contrary efforts to secure wealth and decency for everyone might still be pursued. In open, neglected, or vulnerable spaces of this system, efforts at new program development—such as cultural studies but others as well—can be made that are not necessarily aligned with corporate agendas, even as they might be funded by institutions with such goals in mind. As always in capital’s constant need to grow, every effort is made to seek out and enlist new, creative work, but the challenge for those seeking possibilities other than those valorized by the market economy is to draw on the energy of such developments but not to collapse into the logic and the discipline that creates such spaces in the first place. Working on this very contested terrain to critique the new order and to generate other ways of living is, therefore, a continuing goal of people who are committed to communal justice and freedom rather than to principles of market forces, profitability, and accumulation of wealth. As Chris Newfield and others have already suggested, such work should continue inside established institutions, but to be effective it needs to be coordinated with other projects to build a strong and organized spectrum of opposition. While I would be willing to agree with those, such as Tony Bennett, who argue that “the field of culture has to be thought of as constitutively governmental” and that critical work in cultural studies needs to concern itself with the policies and practices by which government operates as a producer and channeler of knowledge, I would argue that such interventions also require engagement with economic apparatuses and practices.<sup>28</sup> Otherwise, they could all too easily fall into the limited horizon of functionalist reforms that would simply, without any trade-offs, contribute to the increased efficiency of the present global system. However, I am also aware of the limitation (the banality, as Meaghan Morris puts it) of critical work that limits itself to tracking and supporting moments of resistance in the cultural sphere; I would hope that all projects (including the ones in which Bennett is engaged) that attend to the imbrication of culture and policy would, on the one hand, combine a focus on the state with a contestation at the level of the global economy and, on the other hand, work closely with grassroots labor and other movements.

Finally, to move back into the context of the university, I want to recall that it is the student who is situated in the center of this historic educational vortex: that prime subject of the university who is in the process of being reinterpellated from a learner to a consumer and worker, from a knowledgeable and active citizen to a flexible, transnational subject able to work anywhere, any way, and to keep happily occupied while unemployed in the mean time.

## Notes

I am grateful to Denise Albanese, Avery Gordon, and Chris Newfield for the conversations that catalyzed this project. I want also to thank the arts residents at the Banff Centre in summer 1994 (Áine O'Brien, Alberto Gomez, Oliver Kellhammer, Catalina Parra, and Dot Tuer) who comprised our study group on economic restructuring and its impact on artistic and intellectual institutions. The section on the Banff Centre is the collective product of this group. I am grateful to George Mason University for the support that enabled me to complete this essay, and I am thankful to the Banff Centre for the summer residency (with its generous staff and fine facilities) during which I worked on this essay among others. I want especially to thank Lorne Falk (the former director of the Arts Studio Program who organized the thematic residency programs for the past five years) for his comments. I also benefited from the earlier assessment of the Banff Centre by Hans Haacke: "The Key to an Integrated Lifestyle at the Top," Slide and Sound Installation [with catalog copy by the artist], Walter Phillips Gallery, the Banff Centre for the Arts, Banff, Alberta, Canada, 19–29 November 1981.

1. Michael D. Lemonick, "How Man Began," *Time*, 14 March 1994, 83.

2. Richard E. Wagner, "The University and the Market for Higher Education," *George Mason College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Newsletter* no. 11 (1994), 3, 4, 5. I am grateful to Denise Albanese for bringing this to my attention.

3. *Ibid.*, 2, 5. These pressures can also be found in legislative efforts. For example, recent proposals in the Virginia legislature have aimed to realign fees in market terms: H.B. 520 set tuition by the market value of the major, and H.B. 519 based tuition on the "credentials of the instructional personnel" (Jack Censer, faculty memorandum, 18 April 1994). A fuller exploration of these pressures would reveal a conflict between a neoconservatism, as expressed in the above bills and more so in campaigns for censorship and other efforts to shut down secular education, and a business-based neoliberalism which has defended university funding, albeit in order to save the university for service to the business community.

4. Information on the Banff Centre came from the history written by its former president (see David Leighton, *Artists, Builders and Dreamers* [Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982]) and from a Banff planning document (*A Place for Artists: The Banff Centre for the Arts Planning in the 1990s* [Banff: Banff Centre for Continuing Education, 1994]). Other details came from conversations with arts residents, staff, and administrators, and from Toronto art critic, Dot Tuer.

5. Leighton, *Artists*, 154.

6. Corporate loyalties, however, were already present. While heading the

Ontario College of Art, Paul Fleck, recent Centre president, “attempted to put down a strike by models and other college staff by bringing in outside personnel.” See Oliver Kellhammer, “Strategic Maneuvers: Corporate Money Laundering through the Arts,” *Fuse*, August 1989, 18.

7. Francois Dumaine, “Is the New Economy Allergic to Fairness?” *Globe and Mail*, 11 August 1944, A17.

8. Ibid.

9. As Lorne Falk described it, over a five-year period there were twelve residencies involving over 240 artists from a range of cultural backgrounds. Titles of the residencies included “Living at the End of Nation States,” “The Subject as Agent,” “Race and the Body Politic,” “Rhetoric, Utopia, Technology,” “The Bioapparatus,” “Mass Culture and Art,” and “Border Culture.”

10. I do not want to imply that those who survived the cuts and are trying to make the Centre work in spite of the restructuring have been coopted or are acting in bad faith. I do suggest that cooperation with the arts staff by those outside the Banff Centre can play a role in helping to retain, or regain, space devoted to the arts without corporate control. It is not the time to abandon Banff Centre to the new order of things, but rather to help those who are there find ways to work through and against it.

11. “Focus On Learning,” Banff Centre for Management Program Schedule (Banff: Banff Centre for Continuing Education, 1994). See also the brochure, “A Special Place: The Banff Centre” (Banff: Banff Centre for Continuing Education, n.d.).

12. For an example of this silencing discipline, see Kellhammer’s report of Haacke’s exhibit in Canada’s National Gallery in which his *Voici Alcon*, a critique of the Alcon Aluminum Corporation’s involvement in South Africa, was attacked by the corporation and by *Globe and Mail* art critic, J. B. Mays, who called the work “undocumented gossip” and “tittle-tattle” (quoted in Kellhammer 17). In this membrane of market rhetoric, critical words cannot be heard, or if heard cannot be taken seriously by the hegemonic order.

13. For more on this history, and the contradictions and failures of the policy as it privileged an approved official art over more marginal, political, or community-based art, in spite of its social claims, see Dot Tuer, “The Art of Nation Building: Constructing a ‘Cultural Identity’ for Post-War Canada,” *Parallélogramme* 17, no. 4 (1992): 24–36.

14. I am grateful to Banff Centre resident, video artist Peter D’Agostino, for his discussions of this situation with me.

15. John Frow and Meaghan Morris, “Introduction,” *Australian Cultural Studies: A Reader* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1993), vii. For background to my discussion of the distinctions and connections among the spheres of the economic, the political, and the cultural, see Nancy Fraser, “Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy,” *The Phantom Public Sphere*, ed. Bruce Robbins (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993), 109–142. My sense of the need for critical work responsive to these changes is echoed in the discussion of the interconnections of the economic and the cultural in Paul Smith’s interview with Rick Wolff. See “Interview with Richard D. Wolff,” *Mediations* 18, no.1 (1994), 5–18.

16. See Avery Gordon, “On Corporate Culture,” *Alphabet City* 3 (1993), 41–45.

17. See Lawrence Grossberg, *We Gotta Get Out of This Place: Popular Con-*

*servatism and Postmodern Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1992). See also Ruth Levitas, ed., *The Ideology of the New Right* (Cambridge, Mass.: Polity, 1986).

18. Radhika Desai, "Second-Hand Dealers in Ideas: Think-Tanks and Thatcherite Hegemony," *New Left Review* 203 (1994): 31.

19. Gordon, 41.

20. I am grateful to Dot Tuer for sharing her assessment of this changing attitude among liberals and neoliberals.

21. Gordon, 41.

22. How these techniques combine with practices such as the computerization of work habits or the institutionalization of health programs, from drug and alcohol rehabilitation to physical fitness facilities, would also be worth tracing.

23. See Carole Condé and Karl Beveridge, "In the Corporate Shadows: Community Arts Practice and Technology," *Leonardo* 26, no. 5 (1993), 451–57. The motivational campaign was short-lived, for in 1993 the company moved to Taiwan. What was done with the videos inside the homes—how they might have been refunctioned as bookends, props for table legs, or sources of blank tapes—was not recorded. I am grateful to Dot Tuer for introducing me to Condé and Beveridge's work.

24. Lorne Falk directed me to Miyoshi's apt commentary on the complicity of academics, including those in cultural studies, with the development and legitimation of the global culture of transnational corporate hegemony:

Finally, academia, the institution that might play the principal role in investigating transnational corporatism and its implications for humanity, seems all too ready to cooperate rather than deliberate. . . . Once again, we are sanitizing our academic discourse on the ongoing political conditions—this time around TNCs and their eager host governments. . . . In the recent rise in cultural studies and multiculturalism among cultural traders and academic administrators, inquiry stops as soon as it begins. What we need is a rigorous political and economic scrutiny rather than a gesture of pedagogic expediency. . . . To the extent that cultural studies and multiculturalism provide students and scholars with an alibi for their complicity in the TNC version of neocolonialism, they are serving, once again, just as one more device to conceal liberal self-deception. (749)

See Masao Miyoshi, "A Borderless World? From Colonialism to Transnationalism and the Decline of the Nation-State," *Critical Inquiry* 19 (1993): 748–51.

25. For more on the corporate incursions in the science and technology sectors of academia, see Lawrence C. Soley, *Leasing the Ivory Tower: The Corporate Takeover of America* (Boston: South End, 1996).

26. Lorne Falk, "Demo-Aesthetics," unpublished ms., 1994.

27. In conversation at the Banff Centre, 20 July 1994.

28. Tony Bennett, "Putting Policy into Cultural Studies," *Cultural Studies*, eds. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson, and Paula Treichler (New York: Routledge, 1992), 32.