

Scientia Canadensis

Canadian Journal of the History of Science, Technology and Medicine
Revue canadienne d'histoire des sciences, des techniques et de la médecine

Scientia
Canadensis

The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture. Edited by Adrienne S. Chan and Donald Fisher. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008. xii + 228 p., notes, index. ISBN 978-0-7748-1569-7 85\$ hc. 978-0-7748-1570-3 34.95\$ pb.)

George Fallis

Volume 33, numéro 2, 2010

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1006154ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/1006154ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

CSTHA/AHSTC

ISSN

0829-2507 (imprimé)

1918-7750 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer ce compte rendu

Fallis, G. (2010). Compte rendu de [*The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture*. Edited by Adrienne S. Chan and Donald Fisher. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008. xii + 228 p., notes, index. ISBN 978-0-7748-1569-7 85\$ hc. 978-0-7748-1570-3 34.95\$ pb.)]. *Scientia Canadensis*, 33(2), 123–127. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1006154ar>

préoccupations pour les autres inégalités sociales fondées sur la classe, l'orientation sexuelle et la race ainsi que pour l'articulation des divers systèmes d'oppression. Les principales intéressées reconnaissent néanmoins, et par surcroît humblement, le caractère embryonnaire de leurs travaux de l'époque sur ce qui prend aujourd'hui le nom d'intersectionnalité. Il est toutefois étonnant que les différents récits, qui font tous ressortir l'expérience individuelle des contraintes liées à la maternité, ne proposent pas de réflexions sur le problème de la non-reconnaissance des temporalités domestiques et de la reproduction humaine dans les modes actuels de promotion universitaire. Peut-être est-ce dû au format biographique qui incite moins à la réflexion sociologique ou encore au fait que toutes ces femmes représentent finalement la minorité qui, au final, a obtenu le plus de reconnaissance de la part de l'institution parmi toutes celles qui ont fait des études supérieures sans obtenir nécessairement de postes universitaires.

Malgré une justification tout à fait valable et convaincante, la périodisation choisie provoque une certaine insatisfaction. L'étude d'une période assez restreinte (1965-1975) de l'histoire de la mise en place de la pensée et des structures de recherches et d'enseignements féministes fait voir un portrait un peu trop circonscrit de cette histoire encore tout à fait méconnue. Le lecteur ou la lectrice néophyte ne peut pas saisir quels sont les liens entre les premières initiatives étudiées dans ce livre et les nombreuses structures mises en place dans les années 1970 et 1980, et toujours actives, comme *Canadian Woman Studies/Les cahiers de la femme*, *Recherches féministes*, la Chaire d'études Claire-Bonenfant sur la condition des femmes à l'Université Laval ou encore l'Institut Simone-de-Beauvoir à l'Université Concordia. Espérons donc une autre publication qui fasse le pont avec la période plus récente, sachant à quel point est encore actuel le paradoxe des intellectuelles qui font ressurgir la parole et l'expérience des femmes mais qui peinent à transmettre leur propre mémoire, à faire leur propre histoire et construire leur légitimité historique.

HÉLÈNE CHARRON
Université Laval

***The Exchange University: Corporatization of Academic Culture.* Edited by Adrienne S. Chan and Donald Fisher. (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008. xii + 228 p., notes, index. ISBN 978-0-7748-1569-7 85\$ hc. 978-0-7748-1570-3 34.95\$ pb.).**

This volume was assembled after a 2003 symposium at the annual meeting of the Congress of Humanities and Social Sciences/Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences. The symposium

generated animated discussion and attracted widespread interest. The participants revised their presentations into nine papers for the volume; the editors, Chan and Fisher, provided an Introduction and Conclusion. Clearly, something is happening at the university in Canada that its professors find deeply troubling.

Chan and Fisher, begin the Introduction: “Historically, higher education in Canada has been a public enterprise.” They go on: “universities have been encouraged to become centers for capital accumulation through commercialization of research, an increase in technology transfer and the production of intellectual property, and a weakening of the boundary between the academy and industry. The relationships between the academy and industry now constitute a new academic culture for universities.” (p.1) If one had to summarize, however crudely, the worry that runs throughout this volume, it would be: the university was once unambiguously a public enterprise but has become corporatized.

The summary picture presented of the state of Canadian universities and the identification of the principal forces shaping universities—major shifts in government policy toward universities, especially research policy, and a mix of neo-liberalism, globalization, the new knowledge-based economy, and market fundamentalism—are familiar in the literature of higher education. Other authors have written of the commercialization or privatization of universities; some have written of the emergence of the entrepreneurial university, or the enterprise university. This volume calls it the ‘exchange university’ and seeks to analyze the ‘corporatization of academic culture.’

This transformation of academic culture is rooted in the transformation of how governments view scientific, technological, and medical research at universities. In the new knowledge economy, future economic prosperity will depend upon research and innovation in science, technology, and medicine. Governments have significantly increased money available for research in these areas and have emphasized the commercialization of the results. The humanities, fine arts, social sciences, and many professional fields, because their graduates and their research offer less obvious economic benefits, receive (relatively) less support.

The theoretical orientation of the volume draws heavily upon earlier work by Sheila Slaughter and Larry L. Leslie (1997) *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press) and by Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades (2004) *Academic Capitalism and the New Economy: Markets, State, and Higher Education* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press). The first paper in this volume, by Slaughter and Rhoades, extends the theoretical framework, arguing that an ‘academic

capitalist knowledge/learning regime' is ascendant. They focus upon the borders between universities, market and state; and upon interstitial organizations that shape knowledge circuits in the new economy. These interstitial organizations are especially prominent in the fields of science, technology, and medicine.

Within this theoretical framework, the other papers offer: a case study of the changing academic culture at the University of Ottawa; an analysis of the training and socialization of graduate students; an examination of Ontario's postwar higher education policies; a study on the place of contingent faculty in the exchange university; an essay about how resistance to the trends can be constructed around a defense of academic autonomy, an autonomy strongly rooted in the idea of serving the public interest; an analysis of reconfigured elements of gender relations in higher education, with a focus on women teacher educators; a case study of the academic culture of the University of British Columbia Law School; and an appeal to sustaining a 'knowledge commons' against enclosure in the new economy.

The quality of the papers is uniformly high; and their analyses more nuanced than much writing on the subject. Nonetheless, one is left with the feeling that much has been missed in this analysis of the Canadian university; and for all the nuance of the analysis, the picture is a monochrome. Most troubling for readers of this journal, the analysis, although apparently of a great transformation, is a-historical. This volume is part of the long tradition of books about universities, lamenting an imagined lost golden age and viewing the future with alarm.

The exchange university of today is contrasted with the public enterprise of yesterday. But the public enterprise is never really examined. This is despite the fact that the one historical paper, by Paul Axelrod, of Ontario government policy, states that over the entire postwar period "universities were perceived, both by the individual and by society as a whole, as a critical element in the process of generating and accumulating wealth, and for this reason they were generously supported." (p.90) And the American land grant universities, so influential in the development of Canadian universities, were most emphatically intended to prepare their graduates for jobs and to conduct research that would be useful in the economy. Indeed, it is puzzling to consider that a university—preparing graduates for jobs and conducting research of economic use—is somehow not a public enterprise.

Most certainly government support for research in science, technology, and medicine has increased faster than in other areas; and the government wants to see economic benefits from the research. But government support for the Social Sciences and Humanities (SSHRC) areas has also

increased. The case study of the University of Ottawa showed their SSHRC revenues went up by more than a factor of three from 1986 to 2003; their funds from the National Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) did not even double over the same period. And new SSHRC programs, especially the Multiple Collaborative Research Initiatives (MCRIs) and the Community University Research Alliances (CURAs), have a strong effect on the university and how it interacts with the world. But this cannot be understood through the frame of ‘a weakening of the boundary between the university and industry.’ Indeed, the university has many, probably more connections, beyond its walls with non-university organizations than with industry. Yet, the volume asserts that it is the university-industry connection which is determining the academic culture.

Certainly there are many pressures that have “the potential for the government to influence university research priorities.”(p.2) But we cannot simply assert that priorities and actual research has shifted; we must investigate directly. And ironically, the one case study of an actual research culture within the university, Theresa Shanahan’s paper on the UBC Law School, finds little of the exchange university and instead an engagement with CURAs and MCRIs and a flourishing of theoretical and critical scholarship. My conjecture would be that if such case studies were conducted through many departments, especially in the humanities, social sciences and professions, most research cultures would look rather like the Law School’s: theoretical and critical scholarship is flourishing. And if we were to take an historical look, we would find that research at universities 25 years ago would be more whig and less critical than today.

I continue to believe that Clark Kerr’s conception of the modern research university as a ‘multiversity’—an institutional with many often-conflicting purposes and constituencies—is more illuminating than the monochrome that dominates this volume and so much of the literature. (See George Fallis, *Multiversities, Ideas, and Democracy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007.) Today’s Canadian universities are centres of critical scholarship, with deep engagement with the non-profit and public sectors, and with strong commitments to liberal learning and knowledge for its own sake. To be sure, to these have been added commitments to applied research and technology transfer, but universities remain complex bundles of these different missions.

Has the university ceased to be a public enterprise? Has our academic culture become corporatized? These are important questions; but the unambiguous ‘yes’ answer of this volume is unpersuasive. The theoretical paper by Slaughter and Rhoades actually points toward a more complex analysis. They write: “we conceptualize how higher education as an

institution embodies the changing social understanding of what is ‘public’.” (p.19) “Academic capitalism does not involve ‘privatization’; rather it entails a redefinition of public space and of appropriate activity in that space.” (p.20) Perhaps, the next volume can explore in this direction.

GEORGE FALLIS
York University

***Science on the Air: Popularizers and Personalities on Radio and Early Television.* By Marcel Chotkowski LaFollette.** (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008. 314 p., ill. ISBN-9780226467597).

There seems to be a move afoot in the history of science. A move away from laboratories and field stations to focus not on the *generation* of scientific knowledge, but on its spread into the wider consciousness. Many scholars have focused on the role of printed materials—textbooks, popular science books for children or science articles in periodicals—particularly in the 19th century. But any attempt to look at scientific communication in the 20th century has to come to grips with the advent of radio and television: two media so often marked by their ephemeral nature. How do you relate the importance of a medium that leaves so little trace?

This is the challenge Marcel Chotkowski LaFollette takes on in her immensely-readable *Science on the Air*. In her earlier book, *Making Science Our Own*, LaFollette looked at the rise of the Scripps Science Service—a noble (if ultimately futile) attempt to use scientifically-trained communicators to deliver quality science news to newspapers.

In this book, LaFollette takes a similar look at the early days of radio and television, when a band of idealistic communicators believed the new media could be more than mere entertainment.

The early days of radio seem to have been a glorious time for scientists as the first generation of radio stations—desperate to fill air time—found lectures and scientific discussions an effective (and cheap) way to fit the bill. Chotkowski focuses on early attempts by institutions like the Smithsonian Institution or the Harvard Observatory to use the new medium. The rapid rise of radio stations in the early 1920s created countless opportunities for scientists to take to the airwaves. But over time, as more attention began to be paid to audience size, and as radio stations began (later in the 1920s) to come together into larger, more powerful networks, scientists found it much harder to get airtime to deliver an unmediated message to a mass audience. Within the span of