# Introduction

The reforming of universities, which has preoccupied most European countries in recent decades, marks their gradual transformation into service institutions. The effort to create an integrated European higher education area (EHEA), which was the main goal behind the Bologna Process[1] and the Lisbon Strategy, initiated in 2000, has induced large-scale structural changes on the national level in many countries. The introduction of standards for quality assurance and accreditation, credit transfers and certification, degree systems, a three-cycle structure, etc., has been justified as necessary means for ensuring efficient interaction, and for creating a larger competitive region of higher education and research. Because the reforms are regarded as merely instrumental, that is, as means to secure economic progress and increased opportunities for all, the changes have mostly been regarded as necessary adjustments and appropriations to changing external demands. The wave of reforms, beginning in Europe in the late 1990s, have later spread and are now widely referred to as GEM, a global educational movement. Despite some notable criticism and opposition to the way international agreements constrain national policies and limit the academic autonomy of universities, such discontent has largely been overruled with references to large-scale challenges and socioeconomic changes beyond the control of any national jurisdiction.

This book is an attempt to question and problematize the ways the last decades' reforms for a radical transformation of the university have attained legitimacy. It is an attempt, paradoxically perhaps, to answer some questions that have not yet been posed: What is it that makes the political quest for reform so meaningful and the arguments so credible and convincing? Why are the current changes met with so few objections and counteractions? What is it that makes the rhetoric of "service" and "marketability" so persuasive? What is it that enables some views, assessments, and opinions to be taken as intelligible and significant, while others are deemed insignificant or inapt? In short, from where does the power to reform derive its basis, justification, and rules?

## The Discourse on the Knowledge Society

The wave of reforms has for the most part been articulated and made meaningful within a translocal discourse dealing with the role and relation of universities to large-scale economic and social changes in the Western world. The need for universities to adapt to new demands, for instance, is proclaimed as important to ensure their future survival in competition with other producers in the emerging "knowledge society." Hence, universities are understood within a discourse that re-presents them as enterprising, autonomous service actors in a globalized labor and education market. This representation has allowed a managerial mode of speech to become commonplace and convincing when problems are identified and analyzed and has made concepts such as "excellence" commonplace, if not mandatory, for evaluating academic performance. It is within this discursive reality that universities currently evaluate their own practices, often with the aid of professional higher education experts certified to make authoritative judgment on the university's internal and external activities. The political demand for a transformation of the university into a more flexible, service organization is often justified by reference to large-scale socioeconomic changes stemming from globalization: the emergence of a postindustrial economy, the spread of ICT (information and communication technologies), and the development of a global multiculture. These and similar references are based on assessments that are embraced and articulated by policymakers and reinforced by most academics within the field. I will briefly list some of the most common ingredients of these assessments of our current state.

The "knowledge economy" is one of the key slogans used to describe the emergence of a postindustrial society, or rather, the transformation from predominantly industrial mass production based on lower-skilled manual labor and linear careers to a more knowledge-intensive service production that demands flexible specialization and a mobile workforce. The transformation is portrayed as a major shift in the organization of work, like that of the Industrial Revolution; it has generated new understandings of the concept of work and new patterns of organizational structure. Due to the new economic conditions,[2] businesses and organizations, such as universities, are more exposed to risk and uncertainty—global competition, market flux, rapid technological change—and thus are more vulnerable to external forces. The imperative claim is that universities, in order to survive, must adapt to the changes and re-engineer their functions from a

traditional, bureaucratic mode of production to a more flexible mode of production. The transformation of the university into a flexible, consumer-oriented service institution is thus justified by reference to new demands for technical and social innovations and highly skilled labor[3] in the emerging global market for research goods and educational services.

The claim that universities need to re-engineer their function is supported by references to increased internationalization due to the worldwide diffusion of digital technologies. The widespread adoption of information and communication technologies (ICT) is credited with enabling more knowledge producers to compete on an equal footing, thus providing universities with new challenges and new opportunities. Since more knowledge producers have the option of offering their services in teaching and research over the Internet, through e-learning and by virtual "campus-free" educational programs, there is a call for the universities to readjust their activities in order to take part in the new technological arenas. Furthermore, the digital, smart technologies are presented as creating new opportunities for universities to increase the prosperity of their home countries by providing scholars with infrastructure and open access to international research networks and thus gateways to valuable know-how.

Concomitant with references to technological advances, claims are made about the emergence of a multicultural global world that challenges universities to contribute in fostering mutual understanding on a larger scale. The assumption is that widespread distribution of knowledge through the Internet and "borderless" communication will bring people around the world closer together. The frequent reference to a "global village" alludes to the multitude of cultural expressions made possible by the Internet and the new wireless social media. Furthermore, it is argued that a better adjusted service university will be able to contribute to the advancement of democracy; it will be an important generator of a democratic culture by empowering more actors and thereby ensuring freedom of expression. It is assumed that a university committed to serving the common good will be an important contributor to a more integrated world community by guaranteeing the universal (human) right to education, and by participating in joint efforts to secure and sustain world peace and friendship among nations. By providing know-how, the university can become more involved in dealing with common global issues and challenges such as outbreaks of pandemic diseases, famine, climate change, international terrorism, etc.

*The Service University*

The discourse on the knowledge society/knowledge economy, which currently sets the terms for how we are to approach and evaluate the university, draws together a variety of elements from other discourses that are assembled to provide a logical, coherent order. References to the knowledge economy, network society, and globalization are key ingredients that are linked together to shape a common frame of reference, rationality or logic within which the service university is currently articulated and brought into existence as something meaningful and legitimate. Together they create a taken-for-granted reality that guides and governs the activities of governments and sets the terms for debates on education. Meanwhile, the term 'service university' carries no specific reference in itself but acquires rich conceptual meaning in relation to the key discursive elements mentioned above. When "the university" is articulated in relation to the discourse on the knowledge economy, it signifies a university adjusted to the flexible mode of production of the new profit-oriented knowledge industry. When "the university" is articulated in relation to the network society, it denotes a technically advanced university capable of providing service to a large number of people. And when "the university" is linked to discourses on globalization, it signifies either a university allowing the expression of cultural diversity or a university committed to serving the global good, such as becoming a provider of the universal (human) right to education and a committed partner in the battle against global hazards and crises. Thus, the key elements mentioned above confer on the discourse a legitimacy that enables some statements, questions, concerns, proposals, plans, and so forth, to be taken as intelligible, relevant, or significant, while others are rendered invalid, inappropriate, or illegitimate. To question the new discursive order and the parameters of action defined as appropriate is concomitant with questioning the reality that infuses "what is said" with meaning. This is what makes the new discursive order so difficult to address critically.

## Goals and Purposes

Much has been written about the fate and future prospects of the university. This book will not address the emerging service university from the vantage point of the socioeconomic changes depicted above. The aim is not to address the changes articulated in the reforms as necessary adaptations to an international market for knowledge exchange.

Neither will the service university be analyzed as an outcome of ideological trends, such as New Public Management/Governance, nor as a consequence of a new alignment between higher education and the economy or the marketplace.[4] The service university is approached not as a natural response to globalization, nor as a consequence of technological advances, nor as a response to the profusion of needs and demands in a multicultural global world. Instead, an attempt is made to contextualize the facts about our present condition so that these facts may be perceived as having a different significance. This is done by approaching the service university from another perspective, addressing its historical conditions of possibility.

This book, in other words, is an attempt to identify the historical conditions that provide the service university with meaning and legitimacy. It is an attempt to locate some of the historical contingencies and transformations that have made it possible for the service university to appear as an object of discourse. This means that an attempt is made to carefully trace the historical origin of the different, yet intertwined layers of meaning that have enabled the present managerial objects, concepts, and modes of speech to appear, yet whose origins are forgotten, considered irrelevant, or are simply hidden from view. Thus, the aim is not to revise or reject other interpretations and explanations, but rather to introduce an alternative interpretation that treats the service university as a privileged sign within a historically and politically constructed discourse that strives for hegemony. The book examines whether the conditions that imbue the service university with meaning have been formed by specific historical events and experiences, which appear to have no immediate relation to the present situation and contemporary circumstances.

### *The Exclusion of the Humboldt University*

One of the conditions for the emergence of the service university seems to be the exclusion and dislocation of the old university, particularly the classical, continental university in the legacy of Wilhelm von Humboldt: the modern Enlightenment university. Although familiar concepts like "university," "academic freedom," "science," "culture," and more are important ingredients in the present discourse, these concepts are now embedded in a different order that imbues them with new meaning. When universities are referred to as "producers," and scholarship as a "mode of production," then the norms, practices and institutional arrangements that provided the modern

Enlightenment-university with identity and meaning are excluded and subsequently silenced. When academic freedom is understood as "rights to educational opportunities and intellectual property," other conceptions of academic freedom, such as "a public space bereft of political, economic and ecclesiastic concerns," are lost from view. The way knowledge is referred to as a "product" rules out the possibility of scientific knowledge (*Wissenschaft*) being understood as something indeterminate, something that continuously needs to be searched for. And when the university is requested to educate "knowledge-workers" and to ensure "employability," it becomes difficult, if not impossible, to address the question of education and individuation (*Bildung*). The condition that provides the service university with identity and meaning seems, therefore, to be the same condition that excludes the "Humboldtian university" and deprives it of meaning.

The way old concepts are re-interpreted and infused with new meaning, old practices superimposed with new significance, familiar ideals are paraphrased (e.g., *academic freedom* is exchanged for *rights of individual agents*), and new words are introduced that cause a metonymic slide of meaning, suggests the existence of antagonistic forces in the process of infusing the new service university with identity and meaning. Given the fact that concepts such as *service* and *knowledge society* are not new,[5] but were introduced much earlier and in other discursive settings, suggests that the conditions for what now is considered relevant and appropriate in evaluating and criticizing the university may have been imported from elsewhere and have their origin in other temporal and spatial settings. This book is an attempt to inquire into this possibility.

The way scholarship is re-inscribed as a "mode of production," knowledge as "goods," and academic autonomy as "rights" cannot be properly accounted for by simply reducing them to being effects of a necessary modernization of the existing public institutions or a "hostile takeover" by managerial, neoliberal ideology. Nor is it sufficient to interpret the proliferation of concepts manifest in the discourse, such as *flexibility*, *marketability*, and *applicability*, as responses to societal demands for less control and greater autonomy. Rather, I suggest that the service university, which underpins the present-day discourse, is the outcome of a series of historically discontinuous reactions against the Humboldtian university and consists of a variety of elements descending from prior discourses that have aligned themselves in a new and logically coherent order.

## Research Strategies and Design

Through a rich selection of historical and contemporary texts, this work attempts to trace some of the historical contingencies and transformations that may have caused this new discursive configuration: the service university. The chapters strive to investigate the historical process from which the prevailing truth about the university, manifest in concepts, modes of speech, and objects, was formed in the past and has emerged. This mode of inquiry is frequently referred to as archaeological-genealogical history,[6] or simply as "writing the history of the present," by stressing the historical contingencies that have generated a new interpretation of concepts, morals and rules. Genealogy is an investigative method inspired by Friedrich Nietzsche,[7] which involves an inquiry into the past with an aim to detect how present practices and modes of thought have emerged and come into existence. The purpose is not to analyze and thus uncover a pure origin or essence, but rather to detect in history a series of transformations (i.e., reinterpretations, conversions, etc.) affirmed by particular perspectives or local struggles. In other words, the purpose is to detect in history a series of instantiations of power. That said, the purpose is not to detect powerful agents in the course of events or to determine cause and effect, but rather to describe how contemporary objects, modes of thought, and themes can be found in more or less transformed editions in the past. Genealogy may thus be regarded as a narrative strategy that aims to describe how current modes and practices may have emerged through a historical process of assimilation, in which elements from past discourses and isolated practices have aligned themselves into new forms and come into new applications.

Genealogy, as adapted by Michel Foucault,[8] is a form of history that tries to account for the operations of power in the production of discourse. It is an attempt to show that the conditions for rendering an object in the social world into a form that is "knowable" are the same as those that render it "governable." This is also the case for an "object" such as the university. Power is thus not regarded as external to knowledge, since techniques of knowledge are always immanent to and entangled in strategies of power.[9] Thus, a genealogical analysis, on a more general level, may be thought of as an analysis of how one nexus or constellation of power-knowledge relations is displaced by another.[10] A historical and genealogical strategy involves moving backward in time from the immediate present to the distant past. The aim of

this book, therefore, is to indicate at least three things: first, what the "Humboldtian university" was originally at the time of its emergence; second, what it became historically as it unfolded through a chain of transformations; and third, what it became after it was pulled from its historical context and made to *refunction* in the present discourse. In addition to the three dimensions, the book also attempts to show that some views or "statements" existing at the margin of the present discourse may be traces of the original Humboldtian ideal of higher education—*das Humboldtsche Bildungsideal*—that have survived and are preserved in another form. In line with this logic, the chapters are organized according to the following questions:

1. What was the "Humboldtian university" at the time of its emergence? (chapter 1)
2. What did it become as it unfolded through a chain of transformations? (chapters 2 and 3)
3. What did it become after it was set to work in a different context? (chapter 4)
4. How does the transformed version function in the present discussion? (chapter 5)
5. Are contemporary reflections on "academic identity," deemed dysfunctional, residues of the original Humboldtian ideals that have managed to survive? (chapter 6)

This study will not focus on the German reception of Humboldt's ideals, or for that matter the Norwegian reception. Instead, the American reception of Humboldt's ideals from the mid-nineteenth century and up until the 1960s is chosen as the archeological territory for a genealogical excavation. I intend to explore this particular spatial and temporal setting as a process of interpretation or translation, in which Humboldt's ideals underwent semantic changes and suffered major qualitative transformations. The American reception is treated as the possible archive[11] or locus of rules and heterogeneous prior practices forming the conditions of inclusion and exclusion that now enable the service university to emerge as an object of discourse. The text is separated into four sections and is guided by certain key questions.

## Key Questions and Corresponding Sections

The first section presents the educational ideas and principles associated with Wilhelm von Humboldt. This is not the "truth" about Humboldt's ideals (heretofore often referred to merely as 'Humboldt'),

but an effort to revisit the educational ideals that provided the foundation for the modern university by relating them to the time of their appearance, that is, the philosophical and political debates that occurred in late Enlightenment Germany. A particular emphasis is placed on Humboldt's reflections on the relationship between language, history, and *Bildung*.

This section offers an outline of the key characteristics of the Humboldtian university: academic freedom, in-depth learning/the union of research and teaching, individual cultivation (*Bildung*), and scientific knowledge (*Wissenschaft*). I argue from the vantage point that the key characteristics constitute a frame or plot (*mythos*), which supports, organizes, and provides the design for different yet comprehensive representations of what a university is and what characterizes academic activity. These representations rest upon different interpretations, appropriations or translations of the ideas of Humboldt. The metaphor of translation is borrowed from Bruno Latour (1986) and suggests that change is a mimetic process in which ideas spread and are translated from one time/space context to another.[12] The different representations may be regarded as answers to the same questions:

What is the aim and purpose of a university?
What is the relationship between the university and society?
How does the university fulfill its role as educator of future citizens and scholars?
What is the status of science and academic activity?

The second section examines the American reception of Humboldt from the mid-eighteenth century to the 1960s. It asks whether dramatic shifts in this reception may have provided the historical conditions for the present discourse on the university.

This section provides a narrative account of the American reception of Humboldt. Texts from American educational debates are subjected to a historical investigation in which an attempt is made to trace some of the transformations, displacements, and conversions the Humboldtian ideas underwent. The focus is on identifying "cognitive shifts" in the American debates concerning "the German university," which is the collective term frequently used, and relate these shifts to conflicts and dramatic events occurring in American history. The aim is to examine whether the current practices—the service university—perhaps have emerged through a historical process of assimilation and conversion, in which elements from different local discourses and heterogeneous practice rooted in the American historical context have become aligned

into new forms. There are three guiding questions: first, to what extent has the American reception of Humboldt contributed to a dislocation and delegitimation of Humboldt? Second, to what extent has it subsequently dismissed other alternatives to the service university? Third, have the American experiences with the German university contributed to what today appears to be a discursive closure—or silence—on certain questions concerning the university?

The third section explores the present discourse on the university with an aim to reveal the set of rules that governs "what can be said" about the university and subsequently how we can relate to it.

The aim of this section is to understand how these rules regulate the present debates, by allowing some questions to be posed as important and relevant while excluding others. How are we expected to approach the university, and what is considered true (and conversely, false) in addressing it? This section addresses some well-reputed and influential contributions to the current debate. The texts are read with a critical intention aimed at exposing explicit as well as implicit conditions that make the present discourse possible. To what extent are these conditions related to and perhaps formed by the American translation—the American *mythos Humboldt*.

The fourth section readdresses the *mythos Humboldt* in relation to some reflections on "academic identity"—the idea and purpose of critical inquiry—provided by late or postmodern philosophers,[13] such as, in this case, Hannah Arendt. Is it possible to see Arendt's attempts to promote new forms of critique as reappropriations or translations of Humboldt?

An attempt is made to relate Arendt's ideas and philosophical reflections to the American reception. Are her reflections on "academic identity" translations of some elements of the original Humboldt that have managed to survive at the margin of the present discourse? Are her ideas perhaps residue from Humboldt that have persisted because they fulfill a need not satisfied within the present discourse? And can these reflections contribute to reopening a discourse on Humboldt and inspiring a revisiting of some forgotten aspect of Humboldt's ideas?

## Reflection on the Use of Theories

The study is based on a wide range of different theories and theoretical positions. No attempt, however, is made to describe or analyze

the discourse or discursive formation (i.e., objects, modes of speech, etc.) via particular theories or theoretical systems. Rather, I provide an interpretation of how and under what conditions the discursive objects (concepts, modes of speech, etc.) emerged. This means that theories are not treated as analytic instruments to investigate the case at hand but are *contextualized* in order to see them as situated within a particular historical setting that allowed them to appear and within which they become meaningful. Theories, in other words, are treated as practices and their meaning as contingent, contextual and relational. This approach is particularly important in the case of Humboldt, whose educational ideas are frequently interpreted and understood in retrospect and thus attributed to, or even seen as the root cause of, the later political disasters in Germany. This perspective enables me to approach the theories of well-reputed scholars, such as John Dewey, in relation to other theories, political opinions and events at a particular time, rather than reducing them to novel contributions or modifications of an already given mode of thought. It becomes possible to see how theories may be responses or even reactions to dramatic events in time, rather than outcomes of ingenious inventions. I am thus more concerned with determining how certain ideas or theories functioned in relation to actual events or in relation to other theories in time, than I am with determining their position or explanatory strength. Furthermore, to read theories as being the knowledge produced in relation to the social circumstances in which they appeared, makes it possible to detect similarities or even underlying regularities between perspectives that today appear to be radically different or even conflicting. Moreover, the approach makes it possible to identify perhaps deep-seated conflicts that were later forgotten or reduced to incidents of minor importance. Dewey's attack on Immanuel Kant's idealism during World War I may serve as an example of a great controversy that was later forgotten, or that perhaps survived in another form. It may thus be possible to locate the social and political relations that may have provided support, acclaim, and validation to some ideas or theories, and conceived of others as problematic or controversial. By regarding theories as practices, I have avoided becoming too entangled in particular interpretations or positions. However, at least to a certain extent, I have treated some theories in a more conventional way, such as in the chapter on Arendt, where I examine her theory of action. However, I also try to show that this theory or set of reflections may be expressions of particular local concerns and may be interpreted as responses to events in time.

## Methodological Considerations

I base my investigation on an ensemble of contemporary and historical texts. The following provides a brief reflection on the selection of texts, how they are read, and why the presentation is given in a descriptive, narrative style. In addition, I add some comments on the empirical accuracy of my presentation, evidential support, oversimplification, and so forth.

### *Texts on Humboldt and the German University*

The chapter on Humboldt and his contemporaries is based on a wide variety of texts, primarily from philosophical, historical, and sociological journals. In an attempt to grasp the atmosphere in which these ideas were formed, I have also made a selection of original texts from Humboldt's works. A reading of the original texts has also been important to either "check" or "balance" other interpretations. I have also made use of biographical works on Humboldt, historical descriptions and critical reflections on the historical period in question (1790–1810). Meanwhile, I am perfectly aware that my own representation is situated, in the sense that I am subject to my own time and historical conditions. Nevertheless, I have tried to be faithful to the content and purpose of these ideas by relating them to the time of their appearance. I employ a wide range of commentaries on Humboldt and his contemporaries, as well as other relevant sources dealing with German ideas on education, in particular, the notion of *Bildung*. Many of the commentaries on Humboldt and the German universities may well be characterized as intertextual fields where a variety of interpretations blend and clash. Each text may, of course, be a reflection of the time when it appeared and can be related to the political climate and the theoretical tools available when it was written. I have found the multiplicity of voices intriguing; they indicate that Humboldt's ideas (or what now are more often referred to as "the German university") have become and still remain a field for discursive battles. This fact will obviously affect my own presentation, although I have tried to avoid becoming too heavily entangled in any single interpretation or position. In fact, I have placed particular emphasis on conveying the tensions that reside within the ideas of educational *Bildung* and tried to relate these tensions to the inspiration Humboldt derived from the intellectual currents and questions of his time. I have emphasized two important yet, to my knowledge, neglected sources of inspiration: first,

the debate about Enlightenment played out in Berlin's Jewish Salons where Humboldt was an active participant, and second, the inspiration he and many of his contemporaries got from the life sciences, particularly from what was later referred to as Enlightenment vitalism.

### *Text from the American Context*

The chapters on the American reception of Humboldt are based primarily on articles from well-reputed scientific journals. Other sources are biographical works by and about university presidents and/or educational entrepreneurs. I have also examined a postwar policy document (the *Harvard Report*), as well as contemporary historical works on the emergence of the American university. Finally, I use a range of other sources (journal articles, books, reviews, etc.) that cover issues not immediately related to the subject of my study. References, for instance, to US immigration patterns, dismissal cases at the University of Michigan, utopian novels, race riots, and more, may seem like unnecessary digressions. Some of these sidetracks are not necessarily explored any further but are nevertheless important because they underscore the points I am trying to convey; they hint at how and why new possibilities (e.g., practices, ideas, etc.) for thought and action emerged, which, in turn, may help to explain political responses and courses of action made at a much later point in history.

The two chapters on the American reception overlap somewhat in time. Chapter 3 provides the overall, chronological view, whereas chapter 4 pauses and delves deeper into certain periods that are merely outlined in the previous chapter. This is done partly in order to change angles and force the reader to look twice at some issues in relation to particular historical events. In addition, the latter of these two chapters will, to a greater extent than the former, reflect debates that went on between educational reformers (i.e., university presidents, scholars, etc.); it covers some of the debate that gradually evolved among educational scholars/philosophers and teachers. However, there is no clear-cut definite pattern.

## Reading for the Plot

The texts from the American setting are not treated as historical documents in the sense that they are forced into certain combinations or ordered into a hierarchy of importance so as to imitate the work of an historian. There is no attempt to search for an underlying principle

or Zeitgeist, nor is there any ambition to convey a story of linear progression from an old to a new way of thinking about education and the university. I try to write the story of Humboldt in America, from a perspective that is contemporaneous with it. However, some texts are treated more thoroughly than others because they have had greater impact, facilitated more comments, and thus have been more widely discussed. Still, to avoid treating some texts as more valuable than others, I have tried to follow the "trail of the texts" (in other words, I have followed up on key references, comments of debates, etc.), and thus have focused attention on specific journals, to the neglect of others.

This does not imply that my reading is completely random. My reading of the texts, as well as the narrative representation, is largely organized and shaped by the elements that constitute *mythos Humboldt*. The aim is to treat the texts as clues to detect changes in the perception or experience of Humboldt, and thus associate these with the historical and political circumstances of the time. Thus, it is the plot or the semantic transformation of these signifying elements as they unfold, that provides the dynamic driving the story forward.[14] That said, it is worth remembering that the theme I am trying to present does not exist as such; it is created or produced by the way these texts combine and relate to each other and are incorporated into the narrative structure of my description. I am therefore not trying to compete with other more thorough historical descriptions of "Humboldt in America," such as Hermann Röhrs's (1995), in a vain attempt to ascertain who is closest to the truth, nor do I argue that other readings are less complete or more biased. The narrative I present is informed by an archaeological-genealogical approach and may thus be considered as another way of getting at the past. My effort must be regarded as an attempt, which perhaps may engender further investigation and complement other forms of historical inquiry, for instance, by pointing to the lacunas or gaps in other explanations.

There is no real beginning or end of my story. Nevertheless, I deemed it essential to delineate a period that would be possible to investigate and that I would be able to access through texts. The choice of time period is not completely arbitrary; it marks the period between the introduction of Humboldt in America (mid-nineteenth century) and the emergence of a discourse on "knowledgeable society" in the mid-1960s. The debates in America during the 1960s are important inasmuch as they incite an international or translocal discourse on higher education. Although the focus is on some key historical conjunctures (the 1890s, the period around the two World Wars, and two decades

after World War II), with such a wide span of time and the huge quantity of texts available, especially from the post–World War II period, there are bound to be some oversimplifications. However, without reducing my own effort to a case of guesswork, I will admit that there are limitations to my approach in terms of the selection of texts and my own knowledge of the periods in question. I have thus relied on contemporary scientific works of these periods in American intellectual life, particularly some works of David Hollinger.

### *Contemporary Texts (1960 and Onward)*

I have selected some texts by well-known historians and historical-sociologists that present aspects of nineteenth-century German intellectual history and the German university, in a documentary, matter-of-fact way. These texts are chosen, in part, because they are frequently cited (e.g., Fritz Ringer's texts tend to reappear as validating references) and are thus regarded as important resources mobilized in the current discourse. I am particularly concerned with how the German university is represented in these contemporary texts, what they present as "factual," and how these representations may reflect a set of underlying rules for what is considered relevant for the way we are to relate to the old university in this period.

I have selected some texts from the present debate for a close reading. The purpose is not to analyze them so as to detect an underlying intention or hidden agenda, but rather to detect the anonymous rules that govern and guide the discourse and to which policy makers conform. It goes without saying that the quantity of texts available within the field at the moment is immense. The chosen texts are well-reputed and influential contributions, known by most participants in the current debate, and they function more or less as entrances to the issues currently debated. In addition to presenting the content of the texts, I investigate them as "statements,"[15] or as means or leads to revealing the condition of possibility for the present discourse on the university. What do the texts permit us to see, and what is hidden from view? What are the conditions that enable the text to convey a message considered plausible and deserving of attention?

## Structure of Study

Chapter 1 examines in some depth the Humboldtian ideals of the university. An attempt is made to relate Humboldt's educational ideas to

the intellectual debates of the German Enlightenment (*Aufklärung*), particularly Kant's reflections on the university as an arena for critique. Furthermore, the chapter explores the "vital" element in Humboldt's intellectual endeavor, in particular how he was influenced by one of the major counterdiscourses in late Enlightenment Germany—Enlightenment vitalism.

Chapters 2 and 3 address the American reception of Humboldt from the mid-nineteenth century until the mid-1960s. The chapters focus on gradual transformations as well as more radical ruptures in the way these ideas were perceived. The focus is on three key historical conjunctures: the rise of the Progressive movement, the period during and after World Wars I and II, and the immediate post–World War II period. Whereas chapter 2 examines in more detail the early period and delves into academic reactions and responses to political events such as the wars, chapter 3 explores the significance of Dewey's reactions against idealism, the rise of social psychology, and the progressives' program for social reconstruction in shaping new perceptions. Some attention is also devoted to the *General Education in a Free Society* (often referred to as the *Harvard Report*), which set the terms for the American educational policy in the postwar years. Chapter 3 also examines some accounts of "the German university" in narratives by historians and historical sociologists in the late 1960s and 1970s.

Chapter 4 examines two well-known and frequently cited texts of the university in relation to the "emerging new mode of knowledge production." The chapter tries to determine the main claims and reasons for defending a large-scale transformation of the university. The chapter explores the artificially constructed typologies, Mode 1 and Mode 2, and examines how the Mode 2 university, which is presented as providing a better fit for the post-industrial era, acquires meaning through its negation of the Mode 1 university, presented as the "truth" about the university as it stands today. The purpose is to detect the underlying interpretation, perspective, or hypothesis of the old university that is operative yet concealed within such similar abstractions as Mode 1.

Chapter 5 treats the texts accounted for in chapter 4 as leads in revealing the underlying conditions or "truths" that govern "what can be said" about the university at present. It explores some of the tensions (i.e., ambiguities, contradictions, paradoxes, voids, etc.) residing in the texts to detect the underlying condition that makes them meaningful: for instance, how are other texts put into play, and how are other layers of meaning activated by implicit reference? The chapter explores

whether it is the American translation of the German university, that currently—in such disguises as Mode 1—dictates what is possible as well as impossible to say about the university. Is it thus the American experiences with the German university that provides some of the conditions for the present European debates?

Chapter 6 discusses Hannah Arendt's notion of "critical understanding." It examines her reinterpretation of "political action" as a practical example of her own critical strategy, in which language, history and imagination hold a prominent place. The chapter asks whether Arendt's attentiveness to education as a process of individuation, her emphasis on history and on the relationship between thinking and judgment, are residues of the Humboldtian legacy that have survived in another form.

The conclusion provides a condensed summary and is an attempt to recapture the main points in an effort to contextualize the interpretation offered.

## Notes

1. The Bologna Process is based on the declaration signed in Bologna on 19 June 1999 by the Ministers of Education in twenty-nine European countries. It now comprises more that forty-nine countries, plus the European Commission.
2. There have been many attempts to contest the "postindustrial" thesis (Vallas 1999). He points out that the concept of *flexibility*, which is a key component, came to occupy a central place in the social scientific and managerial thinking about work in the 1980s.
3. It is often assumed that since the traditional work structure based on mass production and manufacturing has become obsolete, there is less focus on the organization and more on the individual employee, in terms of mobility, adaptable and transferable skills, and competence.
4. This study is not an attempt to critique "academic capitalism," as for instance, Sheila Slaughter and Larry Leslie (1997) or Sheila Slaughter and Gary Rhoades (2007) do. Because the discourse on the knowledge society articulates cooperation within a framework of competition and freedom/rights within a framework of market access (and intellectual property), the service university cannot unambiguously be linked to the logic of corporate business or denote a market-driven enterprise. In fact, it seems that any opposition to competition is rendered somewhat suspect, as it is tantamount to an assault on democratic values. This is what makes the discourse particularly resistant to criticism.
5. The European Commission attributes the concept to Fredrich A. Hayek, who in 1945 wrote the article "The Uses of Knowledge in Society."
6. Foucault (1984b). Archaeology denotes an attempt to understand the historical a priori, archive, or form, which has enabled certain systems of thought to emerge, while genealogy signifies an attempt to identify the practices that

go into the formation of these systems or archives. Put differently, it identifies how present practices have their origin in past rules or formations.

7. Nietzsche (1967/1887), Foucault (1984c), Babich (1994), Dean (1994), Irwin (2001).
8. Foucault (1984a).
9. Foucault (1978) provides some suggestions or "rules" to follow in an investigation. However, these suggestions are best regarded as prescriptions rather than as methodological imperatives: In a genealogical investigation, it is suggested to start with "local centers" of power-knowledge, since any area or field of investigation is always made possible because power-relations have established it as a possible object ("the rules of immanence"). Since relations of power-knowledge are not static forms of distribution, but "matrices of transformations," the researcher is urged to seek the patterns of modifications, variations and shifts that the relationship of forces implies by the very nature of its process ("rules of continual variation"). For any "local center" to function and have an effect, it is best to link it to an overall strategy. Therefore, Foucault urges the researcher to conceive of how a strategy is made possible by the specificity of possible tactics, but also how tactics are made possible by the strategic envelope or frame that makes them work ("rule of double conditioning"). Through conceiving of discourse as a multiplicity of discontinuous segments that can come into play in various strategies, the researcher may try to reconstruct the distribution, with the things said and those concealed, the enunciations necessarily forbidden, the position of the speaker, etc. Finally, the researcher is encouraged to seek how discourses transmit and produce, reinforce and undermine power, how silence and secrecy are shelters of power, as well as obscure areas of tolerance ("rules of the tactical polyvalence of discourses").
10. Shiner (1982: 387).
11. Foucault (1972).
12. This spread may explain why there are different translations of the Humboldtian university at the same time, all of which may be the outcome of transformations or local experiences and adaptations of Humboldt's ideals. I will return to the issue of translation in the concluding chapter.
13. This study will focus on Hannah Arendt. I provide a similar inquiry into the reflection on the "academic identity" of Richard Rorty and Michel Foucault (2005).
14. My source of inspiration is Peter Brooks (1984), *Reading for the Plot*.
15. I refer to "statement" much in the same way as Foucault (1972). A "statement" can be attributed to a subject, but the subject is not understood as a "speaking consciousness" such as within traditional hermeneutics, where one searches in the "utterance" for deep-seated meaning (i.e., in the subject's thoughts or experiences, or in his/her context). A statement may be regarded as a "material object" that carries a specific meaning in relation to other statements subject to a set of "rules." Although a statement may be regarded as verbal performances in the sense that something (i.e., the discursive rules) is

manifested though them, this does not mean that a statement can be equated to a performative "speech-act." It is not rhetorical in the sense that it aims at an effect.