

THE TRANSFORMATION OF UNIVERSITY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

SERCAN KIYAK

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

SEPTEMBER 2013

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Prof. Dr. Ayşe Nur Saktanber
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

Assoc. Prof. Erdoğan Yıldırım
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Tansu Açık (Ankara Uni.)

Assoc. Prof. Erdoğan Yıldırım (METU, SOC)

Instructor Dr. Barış Mücen (METU, SOC)

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last name : Sercan Kiyak

Signature :

ABSTRACT

THE TRANSFORMATION OF UNIVERSITY

Sercan Kiyak
M.Sc., Department of Sociology
Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Erdoğan Yıldırım

September 2013, 108 pages

The mission and function of university is now a highly debated issue. It will be argued in this thesis that this debate is a result of the demise of the alliance between state and university. This modern alliance was mainly conceived to be based on a notion of culture that would give meaning to the social bound of the national community. However it was weakened after 1970's with the emergence of global market and the consequent decline of the political power of the state. Due to these developments contemporary universities operate based on transnational, entrepreneurial and managerial principles, just like corporations. However, as universities no longer define themselves directly in relation to a certain political will but to universal power of global economy, the essential idea of university dissolves and becomes replaced by a discourse of excellence, which is mostly derived from the economic language. This rhetorical device does not mean anything by itself but functions as a tool to generate a general consent for administration of universities mainly as corporations in higher education and technological innovation sectors. Bologna Process is a key policy reform that will affect the future of university on an international basis. In this thesis, the implications of the reforms of Bologna Process will be analyzed in relation to University of Excellence and it will be argued that the process will further enforce integration of universities into all-encompassing global market.

KEYWORDS: University, the Idea of University, Modern University, Discourse of Excellence, Bologna Process

Öz

ÜNİVERSİTENİN DÖNÜŞÜMÜ

Sercan Kıyak
Yüksek Lisans, Sosyoloji Bölümü
Tez Danışmanı: Doç Dr. Erdoğan Yıldırım

Eylül 2013, 108 sayfa

Üniversitenin misyonu ve işlevi bugün oldukça tartışmalı bir konudur. Bu tezde bu tartışmanın nedeninin devlet ile üniversite arasındaki ittifakın çözülüşü olduğu öne sürülecektir. Bu modern ittifak, ağırlıklı olarak ulusal topluluğun sosyal birlikteliğine anlam verecek bir kültür fikri temelinde düşünülmekteydi. Fakat 1970'lerden sonra küresel pazarın ortaya çıkışı ve bunun sonucunda devletin politik gücünün azalmasıyla, bu bağ zayıfladı. Bu gelişmeler sonucunda günümüz üniversiteleri, tıpkı bir şirket gibi, uluslararası, girişimci ve idari prensipler temelinde işler hale geldiler. Fakat üniversiteler kendilerini artık belli bir politik iradeye değil de, marketin evrensel gücüne bağlı tanımladıklarından, üniversitenin öz fikri çözüldü ve ekonomik dilden türetilen bir mükemmeliyet söylemi tarafından yerinden edildi. Kendi başına hiç bir anlam ifade etmeyen bu retorik aygıt üniversitelerin temelde yüksek öğrenim ve teknolojik inovasyon sektöründeki bir şirket gibi yönetilmeleri için genel onay üreten bir araç olarak iş görür. Bologna Süreci üniversitenin geleceğini uluslararası bir çapta belirleyecek anahtar bir reform sürecidir. Bu tezde Bologna Süreci reformları Mükemmeliyet Üniversitesi ile ilişkili olarak ele alınacak ve sürecin üniversiteleri her şeyi kapsayan küresel pazara daha da entegre olmaya zorlayacağı iddia edilecektir.

ANAHTAR KELİMELELER: Üniversite, Üniversite İdeası, Modern Üniversite, Mükemmeliyet Söylemi, Bologna Süreci

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Erdođan Yıldırım for his guidance, advice, criticism, encouragements and insight throughout the research. I also would like to thank the examining community members Prof. Tansu Aık and Dr. Barıř Mcen for their valuable comments and the time they devoted to me.

I am grateful to my friends Ezgi Burgan, Ođuz zgr Karadeniz, Gksel Dođan and Emrah zdemir for their help and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Preliminary	1
1.2 Theme: The University as a Socio-historical Construct	5
1.2.1 Theoretical Considerations.....	6
1.2.2 Methodology: Defining the Aims of Sociology of University	17
2. MODERNITY AND UNIVERSITY.....	24
2.1 The Prehistory of Modern University	24
2.2 The University of Culture	31
2.2.1 Modernity and Advent of the Nation-State	31
2.2.2 The Idea of University Debate among Prussian Thinkers:	34
2.2.2.1 Kant and Idea of University as a Site of Critique	34
2.2.2.2 Fichte, Schelling and the Idea of Revival of Nation through Education	38
2.2.2.3 Schleiermacher and the Idea of <i>Bildung</i>	41
2.2.2.4 Wilhelm von Humboldt: The Founder of Modern University.....	45
2.3 The Legacy of Humboldtian University.....	57
2.3.1 Modern University in Different Social Contexts.....	62
3. UNIVERSITY IN POSTMODERN CONDITION	66
3.1 University and The Crisis of Modernity.....	66
3.2 The University of Excellence	69
3.2.1 Globalization: Decline of Nation-State and Culture	75

3.2.2 Audit Culture: Academic Freedom and Work in the University of Excellence	79
3.2.3 Informationalization: Knowledge in Postmodern Condition	82
3.3 Bologna Process: University as a Transnational Corporation	85
3.3.1 Discourse of Bologna Process	87
4. CONCLUSION.....	93
REFERENCES.....	100
APPENDICES	
A. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU	108

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Preliminary

Universities as the places where vanguard ideas, peaceful projects and a culture of democratic existence has historically sprung and defended are in a position which necessitates their strive for lessening of tension our country experiences today and their advocacy of stability. Turkey has found a great opportunity with its normalized democracy, developing economy and increasing reputation. Important steps have been taken for establishment of social peace. The peace process is an important opportunity for our country. We cannot comply with wasting of this opportunity. This environment of instability that is tried to be achieved creates dangers for today and future of our country. They create an occasion that could harm the peace process. In this respect, stability and social peace must be re-enacted; peace process must not ever be harmed. Therefore we have a huge responsibility. (Çetinsaya, 2013)

This is a part of the speech which was given by Prof. Gökhan Çetinsaya, who is the head of Council of Higher Education (Yüksek Öğretim Kurumu – YÖK) in Turkey, on the issue called as “Gezi Parkı protests” or “Turkish Spring”¹ in national and global media. Gezi Parkı event is a complex issue and it is beyond limits of this thesis. However a close reading of the remarks of Çetinsaya on the essence, mission and/or identity of university will show that he implies two things: The first in his rhetoric universities are codified as places of peace and democracy. Moreover they have been “avant-garde” institutions of such “good” values throughout the human history. The second one is that universities, due to being such nice places, should favor stability over transformation thus in effect they must unite themselves with the interests of the nation-state and its elected government.

Çetinsaya’s concerns are only solvable from an administrative perspective. He sees the ongoing protests as an obstacle to conduct university “business as usual”. Universities

¹Gezi Parkı Protests started after peaceful protesters who oppose destruction of a public park in the middle of Taksim to be replaced by a shopping mall were brutally beaten and their camping equipment and similar stuff was burned down by police in 28th May 2013. This event gathered a lot of protests especially on issue of police brutality in Turkey. As the time passed demonstration get bigger contrary to expectations of government of Turkey and it resulted in one of the biggest social movements in recent Turkish political history.

should not intervene into politics and avoid assuming political missions. They must support “normalized democracy, developing economy and increasing reputation”. In essence these words signify that Turkey is becoming a winning player in the global capitalist market. Universities thus must orient themselves as economic units that will contribute to the competitive capacity of the Turkey in the global market. In such rhetoric which will be called in this thesis as “excellence”, it is emphasized that the main function of university is an economic one and university as an organization is not different from a corporation. Like all corporations universities must aim for smooth internal functioning to increase their competitiveness in the post-secondary education sector. Moreover such rhetoric gives increasing importance to administrative body of university as opposed to its academic body. As universities become organized like corporations the organizational goals they set for themselves increasingly became economical, devoid of reference to any other political or social affiliation. Thus realizing them increasingly becomes a question of administrative success, in other words a question which must be answered according to logic of efficiency, which is internally economic and not intellectual nor academic itself.

At this point, some information on the institution Çetinsaya represents might be required to better understand his remarks. YÖK is an institution that was established in 1982 by the government of *coup d'état* of 1980. It is responsible for the supervision of universities in Turkey according to constitution of 1982 which is still in effect. The institution was established to diminish the university autonomy and therefore put universities under government control. Thus establishment of YÖK is considered as opening a new phrase in the history of university institution in Turkey (Dölen, 2010, p. 115-116). It effectively suppressed student protests and depoliticized universities. As universities become stabilized and passivized, it became easier to reorganize university and society by neoliberal reforms (Dölen, 2010, p. 115). Therefore in Turkish context, YÖK not only encourages and controls the universities to become administration oriented corporate institutions; it also serves as the highest of the administrative body of universities in Turkey responsible for their organization in terms of market. In this context of being a state appointed officer at the head of institution responsible for supervision of universities, internal logic of Çetinsaya’s comment that universities must favor stability and orient themselves to be competitive players in the global market devoid of any political or social references

represents not a particular political idea but rather represents a global trend. The idea that universities are just like corporations and must function like them constitutes the hegemonic position among the ideas about the function of universities.

Nonetheless, there are also different opinions on the mission of university (in general and on Gezi Protests in particular) expressed by universities, academics and students. In the newspaper article below some of which is summarized:

Petition campaign by academicians for Gezi Parkı

Academicians started a petition campaign for Gezi Parkı. The Academicians condemned the events that occurred in İstanbul demanded police action to stop.

The Campaign started by academic staff of Boğaziçi University in 30th May Thursday gained support of 230 Academicians in two days...Academic staff of Koç University released a public appeal and demanded police action to stop... In the condemnation statement signed by academic staff of İstanbul Bilgi University... Academic staff of Urban and Regional Planning Departments of Istanbul Technical University, Yıldız Technical University and Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University made a press release yesterday at 3:00pm... Academic staff of Sabancı University also released a public statement together... Administrative board of Law Faculty of Ankara University made a statement, demanding the authorities to permit the citizens to use their constitutional rights... These issues were expressed in the statement by The Society of Alumni of Middle East Technical University... Academic staff of Communication Faculty of Galatasaray University released an announcement headlined as “What Kind of Media We Want”... Academic staff of Law Faculty of Bilkent University invited authorities to act coherently to the rules of democratic constitutional state in their announcement... Bilkent University also made a press release about the events of Gezi Parkı. In the statement that represent 141 academicians it was stated that: “We, the under signed academic staff of Bilkent University condemn the state violence against the peaceful protestors among whom there were also our students and colleagues. (Akademisyenlerden Gezi, 2013)

This newspaper article show that some of the universities in Turkey assume roles that is not a corporate one, as the main responsibility of any corporation is essentially limited to its customer. By expressing their institutional opinions on the recent protests that affected political scene in Turkey, universities show a wider responsibility that has a political content. These activities show that there are different opinions prevailing in the minds of at least some members of universities in Turkey on what universities stand for. Essentially in

this example we can see that some members of universities see the mission of university as supporter of democratic change and progressive political action. Taking the risk of oversimplifying, their position could be stated as promotion of university as a site of universalist critical thinking². In this sense they are closer to the framework of idea of university based on the concept of reason, based on Kant. In modern understanding university is not distant from political content. It can even be argued that it was designed for implicitly or explicitly political purposes, though in realization it incorporates both. In Kantian framework university has an implicit political mission of emancipation of humanity by the founding of the principles of reason and organizing a rational society, free from partiality and arbitrariness of tyrant and tradition. Explicitly in the formulations of Fichte and Humboldt that university is the protector and hero of national culture, it is needed for modern societies for realization of historical mission of the nation. Thus universities are spiritual centers of society and create a social bound that binds the national collective together (Readings, 1996, pp. 45-46). Therefore, there is (and was) conceptions of university that had a role and responsibility that was beyond the role given to it by the proponents of “the University of Excellence”.

The debate, given in the paragraphs above, is the reflection of a global crisis of university in Turkish context. The reorganization of university in terms of excellence is an ongoing process. This process is replacing the older mission of university, namely the cultural and historical mission of university related to the emancipation of human subject in reference to humanity or nation. In this sense the modern university, the University of Culture, is being replaced by a new idea of university that is based on the excellence. Excellence assumes universities must be organized as bureaucratic corporations that compete in the global education sector. This means a process of dereferentialization of essence of university and its separation from the nation-state as its main referent.

The situation of higher education is highly debated today. There are arguments that liberal education of university is replaced by technical education. The work conditions of academicians in university also decline reflecting the general trend in contemporary

² Thus they are in line with thinker who emphasize this critical mission of university as indispensable for betterment of humanity, some of the recent and important formulations of this notion could be found in the writings of Nussbaum (2010) and Giroux (2007).

capitalism towards precariousness. Also the future of university is uncertain as a site of production of knowledge. As new actors of knowledge production appear, consumers of knowledge change and state support diminishes, the old ideals of university education and knowledge production in general appears to be problematic. In this thesis it will be argued that in contemporary society due to the transformations in the structure of capitalism University changed institutionally. The modern university is no longer realizable in the context of global organization capitalism and changing nature of capitalist state and it's replaced by administrative bureaucratic organization of "University of Excellence" (Readings, 1996).

In this thesis the advent of the University of Excellence will be discussed from sociology of knowledge perspective. The changes in the organization and modes of legitimization of university will be discussed in relation to major transformations in the institutional frameworks of society and their effects on the mode of knowledge. To do so, firstly the emergence of modern idea of university will be discussed. After that the university in the postmodern social conditions will be analyzed.

1.2. Theme: The University as a Socio-historical Construct

Delanty (2001b, p. 150) notes that "As one of the key institutions of modernity, it is true that the university has been linked to the project of modernity and may be, in certain respects, suffering the same fate." In a more extended paragraph he also notes that

Taking a broader view of knowledge as entailing more than science but also cultural knowledge, the university can be seen as the space where the project of modernity unfolded through cognitive struggles, between science and culture. In this view of modernity, the university is a site where many contradictions are expressed, for instance the conflict between cosmopolitanism and national culture, universalism and particularism, secularism and religion, modernity and tradition, power and culture, intellectuals and experts, democracy and knowledge. The university is, then, more than an institution of knowledge production but has also nurtured the dominant and emergent cultural models of society. Thus, one should not focus merely on knowledge as information or as science, but on a deeper conception of knowledge. (Delanty, 2001b, p. 150)

To understand modern university and its transformation, it must be understood as a socio-historical constructs and a multitude of sociological theories and philosophical ideas must be utilized in its sociological inquiry. It requires a historical (and when necessary spacial) understanding of both organization of society and university itself. It would be appropriate to call this task; the sociology of university. Sociology of university that will be conducted here would take its theoretical basis from the tradition of sociology of knowledge. Universities would be taken as institutions that play the intermediately role between a socio-historical formation and its subjective reflection in the realm of ideas. Universities themselves, in such a paradigm under sociology of knowledge, would appear as both reproducers of the given formation and at the same time possible reshapers (or enforcers) of the formation they are originated in, due to their ability of articulating the abstract and reflective knowledge.

The sociology of knowledge that will be employed in the thesis will be a historical one that will focus on how different social formations articulate different forms of knowledge in the context of their cultural and historical conditions of existence. The nature of knowledge production on the one hand depends upon the cognitive powers people derive from their social existence. However on the other hand their understanding is also limited by the horizons of the same social existence. University is not immune to this paradoxical nature of knowledge. As a consequence of the perspective described, the thesis would have a potential that could contribute to enlighten the roots of the current crisis of university.

In the following sections; firstly, a general discussion of sociology of knowledge will be given, followed by a description of the categories and concepts we will utilize in the thesis; secondly, methodological questions and tools of the sociology of university will be further evaluated.

1.2.1. Theoretical Considerations

In this section relevant ideas on concepts of modernity, society and knowledge will be discussed that will be illuminating in sociology of university. The most important branch of sociology for this thesis will be sociology of knowledge, as its field of study essentially

includes all of these key concepts. The sociology of knowledge is a well-established field with a huge base of study areas which includes from everyday knowledge to production of scientific facts in the laboratories. Although this branch of sociology was once considered dead, there is now a genuine interest in the field, especially in the study of higher forms of knowledge (as opposed to study of everyday knowledge). As university is a social institution that deals with knowledge its social study must incorporate the ideas and insights generated in sociology of knowledge from classics to contemporary sociologists. Therefore the usage of sociology of knowledge in this study will be limited and general at the same time. It will be limited as this study will not include the emergence of social reality in the micro level but it will extend to the recent debates on the conditions of knowledge in contemporary society and study of science and technology as they would tend to intervene into subjects covered in this study.

It would be appropriate to start our account of sociology of knowledge with Hegel. Although he was not a sociologist, his philosophy had important arguments that had effects over the later development sociology. He contributed sociology of knowledge by relating the knowledge to consciousness. Therefore it is legitimate to start sociology of knowledge with philosophy as some of the most important formulations on what knowledge is came from philosophy itself.

Hegel (2012) was critical of the problems posed by Kantian philosophy as Kantian philosophical framework was skeptical about truth claims in relation to noumenal world. Limnatis (2008, p. 2) claims that Hegelian philosophy emphasizes not one-sided reductionist idealism, but the reciprocity of movement of knowledge “from the object to thought, and from thought to the object”. Due to this reciprocal relation Limnatis (2008, p. 2) argues that Hegelian epistemology is itself already a form of social theory with philosophical underpinnings:

[For Hegel] any engagement in social theory cannot but be intellectual in nature. It must rest on the categorical presuppositions that are revealed by reflection, and form the basis of cognition. At the same time, the presuppositions (the categorical background) are determined by what they determine (the given Life-world)

Therefore for Hegel knowledge was not a fixed system of thought that operates in its autonomous discursive domain and produced by an ahistorical rational subject (Delanty,

2001a, p. 13). Due to this relation established by Hegelian thinking between social theory and philosophy, Delanty's argument that Hegelian project of analysis of dialectical movement of Geist to its total unfolding can be interpreted as a sociological analysis of knowledge as a cultural construct that is shaped by the social and historical conditions of its emergence. The conditions of emergence of ideas can be understood as ideas and values prevailing in a given society. In this way Hegel can be read as theoretician of knowledge as a socio-historical product (Delanty, 2001a, p. 13). His accomplishment of linking the knowledge to the phrases of social formation will be a central notion also in this study.

Delanty (2001a, p. 14) argues that "Knowledge and self-reflection were mutually entwined" This Hegelian emphasis on consciousness is continued to be part of western Marxism. Although mainstream sociology of knowledge was regarded by western Marxism as politically conservative (Adorno, 1983), they also developed their own social analysis of knowledge mainly on the basis of critique of knowledge as self-deception (Horkheimer & Adorno 2002; Horkheimer, 2004) In short, Hegelian reciprocity, namely the knowledge as a part of self-constitution of a social formation gives way to a constructivist approach to knowledge. This is further important for the thesis that it is this notion that connects the social theory with philosophy as a social epistemology (Delanty, 2001a, p. 13).

Delanty, (2001a, p. 13) claims that "Sociology of knowledge has its roots in classical French Sociology, and has even deeper roots in late Enlightenment thinking". In spirit of Condorcet and Saint Simon, Auguste Comte (1848) in his "A General View of Positivism" saw an evolutionary development in societies in terms of their knowledge and *Telos* of this evolution was the achievement of positive knowledge. His ideas on development of human societies were based on an evolutionary schema. Comte's law of "three stages" say that theological or traditional stage (where magical mythic non-reflective forms of knowledge are dominant) is followed by a metaphysical stage (When abstract and rational forms of knowledge are dominant) and as the last stage positivistic stage (when experimental sciences become dominant from of knowledge) (Delanty, 2001a, p. 13). Therefore Comte (1848) thought that through evolution of human societies the knowledge will develop to higher forms. Due to his analysis of evolution of societies on basis of their form of knowledge he can be considered as the founder of sociology of knowledge.

Although Durkheim is generally considered as a positivist, his sociology represents also a theory of sociology of knowledge which took social representations as its object (Schamus, 1994, p. 4). Therefore he studied knowledge as a cultural constructed meaning or belief. His analysis was not aimed at showing privileged status of some form of knowledge but to treat the whole knowledge as equal, because they were all social constructs of meaning, social representations and symbols. Durkheim instead tried to show how the categories of human reasoning are shaped by the society the individual was born in. Thus he was critical of naïve empiricism and condemned it with falling into the trap of irrationalism (Durkheim, 1915, pp. 12-13). He accepted what he considers as the fundamental proposition of apriorist theory and links the existence of categories of human reason without which understanding would be impossible to social representations (Durkheim, 1915, p. 15-16). Thus he formulated the society as the core factor determining the apriori categories of the human mind, thus as the factor that determined the possible conditions of emergence of truth. Similarly, for Durkheim the nature of knowledge did not changed substantially in the modern period as it was argued by Comte. It was still a cultural mechanism of meaning production³. He also contributed to the sociological analysis of education by his work "Evolution of Educational Thought" (Durkheim, 1977).

Scheler coined the term sociology of knowledge in 1924 in his essay "The Sociology of Knowledge: Formal Problems" (Berger & Luchmann, 1991, p. 15). He proposed that knowledge is a part of constitution of society. A certain knowledge that is determined by the social conditions of existence of individual was necessary for existence of society. Therefore a consciousness of being a certain social entity was necessary for existence of such entity. However it could not be assumed that the knowledge was a free determining factor. It was also "conversely determined by the society and its structure" (Scheler, 1970, p. 170). An important part of work for this study comes at the last paragraph of the text. He argued that following his sociology of knowledge it would be possible to understand:

- (1) the distinct ideal-typical leader qualities in these three fields of knowledge (homo religious, sage and scientist and technician)
- (2) the distinct sources and methods of their acquisition of knowledge (God contact of the charismatic leader, idea-thinking, inductive and deductive interference)
- (3) the distinct forms of

³ However it was certainly a more complex and different one compared to cultural mechanism of primitive societies.

movement of their development (4) the distinct basic social forms expressing the acquisition and conversion of knowledge (5) their distinct functions in human society and (6) their distinct social origins (classes, vocations, estates). (Scheler, 1970, p. 183)

Therefore he not only formulated knowledge as a central part of existence of societies but he also proposed some future guidelines for research in sociology of knowledge which will call upon university as their object. In this thesis a similar approach based on historicity of mode of knowledge, the subjectivity of knowledge producer, the site of knowledge production, the methods of production and reproduction of knowledge will be analyzed. However one weakness of his approach can be seen in his insistence for exclusion of the things that appear to be objective from the domain of sociology of knowledge, however even his selection for such objective things show themselves to be very subjective when read today⁴.

Weber (2001) emphasized the process of rationalization as the primary dynamic of modernization. According to him in capitalist societies, means-oriented rationalism becomes dominant type of rationality. This meant that modern individual was trapped by modern mechanisms of bureaucracy and capitalism. As these mechanisms provide a formal impartiality regarding the partial goals of human activity they made the evaluation on their ultimate goals and thus their existence in the first place irrelevant. This is so, because these mechanisms take their legitimacy not from their goals but from their efficiency in what they are doing. As long as they appear as the most rational and efficient organization for human societies they become ideals in themselves that go beyond desires and values of humans. Under such conditions of social existence for humans set by the principle of instrumental rationality human subjectivity can only has a value as long as it can fulfill its given role better than another human or machine that he/she could replace in the mechanism. Moreover under these conditions any attempt to evaluate for deeper meaning of existence would be seen as inefficient and unproductive by the social mechanism and would be discouraged by the society in general. Thus he formulated de-humanizing effect of the dominance of instrumental rationality in his interpretive sociology. Weberian insight on the hand to hand development of modernization process and instrumental rationality (as

⁴ "For example, classifying races by objective traits: color of skin, shape of skull." (Scheler, 1970, p.170)

opposed to goal oriented rationality) will be an enlightening idea in our analysis of contemporary university. Weber is also important for sociology of university as he already discussed this issue in terms of transformation of university in his important work "Science as Vocation" in 1922. Although Weberian framework will not be employed directly in this, insights of Weberian sociology are especially important for this thesis for understanding the discourse of excellence especially in context of replacement of modern subject by the instrumental rationality of the university of excellence.

Parsons and Platt (1973) on the other hand recognized the value of knowledge to society and also value of university as a subsystem of interpretation in between cultural system and society, however he neglected too much of antagonism, conflict and contest on knowledge due to his functionalist paradigm. His successor in Sorbonne was Gurvitch. Delanty (2001a, p. 14) argues that he continued the distinction between knowledge and cultural frameworks, but again his approach was functionalistic so there was no space for internal development of knowledge, thus reducing it very much to a cultural variable, in the end neglecting its cognitive side and its process of internal development. Gurvitch (1971) in his book "The Social Framework of Knowledge" dealt with systematic sociology of cognitive systems that includes lower and minor to higher and major forms of knowledge. This early attempt for formation of sociology of knowledge was influenced by anthropology and particularly by the work of Lucien Levy-Bruhl. (Delanty, 2001a, p. 14)

An Anglo-Saxon tradition of sociology of science developed with the studies of Robert Merton which were laid down in his work "Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth Century England" in 1938. He was critical of Marxist analysis of science which according to him reduced knowledge to mere epiphenomena of production and wished to formulate a social analysis of science as an empirical sociology of science in part of his functionalist framework (Delanty 2001a, p. 15). This tradition of sociology of science will later continue under the name of analytic social epistemology whose prominent figure will be Alvin Goodman (Fuller, 2012, p. 269) However our thesis will not follow this tradition of thought as they presuppose the idea of science as a transcendental form of thought. Therefore debate now will be switched to the discussion of the "constructivist" side of sociology of knowledge.

Nevertheless Mannheim's work on the field of sociology of knowledge became dominant and definitive for future of the field (Delanty, 2001a, pp. 14-15). The general idea as formulated by Mannheim, which is "sociology of knowledge seeks to comprehend thought in the concrete setting of an historical-social situation" (Mannheim, 1954, p. 3), is also utilized in this study in a reformed mode (as the university as a socio-historical construct). Central question of his sociology was "how it [knowledge] really functions in public life and in politics as an instrument of collective action" (Mannheim 1954, p. 1). In his account of sociology of knowledge in premodern social formation there was an "intellectual stratum, organized as a caste and monopolizing the right to preach, teach and interpret the world" (Mannheim 1954, p. 9). However for sociology of knowledge

Decisive fact of modern times, in contrast with the situation during the Middle Ages, is that monopoly of the ecclesiastical interpretation of the world which was held by the priestly caste is broken and in the place of a closed and throughout organized stratum of intellectuals, a free intelligentsia has arisen (Mannheim 1954, p. 10).

Therefore for him modernity made possible the emergence of a group of intellectuals as free-floating class that could have a special function. Discovery of unconsciousness and sociology of knowledge were just two instances of this fact that humans now beginning to understand the psychological and social factors that affect the knowledge (Mannheim 1954, p. 10). With such understanding of knowledge it could be possible to control the multitude of different world-views that exist in conflict with each other in the modernity. Therefore except the scientific knowledge of free intelligentsia, his approach to knowledge renders it as ideology. But doing so, he reduced knowledge to the world of ideas and ideologies associated with particular groups in society. However his approach also suffers from the non-reflexive attitude about his own work (or knowledge produced by free intelligentsia in general). He was inclined to exclude the knowledge produced by "philosophers" from the domain of sociology of knowledge. He considered their thinking activity to occur in an autonomous domain and mostly develop by the formal rules of reason and in an isolated manner from social life (Mannheim 1954, p. 1). Thus, according to Bloom he separated between science and knowledge and considered the pure functioning of human mind (in fields like logic and mathematics) was not related to any social or other external constraint, therefore accepted the autonomy of rules of reason (Bloor, 1991)

The history of the discipline told till this moment is generally categorized under the term the classical sociology of knowledge. In words of Berger & Luchmann (1991, p. 21) "It is safe to say when sociologists today think of the sociology of knowledge, *pro* or *con*, they usually do so in terms of Mannheim's formulation of it". After its peak point with Manheim, sociology of knowledge lost its momentum and the field became practically abandoned (Delanty, 2001a, p. 15). The classical sociology of knowledge ended after Manheimian version of sociology of knowledge established itself as definitive form of discipline in 50's. After that the classical sociology of knowledge entered into period of decline and practically finished until its revitalization in 1967 by social constructivist account of Berger & Luchmann in their "Social Construction of Reality"

Berger & Luchmann's account was heavily influenced by the work of Schütz (1967) who developed phenomenological approach to sociology. Berger & Luchmann's coined the term "social construction", which will later be accepted by many sociologists as a general paradigm. Social constructionist paradigm in sociology of knowledge "is concerned with the analysis of social construction of reality" (Berger & Luchmann, 1991, p. 15). Although Berger & Luchmann state that "the sociology of knowledge must concern itself with everything that passes for 'knowledge' in society", what they mean is "the sociology of knowledge must first of all concern itself with what people 'know' as 'reality' in their everyday, non- or pre-theoretical lives" (Berger & Luchmann, 1991, p. 26-27). Due to the marginality of the people who engage with higher, theoretical forms of knowledge they are relatively trivial for the functioning of society as a whole. In this study social constructivism will be accepted, however the emphasis of Berger & Luchmann on the primacy of everyday knowledge will be replaced with a focus on the higher forms of knowledge as the topic of study necessitates that.

An important point to add in this discussion can be Foucaultian notion of power/knowledge. An important aspect of this notion was to link epistemological and political in a deeper level. "Knowledge is a system of power and a discursive practice at the same time" (Foucault, 1980). For Foucault knowledge cannot be reduced to a mere tool in the power play between different social groups. Power/knowledge is rather producing the subjectivities that are in conflict. Following this idea it would be wrong to assume that knowledge was used by power groups in modernity for their own interests and thus they

corrupted ideals of autonomous individuality and freedom of academy. Knowledge as a discursive form of power (and power as knowledge in operation) sets the possibilities of politics itself. It defines what could be said, what forms of action are legitimate and what are the ultimate aims of political action are, in other words power/knowledge defines the subjectivities that will be manifested in a given historical political field. Therefore the political field itself is product of knowledge/power.

Subjectivity in Foucaultian framework appears according to the nexus of power knowledge. Therefore for Foucault, unlike the liberal or Marxist formulations, knowledge does not have an emancipatory moment or power has no neutral, legitimate or privileged domain for its operation (Delanty, 2001a, p. 16). Their existence and activity must be rather considered as mutually dependent and productive for other. The process of “normalization” discussed by Foucault in “Discipline and Punish” is especially to understand the university. The notion of excellence implies integration and standardization for universities similar to the Foucault’s concept normalization. Foucault explored the concept in context of emergence of modern penal system that sees variations from norm as pathologies that must be corrected in his Discipline and Punish. In the premodern punishment system the crime was seen as the challenge to law in its essence, thus the violator of law must be punished in a spectacle manner so that it was made clear again the authority, which was understood related to the body of the king, would not tolerate such acts that tried to transgress its boundaries. However in modern disciplinary apparatuses understands crime not as an act of freedom but rather as pathological action of a sick body that must be cured to its healthy state and reintegrate the perpetrator into the system as a healthy subject. Thus the normal subject is the natural, healthy and desired one. After its emergence, in the eyes of modern subject retrospectively all the pre-modern forms of punishment seemed obsolete, uncivilized and unnecessary forms of cruelty. Similarly from the perspective of university of excellence, old university appears to be wasteful, slow and inefficient.

The Foucaultian idea become influential and accepted by other important thinkers. Such accounts accepted the relation between power and knowledge. However they also proposed that knowledge is also shaped by deeper cognitive structures. They focused on explaining how society and its culture penetrate into knowledge as science. In Kuhn this was something that threatens the consensus based paradigm (Kuhn, 1970; Fuller, 2000). For

Apel (1980) it was necessary part of constitution of a “scientific communication community”. And for Habermas (1987) in his famous work “Knowledge and human Interests” there is a distinction between “knowledge as Wissen” and “knowledge as Erkenntnis” and his emphasis was on Erkenntnis. Moreover Habermas (Delanty, 2001a, p.16) proposes a different position. He emphasizes communicative aspect of social relations and sees the modernity as the expansion of the communication. This expansion means the possibility of openness to every part of social system, thus the project of modernity is an emancipatory one. He also wrote on the university reforms debate in Germany after World War II. His vision on university similarly emphasized the indispensability of communication to university. He argued the ongoing communication of academics and professionals provide enough unity for university continue without any reference to underlying idea (Habermas, 1987, pp. 20-22). Another noteworthy work on sociology of university is produced by Bourdieu (1988). His research was based on “academic field”. In line with all his research he tried to emphasize the relationally of social field by considering vast amount of data.

An important theorization of science as a socially constructed knowledge comes from Bloor (1991) in his “Knowledge and Social Imaginary”. He argues powerfully that science can be object of sociology of knowledge. He criticizes arbitrary division made by sociologist that sociology just analyses different or primitive forms of knowledge but does not try to explain the production of scientific forms of knowledge, although the works by sociologist of knowledge structures and categories of other societies provide examples that can be used for analysis of scientific knowledge. This is caused by a deep assumption that science is a specific case. This assumption must be overcome in order to conduct sociology of knowledge on university, as university in its modern meaning signifies higher scientific establishment⁵. Our conception of knowledge as a social construct accepts the Bloorian Strong Programme and its premises on nature of science and all knowledge in general. The most important premise of strong programme in this sense is that it rejects autonomy of knowledge and proposes to use a “symmetrical analysis” where all forms of knowledge will be able to make and the same models for explanation will be applied to both true and false

⁵ Arguably the task of this study would be easier compared to that of Bloor’s as the analysis of higher scientific establishment as the site of production of knowledge already implies the social roots of knowledge and gives us the upper hand.

ideas (Bloor, 1991, pp. 7-8). The rejection of some ideas over others happen in a social context and any sociological explanation (like Merton's) will fall to the trap of absolutizing a form of knowledge or a faculty of human beings in believing that it produces a privileged form of knowledge. The constructivist position of strong programme will be a central tenet in our approach to sociology of knowledge.

An important debate in philosophy of knowledge was the debate between Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn. Thomas Kuhn (1970) argued that science does not culminate but rather operate through periods of order interrupted by ruptures and emergence of a period of scientific order. In other words paradigms (in Kuhn's words "normal science") are later followed by emergence of a new paradigm to serve as the basis for unity of science. Therefore science operates with episodes in scientific history. A paradigm signifies that there is an established belief in certain premises and metaphors on the nature of reality that science is based on. The normal science is always creative as it extends its internal logic for explanation of principally all known phenomena. If there are inconsistencies (like unsolvable paradoxes) they are not seen as barriers for paradigm as the paradigm is still in process of expanding. Therefore such events of hardship are seen as unsolvable issues due to their complexity or due to methods of measurement that are not available at that time. Scientists operate in this field of possible knowledge until they reach hardships and paradigm starts to seem unable to explain much of the new phenomena that are discovered. Such moments are signs of limits of paradigms, usually on these moments different (and sometimes mutually exclusive) paradigms compete for hegemony over scientific field. These times of non-hegemony ends when a certain paradigm establishes its hegemony and a state of normal science emerges again (though a different one). The times of non-hegemony between different claims to scientific knowledge are called by Kuhn as "extraordinary science". Between periods of extraordinary science and normal science there is a moment of revolution the time of emergence of a new paradigm. Therefore a paradigm is actually a belief held by a group of scientists who has authority over a given field. The community of scientists as a notion can also be linked to society just like university as site of production of higher forms of knowledge is linked to society. Similarly the notion of paradigm will be employed as the model of development (or rather operation) of knowledge in our analysis. Moreover these paradigms (as modes of

knowledge) will be linked to their social conditions of existence and university as a part of those conditions.

There were also other sociologists and social theorists who studied contemporary transformation of society on the basis of change in the structures and essence of knowledge. This makes them relevant to the thesis. Some of them were Bell (1976), Touraine (1971) and Castells (1996) who produced extensive accounts of contemporary society. Their importance for us comes from their extensive analysis of knowledge and society relation in post-industrial age. According to Castells humans are now living in a knowledge society as knowledge become central to our social formation (Webster, 2002). With this remark a short discussion of history of sociology of knowledge and a selection of important ideas that will give insight into contemporary society and knowledge will be concluded for purposes of this thesis.

1.2.2. Methodology: Defining the Aims of Sociology of University

A social and historical account of university would require employing diverse ideas, in the following paragraphs justification for the methodological approach of thesis will be provided.

The two most important concepts that will be employed are “University of Culture”, which signifies the modern university institution based around the idea of national culture, and “University of Excellence”, which defines university as a bureaucratic administrative institution, devoid of ideological content (Readings, 1996)⁶. Readings also calls the contemporary university as “Posthistorical University” as narrative of historical mission of nation becomes irrelevant in globalizing capitalism. Instead of narratives of national or human emancipation, University of Excellence is committed to maximize customer (student) satisfaction, increase its commercial research and do whatever needed to increase its competitiveness and go higher in the university ranking systems. Readings calls the process that university gives up giving reference to culture as its legitimation point, as

⁶ Some of such works about university and written from excellence discourse are the following: Cabal (1993), Etzkowitz, Webster, Gebhardt & Terra (2000), Oleksiyyenko (2002) and Karaca (2002)

the process of dereferentialization. Erdoğan (2003) warns that posing the contemporary university this way Readings lapses into assuming that it no longer embodies an ideology. He claims due to the fetishist character of commodity form, "Ideology does not need to address an integral, a doxa or belief content". In this sense "Excellence itself is the proof that ideology functions" and "University of Excellence is an ideology that becomes material in its practices" (Erdoğan 2003, p.47). This debate is about the nature of excellence, whether it is a discourse or an ideology. Readings in his book defends his position against possible criticism, one of which is the one expressed by Erdoğan. He argues he consciously avoided calling Excellence an ideology as the concept ideology can only be meaningful when it is contrasted to a non-ideology, such as "Lukacsian notion of "objective Truth" or an Althusserian account of "critical self-consciousness" (Readings, 1996, p. 197). Therefore for Readings as it is now impossible to determine such an outside position to ideology, ideology loses its significance as concept. In this thesis Excellence will be taken as a discourse to show the change in the role of university more precisely.

In the thesis theoretical framework of the sociology of knowledge developed by Delanty (2001a) will be critically discussed and utilized in order to understand the historical transition of university and condition of university in the contemporary social formation. Delanty (2001a, pp. 17-18) makes a threefold distinction; institutional framework, the cultural model and the mode of knowledge production of a given society. These terms will be central to our understanding therefore each of them will be explained in detail below:

Institutional Framework (Delanty, 2001a, p.18): This concept refers to social, political and economic organization of a society in a given period. All relevant systems and institutions of a social formation will be included under this term (except university which will be discussed in a more detailed manner). Also terms related to organization of production in a given society will be a part of this category, namely the mode of production (Marx) and mode of development (Castells) will be seen as important structural determinants of a social system. Moreover following the characteristics of knowledge all contents of institutional framework of a society are products of knowledge, in other words they are objectified knowledge. In the thesis three institutional frameworks will be analyzed, liberal capitalist period that starts with the emergence of modern nation-state, followed by Fordist

period that starts by after the Great Depression and World Wars and lastly followed by the emergence of global capitalist period starting in early 70's.

Culture: This concept which Delanty employs as the cultural model of society refers to what Weber's interpretive sociology as "value orientations". According to Delanty cultural model signifies the self-knowledge of groups in society. However for a more precise description of the essential relation between modern university and culture in this thesis cultural model will be used as the sum of all knowledge and result of tradition of an ethnic identity, as it was expressed in the mother language of community (Readings, 1996, pp. 14-15). Therefore it signifies a specific legitimating ideology of a social formation. It will be argued that emergence of modernity was based on formulation of such national culture. Readings argues "culture was always positioned in modernity as a reconstruction of a lost authenticity (in its nostalgic or romantic mode) or as a coming to terms with the loss of origin (in its ironic or high modernist mode)" (Readings 1996, p. 50). Therefore culture means a peculiar social bound that was the basis of human society in modern period. However decline of national culture and loss of culture as a significant reference in postmodernity problematized the function of university, giving way to transformation of university from University of culture to University of Excellence.

Mode of knowledge production: signifies the most abstract and theoretical formulations of self-consciousness of a given society and organizations that are responsible for their formulations (Delanty, 2001a, pp.17-18). It signifies the conditions of knowledge and its production in a given historical period of human societies. In the thesis a transformation in mode of production will be analyzed as a change from general intellectual to a specialist professional. The coming of prominence of technology will be another central tenet of this concept.

The unity of these three categories represents a trifold dialectic in which each of them became active elements of both reproduction and transformation of others and itself at the same time. "In this view knowledge is linked (largely through the institution of university) to the cognitive complexes of culture and to social practices and institutional structures" (Delanty, 2001, p.18).

The concept of cognitive shift (Delanty, 2001a, p.19) will also be employed. However to make sense of the concept first discussion of the relation between history and sociology must be made. The socio-historical theory of modernity gives some insights on how to link social change with changes in knowledge. “Social theory of modernity from Weber to Foucault, Bourdieu, Touraine and Habermas has offered ways to linking knowledge and intellectual paradigms to major social transformations” (Delanty, 2001a, p. 16). The insight these works brings us to formulate the cognitive periods and cognitive shifts that occurred in modernity. “By this [Cognitive shift] is meant more than just changes in the mode of knowledge; it encompasses the wider transformation of culture and society. A shift entails a shift from potential for learning that is contained on the level of knowledge to its socio-cultural appropriation on the level of cultural models and institutional innovation. (Delanty, 2001a, p. 19)”

Delanty (2001a) theorizes cognitive shift as “an evolutionary change in cultural model and institutional framework” in his functionalistic approach to the topic. However he also warns that a sole change or renegotiation in mode of knowledge production or dominant cultural model or some superficial change in the institutional framework of society does not automatically entail a cognitive shift (Delanty, 2001a, p. 19). The old structures and ideas can continue to function even under conditions of contest and challenge (Delanty, 2001a p. 19). A process of transition that demands to be categorized as cognitive shift must consist of a change in mode of knowledge and cultural model that creates an institutional innovation (and institutional evolution) in a society. A similar concept was also introduced by Santos, (1995). He called it “paradigmatic shift” and analyzed as the moment when knowledge as emancipation gains power over knowledge as regulation thus leading to a change in organization of society on an institutional basis and culture.

By expressing the essential ideas of sociology of knowledge Fuchs (2008, p. 115) defines knowledge as such:

Knowledge doesn't exist in nature as such; it is a human and cultural product. It exists both in individual human brain and in social structures and artifacts. Due to being social and not naturally given it have subjective and objective aspects that are mutually connected. As knowledge can only be produced in an already existing tradition of thought it necessarily refers to a social process. One of the main ideas

behind sociology of knowledge is that knowledge does not exist as a metaphysical entity; rather it is a product of society.

Therefore essential characteristics of Knowledge according to Fuchs are the following: (1) It is a human product. Its nature is inevitably cultural and social. It is always an act of understanding as subject can never be totally separated from its own conditions of experience, (2) it can be materialized as concrete artifacts or social institutions. Therefore they are not just ideas but they are ideas that could have concrete effects, (3) it has a dialectical relationship with the social processes. Knowledge always travels between the first and second aspects mentioned. Knowledge is produced by subjective humans and produce objective conditions of social existence. The social condition of existence in return determines the boundaries of possible knowledge by producing subjectivities that produce new forms of knowledge.

Therefore this dialectic between subjective knowledge and its objective realization as a socio-historical thing occurs and reoccurs continuously in an active way. These three essential and interconnected characteristics of knowledge will be taken as basis of knowledge as it will be used in thesis. It is now also appropriate to emphasize that university must be seen as the social institution that produces and reproduces knowledge is also a product of knowledge, thus it is part of the dialectic of knowledge.

On more specific level the questions that will be emphasized upon in each period of social organization between university and society will be those articulated by Guy Neave (2000). Modern university is closely related to emergence of modern nation-state and modern society. On this issue Guy Neave proposes six questions that are important to understand the relation between society and university. In this sense these questions remained as important guides for understanding the relation between university and the society it is related. Of course this does not mean that answers to these questions remained the same throughout ages or societies. The points that must be discussed can be summarized as follows (Neave, 2000, p.4):

- 1) How is the community which the university is answerable conceived
- 2) What is the role of Government in relation to university?
- 3) What is the place of Academia in the nation?

- 4) Is university an institution of change or stability?
- 5) What does knowledge of university play in society?
- 6) What is the opinion on control over knowledge by society (through government)?

There is also need to mention that although the thesis takes globalization in relation to capitalism to be the most important factor of decline of modern university the unequal development of different nations will not be addressed. Therefore although capitalist globalization implies homogenization in universities throughout the world, it is not necessarily the case that each and every university and national system is totally integrated into the global academic market. Rather the typology of University of Excellence represents a global trend that is still in progress of realization, reconfiguring the specific universities and national and international higher education systems.

In the rest of this chapter a short summary of the central discussion of thesis will be provided. Modernity was a huge rupture in the self-understanding of humanity. The social existence of humans changed greatly due to transformations that culminated in the French Revolution and advent of nation-state. As the knowledge was started to be seen related to emancipation of humanity by production of autonomous subjects, the importance of university increased greatly. It replaced the spiritual bound of society by providing a national narrative of historical mission of humanity that give meaning to the unity of particular societies and a general sense of humanity as a whole. Moreover at the same time the modern university had made a very profitable alliance with the nation-state in this period that granted it a lot of privileges in exchange of production and reproduction of the particularity of the nation-state (Kwiek, 2008, pp. 3-4). In this thesis the emergence of modern university and nation-state will be followed in the discussions of Prussian philosophers' discussion on the Idea of University. Tension between Kant's liberal narrative of university (based on reason and progress of humanity) and Fichte's nationalist narrative of university (based on the ethnic identity and its historical mission) represent the two sides of the enlightenment project of emancipation in relation to modern university. These debates were realized in the founding of Berlin University by Prussian minister of education of the time, and also a philosopher himself, Wilhelm von Humboldt. The Humboldtian idea of university was based on defending the development of philosophical knowledge and education of pupils according to the ideal of *Bildung*. Although in the Prussian context the

central faculty that will lead nation to emancipation was thought to be the Philosophy, in other social contexts national literature departments replaced it. They provided the knowledge of national unity in terms of shared literature, not as a shared philosophical tradition.

In Fordist industrial period, technological necessities in research and technical knowledge requirement in education in the 21st Century, massified university which was essentially an elitist institution from its beginnings. Technological knowledge and skills increasingly become come to fore of function of universities. Especially after World War II, the assigning the role to technology as a tool to realize historical mission of nation is replaced by the prominence of technology over the national ideals. Also throughout the 20th Century United States increasingly moved to the global dominance of university education replacing the German Universities.

In early 70's another period started to emerge which will be as postmodern⁷. In this era, which still continues, economy increasingly becomes knowledge based and globalized, cultural values associated with modernity fall into a decline and a major transformation in the nature of knowledge production and mode of knowledge occurs.

⁷ The utilization of the term postmodern does not imply that continuities between modernity and postmodernity will be undermined.

CHAPTER II

Modernity and University

2.1. The Prehistory of Modern University

In this section the prehistory of modern university will be provided to show its historical roots. According to K. Jaspers (1959, p. 7) “it was in Greece that idea of education was first carried out and perceived in a way which has been accepted since then by everyone who understands it.” Though, the real connection between modern universities and the Greek philosophical Communities might be less significant than Jaspers’ idealistic account implies⁸.

Chroust (1967) argued “Academy itself was indeed a school for aspiring statesmen — perhaps the first organized “institute of political science” in the Western world”. Chronologically the emergence of Plato’s Academy dates back to 386-385 BC. In pedagogical terms Plato believed the imitation of the teacher was the best way of education. He was proponent of the idea that learner can only learn by imitation of the teacher. Beyond the bounds of imitation no text book existed in Academy. This was absolute truth for Plato in the process of education. Plato did not believe that there was a genuine method that guarantees the learners penetration to essence of truth as sophists claimed to have. Plato criticized Sophists that they believed teaching only technical methods could make learner virtuous, he ridiculed them for that. (Shichalin, 2000 p. 170-171)

⁸ Reading finds ideological reasons at the core of this idea of lost origin in Greek culture. He says the classics departments were important for the modern university due to their function as the link between Greek roots to the modern nation, thus representing the modern nation as the true heirs of the rational public community of Greek-city states (Readings, 1996, p. 33). Although, this portrayal of Greek community was anachronistic and based on what we want to see in the Greek way of life today, it never the less helped the narrative of historical mission of nation-state based on development of human culture.

In "The state" Plato creates a program of education in which he formulates the aim of education as the rising soul of the learner to true being. In there he determined the necessary courses for the learners' souls were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy and music. These subjects constitute contents of "quadrivium". This tradition –as it will be discussed– was continued in liberal education tradition through Middle Ages to Modernity Era. According to Plato all these subjects were crowned by dialectics. In his opinion a philosophical school must make the soul of learner an embodiment of ideal norms upbringing and to develop the learner's virtues and his aspiration for truth. Provided that everyone gets their proper upbringing for their social stratum one can attain an ideal state system.

After Plato another important community, called Lyceum, was established by Aristotle. He appeared in Athens in 366 BC and remained in academy until Plato's death (He spent about 20 years in Academy). Academy had a tradition that most talented students could be teachers in time. Unsurprisingly, Aristotle was one of them. In his years in Academy he noticed the efficiency of rhetorical principles in the analysis of the art of speculation as developing this tradition he created the form of writing that is called "treatise" – a didactic work analyzing a particular theme or range of themes in a systematic way.

At the academy he wrote some texts whose importance come from the fact that due to their stress on the successive study of sciences and their significance, most of them were could be regarded as concrete manuals which can be used to study rhetoric, poetics, dialectics or topics analytics, physics, a science of sky, the first form of philosophy, ethics, psychology, biology, and lastly politics (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, pp. 11-13). The properties of Lyceum: The Lyceum had Mouseion (temple of muses) an altar and a number of premises. There was a library in a separate building where numerous collections and maps of Earth were preserved (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, pp. 11-13). The system of education was well arranged and regulated. Once a month students were assembled at symposia. They kept the tradition of Plato's school, where along the head of the school, the most prominent students of him could deliver lectures. It became traditional that Aristotle gave lectures on more complicated subjects in the morning, after that elementary lectures on rhetoric and dialectics were given to general public.

According to Poliakov & Savchuk (2010, p. 17) "Education in the early middle ages was actually the prerogative of church". The principles of education were based on the provisions of its most prominent representatives, in particular St. Augustine. In accordance with that in medieval Christian social formation it was believed that the faith must precede the knowledge. The central questions of medieval knowledge was not epistemological, the questions were metaphysical and concerned with the overcoming of the finitude and insufficiency of man by means of reaching to the infinite and sufficient and whole (Frederick, 1993, p. 51). Similarly, education in the early middle ages had two separate aims. In the schools like Bologna University the aim was towards acquiring of necessary vocational skills to achieve high ranks in bureaucracy and in other schools like Paris University the aim was the cognition of god (Poliakov & Savchuk 2010, p.17).

Historians assume that the first university was University of Bologna in 1088. The origin of University of Bologna was bounded with the activity of one lawyer, Irnerius (Poliakov & Savchuk 2010, p.18). He and his students studied Roman law to provide solutions for better organization of the legal system of the time. The successes of this group were so huge that large amount of students were sent to Bologna in search of knowledge that was so authentic, resulting in the establishment of the oldest known university. The second known university was also founded around the same time, which was The University of Paris. Its education was based on liberal arts and theology (but mainly the latter). There was a strict separation between subjects, supervised by Pope. For example; University of Paris was center of theology and University of Bologna was center of legal science and education.

The University in Bologna was largely controlled by university pupils (*Universitas Scholarium*) who in certain agreement hired the professors whose lectures they wanted to listen to. The teacher and a student relation were on corporate basis. Teaching was the private affair of teacher and student. If a teacher had knowledge that student wished to acquire he needed to pay for that. Governing body was consisted of students and professors had to obey them. Moreover the right to elect rector belonged to students and only a student could be rector. Both professors and students swore to obey the rector and follow the university code. In sharp contrast to Bolognian model, from the beginning university was controlled by professors (*Universitas Magistrorum*) in University of Paris. Students had practically had no possibility to effect the decisions of university in Parisian

model. Model of organization of Bologna University historically became marginalized and universities increasingly organize closer to the Parisian example and Parisian one became the dominant model for Continental Europe for rest of the Medieval Era (Poliakov & Savchuk 2010, pp. 20-22). British university system was similar to Parisian one. The only important difference was co-residence of students. In the end of 13th Century such student residents were provided with land and lodging creating a space called college (*Collegia*) (Poliakov & Savchuk 2010, p. 25).

There was no fixed academic period until 15th Century (Poliakov & Savchuk 2010, p. 33). The lectures were given in Latin and were divided as ordinary and extraordinary. This division was based on the hardness of the text studied similar to contemporary division of courses in undergraduate and graduate (and also similar to division of courses in Lyceum) (Poliakov & Savchuk 2010, p. 33). One peculiarity of academic process in medieval mode of knowledge and its pedagogical form in medieval society was the stability of the texts to study in general and at each faculty at particular. In the faculty of medicine the course material were Galen's works, at the faculty of law it was Justinian's works, at the faculty of theology they were the Bible and "The Book of Maxims" by Peter Lombardy as its complimentary. "*Historia Scholastic*" by Peter Yedoc was also used in courses (Poliakov & Savchuk 2010, pp. 33-34). In liberal arts the distinction of two standard blocks of subjects; *trivium* (grammar, rhetoric and logics) and *quadrivium* (arithmetic, music, geometry and astronomy) was continued. However three philosophies were added to quadrivium natural, moral and metaphysical ones. Following Aristotelian tradition, the most complex lessons were delivered in the morning, and more elementary ones were delivered in afternoon (Poliakov & Savchuk 2010, p. 34).

In Medieval social formation the Christianity was the center of life and provider of the sense of community for people. However The Great Schism of The Church damaged the spiritual unity of Christianity in 15th Century (Rüegg, 1996). The second hit came in 16th Century by emergence of Reform movement. These internal conflicts in Christianity weakened the social fabric of medieval society leading to emergence of modernity. In the rest of this part, it will be argued that development of a new mode of knowledge which Delanty calls (2001a, p. 20) revolutionary knowledge which appeared after Reformation

lead to rapid growth in human knowledge in geographical, medical and technical fields and initiated early modernity.

In early modernity “finite spherical and earth-centered universe of pre-modern times was replaced by the notion of a sun centered solar system in an infinite expanse of space”, and the new mode of knowledge based on what can be broadly called as scientific methodology become the new legitimate ground of knowledge claims (Henry, 2004, p. 10). Moreover, the knowledge of natural world acquired by the proper application of scientific method and thinking was considered to “lead to irresistible progress of mankind” by Enlightenment thinkers (Henry, 2004, p. 11). This new idea of progress was so powerful that “[b]y seventeenth century the universal ideology gradually shifted from Christianity to modern experimental science and its rationalizing logic” (Delanty, 2008, p 6).

These developments signify a change in the mode of knowledge. The new mode of knowledge was revolutionary, emancipatory and humanist (Delanty 2001a, p. 20). It marked a turn to subject as measure of truth in the sense that knowledge became something that was publically available. Reformation and Enlightenment were all expressions of a preoccupation with the independence of knowledge from political and religious authority. Development of empiricism and rationalism were against dogmatic status quo at the time, although positivism is now widely seen as oppressive. In the words of Delanty (2001b):

Although these epistemologies were tainted as positivistic, it must be remembered that in their time they were emancipatory in their postulation of democratic nature of knowledge as something available to any human being as opposed to the prerogative of an institutional authority (p. 22).

Empiricism developed idea of experience and claimed that the validity of knowledge must be tested by sensible methods. On the other hand rationalism was focusing on the certainty of mind and logic as the criteria for truth (Henry, 2004, pp. 12-13). They enabled the human subject both as the producer and discoverer of knowledge, as opposed to any dogma or text that supposed to contain the ultimate truth.

The two champions of this new philosophy were Descartes and Bacon. Newton combined experimentalism of Bacon with rational logical technique of Descartes and also contributed

greatly to physics by his theory of gravity (Henry, 2004, p. 12). It was a huge achievement if it is considered in the context that for two thousand years there were no serious knowledge that could challenge the natural philosophy of Aristotle.

The effect of the new mode of knowledge that transcends its epistemological benefits was related to the idea of subject. In the essence of revolutionary mode of knowledge, there was the Enlightenment narrative of the emancipation of autonomous subject from tyranny and tradition. However the emancipation could only be acquired with rational knowledge, which could provide the power for one to transcend tradition and superstition and reach universality. Therefore reason started to be seen as a transparent and autonomous entity that could transcend the historicity of individual. With the autonomous activity of reason, human could find the natural laws that must govern the human conduct in social relations (just like it could found the laws of nature). Toulmin (1992) calls this vision of society perfectly ordered by laws of nature as the idea of "Cosmopolis". Moreover this meant that scientific knowledge that was achieved by the free inquiry of reason must be considered as an autonomous entity, which could lead the human life to a better future. Due to this idea of human progress, progressives of the era thought it would be best for humanity if knowledge was put at the center of society, replacing the religion. In short autonomy of knowledge was seen as a progressive force that could bring enlightenment to people. This essential idea that lies at the heart of enlightenment thinking gradually became popular throughout the modernity.

In terms of mode of knowledge production, the universities (especially the catholic ones) were initially outside of this new wave of knowledge, though by the 17th Century they gradually started to leave their bounds with the religious authority and started to become affected by the new mode of knowledge (Delanty, 1998b, p. 7)⁹. However, their distance from the progress, combined with their elitist nature made them very unpopular institutions in early modern period

Even though mechanistic approaches of natural and technical sciences were gradually penetrating into the university, this process was so slow that the role of the significant centers was performed to a large extent by academies and

⁹ The account of University in early modernity is different in the important work of Rüegg (1996). He claims universities contributed substantially to the enlightenment.

alternative higher educational establishments [and not by universities themselves]. Universities acted as censors, they withdraw works that are seen as too liberal. In 18th Century universities were increasingly started to be seen by states in modernization processes as dysfunctional institutions. “They were criticized due to their low level of culture isolated intellectualism and sluggish way of thinking, this was [especially] true for France, England and Italy (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p. 51).

As universities were considered as obsolete institutions that supported status quo, in other words ancient regime (Except non-Catholic universities that started to appear after Restoration), the early modern thinkers and scientists were mostly outside of university institutions of their time (Delanty, 1998b, p. 7). The prominent thinkers of this time period were mostly general intellectuals, mostly self-thought and had a distance, even distaste for universities. Especially the Renaissance intellectual as the social type that produced revolutionary mode of knowledge was mostly autodidact and polymath. The intellectuals of the era were free floating individuals mostly writing letters in between their intellectual communities, which was the main mode of communication of academic ideas till they were replaced by journals. They were “often members of aristocracy or reformed clergy” (Delanty, 2001a, p. 22). Revolutionary mode of knowledge of the period was produced in a diffused, non-specialized and uninstitutionalized manner and in close relation to public.

Outside of university circles there were state supported royal societies, academies and research institutions that supported intellectuals and scientific research. These spaces were more vibrant in terms of knowledge production and scientific discussion. Due to this duality between universities and public spaces of science, two kinds of knowledge can be mentioned in early modern period; one public and the other one academic. As many universities were sided with the Catholic Church, universities’ distance from public and society and their lay knowledge become problematic in early modern conditions, this “disdain for common knowledge eventually became the hallmark of intellectual critique” (Delanty, 1998b, p. 7).

The main reason behind the rise of the soundness of the autonomy of knowledge in early modernity was the progress achieved in the human knowledge, especially in terms of empirical sciences as discussed in the paragraphs above. However, the change experienced in modernity was not just a change in mode of production; it was much more substantial than that. The full effect of penetration of the revolutionary mode of knowledge into

culture and institutional framework of society unfolded in French and American Revolutions with their ground breaking manifestations of humanly order and radical opposition to religion. These events signaled the success of modernity and changed organization of societies globally. These events also signify the limits of early modernity as the success of the project of modernity brings about new questions (Delanty, 2001a). The most important of which, in relation to university, was the question of how to unify autonomy of knowledge with the new modern nation-state.

2.2. The University of Culture

2.2.1. Modernity and Advent of The Nation-State

The success of French and American Revolutions caused a global effect that necessitated modernization process to speed up in every aspect of social and political life throughout the World. Nation-states emerged as new hegemonic forms of political power.

Seeking such answers necessarily lead to reformulation of questions which in the end affected both cultural models and mode of knowledge of modernity and resulted in a new cognitive regime. Cultural model emerged based itself on secularization, cultural differentiation, rationalization (Delanty, 2001a, p. 20) and expressed the ideal of autonomy. This ideal of autonomy also appeared in the mode of knowledge production of the time as ideals of academic freedom, institutional autonomy of universities (Delanty, 2001a p. 20) (Rüegg, 2004, pp. 5-8) and the idea of *Bildung* as a pedagogical model (Kwiek, 2008). As now the social groups with modern ideas were gaining power, this situation created new problems. The relation between power and knowledge needed to be reformulated as it could no longer be an opposition as it was with tyrants of old regime. As bourgeoisies or civil society replaced the court society, mode of knowledge shifted from “unity” to neo-humanist positivist and Enlightenment aspiration towards the autonomy of knowledge (Delanty, 2001a, pp. 20-21). This idea was evident in the thought of Hegel and Comte and before them Kant (Delanty, 2001a, p. 21). Hegel and Comte saw history as progressive self-constitution of humanity by development of knowledge (with each successive development, knowledge and its subjects taking a new form).

According to Delanty (2001b, p. 150) university is “one of the key institutions of modernity”. After French revolution, the idea of university became a hot topic among the thinkers. This debate was especially important in Prussia, which had a tradition of humanistic university education. This tradition gives importance to cultural aspect of education, development of character (which was not given much importance in France). It was this tradition that would create the modern university or, in other words, Humboldtian University. It is essential to look at the debate among the Prussian intellectuals to understand the modern university. This task will now be taken in the following subtopics.

Bjorn Wittrock (1996, p. 305) argues in his essay “The Modern University Three Transformations” that emergence of modern university is intimately linked to another one, namely the rise of nation-state both in newly formed politics of Italy and Germany or through reform of older state organizations such as France and States of America.

In this part of thesis it will be argued that the emergence of modern university was connected to the narrative of culture as the social bound of a secular community, namely the citizens of nation-state. University was an important institution that replaced church as institution that was giving the society its identity. University did that by serving for the development national consciousness and culture. It was instrumental in the formation of national unity of society and functioning of capitalist economy, especially in modernity. In the rest of this section the emergence of nation-state will be seen as the point of inception of the specific power/knowledge nexus called university.

The importance of emergence of nation-states for establishment of modern universities was crucial. Even the symbol of the ideal of modern university (Berlin University) was established as an expressed opposition to Napoleonic model. Neave (2000) agrees with this point that a crucial step in development of European Universities was the process of nationalization. According to Kwiek (2008, p. 6) nationalization signifies “bringing the university formally into the public domain as a national responsibility”. In the process of establishment of national state, university was in obligation to serve the national community thus university was incorporated as a state service (Neave, 2001, p. 21).

The only thing changing in mode of knowledge was not the fact that the medieval mode of knowledge based on derivations from revealed truth was being replaced by a knowledge

whose subject was humanity. The change was deeper: universities were becoming crucial steps in the definition of nation itself by perpetuating certain forms of knowledge, traditions, historical narratives, languages and culture, thus creating a “scientific” knowledge that nation-state could represent its uniqueness and exceptionalism. Moreover, university took the role of creator of a certain national knowledge that is or could be shared by society as a basis of citizenship and provider of the national subjects that could assume the roles in state bureaucracy and further the nationalization process in different forms. Establishment of modern university was also an ideal of modern institution in terms of the responsibility and role of a modern institution and the community which a modern institution needed to be answerable. Modern university in this sense was an example to many other modern institutions that would emerge (Neave, 2000, p. 5). The nationalization of university went hand to hand with the nationalization of academics (Neave, 2001, p. 30)

As the political order changed it created new topics appear that must be addressed in many fields of social life. The new political order was that of the nation-state. Universities made a pact with the new political order and thanks to this new pact they could asses much greater resources than they used to be had. This created an expansion of the knowledge produced as modernity progressed. This success represented university as an achievement of modernity. Kwiek (2008) wrote a detailed paper on the changing relations between university and state. He conducted his research not only as a history but also a philosophy to show the embeddedness of Humboldtian idea of university in the modern social history. The most important factor in development of modern university was the modern nation state. He analyzed the discussions in 19th (Among Humboldt, Fichte, Schleiermacher and Schelling) as well as 20th Century (The debate between Jaspers and Habermas).

A discussion of the debate on idea of university among Prussian thinkers will be provided in the next section. It will provide us with insights on how the relation between knowledge and society were established in the modern era. The importance of this debate should not be underestimated. In the words of Thomas (1973, p. 219) the debate on the idea of university and its social implications “marks one of the few instances in which a philosophical anthropology formed the explicit basis of a successful program for social change”. Emergence of German university, as the blueprint for modern university, was an example of social change that was facilitated and supported by the nationalization itself.

Humboldt as a policy maker and philosopher crystalized these ideas into a concrete institution, The University of Berlin. Therefore in this part it is intended to give a general idea on how the legacy of Humboldtian University continued in different places and continents as the dominant model of university (of course with some local variations). In other words, what this chapter will describe will be the situation of university in modernity. More specifically the period under consideration begins with French Revolution and rise of nation-state and ends with the cognitive crisis experienced in Great Depression and WWI, which led to a general reorganization of society, its dominant cultural model and its mode of knowledge.

2.2.2. The Idea of University Debate Among Prussian Thinkers:

2.2.2.1. Kant and Idea of University as a Site of Critique

University became modern when the need to centralize all activities of university according to one criterion. Kant, one of the earliest of German philosophers who tried find such criterion, proposed it to be reason, and formulated a way to unite power and knowledge (institutionally signified as state and university). According to Kant (1979) a university consists of different domains of knowledge brought together in a community. University has autonomy because only other professors can judge other professors in their fields. Universities have Faculties in order to fulfill their functions. Finally university has right to entitle people (according to its own rules) to be doctors.

However this ideal schema is distorted because of the powers of state authority in positioning people in university. According to Kant University requires a faculty that is free from all constraints of power in order to be free to evaluate on everything, and as the scientific reason's aim is to find the truth. This faculty must be allowed to think freely and to share the truth with wider public. Thus, only this faculty can bring truth to light. If the state does not allow such a faculty to exist freely, it would be government that would cause the closure of truth to humanity. This faculty, because of its nature as being apart from government and having no use value apart from other faculties, is the Faculty of philosophy which is unfortunately and wrongly started to be seen as a lower faculty among the others.

Kant (1979) discussed the hierarchy of faculties prevalent at his time as follows:

According to reason (that is, objectively), the following order exists among the incentives that the government can use to achieve its end (of influencing the people): first comes the eternal well-being of each, then his civil well-being as a member of society, and finally his physical well-being (a long life and health). By public teachings about the first of these, the government can exercise very great influence to uncover the inmost thoughts and guide the most secret intentions of its subjects. By teachings regarding the second, it helps to keep their external conduct under the reins of public laws, and by its teachings regarding the third, to make sure that it will have a strong and numerous people to serve its purposes. So the ranks customarily assigned to the higher faculties-theology first, law second, and medicine third-are in accordance with reason. According to natural instinct, however, men consider the physician most important, because he prolongs their life. Next to him comes the jurist, who promises to secure their contingent possessions. And only last (almost at the point of death) do they send for the clergyman, though it is their salvation that is in question; for even the clergyman, no matter how highly he commends the happiness of the world to come, actually perceives nothing of it and hopes fervently that the doctor can keep him in this vale of tears a while longer (p. 31).

Here Kant leaves faculty of philosophy to be later introduced to the hierarchy of faculties. According to him logical order of faculties would start with theology as it deals with questions of eternal well-being and then to faculty of law as it deals with civic and social nature of humans and lastly the faculty of medicine as it is for the physical well-being of humans. Here it is apparent that he makes this hierarchy according to the premise of superiority of infinite to finite, from spiritual to bodily. However he also complains that in practice the hierarchy works in the opposite way that people, including the ones in most prestigious positions like clergyman; focus more on the physical well-being than his/her civic or divine position. Kant attributes this fact conservatively to finitude of humanity.

Kant wrote a plea to Prussian King to let philosophy faculty be dominated by principles of reason alone. his Conflict of Faculties become the statement of one of the most important views on the idea of university, especially his adherence to autonomy from social forces and demand for autonomy for academic pursuits. However, a careful reading of his statements reveals that he was not demanding this freedom in any antagonistic fashion or anything that might resemble a treat to established social order. He even respects the motto of the king "think as much as you want but obey". Thus his view excludes any attempts to social or political reform (possibly like they did in France), thus his call is to

establish enlightenment project in an orderly manner and in an elite institution. In short, knowledge and democracy did not seem allies in the modern times either. It was no surprise that emancipatory movements till 1960's did not originate from established bodies of universities (Delanty, 2001a, pp. 61-63).

In short arguably the most important piece of this debate was written by Kant in conflict of faculties in which he put the basics of academic freedom and idea of western university. In this debate, he defended philosophy faculty as the most important one on the basis that it was not connected with the state, thus it was possible for it to freely inquire into the truth. His justification for existence and importance of philosophy faculty was based on reason. In this sense the existence and free functioning of the faculty of university was requirement of a modern government, or otherwise bias would rule over reason and there would be tyranny. So he concluded that philosophy faculty must be governed by the rules of reason, not the king.

Kant's account of university became very influential and had a lasting impact which even continued to exist till this day. It became the basis for the history of university as an enlightenment institution. And on the side of knowledge, it emphasized knowledge as an end in itself, something that must be done for the sole purpose of itself.

In his view Philosophy epitomizes modernity and the university should reflect this higher domain of knowledge — 'the conflict of the faculties ' was ultimately a conflict between modernity and despotism, Enlightenment and ignorance. Kant's defense of the university as a place in which truth is reflected upon had a great impact on the subsequent history of the university as an Enlightenment design and created the justification for academic freedom in terms of knowledge as an end: the university was the protector of the nation's cognitive structures. (Delanty, 1998, p. 8)

This notion of the interest of the nation-state from the academic freedom granted to universities would be followed by some other Prussian intellectuals who were on the liberal side of the debate, including the Humboldt himself.

Epistemology was the center of the philosophical discussions of the time. As the dogmas of the Church lost their supremacy and scholastic philosophy lost its ground, the question of the true knowledge become a contested issue again. The debate essentially revolved

around the proper mode of scientific inquiry; on one side there were the followers of English empiricists (especially Bacon and Locke) who defend the idea that knowledge is essentially produced by observation of empirical phenomena, and on the other side there was Cartesian rationalism.

However, Kant and others were proposing that empirical study could not be the source of all human knowledge, thus they were trying to introduce moral philosophy and German idealism back into the domain of true knowledge. Kant's argument was dependent on separation of different spheres of human understanding, which in turn could open space for moral philosophy once again in the intellectual life.

Kant was a supporter of Enlightenment ideas. He believed firmly in the progress of humanity. Kant (1979) sees French Revolution as an event of progress in human history. However, he says the value of the revolution does not originate by the actual event that occurred in history, as it might fail or degenerate to something else; the real importance of revolution comes from the "real enthusiasm" (Wahrer Enthusiasm) people experienced during the revolution. This enthusiasm always aims for the ideal; therefore it is actually a sign of moral development in human history. Therefore, for Kant the development of humanity is at the basis its moral development. This notion of moral development will be followed by other thinkers in German tradition (some of which will be mentioned in the following chapters). According to this notion, the real progress in history does not come from structural changes or events that had great impact, but rather progress operates at a deeper level, it comes from a change in the construction of subject. In the case of enlightenment it means for Kant going beyond the selfish primitive individual who is only motivated by simple calculation of pain and pleasure to a whole new individual who reached an intellectual and moral maturity. This modern individual decides for himself, uses his/her own reason to find the ideals, norms and rules that must govern the life of civilized people. He/she only obeys the will of his/her reason. Therefore the progress of humanity could be observed by some special events as actual representations of moral development of humanity. Therefore the understanding of Kant on human progress is very different from contemporary idea of development (like progress by technological development of humanity, by abundance of wealth produced, etc...). For Kant, progress signifies moral development of individual to become an autonomous being and being autonomous

signifies going beyond the self-interest motivated behavior (the analogy Kant uses for this type of motivation is animal)

In conclusion; Kant formulates university as a site of critique. The power of critique comes from the fact that it only bows to the human reason alone. In this sense reason has the power to be critical to find its limits and demarcate right from the wrong in its domain. Due to this capacity of self-critiquing reason can not only identify the laws governing the nature but it can also be used for finding answers to the metaphysical questions, like the essential rules of social existence and aesthetics. Therefore human reason had the power to govern all aspects of human existence and in a way that would be much better than the old forms of social consensus. It could enable humans to reach the universality passing over the traditions, superstitions, arbitrariness and partiality of the previous societies (Readings, 1996, p. 57); Elevating humanity to a whole new level of humanity in the future when reason is realized in human society in an age of Enlightenment. University was in this sense a nucleus of the age of reason to come. This formulation of university became very influential. Poliakov & Savchuk (2010, p. 74) also add that “At the end of 18th Century in Protestant German universities ideas of Kant firmly established. In his works he criticized dogmatic philosophy, developing critical philosophy in place of it”. The traces of Kantian narrative based on the human emancipation and university (or critical academician) as its liberal hero could be seen in the ideas of his contemporaries like Schleiermacher and Humboldt but also in Habermas and other more recent intellectuals who wrote on university in 20th century. Readings (1996) claims that Kantian concept of reason is one of the essentials of modern university.

2.2.2.2. Fichte, Schelling and the Idea of Revival of Nation through Education

Although Kantian defense of autonomy of university was universalistic, later Prussian thinkers gave a more political role to the mission of knowledge and university. Basically, culture was the sum of all knowledge and result of tradition of an ethnic identity, as it was expressed in the mother language of community. Due to that, Readings argues that “culture” was always positioned in modernity as a reconstruction of a lost authenticity (in

its nostalgic or romantic mode) or as a coming to terms with the loss of origin (in its ironic or high modernist mode) (Readings 1996, p. 50).

In terms of national culture and university, Fichte's ideas represent romantic model. He believes the rebirth of German Nation through education was possible. His important works on the idea of university are the vocation of the scholar (given as a speech at University of Jena in 1794) and Addresses to the German nation (delivered between 1807 and 1808). He made a detailed plan for University of Berlin and was made Rector after its foundation. For Fichte (1988, p. 54) vocation of Scholar (in a Hegelian vein) was to constantly report on and support the progress of humanity. Therefore moral ennoblement of humanity was ultimate aim of education and university professor had to (?) educate the pupil for this aim. However this moral achievement cannot be secured solely by discursive education, the teacher must go beyond and transform its character to become the embodiment of the highest moral level of his/her age. Therefore must teach to pupil not only by his words but also by his example. His thinking represents philosopher as a hero of humanity to be admired.

According to Kwiek (2008, p. 20) Fichte transformed idea of *Bildung* to "a platonic educational structure that transformed *Bildung* into mere pedagogy with a pre-determined patriotic content¹⁰." His ideas were the most abstract expression of the emerging German bourgeoisie society that wished to take the revenge of their military defeat by suppressing their oppressors in the field of science. This was the aim that motivated Fichte to develop his version of a higher scientific establishment. His views were in opposition to Humboldt's and Schleiermacher's who rejected the movement for national political education.

For him the defeat of Prussia would mean death of true *Kultur* (Kwiek, 2008). The only place of refuge that could be found was through German education. However this can be asked to him that why Germans? This was due to German language which was a culmination of history that the truth can be articulated (Philosophical discussion could be made). In this logic Germans owe their uniqueness to German language, and it's the uniqueness of

¹⁰ Therefore it is no surprise that *Bildung* is sometimes used as *Allemande Bildung* (Wittrock, 1996, p. 319)

German language that for Fichte proved the uniqueness of German Nation (Kwiek, 2008). This was of course a tautology. But it proved to find its audience.

The aim of education must be training of man himself not just a part of it as it was done by the old system. The old system made the mistake of depending on the free will of the pupil. New German national education must aim to smash the free will and aim to create "a stable settled and steadfast character who is no longer developing but is and cannot be other than it is" (Fichte, 1979, p. 20). The content of this training must be "Germaneness". But who would carry out this education? Fichte answers this question as the state. The expenses of state for national education will pay off in the long term as through education there will be no deviant behavior in the nation. The state will no longer need to spend money on army, prisons or reformatories. In short Fichte believed education alone can "save us from all the ills that oppress us" (Fichte, 1979, p. 193). He believed in the emancipatory power of his philosophy and national education.

Since philosophy, as Hegel would put it, expresses its age in thought, it should replace the socially integrative power of religion with the reconciliatory power of reason. Fichte could therefore envision that a university which institutionalized such a science would become the birthplace of a future, emancipated society, the very focus of national cultivation (Habermas, 1987, p. 11)

The opponent of Fichte on the issue of university was Schleiermacher. Humboldt closer to the side of Schleiermacher in this debate and expressed his support for a more liberal approach to pedagogy (as it will be discussed in following subtopics). However it was Fichte who became the first rector of university. Therefore his ideas continued to be influential in development of universities. In short Fichte's narrative based on the national culture of community argued for reclaiming the original unity of the German nation. Fichte considered that fulfilling this historic mission of culture was the task of university.

Schelling (1981) wrote a very important book that is arguably the best explanation of philosophy, and at the same time its topic is university. As an important member of German idealist tradition he had made an important effect on development and the idea of university. His ideas are important for understanding the development of German university, therefore deserve a closer look.

His book was translated into English as “On University Studies”. His position was close to Fichte on the issue of university. He does not question and takes for granted that “universities are instruments of state and must be what the state intend them to be” (Schelling, 1981, p. 22). His ideas represent the same tension between national organization of university and universal orientation of science. He tries to overcome this problem arguing that although state can reduce universities to training schools for his staff, he cannot make (in the strong sense of the word, as a an act of creation) them “real scientific institutions”. Therefore as state requires its staff to be educated civilized and have a sense of the current situation of science and age they live in, state must let universities be guided by idea of university itself. In Schelling’s words: universities can have only an absolute purpose – beyond that they have none (Schelling, 1981, p. 29). He was also a supporter of unity of research and teaching like other philosophers, for him the idea of university necessitates the ideal of *Bildung*. In words of Habermas:

Whereas today discussions at the cutting edge of research and the presentation of this state of knowledge for purposes of instruction are two quite different things, Schelling [...] still could maintain that the construction of Philosophic thought itself gave rise to the form of its pedagogical presentation. (1987, p. 10)

2.2.2.3. Schleiermacher and The Idea of *Bildung*

Daniel Fallon (1980) noted that Schleiermacher, who prepared statutes for University of Berlin based on his earlier ideas in “Occasional Thoughts on Universities in German Sense”, determined the basic structure of German university institutions up to present time. However, a very important part of the structure he proposed, which is generally undermined and not focused enough, is that “[t]his form of administrative organization... leaves a substantial controlling share of academic administration exclusively to the state through its Ministry of Culture” (Fallon, 1980, p. 36) His ideas on the organizational structure of university later guided Humboldt. Due to that the state and university relation will be discussed on in the section on Humboldt. The focus of this section will be on the Schleiermacher’s discussion of idea of *Bildung*.

In Schleiermacher's philosophy university must be considered as a communal effort; communication was an important part of university. "Nature itself has quite clearly enunciated this law in the impossibility of scientifically producing anything exclusively without language" (Schleiermacher, 1991, p. 3). According to Schleiermacher university and state mutually require each other. The state needs the sciences as true knowledge. However state has two issues with the knowledge: Firstly, it is not impartial, it wants the knowledge that fits it, and secondly, state prefers real information over philosophical speculation. Therefore as university needs state for its existence (its political allowance and economical support) members of university must try to disassociate themselves from the state as much as possible without cutting the bound with state. They must try to infuse science into state or maintain their respect in the eyes of state (Schleiermacher, 1991, p. 42).

Schleiermacher places university in between two completely different forms of institutions. The first one is school whose mission is to instruct pupils with pre-given information. The other one is academy which presupposes all of its members are in possession of scientific thinking. Thus the mission of university is to "breed the scientific (philosophical) spirit in young people" (Kwiek, 2006, p. 18). This point shows the essence of university. It forms a transitional site between the time when the young are first influenced for science through a grounding in basic information (like a school), through authentic learning, and the time when adults in the mature power and abundance of scientific life inquire on their own so as to expand or improve the domain of knowledge (as they are members of an academy) (Schleiermacher, 1991, p. 16).

Thus the business of university, according to Schleiermacher, is development of a second nature in pupils. This second nature will make them contemplate everything from the viewpoint of science. They will look at everything in a cohesive manner, relating everything to unity of knowledge. Thus they will develop their capacity to be scientists themselves, who are able to investigate, contrive and give account (Schleiermacher, 1991, p. 16). Therefore, university gives not just information but knowledge. University represents "the unity of knowledge" (Schleiermacher, 1991, p. 17). No one can learn any part of knowledge without the proper understanding of its totality. Schleiermacher (1991, p. 16) says that " an individual who has not cultivated a definite philosophical mode of thinking will

likewise not produce scientifically and originally anything that is either noteworthy or sound". This differentiation between knowledge and information is important as this difference will become important with the change in the nature of knowledge in the postmodern condition.

Schleiermacher acknowledges that modern state requires information to continue to function. Therefore university must also provide some information for students. Therefore University is a post-school but pre-academia institution. University must relate to all knowledge and information from practical to purely theoretical. The university "has to embrace all knowing" and "must express its natural internal relation to knowing as a whole" (Schleiermacher, 1991, p. 24). Therefore although philosophy is superior, the specific disciplines of science are needed to exist under the hood of university as university must represent the unity of all knowledge.

According to Schleiermacher university has a grotesque appearance due to its divided structure into four faculties, namely the theological, legal, medical and philosophical faculties. The essence of university according to Schleiermacher lies in faculty of philosophy. Similar to Kant, Schleiermacher sees other three faculties as specialized schools; they are demanded by state and transmit pre-determined information content. Schleiermacher says all heads of faculties must be rooted in philosophical faculty. And all students must be students of philosophy at the beginning of education and must specialize later in their education in their desired fields. So each student must study their first year in philosophy faculty (Schleiermacher, 1991, p. 36).

Schleiermacher grants freedom to professors who wants to conduct research in a field he is not specialized in, thus has positive view of interdisciplinarity. Finds taking fees from students normal and useful as it "diminishes the feeling of one's dependence on the state" (Schleiermacher, 1991, p. 40). However Schleiermacher is against appointment of professors by university itself. On this issue he is interestingly pessimistic and gives a very negative impression on the profession. Universities are notorious about feuds and personal favoritism that sometimes reaches to point of self-elimination. However he says as the science reaches a more mature level the need for such external control will not be needed.

He was also supporter of academic freedom, especially the freedom to learn. The extent of freedom to learn according to Kwiek (2008) become impossible to attain today, due to its substantiality. It includes that:

[Students should not be] subject to compulsion of any kind; never will they be forced in any direction, and nothing is closed to them. No one orders them to attend this or that course session; no one can reproach them if they neglect or omit to do their work. There is no control over any of their efforts save what they themselves may give over to a teacher. They know what will be required of them when they leave the university and what kind of examinations they will then face; but with what zeal they intend to work towards this goal at any given time, and how uniformly or not they distribute it remains completely up to them. Care is taken that they do not lack in aids and resources for going ever deeper into their studies; but even though notice may be taken of how well or poorly they make use of these, at least they are not held directly accountable to anyone. In this way they therefore have full freedom to give way to indolence or worthless diversions, and instead of showing a commendable industry they can irresponsibly waste the finest time of their life (Schleiermacher, 1991, p. 50).

In short according to Schleiermacher any intervention and coercion into process of culmination of student is hazardous for pedagogical goals of university. This was so because the ultimate aim of education in university is not to instruct but to enable student (who is assumed to be wishing to do so) to develop his own mind to use for understanding. The freedom of student included all formal and habitual activities that student was used to; according to Schleiermacher they must be respected.

Freedom to teach was originally more important than freedom to learn. However later freedom to teach became more important and freedom to learn diminished in significance in the general understanding of university institution. However one thing to note on academic freedom is that Phillip G. Altbach (2003, p. 13) argues that in its original German formulation academic freedom did not include protection of expression on wider social and political issues. "Nor it was considered a violation of academic freedom that socialists and other dissenters were not eligible for academic appointments. The broader notion of

academic freedom was developed much later, mainly by American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in the beginning of 20th Century¹¹.

In this section the liberal approach of Schleiermacher on university and his view of idea of *Bildung* which will be supported and continued by Humboldt were discussed. Another important notion was the difference between knowledge and information. Information was a fragment of knowledge learned for its usefulness for a desired purpose. In this sense it was not learnt but rather memorized. In the specific sense used by German thinking, “learning or having knowledge” on the other hand meant having a perspective about the totality of knowledge. The grasp of this totality of knowledge was seen as crucial for any scientific enterprise. The pedagogical model based on the idea of *Bildung* was related to this unitary approach to knowledge, as a modern scientist or philosopher was considered to have a person with an understanding of basic principles of the state of human knowledge. Therefore at least in principle he could both contribute to the totality of knowledge and at the same time it will be guaranteed that his specific scientific profession would protect its relations with the human knowledge in general.

2.2.2.4. Wilhelm von Humboldt: The Founder of Modern University

Wilhelm von Humboldt grew up at the age of collapse of absolute monarchies and rise of French Revolution and its reshaping of Europe. He was “educated in the spirit of Rousseau and of the philanthropic school” (UNESCO, 2000, p. 1). He became friends with Schiller and Goethe. Humboldt delved into philosophy of language and linguistics^{12 13}.

¹¹ According to own history documents of AAUP: “When he [Arthur O. Lovejoy] and John Dewey organized a meeting in 1915 to form an organization to ensure academic freedom for faculty members, the AAUP was born. “Academic freedom was a new idea then” (AAUP, n.d.). The most important contribution of AAUP was their “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure”, which promoted “The common good depends upon the free search for truth and its free exposition”. This time however as opposed to narrow definition prevailing of Germany, academics of USA expanded it to include also the political and social issues (AAUP, 2006.).

¹² As a side note for explanation of Humboldt’s political position in his time: Wilhelm defended a liberal view that was very skeptical of state intervention in general on individual freedoms. He advocated for greatest freedoms for individual, proposing “I therefore deduce, as the natural inference from what has been argued, that reason cannot desire for man any other condition than that in which each individual not only enjoys the most absolute freedom of developing himself by his

When the Battle of Halle was lost by Prussian empire, the empire not only lost part of Province of Saxony but also their first reformed university. This war also signified the inability of Prussians to win the war against French which had a meaning beyond its militarist meaning that the French Republic, which was established after a popular uprising, was more powerful than a traditional empire. French nation was seemingly on its golden age. To counter their military defeat German thinkers formulated an idea namely that “a model for renewal of state by power of thinking” (Röhrs, 1995, p.18). “The nineteenth century swiftly changed social and political conditions in Europe. French revolution wiped off old political and social institutes, Germany was in a state of breaking up and England remained the most conservative.” (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p.74) As it was already discussed, rationalism and experimental method were increasingly more dominant throughout Europe. Newtonian paradigm was able to establish its authority. “The ideas of natural philosophy deeply get to the German universities” in the 19th Century (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p. 74).

Prussia at the edge of break down felt a desperate need for reforms in crucial institutions of state, one of which was university. The reform process took place between 1807 and 1813 (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p. 72). The German neo-humanism was on the rise at this point. Due to that, philosophy and development of moral citizen were seen as primary as opposed to training of specialist at the time. This was the position defended by Kant and Schleiermacher. This implied the replacement of hierarchy of faculties, making the faculty of philosophy the most crucial one. The embodiment of these ideas became “the destiny of W. Humboldt who was asked by one of the well-known Prussian reformers Baron von Stein to lead the reform of educational system.” (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p. 72) The University of Berlin became the crystallization of modern university. The importance of Humboldt came from his gathering of other German philosopher’s ideas on university and more

own energies, in his perfect individuality, but in which external nature even is left unfashioned by any human agency, but only receives the impress given to it by each individual of himself and his own free will, according to the measure of his wants and instincts, and restricted only by the limits of his powers and his rights” (Humboldt, 1854, p. 16). In this sense he was a proponent of classical liberalism and enlightenment ideal of development of human subjectivity to its maturity.

¹³ Humboldt’s main texts on university, which will be employed in this section are: “Proposal for establishment of the University of Berlin” written in 1809 to King Frederick William and “On internal and external organization of higher scientific establishments in Berlin” written in 1810.

importantly his definitive contribution to establishment of University of Berlin which was the first institutional realization of the mode of knowledge production of modernity¹⁴¹⁵. Lenore O'Boyle (1983, p. 3) supports this argument and approves its success by saying that "In the nineteenth century the German university was the most admired institution of higher education in the Western world".

However some reservations must be made and some criticisms of this historical account must be expressed before moving on to the details of Humboldtian University. Daniel Fallon disagrees with the historical representation of Humboldt as a hero of modern university. It is an interesting fact that Humboldt actually held the office as Prussian minister of education only for 16th months and his participation in the discussion of university reform was very limited. The discussions were started at the end of 18th Century which was long before he became the minister. Fallon (1980) says that the portrayal of Humboldt as the founder of modern university is historically inaccurate; at most he could only be seen as a state official who had knowledge of the idea of university debate and managed to arrange state sources for its realization. In Fallon's words:

The tribute lavished on Humboldt is so extravagantly adulatory that the contemporary observer is led to believe that he not only devoted his life to the university but also created the institution alone from whole cloth. ... [T]here is little to suggest that he did much more than synthesize and bring to fruition, through competent management within the government bureaucracy, an idea developed in large measure by others (1980, p. 11).

Fallon gives two reasons for this reduction of emergence of modern university to a single man. The first one was that Humboldt was a clear thinking intellectual with practical

¹⁴ As a side note, actually the process of modernization and nationalization of universities started before University of Berlin. For example the same educational principles of Humboldtian model were actually implemented first time in the founding of University of Halle in 1694 (Kwiek 2010, p.46) Also Poliakov & Savchuk (2010, p. 51-52) claim that "The idea that German universities, especially those in Halle and Gottingen, marked the new methods in education in the 18th century. That it was in those universities where the principle of *libertas philosophandi* was first claimed, is implied in the works of researchers both in the 19th century and the following ones". However "Humboldt's contribution was to make clear that the protection of the university was essential, even if viewed in terms of the interests of the state" (Kwiek, 2006, p.46). Combined with the other social factors that will be discussed in the study, establishment of university of Berlin is considered as the symbol event of modernization and nationalization of universities.

¹⁵ Humboldt's name also later given to university he contributed to its establishment. The university still exists under the name "*Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*"

government expertise, the other is that the zeitgeist of time permitted emergence of such singular figures as creators of history. Therefore it is important to note on the basis of importance of Humboldtian University, according to Kwiek, (2006, p. 29) “whatever explanation we present, the facts are there: the “Humboldtian” – rather than any other – university has been a constant point of reference for university reformers in major parts of Continental Europe for two centuries now”. Therefore the main point can be summarized as that the idea of the renewed German University was incarnated by Humboldt in relation to other German philosophers who also advocated for establishment of a new higher knowledge institution.

Stating the task of university Schleiermacher wrote: “The purpose of university is to stir young people the idea of science, to help them capture it in that area of knowledge, to which each of them wants himself specially devote, so that contemplation of everything from the point of science became their secondary nature. That is they should get used to examine every separate object in its nearest scientific relations, constantly taking into account the unity and integrity of knowledge in such a way that they could gradually cultivate themselves the ability of individual research, discovery and formulating the truth”. S. I. Gessen (quoted from Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p. 73) saw in this quote that it was application of integrity of knowledge to university education. “That is confluence of scientific and educational processes is a necessary element of university education.”

To comprehend the Humboldtian model of university, three principles were proposed by Kwiek (2008) as basic principles of Humboldtian University: The unity of research and teaching, the notion of academic freedom and lastly the faculty of philosophy as the central faculty that provides unity of all knowledge. In our opinion some additions must be made to these principles to understand Humboldtian model better. First of all, the notion of *Bildung* stands as an important idea behind the Humboldtian University. All these three principles (plus the notion of *Bildung*) were developed in the discussion between Prussian thinkers and they guided university in 19th Century and early 20th Century and should not be considered as singular formulations of Humboldt himself. Therefore to better understand the modern university a more detailed discussion is necessary. The topics we will discuss will be (1) the principle of unity of research and education, (2) the notion of disinterested pursuit of truth, followed by (3) the notion of academic freedom and (4) the Humboldt’s

idea on state university relation, (5) philosophical faculty as the central faculty and lastly (6) the notion of *Bildung* in Humboldtian model of university.

The first thing that will be discussed is the principle of unity of research and education. The Humboldtian model is also called “Research University¹⁶”, although calling a university model dedicated to unity of teaching and research a research university may appear contradictory in the first instance. The answer is that the Humboldtian University model was a first in its kind which was not only preoccupied with transmission of knowledge to pupils but also actively demanded from professors to their continuous involvement in the production of new knowledge and development of science in their discipline.

Before modern cognitive era as it was discussed in previous chapters the main role of professor was to teach. It was expected from teachers to master their domain of knowledge but making contribution to already existing knowledge was an optional and highly individual endeavor. Therefore the ideas of Humboldt which emphasizes importance of research as well as education are not meant to mean that there must be a balance between these two but rather it is an attempt to reformulate the mission of university to include the advancement of knowledge and science as one of its core elements. In other words unity of research and education represents the importance of research and insufficiency of teaching without the research in a modern university.

Due to his belief in the importance of unity of research and education, Humboldt was against any form of overspecialization in education curriculum. He favored the education in the study of philosophy of both natural sciences and humanities for every student. He thought Only in this way students could have chance to achieve self-cultivation., resulting in a development of an intellectual with at least a general knowledge of his/her time. Humboldt’s idea of research was different from revolutionary mode of knowledge of early modernity and specialized and positivistic mode of knowledge of Fordist period; it was based on holistic understanding of *Wissenschaft*. His ideas on truth were also different from ideas of positivism in the sense that he emphasized the fleeting character of truth which is always searched but never found. Humboldt thought that an educated mind in this

¹⁶ For example, see Kwiek (2006). However we will refrain from using this term as it is also used to signify university after 1850’s as the university of organized modernity, for example usage of Wittrock (1996).

way will aspire to *Wissenschaft*. And the way to achieve such mind passes through *Bildung*, cultivation. And this educated mind will be capable of free thinking, not only in humanities but in domain of sciences in general.

Liedman's essay (1996, p. 82) also supports this point that University of Berlin was the first university in the world that required its scholars not only instruct but also to engage in active production of knowledge, in other words, conduct research. Jaspers (1959, p. 54) also stated the importance of research for modern university: "University exists for research, fulfills its meaning through research. The student is scholar and scientist-to-be." Jaspers (1959, p. 40) also theorizes mission of universities in a Humboldtian fashion as following; professional training, education of a whole man (in other words ideal of *Bildung*) and research. These are interconnected and cannot be separated. A good teacher must also be a good researcher and vice versa. In a similar vein to German idealists and romantics, for Jaspers teaching needs the substance only research can provide (Kwiek, 2006, p.24). Therefore it was research that was particularly inspiring and unique in modern university. In other words Humboldt's idea was to combine research and education, which were separate previously, in the university institution.

Unity of teaching and research was also an underlying consensus among German idealists and romantics in general. Similarly there was a general agreement on the imagining university as a community of scholars and students who are engaged in a task of seeking truth unconditionally. Due to having such direct and disinterested orientation toward truth, Academy should not be diverted by external forces for their own particular aims.

Secondly, it is even argued that the meta-principle that lies behind all others in Humboldtian University was "the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake" (Röhrs, 1995, pp. 12-13). Kwiek (2006, p. 25) defined the mission of scholarship in Modern university as "the quest of truth within the framework of methodically organized research". An important part of this discussion will be the nature of knowledge as understood by Humboldt. According to Humboldt science is a never fully-solved problem and it is always in a state of progress. In his words:

In the internal organization of higher scientific establishments, everything is based on the principle that science should be treated as something not discovered and

something that can never be fully discovered and as such science should be permanently sought (quoted from Kwiek, 2006)

According to Kwiek (2006) Humboldt's view on science is parallel to his idea on the task of research. As the truth always flies away, the continuous research becomes important. In this sense research stops to be a mere tool but appear as an attempt that is valuable in itself. Therefore research becomes the core activity of professor, an important element in function of university and the desired result of pedagogical process (cultivation of a scientist who can conduct scientific research just like his mentors). This last issue is important as the inclusion of research as core activity also points to the fact that the relation between teacher and pupil changes. Under research university both student and professor exist for science (quoted from Kwiek, 2006) The ideas of freedom to learn and teach can only be understood and be meaningful in this context (and degenerate as this basis disappear in the changing conditions of university)

However Heyman (2001) is critical of this representation of Humboldt's epistemology as a romantic one. He claims the thought of Wilhelm von Humboldt could only be understood in relation to his brother Alexander von Humboldt. Heyman says that they tried to reach "a middle way" between romantic idealism and empirical scientific method. First of all Humboldt brothers were against this dualism of knowledge. They tried to develop a unifying version of inquiry represented by the German concept of *Wissenschaft*¹⁷. *Wissenschaft* signified a systematic inquiry that includes humanities and natural sciences, in other words, totality of knowledge production as a whole. It was an organic and holistic epistemological position in its basis. Heyman (2001, pp. 297-298) criticizes association of Humboldt Brother's ideas to the German Romantic tradition as being reductionist arguments. However Humboldt brothers were trying to create a new understanding of science that will unify empiricism with more speculative philosophy. Moreover they did not think science is inferior to "literary" romantic texts. For example Alexander (quoted from Heyman, 2001, p. 298) wrote that although his geographical method incorporated elements of interpretation, it was not "a purely speculative philosophy" and claimed that inquiry cannot "admit of being based only on a rational foundation that is to say, of being deduced

¹⁷ Which seems to be the reason why their philosophy is so easily represented as a form of romanticism by sometimes careless evaluations.

from ideas alone” After this warning of too much integration of speculative content to knowledge, he then criticizes being carried away in the empiricism: “Science is the labor of mind applied to nature, but the external world has no real existence for us beyond the image reflected within ourselves through the medium of the senses”. Therefore he was both critical of idealism and empiricism. Moreover Alexander’s “project of fashioning a holistic conception of knowledge production underpinned” his brother Wilhelm von Humboldt’s project to establish a new model of university based on a different pedagogy (Heyman, 2001, p. 299). Like his brother tried to do in the proper method of scientific inquiry, Wilhelm von Humboldt’s idea was to find “a middle between both sides of the conflicting faculties of university” (Reill, 1994, p. 348).

The third issue that will be discussed derives its self-legitimation from the ideal of disinterested pursuit of truth, namely the ideal of academic freedom. Although the academic freedom is considered one of the main principles of Humboldtian University, in modernity its meaning and what it covers must be understood in its specific moment in history. Such an inquiry into contents of academic freedom will require a clear understanding of the relation between university and state in modernity.

It is important to comprehend how Humboldt justified the existence of such university under modern nation-state¹⁸. He thought that “the university provides moral education of nation and its spiritual and moral formation” (quoted from Kwiek, 2006). The state could control university as “the nature of university was so closely tied to the vital interest of the state” (quoted from Kwiek, 2006). In this context it can be noted that he was also supporter of Schleiermacher’s proposition that the mission of state about university, apart from providing funding, was selection of right men to the university posts. He did not consider it as a problem in relation to the issue of academic freedom. However this does not mean Humboldt favored state intervention into the education. On the contrary, he made remarks that emphasized the state should not intervene into university. Humboldt’s formulation of

¹⁸ O’Boyle (1983) asks the same question of how Berlin University justified its social and economic existence to wider German society. According to her political economical approach; it opened way for lower middle classes whose resources were scarce, for upwards social mobility. University professors were paid enough to continue a bourgeoisie life. They formed an academic community which was writing with each other in mind. And they were able to decide on their successors and educated state officials so they appeared to be serving the needs of Germany.

this issue was similar to classical liberal discourse: the state “rather disturbs when it intrudes” (quoted from Kwiek, 2006). In this context Fallon (1980, p. 25) concludes that Humboldt’s position is better understood not as a radical supporter of university autonomy but rather as a “wise paternalist”¹⁹.

According to Bauman (1997, p. 50) “science –so it was believed- was a most potent humanizing factor” for the modern age. This was particularly true for Humboldt as he stated that “Knowledge alone, which comes from and can be planted in the depths of the spirit, also transforms character” (quoted from Kwiek, 2006). The orientation of this change was for development of rational and moral subjects which would leave behind their animosity or barbarous nature and become parts of civilization as the citizens of the nation-state. This would in turn humanize the state and human societies in general to a level that was never reached before modernity.

Another important development in state university relation was the emergence of state patronage of universities. Although state was more connected to the universities, academic autonomy was (in principle) protected by university and its self-government. University lost its religious character. The title of Professor Emeritus emerged. They were famous and successful professors who could deliver lectures under this title without being member of academic staff of university. German universities protected this structure until Nazis came to power. It is important to note that the state funding was a huge advantage for universities as they reached the resources they never had before. This political economical fact must also be considered in relation to both emergence of research as a part of main mission of university and idea of academic freedom.

The fourth element of Humboldtian University would be the role of philosophy in the totality of human knowledge. This specifically includes, in the context of modern university, the role of philosophy faculty in the hierarchy of faculties and the importance of

¹⁹ Therefore contemporary accounts of Humboldtian tradition as emancipatory or liberal anti-authoritarian committed to autonomy of university are historically at err, because although his liberal rhetoric seems to claim something else, the idea lie behind words of Humboldt were clearly compatible with pacification (daha uygun kelime gerek) of intellectuals (especially politically), establishing alliance with nation-state and serve knowledge and education to interests of nation-state. These new left or liberal interpretations of Humboldtian model as a radical defense of academic freedom must be seen as new formulations and they employ actually more Kantian ideas in formulation of university as a site of critique.

philosophy in the pedagogical process. Although Humboldt also placed faculty of philosophy at the basis of all other disciplines, in other words to the highest place in the hierarchy of faculties, his argument did not share the critical edge of Kant's philosophy. The possibly political underpinnings of Kantian argument were absent and replaced by arguments of value of unity of knowledge in university and role of philosophy faculty as only possible candidate for such unity.

Our discussion on Humboldtian model of university will be concluded by a discussion of ideal of *Bildung* in relation to wider pedagogical and scientific aims of university. It can be argued that ideal of *Bildung* is the essence of Humboldtian University; it penetrated to our discussion so far to a certain level. However this discussion will be concluded with some more remarks on the ideal of *Bildung*. In Humboldt's understanding of university, theoretical comprehension by principles of reason was seen as primary task of both university as an institution that produces knowledge but also an integral part of education itself. A professor must not be the translator of knowledge, which they find in books, and must not teach the prepared truths. His duty is to foresee the future scientists and wake up the scientific cognition in them. Freedom of studying must be related to freedom of teaching as a necessary condition of effectiveness of university teaching. According to principle of learning freedom, a student should be able to choose the professor he wishes to study with. "A student is not someone who is involved in a process of teaching, but it is a person who carries out his own research under the guidance and with the support of a professor." It is important to note that Humboldt's main emphasis was on the freedom of learning rather than teaching, as it is now. Another important thing was in Humboldt's model mastering of knowledge must go in hand with development of a personality which is committed to science. "The combination of objective knowledge with subjective development" was emphasized by him.

According to Heart (quoted from Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p. 74-75) in German understanding, idea of university includes a certain purpose and conditions: the purpose is *Wissenschaft*, which is knowledge in the highest sense of the word. It means zealous systematic, independent search of truth in all of its forms, irrespective to any utilitarian use. The conditions of its possibility were seen as linked to *Lehrfreiheit* and *Lernfreiheit*. There

were relatively few prohibitions for any scientific discussion in Germany at the time of university reform.

Organizational disputes on university were relatively calmed down in the time of reform. There was a widespread agreement among German thinkers on some issues. The philosophy faculty became considered as giving the elementary and basic knowledge that was required for all other faculties, thus it moved up in the ranks of hierarchy of university faculties. Natural history and sociology faculties appeared under basis of philosophy faculty. Participation of assistants in practical classes introduced. Official curriculum was absent. A professor was only obliged to inform authorities about the general idea of class he was to teach but he was free to arrange and teach it as he wished. Contents and methods of class were chosen freely by him. There were very few controls or surveillance over academics and students (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p.75)

Education in Humboldtian University gave students a freer relation with professors, as they were expected to learn not by passive study of the texts, but by being active and participate as much as they can in some sort of research activity themselves. This way they were thought to be able to develop a mindset similar to their researcher teachers. Although the professors were at the higher point in hierarchy of knowledge compared to students, this new form of student teacher relation implied a reform of pre-modern form of student-teacher apprenticeship model. According to the notion of *Bildung* there is no such thing as the educational rights of the professor, in the sense of upbringing, here the student is considered to be an adult, and learns only in the light of self-education. Therefore the main part of education is seen as self-education, contrary to upbringing of ignorant student in the European University model (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, pp. 75-77)

Wilhelm von Humboldt's vision contained the idea of a unity between research and personal cultivation and "[t]he true activity of *Wissenschaft* was to lead through self-directedness to self-perfection and self-moralization". He believed that there was a strong and direct connection between moral development of the self and education. Therefore education cannot be given solely from outside (by a teacher whatever his/her knowledge on the subjects he/she masters) but it must be result of the self-cultivation of individual. The effect of teacher in this learning schema was reduced compared to a pre-modern one.

In pre-modern one, teacher (or the text that containing the truth) was expected to transfer its knowledge content to passive student. In Humboldtian modern education schema teacher must facilitate the process of learning of already inspired and interested student to the knowledge which can support his/her self-education. This understanding of education to a certain extend replaces the self-cultivating student with the knowing mentor as the primary subject of education process.

However the ideal of *Bildung* in no way constituted the totality of the mission of university. In this paragraph this excess of university that escapes the idea of *Bildung* and creates an internal tension in university will be discussed. Although an important characteristic in Humboldtian University model lies at the idea that the unity of teaching and research is essential for university and it is what separates university from any other school. It was to be “a special feature of the higher scientific establishments that they treated science as a problem which is never completely solved and therefore engaged in constant research”. “The university was also to be an establishment of general education, an alma mater that taught all the sciences and did not concentrate on occupational training”. The responsibility of education of professional for various occupational positions (mainly for taking offices in the state bureaucracy) was inescapable for university in 19th Century. Here lies a paradox that not only appears in the role of university but also in a deeper level in the nature of knowledge. It shows itself in the tensions between the function of university that involves both “disinterested pursuit of truth” and “its public responsibilities (Kwiek, 2006, pp.8-10). Therefore Humboldt needed to overcome this tension to justify the existence of university as a state funded and protected institution.

David Sorkin (1983, p. 65) articulates an argument in this point in his text on idea of *Bildung* that when the Prussia was inferior position compared to Napoleon and his French army university appeared as “a new weapon to continue the struggle”. University would buy back some of the prestige Prussia lost in the battlefield. Thus it had a political goal that served the nation state which had influence in realization of the Berlin University. Humboldt further argued for university freedom on the same basis as success of this political project of establishment for German university the state should not intervene as such an attempt would destroy the authenticity of university which was its claim for production of disinterested pursuit of knowledge.

According to Sorkin (1983) the idea of *Bildung* was actually a key element in creating an alliance between intellectuals and state through university. In limits of state action Humboldt put freedom of individual as the first condition for *Bildung*. The second condition was free communication and exchange of ideas between individuals. Only at the process of university reform Humboldt had a chance to realize this and it was possible by giving the university to the control of nation (guarantee of external protection for internal freedom: Academic Freedom).

The concept of *Bildung* was not invented by Humboldt but it had been a part of the discussion on the idea of university since Goethe's time. It was employed by Schiller on the Aesthetic Education of Man in 1759 and Fichte in his Addresses to the German Nation in 1808. Origins of idea of *Bildung* lie at the neo-humanism. According to Wittrock (1993, p. 317) "University of Berlin was institutionalized form of *Bildung*". Therefore like university, the ideal of *Bildung* had an element of national revival and political orientation hidden in itself. In other words, although at a certain level of abstraction *Bildung* ideal can be called as cultivation of man, as a historically conditioned reality its concrete form and content was realized in a way that was nationalistic and statist. A proof of this argument can be seen in the tension in writings on *Bildung* between individual and state.

As discussed before Fichte was proponent of national political education and Humboldt was in opposition to this idea, and Berlin University actually resulted in "the capitulation of intelligence by the state" (Sorkin, 1983). It was no surprise that Fichte become the first Rector of Berlin University. In this sense critical accounts of history of Berlin University were correct that there were not enough evidence to assume that University of Berlin managed to be the embodiment liberal ideals put forward by Humboldt himself²⁰.

In conclusion of this section on the Humboldtian model of university, it can be said that the dual aspect of knowledge shows itself in the tensions between the function of university that involves both "disinterested pursuit of truth" and "its public responsibilities", contents of which must be considered cultural as well as political.

²⁰ Wittrock (1996) also notes that Humboldt increasingly become pessimistic of the realization of liberal ideals in education, due to political success of conservatives in Prussia and in Europe in general in the middle of 19th Century. This unhappiness can be understood in light of the transformation of mode of knowledge production from liberal modern to organized modern one (Law, 1994).

2.3. The Legacy of Humboldtian University

Habermas describes this idea behind development of modern German university as:

By grasping its age in thought, as Hegel was to say, philosophy was to replace the integrative social force of religion with the reconciling force of reason. Thus Fichte could see the university, which merely institutionalized a science of this kind, as the birthplace of an emancipated society of the future, even as the locus of the education of the nation (1989, p. 111).

Wittrock (1996, p. 312) argues that “it is undeniably the case that the turn of the century [from 18th to 19th Century] is a period of major institutional restructuring in the university world of Europe”. About the legacy of Humboldtian University model, he asserts: “It is... clear that in the latter part of nineteenth century the University of Berlin came to be unquestioned model for university reforms from United States in the west to Japan in the east” (p. 312). Humboldtian University became the dominant model of university at the end of 19h century. It set the ideals and standards for how a university must be in the modern age. Especially after the advent of nation state it became the norm for appropriate higher education. According to Larsen (2006, p.3) The Humboldtian idea of a university has for better or worse served as a blueprint in the last 200 years of university development in large parts of Europe. Universities of the German speaking area of central Europe, the Low Countries and Scandinavia can still to a large extent be seen as inspired by the Humboldt tradition. Especially the self-understanding of the university staff shows this tradition. The university lector or professor sees herself primarily as a researcher that also has students and guides their research.” It was seen as the answer for how a university education should be organized and what it must do. Moreover it was seen as an important institution for modern political ideals and it promoted the kind of “enlightened citizen” new European nation states require for functioning. Although it would be wrong to assume that in implementation these ideals were always fully realized or there weren’t any differences between different national contexts, nevertheless the ideal of Humboldtian University represented the universalizing discourse of modernity based on cultivation of human rational capabilities and progress of humanity in relation to this process of rationalization.

It is necessary to situate the characteristics of university of modernity for the sociology of university. In this part this task will be by discussing the relation of Humboldtian University model to social classes. "On 28 February 1809, Wilhelm von Humboldt became head of the culture and education section at the Ministry of the Interior" "Humboldt advocated 'complete training of the human personality'. This for him included even for the poorest members of society in the elementary schools" including those poor sections of the society who lack the resources to do so. Plans to set up a university in Berlin had already existed since the beginning of the Prussian reforms. However, as an intellectual who had familiarity with the academic circles and an important bureaucrat, Wilhelm Von Humboldt's efforts proved important in establishment of Berlin University. Fallon says he did never question whether state had a responsibility to provide education for people on all levels or not. He took it as a given responsibility on the side of state. However in practice this was not much the case.

Fundamentally modern university by its nature emphasized differentiation of knowledge and superiority of the higher form of knowledge whose characteristic was pursuit of it for itself. In this sense it was opposite of the enlightenment ethos of mixture of lay knowledge with high knowledge and salons as Enlightenment ideal of space of public of communication. University was an institution organized in a closed fashion. Modern university avoided direct intervention or mixing into society and saw knowledge as its possession; due to that it was an elitist institution (Delanty, 1998b). Apart from the dominance of lower middle classes in universities for employment in state posts²¹, the universities themselves started to be reproducers of the class character of the nation. Wittrock (1996, p. 319) says on this point that although the notion of *Bildung* was intended to signify the capacity of each individual to reach a higher level of humanity, in practice it became a symbol of higher classes. This meant that in society it started to signify a demarcation between people who possess standarts of *Allemande Bildung* and those who lack such qualities. Therefore the ideal of *Bildung* which was a product of modernity turned upside down in the process of modernization from a goal in itself to a mere instrument (Wittrock, 1996, p. 319). This instrumentalization of ideals, values and goals of human action and thought will be a major theme in the following chapters of our thesis. However it is

²¹ Thus as tools for upward social mobility for members of pretty bourgeoisie classes (O'Boyle, 1983)

now enough to show the deep roots of instrumentalization in the process of modernization and leave it for now.

Also the state and university pact emerged in the classical period and it will be one of the main characteristics of modern university. Humboldt was opposed to subordination of university to state, following Schleiermacher (thus in a similar position to Kant). He supported his proposal for autonomy of university by essentially arguing that the special function of university was that only it can develop (cultivate) the character of the nation. Thus function of university cannot be reduced to just an institution that provides pragmatic benefits to state or to people²². It had a function of developing the national consciousness and serving the human progress in general that no other institution could fulfill. And the fulfillment of these unique functions of university was dependent upon the non-intervention of state into the academic life in university. Therefore the state's external guarantee of internal freedom of university was dependent on the condition that University would replace Church in providing the state with a "moral and spiritual basis" for its existence. This legitimation for modern power to function was dependent upon emergence of nation as the population under the sovereign a nation-state. Moreover universities were also important for states as (mostly the only) sources of professionals to be employed for specific tasks of the modern state. In addition to all these, modern university also played the role of nationalization and pacification of intellectuals for the state. Those intellectuals who had different ideas and political projects that were not compatible the national modernization process operated by modern state were not welcomed in the university. So briefly, the alliance between university and state was established strongly in the classical cognitive period which would continue to operate until the 1970's²³.

²² Providing such beneficial professional knowledge was also part of university institutions. However, as discussed, according to Kant's new organization of faculties they were business of "lower" faculties. As the university finds its meaning in the faculty of philosophy as the higher faculty, it was devoted to only the disinterested search for truth.

²³ In words of Habermas, Humboldtian University had three implicit features. First of all an affirmative relationship with the state, in other words accepts itself as an apolitical institution. The second one was a defensive relationship of university to professional practice. The last one was centrality of philosophy faculty and emphatic significance attributed to science and philosophy for culture and society. These features enabled Humboldt to first institutionalize modern science and scholarship in university and also helped him to explain why it is interest of state to fund and guarantee external freedom for university (Habermas 1989 p.109).

However, there is also a dispute among historians on the functioning of actual Berlin University. Heyman (2001) disagrees with the above mentioned portrayal of Berlin University and claims that: "Humboldt sought to make a material intervention in history, attempted to bring a new idea into what Gramsci (1971) would call a hegemonic position in society. Humboldt saw his project as forward looking, as a dialectical strategy to prevent the triumph of instrumental reason... However, his project, failed to attain such a position". He claims that this is due to increasing influence of empiricism in more and more fields of knowledge in universities and resulted isolation of questions of value in humanities. This increase of influence of empiricism was contrary to what Humboldtian model represented and for Heyman this means the model has failed.

The point Heyman makes can be criticized because what he call as rise of empiricism²⁴ did not necessarily had an problematic relation with Humboldtian ideas. It was rather a philosophy mostly developed in Anglo-Saxon world. Therefore Heyman's argument can be considered only partially true. It was not true that the main ideas that influenced university members and society in general were still based on Humboldtian principles. An example of this can be found in the student protests. Therefore it is a valid criticism that the Humboldtian University had a century long hegemony over university education, as especially in practice it was very limited.

However, it is obvious that ideas of Humboldtian University also provide a space in universities for questions of value and morality and encouraged the development of not just specialist scientists but also all-around developed intellectuals. The effects of discourse of Humboldtian University still continues today as it can be observed on the public debates on professors in university, who are still expected to be enlightened champions of democracy and modern values. This in turn gives way to their being seen as entitled to special privileges of academic freedoms and institutionally universities as having academic autonomies individually. Moreover, as it will be discussed in Bologna Process section, any direct attack on these issues generally bring outrage from members of university community as well as from general public. This alone can demonstrate the ongoing effects of the ideas of Humboldt on the idea of university. According to H. Weyl (quoted from Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, pp. 77-78) analysis of Humboldt myth actually proves the

²⁴What Heyman means is similar to what will be called in the organized modernity as positivism.

immerse influence of the idea although it may not be applied as always as it should be. His idea of university was later called: Scientific Research University. Successful ideas of Humboldt continue their influence in the rest of the Europe as well as in United States of America. As Humboldtian University became the hegemonic model of university institution in modern period, it was implemented in different societies. The discussion of the liberal modern period will end with the appearances of modern university in different social contexts.

2.3.1. Modern University in Different Social Contexts

Although modern university became the hegemonic form of university its application in different social contexts differed in important ways. In this section a general description of the different forms of organization of modern university will be discussed. The first national context that will be discussed will be United Kingdom. It can be argued that, university institutions were relatively stable in Britain and did not change much although there were some pressures for change due to emergence of factors directly related to industrial revolution. English, Scottish and Irish universities continued to emphasize university education, taking a very few lectures in form of private lessons with tutors. There were also annual examinations. The goal of education was that of training of an ideal person who was called “the gentleman”. The notion of gentleman signified a highly educated person in the tradition of liberal arts.

However, in the middle of 20th Century, particularly due to increasingly felt effects of industrial revolution on social and cultural level and also due to success of university reforms throughout the Europe the relative stability of the British Universities was shaken. There were two new alternatives proposed by reformers²⁵:

²⁵ More on this issue can be found in the works of (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010), (Delanty, 1998) and (Wittrock & Rothblatt, 1996). We must also note that we omitted one orientation that was listed by Poliakov & Savchuk, (2010, p. 79), namely the conservative position based on the preservation of traditional religious education practiced in tradition of Oxbridge Universities. As the reactions against the modern idea of university is not our topic, we find it more useful to focus on the new models of university that were proposed in relation to Humboldtian model and involve some basis with it that conformity or rejection can be expressed.

The first one was the utilitarians' progressive proposal for university reform. This position was defended by important thinkers like Bentham, James Mill, David Ricardo, John Mill and Thomas Huxley. The main idea was that university must prepare students for professional life rather than academic one. The disinterested pursuit of knowledge sounded as an empty promise to British ears and they replaced it with the tradition of useful knowledge they inherited from Scottish enlightenment. They emphasized that the progressive scientific knowledge must be taught in university education and graduated professionals must use it for the advancement of modern industry. Secularization and professionalization of universities were main principles of their proposed reform. However despite their differences their proposal for reform preserved much of the spirit of university as a modern institution.

Against the background of utilitarians' secular reform proposal and apparent success of Humboldtian model, a liberal conservative reform movement also emerged. This position was best manifested by Cardinal John Newman (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p. 81), who was an Oxford graduate. He elaborated his ideal university as ten lectures written between 1851 and 1858 and published under the title "The Idea of University". He emphasized not the research but the teaching function of university. He tried to articulate theology as an appropriate field of study in the modern secular university (Delanty, 1998). He said university is the place that student gets universal knowledge and formulates the corresponding notion of university. It is *Stadium Generale* or the school of universal education. He claimed "The task of university is to make the intellectual culture the sphere of its activity: its task is to form intellectual abilities" and "The task of university lies in intellectual culture." He emphasized, following the British tradition of education of the gentleman, all-around intellectual development. Therefore liberal education must be the pivotal role of university. He imagined a world in which university stood on the heritage of olders, in which everybody spoke one language of same beliefs and aimed for common wisdom. According to Poliakov & Savchuk (2010, p. 82) to a certain extent his utopia is idealism²⁶. His position had some similarities and differences compared to Humboldtian one. He did not support the development of knowledge in a specialized fashion. He rather

²⁶ However there are also ideas to the contrary. Particularly work of Pelikan(1992) argues that: Humboldt's research university and Newman's intellectual university together became fundamental for development of later ideas and models of modern university.

argued for development knowledge for itself. However he differs from Humboldt that he did not think university must combine education and research at the same time.

In short, Great Britain developed its own university education blending different attitudes and notions. But their blend was harmonious with Humboldtian model and more importantly they were affected by the academic power of Humboldtian University. This new Humboldt inspired British model was very well implemented, especially in Oxbridge Universities and “civic universities” which was the general name of universities after the university reforms in the middle of 19th Century. A better description of English University must emphasize its Humboldtian model as its basis with following reservation: Firstly the central role of philosophical faculty was replaced by literature faculty, continuing the liberal education tradition of deep-rooted British universities. Secondly a Scottish Enlightenment attitude of skepticism about separation of higher and lay knowledge was protected and replaced the Humboldtian emphasis on higher knowledge. Lastly, again following the premises of Enlightenment tradition, a utilitarian objective pre-given for knowledge was kept. Although in the implementation it did not achieve full success, British modernization of university institution was based Humboldtian Ideals of general education designed for development of free thinking, intellectually and theoretically capable individuals.

The only exception country that escaped the influence of Humboldtian model was France. The Revolution created a different path for nationalization of university that occurred apart from the effect of Prussian context. In 18th century, as the political conflict increased between people and the king, a hatred against university appeared. University was seen as a much closed institution that had monopoly over awarding degrees because of the king, and there were alternative organizations. “The university was a servant of king in the eyes of society. It functioned as a censor to assess the extent of authors’ free thinking in their papers [...] People of France not only toppled of their kings but also university” which was the embodiment of royal power in intellectual space (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p. 50).

According to Delanty (1998b, p. 8) “The French Enlightenment concept of the university was reflected in Denis Diderot’s ‘Idea of a University’, which he proposed to Catherine II of Russia in 1776”. Although “this plan was very different from Kant's humanistic emphasis on philosophy as the most autonomous faculty”, “it would be wrong to overemphasize the

difference because they both were committed to autonomous pursuit of knowledge” (Delanty 1998b, p. 8)

After the Revolution a process of reform was also implemented for renewal of the universities as institutions of republic²⁷. The most prominent alternative to university was Higher Polytechnic School which was established in 1795.

On December 1789 The National Assembly adopted a resolution on the general popular schooling and after a while in 1792 Convention took a decision about the abolition of all colleges and faculties in the county. According to the resolutions of the convention dated August 14, 1793 and September 15, 1793 academies were closed and universities were abolished respectively. Shortly after universities ceased to exist and were resumed only at the end of 19th century (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p. 50).

The support of state meant in the revolutionary context production of knowledge that was required from scientific institutions. A direct example of this was Polytechnic; it was an idea of Napoleon who imagined universities as providers of state officials. As discussed Humboldtian idea of university was also accepting that role as a given. However it did not favor such direct intervention of state in university. Humboldtian University model, in this context, can be seen as trying to achieve a balance between culture of experts and intellectuals. However in French context, which was experiencing the political aspects of modernization process more sharply, the privilege was clearly on the side of state thus autonomy of university was much more limited (Rüegg, 2004, p 5).

²⁷ Some of the already existing famous university and equivalent institution before the revolution were; Royal College (College de France) which was established in 1530 as well as Paris Observatory which was established in 1672, National School of Arts and Crafts which was established in 1794 and Museum of Natural History. Some of them were actually quite famous for standards of 19th century (Poliakov & Savchuk, 2010, p. 50).

CHAPTER III

University in Postmodern Condition

3.1. University and The Crisis of Modernity

In this chapter of thesis, it will be argued that the change in function and identity of university was determined by the decline of nation-state in the age of global capitalism. In this section however, the crisis of modernity that was experienced after the World War II and reached its peak point in the political protests of 68 movements will be discussed to show how the University of Excellence could emerged as the dominant model of university after the 70's.

As discussed before, until 1970's the legitimacy of university was based upon its function as the producer and reproducer of national culture (Readings, 1996, p. 3). The modern university was an ideological arm of the nation-state. Accordingly, Keynesian economic policies were employed throughout the first world countries and the national market administrated by the will of the nation-state was prominent site of capital. Therefore there was *political* control over the functioning of *economic* activity.

As state was powerful and acquired economic resources by taxing, universities were also acquired increasing shares from the public investments. Some important trends in higher education appeared around this time that will change the university. The first of these trends was the replacement of elitist roots of university. Universities expanded throughout the world. "The expansion in education after World War II was a worldwide phenomenon which led Talcott Parsons to speak of an "educational revolution" (quoted from Habermas, 1989, 5). Although at the first half of 20th Century many universities were closed and population of students declined due to economic crisis and conditions of two World Wars, the number of universities and population of students in universities increased greatly especially after the years following the World War II. In the beginnings of sixties the

population of students reached to numbers that were never seen before and this trend of expansion of universities continue to be the case up to this date (Habermas, 1989, p. 5).

The second trend that became increasingly apparent after World War II was the fact that unity of university was becoming increasingly fragmented. Expansion of number of disciplines, increasing specialization and professionalization were the marks of epistemological hegemony of positivism in universities. According to Habermas even German universities despite their discursive defense of Humboldtian ideals had substantially changed.

German universities have changed in more than just their quantitative dimensions. The most salient characteristics of a specifically German heritage have been smoothed away. Antiquated hierarchies were dismantled along with the *Ordinarien*-university; and with a certain leveling of status, the Mandarin ideology, too, lost its basis. External and internal differentiations have allowed teaching and research to become more specialized. In sum, even in their internal structures, West Germany's mass universities have come to resemble those of other industrial nations (Habermas, 1989, p.6)

As discussed in the previous chapter, the issue of specialization and professionalization were never away from the modern university as an institution, however in the ideal of modern university specialization was tried to be managed and kept under control by attributing the spiritual mission of university to faculty of philosophy due to its special, unmediated and disinterested relation to truth, thus making it the center of academic life of university. However such proposition can no longer be seen as applicable in the political economy of Fordist Capitalism. According to Habermas rise of specialism and professionalism were inevitable.

A differentiated occupational system required academic preparation for more and more professional careers. In the long run, the advanced schools for engineering, commerce, pedagogy and art couldn't remain outside the universities Secondly, the empirical sciences, which had emerged from the womb of the philosophical faculty, followed an ideal of procedural rationality which condemned to failure all attempts at encyclopedically embedding their substantive contents within an all-encompassing philosophical interpretation. This emancipation of the empirical sciences sealed the destruction of all metaphysical world views. In the midst of a pluralism of privatized religious

beliefs [Glaubensmaechten], philosophy also lost its monopoly on interpreting culture as a whole (Habermas, 1989, p. 12).

On the domain of education, the goal of university was training of experts, specialists and professionals. The specialized, skilled work force was a requirement of the national big industry which had close relation to state and had power to canalize the national policies of education. The ideal of unity of research and teaching like all other principles of Humboldtian model, in the absence of *Bildung* ideal, become empty words and existed mostly in the self-understanding of some academics (Habermas, 1989, p. 10). Therefore university increasingly became an apparatus of state that provided national culture and industrial technology after World War II.

These changes in the society and their effect on the university organization lead to a second university reform debate on how to reconstruct universities after World War II. In Germany, Karl Jaspers (1959) proposed the resurrection of German universities in the spirit of Humboldtian model emphasizing the cultural aspect of university and its dependence on state as its protector. "An institution remains capable of functioning as long as it embodies in living form idea inherent in it" (Jaspers, 1959, p. 3). Habermas (1989) on the other hand, explicitly rejected the notion that institutions must be guided by a simple idea, claiming it is no longer possible in 20th Century. He defended a Kantian understanding of university as a community of individuals who are united by the formal rules of reason. In United States Clark Kerr (1963) argued that "American Research University" was the best answer to the educational needs of the age. He asserted that universities could no longer fulfill a primary function and content with it. The new social formation necessitates the universities to answer different demands of society at once, from cultural to economic and social to technological. This necessity was overcome by American universities who reorganize themselves according to a new model, which Kerr calls "Multiversity". The idea of multiversity shows that in the self-understanding of academics the role of administration and importance of technology was becoming more important than it was before. These trends will provide optimal ground for emergence of University of Excellence in United States, once the connection between the nation-state and university will be broken.

The Fordist organization of capitalism ended with the crisis of Keynesian economics in The First World, According to Fuchs (2008, p. 106) technological and organizational limits of

Centralist and Taylorist methods were reached by the late 60's. Due to this crisis of Fordist mode of development, the growth rate of productivity decreased but wages and the constant capital increased, creating an unsuitable situation for accumulation of capital. In short centralized and hierarchic forms of organization proved to be inflexible and ineffective. Such sharp decrease in profit rates made the hegemony of USA a questionable issue in the context of rise of new economies in Europe and Japan. As result of all these developments the USA dollar lost its power as the Bretton Woods agreement broke down. As the flow of money increasingly became globalized, Keynesian economic policies become impossible to maintain.

3.2. The University of Excellence

“The replacement of culture by the discourse of excellence is University’s response to 1968” (Readings, 1996, p. 150). In face of critics university abandoned its cultural claim and become a bureaucratic administrative organization committed to “Excellence”. Excellence was protected from the campus politics as it can be appropriated as assign of student commitment – for example used as one of the criteria in ranking of universities (Readings, 1996, p. 150)

Readings (1996, p.21) claims that “excellence is rapidly becoming the watch word for university”. According to Readings the discourse of excellence is not something imported to university from outside. Universities might be *like* corporations in the past. But now they are actively organizing themselves as corporations. Therefore the premise of discourse of excellence is the idea that “universities are corporations”. Students of University of Excellence are not like customers, “they *are* customers”. The discourse of university and its idea develops within the university today as a global trend in higher education. This not only changes university but also changes the message the idea university represents to its outside. Miyoschi notes the apparent lack of protest of academics and university members against the process of academic capitalism. On the contrary they seem too happy to go global. Although Miyoshci finds his morally problematic, Readings (1996, p. 46) argues that this is due to the development of universities as TNCs themselves.

Today, the concepts discourse of excellence become indispensable for rhetoric of universities throughout the world. University of Excellence is born replacing the old Humboldtian university model which provided university legitimacy for university as an institution that needs external protection and internal freedom to serve the best interests of the nation-state. In university of excellence university is freed from this external obligation to serve the interest of a single nation-state as both contemporary states less tend to publically fund “freedom” of university. University of excellence as an institution organized as a corporation aims to increase its-profit and its survivability in the global education market. The corporate university needs to commodify its two main activities; education and research.

Another important point made by Readings is that the lack of reference the discourse of excellence makes. “Excellence” is an entirely meaningless, it is non-referential (1996, p. 22). In this sense the words like “excellence” and “quality” appears as “uncontestable ground, the rhetorical arm most likely to gain general assent” (Readings, 1996, p. 23). Everyone can agree on “excellence” as it has no external and internal referent. That is why academics whatever their position may be seem to agree on that. For example certain privatization or certain relation between university and business world can be called into question even within the discourse of excellence, as it is not the best, most excellent activity to be done or policy to follow. But as it lack any referent all sides of debate appear to agree on there is a need to reach excellence in university. In this sense excellence (whatever it is) is believed to be answer of the value of knowledge, research and education in all disciplines and fields, as this discourse is employed by diverse departments and universities throughout the world.

Here, it is important to note that excellence has no criteria it is not a final goal for itself, but it rather signifies efficient organization and arrangement of things. There is no fixed criterion for anything to be excellent, except to be efficient. Two things that are excellent not necessarily share the same standards, they could even be totally contradictory to each other (1996, p. 24) For example the university rankings as measures of excellence are most part made up to measure excellence. The basic example of this can be the period of education. What makes graduating on time a good thing? Such questioning of the accountability are weak points of university excellence as they immediately reveal that in the background of discourse of excellence there lies an assumption that all universities can

be judged according to same criteria. There is a measure of excellence that could judge all university in terms of their excellence.

In such rankings and similar policies, the issues of reference and function are excluded in the beginning. This creates an entirely closed market, making excellence as the currency in the market and competition for a higher ranking as the main purpose for educational institution. "Excellence is clearly a pure internal unit of value that effectively brackets all questions of reference or function thus creating an internal market" (Readings, 1996, p.27). For example in terms of education it is very easy to see. For student who is entirely situated as the consumer of education product, the decision is not made based on any other issue than relative value for money to receive education in a university. In homogenous categories of university ranking systems, "choosing a particular university over another is not represented as not all that different from weighing the costs and benefits of a Honda Civic against those of a Lincoln Continental in a given year or period" (Readings, 1996, p. 28).

The notion of excellence implies integration and standardization similar to the Foucault's concept normalization. Foucault explored the concept in context of emergence of modern penal system that sees variations from norm as pathologies that must be corrected in his *Discipline and Punish* (1995). In the premodern punishment system the crime was seen as the challenge to law in its essence, thus the violator of law must be punished in a spectacle manner so that it was made clear against the authority, which was understood related to the body of the king, would not tolerate such acts that tried to transgress its boundaries. However in modern disciplinary apparatuses understand crime not as an act of freedom but rather as pathological action of a sick body that must be cured to its healthy state and reintegrate the perpetrator into the system as a healthy subject. Thus the normal subject is the natural, healthy and desired one. After its emergence, in the eyes of modern subject retrospectively all the pre-modern forms of punishment seemed obsolete, uncivilized and unnecessary forms of cruelty.

The discourse of Excellence works in a similar vein, that for example Triple Helix theory sees all old forms of university administration as obsolete, unnatural, and ineffective. Another version of the same thing is that it projects its own image to history and anachronistically

finds what it does as natural. In this sense what new university reforms try to achieve is just a better arrangement of university in terms of production of commodities as its ultimate goal. For example just as the University of Berlin in its establishment by Humboldt and Fichte as rector was trying to do the same thing in the era of global capitalism and its commoditized knowledge. Although it is lost in the discourse itself what is achieved by this new discourse on university actually rearranges the problem of university, thus shifting the questions that need to be answered from nation-state to global economy it envisages a new form of university.

What is suggested for universities is that they must be in a process of self-evaluation by constantly improving themselves according to “performance indicators”. According to Cabal (quoted from Readings, 1996, p. 12) the task of performance indicators is to enable us to judge “quality, excellence, effectiveness and pertinence”. As also Cabal admits these terms are all taken from economic jargon. Therefore in the discourse of excellence accountability of university to society is reduced to accounting of its commodity value.

“Excellence responds very well to the needs of technological capitalism in the production and processing information in that it allows for increasing integration of all activities into a generalized market, while permitting a large degree of flexibility and innovation at the local level” (Readings, 1996, p. 32). Excellence can integrate “diversity” without interrupting the unity of system. As everyone is excellent according to his/her own criteria and everyone wants to be left alone. And in University of Excellence this chance is not restricted from the beginning. However this type of functioning has only one boundary that is the administration must have the ultimate power. As any one department fails to meet the excellence criteria than it can be eliminated without damaging the other parts of system and already fragmented knowledge university produces. As Readings notes (1996, p. 33) this has happened many classics departments and it is now happening to philosophy. In contemporary situation it can be said that now even the natural science departments are replaced by more technology and engineering oriented interdisciplinary departments.

At the core of crisis of university today lies the fact that the notion of national culture as the social bound that ties society together under the sovereignty of nation-state is in a process of dissolution. As the capital becomes increasingly global, nation-state loses its core value

for capitalism. Construction and continuity of national markets are no longer most important part of reproduction of capital in contemporary capitalism. In words of Readings (1996, p. 3) "university is becoming a different kind of institution, one that is no longer linked to the destiny of nation-state by virtue of its role as producer, protector and inculcator of an idea of national culture". This issue is illustrated by the fact that crisis of university is most deeply felt in humanistic disciplines (or national literature departments) as their organic relation to state makes them more vulnerable to the effects of demise of nation-state. As Readings (1996, p. 3) notes: "the centrality of the traditional humanistic disciplines to the life of the University is no longer assured". However due to this particularity of humanities departments it is easier to follow the change in the nature of university crystalized in the role of humanity departments.

The discourse of excellence appeared firstly in the United States whose relation to culture was always problematic as it was made up of different ethnicities and universities were already changed to multiversities. The establishment of the state in United States was not based on a tradition or ethnicity or even a race (as the people of color slowly but progressively gained their rights and integrated into the system, though this might not mean there is no prejudice against people of color). Due to this historicity United States unlike most European States culture was not basis of the unity of people. The rational choice of people, the voluntary membership (though hypothetically mostly) in the social contract is seen to be the basis of social bound. The unity of people was not based on a cultural essence but rather on a republican will of people to come together. Also the literature that was taught in the literacy departments was named as a canon, as although copied the cultural form of education, there were no culture in essence that was seen as substantial. Thus canon was also a contract. The point is as there was no such organic tie between the state and nation in United States, this situation provided fertile grounds for emergence and progress of Discourse of Excellence. According to Readings in sense all three are contentless: the cash nexus, the discourse of excellence and American national idea. This explains why USA as one of the most developed countries of the First World became also the born place of discourse of excellence. As the Globalization process in universities also represents the same developments and marks them as a global trend in higher education.

In Readings' words (1996, p. 40) "The implication of this shift in function is that the analysis of the University as an Ideological State Apparatus, in Althusser's terms, is no longer appropriate, since the University is no longer primarily an ideological arm of the nation-state but an autonomous bureaucratic corporation". In this sense he gives example of local sports clubs. A local sports club maybe supported by local authorities however their success is not determined by an external referent or a function outside of play, but rather defined by the rules of the game they play and their performance in that play. Universities become institutions of such kind. Another example is national airway corporations which are today act as independent corporations, they are no longer directly related to their states but rather like competitors in a market. This corporate nature of universities reveals that they are mainly bureaucratic organization whose main goal is to maximize their efficiency. As it was defined in terms of academic credibility and economical survivability (or even profit) their administrative logic will function to ensure that.

Universities in contemporary societies become controlled by new managerialism (Deem, Hillyard & Reed, 2007). Traditional culture of open of enquiry and debate has been replaced by institutional stress on performativity. The sign of this shift can be seen by the emphasis on desire of university authorities on measurable outputs such as strategic planning, performance indicators, quality assurance measures and academic audits. Ron Barnett (2000) utilizes Lyotard's concept of performativity as the defining criteria of postmodern university. Increasing of performativity goes in hand to hand with increasing privatization of education, audit culture, managerialism, entrepreneurialism and similar elements of neoliberal discourse in universities. The same patterns of social relations emerge as a global phenomenon. Bologna process itself can also be seen one of such developments.

Olssen & Peters (2005, p. 335) concludes that "Hayekian views have inserted themselves in the World Bank's changed picture of development economics, an economics now centrally motivated by questions of knowledge and information". This means there are cuts on public spending on universities and increasing regulations and marketization and privatization of knowledge and this trend is here to stay in the age of knowledge capitalism. Therefore he claims, following Foucault, contemporary age may witness the education wars, due to increasing importance of reproduction and production of knowledge in terms of power.

Cabal's (1993) analysis of contemporary university provides an important insight into the nature of university today which is the fact that prominent figure is no longer professor but administrator. And the legitimacy of university is based on "accountability". Being accountable depends on the university's endeavor to pursue "excellence" in all parts of its functioning. Excellence is according to Readings a discourse (as opposed to an ideology) that refers to nothing in itself thus could be attached to any pre-determined goal. This global trend can be observed from every university's vision and mission statements and similar documents.

To sum up, according to Readings (1996) the postmodern university, modern university could not be understood without an external referent, which was the nation-state. Excellence can only be the most important factor of university in absence of any external referent. And this lack of external referent was made possible by the development of capitalism in a way ended the special role of nation state and national economy for contemporary capitalism. However the lack of external referent for legitimacy signifies how contemporary university embedded much more firmly into the global economy. As postmodern university no longer carry any substantial mission or function except production of economically valuable knowledge and sell the knowledge it possesses in education sector. The discourse of excellence is the sign that universities are today organized as bureaucratic transnational corporations (Readings, 1996, p. 3). The most important figure of university is no longer the academicians but its administrative staff.

3.2.1. Globalization: Decline of Nation-State and Culture

The modern university as discussed in previous chapter was based on the idea of culture. However as the nation-state lost its importance as the primary site of circulation of capital due to globalization, two centuries old alliance between university and state shattered. As the born of modern university was dependent made possible by the alliance of state and university. Demise of this alliance and notion of national culture in general marks the end of university as it was used to know. The contemporary university and state are essentially modern institutions and their origin is interconnected. And in the absence and transformation of state university could not survive without significant changes. (Readings,

1996, p. 6) Today the expectations from universities (elaborated by key policy maker organizations like European Commission, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the World Bank and others form other international organizations to national and regional authorities) are becoming increasingly different from their modern forms as they are no longer national demands (Kwiek, 2006, p. 53).

As the Fordist mode of development reached its limits by the 70's the capitalism was reorganized in a new mode (Harvey, 2003). Its new mode of development can be called as post-Fordism. In this organization of capitalism flexibility of accumulation regime (Harvey, 2005) and flexibility of work (Piore & Sabel, 1984) is essential and market is not only national but global. The basic characteristics of post-Fordism are as follows: customer oriented just-in-time production of commodities, emphasis on team work and decentralization, networked units of production and flat hierarchies in corporations, Kanban system, automation, the rise of transnational corporations and triadization of world trade and capital investment (Fuchs, 2008, 107).

The concept of networks emerged as an influential idea to describe the organizational form of contemporary society. According to Castells (2010, p. xvii) the network logic lies deep at the contemporary society. Organization of different processes and institution in knowledge society are modeled after networks. In his own words "Networks constitute the new social morphology of our societies" (Castells, 2000, p. 500). To be able to analyze knowledge in relation to both society and economy Castell mentions technological paradigms. Today's technological paradigm requires on information as its raw material (Castells, 2010, p. 70). It is also pervasive, based upon network logic, flexible and creates a highly integrated and complex social formation (Castells, 2010, pp. 70-72). Castells connects network society to transformation of capitalism into an informational mode, thus establishing an understanding that neither proposes total rupture nor continuity with the capitalism as a mode of production.

This is not different in the case of the current technological revolution. It originated and diffused, not by accident, in an historical period of the global restructuring of capitalism, for which it was an essential tool. Thus, the new society emerging from this process of change is both capitalist and informational, while presenting

considerable historical variation in different countries, according to their history, culture, institutions, and their specific relationship to global capitalism and information technology. (Castells, 2010, p. 13)

Castells argues that decisive factor of realization of informational technological paradigm and its associated social and cultural forms came from capitalist restructuring that is undertaken since 1980's (Castells, 2010, p. 18). As only such radical transformation of society by political power was able to construct the current techno-economic system.

In contemporary economics national economy is only meaningful as long as it's part of global chain of trade. Due to that Readings (1996, p. 46) argues "national production" is no longer as important as "global consumers". Therefore in a certain sense the nation-state is withering. However this does not mean that the state is about to be demolished and the nation and nationalism are declining to their disappearance. What this means is that state unlike its old ideological role and its political power to organize economic activities will change its form. It will increasingly become an administrative structure as opposed to its political role. State is increasingly reorganized by neoliberal governments to be a companion to the capitalist processes that are considered to be natural. State increasingly appears as an entity that does not impose its political will that it took legitimacy from some collective entity but rather as an organization responsible for opening up and integrating its borders and subjects to global capitalist order. The nationalism in this sense mostly does not imply any resistance to it as many "so called" nationalist parties agree on the inescapable reality of global market. The emergent other forms of nationalisms are mostly reactions to these developments but they are marginalized (Readings, 1996 p. 47). For example IMF replaced the "independent" central banks of nation state.

Olssen & Peters (2005) analyses the process of commercialization of knowledge and university in relation to neoliberal ideology and its neo-managerial techniques. They argue that "the ascendancy of neoliberalism and the associated discourses of 'new public management', during the 1980s and 1990s have produced a fundamental shift in the way universities and other institutions of higher education have defined and justified their institutional existence. "As the importance given to knowledge increased with informational capitalism, neoliberal ideology increasingly turned its face to universities as important sites for commodity production" (Olssen & Peters, 2005). Universities are seen as

key driver in the knowledge economy” and thus they were encouraged to create links with industry and business.

Olssen & Peters (2005, p. 331) in this context say that the emergence of the term knowledge economy, whose origin can be followed to public policies that developed in 1990's, was to hide the capitalist nature of the process. Some of important documents on Knowledge Economy that had policy shaping effects were “Information activities, electronics and telecommunications technologies: Impact on employment, growth and trade” by OECD (1981), “Trends in the information economy” by OECD (1986), “The knowledge-based economy” by OECD (1996) and “The knowledge for development program” launched by World Bank in 1998. These reports enjoyed significant acceptance by governments and implemented. In these report education is seen as an overly undervalued good that will define the future of economics and consequently the societies. Therefore calling for commodification of knowledge and capitalizing the academic work.

In conclusion, following Castells it can be argued that information and communication technologies (ICTs) allowed (but not determined) the emergence of global network capitalism (Fuchs, 2008, p. 110). ICTs are both medium and result of global capitalism²⁸. Post-Fordism is only possible under the conditions realized by ICTs -namely outsourcing, decentralization and reflexivity. Parallel to these developments speculative flow of capital that is also enabled by ICTs increasingly becomes an important of world market making the global flow of capital arguably unstable (Fuchs, 2008, pp. 110-111)²⁹. The global capitalism reduced the states to be administrators and guarantors of global circulation of capital unhindered, effectively making them unable to construct a relatively closed market system in order to gather the political power to control economy. This development made

²⁸ For a deterministic reading of Castells' theory of network society, see Djik (2006).

²⁹ However the concept of network society is also used by interpreters like Jan Van Djik (2006) who accepts the concept of network society but neutralizes the implications of the concept as a result of evolution of society (Fuchs, 2008, pp. 102-103). Hence Barney (2004) warns us that network society can be used to represent the current state of events as inevitable and neutral thus hiding the increasing exploitation and social exclusion of masses (Fuchs, 2008, p. 101). Shaviro (2003) in this context speaks of “soft fascism” of such accounts that presume the neutrality of technological developments. “Such is the soft fascism of the corporate network: it reconciles the conflicting imperatives of aggressive predation on one hand, and unquestioning obedience and conformity on the other” (Shaviro, 2003, p. 4). The realistic accounts of network society must also pay attention of such unpleasant effects of contemporary society.

commodity relations the universal ideal of any relation rendering the notions like nation, culture and knowledge obsolete and powerless.

3.2.2. Audit Culture: Academic Freedom and Work in the University of Excellence

Today university became a corporation and administrator replaces the academician as the center of university. Similarly academic values and responsibilities are replaced by entrepreneurial desires and commercial responsibilities. Moreover the relation between students and professors university changed from a “community of selves” (Himanka, 2012) to a commodity relation between a provider and consumer. This new organization of university affected the working conditions of university staff in two important ways. Firstly the permanent academic positions are replaced by more precarious, short term and reflexive forms of work opportunities, affecting badly the conditions of work of many intellectual workers. Secondly as the administration become the center of university, the auditing and accounting techniques become normalized for university jobs, damaging both the quality of the knowledge produced or taught and also academic freedom.

Neoliberalism causes de-professionalization of academic staff (Amsler & Canaan, 2008, p. 3). According to Olssen & Peters the effects of de-professionalization of academicians result in three important interrelated changes in the organization of university:

- 1) A shift from collegial or democratic governance in flat structures, to hierarchical models based on dictated management specifications of job performance in principal-agent chains of command.
- 2) The implementation of restructuring initiatives in response to market and state demands involves increasing specifications by management over workloads and course content by management. Such hierarchically imposed specifications erode traditional conceptions of professional autonomy over work in relation to both teaching and research. Neoliberalism systematically deconstructs the space in terms of which professional autonomy is exercised.
- 3) Traditional conceptions of professionalism involved an ascription of rights and powers over work in line with classical liberal notions of freedom of the individual. Market pressures increasingly encroach and redesign their traditional understandings of rights, as TEIs must adapt to market trends (for example, just as

individual departments and academics are being told of the necessity for acquiring external research grants, so they are also being told they must teach summer schools) (Olssen & Peters, 2005, p. 325)

Therefore contemporary university tends to be organized on the basis of hierarchical structural forms rather than collegial and democratic forms. Moreover the power of managerial body increases and the power of actual researcher/educator academics decrease. This makes professional autonomy of academicians problematic and replaces it with manager controlled specifications. Unlike modern liberal ideals which has emphasized individual rights as natural and inalienable, in the University of Excellence the responsibility of individual (or departments) to secure their own survival in capitalist economy is seen as a pre-given goal. All these organizational trends in university makes the position of any academic who wants to act contrary to market rationality risky (Thorton, 2009). To sum up, the de-professionalization of academic personal and the erosion of ideas of academic autonomy are all go hand in hand in University of Excellence. Furthermore academic freedom itself is considered to be compatible with conformity with the market; as researches that could not secure funding is considered to be lacking in "excellence" and quality.

According to (Olssen & Peters, 2005, p. 324) the essence of contractual model is specification which is at odds with professionalism. Professionalism implies a classical liberal oriented subjectivity which uses its power (for example academic) in context of rights and freedoms bestowed upon him/her. Therefore professionalism that was endorsed by Humboldtian mode is at odds with the current neoliberal policies whose effect is de-professionalization of academic stuff. Moreover Susan Halford and Peter Leonard (1999, p. 129) point to the heterogeneity of individual actions to adapt or resist the changes in academic life. However Olssen & Peters (2005) are right in their emphasis that new managerialism, as the face of neoliberalism in academy, creates a structural effect that causes performativity to be the first principle of academy and the targets and forms of management in university all increasingly become determined from outside of university. The replacement of discourse of academic proficiency with managerial discourse derived from the economy in universities globally is the mark of University of Excellence. This being embedded in the universal logic of market is the essential element of lack of external

reference of university which was analyzed by Readings (1996). However as Olssen & Peters note:

The extent to which idea is expressed by Kant and Newman, of universities as an institutionally autonomous and politically isolated realm, where there are traditional commitments to a liberal conception of professional autonomy, in keeping with a public service ethic, has any relevance in global economic order, is increasingly seen as an irrelevant concern" (2005, p. 326).

According to excellence discourse university activities and especially the research can be made measurable. Measurability of research in terms of quantitative units will improve the overall production of academic activity, making the whole system more efficient. Therefore they reduce it to an economic function. Triple Helix model introduces one of such theories (For example: Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000). This new analytic approach became quite influential for analysis of universities today. The papers and texts based on triple helix model constitute a very important amount of quotations in educational research on university.

One of the main objectives of reforms in higher education is to install relation of competition as it would according to neoliberal logic increase the productivity, accountability and control. Increasing competition (when implemented without resistance) certainly decrease collegiality therefore makes control easy for managers. However it's hard to say the same for other two. However in its own logic competition may mean fulfillment of other two objectives in the sense that in neoliberal logic increased competition mean increase in rates of innovation. Increase in diversity and effectiveness of products, it also strengthen accountability of academic staff and students. Universities are organized according to principles that are general for all public sector these are: Flexibility (use of contract workers); clearly defined objectives and an orientation towards achieving results (this affects the content of what would be considered as a result, neoliberalism favors measurable results) (Olssen & Peters, 2005).

In terms of education, as the funding is given to those who are most relevant to market, disinterested inquiry and integrity of a subject matter is abandoned as principles in university education in favor of" dumbed down" courses that try to show their relevance to labor market. In University of Excellence the content administrated to students by teachers

needs to be made into “manageable doses” (Readings, 1996, p. 152) Textbooks take a new form, more suitable to University of Excellence, shorter and requiring less of the student. Students essentially learn to be administrators; they learn to administer information successfully.

3.2.3. Informationalization: Knowledge in Postmodern Condition

The discussion of situation of knowledge in postmodernity must continue with a differentiation of information from knowledge to adequately describe the change that occurred in the essence of knowledge in postmodernity. In words of Delanty (1998a, p. 111) “information is the instrumentalization of knowledge”. Information signifies a data useful for application and it has a tendency towards quantity. As it will be discussed it is the knowledge proper (but not exclusive) to postmodern era. On the other hand “knowledge refers to the wider cognitive structure of society [...] Knowledge is not reducible to information” (Delanty 1998a, p. 111). Knowledge is part of a system of knowledge that derives its meaning from. Its legitimacy comes from the totality of the system it is part of. Its claim for truth is made possible by the system its part of. In postmodernity knowledge lost its importance and information appeared to be the more demanded on basis of its usefulness. This situation signifies “the collapse of the Enlightenment model of knowledge as autonomous and self-legislating” (Delanty, 1998a, p. 111).

Arguably Lyotard is one of the most important thinkers who analyzed the condition of knowledge in postmodern society According to Lyotard as “local determinism” replaces the totalistic and universalistic assumptions of modernity particularity and multiplicity emerges (Lyotard, 1984, p. xxiv). As a result, the area of social changes from a place that can be analyzed as an organism or structure to “a space of heterogeneity”. Social in postmodern condition turns from an area of “Newtonian anthropology” to an area of “pragmatics of language particulars” (Lyotard, 1984, p. xxiv).

Lyotard points out that all these clouds of knowledge, language and production will be tried to be controlled by policy makers increasingly according to principles of performativity, which is basically maximization of output and minimalization of input. Application of this

efficiency criterion will bring a certain amount and form of terror to human life. But effects and control of power will increase on the subjects that it tries to organize according to performativity principle (Lyotard, 1984, p. 67). Lyotard asserts that the idea of *Bildung* became obsolete (Lyotard, 1984, p. 4). According to him in postmodern condition, the relation between the knower and person who wishes to acquire the knowledge will be increasingly more like the relation between producers and consumers. It will be based on like a commodity with a certain value. And such knowledge commodities will be consumed to be used for production of new commodities.

Knowledge is and will be produced in order to be sold; it is and will be consumed in order to be valorized in a new production: in both cases, the goal is exchange. Thus knowledge will not be an end in itself; it will lose its use value (Lyotard, 1984, pp. 4-5).

One of the most developed models of knowledge capitalism together with its most worked out implications for knowledge and education comes from a book that is titled “Knowledge Capitalism: Business Work and Learning in New Economy” by Alan Burton-Jones (1999). He supports Lyotard’s thesis that knowledge come to fore of capitalist economy in contemporary society: “Among various factors currently causing change in the economy, none is more important than changing role of knowledge. He also claims that as knowledge becomes the most important form of capital, people be like knowledge capitalists at least in western advanced economies. Traditional forms of employment is in decline, skilled work force is required and demanded.

Lyotard (1984, p. 5) argues – similar to the discussion of role of knowledge in informational capitalism- that knowledge will not only be a product, but it will also increasingly become the most valued product. It will be basis of power in general. Knowledge became the most profitable form of production today. This in turn effected the composition of work force in the world. The Lyotard’s main argument on this issue is that knowledge as informational commodity will be indispensable to productive power. This new condition of knowledge requires transparency and fluidity like a product in a market. This transparency will favor the liberalism as its political reflection (Lyotard, 1984, p. 6). In this sense postmodern knowledge will affect the state which as a political entity will create a form of opacity that hinders flow of knowledge. This in turn will require states and power centers to reorient

their relations with the civil society and market, the very influential idea of “governance” is a simple symptom of this change. Moreover neoliberal idea that “government intervention is the problem rather than the solution” (Harvey, 2005, p. 53) and call for “shrinking of the state” in general can be seen from the same perspective as reflections of the postmodernity in the politics.

As discussed the modern idea of university was closely linked to idea of truth, however in postmodern age truth in its modernist sense as a metanarrative will be an object of suspicion (Lyotard, 1984, p. xxiii). Lyotard approaches the concept of truth from a the perspective of pragmatic philosophy and claims as the any claim of truth necessarily takes its legitimacy from the those who claim its legitimate, the legitimacy of any knowledge is an issue of legitimacy of the legislator who holds the authority to bestow a claim with the truth value. In postmodern society therefore the question of truth turns into a question of power, the power to legitimize a particular knowledge claim as truth (Lyotard, 1984, pp. 8-9). Therefore Lyotard foresees an increase in discussions and debates on who has the authority over whom. The authority will be under constant attack and will be less stable. However this situation also implies that in postmodern era, the question of knowledge will even be a less question of truth, but it will be a question of government (Lyotard, 1984, p. 9).

However this crisis of legitimation is a signal of the changed essence of legitimacy. The Lyotard’s explanation of the new narrative legitimation reminds the Wittgenstein’s (1986) account of emergence and solution of philosophical problems. Wittgenstein argued that all of the philosophical problems arose due to usage of philosophical themes on concrete objects outside of its domain. “For philosophical problems arise, when language goes on holiday” (Wittgenstein, 1986, p. 19). This application of particular language to external objects and areas, according to Wittgenstein produces insoluble problems. Due to that philosophical problems could never be solved, but they could only be overcome. The way to overcome a philosophical problem is the elimination of the question that started the debate itself by showing it is actually not a problem at all. Lyotard argues in the same vein that as legitimacy appears to be a philosophical problem that is debated throughout the history. It must be abandoned as a philosophical problem as it could never be resolved and new ways to deal with its absence must be contemplated on. His proposition is replacing

legitimacy principle with “operativity criterion” (Lyotard, 1984, pp. xxiv-xxv). “Operativity criterion is technological” and it has no relation to what is “just or true” (Lyotard, 1984, p. xxv). Operativity criterion seems to be based on the same idea that Feyerabend (1993, p. 14) expressed as “anything goes”. The notion of operativity takes does not take its legitimacy from an outside source (whose legitimacy would be also proved in an endless sequence) but rather holds its self-legitimacy in itself thanks to its functionality to a given purpose. That is also all of what operativity criterion promises as it has no claim for any permanent or metaphysical value beyond the fact of its usefulness. Operativity is closely linked to the concept of performativity which is about the efficiency problem. According to Lyotard (1984, p. 11) performativity as the ultimate goal of any system is about ensuring the output gained is higher than the input spent for an action.

In short, Lyotard’s account of knowledge signifies as the truth becomes democratized in the postmodern era, knowledge lost its status as an autonomous process. Situation of knowledge in postmodernity is a discouraging one in terms of search for truth and final answers. Due to that knowledge as useful data, in other words information became the desired form of knowledge. Informationalization process bring its own set of problems that needs to be addressed, for example; how to store large quantities of data, how to find the useful find in the time of need. As the knowledge becomes reduced to the information the most pressing intellectual problems take the shape of problems of management. In other words as the information produced in a number that was never possible before, the problem of managing the information increasingly become the most crucial issue in information economy.

3.3. Bologna Process: University as a Transnational Corporation

In this section Bologna process will be analyzed as the policy reform to reconfigure university systems of member states according to the University of Excellence. Bologna Process is no ordinary policy reform in education as it has the aim of construction of European education market as a complimentary to the integration of European states to form an economic power compatible with the United States. Although the membership in process is based on individual will, it is shown that participation in project is seen to be

necessary in order to survive the increasingly competitive world market of education. This is illustrated by the fact that now countries that wished to participate in Bologna Process expanded beyond the borders of European continent³⁰.

It would be appropriate start with some general information on the Bologna Process, before moving into the analysis of discourse of its documents. The Bologna Process (BP) is a reform process that aims for creating and consolidating European Higher Education Area (EHEA). It was launched after 29 education ministers signed a declaration in Bologna in June 1999 to reform their respective systems of university. However with additional members added up in the process, today the number of member countries reached 47 including Turkey.

EHEA is according to official documents planned to be based on international cooperation and academic exchange that is attractive to European students and staff as well as to students and staff from other parts of the world. EHEA has become a reality after the Budapest-Vienna Declaration of March, 2010. Now the members of BP try to strengthen it.³¹ The aims of EHEA are summarized under three headings: 1) to facilitate mobility of staff and students 2) to prepare students to their careers as citizens and also to support their personal development 3) to offer broad access to high-quality education

To ensure these some standards were created in different aspects of University. These standards were not accepted altogether in the end but added in different subsequent meetings of Bologna Conference. The first of such standards is three year degree structure. A second one is the use of European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System. A third one is the curriculum reform and modularization of courses offered. There is also strong emphasis on making arrangements for mobility with programs like Erasmus or through bilateral degrees. Increasing recognition among universities is another very important aspect. To this purpose Diploma Supplements were introduced as a standard supplements that must be given by each member university. Another such standard is making a national

³⁰ For example: 1) Kazakhstan is a member of the process and 2) Australia, although not a member of process, remodel its higher education system according to requirements of Bologna Process.

³¹ Therefore there is no difference between BP and EHEA in terms of members, overarching aims, etc... In this thesis Bologna Process would be used to signify the Bologna Process and subsequent formation of European Higher education Era altogether.

qualifications framework for ensuring coherence between different locales. Lifelong Learning (LLL) is also encouraged by Bologna Process³² and lastly social dimension for equal opportunity to have a university education was also introduced into BP.

3.3.1. Discourse of Bologna Process

First of all it can be stated that by starting the conferences in Bologna, participants of the process make a reference to place of born of the first university, thus implying that Bologna Process is second birth to university and somehow linking history of university with the new vision of university. In Bologna declaration the first and foremost aim of Bologna Process is declared as hardening the integration of Europe, with an emphasis on reinforcing the European Union to make it more far reaching and harden it (European Ministers of Education, 1999). A Europe of knowledge is seen as an inevitable requirement for new millennium for economic politic and social reasons. In Sorbonne Declaration (European Ministers of Education, 1998) mentioned the cultural dimensions of integration and employability in Europe and constructing a market of Europe.

Bologna process endorses the fundamental principles laid down in the Bologna Magna Charta Universitatum of 1988 which were:

- 1) Universities are autonomous institutions must be free from social and political authority
- 2) Teaching and research is inseparable for university
- 3) Academic freedom is a central concern
- 4) University is the trustee of European humanist tradition. It aims for universal knowledge (European Ministers of Education, 1999),

This fundamental principles established in Magna Carta are actually nothing new but age old conventions of University of Culture (except importance of national culture is replaced with European culture). The only non-conventional matter of the document is a commitment to encourage mobility (European Ministers of Education, 1988, p. 2).

³² And with LLL we can also note that distance learning and double diplomas and similar new trends in education are encouraged by Bologna as well.

In the Bologna Declaration (European Ministers of Education, 1999) a new approach to university appears to emerge, despite all the familiar university rhetoric namely that university held responsible due to their freedom and autonomy to changes demands of society and technology. Although academic freedom is mentioned in the text is used with a new meaning. Here freedom is defined as the basis of responsibility towards the needs of society and technology. This means what is autonomous is not knowledge in Bolognian University but the social demands and technology. Although they are not explicitly defined it is not hard to guess social demands signify the needs of the global capitalism and consumer subjects. The most important of these demands is development of technology. As they support the globalization by information and communication technologies. Development of technology is assumed as the basis of progress of humanity. The contrast to the Kantian idea of autonomy of reason is sharp. As Kant considered free operation of rationality would result in enlightenment of humanity, in the Bologna documents today technology considered to be progress. In terms of education content of education is reassigned even before the rational inquiry begins. It is actually very similar to the nationalist pedagogy of Fichte that pupil must be trained in national culture. In age of Global capitalism only the content of such pedagogic approach is changed. National culture is replaced by consumerist subjectivity and technological perspective.

In the following paragraphs of text the reader is assured that “The course has been set in the right direction and with meaningful purpose.” (European Ministers of Education, 1999, p. 2) Then, declaration asserts that “The vitality and efficiency of any civilization can be measured by the appeal that its culture has for other countries”. This statement sees the relation between different civilizations as a one of competition following the aggressive and expansionist logic of capitalist market. The racist and colonialist discourse of this sentence means that there are different “monolithic” cultures which appear to have intrinsic wish to compete with each other. This is a clear example of how capitalist subject of today reimagines the past in terms of its own existence and universalizes his/her conditions of existence anachronistically. The belief in this abstraction also points to the ignorance of capitalist subject about his/her production.

Later it is reported that “European higher education system acquires a world-wide degree of attraction equal to our extraordinary cultural and scientific traditions” European

Ministers of Education, 1999). The main novelty and importance of Bologna Declaration (European Ministers of Education, 1999) comes from its short term policy aims: 1) Easily readable and comparable degrees 2) Two main cycles (which would later be increased to three) 3) System of credits 4) Mobility 5) Quality assurance 6) European dimension. The participants of process state their commitment to realize these aims in short term while do not violating the fundamental values of university. However as these reform tracks bring their own affects into the individual universities and national university systems as a whole, it is contradictory statement, though contradiction is nothing new for University of Excellence. As argued by Readings (1996) the ability of discourse of excellence comes from the fact that a unity of discourse and practice is not a primary aim for it. Excellence only aims for competitive advantage which requires efficiency. As long as the mechanism functions in an efficient manner it is irrelevant to ask whether it works in a consistent manner or not. It is even inefficient from an administrative perspective to open up such issues. And when they are opened up they could only be opened up as to propose as a question of optimizing the efficiency, not as external referents that should be achieved.

After Bologna Conference members agreed to meet once a two years' time for further cooperation (European Ministers of Education, 2001) is the first of these. It should be also noted that Turkey official become a member of Bologna Process in this meeting. In terms of policies, three new aims were decided: 1) Lifelong learning: is necessary to face the challenges of knowledge economy and society and for social cohesion, equal opportunities and quality of life. 2) Participation of institutions and students 3) Increasing attractiveness of Bologna Process and academic mobility.

The follow up meeting was held in Berlin (European Ministers of Education, 2003). It was decided that "European Higher Education Area and European Research Area" are seen as two sides for adoption to knowledge based economy. The Doctoral degree as third cycle is introduced. Ministers decided to fund research, training and interdisciplinary should be funded more. The need of university to adapt itself to the requirements of society is restated in Berlin Conference. "Therefore Ministers ask Higher Education Institutions to increase the role and relevance of research to technological, social and cultural evolution and to the needs of society" (European Ministers of Education, 2003, s. 7). The changes in knowledge and society are again considered from a competitive and technological

standpoint. This time the role of state to administer the universities according to these requirements is boldly restated.

In Bergen Conference (European Ministers of Education, 2005) the social dimension is added to list of reforms. It is stated that ensuring everyone has equal chance to attain higher education is an essential part of EHEA. "The social dimension includes measures taken by governments to help students, especially from socially disadvantaged groups, in financial and economic aspects and to provide them with guidance and counseling services with a view to widening access." Social dimension suggests discrimination based on different forms of oppression and exclusion must be prevented in higher education. However there are no specific guidelines or drawbacks that will be implemented if the participating countries fail to employ them. Therefore social dimension of Bologna Process appears to be a rhetorical tool to prevent opposition to Bologna process from a social or economic justice standpoint.

London Communiqué (European Ministers of Education, 2007) starts with appreciation of the steps taken to reach EHEA. Further it is stated that: "Building on our rich and diverse European cultural heritage, we are developing an EHEA based on institutional autonomy, academic freedom, equal opportunities and democratic principles that will facilitate mobility, increase employability and strengthen Europe's attractiveness and competitiveness." Again without explanation how these "old" premises will be protected.

In Leuven Conference (European Ministers of Education, 2009) lifelong learning is mentioned in the second paragraph. This shows the increased importance given to it. It is justified by aging population of Europe. Then text mention about the familiar themes that force universities to change. "European higher education also faces the major challenge and the ensuing opportunities of globalization and accelerated technological developments with new providers, new learners and new types of learning"

Some general conclusions could be derived from the analysis of official documents of Bologna Process and EHEA. They are marked with notions that are peculiar to global capitalism and its informational mode of knowledge. First of all under the rhetoric of adaptation of universities the needs of society universities are pushed towards integrating into the global capitalist market. This does not mean that they are directly privatized,

integration rather occurs in a manner described in the model proposed by Triple Helix theory. This model argues that new conjunction between state, private sector and universities occur in novel forms of institutions and spaces for commercialization of knowledge.

The second thing that stand out is the emphasis on development of human capital through programs like distance learning and lifelong learning. This emphasis is also compatible with the new employment conditions in informational capitalism. The burden of having the right skills in the market is now considered to be an individual responsibility. Thus the cost of education is loaded to the individuals. This enforces the consumer oriented organization of University of Excellence.

A third issue is the problematic situation of academic freedom in context of Bologna reforms. There is a change in the meaning of academic freedom. There is a disposition toward ensuring the technological applicability and usefulness of education and research. The academic freedom also suffers from the increasing consumerism as it forces each and every individual to bow to the demands of market. Failing to do that creates the risk of exclusion from the University of Excellence by the administration. Due to that academicians feel much more restraint in contemporary university (Thorton, 2009).

A forth issue is one type of educational system (the modular system, which is more compatible with the applied sciences) is applied to the all of the university departments. There are complaints from especially in the humanities departments that the modular system and the revisions they had to make in order to fit the system affected the quality of courses badly. For example Larsen (2006, p. 2) criticized Bologna Process as Americanisation of University and argued against devaluation of Humanities in Bologna Process.

Fifth issue is the problem of accounting and quality. As parallel to the administrative logic Bologna process envisions increasing audit culture and assumes it to the guarantee of quality. The accountability is replaced by accounting again as discussed by Readings (1996).

To sum up, Bologna Process as a binding international reform project will ensure the expansion of the University of Excellence. There appears to be a huge demand for it as long as the governments of member states concerned. The Bolognian Idea of University appears

to be fit the concept of University of Excellence described by Readings before the process began. It pushes universities toward entrepreneurial lines in both research (R&D for Private Sector) and educational (lifelong learning, distance learning) functions of university. Implement the methods of evaluation (whose necessity might even be questioned) into all disciplines without discrimination. As these methods of evaluation are based on the quantities, measurable pieces of work and favor short-term benefits over academic quality and long-term development of ideas, Bologna Process seems to designate the future of university as a transnational corporation. This calls for the question Readings' put into title of his book, "did university is ruined irreversibly?"

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

As the accumulation of capital reached its limits in Fordist mode of development in late 60's and there were widespread protest against the world order based on industrialism. Society experienced another transition in terms of its organization and culture and knowledge and entered into what can be called postmodernity. Global economy replaced the Keynesian politics of welfare state gradually but decisively throughout the world. As the global economy became an universal force and referent, political power of nation-state diminished to administrative tasks to better integrate its own market into global system. This new organization of capitalism effected both knowledge and university.

As knowledge become increasingly commoditized and moved to the center of capitalist economics and its associated organization of other spheres of social life. The ideal knowledge itself changed substantially and became information. The informationization of knowledge had tremendous effects over modern university as the self-legitimizing discourse of university dependent on its representation of the unity of knowledge. However as discussed information had a deteriorating effect over knowledge due to its emphasis on quantitative, commodity, useful and efficient nature of desired knowledge. Under such knowledge regime ideals of modern university started to be seen as increasingly irrelevant and they become rhetorical devices in new organization of university at best.

The emerging new form of university of today can be called as University of Excellence, borrowing the term form Readings (1996). As discussed in the previous chapter emergence of university of excellence makes administration the head of university. As the discourse of excellence refers to nothing it's just a tool to create a general consent for transnational corporate bureaucratic organization of university. In this sense excellence includes anything that improves the competitiveness of university in the -now global- higher education market. Therefore its limit is nothing but rules of the market. Those traditions of education

and thinking that were once seen as inseparable from university are now subject the “objective” evaluation” of the economy. This results in their demise and replacement by new interdisciplinary programs, technological education, and other similar consumer oriented programs that provide those interested with information they need in an virtual space or anytime thanks to lifelong learning programmes. This corporate organization of university brings the problems of working conditions peculiar to post-Fordist labor into university. University was once considered to be immune to deterioration of working conditions as it was a highly privileged institution in the service of nation-state thus the will of the people. Short-term and flexible contracts, deprofessionalization are ongoing processes in contemporary university. New managerialism causes administrative body to have increasing control over academics causing what is called as audit culture which challenges the academic freedom (Shore & Wright, 2000) and as university becomes corporation knowledge it produces and transmits transforms into commodities.

Under such hostile conditions one question emerges: Does university still have relevance? In other words, the main intellectual endeavor for modern university was to find its idea that unities all its functions and activities that would in the long term benefit humanity and nation as a whole. However in the age of globalized capital the debate about university shifted from its idea to its future. The central question concerning the university today is whether it has a future or not, and if it has on what grounds we must think about it? According to Delanty (2001) four trends can be identified in this debate:

- 1) The entrenched liberal critique, which can be called a cultural critique since it is primarily concerned with the university as a medium of cultural reproduction. The liberal idea of the university—associated with the positions of Allan Bloom (1987), who bemoans the attack on the traditional curriculum in the name of diversity, and Russell Jacoby (1987), who regrets the decline of the public intellectual who has disappeared from the university—on the whole looks backwards to the golden age of an earlier university. Despite the different positions within this broad stance that derives from the neo-humanist tradition, the tendency is to see the university in crisis because of the decline of the autonomy of culture, be it the culture of critique or, in its more conservative version, the traditional culture of the canon.
- 2) The postmodern thesis, associated with Lyotard (1984) and recently restated by Bill Readings (1996), announces the end of the university along with the end of the nation-state. It is claimed that knowledge has lost its emancipatory role and the very notion of universality, or even the very idea of a curriculum, is now impossible,

given the fragmentation of knowledge, as in, for instance, the separation of teaching and research.

- 3) The reflexivity thesis, which is best associated with claims that there is a new mode of knowledge based on a more reflexive relationship between user and producer, offers a less dramatic theory but one nevertheless that announces the obsolescence of the university (Gibbons et al., 1984). As a Mode 2 paradigm around applied knowledge emerges, the university, which is caught up in the more hierarchical and disciplinary-based Mode 1 knowledge production, becomes, it is claimed, increasingly irrelevant to the Postfordist economy.
- 4) The globalization thesis draws attention to the instrumentalization of the university as it embraces market values and information technology. According to various authors, the university is far from irrelevant to capitalism, as the previous thesis would claim, but is in fact fully integrated into it and, as a new managerialism takes over the university, there is a resulting loss of academic freedom (Curie and Newson, 1998; Etzkowitz and Leydesdorff, 1997; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). This thesis suggests that the university has become a major player in the global market and in information-based capitalism.

The first critique is romantic one and due to its still naïve universalization of a particular culture it is modernist. It is based on an assumption that the old ideas of university can still continue to exist against forces of informational capitalism which does not appear reliable. However this approach appears implausible after on the one hand critiques of Derrida and Heidegger on informationalization of knowledge and merge of principle of reason with techno-science in contemporary era. As discussed by Readings contemporary post-historical university abolished old ideals of hero of knowledge and hero of people and they seem ultimately lost in current academic scene as it increasingly become capitalized. Delanty (2001a, pp. 6-7) refutes the second one, the postmodern thesis, on the basis that it provides no satisfactory proposals for future of knowledge institution. This position is also the one advocated by Readings; therefore it is important for debate of this thesis and will be discussed in the following paragraphs in a more detailed manner. The third one, namely the reflexivity thesis resembles the postmodern thesis in important ways, especially on the issue of new conditions of knowledge and end of university. The difference between the postmodern arguments is not significant for the purpose of this discussion. Lastly, the globalization thesis assumes the historical developments as necessary events. This mystifies the actual relations that occurred in emerging of the current socio-political climate. Therefore as it lacks any understanding for its own conditions emergence it tends to dictate

its derivations from current state of university as a normative ideal for understanding for both history of university and current multiplicity of universities today.

Delanty differentiates opinions to these fourfold schema and criticize them. Then he claims a more nuanced approach to issue at hand is possible and argues that:

Perhaps it is the role of the university to enable society to live with choice and uncertainty. Taming the new technologies and providing a cultural orientation for society is central to that challenge. It is for this reason that we can speak of the continued relevance of the university (Delanty, 2001b, p. 152)

In 1998 journal *Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy* made a special issue on "Sites of Knowledge Production: The University". In that issue Delanty's article "The idea of the university in the global era: From knowledge as an end to the end of knowledge?" was the central text that many other thinkers responded. Looking at that debate can be illuminating to see more a vibrant contemporary discussion of academicians. In 1998 when Delanty's ideas did not matured yet, he admits his position "is ambivalent and possibly self-contradictory". He admits that he wants to accept both "the postmodern conditions of information society and possibility of a rational debate on the normative, cognitive and aesthetic foundations of society". Therefore he claims "the question for the identity of university" cannot be abandoned (Delanty, 1998b, p. 21). His insight on how this question can be answered is based on relating the university to public sphere.

A central theme in nearly all of the participants of the discussion is that all of them accept the university today must engage in the social. However as the consumer society forms the new universal logic of capitalist societies it is not clear how the ideals of university will be protected a university will be defined more or less requirements of contemporary society. However this approach appears to be problematic as the universalist logic of market dominates over much of the intersubjective relations. This proves fatal for strategies that emphasize calling for moderation or engagement with public approach to university, as there no longer appears any social breaks that will hinder extension of market into university.

Does this mean Readings (1996) was right when he called university "a ruined institution"? The conclusions of the thesis show that the developments in the discourse of excellence in

university prove him right. Especially the Bologna Process redefines universities as transnational corporations. Does this mean that academicians are now free from their social and intellectual obligations? This is hardly the case as it was discussed by some academics who try to resituate the possibility of non-conformity of academics to forces of capitalist market. In the following paragraphs such line of thought will be followed.

Following Harpham's (1994) point, forcing the debate to two polar positions of modernity against postmodernity, it might be answered from "all around". His discussion starts with Kant's newspaper article as an answer to the question what is enlightenment (as our paper started with a similar questions) he says it is courage to use your own reason and get rid of your immaturity. As Foucault becomes interested in this question he wrote an essay on it which might be seen as a controversial as he was believed to be counter enlightenment thinker attacking its notions etc... but he sympathizes with Kant and finds similarities between what he does and Kant does that they both make an examination of ontology of the present. Although he wished to arrange a meeting on the issue he passes away and Habermas writes a response after him according to he actually does not find much to criticize in Foucault. As he was also interested in a similar orientation toward connecting the interests of humanity and knowledge together. Harpham notes that however there is a reductionist modernity approach that is going on trying to revitalize the modernity. However they are in err as what they actually call modernity is both an ethnocentric image and an idealist one in the sense that it shadows its own colonial history. Thus he concludes by saying that the true answer to the question of enlightenment cannot be found in the reductionist oppositions like enlightenment and counter-enlightenment. The attitude of enlightenment thought can be found in Foucault as much as Kant, as they both tried to transgress the doxy of their time and produced an emancipatory and new knowledge, providing a critical account of their own times. Then, Enlightenment attitude can be formulated as the act of transgression of the order and limits of one's time.

Derrida (1983) in "Principle of Reason" seeks what he calls "thought" which is beyond the historically determined structure of modern logic (which is weakened by subject-object distinction it presupposes) and its further development into information and also problematizes "theoratico-political hierarchy" that lurked behind the intellectual unconscious of many thinkers. Thus he rejects both political economic intervention of

power into university and autonomy of intellectual conduct. Lastly, Derrida also criticize hierarchy of theory over practice. And such thinking beyond principle of reason and in and outside of it as “thought” must be strived for by thinkers and must be tried to be realized in universities as it might provide the right answer for the renewal of university in postmodern era.

Synthesizing all has been said so far on the knowledge in postmodern condition and Derrida’s warnings of the pitfalls that must be dodged. Three things appear to step out as important facts that must be confronted with:

1) The Lyotard’s analysis of knowledge holds to be true. As the change in knowledge and university is evident, instrumentalization of knowledge prevailed over so called disinterested knowledge. The society now occupies the power position once university enjoyed thanks to the nation-state. The end of “ivory tower” of academy is not something that should be avoided, as Habermas showed it the old idea of autonomy came with strings attached.

2) The principle of reason is not lost its importance as Derrida (1983) emphasized. The principle of reason still holds. A contemporary defense of it is already given by Habermas as it confines the formal rules of communicative rationality in which the best argument wins. This is especially important in the face of increasing doxological thinking that characterizes contemporary era.

3) Establishing another “theoratico-political hierarchy must be avoided. As the history of philosophy is full of such failed attempts, for example the idea of “philosopher king” by Plato and the idea of the faculty of philosophy as the highest faculty and basis of university by Kant.

As all these three points are about the positioning of academician, the discussion should continue in that direction. Blackmore (2003) asks if the liberal university is dead new postmodern university has any chance to be emancipatory? Or is it just became one aspect of global capitalism? She sees there are two new situations now face the universities the first one is that as capitalism becomes increasingly post-Fordist and informational based states and regulatory authorities increasingly see and control universities as important tool

for capitalist development. The second one is that as we discussed before idea of university and academics as legitimate knowledge producers is criticized by postmodernist, feminist and post-colonial and indigenous intellectuals towards a wider trend of democratization of knowledge.

Then question is what becomes to the educational researcher and its professional organization in the context of these social political and economic changes. Especially what happens to the role of academics as public intellectuals (Blackmore, 2003) as it was one of the main reasons universities claimed such unique position compared to others, namely defender of public democratic values thus the civilized heritage of the nation. According to Blackmore (2003) educational feminist researcher must go beyond policy suggestion to policy critique, as the function of intellectual could not be reduced to that alone. The position articulated by Blackmore is illuminating on the role of academics in the face of informational capitalism. While finishing I want to share this lengthy quote from her:

Professionals have a critical role to engage with society and the client as 'professional knowledge is "critique-in-action"' (Barnett 1997, p. 139). Criticality, he suggests, can work simultaneously within and against performativity. It can both yield the desired outcomes within a knowledge-based economy because it provides a competitive edge and even efficiencies, and also promote for universities a sense of ethics and a strong public role. In teacher education, for example, the formation of a profession from this perspective must incorporate four dimensions: a broad commitment to being a public advocate for the profession and the social good; a contribution to the development of the knowledge base and practice of the profession; adherence to professional and ethical standards set by and for the profession, and accountability to the profession, students, parents/carers, employers and the wider community; and being competent and knowledgeable about subject matter. This notion of critical professionalism may require us to promote a 'social science' of education that moves away from specialisms that have led to fragmentation of the field and return to thinking about ourselves as organic intellectuals, where we come to know the field of education and not just our disciplinary field (Blackmore, 2003, p. 17)

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. (1983). *The sociology of knowledge and its consciousness*. In Prisms. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Akademisyenlerden Gezi. (2013). Retrieved from:
<http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/egitim/23413063.asp>
- American Association of University Professors. (n.d.). *History of the AAUP*. Retrived from:
<http://www.aaup.org/about/history-aaup>
- American Association of University Professors. (2006). *1940 statement of principles on academic freedom and tenure: With 1970 interpretive comments*. AAUP Policy Tenth Ed. 2. Retrieved from: <http://www.aaup.org/file/principles-academic-freedom-tenure.pdf>
- Amsler, S., S, & Canaan, J., E. (2008). Whither critical pedagogy in the neo-liberal university today? Two UK practitioners' reflections on constraints and possibilities. *Enhancing Learning in the Social Sciences*. 1(2), 1-31.
- Altbach, P., G. (2003). "Academic Freedom: International Realities and Challenges". In M. Kwiek (ed.). *The university, globalization, Central Europe*. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang.
- Apel, K., O. (1980). *The transformation of philosophy*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Baumann, Z. (1997). *Postmodernity and its discontents*. New York: New York University.
- Barnett, R. (2000). University knowledge in an age of supercomplexity. *Higher Education*, 40, 409–422.
- Barney, D. (2004). *The network society*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bell, D. (1976). *The coming of the post-industrial society*. London: Heinemann.
- Berger, T. & Luchmann, T. (1991). *The social construction of reality*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Blackmore, J. (2003). Tracking the nomadic life of the educational Researcher: What future for feminist public and the performative university. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, 30(3), 1-25.

- Bloom, A. (1987). *Closing of American mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Bloor, D. (1991). *Knowledge and social imaginary*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- Pierre Bourdieu (1988). *Homo-academicus*. Stanford and California: Stanford University
- Burton-Jones, A. (1999). *Knowledge capitalism: Business, work and learning in new economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Castells, M. (2010). *The rise of network society*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Comte, A. (1848). *A General View of Positivism*. Retrieved from:
<http://archive.org/details/ageneralviewofpo00comtuoft>
- Chroust, A. H. (1967). Plato's Academy: The first organized school of political science in antiquity. *The Review of Politics*, 29(1), 25–40.
- Çetinsaya, G. (2013, June 4). Retrieved 06 2013, 06, from Hürriyet Online:
<http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/egitim/23432976.asp>
- Delanty, G. (1998a). Rethinking the university: The autonomy, contestation and reflexivity of knowledge. *Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy*, 12(1), 103-113.
- Delanty, G. (1998b). The idea of the university in the global era: From knowledge as an end to end of knowledge? *Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy*, 12(1), 3-25.
- Delanty, G. (2001a). *Challenging knowledge: The university in the knowledge economy*. Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.
- Delanty, G. (2001b). The university in the knowledge society. *Organization*, 8(2), 149–153.
- Delegates of European Universities (1988). *Magna Carta Universitatum*. Bologna: Bologna University.
- Derrida, J. (1983). The principle of reason: The university in the Eyes of Its Pupils. *Diacritics*, Vol. 13 (3), 2-20.
- Dijk, J. V. (2006). *The network society*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Dölen, E. (2010). *Türkiye üniversite tarihi 5: Özerk üniversite dönemi 1946-1981*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Durkheim, E. (1915). *Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. London and New York: Macmillan

- Durkheim., E. (1977). *Evolution of educational thought*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- European Ministers of Education (1999). The European Higher Education Area: Joint Declaration, Bologna
- European Ministers of Education (2001). Towards the European Higher Education Area: Communiqué of the meeting of European ministers in charge of Higher Education, Prague.
- European Ministers of Education (2003). Realizing the European Higher Education Area: Communiqué of the conference of ministers responsible for higher education, Berlin.
- European Ministers of Education (2005). The European Higher Education Area - Achieving the Goals: Communiqué of the conference of ministers responsible for higher education, Bergen.
- European Ministers of Education (2007). Towards The European Higher Education Area: Responding to challenges in a globalized world, London.
- European Ministers of Education (2009). The Bologna Process 2020: The European Higher Education Area in the new decade: Communiqué of the Conference of European Ministers Responsible for Higher Education, Leuven and Louvain-la-Neuve.
- European Ministers of Education (2010). Budapest-Vienna Declaration: On the European Higher Education Area. Budapest-Vienna.
- Erdoğan, N. (2003). Kültürel Çalışmalar (Kendiliğinden) İdeoloji(si) ve Akademya. *Toplum ve Bilim*. 97, p. 43-64.
- Etzkowitz, H., Webster, A., Gebhardt, C. & Terra, B., R., C. (2000). The future of the university and the university of the future: Evolution of ivory tower to entrepreneurial paradigm, *Research Policy*, 29, 313-330.
- Etzkowitz, H. & Leydesdorff, L. (2000). "The Dynamics of Innovation: From National Systems and 'Mode 2' to a Triple Helix of University–industry–government Relations." *Research Policy*, 29(2), 109–123.
- Fallon, D. (1980). *The German University*. Boulder: Colorado Associated University Press.
- Feyerabend, P. (1993). *Against method*. London: Verso
- Fichte, J. G. (1979). *Addresses to the German Nation*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

- Fichte, J., G. (1988). *Fichte: Early philosophical writings*. (D. Breazeale, Ed.) Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. (D. Bouchard, Ed.) Oxford: Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Fuchs, C. (2008). *Internet and society*. New York: Routledge.
- Fuller, S. (2000). *Thomas Kuhn: A philosophical history of our time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fuller, S. (2012). Social epistemology: A quarter-century itinerary. *Social Epistemology: A Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Policy*, 26(3-4), 267-283.
- Giroux, H. (2007). *University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial-Academic Complex*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *Knowledge and human interests*. Boston : Polity Press
- Habermas, J. (1987). The idea of university: Learning processes. *New German Critique*, 41, 3-22
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Harpham, G. G. (1994). So... What Is Enlightenment? An inquisition into modernity. *Critical Inquiry*, 20 (Spring), 524-555.
- Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *Brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Henry, J. (2004). Science and the coming of Enlightenment. In Fitzpatrick, M., Jones, P., Knellwolf, C. & McCalman, I. (Eds.) *The Enlightenment World*. Oxfordshire, New York: Routledge.
- Heyman, R. (2001). Libraries as armouries: Daniel Coit Gilman, geography and the uses of a university. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 19, 295-316.
- Himanka, J. (2012). The university as a community of selves: Johan Vilhelm Snellman's 'On Academic Studies'. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 64(4), 517-528.
- Horkheimer, M. (2004). *Eclipse of reason*. London; New York: Continuum.

- Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T. W. (2002). *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. California: Stanford University Press.
- Jaspers, K. (1959). *The idea of university*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Kant, I. (1979). *The conflict of the faculties*. New York: Abaris Books.
- Kerr, C. (1963). *The uses of university*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Kwiek, M. (2006). The classical german idea of university revisited, or on the nationalization of the modern institution. *CPS RPS Volume 1*, 1-60.
- Kwiek, M. (2008). The classical german idea of university revisited (on the nationalization of the modern institution). *Polish Journal of Philosophy* vol. 2, no. 1, 1-25.
- Halford, S. & Leonard, P. (1999). New identities? Professionalism, managerialism and the construction of self. In M. Exworthy & S. Halford (eds) *Professionals and the New Managerialism in the Public Sector*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hegel, G. W. F. (2012). *System of science: First part the phenomenology of spirit*. Retrieved from:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21288399/Articles%20for%20Webpage/Phenomenology%20of%20Spirit%20in%20English%20and%20German.pdf>
- Humboldt, W. (1854). *The sphere and duties of government* (The limits of state action). Liberty Fund Inc. Retrieved from:
http://oll.libertyfund.org/?option=com_staticxt&staticfile=show.php%3Ftitle=589
- Larsen, J. E. (2006). The role of the humanities in the Bologna idea of the university: Could Europe learn from the American model?. *Revista Española de Educación Comparada*, 12, 309-327.
- Law, J. (1994). *Organized Modernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Liedman, S., E. (1996). In Search of Isis: General Education in Germany and Sweden". In B. Wittrock, & S. Rothblantt, (Eds.), *The European and American university since 1800: Historical and sociological essays* (pp. 303-363). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Limnatis, N. G. (2008). *German idealism and the problem of knowledge: Kant, Fichte, Schelling, And Hegel*. Springer.

- Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *Postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mannheim, K. (1954). *Ideology and utopia: An introduction to sociology of knowledge*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Neave, G. (2000). Universities' responsibility to society: An historical exploration of an enduring issue. In: Neave, G. (ed.), *The universities' responsibilities to societies: International perspectives*. Amsterdam: Pergamon Press.
- Neave, G. (2001). The European dimension in higher education: An excursion into the modern use of historical analogues. In: Huisman, Jeroen, Peter Maassen, and Guy Neave (eds.). *Higher education and the state: The international dimension of higher education*. Amsterdam: Pergamon Press.
- Nussbaum, M. C. (2010). *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- O'Boyle, L. (1983). Learning for its own sake: the German university as nineteenth-century model. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 25(1), pp.3-25.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1981). *Information activities, electronics and telecommunications technologies: Impact on employment, growth and trade*. Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1986). *Trends in the information economy*. Paris: OECD.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (1996). *The knowledge-based economy*. Paris: OECD.
- Oleksiyenko, A. (2002). The Entrepreneurial Response of Public Universities. *Canadian Society For The Study Of Higher Education*. 22, 1-17.
- Olssen, M., & Peters, A. M. (2005). Neoliberalism, Higher Education and the Knowledge Economy: From the free market to knowledge capitalism. *Journal of Education Policy*, 20(3), 313 – 347.
- Parsons, T. & Platt, G., M. (1973). *The American University*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pelikan, J. (1992). *The Idea of the University : A Reexamination*. New Haven : Yale University Press.
- Piore, M. J. & Sabel, C. (1984). *The second industrial divide: Possibilities for prosperity*. New York: Basic Books.

- Poliakov, M. V., & Savchuk, V. S. (2010). *Classical university: From ideas of antiquity to ideas of the Bologna Process*. Dnipropetrovsk: DNU Publishing House.
- Readings, B. (1996). *The University in Ruins*. Cambridge: MA:Harvard University Press.
- Reill, P. H. (1994). Science and the construction of the cultural sciences in late enlightenment Germany: The case of Wilhelm von Humboldt. *History and Theory*, 33, pp. 345-366
- Rosemary, D., Hillyard, S. & Reed., M. (2007). *Knowledge, higher education, and the new managerialism: The changing management of UK universities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Röhrs, H. (1995). *The classical German concept of the university and its influence on higher education in the United States*. New York: Peterlang Publishing.
- Rüegg, W. (1996). *A history of university in Europe: Volume 2, universities in early modern Europe (1500-1800)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rüegg, W. (2004). *A history of the university in Europe: Volume 3, universities in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (1800-1945)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Santos, D. S. (1995). *Toward a new common sense: Law, science and politics in paradigmatic transformation*. London: Routledge.
- Scheler, M. (1970). Problems of a sociology of knowledge. J. E. Curtis and J. W. Petras. (Eds.). *The sociology of knowledge*. United States: Praeger.
- Schelling, F. W. J. (1981). *On university studies*. Athens: Ohio University Press.
- Schleiermacher, F. (1991). *Occasional thoughts on universities in the German sense: With an appendix regarding a university soon to be established*. San Francisco: EMTText.
- Schamus, W. (1994). *Durkheim's philosophy of science and the sociology of knowledge: creating an intellectual niche*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schültz, A. (1967). *Phenomenology of the social world*. London: Heinemann.
- Shaviro, S. (2003). *Connected: Or what it means to live in the network society?*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Sorkin, D. (1983). Wilhelm von Humboldt: The theory and practice of self-formation (Bildung), 1791–1810. *Journal of The History Of Ideas*, 44(1) pp. 55-73.

- Shore, C. & Wright, C. (2000). Coercive accountability: the rise of audit culture in higher education. in M, Strathern. (ed.). *Audit Cultures: Anthropological studies in accountability, ethics and the academy*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Thomas, C., R. (1973). Philosophical anthropology and educational change: Wilhelm Von Humboldt and the Russian reforms. *History of Education Quarterly*, 13(3), 219-229.
- Toulmin, S. (1992). *Cosmopolis: The hidden agenda of modernity*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Touraine, A. (1971). *Post-industrial society*. New York: Random House.
- Weber, M. (1922). *Science as a vocation*. Retrieved from <http://www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/~oded/X/WeberScienceVocation.pdf>
- Weber, M. (2001). *The Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Webster, F. (2002). *Theories of information society*. London: Routledge.
- Wittrock, B. (1996). The modern university: The three transformations. In B. Wittrock, & S. Rothblantt, (Eds.), *The European and American university since 1800: Historical and sociological essays* (pp. 303-363). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDICES

A. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Kıyak
Adı : Sercan
Bölümü : Sosyoloji

TEZİN ADI : The Transformation of University

TEZİN TÜRÜ : Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: