

Shut up and teach!

A university is characterized by the academic staff. They are dealing with truth and how to discover reality. In their world abstractions are normality. Therefore they are prone to principles.

They are also always, and continuously engaged in critique. The air of an academics is critique, it is what they breathe, it is the oxygen of their minds. Therefore they are prone to critique.

Academics are also subjects of education, which is manifested through them giving reference to other thinkers and other situations. There is nothing in today's reality that cannot be given a reference to another thing. Thus, they are prone to reference.

A university's administrative organization should be well fitted to support the activities of the academics. Therefore it should be accustomed and adjusted to principles, critique and reference.

At Linnaeus University I was corrected by the dean in my language use, among other things, I had in an e-mail to the accounting manager, termed her actions as a worthy heritage of Kreuger, him being a famous accounting manipulator, creating one of the largest corporate disasters in Sweden 1932. I deemed her action of writing of debts to the employees as accounting manipulation, worthy Kreuger. What I meant was that she hide actual debts through accounting manipulation, since the debts were withdrawn from the accountants but not in reality. As an academic, it is natural for me to critique this action since it is against the idea of transparency. It is natural for me to tell her about my opinion. And it is natural for me to give reference to similar actions, as made by Kreuger.

But at Linnaeus this is not accepted. At Linnaeus you should keep your mouth shut. No debate is accepted. No reference to others is allowed. If you break these rules of simple corporate hierarchy, you end up with getting corrections by the dean.

This, and I have other examples, is the sad proof that Linnaeus organization is a corporate organization, not fitted to the activities it should administer. One could make it easy and claim that it is only those corporate individuals that do not understand, so fire them. Sadly, I do not believe that they are examples of bad recruitment. I think they are examples of good recruitment, well fitted to the paradigm of today, which is the corporate organization at the university.

Academic work has to be performed within containers and should not spill over to the organization. Academic work is not the goal of the organization, it is only the mean of the organization. The goals are in the hands of the administrators, not the Academics. The academics are the proletariat of the organization. They are simple workers and should know their place and situation.

So, what about the name: University? Well, it is only a marketing tool. Most people understand it and accept it. It is only me and some others that do not understand that University is but window dressing of the corporate educational factory. They employ people that on occasions are termed academics. Some of them are even called professors. But they are only proletariats, that should do their work, to supervise, teach and do research. But then shut up. Absolutely never ever make critique, never apply principles or make reference. Shut up, do your teaching. We, the administrators, do the governance, we command you, we correct you and your language, they tell me.

Ferrara 18 May 2014

Sven-Olof Yrjö Collin