

Anne Wagner

4.19.07

Let me begin by making one thing clear. The resolutions we have brought to this Senate are not born of some naïve or quixotic conviction that a great public university should have no truck with the dominant social powers in the world around it – including the great multi-national corporations.

Instead, this is a debate about the balance that ought to be struck between those massive organizations whose goal is profit, and the university, whose goals and responsibilities are different. It is about the difference between the university, or some of its members, entering into productive dialogue with this giant oil company or that network of genetic engineering firms, and the university, or more and more of it, becoming the corporation's paid servant, with more and more of the outcomes of hired research never entering the public realm, and less and less of the actual detail of university/industry agreement being available for the university's normal oversight bodies to inspect and debate. Of course we know that some, maybe many, universities have thrown up their hands and abandoned the idea that a difference – indeed, an active tension – might exist between what a BP wants from research and what a great university community wants. Berkeley shouldn't follow suit. Too much about the rush toward the arrangement with BP suggests that it has.

You ask what in the moves taken toward a Berkeley-BP agreement, has set alarm bells ringing for so many of us? Of course the alarm has something to do with our skepticism of BP as a reliable and trustworthy partner. We believe we have every right, given the

public record, to doubt BP's good faith. If it proves true that the proposed contract allows BP to withdraw at any moment, more or less without penalty, then it would be hard to imagine an agreement with fewer safeguards against raw commercial pressure. And what if the head of the EBI is not a Berkeley professor? But it's not these issues that rankle most deeply. If we *knew* the deal's terms, then at least a debate could begin about their wisdom and compatibility with the university's mission. But we don't know the terms, and if the contract is sealed, we never shall.

We're faced, in other words, with a deal between the university and the corporate world on a truly unprecedented scale, making use of scarce land and scarcer resources, and envisaging fundamental changes in the balance and direction of a whole area of Berkeley's teaching and research. A deal pushed through, yes, at "warp speed," and only then – after the fact, when faculty started objecting – loosely retrofitted to appear to conform to the university's governance norms. Think of all the available wisdom—not least the recommendations of a report commissioned by the administration itself – that's been ignored.

Why has the university chosen not even to give the *impression* of taking into account this wisdom, these norms? We've racked our brains for an answer. Has it learnt nothing from the past years of bad smells in the public press? How much more muck is it going to give the muckrakers to rake? Is it likely that the report was ignored out of sheer carelessness or stupidity? No – the most reasonable hypothesis is that things have taken the course they have because the administration's negotiators believed that BP *would not agree* to a

deal subject to the most elementary forms of transparency. They believed BP wanted a public university's services on private corporate terms. This does not surprise us. BP is a multi-national oil company, not a foundation or a government department. What we are surprised by – what brought on this meeting and these motions – is the university's willingness to go so far to do business with the giant.... far enough to renege on shared governance and to deplete its fund of public trust.

I am told that many of the scientists in this forum are angry, and that their anger stems from the mistaken belief that their academic freedom is threatened by the motions before you. Many have signed a petition to this effect, a petition also signed, in an extraordinary breach of neutrality, by Berkeley administrators; this petition is to be found on the website of that still non-existent entity, the EBI. If academic freedom were really the question, this petition should have been posted on the Academic Senate site. The absence speaks volumes, not least in the present climate, where the most senior administrators are rumored to threaten retaliation—denials of promotion and tenure—against those who have called the special meeting, and to declare that there is only one possible view on this matter—their own. But these rumors, while symptomatic, should not distract us from the fact that the real issue before us is shared governance, that and the need for a modicum of transparency, a bare minimum of scrutiny – a bringing of these matters into the light of day. I believe Berkeley's stature—its reputation for both independence and innovation-- cannot help but be diminished if we fail to agree on these goals.