

local economy and community. Learned societies often own and run their own journals; sometimes they operate in partnership with the big publishers who return some benefits to the society.

When academic journal writing becomes a commodity of mass academic production all that we value about writing in a traditional sense goes out the window: originality, style, creativity and self-expression. In one sense the scientising effects of the modern research university effected a change from the philosophical model of dialogue and argumentation that dominated the genre of the academic periodical to one that developed as a scientific genre with all its characteristics: the introduction, the obsession with method, analysis of findings or “results” conclusions, bibliography or references; sometimes the deafening “limitations” and “directions for future research.” With “educational research,” starting in the nineteenth century under the umbrella of German empirical research in psychology the academic paper and periodical become standard industrial issue and an element of academic mass production. By “dirty little industrial machine” I mean to help students decode and demystify the process of academic writing and of writing for publication. Yet the form and genre of the academic essay is a standard product within which it is still possible to achieve a degree of originality at the level of content and concept. Some scholars succeed in their experimentations of form. Few scholars succeed at either level at a time paradoxically when several million academic papers produced annually and quantities and rates are still growing as journals multiply and higher education expands.

One of the reasons that I still like to read the great stylists in philosophy—Hegel, Marx, Nietzsche, Freud, Wittgenstein, Foucault, Derrida, Rorty, Cavell—is because of what they manage to achieve within their chosen forms and the level of experimentation they engage in within the genre of academic writing (Peters, 2009a). Few scholars achieve this kind of status. We all recognize the new forms and models these thinkers provide and also the ways they encourage us to think, write and behave differently. By comparison, those educationalists that adopt the scientific model of the hypothesis are to be distinguished by a group style that encourages all the virtues of science: its precision, replicability, objectivity etc. (Now I am entering dangerous territory—the politics of a generic epistemology that often displays little understanding of its own historical or empirical status. In this vein I am inclined to reference Kuhn and Foucault and to speculate about whether educational research, despite its institutional and national legislation, will ever attain epistemological maturity in its scientific form. The educational humanities follow different models that are not open to the same epistemological criticisms but suffer from different problems.)

Nowadays academic writing has been regulated by governments to be classified as “outputs” and duly audited as part of academic performativity, as a basis for research funding, academic promotion and tenure. (Come back Lyotard, all is forgiven!) This governmentality of research and academic writing has changed the game, compromised academic freedom and led to a well-meaning bunch of academic-administrators doing it to themselves as they invent a new raft of regulations and models to govern thesis proposals, registrations and examinations (Peters, 2009c).¹

When advising students on these matters I try also to indicate how the historical emergence of the academic publishing industry was linked to small family companies that grew up as printers and book-sellers around the development of the printing industry in the seventeenth century and the concomitant growth of learned societies that flowered as national and regional science academies in the nineteenth century. In this regard I want to draw attention to the law and the way various laws governed libel, plagiarism, copyright, printing and freedom of speech in general. This is in part the juridification of academic discourse that in turn creates, preserves and controls academic freedoms.

When I first came to Auckland University I was still star-struck from reading Wittgenstein for a Bachelor of Science degree at Canterbury University where I was able to major in philosophy of science and cross-credit my Geography papers. I had great problems writing as a student. I never got the idea of the essay, even when its history and literary precedence was carefully explained in English Lit. classes. I did not experience the versatility of its form, the way it transformed itself from

a literary vehicle that fundamentally expressed a personal point of view and observations of daily life to one that was shorn of all pronouns and pretended a writerly objectivism that performs an “analysis from nowhere” in a pseudo-science designed to hoodwink its readers. Although as a working class boy unaware of my own class origins, except for a habit of feeling inferior in company of my loquacious middle class peers and defensively sneering at what I took to be their pretentiousness, I desperately wanted and needed to express myself. The identity benefits of publication were inestimable to me: they provided the chance of self-transformation. From my late teens writing was based first on a model I gained from reading Sartre’s *Words*, an autobiographical work of self-reflection. Later I became aware of how the essay form originated in Montaigne’s (1603) *Essai* and Locke’s (1690) *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* before finding favour in the works of Addison and Steele, William Hazlitt, Charles Lamb, Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau. It developed as a vehicle for an argument and was adopted by schools as the model for learning to write (in paragraphs, in the active voice, in a structure that advances an argument or theme etc.) and also as the general utility mode of examination. Too little critical attention has been focused on the pedagogy of the essay, its historical development, the variety of its forms from the anecdotal to the argumentative, its author-asides to the audience, and its transformation in the age of the digital humanities.

While I got my start writing a series of papers in geography on Indian economic planning in my training college year in 1971 and was introduced to the turgid world of educational hypothesis-testing the same year, it was not until I came to do a philosophy masters degree at Auckland that I wrote my first published academic papers with Miles Shephard (another Masters student) under the tutelage of Jim Marshall who provided the best possible model of one-to-one apprenticeship. We sat in his office vocalising our thoughts, arguing, and making a case that depended on advancing an argument (in this case against Richard Pring and for Michael Young’s “relativism”). These academic papers were published in the *Journal of Philosophy of Education* in the days before ACCESS.

When Jim and Colin established ACCESS I cut my academic teeth on publishing several book reviews and then published my first solo academic paper called “A Critique of Knowledge as Production” (1984). I dimly remember the argument although I realize how it prefigured most of what I tried to accomplish with respect to the political economy of academic knowledge, which is a theme of much of my later work. The paper represented my first sustained engagement with the epistemological works of Louis Althusser and with the general question of the production, distribution and consumption of academic knowledge—a question that has made an understanding of journals and their changing historical forms central for me. ACCESS gave me the opportunity to publish my work and also gave me an interest in the related concepts of “editor” and “editing” as well as a host of concepts and practices associated with journals including peer review.

While ACCESS was a small journal and has remained so servicing a small academic community across a range of fields it has existed continuously for thirty years. This is no mean achievement and owes a lot to Jim’s and Colin’s initiative, and to the editors, and the contributors. There have been something in the order of 400 articles with almost as many contributors and probably some 500 readers that brought together educational and related theorists in the fields of philosophy, sociology, cultural studies, Māori studies, Aboriginal education, art and media education with interests in a range of thinkers from Marx, Heidegger, Derrida, Foucault and Friere to topics in literacy, higher education, technology, and art education among many others. The journal originally included New Zealanders and Australians, as well as notable scholars from the US, UK, and Latin America. It defined an emphasis on critical studies in education with a wide cultural perspective and avoided the doctrinaire and dogmatic.

I was closely involved with the production of the journal from its beginnings, writing a number of book reviews in the 1980s until I took over as editor in 1995 after returning to Auckland after a two-year sojourn at the University of Canterbury. I remained editor of ACCESS for six years and thereafter served as a consulting editor, often contributing articles or co-editing issues with

Elizabeth Grierson. This is where I did my training as an editor and also began to reflect on the role and task of the academic journal and later the learned society. As well as acting as the editor for these years over the time of the journal I contributed some fourteen articles and edited or co-edited several special issues (some might say way too much!).

As editor I farmed out special issues to guest editors including Alan Scott and John Freeman-Moir (on Marxism), Amarjit Singh Dhillon (on constructivism in science education), Brian Findsen and John Benseman (on adult and community education), Susan Robertson (on privacy and information), Patrick Fitzsimons (on NZ Qualifications Authority), Amarjit Singh Dillon (on information technology), Susan Robertson (on global education), Lucy Holmes and Tina Engels-Schwarzpaul (on art education), Simon Marginson (on universities), Lynne Eagle (on human capital theory), and Tina Engels-Schwarzpaul, Elizabeth Grierson and Janet Mansfield (on art education). In many instances these special issues were guest edited by younger scholars completing their PhDs with me; in other cases editors were colleagues. Thus ACCESS was a training ground for graduate students who were mentored in processes of publication and editing. While not counting for much within the current performance-based academic culture audits these opportunities proved of central significance to academic careers and to the habits of writing; often the basis of ongoing collaborations some ten years or more later.

The special issues deserve some mention because some of these were of great significance to me. Some were projects that sprang from seminar series that I organised like the issue on the university, which was originally the Winter Lecture Series I organized at Auckland University and my first collaboration with Simon Marginson. In this regard I should mention the issue on Heidegger that came out of a summer class I held with participants from both Auckland University and Auckland University of Technology. (John Hattie on the advice of his seniors tried to can this because it was advertised by AUT!). I also published the lectures I gave when awarded the University of Canterbury's Macmillan Brown Lectures in 2000, with responses by Peter Roberts, Sharon Harvey and Mark Olssen.² These special issues also acted as preliminary studies for my work on neoliberalism with Jim Marshall and Patrick Fitzsimons; or work on technology with the likes of Tim Luke, Brian Opie and Peter Roberts.

After handing in my credentials as a philosopher I joined the ranks of those interested in critical educational theory. This was a blessing in disguise. I relinquished the prospect of becoming a card-carrying Wittgensteinian to being an educational theorist with an unpoliced warrant of being able to write on anything at all. ACCESS was fundamental to my professional training and the learned ability to write and think in all respects. I was fortunate to have such a great mentor in the shape of Jim Marshall with whom I wrote many articles and books over the years. I was also fortunate to be among such colleagues both in the same department at Auckland, in New Zealand universities, or in universities overseas. There are too many to name here but their names are included in the Annotated Bibliography of ACCESS. They are (and were in some cases) exceptional scholars, leaders in the field and part of the same community that mentored and educated me in all sorts of ways. I am indebted to them beyond any numerical calculation and still in touch with most of them. Collectively their work has really made a difference.

The intellectual work of ACCESS as an editorial collective does sociologically speak of the notion of an academic community based around a journal even if it was not much recognised by the university or university authorities at the time: by "community" I do not mean a group bound by doctrine or any particular theory but rather by an ethos of criticality and by the importance of writing and thinking which became for me the ideal academic socialisation. One only has to realise the significance of journals in this regard: think of, for example, the French avant-garde literary journal *Tel Quel* played in Parisian intellectual life. Founded in 1960 by Philippe Sollers and Jean-Edern Hallier and published by Éditions du Seuil the journal published path-breaking essays in French poststructuralism and deconstruction. It ceased publication in 1982 and was followed by *L'Infini*. For

me journals like *Telos*, *New Left Review*, *Thesis Eleven*, and *New German Critique* played a fundamental role. I read these in preference to educational journals.

Universities and higher education authorities often pay too little heed to journals at least in the field of education even though intellectual life is governed by them. When I say this I mean the contents of journals as the material reproduction of ideas and “knowledge cultures” are in effect built on journal cultures. University authorities in the main seem mostly interested only in *counting* publications in the new panopticum of bibliometrics and the governmentality of research.

New digital architectures now promote new forms of academic publishing with the prospects of open education and science serving as the means for a revitalisation of public knowledge institutions (Peters & Roberts, 2011). Algorithmic knowledge capitalism also carries dangers of even greater system monopolies than industrial knowledge capitalism (Peters, 2012).

With ACCESS we now face a different future. After existing at RMIT and AUT with Elizabeth Grierson as editor for over a decade, Elizabeth and I have sought to put the journal on a firmer footing by incorporating it with Educational Philosophy and Theory (EPAT) under the publishing house of Routledge of Taylor and Francis, beginning in 2014. The journal has been gifted to the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia (PESA) and will utilize EPAT’s digital infrastructures and automated editorial office. It will keep its identity and name and also editorial autonomy of content. Two issues per year will be produced from 2014. This is an experiment in format and cooperation with some interesting benefits and synergies. ACCESS will become part of a commercial publisher for the first time. It will in effect be associated with EPAT, already twelve issues a year from 2013, extending PESA publishing opportunities especially for *Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural and Policy Studies* (the ACCESS mandate). I am looking forward to working with Elizabeth on this project and to firmly establishing ACCESS on a sounder commercial basis which is in the interests of all those who have contributed to ACCESS through reading, writing, reviewing and editing.

Notes

1. In this regard see Thomas Docherty’s “The Attack on Knowledge”. Retrieved November 13, 2012, from <http://www.indexonensorship.org/2012/09/the-attack-on-knowledge/>
2. See <http://www.pacs.canterbury.ac.nz/lectures.shtml>

References

- Peters, M.A. (1984). A Critique of the Knowledge as Production Thesis. *Access*, 3(2), 23-36.
- Peters, M.A. (Ed.). (2009a). *Academic Writing, Genres and Philosophy*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Peters, M.A. (2009b). Research Quality, Bibliometrics and the Republic of Science. In Tina (A.C.) Besley (Ed.), *Assessing the Quality of Educational Research in Higher Education International Perspectives* (pp. 343-360). Rotterdam: Sense.
- Peters, M.A. (2009c). The Political Economy of Academic Publishing: Education journals in the English-speaking world. In Bill Cope (Ed.), *The Future of the Journal in the Digital Age* (pp. 225-258). London: Chandos.
- Peters, M.A. (2012). Algorithmic Capitalism and the Googlization of Education. In M. A. Peters & E. Bulut (Eds.), *Cognitive Capitalism, Education and the question of digital labor* (pp. 245-258). New York: Peter Lang.
- Peters, M.A. & Besley, Tina (A.C.). (2006). *Building Knowledge Cultures: Education and development in the age of knowledge capitalism*. Lanham, Boulder, NY, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Peters, M.A. & Roberts, P. (2011). *The Virtues of Openness: Education, science and scholarship in a digital age*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.