Higher Education without Commodification, Mechanization or Moralization

Robert Hanna ⓘD

Independent Philosopher, Canada. Email: bobhannahbob1@gmail.com

Article Info	ABSTRACT
	What is the ultimate end of higher education? Giambattista Vico, echoing Socrates's Delphic oracle, claimed that the ultimate end of all education is self-knowledge. I fully agree with Vico's claim, but also radically extend his idea about education, in accordance with contemporary and futuristic Kantianism, and then apply it specifically to contemporary and near-future higher education. In 1784, Kant published an essay called "An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?" in which he argued that the fundamental thesis of "enlightenment" or Aufklärung is that all rational human animals are strictly obligated to think for themselves and to act freely, with resolution and courage, in accordance with sufficient respect for their own and everyone else's human dignity. Taking together Vico's Socratic idea about self-knowledge, with Kant's idea about enlightenment, and then creatively revising-&-updating them both to fit the contemporary 21st century existential, moral, and sociopolitical predicament of humankind, then in my view, the ultimate end of higher education is not only (i) self-knowledge, but also (ii) rational autonomy in thinking, caring, and acting, (iii) authentic human creativity, and (iv) sufficient respect for everyone's human dignity. In turn, the four-part conjunction of these ultimate ends is what I call radical enlightenment. Therefore, I'm saying that the ultimate end of higher education is radical enlightenment.

(Wong, 2016).

What is the ultimate end of higher education? Giambattista Vico, echoing Socrates's Delphic oracle, claimed that the ultimate end of all education is *self-knowledge* (Vico 1709/1990, 24, 1699-1707/1993, 37-38). I fully agree with Vico's claim, but also want radically to extend his idea about education, in accordance with contemporary and futuristic Kantianism (Hanna, 2024a), and then apply it specifically to contemporary and near-future higher education. In 1784, Kant published an essay called "An Answer to the Question: What is Enlightenment?" in which he argued that the fundamental thesis of "enlightenment" or *Aufklärung* is that all rational human animals are strictly obligated to think for themselves and to act freely, with resolution and courage, in accordance with sufficient respect for their own and everyone else's human dignity:

> Enlightenment is the human being's emergence from their self-inflicted immaturity. Immaturity is the inability to use one's own understanding without the guidance of another. This immaturity is self-inflicted if its cause is not lack of understanding, but lack of resolution and courage to use it without the guidance of another. The motto of enlightenment is therefore: *Sapere aude!* Have the courage to use your own understanding! …. [O]nce the germ on which nature has lavished most care—the human being's inclination and vocation to think freely—has developed within its hard shell, it gradually reacts upon the mentality of the people, who thus gradually become increasingly able to *act freely*. Eventually, it even influences the principles of governments, which find that they can themselves profit by treating the human being, *who is now more than a machine*, in a manner

appropriate to their dignity. (Kant, 1784/1996, 17, 22, Ak 8: 35 and 41-42, italics in the original, translation modified slightly)

Taking together Vico's Socratic idea about self-knowledge, with Kant's idea about enlightenment, and then creatively revising-&-updating them both to fit the contemporary 21st century existential, moral, and sociopolitical predicament of humankind, then in my view, the ultimate end of higher education is not only (i) *self-knowledge*, but also (ii) *rational autonomy in thinking, caring, and acting,* (iii) *authentic human creativity* (Hanna, 2025: ch. 2, esp. section 2.8), and (iv) *sufficient respect for everyone's human dignity* (Hanna, 2023a, 2023b, 2025: chs. 3-5). In turn, the four-part conjunction of these ultimate ends is what I call *radical enlightenment* (see also Hanna, 2016, 2018). Therefore, I'm saying that the ultimate end of higher education is radical enlightenment.

If I'm right about this, then the ultimate aim of higher education is *not* how best to satisfy our individual or collective self-interests by means of instrumental reason and corporate capitalism, as per their ideological valorization, *neoliberalism* (Maiese and Hanna, 2019: ch. 4; Maiese, 2023). Let's call that the *commodification* of higher education. *Nor* is it how best to advance the research projects of mechanistic formal and natural science, especially including computer science and digital technology, as per their ideological valorizations, *technocracy* and what I call *the myth of artificial intelligence* (Hanna, 2024b, 2025: ch. 2, esp. section 2.9). Let's call that the *mechanization* of higher education. *Nor* is it how best to advance the coercive and moralistic demands of post-1970s identitarian multi-culturalist social justice theory, as per its ideological valorizations, *cancel culture* and *wokeism* (Rorty, 1994; Mann, 2019). Let's call that the *moralization* of higher education. In other words, radical enlightenment is the ultimate aim of a higher education that's *without* commodification, mechanization, or moralization.

Tragically, however, contemporary higher education is in fact *pervasively* commodified, mechanized, and moralized, as can be easily confirmed by critically monitoring and witnessing the never-ending roll-out of bland, bog-standard boosterism and bullshit that's delivered weekly, monthly, quarterly, and yearly by college and university presidents, administrations, human resources (HR) bureaucracies, and alumni magazines, all of which is intended to normalize and vindicate the commodification, mechanization, and moralization of higher education—and above all, to raise more money (see, e.g., Univ. of Toronto, 2025; Yale, 2025).[1] Ironically, however, for all its commodification, higher education in the USA is actually pricing itself out of the market, by virtue of demanding exorbitant tuition costs but at the same time no longer providing guaranteed higher incomes for its student-consumers as compared to their non-higher-ed-consuming cohort, who don't incur the same crippling debts for their job-

---

[1] I could have chosen any one or two of thousands of colleges or universities anywhere in the world. But it so happens that I'm an alumnus and graduate of both U of T and Yale, and have read their magazines regularly since the 1980s with increasing critical detachment and dismay.

accreditation or job-training, and therefore currently higher education in the USA is even failing miserably at its own money-grubbing game (Tough, 2023). So that's the way we live now.

Nevertheless, against the grain of all that, in the rest of this essay I'll spell out the basic elements of a radically enlightened higher education system, and also restrict myself to the USA, simply in order to provide a well-focused philosophical schema or template for what higher education *could be* and *should be*. But with appropriate adjustments, my schema or template could also be generalized to any other country in the world.

It will also be useful in what follows to have in hand some fine-grained conceptual definitions and distinctions that have a direct bearing on my overall argument.

By *education* I mean any human acts or processes inherently involving learning, teaching, and training, whether in groups or self-directed, in any subject-matter whatsoever. By *higher education* I mean post-secondary education. By *being a professional* I mean someone's belonging to a social institution (aka "a profession") that's composed of people (i) who are paid for doing a specific kind of work, and are also public practitioners of that kind of work, (ii) who must be accredited or certified by the governing body of that particular social institution in order to be officially licensed, or otherwise explicitly permitted, to do and publicly practice that kind of work, (iii) who are further constrained by a set of special and highly restrictive normative rules for the doing and public practicing of that kind of work, and (iv) who are even further constrained by a special and highly restrictive code of conduct that goes beyond the work itself into their social-institutional lives more generally, such that, (v) if someone refuses to comply with either the highly restrictive normative rules for the doing and public practicing of the specific kind of work or the highly restrictive code of conduct, then they are publicly reprimanded, sanctioned, or expelled from the profession (see also Schmidt, 2000). And *by being an academic* I mean someone's belonging to a scholarly or scientific (in the broad sense of "science" captured by the German term *Wissenschaft*) social institution devoted either to research alone or to research-&-teaching, originally Plato's Academy, but since the medieval or Scholastic period, and especially since the 18th century, to a college, university, or other social institution of higher education, but also including more-or-less loosely organized circles, teams, or other organizations dedicated solely to scholarly or scientific research and learning without teaching or training. Academies can also operate without either payment (after all, being paid to do philosophy was one of Plato's prime objections to the Sophists), without normative rules for doing scholarly or scientific work, or without codes of conduct.

So although higher education, professionalism, and academicism are all obviously conceptually and logically consistent with one another and indeed also obviously coexist in the real world at contemporary colleges and universities, nevertheless, strictly speaking, they're also *mutually conceptually and logically independent of one another*, and therefore *they aren't the same things*: at least in principle, higher education can exist without professionalism or

academicism; professionalism can exist without higher education or academicism; and academicism can exist without higher education or professionalism.

Now, as to the commodification of higher education. *Commodification*, according to the Marxist-humanist tradition that focuses on the early Marx of the *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* of the 1840s (Marx, 1961, 1964; Fromm, 1961) and also acccording to the neo-Marxist tradition (Horkheimer and Adorno, 1947; Marcuse 1964; Geuss, 1981; Hartmann and Honneth, 2006; Honneth, 2009), is the process whereby capitalism turns everything that has human moral and spiritual value into *mere means or things*—commodities—that can be produced, re-produced, bought, and sold. Commodification also applies directly to rational "human, all-too-human" animals, who, by being unintentionally absorbed into the capitalist system, to that extent, turn themselves into *mere decision-theoretic Hobbesian machines*—self-interested, mutually antagonistic, biochemical puppets—who endlessly produce and consume, controlled by their bosses and political masters, via hegemonic ideology and coercive authoritarian means, until the biochemical puppets finally break down, fall apart, and die. In the 21st century, commodification is a direct implication of corporate capitalism, neoconservatism, and especially neoliberalism, with its fusion of classical Hobbesian liberalism, Millian democratic or republican liberalism, and above all the post-World War II valorization of capitalism in the USA and other democratic or not-so-democratic nation-States. It is by no means an antiquarian or irrelevant historical fact, however, that the origins of the 19th, 20th, and 21st century concept of commodification lie in the Hegelian and Young Hegelian idea that organized religion, in Hegelian lingo, is "the alienation and externalization of absolute Spirit," and also in Kant's moral critique of organized religion in *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason* (Kant, 1793/1996): you merely substitute *corporate capitalism* for *organized religion*, and then you've got Marx's theory of alienation. In Marxist humanist lingo, commodification systematically degrades, distorts, and finally exterminates our species-essence or *Gattungswesen*; and in Kantian lingo, commodification systematically degrades, distorts, and finally exterminates all human *dignity* or *Würde* and all human moral *faith* or *Glaube*. Therefore, commodification is the *genocide* of all rational human moral and spiritual values. Recent or contemporary critics of commodification in higher education in particular, include Robert Paul Wolff (Wolff, 1969), Jeff Schmidt (Schmidt, 2000), Jane Jacobs (Jacobs, 2004), William Deresiewicz (2015a, 2015b), Alia Wong (2016), and Michelle Maiese and myself (Maiese and Hanna, 2019: ch. 4; Maiese, 2023).

As to the mechanization of higher education. Elsewhere I've argued that the very idea of "artificial intelligence" is not only an *oxymoron*—i.e., a two-word contradiction in terms, i.e., there's actually *no such thing* as something that's "artificial" in the specific sense of being a digital computing system or digital technology, and *also* "intelligent" in the specific sense in which we're intelligent—but also a *pernicious myth* from which we urgently need to liberate

ourselves. It's a pernicious myth, precisely because our widespread contemporary dogmatic or at least uncritical acceptance of it leads us to depreciate, neglect, misuse, and even impair our own essentially embodied, innate mental capacities, faculties, and powers, via our excessive use of, reliance on, and indeed addiction to, digital computing systems and digital technology (Hanna, 2024b, 2025: esp. chs. 1, 2, and 6). Correspondingly, I've also argued that the primary problem posed by the recent invasion of Large Language Language Models (LLMs) or chatbots like ChatGPT isn't in fact cheating or plagiarism at colleges and universities, but instead the fact that a great many and indeed increasingly many, perhaps even a majority, of all students at contemporary social institutions of higher education, and indeed also at contemporary social institutions of primary and secondary education, are now simply refusing—and will increasingly refuse in the foreseeable future—to think and write for themselves, with grave and indeed tragic consequences, namely, depreciating, misusing, neglecting, and even impairing their innate mental capacities, faculties, and powers, especially those required for autonomous critical reasoning and authentic human creativity: hence I call this *invasion of the mind snatchers* (Hanna, 2023b, 2023c).

And finally, as to the moralization of higher education. After Martin Luther King's assassination in 1968, the Americal Left underwent an internal factionalization, implosion, and retreat into colleges and universities, that drove many on the Left sharply away from the essentially dignitarian foundations of King's civil rights movement in the 1960s, and sharply towards a coercive and moralistic, free-speech-intolerant, academic-freedom-restricting, identitarian multi-culturalist social justice theory morality and sociopolitics during the 1970s and beyond, right up to 6am this morning (Rorty, 1994; Kazin, 2012: chs. 6-7; Mann, 2019). Most importantly, self-stultifyingly, and indeed tragically, this morality and sociopolitics are *anti-dignitarian* and therefore the very concept and fact of dignity have to be defended against them (Hanna, 2023a).

As necessary preconditions for a radically enlightened higher education system in the USA, we can and should demand, wholeheartedly work towards, and ultimately implement, these two sociopolitical proposals, both based on the assumption that the current median yearly household income in the USA is $70,000 USD—

1. *Truly Generous Universal Basic Income* (TGUBI):

Anyone 21 years of age or over and living permanently in the USA, who has a personal yearly income of $70,000 USD or less, and who is mentally and physically capable of requesting their universal basic income (UBI), would receive $35,000 USD per year, with no strings attached.

2. *A 15-Hour Workweek for Universal Basic Jobs* (FHW-for-UBJs):

Anyone 18 years of age or older who is living permanently in the USA, who has completed a high school education, and is mentally and physically capable of doing a job, would be offered a productive and useful *eco-job*, paying a yearly wage of $35,000 USD, for *no more than* fifteen hours of work per week.

According to the FHW-for-UBJs/eco-jobs proposal, there would be at least five different types of eco-jobs: (i) *eco-education (eco-ed) jobs*: that is, jobs whose specific role is to provide help in currently under-staffed areas within the existing system of universal public education up to the end of high school (UPE), (ii) *eco-healthcare (eco-health) jobs*: that is, jobs whose specific role is to provide help in currently under-staffed areas within a future system of universal free healthcare (UFH), (iii) *eco-protection (eco-pro) jobs*: that is, jobs whose specific role is to provide help in currently under-staffed areas in (iii.1) urban-environmental clean-up and tending (including garbage collection, litter removal, recycling, public gardening, snow removal, etc.) and (iii.2) natural-environmental clean-up and tending (including forestry and re-forestation, water pollution-clean up, industrial pollution clean-up, etc.), (iv) *eco-transportation (eco-trans) jobs*: that is, jobs whose specific role is to provide help in currently under-staffed areas in the all-electric car industry, and (v) *eco-administration (eco-admin) jobs*: that is, jobs whose specific role is to provide help in organizing, implementing, and running the system of eco-jobs. Moreover, there would be six individually necessary and jointly sufficient requirements for someone's having an eco-job: (i) they've completed a high school education, (ii) they're 18 years of age or older, (iii) they're mentally and physically capable of doing your eco-job, (iv) if they want to own a vehicle other than a bicycle or other self-propelled machine, then they either (iv.1) sell or trade in any gasoline-only vehicles you already own, in return or a free all-electric car, or (iv.2) if they do not already own a gasoline-only vehicle, then they receive a free all-electric car, (v) if, by virtue of requirement (iv), they do own an all-electric car, then they also agree to drive it according to a regular plan for modest electricity consumption, and (vi) they agree to purchase and eat meat-products according to a regular plan for modest meat-consumption.

Now, assuming the actual existence of UPE, and optimistically assuming the future existence of UFH, TGUBI, and FHW-for-UBJs, then I'm in a position to make a further proposal about the radical reform of higher education at colleges and universities in the USA, which I'll call *radically enlightened higher education* (REHE). What do I mean by REHE?

REHE would make available to everyone, beyond their high school education, a free, three-year minimum, optional (but also open-ended beyond those three years, as a further option), part-time or full-time UPE program in the so-called "liberal arts," and also in some of the so-called "STEM" fields, including the humanities, the fine arts, the social sciences, mathematics, and the natural sciences. For many or even most people, their REHE would fall between (i) the

end of their high school education at age 18 and the corresponding availability of eco-jobs, and (ii) the beginning of their TGUBI at age 21. But REHE *would be open to anyone with a high school degree, no matter how old they are,* provided they are mentally and physically capable of doing the program. Some people would opt to do REHE part-time, along with eco-jobs, while others would opt to do REHE full-time, either with or without their TGUBI. REHE *would involve no credentialing whatsoever*, and in particular, *no degrees or diplomas*. Therefore, the current system of job-oriented education, or job-training, with credentialing for example, business school, education school, law school, medical school, engineering school, social work school, forestry school, architecture school, communications and media school, etc., and technical-vocational schools of all kinds would be entirely independent of REHE and subject to the standard service-industry fee-structure of all such social institutions, provided that this system is also sufficiently dignity-respecting, non-exploitative. and non-oppressive. Above all, REHE would neither prepare people for jobwork, nor be a necessary condition of any sort of jobwork.

The REHE system would consist in a series of open-enrollment courses offered by REHE instructors, either in person or online. REHE instructors would normally belong to at least one *open research community*, each one consisting of some voluntarily-associated, like-minded people wholeheartedly engaged in individual or collective research projects together with one another, belonging to a worldwide network of such groups—although belonging to this network is not *strictly required*, merely *highly recommended*. REHE instructorship would fall under the general rubric of *eco-ed jobs*; hence each REHE instructor would receive a yearly salary of $35,000 for a 15-hour workweek teaching REHE courses in some REHE subject(s), over and above their $35,000 TGUBI. In turn, anyone could become a REHE instructor, provided that: (i) they meet the requirements for any eco-job, and (ii) either they already have a PhD in the subject for which they propose to work as a REHE instructor or they have already taught a minimum of 28 courses (= 7 years x 4 courses per year, roughly the same as what is required for tenure in most academic departments currently) in that subject.

Every REHE instructor would be free to design their REHE courses as they see fit, provided that they assign some written or performed coursework, to be submitted by a certain date falling within the same calendar year as the course. REHE instructors would make analytical-critical comments on all written or performed coursework, but there would no grades or other systematized method of evaluation. Students would *complete* a given REHE course if and only if they have finished the assigned coursework by the date determined by the REHE instructor. Students would be able to take as many or as few REHE courses in a given calendar year as they want to. At the end of every calendar year, REHE students would receive a list of the REHE courses they have completed during that year; but there would be no official record of

uncompleted courses. All REHE courses would fall under one of three classifications: (i) introductory, (ii) advanced, or (iii) research-level.

Students would be able to take *advanced* REHE courses in a given subject if and only if they have completed a specified number and kind of *introductory* courses in that subject; and students would be able to take *research-level* REHE courses if and only if they have completed a specified number and kind of *advanced* courses in that subject. The classification-level and specific requirements for any given REHE course would be determined by the REHE instructor for that course. Students would enroll in a given REHE course simply by formally declaring their intention to take the course, to that course's instructor. The enrollment for a given REHE course would be fixed by a certain date, to be determined by the REHE instructor, and after that date no one would be able to take that course until the next time it is offered. Nevertheless, audits would also be permitted, provided that the REHE instructor agreed. Finally, there would be no official REHE course evaluations by students: if students did not like a course, the instructor, the subject, or the assigned coursework, they could either formally declare their intention to drop the course, by informing the REHE instructor, or else, they could implicitly declare their intention to drop the course by simply not submitting the assigned coursework.

Looked at synoptically, the REHE system has one fundamental purpose: to enable people to pursue radically enlightened higher education, for three years minimum, but also for their entire lives, if they wanted to, precisely in order to activate, nurture, and sustain people's (i) self-knowledge, (ii) rational autonomy in thinking, caring, and acting, (iii) authentic human creativity, and (iv) sufficient respect for everyone's human dignity.

Here is a contemporary application of REHE that also clearly and distinctly brings out its anti-mechanistic dimension. I've argued that a simple but also radical solution to the problem of LLMs or chatbots in contemporary higher education is not only to shift *backward* to the required use of handwritten, in-class assignments for the purposes of undergraduate and graduate student evaluation and grading, but also to shift *forward* to an REHE-driven professional academic higher education system in which all career advancement and the highest salaries for faculty members are based on teaching and other non-digital achievements, in which research-&-scholarship is done strictly for its own sake, and in which all publishing by means of hard-copy books or journals, or by means of digital technology, is done strictly for its own sake and for the sake of the general advancement of human rational inquiry and knowledge (Hanna, 2023c, 2023d).

I also believe that, in addition to shifting *backward* by requiring the use of handwritten, in-class assignments for the purposes of all undergraduate and graduate student evaluation and grading, REHE-driven professional academic higher education should also *double-shift* backward by including further requirements that exercise, promote, and sustain *all* of the innate capacities or inherent features of our rational yet also characteristically "human, all-too-human"

intelligence, that no digital computing system or digital technology can ever have (Hanna, 2024a, 2025: esp. ch. 2). To take only one example, undergraduate and graduate students should be required *to read hard-copy books*, because this not only activates, nurtures, and sustains our characteristically and uniquely rational human capacity for reading (Hanna, 2024c; MacArthur, 2024), but also activates, nurtures, and sustains our characteristically minded animal capacities for essentially non-conceptual, sensible skills and for orientating proprioception *in the act of actually holding and manipulating a hard-copy book*.

But, under the *pessimistic* assumption that UFH, TGUBI, and FHW-for-UBJs are *not* (or at least not *yet*) implemented, could REHE ever really be implemented *inside* the contemporary professional academy? Sadly but also realistically, it seems to me *extremely unlikely* that all those who have greatly succeeded in the contemporary professional academic higher education system, who have the highest social-institutional status in that system, who are paid the highest salaries in that system, and who wield the great social-institutional power in that system—let's call them *The Big Winners*—and therefore who have a huge vested interest in retaining and sustaining that system just as it is, would *ever* let this reversing-&-rejecting happen—*over our dead bodies*, they'd say, if they were speaking honestly and plainly for a change. Therefore, it seems obvious that the only way of implementing REHE under the pessimistic assumption is *exiting the professional academy* and then pursuing radically enlightened higher education, including all learning, teaching, and training, research-&-scholarship, and creative work in the humanities, the fine arts and applied arts, the social, natural, and formal sciences, and philosophy, alike, *outside* the professional academy.

But it also seems obvious that such an exodus and relocation would require many millions or even billions of dollars in order to provide financial support for these extra-professional-academic teachers, researchers-&-scholars, artists, scientists and philosophers, so that they would be able to live and thrive by pursuing and practicing their various REHE-driven callings and disciplines. Nevertheless, again sadly but also realistically under the pessimistic assumption, it *also* seems if not obvious then at least highly likely that there's simply no way to raise enough money to support them financially, without *also* capitulating to neoliberalism and the technocratic corporate capitalism that fully enables the myth of artificial intelligence, and therefore capitulating again to the commodification and mechanization of higher education, only this time *outside* the professional academy instead of *inside* it.

Therefore, under the pessimistic assumption, *either* (i) REHE is hopeless, *or else* (ii) some new idea must be devised that will somehow solve the financial support problem and thereby make it really possible to implement REHE outside the professional academy.

Instead of throwing up our hands in despair, let's focus on (ii). My new idea is that some *effective collaboration* between a fairly large number of teachers, researchers-&-scholars, artists, scientists and philosophers who are currently working *inside* the professional academy,

and those teachers, researchers-&-scholars, artists, scientists and philosophers who are currently working *outside* the professional academy, might make REHE really possible.

For convenience, let's call the teachers, researchers-&-scholars, artists, scientists and philosophers who are currently working inside the professional academy and would be seriously interested in effectively collaborating with the teachers, researchers-&-scholars, artists, scientists and philosophers who are currently working outside the professional academy, *The League of Fellow Travelers*, and let's call the teachers, researchers-&-scholars, artists, scientists and philosophers who are currently working *outside* the professional academy, *The League of Independents*. And for the purposes of argument, holding in place the pessimistic assumption, let's also make the not implausible sub-assumption that there truly is a fairly large number of actual or at least potential members of The League of Fellow Travelers—perhaps as many as 25% of all contemporary professional academics?, especially under the current crisis-conditions of ever-increasing neoliberalization, ever-increasing mechanization via the mind-snatching invasion of the chatbots, and ever-increasing restrictions on academic freedom via moralization—inside the contemporary professional academy, once we've subtracted out The Big Winners.

What then do I mean by an "effective collaboration" between The League of Fellow Travelers and The League of Independents?

On the one hand, The League of Independents could provide a set of non-neoliberal, non-technocratic-capitalist, non-careerist, non-hyperspecialized, non-irrelevant, non-AI-mythical, non-chatbot-infested, non-coercive-moralistic, and above all, *autonomous* conditions for and publication venues in which authentically creative teaching, learning, training, research-&-scholarship, fine art and applied art, science, and philosophy could genuinely be done for the sake of radical enlightenment, such that The League of Fellow Travelers could engage in this autonomous, authentically creative activity whenever they were able and willing to do so. And *on the other hand*, and reciprocally, The League of Fellow Travelers could quietly provide some non-trivial amount of crowd funding and also some non-trivial amount of under-the-administrative-&-HR-bureaucracy-radar social-institutional support—say, providing venues for regular meetings or workshops—The League of Independents. *Moreover*, whenever members of The League of Fellow Travelers were themselves financially able to exit the professional academy, whether by retirement or by some other means—say, simply resigning—then they could also join The League of Independents, and in turn effectively collaborate with the remaining members of The League of Fellow Travelers.

So, my new idea is that, under the pessimistic assumption, if such an effective collaboration between The League of Fellow Travelers and The League of Independents *were to be actually enacted*, then implementing REHE in the USA *would be really possible*. For a system of higher education without commodification, mechanization, or moralization, whose ultimate end is

radical enlightenment in the tradition of Vico and Kant, creatively revised-&-updated to fit the contemporary 21st century existential, moral, and sociopolitical predicament of humankind, would thereby be gradually and progressively realized *outside* the professional academy.[1]

References

Deresiewicz, W. (2015a). *Excellent sheep*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Deresiewicz, W. (2015b, September). The neoliberal arts: How college sold its soul to the market. *Harper's*. http://harpers.org/archive/2015/09/the-neoliberal-arts/

Fromm, E. (1961). *Marx's concept of man*. New York, NY: Frederick Ungar.

Gare, A. (2023). Challenging the dominant grand narrative in global education and culture. In R. Rozzi, A. Tauro, N. Avriel-Avni, T. Wright, & R. H. May Jr. (Eds.), *Field environmental philosophy: Ecology and ethics* (Vol. 5). Cham, Switzerland: Springer. https://www.academia.edu/103883982

Geuss, R. (1981). *The idea of a critical theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hanna, R. (2016). Radical enlightenment: Existential Kantian cosmopolitan anarchism, with a concluding quasi-federalist postscript. In D. Heidemann & K. Stoppenbrink (Eds.), *Join, or die: Philosophical foundations of federalism* (pp. 63–90). Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter. https://www.academia.edu/6994230

Hanna, R. (2018). *Kant, agnosticism, and anarchism: A theological-political treatise* (The Rational Human Condition, Vol. 4). New York, NY: Nova Science. https://www.academia.edu/36359665

Hanna, R. (2023a). In defence of dignity. *Borderless Philosophy, 6*, 77–98. https://www.cckp.space/single-post/bp6-2023-robert-hanna-in-defence-of-dignity-77-98

Hanna, R. (2023b). Dignitarian post-capitalism. *Borderless Philosophy, 6*, 99–129. https://www.cckp.space/single-post/bp6-2023-robert-hanna-dignitarian-post-capitalism-99-129

Hanna, R. (2023c). *Invasion of the mind snatchers, or, the easy solution to the problem of chatbots in higher education* (Unpublished manuscript). https://www.academia.edu/102995569

Hanna, R. (2023d). *Further thoughts on the myth of artificial intelligence, the mind snatching invasion of the chatbots, and how to save higher education* (Unpublished manuscript). https://www.academia.edu/103442312

Hanna, R. (2024a). Kantian futurism. *Journal of Philosophical Investigations, 18*(47), 1–8. https://philosophy.tabrizu.ac.ir/article_18254.html

Hanna, R. (2024b). The myth of AI, existential threat, why the myth persists, and what is to be done about it. *Borderless Philosophy, 7*, 35–61. https://www.cckp.space/single-post/bp-7-2024-robert-hanna-the-myth-of-ai

Hanna, R. (2024c). Caveat lector: From Wittgenstein to the philosophy of reading. *Journal for the Philosophy of Language, Mind and the Arts, 5*, 1–26. https://edizionicafoscari.unive.it

[1] This essay was inspired by reading and thinking about Arran Gare's important essay, "Challenging the Dominant Grand Narrative in Global Education and Culture" (Gare, 2023). I'm also grateful to Scott Heftler for drawing my attention to (MacArthur, 2024).

Hanna, R. (2025). *Digital technology for humans: The myth of AI, human dignity, and neo-Luddism*. Berlin, Germany: De Gruyter Brill. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111260525

Hartmann, M., & Honneth, A. (2006). Paradoxes of capitalism. *Constellations, 13*, 41–58.

Honneth, A. (2009). *Pathologies of Reason: On the legacy of critical theory* (J. Ingram, Trans.). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Horkheimer, M. (1947). *Eclipse of Reason*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Horkheimer, M., & Adorno, T. W. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment* (E. Jephcott, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Jacobs, J. (2004). *Dark Age Ahead*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Kant, I. (1996). An answer to the question: What is enlightenment? (M. Gregor, Trans.). In *Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy* (pp. 17–22). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1784)

Kant, I. (1996). *Religion within the Boundaries of Mere Reason* (A. Wood & G. Di Giovanni, Trans.). In *Immanuel Kant: Religion and rational theology* (pp. 57–215). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1793)

MacArthur, J. R. (2024, January 17). A groundbreaking study shows kids learn better on paper, not screens. Now what? *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com

Maiese, M. (2023, September 24). A philosopher's diary #14: ChatGPT, high-tech plagiarism, and the neoliberal university. *Against Professional Philosophy*. https://againstprofphil.org

Maiese, M., & Hanna, R. (2019). *The Mind-Body Politic*. London, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. https://www.academia.edu/38764188

Mann, D. (2019, March 4). The new inquisitors. *Against Professional Philosophy*. https://againstprofphil.org

Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-Dimensional Man*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Marx, K. (1961). Economic and philosophical manuscripts (T. B. Bottomore, Trans.). In E. Fromm (Ed.), *Marx's concept of man* (pp. 90–196). New York, NY: Frederick Ungar.

Marx, K. (1964). *Karl Marx: Selected Writings in Sociology and Social Philosophy* (T. B. Bottomore, Trans.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Rorty, R. (1994, February 13). The unpatriotic academy. *The New York Times*. https://www.nytimes.com

Schmidt, J. (2000). *Disciplined minds: A critical Look at Salaried Professionals and the Soul-Battering System That Shapes Their Lives*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield.

Tough, P. (2023, September 5). Americans are losing faith in the value of college. Whose fault is that? *New York Times Magazine*. https://www.nytimes.com

University of Toronto Magazine. (2025). https://magazine.utoronto.ca/

Vico, G. (1990). *On the study methods of our times*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. (Original work published 1709)

Vico, G. (1993). *On humanistic education* (G. A. Pinton & A. W. Shippee, Trans.). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. (Original works published 1699–1707)

Wolff, R. P. (1969). *The ideal of the university*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Wong, A. (2016). March 30). The commodification of higher education. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com

Yale Alumni Magazine. (2025). https://yalealumnimagazine.org/