

---

## NO PLACE LIKE HOME: THE GENDERED CONSEQUENCES OF OUTRAGE ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

Annie Schultz  
Loyola University Chicago

---

In the fall of 2015, Erika Christakis, a non-tenured faculty member at Yale University and faculty-in-residence (or residential fellow) at Yale's Silliman College, wrote an email critiquing the university's policy on Halloween costumes. Specifically, Christakis's email was critical of the policy's call for students to avoid wearing any costume that might offend someone, such as one that could be marked cultural appropriation like a Native American headdress, for example.<sup>1</sup> Yale students were outraged and demanded that Christakis, along with her husband, Nicholas Christakis, with whom she shared the position, step down as residential fellows at Silliman College, which they did. Nicholas came to Erika's defense: there is a now viral video of Nicholas standing, surrounded by students on the quad, attempting to initiate a dialogue about the ideas Erika expressed in her letter.<sup>2</sup> He was met with anger, shouting, and demands that he admit wrong-doing (or admit hers). The chief grievance among students was that the Christakis failed to uphold their duties as residential fellows: to create "a place of comfort and home for students."<sup>3</sup> The intersections between Erika's non-tenure track status, her position as spouse of a tenured faculty member, and her role as perceived homemaker for Silliman College are meaningful and warrant further exploration into their consequences for the evolving institutional ethos of the American university.

This case points to the problem of the gendered precariousness of academia.<sup>4</sup> While "a casual observer of academic environments might come to

---

<sup>1</sup> Erika Christakis, "Email from Erika Christakis: 'Dressing Yourself,'" email to Silliman College (Yale) Students on Halloween Costumes," *Fire: Foundation for Individual Rights in Education*, October 30, 2015, <https://www.thefire.org/email-from-erika-christakis-dressing-yourself-email-to-silliman-college-yale-students-on-halloween-costumes/>.

<sup>2</sup> TheAsianRepublican, "Yale University - Full Version - New Videos of The Halloween Email Protest," YouTube video, 23:44, September 20, 2016, [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hiMVx2C5\\_Wg](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hiMVx2C5_Wg).

<sup>3</sup> Conor Friedersdorf, "The Perils of Writing a Provocative Email at Yale," *The Atlantic*, May 26, 2016, <https://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2016/05/the-peril-of-writing-a-provocative-email-at-yale/484418/>.

<sup>4</sup> See for example Sandra Acker, Anne Wagner, and Kimine Mayuzumi, *Whose University Is It, Anyway? Power and privilege on Gendered Terrain* (Toronto: Sumach Press, 2008); Barbara Bagilhole and Jackie Goode, "The Contradiction of the Myth of Individual Merit, and the Reality of a Patriarchal Support System in Academic Careers," *European Journal of Women's Studies* 8, no. 2 (2001): 161–80; Jeni Hart, "Non-Tenure

the conclusion that women’s problems in higher education have been solved,” a second look reveals that “while women in positions of power and authority on American campuses have increased, they are still well below the levels of their male counterparts.”<sup>5</sup> Women who work in academia still function under expectations informed by dated gender norms; namely, the expectation to make the rapidly privatizing university homelike and to embody this sense of home in their speech, actions, and writing.

In this paper, I investigate the continued expectation of women to do the emotional homemaking in the academy as in all spaces. Toward this end, I examine this controversy at Yale University’s Silliman College in which a husband and wife—both professors at Yale, one tenured and one not—shared the position of residential fellows and were accused by students of not upholding their duties of making the residential college a home for students. I am interested in the expectation of homemaking coupled with the woman faculty member’s status of non-tenure track, the accusations made against her by students, and what this means for the cultural climates of American universities and their function as spaces of meaning-making and knowledge production. To aid me in this examination, I first turn to the work of Pamela Eddy and Kelly Ward to illustrate that academe continues to be a precarious space for women as working professionals and as scholars; because both a woman and a man were implicated in this controversy at Yale, an illustration of the gendered dimension of this debate is necessary. I additionally turn to Simone de Beauvoir and Iris Marion Young’s explorations of the woman’s relationship to the space of home, the ways that women and ideas of home are inextricably tied, and that these ideas are consequential to modes of meaning-making and knowledge production. Although writing about the lives of women fifty years apart, both Beauvoir and Young have something important to say about imminence and the private realm. Finally, I want to illustrate that the rapid privatization of the university has meaningful consequences for not only women but potentially all marginalized groups as the private realm, historically separated from the discourse-ruled and democratic public sphere, is one that

---

Track Women Faculty: Opening the Door,” *Journal of the Professoriate* 4, no. 1 (2011): 96–124; Linda Joan Paul, “The Untenured Female Academic in the Corporate University,” in *Inside Corporate U: Women in the Academy Speak Out*, ed. Marilee Reimer (Toronto: Sumach Press, 2004), 226–245; Laura Perna, “Sex Differences in Faculty Tenure and Promotion: The Contribution of Family Ties,” *Research in Higher Education* 46, no. 3 (2005): 277–307; Glenda Strachan, David Peetz, Gillian Whitehouse, Janis Bailey, Kaye Broadbent, Robyn May, Carolyn Troup, and Michelle Nesic, “Women, Careers, and Universities: Where To From Here?” in *Brisbane: Centre for Work, Organization and Wellbeing* (Griffith University, 2016). <http://www.uq.edu.au/equity/filething/get/791/women-careers-and- universities-where-to-from-here.pdf>.

<sup>5</sup> Pamela L. Eddy and Kelly Ward, “Lean In or Opt Out: Career Pathways of Academic Women,” *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 42, no. 2 (2015): 6–13.

---

has historically trapped those oppressed and made space for their suffering and subjugation.

First, I will briefly outline the controversy at Yale’s Silliman College and the Residential Fellow position and why it is important to my investigation.

Erika Christakis’s email to the residents of Silliman College problematized what she interpreted as the university’s attempt to police students’ choices with regard to appropriate dress on Halloween. Erika writes:

I don’t wish to trivialize genuine concerns about cultural and personal representation, and other challenges to our lived experience in a plural community. I know that many decent people have proposed guidelines on Halloween costumes from a spirit of avoiding hurt and offense. I laud those goals, in theory, as most of us do. But in practice, I wonder if we should reflect more transparently, as a community, on the consequences of an institutional (which is to say: bureaucratic and administrative) exercise of implied control over college students.<sup>6</sup>

A specialist in childhood and adolescent development, Erika’s scholarship speaks to the importance of young people having space for exploration and transgression; she is, therefore, not just doing the usual anti-political-correctness song and dance.<sup>7</sup> Students’ claim that the Christakis—namely, Erika—failed to make the residential college a safe space by proposing the idea that students ought to “dress themselves” on Halloween calls for an examination of the role of residential fellow itself and what the specific expectations were and if there is a gendered dimension to those expectations.<sup>8</sup> The prescribed role of the residential fellow position, according to Yale’s residential life website, is to “create a visible presence in the residential college through living in the college (in apartments for faculty fellows), eating meals in the college’s [communal dining facilities], advising students, helping the college Heads and Deans identify potential resources and contacts for undergraduates.”<sup>9</sup> In addition to performing tasks typical of a university faculty member (advising and mentoring), the residential fellows at Yale are also meant to foster more intimate connections with students by sharing living space and eating communally with them. Yale does not make explicit any expectation of homemaking, but that interpretation is not an unorthodox one given the language of the description of the position.

---

<sup>6</sup> Christakis, “Dressing Yourself.”

<sup>7</sup> “The Importance of Being Little,” Erika Christakis, 2019, <http://erikachristakis.com/author/>.

<sup>8</sup> Christakis, “Dressing Yourself.”

<sup>9</sup> “Fellows,” Yale College, Council of the Heads of College, 2019, <https://chc.yalecollege.yale.edu/fellows>.

---

Before going further, I acknowledge that some might contend that, as a white academic, Erika Christakis was in a position of power. I do not contest that Erika was in a position of privilege due to her whiteness, upper middle-class status, and position as a faculty member at an ivy league university. However, it is worth reiterating that Erika was not a tenure-track faculty member,<sup>10</sup> whereas Nicholas not only continues to teach as a tenured faculty member at Yale but was recently awarded “the university’s highest faculty honor, the Sterling Professorship.”<sup>11</sup> The press release announcing the appointment “cited Professor Christakis’s extensive educational record and published works and his research into topics from public health to artificial intelligence.”<sup>12</sup> I note this to illustrate that, though there is a power dynamic associated with Erika’s words with regard to race and social position, there is an imbalance of power given the precarity of Erika’s position and the security of Nicholas’s; namely, that although Nicholas openly advocated for Erika’s stance on the Halloween costume policy, he was not met with the same reactions as Erika and is clearly considered more valuable to the university. Students may not share the institution’s opinion that Nicholas’s research and scholarship make him valuable, but this does not change the fact that Erika’s position was precarious and his was not. Moreover, journalists continue to write about this case: a New York Times opinion column as recent as March 19<sup>th</sup> of this year covers Nicholas Christakis’s “intellectual rock star” career and new book, “which makes unmistakable allusions to the Yale ugliness.”<sup>13</sup> In

---

<sup>10</sup> Scott Jaschik, “Resignation at Yale,” *Inside Higher Ed*, December 7, 2015, <https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2015/12/07/academic-center-yale-controversy-over-halloween-costumes-wont-teach-there-again>.

<sup>11</sup> Vivian Wang, “Once at Center of Yale Protests, Professor Wins the School’s Highest Honor,” *The New York Times*, August 14, 2018, <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/08/14/nyregion/yale-professor-protests-christakis-honored-sterling.html>.

<sup>12</sup> Wang, “Once at Center of Yale Protests;” I think it is also worth noting the subject matter of Nicholas’s scholarship contrasted to Erika’s. Nicholas publishes on political and STEM related topics, which are valued higher across all funding mechanisms related to higher education. Erika’s scholarship, on child and adolescent development, is related to the care work and “soft subjects” that are often associated with the work and concerns of women, and, therefore, are not valued as highly. Stephanie Coontz points out in her book *The Way We Never Were* that, by the late nineteenth century, “the general tendency of liberal capitalism was to polarize people’s thinking between ‘objective,’ universal principles in the public sphere and ‘subjective,’ particularistic relationships in the private one.” According to Coontz, there is no market principle for matters related to familial or interpersonal relationships, and, I argue, this lack of market value is made clear by the way some fields of study are bolstered by capitalism and some are not. Stephanie Coontz, *The Way We Never Were: American Families and the Nostalgia Trap* (New York: Basic Books, 2019), 65.

<sup>13</sup> Frank Bruni, “A ‘Disgusting’ Yale Professor Moves On: How a Target of Students’ Ire Came to Write a Book About Humanity’s Transcendent Goodness,” *The New York*

fact, Nicholas dedicated the book to Erika (“The world is better the closer you are to Erika”), and when asked by New York Times columnist Frank Bruni about the dedication, said it “was especially important to him given what had happened at Yale. His eyes filled with tears. He said he was telling the world: ‘You guys have no idea who she is. You have no idea what an extraordinary person she is—just astonishing, full of grace and goodness.’”<sup>14</sup> While this dedication is admittedly touching, it also reifies the absence of Erika’s voice in much of the media coverage of the event and further associates the event with Nicholas even though the ideas that were originally the source of such ire for students were Erika’s. The controversy seems to have furthered Nicholas’s career, and, though Erika still writes and publishes, she thrives *in spite of* the Yale controversy while Nicholas seems to have gained creative and scholarly momentum from it.

There are two issues of gendered injustice at work in this case, and, while they can operate independently of one another, they are interconnected and inform one another. The first one has to do with continued gender-related inequities in higher education employment, and the second has to do with the institutional ethos of university campuses and the expectations that women remain in the role of meaning *maintainer* rather than meaning *constructor*, a notion that Beauvoir discusses in *The Second Sex*. Iris Marion Young enters conversation with Beauvoir in her examination of the relationship between meaning maintenance and homemaking. However, before getting there, it is important to establish the gendered dimensions of the discrepancies in the Christakis’s employment status as it relates to their shared role as residential fellows. Erika was expected to perform this service role under precarious employment conditions and was not rewarded or regarded in the same ways that Nicholas, the spouse who was tenured, was for performing the same role. The argument could be made that this is an issue of strictly employment status and not of gender, but, as Eddy and Ward point out, “the academic pipeline begins to leak at the associate-professor level” for women: “the number of women associated professors dips to an average of 42 percent, and by the time [and if] they become full professors, women comprise only 29 percent of those at the top of the faculty pipeline.”<sup>15</sup> Because these inequities continue to exist in academe, Erika’s gender is relevant in this case. Moreover, and in addition to gender inequity in the academy, the culture of institutions can foster dated gendered expectations of role fulfillment, even if these expectations are subtle and ambiguous. Indeed, while not obviously embodied in any single individual’s actions, “the organization structure[s] of higher education [*themselves*] build on the division of work along gender lines and the

---

*Times*, March 19, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/19/opinion/nicholas-christakis-yale.html>.

<sup>14</sup> Bruni, “A ‘Disgusting’ Yale Professor Moves On.”

<sup>15</sup> Eddy and Ward, *Lean In or Opt Out*, 8.

---

reinforcement of existing power structures that reify gender roles.”<sup>16</sup> “Relational and service-oriented work” such as the residential fellows position which is surely evidence of the cultural privatization of the space of the university campus “can limit women’s advancement,” according to Eddy and Ward.<sup>17</sup> Erika’s advancement at Yale was quite literally limited as she resigned from teaching following the outrage toward her Halloween memo, which, it is worth noting, spoke directly to her topic of research and philosophical leanings. However, both the students and the university placed more importance on her service role. The nature of this role bears importance as well, as Eddy and Ward note, since women “are often assigned ‘mom’ work on campus.”<sup>18</sup> I am interested in the consequences of looking to women academics to be motherly, nurturing, and to perform homemaking work.

College students may look to a maternal figure whose perceived duty it is to nurture and maintain their sense of self while they navigate the chaotic space of college where their identity is in a state of flux. Stephanie Coontz, in *The Way We Never Were*, remarks that the nostalgia associated with clear-cut familial roles signified by gender, while subconscious, is pervasive in even our current cultural moment, but, importantly, is informed by a notion that Allan Bloom articulates as the link between “the decline of traditional Western . . . liberal thought” and “the erosion of the family.”<sup>19</sup> According to Bloom, “the reopening of the American mind cannot be accomplished without the reenclousure of women in traditional gender roles.”<sup>20</sup> I argue there may still be a tendency on university campuses to view the male academic as the challenger, the provoker of higher-level thinking, and the female academic as the one assigned to care for and nurture the burgeoning identity. In the case of the Christakis and Silliman College, the idea of home and parents take quite literal forms in the residential community and in the husband and wife faculty-in-residence team (mom and dad).<sup>21</sup> One of the ways university life throws a young person’s sense of self into a state of flux is the loss of identity imposed by the absence of family home, childhood neighborhoods, and communities. All of us “tend to identify ourselves by and with the places in which we reside.”<sup>22</sup> Residual rhetoric from the Victorian period, which heralded the nuclear family as the glue that held society together, tells us that emotions

---

<sup>16</sup> Eddy and Ward, 8.

<sup>17</sup> Eddy and Ward, 9.

<sup>18</sup> Eddy and Ward, 9.

<sup>19</sup> Coontz paraphrasing Bloom, *The Way We Never Were*, 49.

<sup>20</sup> Coontz paraphrasing Bloom, 49.

<sup>21</sup> Interestingly, the current serving residential fellows at Silliman College are also a married couple, which supports the idea that universities are making great strides toward privatizing efforts. “Residential Fellows,” Yale College, Silliman College, 2019, <https://silliman.yalecollege.yale.edu/people/residential-fellows-tutors>.

<sup>22</sup> Edward S. Casey, *Getting Back into Place: Toward a Renewed Understanding of the Place-World* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), 120.

---

cannot be brought out into the “open market” of the public sphere, and children must therefore shed the interpersonal fragilities that informed their homelife, and, traditionally, their relationship with their mother, when they enter public life.<sup>23</sup> University administrations take care to erect spaces that fill this need for students in the form of residential communities like Silliman College at Yale. The students were perhaps not wrong in their disdain for the ideas in Erika’s email. Perhaps it is in fact the job of the university as an institution to make students feel safe in the way they might at home. I maintain, though, that we should be critical of this ideation of the university for reasons I discuss later in the paper. Further, the students directed their anger at Erika herself and accused *her* of not *making* the college a home.<sup>24</sup> While Nicholas may have been the one being shouted at on the quad, it was Erika’s ideas that the students were reacting to by demanding that a safe space be created for them.

The students have one kind of expectation of the university and their residential community within it: to be a safe space—one that affirms their identities and beliefs. Erika, however, suggested another meaning to the space of the university: one which calls for young people to explore, make mistakes, “to be a little bit obnoxious . . . a little bit inappropriate or provocative or, yes, offensive” in the name of their own identity formation.<sup>25</sup> The rub is that the role of the homemaker is not to suggest new meanings but to preserve the ones in place. Iris Marion Young notes that one of the historical roles of the woman as the homemaker is to preserve meanings constructed by the man, “arranging them in space in order to facilitate the life activities of those to whom they belong.”<sup>26</sup> Preserving is decidedly different from constructing or creating: “As a founding construction, making is a rupture in the continuity of history. But recurrence is the temporality of preservation.”<sup>27</sup> If, as Eddy and Ward point out, women academics disproportionately perform service and care work roles in universities, then they are the ones charged with maintaining students’ existential understandings of their identity by making the university homelike, while men academics are presumed to disrupt the temporality of the burgeoning identity by intellectual rigor and knowledge production. If we think of the university as a home and thereby the women who work inside of it as mothers and the men as fathers, the historical tropes of mother and father roles are easily (if subconsciously) replicated: mother stays home and

---

<sup>23</sup> Coontz, *The Way We Never Were*, 66, 70.

<sup>24</sup> Jeanna Boydston’s account is helpful here. Jeanna Boydston, *Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990).

<sup>25</sup> Christakis, “Dressing Yourselves.”

<sup>26</sup> Iris Marion Young, “House and Home: Feminist Variations on a Theme,” in *One Female Body Experience: ‘Throwing Like a Girl’ and Other Essays* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 140–141.

<sup>27</sup> Young, 143.

---

maintains meanings; father comes home in the evening, shares the events of the outside world and generates new meaning in the minds of the children.

Simone de Beauvoir characterized the earliest social trapping of the woman as being left behind to preserve life and its spaces, “which locks her into repetition and imminence.”<sup>28</sup> It is the man who is *homo faber*, who constructs and invents—enters transcendence. To return for a moment to Young’s depiction of the home as a space that mitigates the “flux of interaction and history” we all exist in, the distinction between constructing identity and anchoring identity is noteworthy: “home as the materialization of identity . . . anchors it in physical being [establishing] a continuity between past and present.”<sup>29</sup> Perhaps *home-maintainer* is a more appropriate phrasing than *homemaker*. In the twenty-first century, when, more than ever, “public administration and corporate standardization tend to drain individualized meaning from politics, schooling, and work, home and neighborhood [the spaces of the homemaker (or home-maintainer)] retain meaningful importance as primary bearers of cultural identity and differentiation.”<sup>30</sup> According to Young, such identity preservation “is not done exclusively by women, but to the degree that women more than men attend more to family and community ties in everyday life, the activity of preservation tends to be gender-specific.”<sup>31</sup> The woman’s role as meaning maintainer and identity nurturer is, for Beauvoir, inextricably linked to her biologically predetermined role as mother: “her misfortune is to have been biologically destined to repeat [or perpetuate] life,” which leaves her in a state of imminence.<sup>32</sup> Beauvoir is interested in what role women’s biological and cultural identity as mother plays in her access to “transcendence.”

The transcendence of an artisan or a man of action is driven by subjectivity, but for the future mother the opposition between subject and object disappears; she and this child who swells in her form an ambivalent couple that life submerges; snared by nature, she is plant and animal, a collection of colloids, and incubator, an egg.<sup>33</sup>

In what ways do social institutions such as universities still subtly associate women with motherhood and the nurturing process and men with the realm of action, industry, and knowledge production? Because, for Beauvoir, the mother’s subjectivity cannot be extracted from her nature as incubator, she cannot reach transcendence via her motherhood as such; she must transcend via the child’s potential for subjectivity and her role as the life-giving force which

---

<sup>28</sup> Simone De Beauvoir, *The Second Sex* (New York: Random House, 2011), 73.

<sup>29</sup> Young, *House and Home*, 140.

<sup>30</sup> Young, 144.

<sup>31</sup> Young, 144.

<sup>32</sup> Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, 74.

<sup>33</sup> Beauvoir, 539.

---



perpetuates human beings as transcendent subjects. The transcendent role of meaning creation was reserved for men in Beauvoir's estimation, and, given university cultural undertones, perhaps Beauvoir's account is not so dated as it might first appear. If the woman professional in the academy is disproportionately expected to perform service roles concerned with nurturing the potential subjectivities of students, then she is not in so different a position as Beauvoir's imminent incubator.

These subtle institutional norms which relegate women to roles of mother and homemaker are informed by the efforts to make the public spaces of universities feel more like the private ones of home. These efforts seem tied to the sociocultural climate of safe spaces and identity politics and affirmation. These privatizing efforts, though, seem detrimental to women. Indeed, one way to characterize the precarity of female academics is what Robin Zheng calls "the casualization of work": the "erosion of a notion of the public good, which higher education once served as a mainstay and centerpiece, is responsible for numerous trends gathered under the umbrella of the 'corporatization' of the university."<sup>34</sup> As the American university becomes rapidly privatized, the market strategies of indulging identity politics take precedence over the protection of intellectual inquiry and rigor. Notions of intellect, reason, and rationality have been historically coded as European, white, male, and middle class (Elizabeth Ellsworth notes "rational argument has operated in ways that set up as its opposite an irrational Other, which has been understood historically as the province of women and other exotic Others"); due to this sociocultural coding, "reason" and "rationality" may be shunned in favor of expressions that appear more liberating, but ultimately limit civil outcomes.<sup>35</sup> Democratic discourse which privileges contemplative thought over emotion-fueled outrage is the driving force behind civil public deliberation. Emotion-fueled outrage which results in ideological extremism not only leaves marginalized groups vulnerable to further cultural violence, it also diminishes the capacity of public spaces like universities to operate democratically. Kelly Oliver puts this succinctly: "privileging *raw* feelings over the *cooked* analysis of them not only fuels anti-intellectualism, but also conceals the socio-historical context that produces those feelings."<sup>36</sup> Arriving at a middle ground which both dismantles Euro-centric universalities of "reason" and "rationality" but also leaves room for thoughtful dialogue that preempts emotion-fueled spectacle seems an impossible feat so long as neoliberal privatizing efforts seek

---

<sup>34</sup> Robin Zheng, "Precarity is a Feminist Issue: Gender and Contingent Labor in the Academy," *Hypatia* 33, no. 2 (2018): 235–255.

<sup>35</sup> Elizabeth Ellsworth, "Why Doesn't this Feel Empowering? Working Through the Repressive Myths of Critical Pedagogy," *Harvard Educational Review* 59, no. 3 (1989): 297–325.

<sup>36</sup> Kelly Oliver, "Education in the Age of Outrage," *The New York Times*, October 17, 2017, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/16/opinion/education-outrage-morality-shaming.html>.

---

to commodify sociopolitical trends. The privatization of higher education which commodifies and marketizes identity-centered politics specifically fuels the outrage fire. Henry Giroux notes that on the neoliberal campus “opinion outdoes reasoned and evidence-based arguments and the power of expression degenerates into a spectacle.”<sup>37</sup> Therefore, “it is all the more necessary to defend educators as public intellectuals and socially concerned citizens who are crucial to the process of defending education as a public good and democratic public sphere.”<sup>38</sup> The academy is less safe for all scholars, but particularly women who remain marginalized across all professions.<sup>39</sup> Moreover, as the idea of the university as a public good erodes, and corporate privatizing, a colonialist and masculinist force to be sure, takes hold and echoes sound of the private realm which historically enclosed women in the home, do all women academics become den mothers?

My aim has been to illustrate the gendered consequences of outrage, but, moreover, that the consequences of treating “outrage as foundational and beyond analysis is to deny the ways in which race, class, gender, politics, upbringing, culture and history shape our emotions.”<sup>40</sup> In other words, all marginalized groups suffer when outrage has space to fester and all attempts at critical thought and open dialogue are stifled by the rhetoric of identity politics. I argue that this is one of the many toxic consequences of privatizing the space of the university and making it home-like. While home, neighborhood, and community are spaces that can foster all kinds of positive growth, fulfillment, and feelings of safety and security, I maintain the importance of remembering that the private realm was and continues to be one in which marginalized groups suffer the brunt of emotion-fueled discrimination and harm. Coontz observes that with regard to “our collective ‘memory’ of [private] life . . . as time passes, the actual complexity of our history—even our own personal experience” gets foggy; “seemingly attractive features [of the private sphere] were inextricably linked to injustices and restrictions on liberty.”<sup>41</sup> Public spaces, such as the traditional vision of the university, are vital to maintaining rational and open dialogue that breaks down barriers and makes society a more open, understanding, and inclusive place.

---

<sup>37</sup> Henry Giroux, “Defending Educators in an Age of Neoliberal Tyranny,” *Tikkun* 31, no. 4 (2016): 47.

<sup>38</sup> Giroux, 47.

<sup>39</sup> See for example Stanley Aronowitz, “Academic Unionism and the Future of Higher Education,” in *Will Teach for Food: Academic Labor in Crisis*, ed. Cary Nelson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997); Ian Robinson, “The Decline of Tenure in Higher Education: Three Analyses of Causes and Consequences,” *Contemporary Sociology* 39, no. 5 (2010): 536–40.

<sup>40</sup> Oliver, “Education in the Age of Outrage.”

<sup>41</sup> Coontz, *The Way We Never Were*, xiv–v.

---