Famous and often times abused reaction at critique is distracting and redirecting attention by pointing out supposed or even imaginary risks. It is a manifestation of a lack of self-reflection; an effort to highlight that your own shortcomings are insignificant compared to those, that would be brought about with change. At this point and time this strategy is intensively abused by universities against new university law. They don't talk about existing problems, not even indicating their possible solutions, just warning about potential politicization.

There are many problems with universities that need to be solved: low ratings within international rankings, closure to foreign countries, plagiarism of students as well as teachers, talent leaking out, complicating management, so on and so forth. Ministry of schools prepared a law for universities, with a goal to enable change. The way in which they want to achieve that is by “opening” universities up to the public.

The term “public universities” comes from the way of their finances, not whether they provide adequate public value. Universities defend themselves with an argument, that the circulation of money is guarded by a whole range of control institutions. but they are forgetting that they control only the possible breaking of a law, not the effectivity of utilization of the money.

So, the argument doesn't lie in if there is too much or too little money, but mostly if it´s being spent and where. And the current system is obstructing this. In this system, all the decision-making powers are in the hands of academic senates of universities and faculties.

So why all those protests? Why are universities so reserved? Probably the most fundamental thing is, that the new law is heading towards the five violations of academic freedoms, which are stated in the legal analysis of the Dean of PF UK.

The first concerns the election of the rector, where the Board of Trustees would have the right to “veto” the decision of the Academic Senate as the highest body of academic self-government.

The second concerns the positions of the dean, who would allegedly be degraded to the position of an official executing the rector’s orders. He wouldn't be elected from the faculty senate, because the new law doesn't state his existence, or at least the proposal talks about every university choosing, which form of faculty self-government they want, which is hardly imaginable.

The universities express strong disagreement with the reduction of competences of the academic senate. The senate is the main representative of the “academic village” of every university. They decide many essential things like choosing a rector, economic matters, they approve the budget, grants, and many other things; and with the newly proposed law, these things would be watched over or be relocated somewhere else.

So, the question is: Which side are you choosing? In my humble opinion, the proposed law wouldn´t hurt universities as much as they are making it out to be. The government would regulate what is being spent where and mostly help universities improve their standard compared to other national universities and by that improve international recognition for graduates of Slovakian universities.